

suggestion is untrue. It may be assumed that, in the province of Quebec, the members of the FLQ support the PQ but it would be wrong to believe that PQ members are also members of the FLQ.

I am deeply convinced that the purpose of this measure is not to embarrass members of the PQ who work towards an ideal that I respect, namely, the independence of Quebec. This option is premature. I am not saying that it is impossible that the independence of Quebec will ever be achieved.

Therefore, the hon. members should keep in mind the willingness and the work to be achieved by the committee on the constitution whose task will consist in considering the granting to Quebec of some legitimate supplementary powers. In so doing, the majority of Quebecers will enjoy a federalism that will respect the needs of the French-Canadian people of Quebec.

In concluding, Mr. Speaker, I will say that I felt it was my duty to take part in this debate as the elected member of a very typical Quebec constituency and that I had to voice my opinions.

Needless to say I am deeply convinced in supporting this measure. It is my sincere belief that I am protecting the interests of my people, of my province and at the same time those of Canada.

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear.

● (5:50 p.m.)

[*English*]

**Mr. Frank Howard (Skeena):** Mr. Speaker, like the hon. member who sits close to me, the hon. member for Hillsborough, I have been in this House for some length of time and, so far as I know for some time before my own participation in the business of this House, parliament has never been asked to deal with or express an opinion about such a fundamentally important matter as that which we are talking about right now. We are dealing, in one sense, with the lives of two individuals, Mr. Cross and Mr. Laporte, and in another sense we are dealing with the fundamental liberties of Canadians all across the land.

Endorsement is being sought, in a moral sense not a legalistic, authoritarian sense, for action that has been taken. We are being asked to endorse some action that I believe very clearly could contribute to an escalation of the difficulties and could result in pockets of civil war taking place in Canada. Because if we are to believe the declarations made by the various members of the cabinet concerning the seriousness of the situation, and couple that with our knowledge through newspaper accounts of the terrorists activities over the past seven or eight years, then we know those activities are not going to stop with the arrest of 100, 200, 300 or many more people.

This situation is not going to end with the finding of the dynamite and of the weapons that have been stolen from armouries as well as elsewhere. As long as that psychotic feeling exists among such groups of people, and apparently they are extremely well organized and profi-

#### *Invoking of War Measures Act*

cient in their activities having gained a certain expertise far in excess of what existed in 1963, 1964 and 1965, that activity is not going to desist but is going to increase. That is why it is a very crucial thing that we are being asked to consider and endorse.

I listened, and was greatly impressed, by part of what the Minister of Labour (Mr. Mackasey) had to say today because one thing he mentioned, to which apparently many of his colleagues in his own party did not listen, was that we should be engaged in a type of debate which does not involve the catcalls, the hoots and hollers, that usually take place when differences of opinion are expressed. It is a sorry situation when individuals in any part of the House, expressing their views out of the depths of their own sincerity, are ridiculed and slandered, as was the case in the speech of the hon. member for Bruce (Mr. Whicher). The greatest tribute one can give to that speech is to ignore it. It is unfortunate that those assumptions of the Minister of Labour were not listened to, because we are dealing with a serious situation. From the point of view of the Minister of Labour, it is unfortunate that he had to rely on the opinions of Dr. Forsey in order to buttress his position. If there were four sides to any question Dr. Forsey would, in the time I have known him, be on all four sides of it himself.

● (6:00 p.m.)

**Mr. Perrault:** Do not attack someone when he cannot defend himself.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** I should appreciate it if my hon. friend from Burnaby-Seymour would keep his mouth shut.

**Mr. Perrault:** Do not attack someone here who cannot defend himself.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** I am perfectly willing to repeat what I said about Dr. Forsey outside the House, to his face.

**An hon. Member:** It is Senator Forsey now, is it not?

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** I say to the newly appointed Parliamentary Secretary that he ought to look into his own mind, and at some of the things he has said. They are not very pleasant, are they?

**An hon. Member:** Don't be that way, Frank.

**Mr. Howard (Skeena):** I say here, and I will say outside, that I do not value very highly Dr. Forsey's opinions because so many times I have seen him adopt whatever views seemed to be convenient for the moment. I do not say that unkindly.

**Mr. Peters:** We were paying his salary, too; at least, we had some interest in it.

**Mr. Perrault:** Does the hon. member have any charges to make?

**Mr. Peters:** No, we do not have any charges.