

We should certainly be able to assure them that, as long as they are here for legitimate academic reasons and are not involved in espionage or any other aspect which is inimical to our security, they will not be spied upon, have their mail opened or their telephones wiretapped. We would expect the same kind of treatment for our professors who visit those countries.

I would urge the Minister, or any Member of the Liberal Party who is in the House, to rise and explain how this proposal, which will affect university professors and their organizations, could be viewed as being impractical. Why did the Government not accept that proposal? I would say that there is a very simple reason. The Minister has forgotten the things he knew before he took his present appointment. The Minister has sloughed off all the principles in which he supposedly believed. He is ignoring the advice and urging he receives from the people he has worked with over the years. He has become a complete captive of his bureaucracy and has caved in to it. That is why he has taken this view.

Mr. Gordon Taylor (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal with a number of clauses in the Bill. But I would first like to refer to a problem with Clause 12, which I think is typical of a great many other areas in the Bill, that is, the very poor English in which it is written. The language could be misinterpreted. If and when this legislation goes before the courts, it is the wording that will decide justice. It is not the way someone else interprets it. It is not the way it is discussed in the House of Commons. It is the way in which it is written in the law that will decide justice. It will decide whether we have justice, or whether we have an unfair type of law.

For example, in Clause 12 a sentence appears which reads as follows:

The Service shall collect, by investigation or otherwise,

The first thing I would like to know is: What does "otherwise" mean? Does it mean the bugging of cars, the bugging of telephones or the bugging of the telephone of a person from another country? What does "otherwise" mean? It is like saying *et cetera, et cetera*. It can mean everything and anything. That is the first thing which I object to in the Bill. I would like to know what the service can collect by investigation and by what other means. "Investigation" is a pretty big word. It pretty well covers the slate.

The Government added the words "or otherwise". Therefore, it can collect in formation by investigation or it can do so "otherwise". The words are not "and/or"; the words are "or otherwise". Therefore, if the service cannot do it by investigation, it can do it "otherwise", whatever that is.

I have not heard anyone explain that. It is a matter to which I take objection. If this legislation is sound, why are the Members on the other side of the House not taking their proper turn in defending the legislation?

Mr. Kaplan: Because we want to vote on it, that is why.

Security Intelligence Service

Mr. Taylor: Because you want to vote on it. You want to get it through before people even know what it means. That is what the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) says.

Mr. Kaplan: Before the session ends.

Mr. Taylor: He wants to vote on it. He does not care what it means. He does not care how it will treat human souls, not a bit. He wants to vote on it. This Party wants to do more than vote on it. When we vote on it, we want to know what it means. We want to be able to explain to our constituents what the legislation means. But the Government is not giving us that explanation. The back-benchers sit there like a bunch of clones—pardon the expression. They are simply going to accept anything that the Minister puts into the legislation.

I ask Hon. Members on the other side: What does "otherwise" mean? Instead of standing up and giving us a lecture, as the Solicitor General did a few moments ago, why does he not explain the legislation? That is all we are asking. A simple explanation. It is like a teacher who says to a class: "You are doing it wrong. You are doing it wrong". That does not help the youngsters. They will not learn anything. The pedagogue who knows what he is doing will mark it on the board to show why it was wrong in order that the youngsters will not make the same mistake again. That is pedagogy, not dictatorship.

I would like to make a further comment about Clause 12, which reads:

The Service shall collect, by investigation or otherwise, to the extent that it is strictly necessary,

What is strictly necessary, "the investigation" or "otherwise"? to what does it refer? It is simple English. If the youngsters, who are sitting in the Gallery today, were asked to analyse that, they would tell us that it could not be properly analysed. We do not know to what the "it" refers. "The Service shall collect, by investigation or otherwise, to the extent that it is strictly necessary". "It", what in the world is that?

No wonder the committee is befuddled. No wonder an amendment was put forward in an attempt to have that wording changed. The committee proposed that the service's collection of information and intelligence should be limited to what is "strictly necessary for the purpose of protecting the security of Canada". That is what it should say. We are talking about the security of Canada, but the legislation does not indicate that. It says "it". Whatever is that supposed to mean?

The vote on that amendment in committee was: four in favour and five against, with the Chairman not voting with the Government. The Chairman said:

The chairman regrets that the government could not see fit to accept that amendment.

Is that not strange? The committee voted four in favour and five against. The Chairman is a member of the Liberal Party and I believe a lawyer, but I am not sure. I know he is well learned. He said that!