

Parole and Penitentiary Acts

series of events that could take place. But as long as the Senate exists, let us stop dumping on it or expecting rubber stamps. Either you have the courage to say that we will abolish the Senate, or if the Senate exists—

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): An elected Senate.

Mr. Prud'homme: —or if the Senate exists, the Senate is to work.

My Leader was asked by a member of the NDP where the Liberal Party stands on the question of the Senate. My Leader and the caucus is on record as believing that if the Senate is to exist, we would prefer an elected Senate. That is on record.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Prud'homme: When there is a debate, if there is any, I will have certain views to express. I may not, however.

• (1740)

[*Translation*]

And now about the former Solicitor General, Mr. Speaker. Now I think it is really too bad— The people listening to us now and the reporters who are looking down are all wondering why we are here and who is right. Mr. Speaker, you know perfectly well, and I'm looking at the people listening to us in the gallery and I know what they are thinking. When a Government comes and says: we are going to clamp down on criminals; don't worry: we are going to take care of this country's security— It is a popular subject, no one will deny that. I see the Deputy Speaker of the House, an eminent criminal expert. I know and he knows that people like to gang up on the underdog and they like seeing criminals used to scare people. That is considered to be acceptable behaviour. I don't like that because I tend to be perfectly frank with my constituents. I tell them: listen, it's too easy to say: "You know, all these criminals who are going to be let loose on the community—", without further explanations. Mr. Speaker, I realize it's very popular to say that, but it is not the answer to the problem we are considering today.

The former Solicitor General has made a specialty of what we in Quebec call scarecrows. In fact, of using scare tactics. I think that is language we can all understand. So what did he say? I would like to recall two statements, one of which you may not remember. There was a time when here in Canada we had terrorism on the brain. It was terrorism here and terrorism everywhere. Remember when the former Solicitor General rose in the House and said: I want to say that starting next August—

[*English*]

It was last winter that the ex-Solicitor General said, "I want you to know that starting in August we will see about terrorism". My friend was with me in Mexico when we talked about terrorism. It was at the meeting of the Interparliamentary Union. He said then, "I want you to know that we will have a special squad in August". I could not do anything other than

laugh. I thought it would be wiser for the then Solicitor General to get up one morning in August and say, "Oyez, oyez, people of the world, I want you to know that as of today we have a special squad to deal with terrorism" rather than give them a few months' notice, saying, "Hurry up, boys and girls, if you have something to do in Canada, you had better do it before August because in August we will have a special squad". I did not choose to go that way. He did. I thought he would learn his lesson. Now I realize that he wanted to become Minister of National Defence. It worked. He is now the Minister of National Defence. There will be no more problems. Terrorists will be dealt with because now we are in good hands with the ex-Solicitor General, now the Minister of National Defence (Mr. Beatty).

What did he say recently? This is what has made me speak like this today. I am not known to be so aggressive. I thought it was the end of it when I heard the former Solicitor General say, "Any further delay endangers the safety and in some cases the lives of Canadians", and warn that, "we are sitting on time bombs ticking away". Canadians listening to that said, "My God, are we in good hands. He is going to do something about it".

The new House Leader is a good friend. I wish him good luck in his job. I will not back off on my friendship. However, I ask him what Canadians are thinking. We are called back here because we are living with a time bomb. If it is true, I am glad to be here and do my duty. This Bill was introduced in the House on June 27, 1985. The Bill was not dealt with until long after that. Suddenly the Government says, "Boys, quick, the Senate, hurry up boys". That was one year later to the day— June 27, 1985 to June 27, 1986.

An Hon. Member: Irresponsible.

Mr. Prud'homme: I do not know if it is irresponsible, but Canadians will judge. There will be many more occasions on which to talk about national defence. I am sure the former Solicitor General will admit that he was not careful when he announced many months ago that he would have a special squad in August. He must at least admit that it was not wise to say that. He should not have alerted the terrorists of the world. We do not want to see them in our land. He should not have said that we will not be able to cope with them until this coming August.

I believe it was wrong. I will let people judge whether he was right. I believe it was an honest mistake. I did not believe the second one, namely, to make people afraid and then say to Canadians, "Don't worry, big Daddy is here".

[*Translation*]

So, Mr. Speaker, I understand, I was never able to speak any other way than to speak with—When I believe—Do you see the difference between certain political men and women, my dear colleague, the new Quebec caucus president, elected in a very close vote but elected, so I congratulate you.