

*Security Intelligence Service*

Bill, which included a number of very specific recommendations on how the Bill should be amended to meet the standards of fairness which are required. Virtually all of their recommendations have been ignored.

I remind Members of the House that the Canadian Jewish Congress was very active in an earlier major debate which we had in Parliament on the question of the Constitution and the Charter of Rights. Its presentation was made at that time by its then president, Professor Irwin Cotler, a professor of law at McGill University. He is a leading spokesman on human and civil rights, and is legal counsel to Anatoly Shcharansky, the famous Soviet dissident.

Mr. Cotler was an assistant to the new Leader of the Liberal Party, Mr. Turner, when Mr. Turner was the Minister of Justice. A long article in yesterday's *Globe and Mail* said that Professor Cotler was one of the people Mr. Turner recruited when he became the Minister of Justice. Mr. Turner wanted small liberal, progressive thinking people who were interested in questions such as civil rights. Professor Cotler was one of Mr. Turner's assistants. The article in the *Globe and Mail* reads:

Prof. Cotler says at first he mistrusted his boss, figuring that he was not serious about the issues, such as civil liberties or poverty, he said he wanted to address.

Mr. Cotler says his mind was changed when he watched Mr. Turner deliver a hard-hitting speech calling for justice to the poor—

I wonder what Mr. Cotler would think about the Bill we are discussing now. I wonder what the new Leader of the Liberal Party would think about this Bill. Mr. Cotler has not spoken on this Bill, but the organization of which he was the president until about a year ago, has spoken.

I will quote a few of the recommendations of the Canadian Jewish Congress which the Solicitor General has ignored completely. Dealing with threats to the security of Canada they proposed the following amendment to what is now in the Bill.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Guilbault):** The Chair regrets interrupting the Hon. Member, but his time is up. The Hon. Member for Vancouver South (Mr. Fraser).

● (1120)

**Hon. John A. Fraser (Vancouver South):** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member who preceded me was asking rhetorically what Mr. Turner or Mr. Cotler, the eminent lawyer on civil rights, would think of this Bill. What does it matter? It does not matter what Mr. Turner thinks. There is nothing new about Mr. Turner. It is not a new deal, it is the old deal writ large.

Mr. Turner is now the leader of the Liberal Party. We saw the unseemly haste with which all the sycophantic members of the Trudeau Cabinet jumped on his bandwagon early in the game, because they knew that the fix was in. The establishment was going to put him in office.

When the Hon. Member asks what would Mr. Turner think, I say that it does not matter what Mr. Turner thinks. What

matters is whether the public would buy a used Government from that man.

Alan Borovoy is not a kook, lunatic, or nut; he is one of the most sensible and intelligent critics on the question of civil liberties in Canada. He has said that this Bill in its present form is the most dangerous attack on civil liberties since Confederation.

When one talks of Mr. Turner, and reform, and the new Liberal Party, it is all a lot of garbage. The first thing that happened in this House after Mr. Turner became the Leader of the Liberal Party was the implementation of notice of closure on a Bill that is absolutely essential and integral to the civil rights of Canadians. What we listened to last weekend was absolute claptrap. There is nothing new. It is not the new deal. I said, it is the old deal, writ large.

The disgrace about this Bill is that the Government said at second reading stage that we could make suggestions at committee. That was a fraud. It was dishonest and was not intended. The Government has not made a significant acceptance of suggestions made by Hon. Members in committee or by those who came to the committee at great expense to the Canadian taxpayer.

All that we are listening to on the Government side is sanctimonious nonsense. The Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) is reported in today's Canadian Press as saying that this is all a filibuster, and even a child could understand that Hon. Members are just playing games. Are we playing games with Clause 2, subparagraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) which define what are threats to the security of Canada, and trigger what a secret group can do secretly, in the dark, to other Canadians?

Some day someone will ask why some of us MPs did not say something. The fact of the matter is that we have been saying a lot, but because the media have been running around writing inane stories about an inane bunch of people, nobody has been reporting what we have been saying. One of these days the same reporters, the same graduates of the same crummy journalism schools, will be writing sanctimonious, pious editorials asking how did all of this happen in the House of Commons of Canada. When that happens, I hope some of them have their noses rubbed in some of the speeches that have been made here.

I am fed up to the teeth with the hypocritical claptrap of the Liberal Members. We are not even allowed to put most of the amendments in the House that would force them to vote. Even the Liberal Party's former Solicitor General does not agree with this Bill. They will not even listen to him. He is the Hon. Member for Notre-Dame-de-Grâce-Lachine East (Mr. Allmand). Unfortunately he is away, and I had to move his amendments yesterday. He was probably sent away.

The Hon. Member for Winnipeg North (Mr. Orlikow), who is an eminent Member of the House and has been here for many years, asks the rhetorical question: what would John Turner think of this Bill? John Turner knows all about the Bill and has thought about it. He said to get it out of the House as fast as possible because he does not want to be embarrassed by