

*Invoking of War Measures Act*

be proud of. Some talk about the abolition of the monarchy. How many of them realize that as long as we have a Queen, and the Queen remains true to her oath, there can never be a dictatorship in Canada? As one travels across the country, going to schools and colleges, one finds young men and women who say: "Why should I be interested in the past? The past means nothing to me." That question was answered, for me, when I was a young graduate, by a professor who said: "Have you ever noticed what happens to a person who loses his memory?"

I should like to see a committee of this Parliament, in a spirit of give and take, produce a declaration for Canada of objectives and ideals so that there may be new horizons for Canadians.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. MacEachen:** Sounds like the Speech from the Throne.

**Mr. Stanfield:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. I understand that the leader of the Creditiste party, speaking outside the House, stated that I—and I believe the leader of the New Democratic Party was included in this, too—had reached an agreement with the Prime Minister last night but had gone back upon that agreement today.

I said in the House this morning that, while there had been an opportunity for some discussion, I was not in a position to give any approval. I was not aware that the leader of the New Democratic Party gave approval either. I am surprised that the leader of the Creditistes should have made such a statement as has been attributed to him.

I wish to make it perfectly clear that I made no such agreement last night with regard to supporting the position of the government. A great deal of the discussion related to the possibility of consulting our caucuses this morning to see what the position of our parties would be. I rise in my place to say I can only assume that because the discussion took place in English, for the most part out of consideration for the leader of the New Democratic Party and myself, there must have been some misunderstanding. I repeat, there was no agreement. Neither I nor the leader of the New Democratic Party have gone back on any agreement today, and I wish this to be clearly understood.

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** On the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I wish to support entirely what has been said by the Leader of the Opposition. Speaking for myself, not only did I not agree with the course the government was taking but I endeavoured to make it perfectly clear that, in my opinion, the additional powers the government wanted should be secured by resorting to this Parliament and by placing legislation before Parliament.

● (2:40 p.m.)

Therefore I hope the leader of the Creditistes party did not make the statement that has been attributed to him.

[Mr. Diefenbaker.]

If he did, I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that it is wrong. It may be that he was confused by the fact that we did agree we would consult our caucuses this morning, and that we did agree that we would give consent to the motion which the Prime Minister has introduced so that it could be debated today.

**Hon. John N. Turner (Minister of Justice):** Mr. Speaker, we have just listened to the usual eloquent submission made by the right hon. gentleman from Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker), and I hope he will concede that I listened to him with my usual attention. Neither the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) nor I yield to him in our devotion to civil rights in this country, despite the lifetime that he has devoted to protecting and enhancing those rights. I think he will appreciate that while his rhetoric can run a little freer in opposition, because of the responsibilities we have been given by the people of Canada, as temporary custodians of our laws we have to temper what we say within the limits of responsibility, balancing the rights of individual citizens against the rights of society as a whole. As the right hon. gentleman will appreciate, that is always a question of judgment in each individual case.

The action the government has taken is a drastic measure. I have no intention, nor has the government, of evading or attempting to minimize that fact. It is a drastic measure because it has been precipitated by persons with an utter contempt for the rights of others. It is a measure brought on by persons with an utter contempt for the democratic process, by persons who undoubtedly envisage themselves as totalitarian masters in Quebec and perhaps even further afield. They seek to mutilate and destroy our social institutions, including that of representative government.

Their chosen instrument for this purpose—and this is well indicated by the communiqués to which the right hon. gentleman referred—are not instruments of persuasion. They are not the instruments of free dialogue and discussion to attempt to convince their fellow citizens. They are the instruments of hatred, violence, turmoil and chaos. This society in Canada cannot long endure if the time comes when the right of individuals to life and personal security can be rendered meaningless by criminals—not by "political prisoners" but by criminals—through acts of terror directed at the government.

The government of Quebec and the federal government have been urged by some whose good faith I do not doubt, and in respect of whom there is no reason to believe they are sympathetic toward Le Front de Libération du Québec, that we should surrender to the demands of the FLQ, demands in terms of bullion, in terms of exchanging criminals now in prison for the victims of kidnapping. The House is fully aware of the full range and gross enormity of those demands.

I ask this House whether anybody really believes seriously that such surrender or such acquiescence to those demands would have solved anything. It is the view both of the federal government and of the province of Quebec that such surrender would have been nothing less than the first instalment in a program of continuing blackmail.

\* and perhaps /with a field.