Many have made great declarations about Canada, perhaps more than any other country, being a place where freedom of speech, action and movement are taken for granted. They are part of our heritage. They are part of what we understand as we grow up. This carries with it, without fear of consequence, the right to dissent, petition, complain, object, demonstrate, appear on Parliament Hill with placards, picket this place and in that way disseminate information throughout the land. Many people take advantage of that freedom. We should not be misled into thinking this is all that constitutes democracy in our nation. What is the point of dissenting, complaining about a difficult situation and asking for redress or solutions to problems when no one listens, when government refuses to act on complaints or chooses to disregard their legitimacy? People develop frustrations. All across this country there are groups which feel they have a legitimate complaint against the government for what it has done or has not done. The government has ignored or disregarded those legitimate claims and these groups have become frustrated. There is a sense of hopelessness. This, to an extent, probably happens in Quebec as it does elsewhere.

A case in point comes to mind with respect to the Eskimo people in the province of Quebec. With one voice they have insisted that they do not want to have their rights and jurisdiction transferred to the province of Quebec. They have said this on more than one occasion, yet the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Chrétien), who is responsible to them, has completely ignored the unanimous opinion of these people and is continuing with Quebec negotiations regarding the transfer. Surely, frustration and hopelessness will come out of that situation. If it continues, these people will conclude that they must take some other course of action instead of simply expressing their views to a government which will pay no attention to them.

With the death of Maurice Duplessis there came into Quebec a new concept of freedom of political thought, political hope and freedom for the people to advance from the shackles that the Duplessis government had put on that province for a long time. Out of this situation came what we call the separatist feeling, the desire for political individuality within the bounds of the province and a desire for specific recognition of the political unit called the province of Quebec. Some people in political life exploited that feeling for political purposes. One was Jean Lesage, former Premier of Quebec; another was my friend from Témiscamingue, the leader of the Ralliement Créditiste.

Mr. Peters: Témiscamingue, Quebec.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I tried to make the proper pronunciation so that it would not offend my colleague from Ontario, the hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters). The Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) also exploited that attitude and feeling. In fact, he referred to the people in Quebec as his separatist brethren. That is rather an affectionate term to apply. Exploitation and recognition of that feeling in Quebec was abandoned before and

Invoking of War Measures Act

during the time Jean Lesage was Premier of Quebec. He realized that it was dangerous to continue playing games with the separatist feeling. He abandoned it because it was getting out of hand.

Once these people—and they are not confined to those I have mentioned—gave up the idea of trying to establish some sort of political alliance for votes, the people who had been exploited naturally felt frustrated and sought another avenue. I do not know to what extent the members of the FLQ were party to the separatist development in Quebec eight, ten or fifteen years ago.

Mr. Pelletier: Obviously you do not know much about that matter.

Mr. Howard (Skeena): I am glad the Secretary of State has finally said something in this debate, instead of just sitting embarrassed in his seat. I said, quite candidly, that was something I did not know. How much clearer could I be? I am not trying to be shallow or to play games. I make no connection between the FLQ and the Parti Quebecois or any other political party. The fact is that elements within the FLQ have a psychosis; they are not concerned with taking the reasonable approach to anything.

I do not know if anybody knows whether the hope for political support of the growing feeling of separatism in Quebec resulted in the FLQ. This is a distinct possibility. This is one way in which groups develop their objection to society, first by frustration, second by exploitation and third by finding no avenue for their situation. I think the recent unconscionable strike by the police force of Montreal contributed to the present breakdown. If the police, the people who are supposed to protect our rights and positions, abandon their cloak of protection and do not really care what happens to individuals and property, it contributes to the growing disenchantment that exists in that province.

The intrusion the other night by Premier Robarts contributed to the situation. His intrusion and comments resulted in Claude Ryan, Louis Leberge, René Levesque, and I do not know who else, combining their voices and saying to the government: Give in to the demands of the abductors. That did not contribute to the situation in a very helpful way. I am sure Premier Robarts has enough problems with the Mafia, the police force and union movements in the province. He should have been overly cautious about what he said.

• (6:20 p.m.)

I have great doubt about what is the correct course of action. The Prime Minister asks us to trust him. There may be some in the House who will do so. But there are members of the cabinet who would not, I am sure, be trusted by other members of the cabinet in terms of asking them to take their word for something. The Prime Minister rose in the House, made the statement he did and read certain letters. It was difficult for me. It is easier to grasp the meaning of something one reads one-self than it is when someone translates it. This is my own