

of Mr. Laporte than it is to put to the people of Canada what happened in October last in such a way as to make them think that the War Measures Act was invoked as a result of the murder, when the murder occurred perhaps as a result of the invocation of the War Measures Act and certainly after that took place.

There is another way in which the Canadian people have deliberately been made to see something that is not a fact, as a fact. The Prime Minister did it again in the interview to which I have referred when he said, "We needed the War Measures Act; we needed the soldiers and all the police in order to meet the threat in Quebec". Never is the audience told what is the fact, namely, that you do not need the War Measures Act to get the armed forces to assist the civil authority.

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

**Mr. Lewis:** Never is the audience told the truth, namely, that the armed forces were sent into Montreal on the Wednesday and Thursday of that week before the War Measures Act was invoked.

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

**Mr. Lewis:** Never are the people of Canada told that. Never are the people of Canada told by this government that there is in the National Defence Act a provision which makes it obligatory on the Minister of National Defence or on the officers concerned to give assistance to a civil authority if the attorney general of a province demands it.

All the things I have referred to this evening, Mr. Speaker, have been carefully woven together into a piece of fiction in order to defend what was done last fall. I am delighted to see, as I was certain would happen, that in the course of the last few months the people of Canada saw that it was a piece of fiction, that they had been taken in. The Gallup poll which gave this government 59 per cent last fall has now dipped to 42 per cent. I am not referring to the additional numbers that the Conservatives have or the additional percentages that my party has gained. What is of immense significance to this Parliament and to Canada is that the people of Canada are seeing through this government, and that this government is now at one of the lowest levels of popularity in its history.

**Mr. Woolliams:** I hope they do not only see through it; I hope the government is through.

**Mr. Lewis:** Mr. Speaker, I think my time is about up, but I say to the Minister of Justice and to the government that they will have to prove to this Parliament and the people of Canada that special legislation is necessary before anyone in Parliament who has any concern at all for human dignity will vote for this motion or for any legislation that may follow. In my view, the Criminal Code has ample provisions to deal with the situation. When the Minister of Justice said this afternoon—if I am wrong, he will correct me—"the Criminal Code is not sufficient because it is concerned with apprehending the criminal", I say to him that he knows better than that.

### *National Security Measures*

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** That is not what I said.

**Mr. Lewis:** If it is not, then I am glad. I say to the minister that the Criminal Code does not merely provide for the apprehension of a criminal; it provides for preventive action to avoid crime just as readily and importantly. The Minister of Justice nods his head.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** Certainly.

**Mr. Lewis:** Fine. In the Criminal Code we have a widely-worded provision about seditious conspiracy—"sedition is," "libel is," and all the rest of it. We have all the Criminal Code provisions about conspiracy and provisions about unlawful assembly and riot which would have been more than ample to deal with the street riots which the Secretary of State feared in his book. You do not need any special law to deal with that.

There is in the Criminal Code provision for the prohibition of offensive weapons, and the Code provides for search without warrant for offensive weapons anywhere except in a private home.

There is provision in the Criminal Code that gives the Governor in Council authority to define what an offensive weapon is, so that the cabinet can define anything that it believes to be an offensive weapon as such. Not only are there all these, but there are provisions in the Criminal Code that give to police and peace officers the right to arrest without warrant if they have reasonable grounds to believe that a crime is about to be committed. The Code also gives them the right to enter a house without a search warrant if they have reasonable grounds to believe there is someone in the house who may have committed a crime, is about to commit a crime, or if there are people on the premises whom they may have reasonable grounds to believe are conspiring to commit a crime. There are all these provisions in the Criminal Code to prevent the commission of a crime as well as the apprehension of the criminal.

The Minister of Justice discovered the Criminal Code for the first time the other day when he said that when the public order act dies, membership in the FLQ will still be a crime because they are guilty of criminal conspiracy. I interjected then, and I repeat what I said on October 16 or November 5, I forget which, when I was booed by members of the Liberal party. I said then that as far as I was concerned, in view of the stated objectives of the FLQ, stated in every piece of paper that they have distributed since 1963—the stated objective of using violence, the stated admission of having used bombs, having stolen, having robbed, having derailed trains, and so on—anyone who is a member of the FLQ is a member of a criminal conspiracy under the ordinary Criminal Code and you do not have to make the FLQ illegal by special law.

● (9:00 p.m.)

I believe that the Criminal Code is adequate. In my respectful submission, this Parliament ought not to take a single, solitary step, even the smallest step, in the direction of curtailing civil rights and liberties. The history of