

*Oral Questions*

as they related to former office holders and to make sure, in order to protect the Minister, that there would be no suspicion of advantage given to Mr. Gillespie. That is why there was a change. It was not a change made to accommodate Mr. Gillespie; it was a change made to discriminate against him to make sure that he could not receive funds from the \$1 million which is in the control of the Government of Nova Scotia.

REQUEST THAT PRIME MINISTER SEEK RESIGNATION OF  
MINISTER OF FINANCE

**Hon. Jake Epp (Provencher):** Madam Speaker, what we are dealing with here is not the narrow view of legality but the question of whether the Government has the ability to continue governing.

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Epp:** In view of the example of Lord Carrington when he resigned from the British Cabinet, because he failed to foresee the Argentine invasion of the Falklands, and who wrote:

In my view much of the criticism is unfounded but I have been responsible for the conduct of that policy and I think it right that I should resign.

Does the Prime Minister not feel at this stage that his Government is so weakened and its credibility in the eyes of the Canadian people is so tarnished that he must call for the resignation of his Minister of Finance?

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

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, in so far as the Canadian public are concerned, I hope that they will listen in full to the debate in this House. I particularly hope they will listen to the speech made this morning by the Minister of Indian Affairs and Northern Development—

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

**Some Hon. Members:** Oh, oh!

**Mr. Trudeau:**—so they can judge as to the moral right to govern. As to the ability to govern, Madam Speaker, I suggest that question will be put at 5.45 p.m. tonight and we will see the answer.

ACCOUNTING MECHANISM USED IN MAKING PAYMENTS

**Hon. Erik Nielsen (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the Prime Minister. He has stressed on more than one occasion that all of the moneys of the partners to the consortium went into the Consolidated Revenue Fund of the Province of Nova Scotia, that is, the federal contribution as well as the contributions of the two federal Crown Corporations responsible to Parliament and the Contributions of the other members of the consortium. The Prime Minister is also familiar with Clause 4 of the

agreement requiring invoices to be submitted from time to time by the consortium and paid out of that fund.

Can the Prime Minister explain to the House the accounting mechanics by which a cheque written on that fund in payment of the invoices of the consortium would exclude any federal contributions of the federal treasury or the two Crown Corporations involved? By what mechanics could they sort out the individual hundred dollar bills, thousand dollar bills, or whatever, that went to pay the invoices, by cheque, of the consortium?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** Madam Speaker, of course I said nothing of the kind that was attributed to me by the Hon. Member for the Yukon. I merely said that federal funds under the agreement, some, I believe, \$9.3 million at the outset, were transferred to the Government of Nova Scotia to be held by it in a bank in that Province and to be disbursed only with its authority. Those are funds that come from the taxpayers of Canada, the Government of Canada. As to funds which might come from the consortium itself, of course, we have no control over that. It is obviously from those funds that Mr. Gillespie was paid, not from the slush fund of the former Right Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

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

POLICY ON ALTERNATE FORMS OF ENERGY

**Hon. Erik Nielsen (Leader of the Opposition):** Madam Speaker, I have one further question for the Prime Minister. It concerns the policy defined in 1977 which was for the purpose of seeking alternate forms of energy in order to diminish reliance on imported oil for the purpose of generating electricity. That is the definition of the policy applicable in 1977. By what authority can a preamble to an agreement, the agreement of June, take that policy, narrowly defined for the purpose of generating electricity, and enlarge it for the purpose of liquefying coal to produce petroleum products for other purposes?

While answering that question, could the Prime Minister also explain, in his opinion, whether he feels that the Appropriation Act passed by Parliament to allot the funds for that purpose has also been amended by a preamble to that agreement which I described?

**Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister):** The Hon. Member asks me if I feel that. The answer is no, Madam Speaker.

**Mr. Nielsen:** What about the first part?

POSITION OF MINISTER OF FINANCE

**Mr. Ray Skelly (Comox-Powell River):** Madam Speaker, my question today for the Minister of Finance is sort of prefaced by the statement that no code of conduct and no criminal code can compel activities that are honourable or have integrity. Does the Minister of Finance recognize that the