

Public Order Act, 1970

put in the same bag. And if, this time, Percé does not obtain adequate protection, they will take the necessary measures to ensure it themselves.

Mr. Speaker, if I took the trouble to read all this report, it was indeed to clarify the situation and prove that there was negligence on the part of officials in all this story, that they were afraid to stop these trouble-makers from the start. It is to be wondered if some did not want to take advantage of that in order to establish a system aimed at absolute control. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it seems that this situation is taken as a stepping stone towards dictatorship. That is what I think when I read about such events. And when nothing was done to stop them while it was not too late, it is easy to see that the agitation of these recent times was to be expected and that the authorities seemed to anticipate it. They were eager to see it happen so as to use it afterwards to establish another kind of terrorism.

And I come back to this statement in order to confirm the eagerness with which they tried to exploit the whole terrorized population. Furthermore, when the right hon. Prime Minister announced on the very day of the unfortunate murder of Pierre Laporte: Madam, it could be you or your children tomorrow, and where he was engaging in this gross demagoguery, in order to break and to control all the better, Quebec, we had us part of it.

If the government is able to explain in a serious and credible manner that there has been effectively a real conspiracy, an insurrection, we will understand why all these measures were taken.

But, when we know that it was aware of what was going on and did nothing about it, even pleased with the fact that it had happened, in order to take a better control, that makes me quite unhappy. As a member of Parliament, I feel I must denounce this attitude.

In view of all those considerations, I am forced to vote against that bill which is absolutely inadequate, and which, in addition, constitutes a slap in the face of the Quebecers who in the end have to pay the piper. So, the time has come for the members, and especially those from Quebec, to denounce those methods. We still hope to convince the government, so anxious to pass another emergency measure to replace the War Measures Act, to display some wisdom. We understand quite well that because of all it implies the War Measures Act is not quite adequate, but this bill—as all my colleagues pointed out—does not in any way take our suggestions into account. As the leader of the Ralliement créditiste (Mr. Caouette) said himself; What is the use of asking for suggestions when the bill is already being printed?

We have been so ridiculed and downgraded that we are beginning to have enough and to ask that logic and reason prevail. It is too easy to say that the people support the government, because they merely want protection. This is an emotional and spontaneous reaction. Of course, the people want to be protected and all trouble makers to be arrested. That is obvious. It is not because 80 per cent of the Canadian people agree that terrorists are arrested. It only means that the population supports the government. Because it is in power, the

[Mr. Matte.]

present government gets support, considering the circumstances. And taking the situation into account, I think the government did not act with the required competence, with honesty and once again failed in its duty. Sooner or later, the people will recognize those facts and share my view.

● (9:40 p.m.)

[English]

Mr. Eldon M. Woolliams (Calgary North): Mr. Speaker, I did not want to speak on third reading and I shall only take a few moments.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.

Mr. Woolliams: We have come to what appears to be the end of the debate and we are in this position: Before this bill came to the House, the War Measures Act was implemented by Order in Council of the government. Then the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his government came into the House and asked the House to approve the War Measures Act and whether they had the confidence of Parliament and the country.

We in this party took the position that we would vote for the War Measures Act on the ground that another bill would be introduced. We now have that bill before the House. Most members must find themselves in a dilemma, because if they vote against this bill and it is defeated, we are back to the War Measures Act. I am not going to attack the Minister of Justice (Mr. Turner) personally tonight in any way, shape or form. We have had our say, we have moved our amendments and they have all been refused. But if this bill were to be defeated by a vote of the House, then we are back to the War Measures Act.

This bill is far from what we would like. In Toronto, where the game between the Alouettes and Calgary took place, in which Calgary did not seem to do as well as might have been expected, the Prime Minister lumped the whole opposition together, so I should take a few moments to put our position straight.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Woolliams: We intend to vote for the bill. If we do not, we will be back to the War Measures Act and its all-encompassing powers. I should like to read into the record figures on the time spent in this debate. I think it has gone on far too long, and I am sure the Minister of Justice would confirm that many times we have asked that it come to an end. The government have spent 603 minutes, or 10 hours 3 minutes, on the debate. The total opposition have spent 1,656 minutes, or 27 hours 36 minutes, of which the Progressive Conservatives have spent 565 minutes, or 9 hours 25 minutes. One of our members took an entirely different viewpoint to that of the party, so if you subtract his time you might say we took about 465 minutes apart from tonight.

In Toronto the Prime Minister said that the opposition has been holding up Parliament. But it certainly has not been the official opposition. The Progressive Conservatives have not held up this debate in any shape or form.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear.