

Surrender would simply have inflated the ego and whetted the appetite of the FLQ, while at the same time enervating and eroding the will of governments and society to resist the encroachments of these criminals.

I think the House will subscribe to the proposition that no freely elected government can ever be held to ransom. We are fully conscious of the danger to the two men who are in the hands of these abductors. We have respect for them and their lives and are deeply sensitive to the responsibilities we have with regard to how to deal with this matter. But I do not believe that any release or exchange of prisoners—criminals—in return for the victims of kidnapping would have solved the problem. I do not think that any of us could be sure that it would even have saved lives.

Mr. Lewis: No one has suggested otherwise.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Many people have, Mr. Speaker, but I am not going to pick an argument with anybody at this stage. I am merely setting the ground for the atmosphere within which the action of the government has been taken.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Any exchange would merely have invited escalation: hostage for prisoner, hostage for criminal. And there would have been no stop to it.

It is rather a false logic for people to suggest that if we resist these demands we are imperilling the lives of these people and would indirectly be killing the victims. What type of false logic is that? If the victims were killed, then they would have been killed by the abductors. There is no way that that responsibility can be shifted. We have a duty not only to try to save those lives but to anticipate the danger in which other lives might be placed. So we had to act, Mr. Speaker.

It is true, as some distinguished members of the House said earlier, that there had been a developing situation, and I will deal with that later. There had been a recent and rapid escalation. I believe that the climate that had been set by an attempt to negotiate, by the vocabulary which had been adopted of "political prisoners", the use of the word "execution" of those who had been kidnapped instead of "murder", as if to imply some legitimacy, placed the government in a position of immobility whereby all the action in terms of public opinion was left to a bunch of renegades and the government was having difficulty sustaining its position.

All that has now stopped. I believe that the rules of this House ought to be waived this afternoon if this debate is not finished. I believe that the House should deal with this resolution, since it is of such importance that Parliament ought to pronounce upon it at one continuous sitting. This would let the people of Canada know the position we are taking.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): We have brought this resolution to Parliament to test the will of Parliament.

Invoking of War Measures Act

There is no attempt whatsoever being made to evade parliamentary scrutiny.

Mr. Fairweather: You had to bring it here because the law so provides.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No. Any ten members can rise and challenge a proclamation, but there is nothing within the law to force the government to bring this proclamation before Parliament. We did it because we believed the people of Canada should be involved.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I do not believe this House should rise until Parliament has pronounced upon this resolution so the people of Canada, the people of Quebec and the terrorists know exactly what Parliament says.

An hon. Member: We will stay.

Mr. Baldwin: You asked for it; it is agreed.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): I understand we have unanimous agreement to that proposition, Mr. Speaker.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Perhaps in the light of the agreement I heard from all sides of the House I might invite you, Mr. Speaker, to make an order to the effect that this House shall sit until this resolution is dealt with.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. I am not too sure what the proposition is.

An hon. Member: Neither is he.

Mr. Speaker: I believe the hon. Minister of Justice has made a motion which at this point would require the unanimous consent of the House that the House pursue its sitting beyond the usual time of adjournment, for the purpose of continuing the debate on the motion now before the House, until obtaining a resolution of the House thereon.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, we might be prepared to agree to that, but surely this is not the way to deal with a matter of this sort, in the middle of an hon. member's speech. I should like to suggest that the House Leaders get together in the next hour or so, and if there is a disposition to continue the debate certainly I, for one, will raise no objection. Surely, this is the proper way to conduct the business of this House.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. It is apparent that there is no unanimous consent at this point. In any event, I