

*Summer Recess*

ties, they, in turn, refused to co-operate with the Canadian government and they subsequently released the documents.

The fourth example of the cover-up was that the Uranium Information Security regulations were revised only after the opposition, the Progressive Conservative party, brought an action in the Ontario high court to contest their validity. In order to minimize the potential political embarrassment of a negative decision, the government enacted the less restrictive regulations. These at least permitted some public discussion of the government's involvement in the cartel but, of course, all the information came from the investigation conducted in the United States, not from discussions which took place in Canada.

The fifth example of the cover-up was the government's announcement of a combines investigation which came fully two years after the cartel was exposed in the world press. This development was the result of sustained opposition questioning in Parliament. Of course, there was the added benefit to the government that no information about the subject of a combines investigation may be made public while an investigation was in progress. This short-term political expedient had the effect of putting discussion of the cartel on the back burner.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that at the time the then minister of consumer and corporate affairs asked the director of combines investigations to undertake the inquiry, an article appeared in *The Globe and Mail* of October 4, 1977 which reads in part as follows:

Mr. Allmand said Mr. Davidson would be able to look at all relevant documents, including privileged Cabinet documents, during his investigation. "His purpose . . . is to look at all evidence to determine whether there was an infraction of the combines investigation act. This means he has the right to look at documentary evidence, behavioural evidence, conversations and whatever."

But what happened when Mr. Bertrand, the combines investigator, asked to see those confidential cabinet documents? What happened was that he was refused by the government. Today, in the House, the Minister of Justice said that the documents were not necessary for Mr. Bertrand's investigation. That is not so. An article in *The Toronto Sun* of June 8, 1981 reads, referring to Mr. Bertrand, in part, as follows:

He said that, although he was not allowed to see the secret cabinet minutes, they weren't necessary "to make things any clearer." He refused to elaborate.

A cabinet trustee holding the minutes would not release them despite Bertrand's reminder former consumer affairs minister Warren Allmand had pledged cabinet documents would be available, Bertrand said.

"I think now they're making a distinction between documents and minutes. Mind you, I never made that distinction."

How can the government ask for the trust of the Canadian people when its behaviour in this affair from start to finish, has been so tawdry?

The sixth example of how the government has engaged in this cover-up is that there were two provincial inquiries to nuclear affairs, namely the Cluff Lake inquiry in Saskatchewan and the Ontario Select Committee which sought testimony from the unindicted co-conspirators, Dr. Runnalls and Mr. MacNabb, who both worked for the government. In both these cases the government refused to allow them to speak on matters related to the cartel. This was so, notwithstanding the

fact that these were domestic political inquiries and that no question arose as to the need to protect national sovereignty.

The government's argument in the cover-up, from the word go, has been that it was essential to have the gag order to prevent threats to national sovereignty. These were cases in Canada, Mr. Speaker; they were cases where the government sought to prevent evidence from coming out in Canada.

In the seventh example, the Westinghouse Electric Company in England sought evidence for its uranium supply court cases in the United States. This evidence, in the form of testimony and documents from Rio-Tinto Zinc Corp. of London, was crucial to Westinghouse's case, because it could not obtain evidence in Canada and in Australia.

The case was appealed up to House of Lords before it was disposed of by it, and an interesting fact came out; namely that Canada and the other cartel members had applied extremely strong diplomatic pressure to the government of the United Kingdom to step in and prevent the release of the Rio-Tinto Zinc evidence. This point was made by the British attorney general and solicitor general on the motion for leave to appeal to the House of Lords.

The next incident shows that the same sort of pressure was applied in the United States. As the Department of Justice grand jury investigation drew to a close, the U.S. state department prevailed upon the White House to vet the recommendations that the department had sought for criminal indictments. After diplomatic pressure was applied by Canada, however, Gulf Oil Corporation was charged only with a criminal misdemeanor, and was fined \$40,000 after pleading *nolo contendere*.

In the ninth incident, the Government of Canada has consistently refused to make public the Bertrand report, the 1972 opinion by D. W. Henry, or the justice department opinion as to the cartel's potential illegality, as well as other government documents relating to the cartel.

We have seen incident after incident of cover-up taking place, so let the minister then not ask for the trust of the Canadian people and say that there has been no cover-up. On August 5, 1977, the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) outlined to the House what he saw as the course that should be followed. At page 8074 of *Hansard* he is reported as having said the following:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is obviously entering into a debate. I indicated yesterday that we would welcome this debate. We will put every fact we have before parliament so it can debate this matter properly. Obviously, this game of putting statements on the record of which I have no knowledge may be profitable for the hon. gentleman, but I do not think it advances the question whether the government at that time either acted legally or illegally. Nor does it answer the question whether we did so in the interests of the Canadian people or not. We are anxious to have this debated—

● (1520)

That is a firm assurance from the Prime Minister of Canada that all relevant documents will be put before Parliament, yet the cover-up has continued.