

pletely. As a matter of fact, you can have situations where one man declares he is going to terrorize a society and who does terrorize society. This was done for a while in Boston by the Boston strangler.

When you have threats made by a group and you do not know how large the group is, and the group carries out its threats by bombing, by kidnapping and by murder, then I suggest it is the duty of the state to take measures to protect its citizens. The government of this country did take measures to protect its citizens, and I think that again this government will take measures to protect its citizens.

I find it somewhat strange that today the Conservative Party want to make the committee stand in judgment upon something for which that party voted last fall. They are now asking that the committee that it is proposed should study this matter stand in judgment upon a vote and a decision that they took last fall in voting for the regulations under the War Measures Act and in voting for the Public Order (Temporary Measures) Act. Now they are doing a bit of a flip-flop. I do not know whether they think the political winds have changed, but it is very difficult to understand their approach. It is my impression, with all the good faith in the world, that they are still trying to make politics out of what is a very serious issue, an issue which in my province is one of life and death.

The number of people that can terrorize a society, as I have said, can consist of a very small group. But I think we must realize that in addition to that small group committed to carrying out violence under the name of the FLQ there were also others who had great sympathy for what they were trying to do. Although they were not using guns, dynamite or other types of weapons, they were ready to assist those who were. Right now there are people on trial for doing just that, people who have helped hide those who were being pursued by the police, who built secret compartments in their homes and apartments and who helped find houses for the FLQ.

I would say that there were probably large numbers of people—I do not know how many—ready to support the FLQ if they were able to go further, and who are sympathetic to their cause. That is an unfortunate statement to make, but I think it is true. We have seen in Quebec over the last few years hatred and violence expressed in the city of St. Leonard, where there were very terrible riots. We have seen this violence at the St. Jean Baptist parades in 1968 and in 1969, where people were injured, property was damaged and riots broke out. We have also seen it at the march on McGill by thousands of people where, again, property and life were threatened.

● (9:50 p.m.)

Mr. Broadbent: Will the hon. member permit a question?

Mr. Allmand: Yes.

Mr. Broadbent: If the hon. member knows, will he reflect, in the context of his comments, upon the events that took place last week in Washington when several

National Securities Measures

thousand people decided to virtually bring the government of that country to a standstill? That was the openly-declared purpose of the mass demonstration. The United States government did not declare a war measures act, or say that an insurrection was about to take place, although it might well have decided to do so, being faced with the threat of several thousand people who said they were going to bring the government to a standstill. That government used the normal process of law to arrest 7,000 people, keeping them incarcerated for a brief period of time and then releasing them. Would the hon. member, who is defending his government, compare its action with the actions of the government to our south?

Mr. Allmand: Mr. Speaker, I saw a film of what happened in Washington, and the events that took place there seemed to be peaceful. The men and women who went to Washington did not threaten to use violence. They declared in advance that they would not use violence. I think they conducted themselves in a very peaceful way, and I would have supported them. On the other hand, if you consider the St. Leonard demonstration and the riots that followed, the riots that took place during the police strike in Montreal and the riots that took place at other times in that city—

An hon. Member: All insurrections?

Mr. Allmand: The apprehended insurrection, as I said in my speech on the War Measures Act, constituted threats to carry out violence in order to destroy the constitution of the state—not by the traditional type of revolution with armed revolutionaries in the streets challenging the armed forces but by threatening terrorism, selective assassination, bombings and violence in an attempt to throw society into a state of imbalance in which people could no longer feel free to do the things one can do in a democratic state. Under these circumstances people might cease to stand for public office, cease to speak out as they might like, cease to govern in the province and cease to live in a province in which they were not free to do the things one can do in a democratic society.

You do not need a revolution in order to cause this type of atmosphere. All you have to do is establish a group which publicly declares it is going to assassinate, commit terrorism and bombings. This group in fact has carried out an average of one bombing every ten days over seven years and has caused the death of seven people. We must remember that the group which did this threatened the lives of two important people, one a diplomat and one a cabinet minister. At that time no one knew where the violence would stop. This government took strong action to see that nothing else happened, and I suggest that nothing else did happen because the government took that action.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Allmand: As a matter of fact, since last October we have had relative peace in Montreal and Quebec. Because we have had relative peace I was against the prolongation of the public order act. This is why I believe