

*Public Order Act, 1970*

When you start to suppress ideas, to decide what teachers will teach and what students will study, then you have started down the road toward a police state.

The Attorney General of Quebec says that the powers for which he asks "are not to remove civil liberties but to give us an efficient police force". The police force does not need more power; it needs more competence. We all remember the persons who were arrested on the basis of mistaken identity, and the police who raided the house of the Secretary of State (Mr. Pelletier) at four o'clock in the morning. It may be that to the police in Quebec the Secretary of State is a suspicious looking character, and it may be that Westmount is a questionable area. But surely the police in Quebec ought to know who is the Secretary of State for Canada and where he lives. If he can be treated in that way, then can you imagine what would happen to an humble citizen living in St. Jacques or St. Henri.

Let me speak bluntly. The antics of the police in Quebec during the last few weeks have made the Keystone cops look like James Bond. These are the law enforcement bodies to whom the Minister of Justice is now handing powers that could result in unjust imprisonment, arbitrary arrest and conviction on the basis of past association. This is why we have been pressing the government, as have members throughout the opposition, to set up an independent commission, board of review or tribunal to ensure that the powers granted by this Parliament will not be abused.

I am going to move the following amendment, and then if I have time left I will take a few moments to say something about it. I move, seconded by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Barnett):

That Bill C-181 be not now read a third time, but that it be referred back to the Committee of the Whole House for the purpose of reconsidering clause 12 with a view to the inclusion therein of a provision for the establishment of an independent body to review the administration under the said bill.

● (9:50 p.m.)

The Prime Minister said yesterday in the House, and last night on television, that the setting up of an independent body to ensure that the powers under this legislation were not abused would constitute a lack of confidence in the government of Quebec and, particularly, a lack of confidence in the Attorney General of Quebec. That is a specious argument. Let us look at the logic of the situation. The province of Quebec asked the government of Canada for extraordinary powers. It was given those powers under the War Measures Act. The government of Canada is now asking Parliament to give to the province of Quebec extraordinary powers. I submit that before this Parliament is asked to give such arbitrary and extraordinary powers to any provincial government we have the right to insist that extraordinary safeguards shall be written into that legislation.

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

[Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands).]

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** It is not a matter of whether we trust the Attorney General of Quebec or of any other province. I would not be prepared to give these wide, sweeping powers to any Attorney General whether he be in the province of Quebec, Manitoba or any other province of Canada, because the Attorney General of a province is accountable only to his own legislature. We are being asked to pass this legislation. Surely there ought to be a body accountable to us which will supervise the exercise of these powers and see they are used with proper discretion so as to safeguard the civil liberties of the citizens of Canada.

When the Prime Minister says, as he did this afternoon during the question period, that the opposition parties in asking for such a review board are indicating a lack of confidence in Quebec, or we are trying to make Quebec a colonial state, I ask the government whether the delegates attending the Liberal policy conference this weekend tried to insult the province of Quebec and make it a colonial state. Were they as ignorant of the Constitution as we are on this side? Did the delegates attending that conference not understand the implications of this situation?

Surely the hon. members opposite tried to persuade the delegates to accept the government's rejection of this proposal, but could not do it because even their own members attending the conference know perfectly well that it runs contrary to all the sense of decency which Canadian people have that such powers should be given to any man or any government without some safeguards to protect the innocent.

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

**Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands):** To tell us that a committee of volunteers through the John Howard Society or the Civil Liberties Association will do this without any power and without any authority, who can be kicked out of office and be treated as Mr. Jacques Hébert of the Civil Liberties Association has been treated in Quebec, is not good enough. They could not even get the facts or the truth, and I could not even get a report from the Minister of Justice. Is this the travesty we are to have in respect of a review of these powers?

I say in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, that we have had some black pages in Canadian history in respect of violations of basic human rights. In 1919, at the time of the Winnipeg general strike, we had the deportation orders. In the 1930s we had prosecutions under section 98 which outlawed the Communist Party, drove it underground and put men in jail. During the war we had regulations under the War Measures Act which allowed the picking up of Canadian Japanese, interning them and confiscating their property, although at the end of the war the Prime Minister of Canada at that time had to stand up and say there was not one proven case of sabotage by any Canadian Japanese. These are not things we like to look back on.

**An hon. Member:** Why do you bring them up, then?