

Supply

Alastair Gillespie factor prevailed. That at least has to be the prima facie case which we refer to the judge appointed by this Government to judge precisely these kinds of questions.

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Clark: The Members opposite are trying to shout me down. That is exactly the case we had, Mr. Speaker—

Some Hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Watch out, you will wake up the Speaker.

Mr. Clark: I believe, Mr. Speaker, it is doubtful that this project, if it had other sponsors, would ever have been approved, but that is a matter which we are prepared to allow to be judged by the judge whom Parliament appointed, to whom the Liberals want to keep the case from going. They do not want the case to go to the judge. They want to hide the evidence and stifle debate here in the House of Commons.

Let me raise this very important question: what in the world was Alastair Gillespie doing there? What is his expertise in energy matters? Was he there because he is an expert? No, because he is not. Was he there because he had a whole passel of money? No, because he does not. He was there for one reason. He has one asset, and his asset is the "Dear Micky" connection. "Dear Micky, dear Marc, dear Allan, dear Pierre, cher Jean." That is the reason why Alastair Gillespie is involved in this case. That is prima facie evidence, Mr. Speaker, that the guidelines have been violated. That is all that the Associate Deputy Registrar General needs. That prima facie evidence should go before the judge whom this Parliament appointed so that he can see whether the guidelines by which we are supposed to live and Ministers are supposed to live have in fact been honoured. That deals with Alastair Gillespie.

• (1540)

Let me deal now with the Minister of Finance. First the Minister of Finance denied knowing anything about it. He denied knowledge. Then he admitted knowledge. He said he had misled the House but he did not really mean to. As I pointed out earlier, when honourable Ministers in Ontario, Britain and throughout our system, mislead the House, they resign. That is what honourable Ministers do. This Minister did not do that.

Let us review the facts that are known so far, and I emphasize so far because it may well be that not all the facts are yet in the public domain. We have a memorandum dated January 15, 1981, well within the period of prohibition for Alastair Gillespie to be involved in matters with his former Department. I will quote from that memorandum. It is from Mickey again. This is the Mickey to Marc document. It is from the Deputy Minister to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources and it reads:

You will recall that Mr. Gillespie has organized the Scotia Coal Synfuels project whose object is to study the possibilities for the liquefaction of coal in Cape Breton, possibly using the now-dormant refining facilities of the Gulf Company at Point Tupper. Mr. Gillespie now has commitments of \$300,000 from each of four participants: Gulf, Nova, Petro-Canada and Devco. In anticipation of this development, provision was made during the planning stage

of the National Energy Program for a maximum of \$1 million to be available for federal participation in this project.

The Minister was told that on January 15, 1981. The memo began with the words. "You will recall", which suggests that the matter was brought to his attention before that time. The Minister says it does not matter when he knew. Well, it matters very, very much.

That was accompanied by a memorandum asking for the Minister's comments. The Minister's comments were sought. We do not know what the Minister's comments were. They were not in the package.

I note that I am coming near the end of my time. I am citing the evidence that the Hon. Member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Pelletier) wanted. The comments were not in the package presented to the House of Commons. The Minister's comments were asked for. We do not know what they were, but we do know what happened. Nothing happened. For nearly three months after the Minister was advised, nothing happened. Nothing happened until a Treasury Board meeting on April 3, 1981.

Mr. Lalonde: There was no Treasury Board meeting.

Mr. Clark: I will make reference to the Minister's own words outside the House in a media interview when he said that the matter did not then go to Treasury Board on April 3, 1981, it did not go to that meeting because "there was a discussion at the official level about the possibility of—ah—the allegations about potential conflict of interest". He said "at the official level". The officials raised the objection two and a half months, nearly three months, after the Minister knew about the conflict of interest problem. Officials had to raise the objection. He did not do it himself. He did not carry out his duty. That is very clear from the evidence that is available to us.

Some Hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Clark: The Minister is trying two escapes. He says that Alastair Gillespie received no benefit. Let me review it quickly. The guidelines for the program were changed. That is a benefit. Second, the program continues to be studied despite the overwhelming opposition of officials who are expert in the matter. That clearly is a benefit.

Then there is the question of money. The Minister claims he did not make a direct payment of Government money to Alastair Gillespie. As the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Nielsen) has made clear, it is going to be very hard to persuade anybody of that because, how do you trace the payments? He cannot argue that there were no benefits to Alastair Gillespie from the consortium. The consortium is paying him \$30,000, some \$600 per day. He is getting benefits. Do you think he would be getting benefits if he were not involved in this consortium? Do you think he is there out of charity? Of course he is getting benefits as the result of his "Dear Mickey" "Dear Marc" relations with the Government of Canada. There can be no doubt about that.