

ing quite a long time. It is miserably disappointed with the government's hesitancy on the matter. Quebec needs to know the provisions of a new constitution. It should not be thought—and time will prove me right—that a constitution that does not establish distinctions will make the ten provinces happy.

We hear about bilingualism throughout Canada. It is not true that integral bilingualism will exist in all 10 provinces. We shall stay with one French province and nine English ones. The provinces however will acquire a supplementary culture, English or French. But let us face it: Quebec wants to and must remain French, and the other provinces will remain English. Together, we can build Canada according to our culture.

Mr. Eymard Corbin (Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Fisheries and Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member forgets that New Brunswick is also a bilingual province.

Mr. La Salle: Well, yes, New Brunswick is bilingual—

Mr. Corbin: Mr. Speaker, so is the province of Ontario. We are not all turncoats.

Mr. La Salle: I do not deny the hon. member's point, and I do not say that all members are turncoats. But Quebec will not be abused or deceived by federal members from Quebec who do not tell the truth in this House to their English-speaking colleagues who need to know it. Now there are problems in Quebec because those members have failed to express as they should have the needs of the province of Quebec and to support the provincial governments who for well over a decade have been pondering over piles of briefs submitted to federal-provincial conferences. These members have always refused to analyse those documents and they have even laughed at them. In those papers are discussed the fundamentals not for national unity but for national harmony. There is the big difference.

I am not striving after national unity but after national harmony wherein the two founding nations, as acknowledged by history, may understand each other and cooperate in building up one country, Canada. If we fail to do this, Quebec will separate. My forecasts will come true if the government does not become more conscious of Quebec's needs and aspirations.

Mr. Charles-Eugène Dionne (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, once again I am a trifle surprised by the attitude of some hon. members who seem to want to railroad bill C-181 entitled: An Act to provide temporary emergency powers for the preservation of public order in Canada.

In a speech delivered on the program "La Politique Fédérale" on the French TV network of the CBC on October 31, 1970, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) stated, and I quote:

The nation must continue to remain calm and resist with the same lucidity to the confusion which some individuals would like to cause.

23568—26

Public Order Act, 1970

This is precisely the attitude I am trying to have toward the present situation, and I fail to see the exceptional urgency of railroading a bill which, in my view, is confusing. We had evidence of that during the debate, in the House, and among the public, through newspapers and other news media.

● (9:00 p.m.)

Some weeks ago, when it was felt that there was an emergency, most hon. members approved the proclamation of the War Measures Act and have not changed their mind yet. Therefore nothing impedes the work of observation and search which rests with our armed forces. Absolutely nothing prevents our police forces from maintaining law and order and from keeping up their investigations to find the kidnappers. It rather seems to me that most of the people are eager to know what concrete results have been achieved through the extraordinary powers granted in peace time to the police forces so that they may track down the revolutionaries.

We will not achieve the results wished for by the people by approving hastily a new bill which, in my opinion, contains some elements of dissent.

Whereas a confused situation seems to last endlessly, people are anxiously awaiting new facts. And in the meantime, we try to pass special legislation, establishing emergency powers in order to maintain order in the province of Quebec.

We now have the proof that it is not the lack of powers which hinders the work of peace officers. What seems rather obvious is the absence of co-operation and the inefficiency of investigation procedures.

The editor of the newspaper *Montreal-Matin* concluded his editorial of November 24, 1970 by this logical remark, and I quote:

If the handful of agitators were reduced to impotence, the whole of the Quebec people would not need special measures, since the unrest which justifies them would no longer exist.

Like Mr. Cross, we sometimes wonder what is going on. Many people shuddered when they listened to a TV announcer reading the communiqué of the Quebec Liberation Front. Yet, more than four months ago, on July 11, 1970, a Montreal newspaper published an explosive document, quite similar to the one released in October 1970. It dealt with an unsuccessful kidnapping attempt. This should have been a warning for the authorities. But no. People in office now anxious to do something had no reaction at all.

Another time, the Chairman of the Executive Committee of the city of Montreal, in a clear statement, asked for a Royal commission of inquiry on the behaviour of agitators who were spreading revolution in Canada. Did our legislators hasten to take the decisions the events required? Oh no! They were waiting.

I do not see any reason to multiply emergency or special laws. As I said at the beginning, the War Measures Act allows us to solve urgent problems, provided each and every one does his job. Let us take the time needed to prepare legislation really appropriate in the