

*Oral Questions*

**Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada):** In fact that is not the position, Madam Speaker, that the Government of Canada takes. If the Hon. Member will look back at the Treu case, he will see that there it was NATO secrets which were the issue. That demonstrates that the Government was prepared, certainly in that case, to take the position that a breach of NATO secrecy is damaging to the national interests of Canada. But in the Hambleton case, as I indicated, the opinion of the Department of Justice is that a prosecution on the evidence the Security Service had been able to gather would have been unsuccessful.

**Mr. McKinnon:** Madam Speaker, the Minister must know that a Member of the Cabinet has stated outside this House that the reason Hambleton was not prosecuted was because it was looked upon as a breach of NATO security, not a Canadian breach of security.

## REASON FOR DECISION NOT TO PROSECUTE

**Hon. Allan B. McKinnon (Victoria):** Madam Speaker, the Solicitor General is a Member of the Cabinet Security and Intelligence Committee and must know that Canada's heavy involvement on a day-to-day basis in the security and intelligence operations of NATO makes us an integral part of the process. How can the Minister accept the decision not to prosecute Hambleton in Canada on the spurious grounds that a breach of NATO security in Canada is not a breach of Canadian security?

**Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada):** Well, it is the same question and I give the same answer. A breach of NATO security would be considered by Canadians to be a breach of Canadian security.

**Mr. McKinnon:** Then prosecute him.

## ADVICE GIVEN BY DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE

**Mr. Chris Speyer (Cambridge):** Madam Speaker, last night the Commissioner of the RCMP said that the preservation of NATO secrets was absolutely essential to our national interests. In the Hambleton case the RCMP, in my view, did a superb job. They accumulated the evidence, the same evidence being adduced in a British courtroom today. In the case of Peter Worthington and *The Toronto Sun* it was the Department of Justice which decided, both unfairly and politically, to prosecute that case. In the Hambleton case it is that same Department of Justice which, disastrously and incompetently, has decided that there is no evidence to be adduced in a Canadian courtroom. I ask the Minister of Justice to tell us with some precision why this case is not being heard in a Canadian courtroom rather than in the Old Bailey.

**Hon. Mark MacGuigan (Minister of Justice and Attorney General of Canada):** Madam Speaker, the hon. gentleman knows full well that the reason the decision was made not to prosecute in the Hambleton case is that the evidence was not

adequate, in the opinion of the Department of Justice, to sustain a prosecution.

**Mr. Nielsen:** For a conviction.

**Mr. MacGuigan:** It has been quite obvious from much of the information released in the last week or two that the kind of information now available was not before the Department of Justice at that time.

## PROFESSOR'S ROLE IN INTELLIGENCE

**Mr. Chris Speyer (Cambridge):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Solicitor General. On April 25 the Department of Justice rendered a decision that Hambleton was not to be prosecuted. After that time Hambleton was in constant contact with our Security Service. After April 25, and until he went to Britain in June of this year, was he acting as a Canadian agent during that time?

**Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada):** The Hon. Member has tried to obtain information of that sort from me and I indicated that, until the trial is over, I am not prepared to make statements which would bear on the issues before the court in Great Britain. He said that what I might say in Canada would not be quoted in the media of Great Britain. I can categorically contradict that. In *The Times* Wednesday a front page article stated in part, "Opposition MPs peppered Government about Professor Hambleton. Ministers Refuse to Answer in any Detail". That is exactly the kind of headline I should like to have in Great Britain.

\* \* \*

• (1140)

## LABOUR CONDITIONS

## UNEMPLOYMENT IN NORTHWEST BRITISH COLUMBIA

**Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena):** Madam Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Employment and Immigration. I am sure that he is aware by now that the rate of unemployment across northwest British Columbia has broken the 40 per cent mark. Much of this is due to bad management and lack of forest product diversification. Now that there are over 4,000 forest and pulp workers out of work, that across British Columbia the number of unemployed since this time last year increased by 84 per cent, and that by Christmas another 11,400 workers will run out of unemployment insurance and few of those will be able to get any re-employment under the NEED Program, I should like to put a question to the Minister, and I hope I will get a positive response.

Will the Minister designate northwest British Columbia under ILAP, keeping in mind the rates of unemployment in those other areas of Canada that have been designated under ILAP? Will he make funds available so that a group of workers and economists can look at forest product diversification for both domestic and international markets?