
Canadian Sponsorship Scandal: The Whistleblower's Perspective

Case prepared by **Allan CUTLER**,¹ and Professors **Ruth McKAY**² and **François BROUARD**³

The easiest way to describe it is to say I, Allan Cutler, never thought of myself as a whistleblower. Back in the 1990s people knew about whistleblowing but nobody really talked about it. So when I got into the situation I never thought of myself as becoming a whistleblower; it was just that I needed to take action.

In 1994, Allan Cutler, a purchasing manager working for the Government of Canada, became aware of issues in the procurement processes at his branch, the Advertising and Public Opinion Sector of the Government Operational Services branch (APORS). APORS was in charge of the Sponsorship Program, a program aimed at sponsoring community projects and cultural events. After numerous attempts to correct the procurement anomalies he had witnessed, Cutler decided, in April 1996, to blow the whistle and to report the problems to persons higher up in the organization. As a result, he was threatened by his boss and had to fight to keep his job (see Appendix 1 for a sequence of events).

In 2004, ongoing corruption was finally identified in the operations of the program by the then Auditor General, Sheila Fraser. As a result, the Sponsorship Program was discontinued and the Commission of Inquiry into the Sponsorship Program and Advertising Activities, also known as the Gomery Commission, conducted a public inquiry into the program. The inquiry found that \$2 million had been awarded in contracts without a proper bidding process, \$250,000 had been added to one contract price for no additional work, thereby doubling the value of the contract, and \$1.5 million had been awarded for work that was never completed (CBC, 2006). In the meantime, Allan Cutler, who endured severe stress before and after he became the whistleblower for what became known as the Sponsorship Scandal, decided to take early retirement after months off work on stress leave.

¹ Allan Cutler is an MBA graduate from Sprott School of Business, Carleton University in Ottawa and President of Canadians for Accountability, a group formed to help whistleblowers, fight corruption, advocate for truth and transparency.

² Ruth McKay is an Associate Professor at Sprott School of Business, Carleton University in Ottawa.

³ François Brouard is an Associate Professor at Sprott School of Business, Carleton University in Ottawa and Director, Sprott Centre for Social Enterprises (SCSE).

Allan Cutler, APORS and the Sponsorship Program

My values are no different than those of most other people. Most people want to do the right thing – do tasks properly, do their job well. Maybe it's just I'm a little more stubborn.

I was offered a job as a procurement agent in Toronto shortly after I graduated from university. Since I'm an Ottawa boy, I then accepted a job offer from the federal government. I stayed in procurement all my working life. I occasionally did some project work outside procurement, but generally I was buying for the government. I always enjoyed procurement.

Starting in 1974, I did procurement for the Department of Public Works and Government Services. I worked in the Communication Procurement Services Branch of the Supply Operations Sector of the federal government. The Supply Operations Sector did major purchases across the entire government. I started in an entry-level position, but after several years I was designated a PG-05, a purchasing manager. I enjoyed the work. I negotiated advertising and public opinion contracts for the government. There are many rules, so you need to be informed and meticulous to do this work. It was extremely busy. When I started, there were three employees. By the time I was transferred to APORS, I was managing as many as 10 employees. I also trained many employees, which I enjoyed. I would train an employee and when they moved on to another position, I would train someone new.

In 1994, procurement and payment were moved from the Supply Operations Sector to the Advertising and Public Opinion Research Sector (APORS) area of the Government Operations Sector. As a result, the functions of these two areas were merged. Procurement and payment functions, as well as the authority to set fees and cost rates and approve expenditures were embedded in the APORS under the authority of one person, Chuck Guité. These merged functions eventually evolved into the Sponsorship Program, a Liberal Party initiative. The program sponsored Quebec community projects and cultural events as well as events in other provinces. The funding was non-repayable and allowed the federal government to advertise its sponsorship in exchange for the funding.

Guité was responsible for selecting advertising agencies for the federal government as well as monitoring advertising to ensure it conformed to government rules and regulations. Our unit had previously been in an organization with internal checks and balances to ensure procurement was done correctly. The new organization was not designed this way. Guité was now able to select the advertising firm, specify the details of the contract and the amount to be paid and arrange the payment without oversight.

Our unit dealt with advertising and public opinion research. When the unit was moved to be part of APORS, it was also downsized. Before the move, there were five people doing the job, but afterwards there were only three. So, of course, the pace of work accelerated.

Before my unit was transferred, I was a PG-05 manager, a purchasing officer with management responsibilities. I had not been doing the actual buying, but I managed others who did the buying.

All the problems related to buying would be referred to me for resolution. When I was moved over to the new organization with only two other people, I started buying again rather than managing. At the time of the move, I was told the PG-05 manager level was no longer necessary. I objected because it meant the managing side of the task – the oversight – would be ignored. I argued that while it wasn't necessary for someone to be assigned exclusively to managing, the knowledge and expertise of the level were still needed.

Just a Few Unusual Contracts?

The attitude appeared to be that since our area was on its own we did not need to follow the rules. We were isolated. Other employees dealing with procurement for the federal government were in another building. All my reporting relations and contacts were no longer accessible. I had nowhere to send documents that were completed incorrectly because there was no place in this organization to do anything about purchases.

