

of the argument that if you behave yourself you should have nothing to worry about. The question is, who is going to be the judge of this behaviour, a provincial attorney general or the federal government? I, for one, would feel a little disadvantaged in Quebec at the present time because of my inability to converse in French.

I noticed that the leader of the Cr ditiste party said his wife felt disadvantaged because English speaking soldiers were assigned to protect his home in Hull. I do not know whether he is expecting a bilingual bullet or what, but I think if there is any force to his argument, in view of the fact we are dealing with the fundamental rights of all Canadians, the federal government should take the responsibility for enforcing the regulations which it put into effect.

The Bill of Rights is a very important document, and it is a federal statute. We are left in the position where the provincial attorney general can or could act, under the guise of these regulations, in direct contradiction to those rights. I would say that if this situation is as serious as the government implies, and we do not really have that many facts before us on which to base a decision but we have accepted the situation at face value, it should be dealt with by the national government. So far, all we have seen is an example of the government trying to suck and whistle at the same time, which is just not good enough.

As to the long term, the present trouble should indicate to the government that the experiment relating to capital punishment is a failure. If it does not, then surely the great increase in the murder rate all across the country, which I understand has risen by 55 per cent in the past three years, should make it conclusive. Another step that should be taken is a complete change in policy concerning the admission to Canada of United States draft dodgers and military deserters. These people just should not be admitted to Canada.

The people of Canada have shown that they are prepared to have their accustomed rights and freedoms suspended on a temporary basis in order that the government can deal with the present emergency. However, they also demand an end to the extreme permissiveness which they feel has contributed in a material way to the development of that emergency.

The municipal authorities of Montreal came to Ottawa last November and detailed explicitly the explosive situation that was developing in that municipality, largely through the efforts of the people who are now being rounded up under this emergency measure. Mr. Saulnier particularly said he approached the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) some time between February and November of 1969, warning him of these difficulties that were arising and asking that he take some action. No action was taken. Last January at a Liberal fund raising dinner in Montreal the Prime Minister pooh-poohed the FLQ and said they were a bunch of unimportant nobodies. There was warning, but no action was taken.

Because no action was taken, the sweeping powers in these regulations have not proven to be entirely effective to date. It seems like a lot of dynamite still has not

The Address—Mr. Forrestall

shown up. I understand there is supposed to be over a ton of it floating around Montreal. We had a situation that was pooh-poohed and now we have very strong regulations in force that affect every Canadian. A national emergency has been declared by the government. I ask the government to act according to its words and take the responsibility for enforcing these regulations it has proclaimed.

Mr. J. M. Forrestall (Dartmouth-Halifax East): Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues have done, I must at the very outset express congratulations to the mover (Mr. Trudel) and seconder (Mr. Douglas, Assiniboia) and commend them for the very creditable job they did, especially in the light of the material with which they had to work. I do not intend to deal at any great length with the content of the Speech from the Throne itself but rather with some other matters. I do want to make one or two observations which reflect my own view of the speech, and I have no hesitation at all in referring to the editorial page of the *Chronicle-Herald* of Monday, October 12. I should like to quote very briefly from this editorial because again I think this sums up my own feeling about the speech itself. In part, it reads:

If Governor General Roland Michener sounded bored as he read the federal government's Speech from the Throne, at the opening of the new session of the Parliament of Canada in Ottawa on Thursday, who could blame him?

It was a dull, uninspired document, whose rhetoric failed to cloak the government's disturbing complacency and continued disinclination to get its priorities right.

• (2:50 p.m.)

Mr. Stanfield: On the verge of greatness.

Mr. Forrestall: On the verge of greatness, that is right. I continue:

Only in its references to the appointment of a new minister, and department, concerned with urban affairs, and in one or two other matters, did the speech bear any evidence of Prime Minister Trudeau's concern with matters of immediate consequence—

I suggest that these remarks are pertinent in 1970, inasmuch as we are all very familiar with the magnitude of the urban problems facing us. Sometimes one cannot help wondering if the Speech from the Throne,—and this applies to the present speech as well as to many which preceded it—which is a traditional part of our parliamentary procedures, is not being deliberately downgraded and deliberately written in condescending terms in order to further erode, as I have suggested, that part of our tradition which is enshrined in this institution, the House of Commons. I can only conclude that the government does not seriously hold it necessary to put forward clear and hard priorities, or that it simply does not understand them. The government does not understand the seriousness of the situation.

As I indicated, it is not my intention to dwell at great length on the Speech from the Throne. Suffice it to say that it is a personal disappointment to me in a number of areas. At the outset of my remarks, I should like to make a few observations, if I may. First, Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to see in his seat the Minister of Energy, Mines