

Adjournment Debate

having responded in two months when he thought I had had the report for two months. We learn now that he was the first politically accountable person to receive the report, and from September until now, more than six months, it had not yet been taken to Cabinet.

I commissioned that report because I believe that security at foreign missions needed to be upgraded, and I wanted the advice of the RCMP on how that security should be upgraded. Six months after the Government received that advice it still has not gone before Cabinet, and a terrible tragedy has occurred involving the death of a Canadian and serious injury to the Turkish ambassador. It has also embarrassed the Canadian Government considerably before the Turkish Government. I would like to elaborate on that for a moment.

The Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen) said that Turkey was satisfied with some increase in security arrangements that were made a month ago. That was contradicted from Ankara. We learned that the Government of Turkey, through Ministers in the Turkish Assembly, had indicated that it was not satisfied with the amount of security that was provided by the Canadian Government for its mission here. The Ministers say that 10 days ago they warned the Canadian Government of the possibility of a terrorist attack on their embassy.

It is clear from the answers the Government has given that, whatever it did one month ago, it certainly did nothing 10 days ago when news of a possible terrorist attack on the Turkish Embassy was given to Canada. If we saw evidence of it in the arrangements that existed and were made public at the time of the terrorist attack, what the Government did one month ago was not much. It seems to me that in the range of security responses and precautions that could be taken, what should be taken in relation to an embassy with regular threat assessments is action of a much stronger nature than that which seems to have been taken in the case of the Turkish Embassy.

The question that has still not been answered by the Government, which claims that Turkey was happy with the arrangements made one month ago, even though that has been contradicted by Turkey, is whether or not the Mounties were happy with the arrangements that were made one month ago. Were those arrangements the ones that were recommended in their report?

I can see the Parliamentary Secretary preparing to rise to indicate that he does not have to tell us what security arrangements were made on the grounds of national security. I agree with that. I think there are 100 questions I could ask that I should not ask and for which answers should not be given. However, the question of whether or not the RCMP were satisfied with the security arrangements and whether or not they conformed with what was recommended for the Turkish Embassy, particularly at a time of a specific threat assessment which was brought to the attention of the Government by the Turks, ought to be answered, because I believe the Canadian people are entitled to an assurance that those security arrangements were made. If they are not, they should be entitled to the resignation of the Minister.

• (1815)

Mr. John McDermid (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, of course, this is a very serious subject. Any suspected terrorist activity is a threat to our security, and as such is within the mandate of the Canadian Security Intelligence Service to investigate. I might say that the Hon. Member took some poetic licence in that he did not hold his comments to the specific question which he asked the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. Nielsen) in the House. That question is to be found at page 2929 of *Hansard*.

The priority given to the investigation of any particular group by the Service would be consistent with and appropriate to the degree of the threat posed. The record of terrorist acts claimed by anti-Turkish groups in other parts of the world, as well as in Canada, is well known and is a clear indication of the level of threat these groups represent.

I would like to take this occasion to raise my strong concern with the nature of the Hon. Member's question, which I find, in light of his earlier responsibilities, to border on being irresponsible. As the previous Solicitor General, the Hon. Member knows full well that public discussion of security threats and the Government's response to those threats is not in Canada's interests or in the interests of those who may be the subject of such threats. In light of these well-understood and accepted principles, I would strongly urge the Hon. Member to consider very carefully pursuing any further questions of this nature in the House.

In light of the respect which the Solicitor General (Mr. MacKay) has for these principles, I am sure the former Solicitor General would agree that it would be irresponsible for the present Solicitor General to provide any further indication of the extent or nature of any ongoing investigations or surveillance which is being conducted by the Service. I would like to repeat what I have already said. The priority given to the investigation of any particular group by the Service would be consistent with and appropriate to the degree of the threat posed.

[*Translation*]

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Ottawa Centre has the floor.

• (1820)

REGIONAL ECONOMIC EXPANSION (A) GOVERNMENT AID TO DOMTAR. (B) IMPORTANT ECONOMIC PROJECTS FOR QUEBEC—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Mike Cassidy (Ottawa Centre): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate you for your intervention in French. We are dealing now with the subject matter of a question which I put on March 4 and to which the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. de Cotret) replied in the absence of the Minister of Regional Industrial Expansion (Mr. Stevens). It is about the Domtar Corporation and the federal government's failure to intervene in the corporations' investment project for the Eastern Townships, a project of utmost importance for the econom-