

terms of the regulations because they do not believe in overthrowing this form of government by persuasion, gentle or otherwise. Are the students who belong to this group also to be apprehended and dealt with under these regulations? This is something the public should know. I did not think they were very wholesome people. However, if you take them, what do you do with the other types who also suggest changes by violent means?

It would be very easy for one to deliver himself of his views on the FLQ, to apply adjective upon adjective, to heap opprobrium upon opprobrium and every word he would say would be sincere because they deserve all the opprobrium one can think of and then go on to say hear, hear; go, ahead, bravo.

But it is incumbent upon us to calmly, coolly and carefully reflect as to whether this is the best measure and whether it contains dangers which would be harmful to the state. We have to ask ourselves whether stamping out that which should be stamped out by this particular method might result in injuries of other kinds to other people who do not deserve this heavy weaponry of the state. I hope that this emergency, and the consequence invoking of the War Measures Act, will have a much shorter duration than set forth in the regulations.

I will rejoice when the day arrives when the executive is able to say that the immediate need for this has been removed and we will now resort to something else. I invite them to do that as quickly as they can.

The War Measures Act and all it implies has now been in operation for some little time. I fervently hope that what the government set out to do will be achieved. I do not like the situation. I want to terminate it as soon as possible. However, while it is in operation I am sure all decent Canadians wish that it will accomplish its goals, so that terror and anarchy, too long dealt with without efficacy and I am afraid at times without strength, will be brought to an end.

• (5:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Ross Whicher (Bruce):** Mr. Speaker, so much has been said during the past few days that it is certainly not my intention to speak at any great length. What happened the night before last was, of course, that the government decided to make use of the War Measures Act. The government has been accused of doing this in a dictatorial fashion, and the necessity of taking such action at all has been questioned. Some opposition members have said that there was nothing democratic about the action taken.

Let us consider the facts for a few minutes. There is a great deal of difference between sitting to the left of Mr. Speaker, in opposition, and sitting to the right of Mr. Speaker, with the responsibility of governing. Many years ago the War Measures Act was passed in this House by members sitting in the seats which we now occupy. So it was passed democratically. I was not here, of course, and I do not suppose anyone here today was present on that occasion. But the act was certainly passed in a democratic way by Members of Parliament then

### *Invoking of War Measures Act*

living and sitting in these hallowed seats. It was not designed to be used specifically during wartime; it could be applied at any time should the government of the day feel circumstances were such as to justify its being put into force.

Much has been made by members of the opposition of the fact that this is the first time the War Measures Act has ever been proclaimed while the nation was not at war. It has been proclaimed only twice, once during the second world war and once during the first world war. When those proclamations were made, they were made to help protect us from the people we were fighting thousands of miles away. This is the first time in Canadian history that we have faced the possibility of being shot by fellow Canadians. I am sure this is just as much an act of insurrection as those which took place during the war with Germany, Japan, or whatever country it might be.

Parliament passed the War Measures Act in a democratic way, right here in this House of Commons. What could be more democratic than what happened in June of 1968? It is high time those who sit to the left of you, Mr. Speaker, realized that in June, 1968, the people of Canada did not just vote for the Liberals; they voted against the Tories and decided that this government should accept the responsibility for taking action should a crisis arise. A crisis certainly arose the night before last. Is there anyone in this House who would deny it? When property is being bombed, when bullets go through the houses of certain members, when people in Quebec say they are afraid to walk down the street, how much more serious a crisis do we need?

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that the government has acted most democratically. It did not need to bring this matter to debate in the House of Commons. It could have carried on with the normal business before us; it could have continued the debate on the Speech from the Throne. Instead, immediately after the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) had told us what he had done, he gave an opportunity to all of us to discuss the situation and the measures taken. How much more democratic a procedure could be desired?

When I listen to some of the opposition members—I emphasize the word “some” because there are a number who are genuinely worried about what might happen—I realize that some of them have played politics from the word go.

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

**Mr. Whicher:** I know this is not a time to tell stories, but I cannot help recalling the one about the three people who were discussing which was the oldest profession in the world. A doctor said it must be the medical profession because we read in Genesis that God took a rib from Adam; so there must have been a doctor there. An engineer pointed out that even earlier in Genesis we read that God created the world from chaos; so there must