

as some leaders of the Quebec Farmers Union deceive the farmers. My friends can understand that we, on the contrary, want to give workers, farmers and small-wage earners the means to help themselves. How proud of them we are!

In order to strive for progress, my fellow citizens do not use the same means as the fomenters of sedition of the FLQ. They want to make a success of their case and to further Canada's development by working honestly, trying to teach their children to look truth and to respect the best rules of life possible. They are also in favour of freedom, but they do not want tolerance.

As I said earlier, there is no freedom without order or rules. It is said that Parliament is the forum where we can express our freedom, but without order, discipline, procedural rules, we would not be free. Thus, when the Speaker asks a member to resume his seat, does he infringe on the freedom of the latter? Not at all, he protects the rights of the majority as well as those of the minority. Long live freedom in order and discipline!

Evidently, it does not do to be fanatical about order. It should be applied kindly, and primarily sensibly.

We all know in Quebec that we are Canadian citizens. It is true that we want to retain our identity but some people waste our time when they insist so much on constitutional problems and I will even go as far as to say language problems. Proud as I may be of the language I speak, my mother-tongue which I am anxious not to lose and which no one, I hope, will cause me to lose, each value should be put in its proper place on the scale of values.

We want to retain our identity because we are aware of being part of the Canadian family and want to continue doing so.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude my remarks I should like to indicate that I have described my fellow citizens in Quebec to the best of my knowledge. I can assure the House that they are proud of being Canadians and I shall try to state more briefly what they wish and what they think. As they do, I believe that the government though essential, is not everything. It should be noted that each individual in a democracy must belong to the elite, and my fellow citizens as well as all the Quebec members join me in support of the right honourable Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). We consider that he has done his duty. We congratulate him and we are basically happy with what he has accomplished.

Of course some distasteful things have to be done, but they are dictated by the present circumstances. We are against war. We are in favour of peace, but when we must defend ourselves, we must be prepared for war. We are all standing behind the right hon. Prime Minister and the government in order that Canada remain a country of freedom and order.

● (8:00 p.m.)

[English]

**Mr. Baldwin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege which I am required to do at the first available

#### *Invoking of War Measures Act*

opportunity during a sitting when an issue has come up which entitles an hon. member to rise.

During the course of my speech to the House this afternoon I quoted from an article which appeared in the *Ottawa Citizen* of today's date. At the conclusion of my speech, the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Macdonald) intimated that I had misquoted the article. In fact, some hon. member from the opposite side said I was misleading the House. At the time I had before me a photostatic copy of the particular article and I hesitated to impose my views because sometimes a photostatic copy does not include the entire article. The minister indicated I had not read the last part.

I have before me now the article. It is precisely as I indicated it was and the wording is the same. It indicates beyond any doubt at all that all of the operations that are referred to by the police were conducted under the present provisions of the War Measures Act which is now in force.

**An hon. Member:** What is your page number?

**Mr. Baldwin:** The page is number 3. What the minister was referring to was an article which appeared on the front page which indicated at the conclusion that the Ottawa police had not taken any action under this particular proclamation. I thought I should make that position clear at this time.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Laniel):** Order, please. The Chair does not pretend to be a judge on such occasions as this, but because of the importance of the debate now taking place this might be an appropriate opportunity for the Chair to bring to the attention of hon. members citation No. 113 in the fourth edition of Beauchesne which reads in part as follows:

But a dispute arising between two members, as to allegation of facts, does not fulfil the conditions of parliamentary privilege.

[Translation]

**Hon. Martial Asselin (Charlevoix):** Mr. Speaker, Canada is now going through difficult times and I think Quebecers should express their views on the measure now before the House.

As several members have said today, the legislation under study cannot appeal to any member since Canada has always had the reputation abroad of living in a true democracy.

When, in the light of facts, the government decides to resort to such exceptional measures, it is because the situation is most serious.

Should we repeat that the measure before us involves the granting of extraordinary powers to the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) and his cabinet? These powers can even restrict freedom of speech, of the press and of association or assembly. But as a member of this House, am I in a position to judge of the advisability for the government to bring this legislation before us, when I realize that the government must know much more than I do on the present situation.