

*National Security Measures*

narrow. They certainly appear to be narrow from the answers given by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. MacEachen) yesterday, as recorded at page 5736 of *Hansard*. The examination of the past is important only to prepare for the future, and when I say to prepare for the future then I ask these questions: Is any permanent legislation necessary at all? If permanent legislation of this nature is necessary, what kind of legislation will it be? An amendment to the Code? A new public order act? A watered down version of the War Measures Act? We can only come to conclusions on that if we are able to find out the facts from those hon. gentlemen who have made contradictory statements from time to time in reference to the apprehended insurrection and the implementation of the War Measures Act and, indeed, the public order bill.

We need a far clearer statement from the Prime Minister or the Minister of Justice and all the other Ministers who gave reasons for the implementation of the War Measures Act than we have to this date. We want to be assured that if the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and all those other hon. gentlemen I have mentioned are not compellable witnesses—and there is always some difficulty in getting ministers and the Prime Minister before a committee—at least we should have some statement from some distinguished hon. gentlemen that they will at least appear before the committee and give a clear statement of facts. It should be stated, first, why the War Measures Act was implemented and, second, why the public order bill was approved to replace the War Measures Act, then was allowed to wither and die on the vine without any proper and concrete explanation.

We must have the facts and the evidence to make a decision. This government's desire to hide the true situation will produce a useless committee, forcing members to work but not produce.

**Mr. Sharp:** But they will have to think.

**Mr. Woolliams:** This committee, and I pause here for a moment, is merely set up to sweep under the carpet the facts that have not come forth from the government in reference to what took place. If action was taken merely to inflame public opinion or even help out a weak government some way, we want to know this, because we are dealing with a most important matter. We have a Minister of Justice who likes to ride around in shining armour, as a great reformer. If we need any law at all, this kind of act can only come about if the truth is produced and nothing short of having the Prime Minister and the Minister of Justice give a clearcut statement to the committee on why the cabinet implemented the War Measures Act and proposed the public order bill, will do.

At the beginning we on this side of the House had to accept the words of the distinguished ministers and the prime minister. If you look at the original script when the War Measures Act was implemented you will find they said, "you can take it from us, there is an apprehended insurrection." No shadow boxing is acceptable, otherwise this committee, like many other standing committees of the House of Commons, will be used by the government

[Mr. Woolliams.]

to cover up half truths and distortions in an endeavour to justify the implementation of crisis legislation. If this country is to stay together can we, in committee, come up with the kind of legislation that is applicable to one province but really is not going to be used in the other nine? I have always believed that the law should serve every Canadian wherever he walks, runs, thinks or where he sleeps, and it should not depend upon the province in which he resides.

Let us look at the reasons given by the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice and indeed all the other ministers as well as the premier of Quebec for the implementation of the War Measures Act which set aside the civil rights of the people in this country, in particular in the province of Quebec. Even when the public order bill was before this chamber an amendment to have a board of review was denied. It was denied, Mr. Speaker, and since then we have found out that 497 arrests were made. The responsibility for this situation rests on the shoulders of the Minister of Justice, not the Prime Minister, because he just uses the Minister of Justice at times. Of the 497 arrested, 62 were charged and with one or two exceptions, because you cannot pry the information out of this government even with a crowbar, all were charged with offences contrary to the Criminal Code of Canada rather than under the crisis legislation. One is brought to the conclusion of the Prime Minister, upon reflection after the events are over, when he said, "what are you going to do—we have seditious conspiracy." Mr. Speaker, we had seditious conspiracy in the Code on October 16, 1970 when we implemented the War Measures Act.

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

**Mr. Woolliams:** That was a little fresh air, a truth that slipped out.

To digress for a moment, I should like to quote from a statement made by the Prime Minister—as usual outside the House of Commons—at Westminster, British Columbia. This statement was reported in the daily newspapers across the nation when he found out for the first time that we have a monarchy. If one looks at the motion one finds that the committee is supposed to look into the situation and come up with a recommendation as to what kind of legislation we should adopt. I can just see the Prime Minister, as quoted on the front page of the *Globe and Mail* of May 12 1971, saying:

The federal government will resort again to the War Measures Act if violence like that of the October crisis in Quebec breaks out and parliament gets bogged down in considering special anti-terrorist laws.

Let me pause there for a moment. The Prime Minister knew when he made that statement, as the Minister of Justice knows today, that between the time Canadians went to bed on the night of October 15 and when they woke up on October 16, the rules of the game in society had been changed, yet there had been no action by Parliament. Cabinet met in secret, either that night or the day before, and implemented the War Measures Act. As a result 497 people were arrested and 62 charged,