

them in such a way as to enable them to know how to conduct themselves. It is not by crushing them that we will help rehabilitate them.

Equality of opportunities to defend oneself legally must be both great enough not to allow injustices, and explicit enough to avoid abuses as much as possible.

The most complete inventories, the fairest recommendations, the most necessary orientations will remain a dead letter if those who are responsible do not act.

• (9:10 p.m.)

[English]

**Mr. John L. Skoberg (Moose Jaw):** Mr. Speaker, it will not take too many minutes for me to state why it will be a pleasure for me to vote against this incredible and unnecessary piece of legislation. Yesterday I listened to the hon. member for New Westminster (Mr. Hogarth). The points he made further substantiate the fact that at this time in our history this legislation is completely unnecessary. The cockiness of some Liberal Members of Parliament stems from their belief that they cannot be defeated on the stand they are about to take. They are pleased with the stand they are about to take.

They will be denying civil liberties and supporting the principle of guilt by association. They have forgotten about the United Nations Charter of Human Rights regarding retroactivity of offences. They are supporting a situation wherein a husband and wife can be jailed for associating with each other if one is a sympathizer of the FLQ. They do not support the appointment of a legal appeal or review board. Instead, they suggest a voluntary type of body with no power whatsoever. Some hon. members seem quite pleased that people may become unemployed because they are accused, under false pretences, of being associated with the FLQ and the employer dismisses them. I know of situations where persons have lost their jobs because they have been accused of certain things. Their employers did not consider whether or not they were guilty. Any member of the House who supports this legislation is not being consistent or credible in his position.

The Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) has done many things to discredit Canada in the eyes of North Americans. I refer to an item which appeared in the *Moose Jaw Times-Herald* of Saturday, October 1, which reads in part as follows:

Live in Canada?

"No thanks," say four Glasgow, Montana, high school students. "Not with the War Measures Act in existence."

"I wouldn't give up my United States constitutional rights no matter how enjoyable our stay in Moose Jaw has been," one student said.

**Some hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Skoberg:** As I listen to the laughter of hon. members opposite, I realize they are not concerned about the civil rights of anyone in this country. What has been said in this House since I have been here? The hon. member for Timiskaming (Mr. Peters) asked what contribution

*Public Order Act, 1970*

the majority of the Liberal Members of Parliament had made to this House of Commons. I suggest that the members from the province of Quebec have not really told us what the problem is in that province. Have they told us about the economic situation, the unemployment situation or anything else concerning the province of Quebec? Quips are all we have heard from them. They say, "If you knew the situation, you would not talk in this way." I suggest these members have known the situation for the last seven years. The hon. member for New Westminster went to great lengths to show how the situation has been documented since 1963.

The Members of Parliament from Quebec should be ashamed for not telling members from other parts of Canada about the real problems in Quebec. The hon. member for Matane (Mr. De Bané) has been quite forceful in this House in drawing attention to the situation in his area. This was why he moved his amendments. I understand that in his constituency the rate of unemployment is approximately 28.9 per cent. I am disappointed that the hon. member has now been brought back into line by the Liberal Party and will vote in their favour. Has he forgotten the grand words of wisdom that he has used recently?

All hon. members realize that violence is not the usual means adopted by peaceful people. It is used only when there is anxiety, confusion, fear and a gap between the populace and the authorities. These extraordinary powers are a direct result of the lack of activity and participation by Liberal Members of Parliament from Quebec. Surely the 57 Liberals Members of Parliament from Quebec, give or take one or two, cannot justify not letting us know the real reason for the emergency measures taken in that province. I say that the emergency measures were implemented as a direct result of the Liberal members from Quebec. It can be argued that we really do not know much about it.

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

**Mr. Skoberg:** I am glad that some members who have sat on their fannies for the last few weeks are now applauding. The article in the November 26 edition of the *Globe and Mail*, which was referred to by the hon. member for Timiskaming, bears repeating. It reads in part:

Premier Robert Bourassa indirectly indicated agreement yesterday with a statement by his justice minister that Ottawa had exaggerated the strength of the Front de Libération du Québec.

Justice Minister Jerome Choquette was quoted yesterday as describing as highly exaggerated an implication that there may have been 3,000 heavily armed revolutionaries ready to fight for Quebec independence—

When pressed by reporters to say whether he considered 3,000 an exaggerated number for active FLQ members, he said: "Well, you saw the arrests, about 100 still held—you have your answer there."

We do not have to ask what is going on in the province of Quebec: it is well documented. I am sure many members from the province of Quebec are now beginning to wonder whether it is advisable to support the type of