

most of them under the Criminal Code. The *Globe and Mail* article continues:

This was promised recently by Prime Minister Pierre Trudeau on two occasions. One, in a letter dated May 7 to Premier Robert Bourassa of Quebec,—

We now have that letter so I shall not refer to it because it has been tabled in this House. The newspaper article goes on:

—and secondly, in a lengthy interview the same day with a Canadian Broadcasting Corporation television crew.

Having said that, let us analyse now what reasons the Minister of Justice gave for the implementation of the War Measures Act and, finally, the public order bill. He is the highest officer in the government, except for the Prime Minister, because it is the Minister of Justice who looks after the administration of justice in Canada. The minister quoted from two letters, one from the premier of Quebec and one from the mayor of Montreal, the texts of which may be found in Commons Debates for October 16, 1970 at page 212. This letter is from the premier of Quebec and reads:

Under the circumstances, on behalf of the government of Quebec, I request that emergency powers be provided as soon as possible so that more effective steps may be taken. I request particularly that such powers encompass the authority to apprehend and keep in custody individuals who, the attorney general of Quebec has valid reasons to believe, are determined to overthrow the government through violence and illegal means. According to the information we have and which is available to you, we are facing a concerted effort to intimidate and overthrow the government—

Let me pause there for a moment. The Prime Minister, on the Webster radio show in Vancouver—it is quite a show—said one of the reasons the government brought in the War Measures Act was because there was a suggestion of an alternative government. But he did not explain, if Bourassa was so weak at that time, that the alternative might have been a government set up through a democratic process. Maybe one of the members of his own cabinet said, "This man is too weak." Perhaps one of the members of the opposition could have got a group together in the legislature and formed a new government. Mind you, this suggestion was never explained during the debate. That is why the committee must get the facts. That is why we need the Minister of Justice, and the Prime Minister and his friends before that committee as witnesses, not as expert witnesses but as factual witnesses. Then, we will find out.

● (4:00 p.m.)

I really prefer to accept the words of the Minister of Justice because he went beyond the three reasons given by the Prime Minister. The Prime Minister said, "Look, I have laid everything before Parliament. The Canadian people know the reasons." If you read what the Minister of Justice said about that you will see the contradiction and understand why the committee, if it is to come up with adequate, properly legal legislation, has to get at the bottom of this thing. I continue the quotation:

According to the information we have and which is available to you, we are facing a concerted effort to intimidate and overthrow the government—

National Security Measures

Of course in the light of the unemployment situation today, I would think if anybody in this Chamber could overthrow this government it would be a good thing for the nation.

Mr. Sharp: By violence?

Mr. Stanfield: Almost.

Mr. Sharp: Do you support violence?

Mr. Woolliams: Certainly, I don't support violence.

Mr. Sharp: You seem to.

Mr. Woolliams: I ask the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) to read what he and other ministers said. Mr. Speaker, their truth is like a bunch of yo-yos going up and down, changing like the weather changes.

Mr. Sharp: You tell us. I am listening but I have heard nothing new.

Mr. Woolliams: I am sorry the Secretary of State for External Affairs is so touchy on this subject. But he always gets a little touchy when he is here and the Prime Minister is not, because he dreams of the leadership he once sought. However, he made the great compromise to become minister of external affairs, and handed over his troops.

An hon. Member: More than you ever had.

Mr. Woolliams: To continue with this quotation:

It is obvious that those participating in this concerted effort completely reject the principle of freedom under the rule of law.

Then, there was the letter from the Mayor of Montreal. I repeat that I am quoting from the speech of the Minister of Justice as recorded in *Hansard*:

The chief of the Montreal Police has informed us that the means available to him are proving inadequate and that the assistance of higher levels of government has become essential for the protection of society against the seditious plot and the apprehended insurrection in which the recent kidnappings were the first step.

I want to pause there. Under the Criminal Code, kidnapping is an offence, murder is an offence, and suggested conspiracy is an offence. If these people were seditious conspirators plotting kidnappings, plotting murders, blowing up mail boxes, blowing up people,—all of which had been happening,—then all you had to do was get a police force to arrest them under the terms and conditions of the Criminal Code, even in spite of the Minister of Justice's new bail amendment which was more bluff and puff than anything else.

On that day, October 16, as recorded at page 212 of *Hansard*, the Minister of Justice said:

The government of Canada has to take the final responsibility but when the Government of the Province of Quebec and the mayor of the largest city in this country, on the information available to them and the information available to us through our own law enforcement agencies, are of the opinion that the state has been reached where we ought to, as sound and common sense human beings, anticipate a danger to our society in the form of insurrection and are willing to use that type of