

trary to the Criminal Code or contrary to any other law. What is at issue here is whether he fulfilled his responsibilities as a Minister of the Crown in terms of the guidelines for minimum acceptable behaviour as laid down by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau). That is what is at issue, Mr. Speaker. That, and nothing more.

It was interesting to listen to speakers from the Government benches today. They stood up and said that they deplored muckraking; there has not been any; and then they resorted to 20 minutes of muckraking.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Andre: I shall not go up that blind alley. I will not be attracted by that red herring or that straw man which the Hon. Member for Lincoln (Mr. Mackasey) whipped the blazes out of. I will not be attracted by the straw man which the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Mr. Munro) destroyed or the straw man that was taken on by the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources (Mr. Chrétien). We are not impressed with these battles with straw men. What we are concerned about, as has been so eloquently stated today by many, many speakers, is the integrity of Parliament—

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Andre:—and the authority of the Minister of Finance, of all positions, probably next to the Prime Minister, second most important to the nation. The unscrupulous integrity which must be associated with that office clearly has been thrown into question. Overwhelmingly it has been thrown into question by any measure of objective analysis that, the Minister is in violation of the guidelines, as is the previous Minister, not just in the eyes of the Conservative Party, or in the eyes of the New Democratic Party, but in the eyes of every single correspondent working for newspapers, radio and television. They have all reached the same conclusion. If we are wrong, so is everybody else who, in a public way, has commented on this matter. Everybody is wrong except for the Liberal Party. Everybody is wrong except for the Treasury benches and the sheep who follow. That is an absurd situation.

What we have is a clear violation of the conflict of interest guidelines by the Minister of Finance, the former Minister of Energy, Mr. Gillespie and, quite probably, the Deputy Prime Minister (Mr. MacEachen), the Minister of State for Mines (Mrs. Erola) and perhaps the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané), who in his previous incarnation was responsible for the Cape Breton Development Corporation. I will not go over all the evidence that clearly establishes beyond and shadow of a doubt that Mr. Gillespie was in violation of the guidelines. The guidelines have been read several times. I want to read them once more because an important part was left out. These guidelines read:

Within a period of two years of leaving office, Ministers should not:

(c) lobby for or on behalf of any person or commercial corporation before any department or agency for which they were responsible on an ongoing basis during the last two years of their participation in the Ministry.

On the next page we find:

For these purposes "department or agency" includes Crown corporations—

Supply

We have Crown corporations called Petro-Canada and Devco. The former Minister of Energy, Mr. Gillespie, was the Minister responsible for Petro-Canada. He was clearly responsible for Petro-Canada. That means that he should not have had any dealings with Petro-Canada for two years.

● (1740)

The current Minister of Energy said that Gillespie's job was to persuade the other participants. He admits that Gillespie lobbied Petro-Canada. He persuaded them, if you prefer that language. Clearly, it is overwhelmingly established that Mr. Gillespie is in violation of the guidelines.

I will not go over the memos that have been mentioned in terms of the information tabled yesterday which clearly established Mr. Gillespie's culpability. There is the "Dear Micky" letter. They say they treat everyone commonly. I have about 20,000 constituents who would love to be on the terms of "Dear Micky, I have a deal. Do you think you could get your boys to help me with this deal?" Is that not seen as preferential treatment to any reasonable person on the outside? Of course it is preferential treatment.

The Prime Minister says that lobbying is persistent contact. He says that there is no evidence of that. Then they table three inches of documents showing the kind of contact that was occurring. Does it take a file of documents three feet thick before persistence is established?

Of course, there is the quote from the Deputy Prime Minister in Port Hawkesbury that Gillespie is not the beneficiary of his own foresighted policies. From the words of the Deputy Prime Minister, Gillespie is in violation of the guidelines. Automatically, any responsible Minister is also in violation of the guidelines as the current Minister of Finance, the then Minister of Energy, clearly is.

If our system of responsible Government has any meaning whatsoever, Ministers must be responsible for what their deputies do. They are fixed with the knowledge of their deputies. Ignorance cannot possibly be an acceptable defence if we are to try to retain some semblance of parliamentary democracy.

Cohen knew what was going on. Therefore, the Minister of Finance knew too. Cohen and Stewart were directors of Petro-Canada, which was a part of the deal. Therefore, the Minister of Finance was responsible. Finally, the Minister of Finance, as the Minister responsible for Petro-Canada while this deal was going on, has a third level of responsibility in terms of honouring the guidelines, which he most certainly did not honour.

What has happened here during the last week was a bungled attempt to cover up. That is exactly what we have seen. We saw the Prime Minister, on the first day this was raised, saying that it was outside the two-year period, as if that applied to sitting Ministers, which it does not. The next day he stated to the House that he had talked to the Minister of Finance, and the Minister of Finance assured him that he knew nothing about it until September, 1981. The next day he comes in and says that actually it had nothing to do with the federal Government; it was handled by Nova Scotia. We have brought