

Public Order Act, 1970

province of Quebec should be mentioned. The following text is suggested as a substitute for line 10 on page 3:

"mental change within Canada with respect to the Province of Quebec or its relationship to Canada as that"

I wonder why the act could not apply to all the other provinces, if the need should arise.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, the hon. member will notice that the second Whereas on page 1, in the preamble, at lines 12 and 13, stipulates as follows:

—governmental change within Canada with respect to the Province of Quebec or its relationship to Canada—

The only effect of the amendment would be to transfer words from the preamble to clause 3.

It is obvious that the bill is restricted to the FLQ whose purpose is to bring about "a governmental change with respect to the Province of Quebec or its relationship to Canada" through force or violence.

The bill is not limited to Quebec but to the FLQ which seeks to accomplish a governmental change in Quebec or with respect to its relationship to Canada.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the Minister of Justice a question.

If I am not mistaken, the amendment would delete the terms "à peu près". The amendment would read as follows:

—"un changement de gouvernement identique ou à peu près identiques."

Does the amendment of the hon. member strike out the words "à peu près"?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No, Mr. Chairman, the last words of the amendment are:

—"changement de gouvernement identique ou à peu"

—but the following line will be the same, beginning with the word "près", so that both words are not struck out.

Mr. La Salle: Mr. Chairman, this clause seems somewhat vague when it refers to "un changement de gouvernement identique ou à peu près identique à celui préconisé par ledit Front de libération du Québec." Either it is the same or not—

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, lines 8 and 9 only are changed. Line 10 which starts with the word "près" remains the same. The amendment ends with the word "peu". Therefore, the words "à peu près" remain in the text.

Mr. Lambert (Bellechasse): Mr. Chairman, I should like to ask the Minister of Justice what would happen, for instance, if a similar situation occurred in another province. Would Bill C-181 apply anywhere in Canada or would it be limited to a particular territory?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Mr. Chairman, the law will apply throughout Canada and will affect the FLQ or any successor association.

[Mr. Laprise.]

[English]

Mr. Gleave: What I really want to know, Mr. Chairman, is whether this amendment will limit the application of this measure to the province of Quebec.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): No.

Mr. Gleave: Then what is the purpose of the amendment?

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): The purpose of the amendment is to ensure that the definition of the purpose of the FLQ is properly set out in clause 3 and does not merely depend upon the relationship between clause 3 and the second paragraph of the preamble. This was pointed out to me by the hon. member for Calgary North and the hon. member for York South.

[Translation]

Mr. Matte: Mr. Chairman, after reading clause 3 and the amendment, I remain quite puzzled because one might even wonder whether, in this clause, we really want to condemn the means used by the terrorists or whether it is not precisely the purpose sought by those resorting to these means. We seem to condemn both. The purpose might be highly commendable, but the means could be wrong.

After reading the amendment I find that this is anything but clear. We wonder where we are going. Which means that if, for instances, force and terrorism are used as a means to achieve another purpose, it would be accepted. Should the amendment not simply state that those who use or want to use force and violence as a means to achieve a purpose, are guilty anywhere in Canada?

Why should this legislation apply solely to Quebec? Why condemn all those using violence and terrorism to reach objectives that are not necessarily condemnable?

With this amendment and under section 3, the aim is condemnable as such. In fact, Section 3 reads in part as follows:

—any group of persons or association that advocates the use of force or the commission of crime as a means of or as an aid in accomplishing the same or substantially the same governmental change within Canada as that advocated—

I cannot see at all why the proposed change could be acceptable that is not what should be condemned but the means and it could be done by anybody even outside Quebec.

This amendment to Section 3 could be interpreted as meaning—as stated by the Quebec Minister of Justice—that the underworld could use terrorism, machine guns and bombs, that it is acceptable for underworld as we should not be unfair to them. But when it is a political matter, action is an absolute necessity. I quite agree on this but let us write a law designed to check violence and terrorism whatever the purposes. Indeed, one could very well resort to violence and terrorism for very noble objectives.

This is why I find this amendment complex and prejudicial to Quebecers.