

articulated a thought to which I think we should all hearken, including the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) and anyone else who comes from the western provinces.

I am apprehensive because I believe many English speaking Canadians are ready to delegate their authority to the Prime Minister, and not just because of the FLQ. This bothers me. I could not begin to try to emulate the sincerity of the hon. member for Gamelin (Mr. Portelance) who, as did other members today, told us of his personal knowledge of matters within his province. But that province is part of Canada and this is a Canadian problem, not just a Quebec problem. This is the reason I have no hesitation in speaking tonight.

The hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perreault), in what I thought was the most constructive contribution made tonight, wanted to know how we could unite. I say to him that there is no doubt on any side of this House so far as the FLQ is concerned. Members on this side of the House, on his side of the House and in the legislatures of Canada stand unalterably opposed to the FLQ. So far as I am concerned, the actions of the FLQ, the recent kidnappings, the terrorism and the ransom requests, as well as the question of whether or not the government should have acquiesced to them, is not the point of this debate.

● (11:00 p.m.)

This debate comes down to one issue alone. That is whether the application of the War Measures Act as set out in the proclamation, which applies to this country from coast to coast and outlaws associations of certain political parties, was the proper move for the government to make in response to the request of the authorities in Montreal and Quebec; and whether the 6½ months within which the government can exercise this power is the sort of authority which this or any Parliament should delegate to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or any prime minister. That is the issue.

We have heard many sincere expressions of thought from those who have become personally involved in what is happening and who, because their domicile is in the province of Quebec, feel a real apprehension about what is happening in their province. But I put it to you, sir, that coming from Nova Scotia and having practised law for six years in British Columbia, I was horrified when I came back from that pastoral land, that province by the sea, to see three armed soldiers across the street from where I live in Ottawa. The only thing that brought a sense of reality and a sense of humour—which is lacking in this debate because this is a serious issue—to the situation was when my four year old boy went over to cross-examine the soldier, who was in his teens, and there was a humorous exchange between them as the boy was trying to find out whether the gun was loaded.

The only facetious question I wish to put in this debate—it has something to do with the amendment moved tonight and with where we are going in Canada—is that if the amendment to limit the government's extraordinary powers to October 30 does not carry, what

Invoking of War Measures Act

will the children of Ottawa do on Hallowe'en? I ask the question because I say very seriously that there are houses in Ottawa to which I do not want my children to go for trick or treat, and there are houses to which they would not be allowed to go because of things that have happened. Some children in Canada are talking about that. I know that what I am saying is light and frivolous and that it is potentially facetious. A minister lives close to me. I do not know what he will do.

I agree in part with what my friend, the hon. member for South Western Nova (Mr. Comeau), said. I have no doubt that the Prime Minister—who disappointed me in many ways last night, not because of his lack of sincerity but no one has a monopoly on trying to do the best thing for Canada in this hour of crisis—did not give us all the facts. As a politician and a parliamentarian I thought I was entitled to hear the facts. If I am not entitled to hear the facts, I think at least the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield), as one of the three officers of the House—mentioned in the BNA Act—the other two being the Prime Minister and you, Mr. Speaker—could have been taken into the confidence of the Prime Minister and could have been consulted so that we would not have to give a blank cheque on a proclamation under the War Measures Act which gives special powers to the government for 6 months.

There is no doubt in my mind that because of the fear, tension, consternation and apprehension that all Canadians feel at this novel and disgusting development in our political history, the people are instinctively and emotionally with the Prime Minister with regard to the proclamation under the War Measures Act. The hon. member for Coast Chilcotin (Mr. St. Pierre), to whom I usually listen with a great deal of interest and with expectation, disappointed me today because he suggested that under the War Measures Act the press gallery should be banned. While there may well be complaints about the press gallery from time to time, I was hoping he would give a constructive point of view, of the kind that I have always heard him give in this chamber, with regard to the basic problem under discussion, rather than lead us down the trail with the red herring of the press gallery.

After saying that the Canadian people are prepared to give instinctive, emotional support to the Prime Minister, let me say that this was the proper move. There is, for example, the incident mentioned today by the hon. member for Windsor-Walkerville (Mr. MacGuigan) concerning the girl in Hull. Whether this was done by the FLQ or was a result of the hysteria that has developed in Canada, I do not know. The fact that there are troops in the streets makes people prone to look to the father figure and to delegate our responsibility and duty to someone who we believe and hope can resolve the problem.

I do not suggest that the test of the War Measures Act is whether it is popular tonight or whether it will be popular next week because I, like the hon. member for South Western Nova and others, question some of the facts and the reasons behind the invocation of the act. I question where it will lead us. That is not the test of the