

Mr. Speaker, if the government had refused to meet this urgent request from the authorities of the province of Quebec, it would have simply refused to recognize the authority or the right of a provincial government to take the line of action required to protect the people. I believe that in the circumstances, the federal authorities had to comply with the request of the government of Quebec.

Besides, Mr. Speaker, we, in our party, feel that the government could have prevented such events through amendments to the Criminal Code or other appropriate measures likely to achieve the same purposes. The thing is to know whether the government had enough time to pass such a legislation considering that the situation was deteriorating at an alarming speed.

● (4:00 p.m.)

One must have lived under that tension, and worried about one's security and that of one's family to understand the situation and appraise the importance of the decision taken by the government. I feel that we should objectively ask ourselves: What was the situation in Quebec 15 days ago, 7 days ago, a couple of days ago?

The government and the people of Quebec as well as the Canadian government were given the ultimatum by a group of revolutionaries to accede to its requests in order to spare the lives of two innocent people. The alternative was not easy for the governments, and I feel that a sense of responsibility was needed to meet the challenge as the governments of Quebec and Ottawa did. They also had to ask themselves whether there were other means at their disposal. I feel that, under the circumstances, there were none.

In any event, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the member for Cumberland-Colchester North (Mr. Coates), proposed the kind of amendment that will surely ease whatever concern some people might have if the emergency measures were to be maintained over a long period of time.

I trust the government will seriously consider this amendment. Obviously, the measure set before the house smacks of dictatorship and interference with fundamental civil liberties. There is the danger of too strict a control of the state over the individual. That is why we, of the Progressive Conservative Party, have cause for concern if the government intends to apply these emergency measures over too long a period. That is why my colleague moved this amendment. I hope the government will indicate to us that it does not intend to use these extraordinary powers to inflict its whims upon the people.

That is what my colleague was trying to point out earlier.

I would have voted against the measures proposed by the government, but if I have decided, along with some of my colleagues, to support the government, it is because we were to refuse our full support to the government for the implementation of the measures taken, we would be supplying additional weapons to the FLQ, which would use that argument to denounce the autocracy, the interference and the authoritarianism of governments. I would not want to take that chance, because

#### *Invoking of War Measures Act*

radio, television and the press have already given them too much publicity.

**Mr. Marcel Roy (Laval):** Say that to your leader.

**Mr. Valade:** Mr. Speaker, I could easily answer the hon. member for Laval and tell him some government members disagree with the government on that point.

**An hon. Member:** Name them.

**Mr. Valade:** Ask them.

**An hon. Member:** Name them.

**Mr. Valade:** Here is proof that some government members are not being serious about such an important question. And, had I wished to answer, I would have been side-tracked by government members—

**An hon. Member:** Name them.

**Mr. Valade:** —and we would fail to discuss the subject matter and the importance of the question. I do not intend to digress right now, but I shall do so some other time. This is a serious matter, and I feel it is not the proper time to make jokes.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) once said: Enough of this nonsense. Today, it is not nonsense we are discussing but the very serious situation that now exists in Canada. Some 10,000 policemen and a great number of troops are now posted all over Montreal, and specially outside the homes of all diplomats and officials of municipal, provincial and federal governments. That is an indication of a state of things so serious that we cannot afford to wander off into frolic and nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, the information function of the press was discussed earlier. I am among those in the House who are entitled to complain of the lack of objective information supplied by parliamentary reporters with a few exceptions, as our Liberal colleague who spoke before me stated.

Quebec newspapers almost totally lack objective information as regards members of the opposition and here is proof. During the month of November 1969, I asked the government to think seriously of the situation which existed in that province and I said, as recorded on page 453 of *Hansard*:

Mr. Speaker, to close one's eyes and to pretend that things will settle with time is to sit on an erupting volcano.

For too long the Prime Minister of Canada has ignored or made light of the many warnings that were given to him, both in this House and outside. When tolerance, Mr. Speaker, turns to flabbiness, when liberalism becomes licence and political dogma obliterates authority, sweeping reforms are needed to prevent a disaster.

The government answered that we could not foresee that the situation would degenerate into this critical state. This is not true. We were talking about it in the House last year and the newspapers never mentioned our interventions. Were they bent on hiding our warnings to the government? Was what we were saying too serious for them to find the "sensationalism" needed for their