

Mr. Orlikow: And that was a conservative estimate.

Mr. Woolliams: Somebody said there were 5,000. If there were 3,000 or 5,000, why were only 497 people arrested and 62 charged? Why were 3,000 persons not charged with seditious conspiracy? The minister did that to create a scare during the municipal elections. That is why he made that statement with grandeur. We want the minister to appear before the committee. If another 2,500 men are trying to overthrow this government by illegal means, the Minister of Justice should be very interested in telling us who they are. He could have had a telephone conversation with the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion. That is the question. That is why this committee is so important.

Mr. Lewis: They even see each other sometimes.

Mr. Woolliams: How can the words of the Minister of Justice be reconciled with the words of the Prime Minister? When the hon. member for Peace River (Mr. Baldwin) directed a question to the Prime Minister, the Prime Minister said, as recorded at page 689 of *Hansard*:

I am telling the House we did not act on anything else than what is before the House. I am not saying we did not have any other information, but I am saying that if hon. members opposite want to use this information, let them take the credit for it.

I have pointed out the contradictions and distortions on this one matter. I can speak on any matter on which the government is engaged or involved and point out contradictions and distortions. This party is not interested in a committee being set up, without any teeth, to approve what the government has done. If the purpose of the committee is merely to show that the government is right, it should not be set up. This party is not interested in playing games and making political manoeuvres to assist the government in soothing its wounds and, indeed, its conscience. We want a committee that can go into the facts.

This party is not interested in acquiescing to the government in abuses of the law as a result of which people were denied the very limited niceties of their civil rights as understood by our system of jurisprudence or in setting aside the freedoms of the individual guaranteed by the Bill of Rights unless, of course, the evidence before the committee indicates that some limitation must be placed upon the freedom of the individual for the good of society as a whole. We will only have the answer to that question from the Minister of Justice and all the other little ministers who were involved in this drama. Only then can we come to the principle.

This is the reason the Minister of Justice spoke so briefly today. He wanted to be brief. The minister is a tremendous politician. He thought that if his speech were very short, the media would think there was not much involved in this little matter. Well, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot to it. We had another minister like that. The Minister of Justice said that the War Measures Act and the public order bill were produced to lessen the onus of proof on the Crown against the alleged accused. Instead of lessening the onus of proof on the Crown they put the onus of proof on the accused. The Quebec court of

National Security Measures

appeal agreed with me, with other members of this party and members of the New Democratic Party, that clause 8 had a retroactive effect. The Minister of Justice said that he consulted his legal officers. When they speak to the minister, they tell him that is the law. Sometimes the courts do not agree with Ministers of Justice or Attorneys General. I have had that experience.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): That is not what the Quebec court of appeal said.

Mr. Woolliams: Read the case.

Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton): Read the judgment.

Mr. Woolliams: I read the judgment. The courts declared that the legislation was retroactive, although the interpretation by the Minister of Justice in this chamber was the opposite. I can see the great drama playing before my eyes. I can see a committee with Liberal members of Parliament and men from the other place being in the majority, controlling the opinion of the committee and making a majority report, all flavoured as the result of political considerations and associations.

In view of that fact, I wish to move an amendment. Before doing so, I wish to state that I have taken cognizance of the rule. I trust that if Your Honour has any questions as to the legality of this amendment, we will have an opportunity to speak. I would direct Your Honour's attention to Standing Order 47. I have discussed this matter with my hon. friend from Peace River who has a great knowledge of the rules. The Standing Order reads:

• (4:30 p.m.)

A motion to refer a bill, resolution or any question to a committee of the whole or any standing or special committee, shall preclude all amendment of the main question.

The main question here concerns the setting up of a committee. We are not opposing the setting up of a committee. But we do not want it to be a drama coloured by political associations. I have therefore prepared an amendment, in French and English, and perhaps I might read it.

An hon. Member: In French.

Mr. Woolliams: I have been invited to read it in French but we Calgarians have a little difficulty there. The amendment reads as follows:

That the motion be amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof the following:

"and, for better assuring the purposes of such report with respect to emergencies that endanger the existence of government, inquire into and first report upon all the circumstances anticipatory of and giving rise or purported to have given rise to the proclamation of the War Measures Act on October 16, 1970, as well all the circumstances thereafter following and thereto related which may have or presently or in future may endanger the existence of any government, whether federal, provincial or municipal."

If there is any question as to the admissibility of the amendment on procedural grounds, I should like to have the privilege of addressing Your Honour after you have examined it.