

made in this House of Commons at all, and that they should be withdrawn—

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order. The Chair cannot permit the hon. member for Vancouver East to make a speech at this time. He should make his point of order if he has any complaint about what the hon. member has said, and that is all. Perhaps I should take the opportunity to say that the Chair listened to the remarks of the hon. member for Timmins and was worried at one point about whether there was not a danger of getting on to thin ice. However, listening closely, the Chair took it for granted that his remarks were not directed to any members of this House or to any party of this House. Maybe it is a question of grammar or syntax, but I think they were related to the group that is called the FLQ or to the revolutionaries. Maybe the Chair should leave it to the hon. member for Timmins to clarify his point; I am not certain as to the conclusion to which he was coming.

**Mr. Winch:** May I ask, Sir, that you read *Hansard* tomorrow.

**Mr. Francis:** On the question of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I listened carefully to the hon. member who has the floor and while he did retract those remarks to which objection was taken, possibly correctly, by the hon. member for Vancouver East, he has not since that time made any reference to the party or group to which the hon. member for Vancouver East belongs. In those circumstances, it is improper for the hon. member for Vancouver East to make an interjection.

**Mr. Winch:** Then you read *Hansard* tomorrow—uncorrected.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** As I said before, I would expect the hon. member for Timmins to clarify the point he has made, then we might not have to read *Hansard* tomorrow.

**Mr. Winch:** I would appreciate that immensely.

**Mr. Roy (Timmins):** Possibly I could clarify the matter by saying I was referring to the extreme socialists who are causing such disturbances in our country today, wherever they might sit.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** The hon. member implies that his remarks might refer to a member of this House, and this the Chair cannot permit. If he means "sitting anywhere in Canada or the world" I might take a different view, but if there is somewhere in his remarks a reference to members sitting in this House, the Chair cannot accept it.

**Mr. Winch:** Hear, hear.

**Mr. Roy (Timmins):** I am puzzled by the fact that the hon. member should see himself as an extreme socialist. I will say my observations applied to no member of this House. I will except members of this House—while they are sitting in this House.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh,

*The Address—Mr. Mazankowski*

**Mr. Roy (Timmins):** It is these extreme socialists, as I say, who condone violence as a sometimes necessary activity in labour disputes, who condone the destruction of property in the same disputes and then scream for justice having derided the laws. They may stop short of condoning sedition, they may stop short of condoning insurrection or treason, but there the terrorists start, continuing their work beyond the bounds of civilized society, beyond the intentions of these so-called reformers, but helped by their advance to the brink of disaster and social impropriety.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, the socialists have misread the feelings of our citizens. The vacillation of these people would bring more terror, but Canadians want this terror to stop; their hypocritical, confusing words would bring confusion, but Canadians want clarity; their sinister politics would bring help for the terrorists, but Canadians want these terrorists eliminated; their soft-peddalling would bring more senseless murders, but Canadians are sick of all violence; their desires would weaken authority, but Canadians want a restoration of authority; their bleeding hearts would bring anarchy and the termination of our freedoms, but Canadians want their liberty, with law and order.

For my part, I pledge myself to be ever vigilant and watchful for any unnecessary encroachment on the rights of Canadian citizens which could result from the application of the War Measures Act, but I have no hesitation in supporting what is necessary in order to stamp out these murders and terrorists with their violence and hideous crimes. Thank heaven we had a government with the courage and wisdom to act.

**Mr. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville):** May I say at the outset, Mr. Speaker, how pleased I am to have this opportunity to take part in the debate in this House. I should like to extend my congratulations to the hon. member for Bourassa (Mr. Trudel) and the hon. member for Assiniboia (Mr. Douglas) upon the honour bestowed upon them in being chosen as mover and seconder of the Address. I had the opportunity to serve with both these hon. members on parliamentary committees, and I must say I found them very good members to work with, men who were certainly acting in the interests of all Canadians.

The Speech from the Throne which traditionally marks a new session of Parliament was again filled with the usual flowery phrases, catchy clichés and challenging invitations reminiscent of words we heard so often during the election campaign of 1968. What is disappointing is that after two years of this regime we are hearing basically the same old rhetoric—somewhat more dramatic and more passionate on this occasion, with a little more ambivalence and ambiguity.

To use an expression we use out west, if we separate the wheat from the chaff, the tangible and concrete contents of the speech can be summed up adequately in a dozen sentences. We are told the just society is now but a distant ideal. We are told we stand on the threshold of greatness. We are told not to be cold and impersonal for the sake of efficiency but rather to be warm from the