

Rather than introducing a permanent legislation, they have preferred acting hastily by passing an incomplete, temporary legislation, that is a last minute law. When are we going to get a permanent type of legislation?

This reaction from the government is not new. They give everything a temporary character. Nothing is clear in this bill. There is no detailed definition. Of course public order requires the respect of laws, and I am for it, but it infers in return that the government should respect individual rights. The proposed legislation barely touches on the problem and offers limited possibilities, except that it declares that an association is illegal and imposes punishment on those who belong to the said association, who say that they are members or participate one way or another in its meetings.

But who can prove that a person belongs to the unlawful association when no one even knows whether it issues membership cards.

Certain clauses of this bill grant to the government or the attorney general unlimited powers which could lead to abuses. Such powers confer full discretionary authority to the government. Why then pass legislation which will only apply to one association and to one province, Quebec in this instance? The Minister of Justice, in the explanations he supplied in the discussion at the committee stage, concluded by saying that the Criminal Code contains provisions allowing for the condemnation of persons deemed guilty of indictable offences.

Now, if the Criminal Code provides for punishment for crimes committed in October, why then was it necessary to resort to the War Measures Act?

The situation we have experienced and that the government would like to be carried on is extremely serious. We shall have to try, through every means at our disposal, to prevent the recurring of such a situation. We must tackle the task immediately and create a climate that would eliminate the ultimate causes which gave birth to the unlawful association.

We must also ponder over the consequences of the crisis we have just witnessed and particularly over our institutions. Democracy is so fragile a flower that it is seldom to be found under its most perfect form. It rests on a set of rules presupposing the agreement of the community. Should a group choose to live on the fringe of society and claim its own set of morals, every thing goes hay wire since it is true that lawfulness may exist only from a certain standpoint. Such is the case of subversion and terrorism. It is therefore inevitable that democratic rules be redefined. It becomes necessary to fight against a new danger for which there is no such thing as a traditional formula.

First of all, the citizens, and Quebecers in particular, should be given financial security and civil liberties. Right now, it is believed that civil liberties are significant, in theory only.

Our party has for too long preached a fairer distribution of production across the country. It is time that our voice be heard at last, because it is the people's voice which demands justice. The time has come to reform the

Public Order Act, 1970

economic system, to promote brotherhood and to adopt our economic as well as our social and political structures to man. The time has come to put money at the service of the human being, in order to remove the understandable frustration felt by people who do not receive their fair share of the national production.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, if deep constitutional reforms must be contemplated to eliminate in Quebec the causes that brought about the unlawful associations, we believe that our Canadian society should show the necessary flexibility and broadmindedness. This is not the time for arrogance, but for understanding and dialogue; we have a country to build, not to destroy.

We strongly believe that the federal government from now on will have to enter debates on the constitution with a spirit of brotherhood and national reconciliation. Again, what is important is first that Canadians live decently. The constitutional framework must not be an obstacle in the way of the fulfillment of Canadians, including the people of Quebec.

• (8:40 p.m.)

Mr. Léonel Beaudoin (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, for the next few minutes I intend to express my views concerning the causes that led to the troubles we have been through recently and which are probably not over yet, and my opinion on this bill which is before us for third reading.

It is about time, I think, that we should speak frankly. Ever since the crisis reached its height, I have kept my mouth shut because, in my opinion, we had to let the clouds clear and allow the present government all the leeway it needed to keep the situation well in hand and put a stop to terrorist activities.

First of all, I must say I am a true federalist, that I believe in a strong and United Canada, in mutual understanding but not in the submission of one of our provinces to the rest of Canada.

I totally disapprove of all the reprehensible acts of the FLQ, and support the position of my leader, that is, that the most energetic steps possible must be taken to safeguard what democracy we still enjoy.

I doubt that we should have to go over all the suggestions and amendments put forward by the various members of my party, or the opposition or even those of the government members, which, in any event, were turned down by the government although the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had invited us to make them.

All Canadians, and we members of Parliament above all, should stop to consider together the direct cause of all this effervescence in the province of Quebec during the past months.

The world has been shown a new image of Canada. In fact, forgotten are the red tunics, inflation, the Western Prairies, the dairy problem, the wheat problem; even our official recognition of Communist China—excuse me, of Red China—has escaped attention.