

ing his head, may I say that I at least understood him to say that.

**Mr. Turner (Ottawa-Carleton):** I think the hon. member should read my speech.

**Mr. Woolliams:** When the minister says I should read his speech this means that he does not intend to do it and that we are going to have a dictatorship in Canada for six months under this particular Order in Council which re-implements the War Measures Act. In fact, there are people in Canada who have believed that this government led by the distinguished right hon. gentleman has wanted this kind of dictatorship for a long time.

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

**Mr. Woolliams:** I said there are some people who believe that. This belief has been confirmed by this type of action because the same objective could have been accomplished by Parliamentary action. There is no need for me to say anything more. I have set out very carefully the reason we have taken the position we have. We say we appreciate the crisis which exists in the province of Quebec. We appreciate the fact that extraordinary measures were necessary. We say they could have been achieved by amending the Code in Parliament through the proper democratic process. That is our position.

We say it is a very dangerous process of law to do this by order in council. This very order in council could be amended tomorrow night without any consultation with Parliament whatsoever. With that, I thank the members of the House for their kind attention.

**Mr. John Roberts (York-Simcoe):** I shall not speak for long, Mr. Speaker. I doubt that I shall add to the arguments that have already been presented by members of this House. However, perhaps some of the arguments bear repeating because they do not seem to have penetrated the perception of many members of the opposition. Given the level of perception they have shown in the past, that may not be too surprising. I was essentially provoked to take a part in this debate because of the remarks of the hon. member for York South (Mr. Lewis). I regret that he is not in the House now. The hon. member gave us a display of rhetorical fireworks instead of the considered judgment of which he is capable. I regret to say that for the first time in the long time I have known him, he descended to the level of a bush league politician. He alluded to the government backbenchers, as I regret to say did the hon. member for Greenwood (Mr. Brewin) later, and said they would be forced to support this government legislation contrary to their conscience. Well, I can tell you I do not hold my conscience in fee to the hon. member for York South, nor to other members of this House. We hold our conscience in relation to our God, so I suggest the hon. member for York South take care of his own and I shall take care of mine.

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

**Mr. Roberts:** In the past I have not been afraid to speak against, and vote against, this government when I

#### *Invoking of War Measures Act*

felt its action might even remotely or intangibly interfere with the area of free speech and civil liberties. I remind the hon. member for Calgary North (Mr. Woolliams) that we two found ourselves on the same side on this matter once in the past. It is not a fear of conscience that keeps me from speaking out against this government's decision. It is because this decision has the full support of my conscience that I speak now. I think it important not only for my constituents but for the people of Canada to know that in this House the backbenchers support the government, not out of fear but out of a genuine and honest conviction that this is the only course of action now open to us.

The hon. member for York South, in some peculiar argument in contradiction of the Minister of Justice, said that the argument of the Minister of Justice was wrong because we all feel strongly about this event. Of course, we all feel strongly. But feeling is not enough. Feeling is not the test. The test is what do you do. There are those who feel strongly who are not now faced with the responsibility of action. What we must decide upon is not the feelings of the members of the House but on the action of the government. We must ask ourselves what has that action been? It is not that vague strawman that has been set up by the leader of the New Democratic Party when he spoke about deportation. It is not those lengthy descriptions of possible dangers developed by the hon. member for Greenwood and the hon. member for York South. It is not the kind of scarecrow presented to us by the hon. member for Calgary North, the master of wild accusations, when he speaks about dictatorships and a police state. Those, I suggest, are creatures of his fervid mind.

What we are talking about is this act, and I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Greenwood was less than forthright and open when he alluded to the possible provisions of the act, because he did not go on to explain that in section 3(2), it is precisely under regulations that the act is carried forward. What we should be concerned with are the exact limitations which are imposed on the civil liberties of Canadians, not vaguely and hypothetically through the act, but specifically through the regulations. That is what the government has done. It has brought in regulations and has not utilized the full power which the act provides.

● (9:40 p.m.)

There is one thing which has concerned me more than anything else throughout this debate. This is the continuing accusations of the "sweeping" nature of the action of the government when in fact it is not sweeping but limited. There have been accusations that there is abrogation of parliamentary authority when in fact we are at this moment involved in bringing this question before the House of Commons so that it can pronounce in an authoritative way on the action the government has taken. The hon. member for Calgary North says, "Oh, they passed this law deep in the night at four o'clock and it doesn't matter what we say." I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that if the House of Commons voted against the