

*Oral Questions*

making sure that the submission was written in a way that Mr. Gillespie could not have access to public funds.

• (1430)

QUERY RESPECTING PURPOSE OF MINISTERIAL CONDUCT  
GUIDELINES

**Hon. Edward Broadbent (Oshawa):** Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister is confusing two facts. First, it is true that officials rewrote the document so that the money could be laundered in a certain way to get to Mr. Gillespie, leaving the appearance that the guidelines were enforced. It is also true that the proposal was changed in substance, technically, so that, quite apart from the financing, Mr. Gillespie's proposal would qualify.

Does the Prime Minister prepare guidelines for moral behaviour for his Ministers with the intent that they be enforced, or is it all part of a cynical exercise by the Prime Minister himself?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, the Hon. Member asks a rhetorical question and I will not deal with it, but I will certainly deal with the preamble.

He says that the agreement, the submission, was rewritten so that the money would get to Mr. Gillespie. If he is making an accusation there, I suggest he is dead wrong. The agreement was rewritten, the submission was rewritten so that the money would not get to Mr. Gillespie. If he has some information—

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Trudeau:** I see the Leader of the New Democratic Party is shaking his head. If he has some shred of evidence that Mr. Gillespie has touched this money, got one single cent of it, then he should make that accusation. So far we only have head-shaking.

**Mr. Broadbent:** Nonsense.

**Mr. Trudeau:** What I see, Madam Speaker, is a group of officials acting in advice to their Minister, who want to make sure that the Oil Substitution Program is effective and that a program, judged to be beneficial for Nova Scotia by the Premier of Nova Scotia, can be brought into effect.

I think the officials, once again, were acting in a laudatory fashion when they made sure there should be no phoney accusations or conflict of interest and yet that the program proceed as it did.

DATE OF FORMER ENERGY MINISTER'S AWARENESS OF PROJECT

**Mr. John Bosley (Don Valley West):** Madam Speaker, I have a question for the Prime Minister who has been informed today in the House that his then Minister of Energy appeared before the Alternate Energy Committee on November 25,

1980, and that recommendations were made in the planning stages of the National Energy Program to provide funds for this project which, I would assume, the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Energy at the time would have to know about.

Since the document on which the Prime Minister relied from the Minister of Finance yesterday said that rather than knowing for the first time later, he knew in fact for the first time in January, 1981, and since the evidence is clear that the Minister of Finance, if he was performing his duties, knew before that date, will the Prime Minister tell the House of Commons today whether he still maintains that he and the Minister of Finance are telling the truth to this House when they say that the then Minister of Energy knew nothing about this project before January, 1981?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, if the Hon. Member was following the debate closely he would have heard my answer to a previous question along those lines from the Hon. Member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe, I believe, and the statements of the Minister of Finance in answer to a question from a Member of the Opposition Party this morning on that same subject. The Minister said that, as far as he could recollect, there was no information conveyed to him before. He admitted—

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** No, no! He did not say that.

**Mr. Trudeau:** He admitted that he might be wrong in his recollection—

**Mr. Hnatyshyn:** Get another letter from him.

**Mr. Trudeau:**—but he went on to concede that even if he had had information before, or if he had had it only months later, he would not use that as a defence. The guidelines themselves do not talk of a defence in terms of any elapse of time. The guidelines make it imperative upon a present office holder dealing with a former office holder that there be no privileged access. That is what the debate should rest on, not on the elapse of time.

**Mr. Bosley:** Madam Speaker, the Prime Minister, sooner or later, is going to have to deal with the fact that there is every reason to believe that the certifications that have been made to the House have been part of a cover-up and have misled the House.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Some Hon. Members:** Hear, hear!

**Mr. Bosley:** And that the question of whether the House has been misled is quite a different breach of parliamentary privilege.

**An Hon. Member:** Oh, come on!