

National Security Measures

vocabulary to the Prime Minister of Canada, then that is material which we cannot ignore.

I want to recite a list of events that have contributed to the rapid acceleration of this dangerous situation in Quebec. They are the kidnappings, which in themselves if they were isolated would be a purely criminal affair but, within the context of a wider conspiracy and being used for ransom against a legitimately constituted government, are something else. We have the continuous threats to life and property in the communications of the FLQ of a seditious, violent and inflammatory nature. They have been issued and members are aware of them.

Now, I want to pause before I come to that part where the Minister of Justice said—this is something the Prime Minister never said—“There are other facts which I cannot disclose to Parliament.” He was saying, in effect, there are other facts that the people don’t know which I have within my bosom as a result of my responsibility as Minister of Justice. I cannot tell you now, but when history is written either they will be leaked out, or somebody will tell when all this trouble is passed. The Prime Minister said, “I have laid the facts, the three reasons before the House, and there are no other reasons. Parliament has been told. The people have been told.” Therein lies a great contradiction and, as I said earlier, Mr. Speaker, I prefer to take the words of the Minister of Justice because there must have been something more.

An hon. Member: Someday we will know.

Mr. Woolliams: We will know someday, and I hope it will be in this committee because I want to have not only the privilege but the pleasure of asking questions of these distinguished gentlemen.

Now, I want to refer for a few moments to page 8 of the Report of the Royal Commission on Security, published in June, 1969. I do this because the government left the impression that all this was new, that on the night of October 15 all this came to light. The Minister of Justice must have read this report. The Prime Minister must have read it. What did it say? Mr. Coldwell, a very distinguished Canadian, and two other distinguished Canadians were on this commission. Some people used to refer to Mr. Coldwell as a sort of revolutionary in Saskatchewan. I am glad he created one revolution to get rid of the Gardiner machine.

I quote from paragraphs 21 and 22 of the report:

In addition to the requirement for security procedures imposed by the communist threat, Canada is at present faced with a second and perhaps even more difficult internal security problem arising from the activities of some elements of the Quebec separatist movement. Separatism in Quebec, if it commits no illegalities and appears to seek its end by legal and democratic means, must be regarded as a political movement—

With all of which I would agree, and I think any hon. member would agree.

—to be dealt with in a political rather than a security context.

Then, the Commission says:

However, if there is any evidence of an intention to engage in subversive or seditious activities, or if there is any suggestion of foreign influence—

About which I am going to have something to say in a few moments.

—it seems to us inescapable that the federal government has a clear duty to take such security measures as are necessary to protect the integrity of the federation.

[Mr. Woolliams.]

I might digress. This government won’t even protect the constitutional rights of the people.

At the very least it must take adequate steps to inform itself of any such threats, and to collect full information about the intentions and capabilities of individuals or movements whose object is to destroy the federation by subversive or seditious methods.

Before I read paragraph 22, let me summarize what I have just read. There, the Commission warned the government, early in June, 1969, about the events that were taking place. There were bombings. There were murders. There were buildings being blown up. As the Commission said, if it was a separatist movement in a political sense it had to be dealt with in a political way, but if it was a separatist movement to undermine the very foundations of our nation, that was a very different thing.

What the government told us on October 16 was that there was such a movement. But it could have found that out in June, 1969. We were questioning the government, but we never got any answers about the royal commission. Now, let me read paragraph 22:

Although the more moderate elements of the Quebec separatist movement have up till now been conducting a largely political campaign—

That was the way of Levesque, who at one time was a great friend of the minister.

—it appears to us that there is in certain quarters—

And these are the important words

—a tendency to resort to activities that could well be regarded as seditious.

● (4:10 p.m.)

What did the Minister of Justice, the Prime Minister or any member of the cabinet do about that report? The answer is, nothing. I continue quoting:

What is more, there is no doubt about communist and Trotskyist interest and involvement in the movement.

It is significant that the author speaks of communists and Trotskyists. He was a revolutionary in a parliamentary sense. Actually, I am not quite sure what a Trotskyist is. I have an idea that he will try to undermine you and blow you up. I continue quoting:

Both groups have established ‘autonomous’ Quebec organizations as somewhat transparent attempts to exploit separatist sentiment.

May I refer to history for a moment? Kerenski was the leader of a democratic revolt, but he was finally overthrown by Lenin and the Bolsheviks. There, evil supplanted good. I continue quoting:

—members of both have achieved positions of influence in at least some of the separatist groups and agencies, helped by the often bitter factionalism within the movement itself.

Was close attention paid to these organizations? Were instructions given at that time with respect to those organizations? The fact that the government implemented the War Measures Act and picked up certain people, some of whom were charged and have been found not guilty, is significant. The facts in those cases in some ways are similar to the facts in the Vallieres case Vol. 9,