

*Invoking of War Measures Act*

motion today, those regulations would not stay in effect. We are appealing now to the House for its decision.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Roberts:** The government is not escaping its responsibility; it is coming to the podium of the people and their representatives to hear their declaration on the appropriateness or not of its action. I do not think we can say, as some hon. members have suggested, that it is fear that keeps members from pronouncing honestly on this question, or that there is one member in this House, given the gravity of this question, who would squelch his conscience in order to support a government in an action of which he fundamentally disapproves.

This measure is not sweeping. Its limited regulations refer only to organizations which are threatening to overthrow or to reform the government by violence. It is not a permanent measure, it is a temporary one. This measure does not give continual authority to the government. It calls that authority back into question within six months. It is not a blank cheque; it is a cheque that can be cancelled within six months. There is not a suspension of legal processes in these regulations but simply a delay in their operation, a maximum delay of 90 days before a trial must be set. That is the most extensive interference with what has been the traditional liberty of Canadians, not a suspension of the judicial processes but simply a delay in applying them.

How should we judge this limited specific set of regulations which the government has provided? Not, I suggest, with wild alarms and excursions in the night. Instead, we should ask ourselves: do the conditions warrant this kind of limited response? Is there a "clear and present danger" to the security of our society? I suggest that while members may have different views on this, the responsibility must be weighed by the government carefully and it must be taken not simply in conjunction with the isolated set of events that have taken place in the past two weeks. We are not simply speaking of the possibility of two brave men going to their death. We are speaking about events that have taken place this last week in the context of events over the past decade, in the context of a society which is larger than that of Canada, of an international society of which we are members.

I suggest that in the past decade we have had sufficient experience in South America, and in other countries, and sufficient knowledge of revolutionary techniques and ideology to see that this is not simply an isolated event but one step in the continuing process to an increasingly violent attempt to overthrow established government. It is a step on a road to considerable insurrection. We are not speaking simply of one series of events. We are talking about a slippery slope. We are asked to approve action which will determine that the government will not descend that slope and start running away from its responsibilities for action, a running away from which there would be no turning back.

The fundamental question that faces us is whether our citizens can rely on the protection of law or whether they

[Mr. Roberts.]

must submit and come to terms with the practitioners of violence and terror. I suggest to you that a terrorized society cannot be a free society, and I doubt whether anyone who had any knowledge of Quebec could have doubted in the past week that it is a society in danger of being terrorized. If the government loses its own confidence in its capacity to maintain the principles of law and order, how can the citizen find that government credible? What we face is the possible replacement of the law of authority by anarchy and the law of the jungle.

[Translation]

Mr. Speaker, I cannot speak on behalf of Quebecers. The hon. member for York-South (Mr. Lewis) has dared do so. He made predictions as to the future of Quebec and acted as spokesman for that province.

I cannot speak on behalf of Quebecers, but I can speak to the French Canadians of Quebec and of Canada with the hope of getting through to them. I want to tell them that some English-speaking Canadians do recognize the situation which their province is facing. I want to tell them that the issue is not one of choosing between imperialism and independence, between isolation and membership in the Confederation, between francophones and anglophones, but of a choice between democratic and liberal institutions mellowed over centuries of tradition. The choice open to Quebecers is one between civilization and barbarism.

Mr. Speaker, I am a young man and if I were a Quebecer, I could perhaps be a separatist. However, I could never be a separatist in an independent Quebec animated by a spirit like the one which we have come to know these last couple of weeks.

The heart of the matter lies not in whether or not Quebec must stay within the Confederation, because if the terrorists come out on top, whether Quebec is in the Confederation or not, Quebec society will fall a victim of terrorism.

The hon. member for York-South has mentioned an "over-reaction" on the government's part. He fears that the population of Quebec will direct its sympathy towards FLQ members.

However, I can see the possibility of a crystalizing of opinion in the province of Quebec.

I hope this will be a true acknowledgement of the facts, for revolution is not a game played by amateurs or an abstraction concocted by intellectuals; it is the thirst for blood rampant in the minds of evil-haunted murderers.

The FLQ terrorists do not fight for the independence of Quebec; they seek violence not order, fear not freedom, distress not peace.

[English]

I would also like to say something to my fellow Canadians who are English speaking. That is to emphasize what I have already said in French, that this is not a question of one part of our country being against another, of one faction being against another faction. It is a question of a group of extreme, violent, determined, warped madmen, a tiny group who are seeking to impose