

was stated by the previous questioner. He talks about a document of April, 1981, which was changed because the officials said, "Well, this is a former Minister. We must be careful that he does not get any special treatment. We must make sure there is no breach of guidelines". In order to ensure that, Madam Speaker, they changed the form of the submission. But why did they change it? Not to privilege Mr. Gillespie, not to give him any special access. They changed it to be sure he would have no access to public funds. That is the point. That is why it was changed, and that is appearing in the documents.

QUERY RESPECTING ACCESS GRANTED TO ALASTAIR GILLESPIE

**Mr. Ian Deans (Hamilton Mountain):** Madam Speaker, is it not reasonable to conclude from all of the evidence that we now have, including the change to the submission, that the reason for the change was to give Mr. Gillespie access to what he otherwise would not have been entitled to?

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

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Well, I ask the Hon. Member—

**Mr. Deans:** I cannot answer, so do not ask me.

**Mr. Trudeau:** The Hon. Member said that Mr. Gillespie had access to something to which otherwise he would not have been entitled. Under what section of the guidelines or of the law would Mr. Gillespie not have been entitled to put a project together which was based on government policy, which was asked for by the Premier of Saskatchewan—the Premier of Nova Scotia—and which was beneficial to the people of his Province? Why would that have been refused to him?

\* \* \*

● (1200)

PRIVILEGE

MR. LEWIS—SCOTIA COAL SYNFUELS PROJECT—ALLEGED  
TABLING OF INCORRECT DOCUMENTATION

**Mr. Doug Lewis (Simcoe North):** Madam Speaker, I have a question of privilege with respect to the documents tabled by the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) this week, specifically the last letter dated February 23 from the Minister of Finance (Mr. Lalonde), the former Minister of Energy. The point at issue is whether Parliament was given the true facts, not as a matter of debate but as a matter of documents tabled by the Prime Minister.

I have five items to refer to in making my argument. As part of the National Energy Program, on page 85 there was direct reference to "A utility boiler fueled by Cape Breton coal; pre-feasibility study recommended site at Port Hawkesbury, N.S., commissioning expected in 1987".

In the budget of October 30, 1980, on page 10, there appears the following statement:

*Privilege—Mr. Lewis*

New funds will also be available to find ways in which the large reserves of Cape Breton coal can be used to enhance energy security—

When the Minister of Finance, formerly the Minister of Energy, appeared before the Committee on Alternative Energy and Oil Substitution on Tuesday, November 25, 1980, at page 52 of the report he commented as follows:

Yes, I can tell you that on this program—

That is the National Energy Program.

—there is not one word in this program that I did not approve personally. The officials worked, but it is a government program. The decisions and options that were retained were those retained by the federal government—not by officials as such.

On February 17, the Prime Minister tabled in this House a letter from the Minister of Energy which contained the following statement:

—I can state that between my appointment as Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources on March 3, 1980, and the signing of an agreement between the Government of Canada, the Government of Nova Scotia and Scotia Coal Synfuels Project on September 25, 1981, I did not have discussions, at any time, with Mr. Alastair Gillespie concerning that project.

As we all know, that letter was superceded by another letter dated February 23, 1983 from the Minister of Finance, the former Minister of Energy. He referred to the previous letter and then stated:

Pursuant to that review, I was informed yesterday, that on January 1981, a memo on this project was sent to me on behalf of my Deputy Minister and that on April 3, 1981, I had signed a Treasury Board Submission in connection with this project.

**Madam Speaker:** I hesitate to interrupt the Hon. Member because I gather that he is making a case about some information which he thinks is not exactly adequate. That might be a grievance, but unless he tells me more about exactly what he is seeking to argue concerning his briefer question of privilege, it will be difficult for me to continue to hear him.

I am willing to hear him if he tells me straightforwardly what his question of privilege is about. If it is about some information which, in his view, is inadequate, I think he knows that that is not the basis for a question of privilege and unfortunately I will not be able to continue to hear him.

**Mr. Lewis:** Thank you, Madam Speaker, I appreciate your comments. You have allowed me to put on the record the linkage we need to get to this point.

It is not a question of information being inadequate and it is not a question of debate; what it is, Madam Speaker, I respectfully submit, is a contempt of Parliament for documents to be tabled in this House by the Prime Minister, given the force and authority of his office, and to have another Minister of the Crown know that when that letter was tabled the facts contained in it were not correct.

I submit that is a leaving on the record of incorrect facts which I have pointed out are there. It is the leaving on the record by the Minister of Finance of that incorrect fact which is the contempt of Parliament. It is not specifically that the Prime Minister knew, although I would suggest to you that the authorities state he is taken to have known that the facts were incorrect; what I am suggesting to you is that the contempt of