

Supply

Moreover, I find rather strange that when abuses are discussed, those which happened in the 1950s are never mentioned. The hon. member did not mention the Padlock Act passed by the Union Nationale. They went after the Asbestos workers in 1949. They went after my constituents in Murdochville. I find it passing strange that nothing is said about abuses done either at the federal level or especially at the provincial level.

I am not here to criticize the province or the country, but I would like nevertheless to indicate to the hon. member that SIRC was created to ensure the presence of a civilian body operating at arms length both from CSIS and the government itself. We are looking forward to the report SIRC should present in the next few weeks, and I am sure it will be to everyone's satisfaction, or at least I hope so. We will see what we will be able to discuss here with the Opposition members.

Mr. Bellehumeur: Madam Speaker, I think that the hon. member did not ask a direct question but made some questionable allegations, which is even worse.

He said that I referred to the events of 1970. Yes, I did. I do not think that we have to go back to 1950 to dig up provincial problems, when the RCMP is exclusively under federal jurisdiction. We are here to prevent more overlapping, to see that the present Constitution and set-up are respected. Later on, when Quebec has decided on its future, it will be different story.

I must say to the hon. member that if we consider what happened in the 1970s and the information released by the CBC on CSIS's investigation of some members of the Jewish Congress in Toronto, the possibility that CSIS financed or helped found the Heritage Front, the employment of Bristow, a member of Heritage Front, as a bodyguard of the leader of a recognized party, I think that we can make comparisons between 1970 and 1994. There are still reasons today to demand a royal commission of inquiry, just as there were when the McDonald Commission started its hearings in 1977. All we want is to get answers to the questions we have been asking since that time. We never got any answers.

Just by looking at the Harlequin reports published once a year by the SIRC for the past two or three years, it is obvious that we will not be able to get answers even though we, as parliamentarians, were democratically elected by the people of Canada to oversee and monitor public expenditures. These little documents published by the SIRC from time to time will not shed much light on these activities. We need a royal commission of inquiry and I think we have enough allegations to warrant the setting up of such a commission. If there is nothing serious in these allegations, why is the Inspector General of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service looking into the matter? Why is the SIRC looking into the matter and why were its people so nervous when they approved before the Sub-Committee on National Security of which I am a member?

• (1150)

Why is it that parliamentarians felt the need to create this Sub-Committee on National Security to study these allegations? Because they had good grounds for doing so. But, despite all that, we will not get any answers unless we set up a royal commission of inquiry to look into the matter. Then our questions would be answered.

[*English*]

Ms. Val Meredith (Surrey—White Rock—South Langley): Madam Speaker, I would like to ask my hon. colleague from the Bloc why he is not prepared to give SIRC an opportunity to prove it is incompetent of coming up with a report that is satisfactory to us.

The hon. member and probably most other members in the House know how I feel about the make-up of the Security Intelligence Review Committee. It is not a make-up of which I approve. It is not a process of which I approve. However I feel we should allow it to do its job and then judge whether or not the report is adequate and fulfils the needs of the Canadian public to know the facts.

Why is the hon. member unprepared and unwilling to let SIRC complete the report, then sit in judgment and ask for a further commission to be established because the committee has not done its job rather than accusing it of not doing its job when it is not given the chance to do it.

[*Translation*]

Mr. Bellehumeur: Madam Speaker, I am very pleased to answer that question from my hon. colleague whom I admire and for whom I have a liking since we once worked together. There is something else I admire about her, her naivety.

When the SIRC came before the Sub-Committee on National Security, we could see that we would not get answers to our questions. To questions as simple as: "On what date did Mr. So-and-So contact Mr. Such-and-Such?" the Service member's answer was: "I cannot answer you, Mr. Bellehumeur".

When I asked other questions on facts not related to national security, I was told: "We cannot answer you, Mr. Bellehumeur. We will take note of that question and we will get an answer for you, but it will come from the Solicitor General of Canada, not from us".

What will we get from the SIRC? What answers will we get to our questions? Answers censored by the Solicitor General of Canada? That does not satisfy me. Nor does it satisfy the taxpayers I represent. We really need a royal commission of inquiry, where the principals will come face to face with us and will be compelled to give the commissioners answers to the questions we asked and to which we did not get answers from the SIRC.