

We are not here attacking a co-operative, a credit union, the Bar or the College of Physicians, for instance. The FLQists, as far as I know, do not have membership cards. It is therefore difficult for those who are responsible for applying the law to identify the members of the FLQ or those who strive to achieve its aims.

Mr. Chairman, that is why the following words were inserted in clause 4 (c):

—on behalf of or—

If those words were not included in the clause, some people could work for the FLQ without being liable to prosecution, since they would not be or profess to be members of the FLQ. Here, Mr. Chairman, some claim it is censorship. But I wonder if a different yardstick is not applied to the same thing.

I recall that not so long ago the House passed a legislation against hate propaganda and hon. members will remember whom was attacked by the so-called hate propaganda.

In such cases, censorship can be allowed. But if publishing texts, information orders or instructions such as those that were given between October 5 and 15 is forbidden, it is said that censorship is applied and that it should not be.

Mr. Chairman, I feel that some distinctions must be made. For example, if the RCMP forbids a university newspaper to publish the FLQ manifesto, as some of our large newspapers did, that could perhaps be considered as censorship, but if the board of the university prohibits the management of a university newspaper from publishing that text, I think that it will no longer be the same kind of censorship. Then, an organization which can allow or prevent the publication of such and such a thing is involved.

Mr. Chairman, in our Canadian universities and junior colleges, the publication of quite inflammatory articles has in the past been allowed and as far as I know, we have never heard protests from those who object to clause 4(c).

In my opinion, clause 4 (c) should be passed as such and I intend to support it.

[English]

The Deputy Chairman: Order. Is the committee ready for the question?

Some hon. Members: Question.

Amendment (Mr. Lewis) negatived: yeas, 17; nays, 41.

The Deputy Chairman: I declare the amendment lost. Shall clause 4 carry? It is my duty to interrupt proceedings in order to proceed to the consideration of Private Members' Business.

Mr. Baldwin: Mr. Chairman, before you leave the chair I shall make a proposition which you can carry forward when you go to the chair. I should like to ask the committee, when they become the House, if they would be prepared to give up private members' hour—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Business of the House

Mr. Baldwin:—provided we agree to sit long enough tonight to end all questions put in the House.

Some hon. Members: No, no.

Progress reported.

* * *

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

Mr. Deputy Speaker: It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Winnipeg North Centre (Mr. Knowles); Finance, suggested interim income tax changes to assist pensioners; the hon. member for Frontenac-Lennox and Addington (Mr. Alkenbrack); Eganville, progress toward new federal building; the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett); Industry, Trade and Commerce, European common market and Canada's agricultural products, discussion at congress.

It being five o'clock the House will now proceed.

* * *

BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

USE OF PRIVATE MEMBERS' HOUR FOR GOVERNMENT BUSINESS

Mr. G. W. Baldwin (Peace River): Mr. Speaker, may I now formally put my suggestion forward as the representative of the official opposition.

Mr. J. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa-Whitby): Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. member for Peace River would withdraw the condition that we must finish tonight. Certainly, members in this party want to finish as early as possible. Yet at the same time, we intend to make what we regard to be serious arguments on serious amendments. If we have this hour now, it may be that we would finish tonight. However, I believe it would be unwise and undesirable from our point of view to make such a commitment.

• (5:00 p.m.)

Mr. Baldwin: With the type of flexibility we will display when we form the government, I am prepared to accept that condition.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Is there unanimous consent that the private members' hour will be dispensed with under the conditions outlined and agreed between the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) and the hon. member for Oshawa Whitby (Mr. Broadbent)?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

Mr. Deputy Speaker: The committee will resume.