

response to the right hon. gentleman's questions, that a revision of the degree of security at the Turkish Embassy was made as recently as last month, at which time increased security was provided. Whatever the degree, the Turkish Embassy expressed satisfaction with that degree. Surely the right hon. gentleman is not suggesting that we should not accept the views of the Turkish Embassy as reflecting those of the Turkish Government.

CONTENTS OF REPORT

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Prime Minister claims that the Turkish Government, through its embassy, expressed satisfaction at the security measures taken. I suppose if there were any increase there would be an expression of satisfaction. However, this morning in the Parliament of Ankara, according to a CP report, the Minister of State, Mesut Yilmaz, speaking for the Government, was very critical of Canada for not providing adequate security at the embassy here.

Would the Deputy Prime Minister tell the House if that report—which was received not last June by me but was submitted to the Solicitor General for the first time after the election—recommended increased measures of security at the Turkish Embassy which were not taken? Perhaps some were. But did the report recommend measures on which the Government refused to act?

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Defence): I would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that the former Solicitor General would have had more discretion than to put a question the answer to which, he knows, would elicit security details—

Mr. Broadbent: That is not so.

Mr. Guilbault (Saint-Jacques): The answers are not dangerous.

Mr. Nielsen:—which simply would not enhance security arrangements at all, if addressed. The hon. gentleman makes the assertion that he did not receive a report last June which was prepared certainly at the behest of the last Government, and most likely at the Hon. Member's request. I see the Hon. Member nodding in the affirmative. If he did not receive the report in June, he certainly should have. He was in office until September.

With respect to acting upon the report itself, indeed it was acted upon, as I have said three times now to the Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Turner (Vancouver Quadra): One outside security guard.

Mr. Nielsen: As recently as last month those security arrangements at that Embassy were revised, and revised to the satisfaction of the Turkish Embassy.

Oral Questions

IMPLEMENTATION QUERY

Hon. Bob Kaplan (York Centre): Mr. Speaker, there are certainly many things done in the interests of national security where the public interest is not served by making them public, but in this case I think national security would be served and enhanced by getting some straight answers. Is the Deputy Prime Minister aware that this morning, after the Solicitor General's statement, the Ministry confirmed that the report was not prepared in June but later, and that it was submitted to the New Government, not the Government or the Minister who commissioned it? I want to ask him again: were there measures recommended in the report which were not implemented?

● (1425)

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Defence): And I am telling the hon. gentleman again, who should know better than to ask such a question, that any answer with respect to security arrangements, at that or any other embassy, would prejudice those security arrangements. What comfort or aid would that give to those who might have in their minds thoughts such as those which obviously existed in the minds of those who have been arrested and charged now? If they had the details which the former Solicitor General is asking be produced, what a comfort it would be to them. I suggest it would do nothing to enhance any security arrangements for the embassies if we followed that irresponsible course.

RESPONSIBILITY FOR SECURITY

Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa): Mr. Speaker, in his answers today the Minister has told the House a number of times that the Turkish Embassy was happy with the security arrangements that were made. We have heard this morning the official view of the Turkish Government, expressed in Ankara, that it is not happy. However, I suggest that whether the Government in Ankara is happy, or whether the Embassy here is happy, is irrelevant.

The question is this. Would he not acknowledge to the House that Canada has signed an international agreement that obligates Canada to provide fully adequate security for embassy personnel? If he acknowledges that, would he also tell the House, in light of his admission yesterday that there was a gap in the security, why has the Government not done more in the last six months to protect the people in the Turkish Embassy, as well as other embassies?

Hon. Erik Nielsen (Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of National Defence): Mr. Speaker, first I acknowledge that it is Canada's responsibility to provide security for these embassies. We can start from that basic premise, with which all of us agree. With respect to my responses yesterday, I used the term "gap". It could just have easily been "breach". The fact is that security was breached. Logic compels you to that conclusion after yesterday's events. But in discharging its responsibilities to provide security to these embassies, I am sure the hon.