

kidnappers and murderers who are guilty of crimes and subject to procedures under the Criminal Code. Actually, it is directed against those shadowy, unknown figures who have been lurking in the background since this crisis began, people who have never been defined, named or found but who are the justification for a continuing state of emergency and crisis. Who are they? How many are there? Where are they? Will they ever be caught?

Do these few people—if there are any—who are still at large and cannot be charged under the Criminal Code in any way justify this bill? Even if the bill is justified, is it justified in its present terms without the normal protection of the law? I say that regardless of what we have done up to the present time, and regardless of the mistakes that have been made or the praise that has been given, it is time to get back to normal. I think we can make one move toward getting back to normal in this country by accepting the amendment that has been offered.

Mr. Steven Otto (York East): Mr. Speaker,—

Mr. Faulkner: Call it five o'clock.

Mr. Otto: With friends like that I do not need enemies. Listening to this debate over the past two weeks, it would appear that we are introducing some sort of new legislation. We have had speeches about the severity of the measure and its lack of justice as if, indeed, we were introducing some brand new law that would restrict the rights of all citizens.

I would remind this House that this is not new legislation. We have in force at the present time the War Measures Act; the purpose of this legislation is to replace that act with something less onerous, something not quite so severe, and something that will last for a specific length of time. Indeed, the time is so short that I wonder whether we will get through the bill before the expiry date of this legislation. But my point is that we are not imposing new restrictions on the Canadian people.

If members want to be honest, they would have to say: "We don't want this legislation. We want to do away with the War Measures Act. There is no crisis in Montreal or in Quebec, indeed no crisis whatever. Let the FLQ do what it likes". That is what is being said.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Come, come!

Mr. Otto: The hon. member who has just taken his seat said there was no crisis and never has been one. If hon. gentlemen believe that, let them stand up and say so. But why say that this legislation is so repressive—

Mr. Aiken: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege.

Public Order Act, 1970

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. Is the hon. member rising on a point of privilege?

Mr. Aiken: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I hope the hon. member was listening to my speech, because I did not say that there never was a crisis.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order. I wish to remind the hon. member that the point he has made is not a point of privilege but merely a point of debate. The hon. member for York East.

Mr. Otto: I will not debate the issue, Mr. Speaker. I thought I heard the hon. member say that he doubted whether there was a crisis. However, if he now says that there was and that the introduction of the War Measures Act was justified, then I am pleased to hear him say that. May I remind the members of this House that this legislation is indeed less onerous than what is in force at the present time, and no one has denied that. Neither has anyone mentioned that this legislation has a definite expiry date.

Now, I am not going to deny that there will be abuses of this legislation. There are always abuses of legislation which deprives people of their rights. That has been the history of this kind of legislation, and no one wants to use it.

The hon. member for Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands (Mr. Douglas) referred to the introduction of the War Measures Act during the last war. I bow my head in shame with him, and with all Canadians, at what we did to those Canadians of Japanese descent in British Columbia. These things happen, and as I say, I have no doubt there will be abuses of this legislation or of any legislation of this sort.

I should like to ask hon. gentlemen whether these abuses will be more onerous and harder to bear than abuses of the body—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): Order!

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel): I regret to interrupt the hon. member but it is my duty at this time, pursuant to Standing Order 40, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Huron (Mr. McKinley)—national defence; the hon. member for Fraser Valley West (Mr. Rose)—air transport; the hon. member for Burnaby-Richmond-Delta (Mr. Goode)—energy, mines and resources.

It being five o'clock, the House will now proceed to the consideration of private members' business, as listed on today's Order Paper, namely public bills, private bills, notices of motions.