

*Invoking of War Measures Act*

**Mr. Olson:** I would be very happy to do that, Mr. Speaker, and to do it very briefly. I was here when the Leader of the Opposition made his opening remarks. I was also here to listen to the remarks of the leaders of the other parties. I realize that the leader of the official opposition and the leader of the New Democratic Party did, in fact, say that at the outset of their speeches. But what concerns me is that in other parts of their speeches, in the press and in radio and T.V. broadcasts that they have made since, they have attempted—I think this is a fair statement—to lead the Canadian people to believe that this action should have taken a different form; that the government should have come to Parliament to get the authority that the police needed to do this job.

What I am suggesting is that Parliament some time ago made a decision as to what it expected the government to do in this kind of situation.

**Mr. F. J. Bigg (Pembina):** Mr. Speaker, I am not an expert on hair-splitting and I am not going to argue the legal points.

**An hon. Member:** You are a lawyer.

**Mr. Bigg:** Yes, I am a trained lawyer. But I am also a citizen of Canada, and I am putting the welfare of Canada ahead of my own personal and political career. I, therefore, beg the indulgence of the House for a moment while I give my personal views of this matter. My views may or may not agree with my party's views. They may or may not agree with the views of other members of the House.

Having reached the ripe age of 58, I have gained some experience as a result of dedicating most of my active years to the interests of Canada under other people's orders, largely the orders of a Liberal government, and of doing what I was told on the beat. I want to give the House my impressions from, you might say, a retired policeman's point of view. It may be worthwhile because I think I am the only ex-member of the Mounted Police who presently holds a seat in the House.

The present emergency is essentially a job for the police on a very wide scale. I should like the members of the House to remember that the problem in Quebec is not a local problem but a global one. If we look upon it as any less I do not think we can keep it in perspective. It has been said by those in much closer touch with the basic facts than I that these people who are now active in Quebec in murder, arson, bombing and blackmail are not representative of any large segment of the population, but that they get their spiritual leadership, if I may use that word, from an international movement of gangsterism which seeks no less than the tearing up of our western civilization and way of life.

If I wanted to be partisan, I could point my finger at people who in the past have been more or less carried away by no doubt very well meaning ideologies of one form or another. Some people call them fellow travellers, though perhaps I would not go that far. Because of their awareness of inequalities at home, inequalities in regard

perhaps to race, colour or creed, they have from time to time written inflammatory literature. It is not long ago that a very large majority in this House censured this sort of thing.

I am not going to take very much time this evening, but I do want to remind hon. members how dangerous it is to be inflammatory, to encourage racial, religious and other ideological passions to the point where people who mean well but blind themselves with what they call patriotism lead us on the road to anarchy and war. This has happened in Quebec. This is what has caused the wave of revolution to hit the shores of this country. I should like to believe that this wave has come entirely from the outside, but unfortunately I know it has affected some of our own people. No words of mine are going to add to the rifts which might come between one Canadian and another. Therefore, I find myself, perhaps foolishly, aligned without equivocation on the side of law and order.

Hon. members can blame me if they like for saying that. After all, they may say, he is a poor, old, tired policeman who did not think for himself, and it does not sound as though he is thinking for himself now. But that is not quite the case. As someone has remarked, I have dabbled in the law. I think I understand some of the legal ramifications of this measure, but I am not going to worry about those. I want to know what we should do faced with this very serious situation.

I should have liked to have the government ask me for advice, but they did not. I should have liked them to ask the advice of the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stanfield) and a former Prime Minister of the country, the right hon. member for Prince Albert (Mr. Diefenbaker). I would like them to have asked the advice at least of two former premiers of our great provinces who are here and are available. What is the use of calling names at a time like this, when the situation requires the full co-operation of every loyal Canadian?

● (9:20 p.m.)

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

**Mr. Bigg:** I shall try to put forward in my own way a three-point program that we can now follow. The milk has been spilled and an effort has been made to bell the cat that spilled the milk. What can we do now? We have to close ranks. The War Measures Act has been invoked, so I am not now delaying the passage of any important bill. I am here to make a short, positive contribution in the shortest space of time possible. I intend to suggest three steps to which I think no Canadian could object.

Although the War Measures Act has been invoked, I think it is distasteful to Canadian people regardless of the fact that it must be used at the present time. It is time for those on the treasury benches to put aside any false pride they may have and admit that they did not hold the consultations for many reasons. The government is facing a situation which is so grave that it needs consultation with and the support and friendship of every hon. member in this House, particularly

[Mr. Aiken.]