

● (1500)

[English]

NATIONAL SECURITY

CASE OF CANADIAN PROFESSOR—REPORTED OFFER OF IMMUNITY

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, I wish to direct a supplementary question to the Solicitor General. The Solicitor General earlier today, if I heard him correctly, and I believe I did, said he had no personal knowledge of a deal that might have been made with the convicted spy, Hugh Hambleton.

As reported at page 21118 of *Hansard*, on November 30 the Solicitor General said that after Hambleton had been told that no Canadian charges would be laid:

On the basis of having been given that information he agreed to co-operate with the Security Service and produced considerable additional information—

In other words, he was told there would be no charges. After he was told, he provided the additional information. How, having said that on November 30, can the Minister now stand up in this House of Commons and claim that he had no personal knowledge of a deal?

While I am on my feet, the Minister said he would not comment on this matter while it was before the Old Bailey. It has now been decided in Britain. Will he make a full statement on motions in this House of Commons indicating to the Parliament of Canada exactly what are the facts as known now and as known earlier to the Government of Canada, so that we may judge whether the Government of Canada carried out its responsibilities in this case.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Madam Speaker, I meant in my first answer to make it very clear that there is no letter offering an immunity. I said I had no personal knowledge of that letter but I verified with those who might have sent such a letter on my behalf, or on anybody's behalf, and can assure the House that there is no letter offering an immunity. I have no idea what Mr. Hambleton has in that envelope. I am as interested as the Members opposite to know, but I can assure you it is not a letter from me or from anyone on behalf of the Government offering him an immunity.

As to the deal, I think it very important to understand that what the Security Service told Mr. Hambleton was not that the Department of Justice had decided that he would not be prosecuted, but that the Department of Justice had come to the conclusion that he could not be prosecuted because there was insufficient evidence.

Where a deal is created, one side furnishes consideration and the other side furnishes consideration. That was not the arrangement here because, having revealed, as the Security Service was authorized by the Minister of Justice to do, that a prosecution could not be brought because it would not succeed,

Oral Questions

they asked Mr. Hambleton if he would give them further information and he agreed to do it.

Why would Mr. Hambleton do such a thing that could work out to be against his interest? Why did he go to Britain? These are questions that are very difficult for someone to understand, without knowing Mr. Hambleton. I cannot help the House in understanding, for example, why, after being told of the reception he would receive in Great Britain, he would nevertheless decide to go to Britain. Why, when the Security Service was still interested in prosecuting him, if they could get admissible evidence, he would willingly, having been told simply that he could not be prosecuted on the basis of the evidence that they had—

Miss MacDonald: Peter Treu was.

An Hon. Member: He is a spy.

Mr. Kaplan:—why he would willingly give further evidence. He is not an easy person to understand—

Miss MacDonald: That is incredible.

Mr. Kaplan:—and I cannot help the Members opposite in understanding him any better.

REQUEST THAT MINISTER MAKE STATEMENT TO HOUSE

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): Madam Speaker, the Minister himself has used the word "deal". That is his language; he just used the word "deal". He is nodding his head to show that he agrees with that interpretation.

Some Hon. Members: No deal.

Mr. Clark: We will read *Hansard*. The Minister referred to the deal, and he indicated that, after an assurance was given that prosecution would not or could not proceed, Hambleton then took certain actions, as a consequence of that undertaking being given by the Government of Canada.

My question is simple. Will the Solicitor General give us an undertaking now that he will make a full statement to this House of Commons so that we can judge for ourselves what parts of Mr. Hambleton's situation are understandable to this House of Commons, so that we can make that judgment and not be held back by the confusion of the Solicitor General. Will he make the information available to Parliament?

Hon. Bob Kaplan (Solicitor General of Canada): Madam Speaker, I have given forthright answers to the questions that I have been asked today. I am prepared to answer other questions that I am asked to the greatest extent possible, but I would like to remind Hon. Members that the KGB must very well now be doing a damage assessment on this matter, trying to see exactly what the Security Service has learned, what information the Security Service and other friendly Security Services now have about their operations, from Mr. Hambleton and from the information that he has given. I would ask