

Security Intelligence Service

individuals and organizations for which he has worked over the years are completely opposed to many important clauses of the Bill which the Minister has brought before us. He knows that these organizations and individuals have made specific proposals for improving the Bill and have made specific recommendations for amendments to plug what they consider to be important loopholes in the Bill.

The Canadian Association of University Teachers, the Canadian Civil Liberties Association, the Canadian Jewish Congress and the Canadian Conference of Churches are all groups with which the Minister and his Party have worked for many years on many subjects including the Constitution. These organizations have now come forward with objections. Why does the Minister not use the opportunity he has here in the House to answer these—

Mr. Kaplan: I already did. I have answered all of those briefs. You know that perfectly well.

Mr. Orlikow: I was not a member of the committee—

Mr. Kaplan: But you can read.

Mr. Orlikow: Like other Members of Parliament, I was attending other committee meetings when that particular committee met. Now is the time when the Minister—

Mr. Kaplan: This is the time for action, not the time for slicing baloney.

Mr. Orlikow: Now when some Members have brought forward specific objections and reservations to the legislation that have been stated by responsible organizations and individuals is the time for the Minister to stand and explain the Government's position. Perhaps one of his colleagues could do so. I have never seen Liberal Members of Parliament so silent. I can only assume that they do not wish to be on record so that if and when they are questioned and if and when they are criticized, they can say: "Well, I was not very enthused about that Bill. I did not speak for it, I did not speak against it. I had to vote for it because that was what the Party Whip required." I sat on a committee with the Hon. Member for Mississauga North (Mr. Fisher)—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. Could the Hon. Member please inform the Chair of the way in which his general comments are pertinent to the motions now before the House?

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, I was simply trying to give some specific illustrations of the groups that oppose specific clauses. I would invite the Hon. Member for Mississauga North to speak on this Bill. I know that he has spoken frequently about his belief in freedom of speech.

Several Hon. Members have put on the record the views of the Canadian Association of University Teachers with regard to the clause of this Bill which gives the security service the right to put under very aggressive surveillance foreign academics who come to the country even though there is no evidence that those foreign academics are or may be involved in espionage

activities. Let me put on record two of the letters which were received by the Chairman of the committee. These letters were written by university professors who—

Mr. Kaplan: They are on the record already, David. They are part of the record.

Mr. Orlikow: They are on the record. Suddenly the Minister has found his tongue. For days he has been silent, and now suddenly he has found his tongue. I wish—

Mr. Kaplan: You have nothing new to say.

Mr. Orlikow: Mr. Speaker, instead of interjecting—although I do not mind his interjections—I would invite the Minister to stand and give me an explanation—

Mr. Kaplan: My answer is on the record as well.

Mr. Orlikow: I would invite the Minister—

Mr. Deputy Speaker: Order. The Chair finds these repartees from either side of the House disruptive to the process of debate, and they must certainly be annoying to the Hon. Member who has the floor. I invite the Hon. Member to continue his remarks.

Mr. Orlikow: Let me read a portion of a letter which was received by the Chairman of the Standing Committee from the President of the Canadian Association of Slavists, Nicholas Zekulin. The letter reads in part:

We are, of course, aware that not all the activities of all visiting academics, professors or students, are legitimate, but this does not mean that some safeguards should not be built into the legislation specifying that there should be grounds for suspicion of activity inimical to Canada before the provisions of the act are invoked.

That seems to me to be a very reasonable proposal. As well, I have in my possession a letter addressed to the Chairman of the committee from Dr. Peter Bly, Professor of Spanish and President of the Canadian Association of Hispanists. He has written the following:

Obviously, we could not countenance the activities of foreign professors and students detrimental to Canada's security and would publicly support all attempts to prohibit the entry into Canada of such undesirable people. But we feel that indiscriminate surveillance and monitoring of bona fide visitors will adversely affect our attempts to establish links with Spanish-speaking academics as well as being a gross injustice to these individuals in question.

Those are just two of the many letters which I am sure were received by the Government. We are, as we should be, encouraging professors in Canadian universities who wish to learn more and wish to be able to teach their students more about countries in South America, in Africa, in China, in Eastern Europe and elsewhere. If they are to learn more, there must be an exchange of academics. Our professors must visit those countries and their professors must visit Canada.

● (1330)

Let us be realistic. Professors in communist countries are, in all likelihood, members and supporters of those regimes. Otherwise, they could not be professors. We know that when we invite them and when we permit them to come to Canada.