

regulations are used. I think it well to underline that the exceptional powers which the government has actually taken are not the full scope of the powers which would have been available to the government under the War Measures Act. The government could under that act, if the situation had warranted, have requested regulations of a much wider nature than it did. It has not done so and has already in this way, by drawing the regulations as narrowly as it thought advisable, indicated its good faith. I believe that the test of the government's intention, and that the test of what the government is here doing, will be the way in which these powers are exercised in the succeeding weeks and months. Unlike the opposition, I am not prepared to make a judgment before the evidence is at hand. I propose to wait to see the future fate of these regulations and their enforcement, before I make a judgment as to whether or not the powers which the government has assumed are undue.

There are legitimate concerns both about the wording and the consequences of the assumption of these awesome powers by the government. Some of these questions have been raised by members of the opposition. I disagree with some of their arguments, even while recognizing the legitimacy of the concern they have expressed.

The predominant tone of this debate has been political. The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) expressed the view that the government in power must be prepared to answer for the crisis situation. The most remarkable speech along this line, and I very much regret he is not with us in the House at the moment, was made by the leader of the NDP, the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas).

This hon. member made not one but two speeches at the same time. First, he made a statesman's speech in which he said there was no room in Canada for violence. He said, as reported at page 197 of *Hansard*:

—we believe that to allow any group to dictate terms to the democratic, elected government of this country is to invite anarchy and chaos in Canada.

He put himself and his party on record as opposing that. He then went on to make his second speech, his contrary and political speech. After having recognized the problem and the way to deal with it, he in effect, denied the government the effective means of dealing with it. This might have been tenable if his chief argument had been that the government should have proceeded by way of statute rather than by way of regulation. He did make that objection, but the main thrust of his political, second speech was that the government and the Prime Minister personally were responsible for this crisis.

The hon. member recited all the ills of the province of Quebec with no recognition of the special kind of threat we face in the FLQ, the threat to infiltrate our way of life by whatever means may be conveniently at hand for the use of this desperate organization.

I must admit I am reading the remarks of the hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands in light of the explanation of his remarks given by the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). The hon. member

Invoking of War Measures Act

for York South seemed to feel there had been some difficulty in understanding the remarks his leader had made and he, therefore, said he would try to repeat what had been said using different words so we could more clearly understand them. That hon. member put the matter more clearly. He said:

What is happening to Quebec is a result of the policies of this government and is a result of the inflexible attitude of the Prime Minister, which he is continually incorporating in his policies.

The situation in Quebec, he says, results from this government and this Prime Minister. What utter rot for the hon. member to parade before this House. He accused the government of repression and even challenged us to indicate where in the world what he called repression had been useful in dealing with problems of this kind. There are many examples which indicate that the judicious and limited use of force by a legitimate government has succeeded not only in protecting the people of the country but in eliminating a subversive threat that was being made by a particular group. I need mention only such countries as Kenya, Malaysia and the Philippines. In each of those countries, the government had to cope with subversive attacks on their duly constituted authority. If the hon. member does not think those countries are sufficiently western, let us look at France. As we know, General de Gaulle, who knew how to use force when it was necessary, faced down those in France who would have destroyed that country and put her into chaos.

There is a case for legitimate use of force in a democratic country. The hon. member for York South was right in stating that traditional revolution cannot succeed without popular support. He did not use the word "traditional", I put in that word. The point is that this is not traditional revolution, this is criminal war. The FLQ is not trying to win Quebec by battle in the field or, still less, unfortunately, by persuasion. It is trying to win Quebec by terror.

Last night a 27 year old girl from nearby Hull was seized in front of her house about seven o'clock by a group of men. She was carried off, was tortured throughout the night and was released in the early hours of the morning with the letters FLQ scratched across her, and with the message that the FLQ was prepared now to escalate the war not only to women but also to children. These are the methods of the FLQ. These are not the methods of a democratic group. They are the methods of a group which is determined to gain power by terror and tyranny. I am astonished that the hon. member for York South did not see fit to make such distinctions. I am astonished he did not recognize the difference between open violence and hidden violence. The violence we face in Quebec is not of the type that results from the escalation of feelings on the picket line, with which he is familiar. It is not the result of somebody performing a legitimate function who suddenly finds that his emotions get beyond his control to the extent that he breaks the peace. This is not that kind of violence. This is hidden and systematic violence.

In an interview on the CBC some months ago, we saw two FLQ members who had been trained in the Middle