

Public Order Act, 1970

only the province of Quebec instead of the provinces as a whole.

A revolutionary movement could just as well start in Toronto, in Winnipeg or in Regina. The proof is that politicians from Regina have been known to say that they might free themselves one day from Canada to join the United-States.

The premier of Saskatchewan said that.

An hon. Member: Ross Thatcher?

Mr. Caouette: The Liberal premier, a former colleague of my friends of the New Democratic Party—

• (8:10 p.m.)

[English]

Mr. Benjamin: I shall have to listen to the translation of this.

An hon. Member: You'll never believe it.

Mr. Caouette: Ross Thatcher was a friend of mine though he was not a Social Creditor. He was a member of the CCF and I feel that he is still with the CCF, though he did give better leadership than the NDP has now.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, the minister contradicts himself when he says:

This bill does not deal with force used or crime used to overthrow a government in Quebec with respect to the rest of Canada, by the FLQ or another association that might succeed it.

I agree with the minister, but that bill is especially aimed at the FLQ.

The hon. member for Champlain stated the following:

We all agree on that, there is no doubt about it. However, as to the second point, it is that we could eventually use it "as a means of accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change within Canada." The P.Q. could advocate "the same government change" as—

And here is what the Minister of Justice answered to that:

Mr. Chairman, in reply to the question put by the hon. member, I should say that all the words have to be read as a whole. The bill is directed at the FLQ and any eventual successor group. The FLQ is defined as "any group of persons or associations that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. member, but his time has expired.

Some hon. Members: Go on.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Is there unanimous consent to allow the hon. member for Témiscamingue (Mr. Caouette) to complete his remarks?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Caouette: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am grateful to my colleagues and to the Minister of Justice for letting

[Mr. Caouette.]

me finish my speech. I shall not abuse of the additional time given me.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to point out here that the minister contradicted himself when he said in one place:

—force used or crime used to overthrow a government in Quebec—

—and further on—

—force or the commission of crime as a means of accomplishing governmental change—

But the whole thing is no clearer than pipe juice. One the one hand, people are to be prevented from overthrowing the Canadian government and on the other hand we must protect the government of Quebec in its relationship to Canada.

It is that opposition between the province of Quebec and the rest of Canada we cannot approve. I have had the opportunity, as I said this afternoon, of travelling throughout Canada and everywhere I said I did not want a special status for Quebec. I am not asking for more.

As we are considering Bill-181 we all agree that we must adopt measures to prevent the overthrow of a government by violence. But that law should not apply only in Quebec but everywhere in Canada.

It is because we recognize the need to adopt measures to prevent terrorism that we have voted for the application of the War Measures Act. It was urgent to resort to it since rebellion was threatening in the province of Quebec and terrorist acts, kidnappings and murders were committed in Quebec.

But we maintain that the law must be the same for the ten provinces to prevent similar acts in the other provinces.

• (8:20 p.m.)

My colleagues have tried to call the attention of both the government and the Minister of Justice to that point.

The minister, in my opinion, should be more specific. There is not one member in this House who would want to pass a legislation applicable to Quebec only. Otherwise, it would amount to backing up our friend the leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Douglas) whose campaign at the last general election centered around a special status for the province of Quebec. On the other hand, the Leader of the Official Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) he was advocating the theory of two nations in Canada. Therefore, we pass one bill applicable to one nation residing in Quebec and another one for the other nation living elsewhere in Canada.

Parliament must be careful when passing a legislation, even if it will only be in force until the end of April next. Then, the government should introduce legislation of a permanent character which would respect individual liberties while protecting Canadian society as a whole, without favouring any special group.

Our position is simple: let us pass the legislation we want, but it is important to bring in reforms which will allow all Canadians to feel free and secure in this country.