

*Supply*

have to listen to the arguments being put, as opposed to chatting with the Minister of National Health and Welfare (Miss Bégin) who obviously does not give a damn about this, either.

● (1650)

**Mr. Lalonde:** I can listen to you while I am listening to someone else.

**Mr. Deans:** You can, can you? Is that the same way you dealt with the documents which you did not know existed, doing two or three things at a time?

**Mr. Lalonde:** Why will you not cool off?

**Mr. Deans:** Why don't I cool off? Do you know why I don't cool off? You are drawing this institution down to a level the likes of which it has not been in years.

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

**Mr. Deans:** The reason I do not cool off is that this institution is the only thing that stands between the country as it now is and total anarchy. And I say to the Minister that if he can stand up and satisfactorily refute the points which I have made, then I suspect that I would withdraw my argument. But I say to the Minister, frankly, that I do not see how he can do that. I do not see how he or the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau), or the current Minister of Energy or, for that matter, the Attorney General (Mr. MacGuigan), could claim for one minute that Alastair Gillespie was not lobbying. I do not see how any one of them could claim that in the process of lobbying, he was not violating the guidelines. I do not see how anyone can claim that when that violation of the guidelines was brought to the attention of the Ministry, a new submission was drafted in order to circumvent the violation which existed. And I do not see how anyone could claim that if the Minister signed that amended proposal, he is not an accomplice in Mr. Gillespie's violations. I therefore cannot see how the Minister can claim that he is entitled to remain in office.

**Mr. Lalonde:** I have listened with great interest to the Hon. Member's speech and to the attempt he has made to present his case, I think reasonably. Let me put the case to him another way and ask him whether or not he could see the other side of the point which he tried to make, in all fairness and in all reasonableness. He said that Mr. Gillespie had been given preferential treatment because the Treasury Board submission was modified.

**Mr. Deans:** Yes.

**Mr. Lalonde:** He says, yes. Well, that is a strange leg to put his argument on, I would submit, for the very simple reason that Mr. Gillespie has been treated in this case in a way which is indeed different from that accorded to any other average citizen who would have applied. Why has he been treated differently? Because, as he is a former office holder, the Government and the officials have taken exceptional care to prevent him from having access to public funds under the

Canada-Nova Scotia agreement. Far from being an occasion of damning the Minister or of damning the officials, the fact that they have taken that extra care to get the Treasury Board submission changed to eliminate the possibility for Mr. Gillespie to have access to any of these funds, surely should demonstrate to any reasonable being, and I assume my friend is a reasonable being, and approaches this situation reasonably, that all due care was taken to ensure that the conflict of interest guidelines were respected. Surely my hon. friend has quoted from documents and memos where officials have said, "Hey, there is that conflict of interest guideline. We must ensure it is taken care of. The official of the Treasury Board said, 'I will check with the Privy Council Office'", and in the end, the Treasury Board submission and the agreement had a special provision inserted into it to take into account that particular situation.

Does my friend, as a reasonable man, not see that there is another side of his argument and it provides a completely different conclusion from the one he reached using the same facts? It is a completely different conclusion and it shows that the officials and the Government acted responsibly.

**Mr. Deans:** I thank the Minister for making my case for me. I want to suggest to the Minister—

**Miss Bégin:** Listen to the Minister.

**Mr. Deans:** I listened. Believe me I listened. I have sat up every night for the last week puzzling over what has been going on.

**An Hon. Member:** You were talking to Mark Rose.

**Mr. Deans:** I was not talking to Mark Rose. Do you want to hear my answer or do you want to talk? The Minister made the case extremely well. He said that the Ministry officials recognized the potential for a conflict of interest. They recognized the potential because in fact Mr. Gillespie had been in that conflict of interest position for almost two full years. They recognized that. They then decided that if they continued with what they were proposing, he would not be able to participate.

**Mr. Lalonde:** No way.

**Mr. Deans:** No. Hang on. They decided they had to alter the Treasury Board order—

**Mr. Lalonde:** To take extra care.

**Mr. Deans:** In order to allow Mr. Gillespie to not violate the guidelines. I put to the Minister, if Mr. Gillespie had been in violation of the guidelines, and if the Treasury Board orders had to be altered so that he was not in violation—

**Mr. Lalonde:** Even appearing to be in violation.

**Mr. Deans:** —are you not giving him something which he would otherwise not be entitled to? You had to change the guidelines to entitle him to participate. You had to change the Treasury Board orders.