

response from Ottawa. That is within the legitimate range of argument. That is their right and I submit that if they believe it, it is their duty to express that feeling. That I respect. But I believe that it is worth noting that to date not one of the members of this House from the province of Quebec has challenged either the necessity for what was done by the government nor the way in which it was done.

[*Translation*]

The legislation that we have presented in the form of this bill is intended to meet the present threat of the FLQ.

The events we went through make us aware of the vulnerability of our democratic institutions. To the extent that violence breaks out in a democracy, it indicates the failure or weakness of that system. But, as members of the House, we cannot accept the suicide of democracy by remaining passive before violence. Rather we should act—

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** We should not shrink even from using force in a legal and constitutional way in order to check the threat and to restore that atmosphere of stability and control that is the primary condition of any social progress. Only when we have achieved that stability shall we be able to tackle and solve efficiently the problems facing this nation.

• (3:20 p.m.)

[*English*]

I have already mentioned the genuine concern for civil liberties in these past few weeks. I share that concern. The enduring existence of those rights and freedoms enumerated in the Canadian Bill of Rights, the very essence of our democracy, is beyond dispute. For that reason their existence must be cherished and protected. However, it is not, and never has been, part of the democratic process that society should refrain from taking such steps as are necessary to protect itself and protect its citizens from being deprived of those very liberties and freedoms by organized criminals and anarchists. The most fundamental right of all, without which no others can be enjoyed, is the right to life itself. In this regard we must not lose sight of one paramount fact, and that is that the members of the FLQ have demonstrated beyond doubt their willingness to kill, no matter how innocent their victims might be.

Pierre Laporte was not the first person to die at the hands of the FLQ. Only a short time ago and within a few hundred yards of this House, an innocent woman, Madame Jeanne-d'Arc St-Germain, was killed in a bomb blast at National Defence headquarters in Ottawa, for which the FLQ claimed credit. There have been other similar tragedies; I shall not recite the unhappy catalogue.

For a government to refrain from taking the required action to deal with an organization like the FLQ would be the height of irresponsibility and folly; indeed, it

*Public Order Act, 1970*

would be the very negation of the concept of civil liberties as we have come to understand that concept. There are no civil liberties where there is no democratic government to secure them. Mr. Speaker, I cannot state this too strongly: No government entrusted with the security of its people and with the protection of the liberties of the people who conferred the mandate, the temporary power, upon them could have acted otherwise.

No government has a mandate to negotiate away its own existence or surrender the rights of its people. If it did, it would be acting treasonably to its own people while betraying itself. And to suggest, as some members of the opposition have, that because an insurrection did not occur, therefore it could not have been apprehended, is an exercise in false logic.

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** The FLQ is a revolutionary conspiracy. We do not have to read extensively to learn what men like Vallières and Gagnon really stand for. We need examine only brief passages from "Les Nègres Blancs d'Amérique" and copies of the publication of the comité central of the FLQ to understand what their tactics are. This FLQ literature lays out a pattern of revolution, escalating through different levels of action, violence and confrontation to the ultimate overthrow of the established order in Quebec and Canada. By their actions they deny the legitimate means of reform available to the political process. By their words and deeds they repudiate the rule of law. And as they do so, they seek its protection and seek to take advantage of it.

I have heard people say, "Don't overreact; you'll drive the FLQ underground."

**Some hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**An hon. Member:** We heard that two weeks ago.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Drive them underground? They are already underground. This is already a clandestine movement of terror and anarchy.

**An hon. Member:** But you cannot find them.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Some revolutionaries like Vallières and Gagnon have rather strange attitudes as was noted by Hon. Justice Brossard of the Quebec Court of Appeal, in the case Vallières vs. Regina. Vallières had lodged an appeal to the Quebec Court of Appeal in connection with his conviction for manslaughter following the death of a woman killed in a Montreal bombing. The court granted him a new trial, because wrong instructions had been given the jury, but Justice Brossard said, and I quote:

I take the liberty of pointing out the contradictory nature of the situation created by this appeal. The appellant owes those days of grace to legislation which, as can be seen from his writings, he looks down upon and which could remain a dead letter should the use of violence he is advocating in his writings be followed. It is so to speak without his co-operation and in disagreement with some pernicious ideas that he seems anxious to spread around that the principles of justice, the administra-