

*Public Order Act, 1970*

taken since last week by the Ralliement Cr ditiste is not unfounded and that it expresses at least in an avant-garde fashion the ideas that will soon be shared by the people of Quebec and of Canada, I would like to quote an excerpt of an article published in *Le Devoir* on November 27, 1970:

When Mr. Turner was asked what would happen if a terrorist organization should spring up in another province to defend federalism by violence, the minister answered that "the Criminal Code certainly has provisions with respect to the use of this type of violence".

This statement is rather disquieting with regard to the scope of the future emergency powers act. Will the future act also apply exclusively to Quebec? If the Criminal Code is adequate, according to the Minister of Justice, to fight possible terrorist outbursts in other provinces, why is it necessary to resort to special legislation in the case of the province of Quebec?

Let us not forget that this measure suspends some fundamental rights of citizens and goes further than the Criminal Code.

This article appeared in the newspaper *Le Devoir* under the name of Paul Sauriol.

From this statement, we clearly see that we are right in defending Quebec. Too many government members believe that once the right hon. Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has agreed, everybody follows suit. Some are so full of dictatorial power that they think they will get instantaneous and universal support, without reservation or limit, under the pretext that all are indomitably against force, violence and terrorism. It is thought that an emergency powers legislation can be adopted as if we were a bunch of simple-minded, traumatized, frightened people, ready to accept anything upon the word of a government of which the least we can say is that it has shown inefficiency, conceitedness, casual arrogance well hidden under the protective wing of one of the three famous doves, the right hon. Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, in order to spare all kinds of feelings, the bill under consideration circumscribes and demarcates its purpose to the sole province of Quebec. The honour, the pride, the vanity of the entire country are involved; we hasten to restrict the problem to Quebec. The Quebecer becomes this scabby, repulsive animal referred to by Lafontaine in one of his fables as the source of all evil. Who is responsible for all the troubles. We, Quebecers! What have we to defend ourselves against such charges, such an evil? Nobody ever thinks that the many Quebec Liberal members, whose number is inversely proportional to their worth,—

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

**Mr. Matte:** —could take in hand the defence of the vital interests of the province.

We have seen the hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Ban ) acting alone for a while. Since then, he has returned to the ranks. Nothing doing; the party is above the individual. There is no choice; it is "believe or die".

Thus we on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, through circumstances, are the only ones who may in all freedom criticize objectively. No minor consideration will keep us from doing what has been entrusted to us. If

[Mr. Matte.]

other members are not prepared to consider this law with all the seriousness and thoughtfulness required, we do not have to do the same. In fact, we are the official opposition as far as Quebec is concerned. Therefore, we shall not let our rights, privileges and pride be ignored through the irresistible impulse of a Prime Minister who wants to break the Canadians from Quebec once and for all.

Why have we been in favour of the war measures? Merely because we thought that we were dealing with leaders who could assume their responsibilities, who knew what they were doing, who were aware of facts and details that we did not know, and because, in those tragic circumstances, it seemed appropriate and altogether normal to leave this government absolutely free to arrest the terrorists and, thus, to bring back peace in this country.

Unfortunately, we must, after due consideration, ask ourselves whether responsibilities were actually assumed. Of course, an escalation had to be avoided. Already a diplomat and a minister had been kidnapped. Other kidnappings could be expected. This is why we were in favour of invoking the War Measures Act.

However, when it is a matter of voting for a measure aimed at ending violence and terrorism, then, we must take our responsibilities. The War Measures Act was not drafted by us. Besides, it was never directed exclusively at Quebec, that I know, and it being the case, we would still prefer the War Measures Act to other legislations which would place sole responsibility on Quebec.

Therefore, it is essential to fully analyze the situation and to ask ourselves to what extent our leaders could have been mistaken and have not, in their own way, resorted to terrorism.

I should like to endorse a statement by Mr. Fernand Daoust, of the Quebec Federation of Labour, before a delegation of the Quebec Labour Council, contained in a release to the newspaper *La Presse*. He pointed very accurately to the various responsibilities of the government I quote:

The labour movement squarely opposed the War Measures Act because it never believed that the reasons put forward by the Trudeau government were grounded.

To try and make the Quebec people believe that there was, at a given time, a state of apprehended insurrection amounts to a practical joke, he added. The history of revolutions throughout the world proves beyond doubt that when insurrection broke out in some countries, the workers were largely part of it and were involved in demonstrations aimed at overthrowing the government.

In Quebec, since the Cross-Laporte crisis, at no time did the organized workers consider coming down into the streets and overthrowing the government. In factories and offices, the workers, though worried, had no intention to start partial or general strikes. That is why the labour spokesmen started to question the reasons put forward by the three governments involved to invoke the War Measures Act.

And Mr. Daoust added:

This unbelievable rumour spread by the government is quite in the line of thought of Canada's Prime Minister who had said a few months before his famous words "Enough of this nonsense." This appeal from the Prime Minister pointed to a certain