

*Public Order Act, 1970*

having the power to redress abuse, will not listen to the petitions they receive; the men who, when they are asked for bread, give stones.

If I understand correctly what Sir Wilfrid Laurier meant, I would dare say that those who have the advantage of power are really responsible for the present situation. Sir Wilfrid Laurier added, and I quote:

—if there were some criminals, it was not those who fought, who died, but the men in front of me on the government benches?

This was said by Sir Wilfrid Laurier and it is surely not a man who was always sympathetic to us. I merely wish to refer to that time to prove that the reasons which compel us to pass that special legislation today are perhaps not those you have in mind. It is the lack of appropriate social measures which has led to that climate of dissatisfaction and revolt among Quebecers and Canadians.

This bill is quite difficult to accept, since it can interfere with the freedom of the press. I do not approve all the criticisms against the press nor the charges laid against the C.B.C., making them responsible for the present problems.

The Canadian Broadcasting Corporation, I admit it, has broadcasted a number of programs devoted to separatism in Quebec, but it was only the true reflection of the Quebec reality.

● (8:50 p.m.)

Here, in the House, a number of members have always refused to define the Quebec reality. Moreover, we have always considered this group of individuals as insignificant. However it was important that the members of the other provinces know exactly the number of separatists and the growing importance of that movement in Quebec.

Attempts were made to hoodwink the rest of the citizens by telling them that this movement was insignificant, that it was not dangerous and that its membership was small. But following the election we learned that one out of three French Canadians was favourable to independence. This is the truth, and it is this fact that hon. members from the other provinces need to know.

CBC had programs to which Mr. Levesque was allowed to participate just so that the Canadian people would know the Quebec fact. Whether we like it or not, this is freedom of the press and freedom of speech.

I have not been concerned personally as yet about the freedom of the press but I think it is unfortunate that a member who makes an incorrect statement gets a good write up from the press while another who does not make any incorrect statement is not even mentioned by the press. I should like to make a few remarks on another point, that is the inquiry, by a committee of the House, on the Company of Young Canadians, whose findings urged the government to guard against certain dangerous groups or movements. But nothing was done in this regard. This is why we have to discuss now the implementation of some special legislation.

[Mr. La Salle.]

We asked that a royal commission determine the reasons for the introduction of this special legislation, but we were turned down. A royal commission could actually throw light on every aspect of this question and distinguish between the truth and mere rumours, such as that of a provisional government. We have been denied this royal inquiry which would prove the government's good will.

What are the causes of the climate of dissatisfaction. No wonder Quebec is dissatisfied. I have only been in the House for only two years and already there is no hope of recovering the \$250 million paid by Quebec for a service which was never provided. There was and is still some talk of cutting the subsidies to farmers. How can the farmers get along if subsidies are further reduced?

Some are wondering how this discontentment was created and I do not believe that this special legislation will restore confidence or stability in Quebec.

In my own conscience, Mr. Speaker, I will not be able to support such a bill because of its lack of accuracy, and its deficiencies.

At least, a review board should have been authorized to avert abuses in each province. After just one month we already have evidence of abuses and we would like to prevent them from occurring again.

An administrator could have carried on some supervision to check abuse, but we have chosen to abuse power and I am against that.

The words "unlawful association" and "the same or substantially the same" lack precision.

On seven or eight occasions, I believe, I also asked who would foot the bill for the army's stay in Quebec.

First, I was told that the province of Quebec would pay the bill. Another time, I was told that considering the special conditions prevailing, perhaps some agreement could be made with Quebec.

Last week, the negotiations seemed not to progress very fast. In the end, we might get the bill, and, if it happens to be settled like the health insurance plan, Quebec will have to pay once more for a service the expenses of which were met long ago, because the province has been contributing to national defence costs since the birth of Confederation.

We were entitled to explanations the government has refused to provide, and in the circumstances we are led to doubt the government's good faith and to refuse blind support for this legislation.

Many hon. members myself included, wish to re-establish a climate of confidence for the welfare of Canadians. Each citizen in Canada, and in Quebec in particular, must have a greater part of justice.

I presume that we will do more than tabling special legislation, and that we will consider seriously the adoption of social measures which are obviously needed for the re-establishment of a better social climate in Quebec. The formation of a committee on the Constitution is vital today in Canada. The Province of Quebec has been wait-