

part of an editorial by Alain Guilbert in the *Sherbrooke Tribune*. Mr. Guilbert had this to say:

—As the situation is serious and urgent in Quebec, as well as in Canada, could not the Bank of Canada make available to Quebec interest-free loans that would enable the province to launch large projects such as the Trans-Quebec Highway, low-rent housing—

—Also the construction of roads and public buildings.

Such investments would mean decreasing unemployment, restoration of the social climate and promotion of private investments.

The situation appears urgent and severe enough not to dismiss lightly the solution proposed by the *Ralliement des créditistes*. It should at least be considered seriously—

Interest free loans for the construction of public buildings would help improve the situation but we could do better by distributing the affluence of our country amongst the Canadian people. That would be a true reform.

According to federal statistics, the production of goods and services in Canada this year will reach about \$77 billion. Moreover, the Canadian people will earn a total income of about \$55 billion. How can you buy goods for \$77 billion with only \$55 billion? It seems to me that the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion, or any hon. member, is able to understand that with \$55 billion you cannot buy for \$77 billion worth. At the present time there is in Canada an undistributed production of \$22 billion for lack of purchasing power to buy it.

This is when the *Créditistes* suggest the distribution to every Canadian citizen, including the Minister of Justice and every member, of a national dividend based on the surplus of production, the national revenue, which amounts to \$55 billion. They find this suggestion ridiculous.

This government will spend this year \$140 million to encourage western farmers not to grow wheat. Instead of paying western farmers not to grow wheat, why not distribute this money to the Canadian people so that they could buy bread and the wheat the farmers are able to produce? Of course not, the *Créditiste* solution is foolish.

The Quebec dairy producers are penalized because they produce too much milk and the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Olson) says, as well as the Prime Minister, that we must increase our productivity if we want to fight unemployment and create jobs, but they do exactly the opposite.

They advocate one thing but they do the opposite. Then we do our utmost to pass legislation such as the piece now, before us, in order to urge the people not to rebel.

Mr. Speaker, I was in western Canada not so long ago. I noticed that the farmers are angry at the government. In the East, farmers, workers and unemployed feel the same way. And the government says that for the sake of inflation, we must be patient. Today, we have some evi-

Public Order Act, 1970

dence that not all the people are ready to be patient for the sake of inflation.

Those who revolted in Montreal or elsewhere in Quebec, are not the 30-, 60- or 70-year olds, but the young of 16, 18 or 20 years of age. The great part of those who are now detained in jail are about 20, the same as our own children. Who can tell if our own children will not take their place, tomorrow, considering the situation that is prevailing? When our young people cannot integrate themselves in our society, it is obvious that they will blow it up. And this is what we have now.

It is hoped to prevent these revolts and soothe these feelings of discontent by passing a law such as we are now considering.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned earlier this afternoon that before he became a Liberal member of Parliament, the Secretary of State had always been against the government. He was a kind of revolutionary. He was a close friend of Vallières who is presently in jail in Montreal. He was even his boss and his editing collaborator for the magazine *Cité Libre* and the newspaper *La Presse* of Montreal.

Mr. Speaker, if the Secretary of State was not a Liberal member, he might be with the members of the FLQ who are now detained in Montreal.

Let us be logical. On November 23, my colleague from Bellechase (Mr. Lambert) asked the Minister of Justice what would happen if a similar situation should come up in a province other than Quebec. Would Bill C-181 apply throughout Canada or only to a particular territory?

The Minister of Justice replied that this legislation would apply to the whole of Canada and that the target would be the FLQ or any association which would succeed it.

To my mind, the minister contradicts himself. My colleague of Champlain (Mr. Matte) felt that the amendment to clause 3 was complex and prejudicial to Quebec citizens because it mentioned "the province of Quebec". As reported at page 1393 of *Hansard*, the minister of Justice answered as follows:

—agree with the hon. member that we should be against terrorism and crime. This bill does not deal with force or crime in general but with force used or crime used to overthrow a government in Quebec—

But why should this measure apply only to Quebec? If it were applied to Ontario, with regard to Canada, would it not be the same? We ask the minister to state in the legislation that this measure is to apply not only to Quebec but to any other province. It could just as well be British Columbia. In fact, the other day, a teacher declared himself in favour of the FLQ or "FLV" in Vancouver. The authorities did not hesitate one minute in bringing this teacher to heel and dismissing him, I think, from the University of British Columbia. They had no need for Bill C-181 to act there.

But in the present circumstances, what my colleagues wanted the minister to notice is that Bill C-181 mentions