

through the means of terror and violence their undemocratic will upon a society which has democratically shown that it rejects their pattern for the future of Quebec. The men who have violently conducted their tasks within the past two weeks are no more typical of the Quebec society of today than the Doukhobors with their violence are typical of western Canada.

The greatest error that we could make, a tragic error, would be to let the events of the past seduce us into believing that there is divergence among the views of the English or French speaking Canadians on how those criminals should be treated. I am confident that the people of Quebec will react with hostility and with anger to the desperate actions with which we have been faced.

Liberty must grow out of order. It cannot grow from anarchy and it cannot exist in a society where the government has renounced its responsibility for the preservation of the authority of the law.

We have heard from some members of the opposition today counsel for delay, for drift, for reflection, for compromise, for irresolution, for continued delay in legislation. I say we are face to face with those who believe that power grows out of the barrels of guns, who will fight for power with guns and who will maintain a violent society with bloodshed and guns. It is time for a determination to maintain the principles of civilized conduct and law and order so that we do not relinquish ourselves to that black night of despair of a society which has succumbed to the strength of brute, violent and unprincipled power.

• (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. David MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker, I would think that no one on either side of this House could feel the debate we are having here today is not one of great import for the nation. Regardless of what views have been stated here in this debate today, it would be a very foolish person indeed who did not feel we were in effect dealing with the very vitals of the nation itself.

I cannot help but think as well, as I stand here as a member of this House, that there is a very unusual situation in this country tonight in that I am one of the 264 people left in the Dominion of Canada who still have the right to say what they feel and believe. Tragically, none of my fellow citizens has that kind of freedom in this land tonight.

Mr. Olson: Nonsense; read the regulations.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I am going to deal with the regulations very shortly, but I think it must be a person either with lack of eyesight or ability to read who has looked at these regulations even quickly and not realized the kind of sweeping power that has been given to less than 30 men in terms of the freedoms, rights and privileges exercised in a free society. And while some may not be thinking it tonight, I believe that many of our fellow citizens will look back on this day, this black Friday in Canadian history and say, "This is the end of what has been termed a just society." The just society has come to mean, and will come to mean, the suspension

Invoking of War Measures Act

of freedoms and privileges for the citizens of this country.

We have been concerned over the last week or two weeks with the kidnapping of two eminent men in our society, one a citizen of this country, the other a diplomat. We have been concerned about the fate of these two men, the possible securing of their freedom, and the questionable ransom involved. Now, we are not just concerned with the ransom of two men, we are concerned about the possible ransom of 21 million people in this country. I, for one, engage in this debate not with any great sense of wellbeing as to the outcome of this action by the government of the country.

What has been done? There has been some suggestion here today that we have spent too much time looking at the War Measures Act because, as speaker after speaker on the government side has said, from the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) on down, "We have been asked to take this action and proclaim the War Measures Act. We have of necessity proclaimed it as an act in effect, but we have confined ourselves to these regulations." And while I think it would be quite possible, as it has indeed been possible for many members of the House, to make the case that at two o'clock, three o'clock or four o'clock tomorrow morning, or any morning, the government might want to expand and broaden these powers, I am quite prepared for the purpose of this debate to confine myself to what the regulations have to say. I think that any person concerned with the basic functioning of a free society, giving only a modest amount of thought to these regulations, would be disturbed to the greatest possible degree.

I invite members of the House to look at the regulations with me and to examine, first of all, the interpretation of particularly important words used in the regulations. Perhaps I should even raise a question at this stage upon which the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) could advise us, although I am not sure that a legal opinion given by him in this House would be binding in any future legal action. The first definition of which I speak, concerning a peace officer, reads;

—a peace officer as defined in the Criminal Code and includes a member of the Canadian Armed Forces;

We are not told by this definition whether that means active or reserve, duty or off-duty. One could well wonder at the kind of implications this might have for men who might suddenly be faced with a situation which would lead them to take the law into their own hands. Certainly, there is no definition along those lines in this particular interpretation.

But that is not the most serious of the interpretative aspects of these regulations because in the very next paragraph, in the definition of statements, we find this:

"statements" includes words spoken or written or recorded electronically or electromagnetically or otherwise, and gestures, signs or other visible representations;

I ask members of the House what kind of sweeping power does this give to any police officer or any court when the reference is to gestures, signs or other visible representations, which could be part and parcel of man's indictment? We have a Prime Minister who is very well