

*Adjournment Debate*

• (1910)

Since the past is an indication of the future, it is important to find out how these Sherlock Holmeses of national security, these truth seekers, these Colombos of Canadian espionage, these watchdogs of House secrecy, operate.

But, seriously, before putting an extra burden on these part-time defenders' frail shoulders, we must answer these questions. Putting the CSE under surveillance is a very good idea per se.

That is why I can tell you right away that I will support this motion. It is the organization to which we want to give this monitoring authority that is the problem. It is supposed to reassure the elected members and taxpayers, but its chairman says that in this service, they never say either yes or no; you will agree with me that that is not so reassuring.

As matters stand, we must answer no to the questions which I raised earlier. You will understand the reason for the Bloc Quebecois's amendment about follow-up, asking SIRC to report to this House, so that this House can monitor the organization which is supposed to monitor the CSE.

Although the motion is acceptable to the Official Opposition and the law creating SIRC, although flawed, is acceptable, I still say to you that if I were the Solicitor General of Canada and had this law in my hands, you would not recognize it once it had been through my office, it would be changed so much. As the saying goes, we make do with what we got, so we must somehow manage with the law we have. So why does the Bloc Quebecois always have concerns about SIRC? What worries us?

I think that my colleague in the Bloc Quebecois, the member for Bellechasse, summarized it very well in his opening speech, supporting the position of the Official Opposition on this subject. It is not the container but the contents of SIRC that must be changed first of all!

The well-known Conservatives on it no longer have any legitimacy. They no longer have any business there. In my opinion, they never had any business there because SIRC should be non-partisan. But since the system is the way it is, let us keep following the rules.

Again, as I did in the past, I ask, and I hope they are watching, Mr. Jacques Courtois, Mr. Edwin A. Goodman, Mr. George W. Vari, and even Mrs. Rosemary Brown, whose party no longer exists either, at least officially, to resign so that SIRC will reflect the democratic reality of the current Parliament.

With a minimum of four new members and an expanded mandate, SIRC could fulfill its primary role of watchdog. Its monitoring responsibility could then be increased.

I am anxious to see the government's position regarding this motion. I hope the Liberals will support it, especially since it is a motion tabled by a government member, a backbencher but a Liberal member. I hope that the Liberals will gladly support the motion. If it is carried in its present form, that motion will expand the responsibility of the Security Intelligence Review Committee. Consequently, it is important to get things right from the start.

I will end by saying that, in SIRC's 1993-94 annual report, the author refers to William Pitt's line to the effect that where there is no law, tyranny takes hold. Mr. Speaker, I might add that this view is based on the premise that we can trust those who are supposed to apply the law and especially to monitor it. Thank you.

**The Deputy Speaker:** The hour provided for the consideration of Private Members' Business has now expired.

[English]

Pursuant to Standing Order 93 the order is dropped to the bottom of the order of precedence on the Order Paper.

---

## ADJOURNMENT PROCEEDINGS

• (1915)

[English]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

**The Deputy Speaker:** Under an agreement made today, the Parliamentary Secretary to the Minister of Canadian Heritage because of a misunderstanding will answer a question put by the hon. member for Calgary Southeast that was not answered last evening.

CRTC

**Ms. Albina Guarnieri (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Canadian Heritage, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, last March the Minister of Canadian Heritage was approached in his constituency office by a constituent whom he had not met before and who he has not met since, to write a letter drawing the attention of the CRTC to his application for a radio licence.

The minister explained to this constituent that as the minister responsible, he could not interfere with the workings of the CRTC but he agreed as a member of Parliament to do his best to ensure that he was treated fairly.

On March 15 the minister wrote to the chairman of the CRTC in his capacity as the MP for this constituent, asking the commission to give the application a fair hearing. This was the letter of an MP seeking to ensure that a constituent received due process. The letter was not meant in any way to be an endorse-