

The logic of the New Democratic Party, Mr. Speaker, is amazing. I do not know why I always come back to that party; it has been suggested I have a love-hate relationship with it.

Mr. Knowles (Winnipeg North Centre): He really loves us.

Mr. Mackasey: Only certain members. I listened to the leader of that party speaking on television last night, hoping that because he speaks from the heart and without prepared notes he might unintentionally have adopted what I believe to be a most fallacious argument when he spoke here earlier in the day. He suggested then that the FLQ existed only because there is unemployment in Quebec, only because there are slums in Quebec. This part of his speech is reported on page 200 of *Hansard*. He makes a valid point that every terrorist movement, every revolutionary movement, must have a base. I agree with that. Then he goes on to ask: "What is the base of the FLQ?" I apologize to the hon. member for Egmont for my emotional attack on him. This is the point which really upset me. This is what the hon. gentleman has to say:

The base of the FLQ lies in the disadvantaged and unfortunate people in the province of Quebec.

He goes on, then, to talk about unemployment, slums, and regional disparity. Mr. Speaker, by those criteria the FLQ should exist in Newfoundland where there is more unemployment, more disadvantaged people and more regional disparity.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Speaker: Order. I believe the hon. member for Egmont seeks the floor on a question of privilege.

Mr. MacDonald (Egmont): I do not know who is responsible for the quotation which the minister has just made, but it does not come from any speech of mine.

Mr. Mackasey: I am sorry. I suspect the hon. member was not listening closely. I was referring to the speech of the leader of the New Democratic Party.

This is precisely my point. If the people of Quebec have a right to be sorry and upset about the high rate of unemployment in that province, and I think they have, if they are concerned about slums in Montreal and Saint-Henri, and I think they have a legitimate cause to be concerned, and if certain people in Montreal look at some of our delusions of grandeur in that great area and compare the results with their own environment, this is bound to breed unrest. But there is a legitimate way of expressing this unrest and that is at the ballot box. Any time the people of Quebec feel sufficiently fed up with the free enterprise system they can vote for the New Democratic Party—though the NDP has never been able to achieve power in Quebec since confederation. Nevertheless the people have this right. If they do not want to vote for the Liberal party in Quebec they can vote for one of the other parties, and one of the other happens to be the Parti Quebecois. And if the vote in favour of the Parti Quebecois in the last election represented one out

Invoking of War Measures Act

of four, this should provoke us to think about doing something to ease the unrest, and this is the best defence against the legitimate aspirations of the Parti Quebecois.

But let us have no illusion that the base of the FLQ is limited to the underprivileged people of the province of Quebec. The same FLQ would exist in Quebec if there was no poverty, if there were no slums. In fact, it would exist even if the Parti Quebecois was in power, because they are there for one reason only, and that is to overthrow the state, not only in Quebec but as part of an international movement. When I look at the position of some of those in that movement, I wish I had their income; I wish I earned in a year what some of them get in a week. Nevertheless, I can understand the concern of the New Democratic Party about a free enterprise system which tolerates the rate of unemployment which prevails in this country. We all share it.

• (12:10 p.m.)

Mr. Woolliams: Ten per cent.

Mr. Mackasey: It is fine to listen to one of the millionaires who does not understand poverty. What I have been saying is that there is a legitimate way in Quebec of expressing disapproval, just as there is a legitimate way in Newfoundland. If the ingredients of the movement behind the FLQ consists simply of poverty, unemployment, slums, and that type of social disorder, then the FLQ should exist in many other parts of the country, not only in Quebec.

My point is that the NDP have either underestimated or failed to understand at all the real forces that drive the FLQ. My job as Minister of Labour is not the easiest one in the world, but it is a revealing one. I remember going to another part of the country and having to solicit the legitimate assistance of the communist party to put an end to a strike which was being prolonged by Maoist cells in British Columbia, and I can prove that statement. So if any hon. member thinks that the philosophy behind the FLQ is restricted to the province of Quebec, then it is about time people like the hon. member for Egmont get their heads out of the beautiful red sands of Prince Edward Island.

If I return to my notes I will run past my time, so I will not do so. I ask hon. members to take a good look at the letters contained in the appendix to *Hansard*, to read between the lines and see whether there has been any panic. Perhaps we have been a little slow in doing things, and we were reminded of that yesterday. Perhaps our reluctance to do things as repugnant as what we have had to do is based on the fact that there are more than the average number of members of this cabinet who consider themselves small "l" Liberals when it comes to the question of rights of individuals. I think this would also be true were the opposition in power.

The Minister of Regional Economic Expansion spoke yesterday of fear in Quebec. I am not any braver than he is and I am just as fearful as he is. It was not too many months ago that my office was set on fire by a Molotov