

what the bill before us is trying to stop them from doing. You asked for evidence. In 1965, FLQ terrorism included the derailment of two trains, endangering the lives of hundreds of people.

Mr. Paproski: What did the government do about it?

Mr. Hogarth: On May 5, 1966, a 65 year old office employee was killed by an FLQ bomb. His family knows who the FLQ are. In 1968, 300 sticks of dynamite were stolen from The Chomedy quarry, and that year there were 21 bombings, including the bombing of the Montreal city hall.

Mr. Paproski: Where was the government?

Mr. Hogarth: The FLQ bombed the Montreal stock exchange on February 13, 1969, injuring 27 innocent people. On September 28, 1969, the home of the mayor of the city of Montreal was bombed. On June 24, 1970, an FLQ explosive killed a 50-year old Ottawa civil servant.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order, please. Perhaps at this time the Chair should remind hon. members that the debate is now on the amendment which would refer the bill back to the committee for the purpose of establishing an independent body to review the administration of the said bill. The Chair has been lenient and has given some leeway to the previous speaker, but I feel that at this time I should remind hon. members to try to confine themselves as much as possible to the amendment. It is only after a vote has been taken on the amendment that a general debate on all the clauses of the bill can be entered into, unless another amendment is put forward.

[Translation]

So I would ask hon. members to keep as much as possible to the matter now under consideration, that is, the advisability of referring the bill to the Committee of the Whole, with a view to adding to it provisions aimed at the establishment of an independent review agency.

Even if so far the discussion has extended over the subject of such an independent committee to review those measures provided in the bill, I feel that it is important at this stage to ask hon. members to keep as much as possible to the amendment under consideration.

[English]

Mr. Hogarth: I certainly appreciate your directions, Mr. Speaker, but it would appear to me that since the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald), asked these questions and said that there was no evidence, I am entitled to put some of the evidence before him and before the House.

Let me say, to conclude, that there have been riots. There is ample documentation to show what the FLQ intended eventually. There have been kidnappings and the infiltration of federal and provincial agencies. There has been all kinds of evidence.

Public Order Act, 1970

Mr. Paproski: But you did not believe it was in the Company of Young Canadians.

Mr. Hogarth: There has been all kinds of evidence to indicate that this legislation is necessary. When the hon. member says he does not believe it, may I point out to him that if he reads the Committee minutes relating to that evidence he will find I asked why it was that the then government of Quebec had not requested assistance from us. He will see that when the present government of Quebec asked us for assistance, this government acted.

Mr. Paproski: You should have acted there and then.

Mr. Hogarth: That is the point on the proposed amendment of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas). The government of Quebec, whatever political philosophy it might have, is and has been responsible for the administration of justice in the province of Quebec. We are responsible for the establishment of the substantive law.

Mr. Paproski: Then be responsible.

Mr. Hogarth: We are responsible for the establishment of the laws of criminal procedure, but this government is not responsible, nor can it assume the responsibility, for looking after the administration of justice in Quebec. The political decision has been made, and the sound constitutional decision has been made, that the law that we have before us is to continue with the same constitutional provision we have with respect to all our criminal law, and that is that the administration of justice is the responsibility of the attorney general in any province in which justice is to be administered. In this instance we have provided that the attorney general of Quebec have broad powers in dealing with the liberty of the citizen, and he has established *de facto* what is really requested in this amendment.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Where?

Mr. Hogarth: It was announced in this House. The names were given. In addition, there have been absolutely no complaints filed with the federal Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) that he has not carried out his duties properly in the interests of the administration of justice not only in Quebec but in the whole of the country. How could we gain by, first of all, entering the field of the administration of justice by accepting this amendment or one of the amendments similar to it that have been put forward and then telling the attorney general of Quebec that, on the one hand, we give him these powers but, on the other hand, not only are we going to ensure that they are properly carried out but we are going to have independent citizens see that they are? This is absurd. So, we would delegate the administration of justice not even to the Attorney General of Canada or the attorney general of Quebec but, in the last analysis, to a group of independent citizens. How absurd can you get. This is manifestly out of the question.