One of the first things that happened in my new job was that I was asked to change the date on a contract. I was asked how to do this and I gave Guité straight advice. I advised him that he had made the decision and that we could assume that he had the authority as of the previous (other) date, so we could go ahead.

Backdating meant that there was no actual contract in place at the time. Backdating is moving things back earlier than the paperwork states or the work was authorized. Because Guité had authority on an earlier date than the actual contract stated and because he established the contract verbally on an earlier date and the financial authorities were approved, I told him that we could put the contract to the earlier date. So, it was actually putting the correct date on the contract. To me that was not wrong. If Guité had the authority to make the contract and he had booked it that day, then it was just a matter of confirming the correct date.

Eventually, there was one notable incident in which the paperwork came through in January and we were asked to backdate the contract to October. But the financial approvals had only come in January from the department. The department was not backdating their financial authority, but we were being asked to do it. This was wrong, and by assisting I would become culpable. There are many people who changed the dates on their files. These government employees who were requesting the backdating knew what they were doing was wrong.

Many anomalies arose during this time. One was changing contract dates. One reason for changing the date could be if one person had the authority to sign contracts and the second person had no authority. Person two might have asked the firm to start work, but it was not until person one stepped in that the contract was official. Several weeks later, employee two would ask employee one (authorized employee) if they could backdate the day that the firm started work to the date employee two (the unauthorized employee) had asked the firm to start.

There was a mechanism in the federal system to correct these confirmed orders. They were corrected by going to legal counsel and getting an acknowledgement. The legal statement would state that the staff acted without authority, but that the contract they backdated is fine. This is called ratification of an oral contract. But in my case, the instructions were to change the date on the contract and not get legal approval.

Another problem I encountered was being told to pay a firm a certain per diem amount when a firm was willing to work for less. I would not sign it. I would prepare the documents and refuse to sign either a recommendation or an approval.

A further example of a problem was a rushed request. For example, I received a three-day contract in which a firm was paid three million dollars by the Government of Canada to do the work in three days. The contract was for Canadian flags. The contracted company had to buy the flags, receive them and deliver them to me as the procurement officer within three days. For this contract, the selling company received two hundred to three hundred thousand dollars in commission. The dates in question were March 28th to March 31st. These dates coincided with the government's fiscal year-end. As I saw it, the government was mostly focused on spending the money before the end of the fiscal year. In addition, the contract called for payment by immediate release, which meant that the firm would get the cheque within 48 hours, as opposed to waiting 30 days like every other firm. Why were these firms being given preferential treatment? There were other problems too. Guité was approving contracts that were supposed to be approved by the minister. These were serious oversights, and there was no way to correct the situation.

The first time these procurement anomalies occurred, I spoke to Guité. He said it was an accident. The second time it happened, I was getting a little more concerned. Each time it happened, I tried to talk about it and to correct it. I didn't just go off on a tangent and refuse to do things. I would talk to Guité and try to explain what should be done. This doesn't mean I succeeded in getting anywhere, but I tried to get these problems corrected. After several of these problems arose, I realized it was a systemic problem. I also started to realize that this was a problem that I was unable to address. I started reporting to Guité in December 1994, and by February 1995, I knew there was a problem. I started a log book to keep track (see Appendix 2 for a sample of the log book).

When I started working for Guité in December 1994, I tried to be helpful by explaining the proper way to make changes. My advice was ignored. Then, by February 1995, I came to a point where I couldn't do it anymore. I realized they were operating by a different standard than mine. I kept insisting that we follow the legal procedure, but I only had a certain amount of authority. I figured they had a right to ask me to prepare the documents. But they had no right to ask me to sign them, because if I signed them I was saying they were right. So I would prepare the documents and submit them for signature. But on every one of them, I enclosed a note that outlined what the rules were and a separate note with my recommendation(s). My document packages would end up with Guité and he would sign the requests and then they would be returned to me. My concerns were simply ignored.

In February 1995, I met with Guité. He told me that he wanted me to report to Parent, who was a level below me. In a hierarchical organization, this is what I would call the ultimate insult. I think this happened so soon after I started working for Guité because I was slowing the process down. I

believe the move was also in reaction to the fact that I was finding anomalies and making my concerns known both verbally and in writing. The alternative to having me report to Parent was that Guité could have declared me surplus. This was all happening in 1994 and 1995, when the federal bureaucracy was shrinking by about 20 to 25 percent. In this climate, being declared surplus meant being fired. It was not a matter of finding another job. It meant being out of work. Guité threatened to declare me surplus because he didn't need a PG-05, which is what I was.

Initially, I trusted Parent because he had reported to me earlier in our careers. Previously, I had enjoyed an excellent working relationship with him. What I didn't realize was – and he put it to me bluntly one day – that now, anything Guité asked him to do, he would do. So I quickly stopped talking to Parent. I didn't trust anybody in the Government Operational Sector. I didn't really know the staff. I didn't feel I could talk to anybody. I decided that the situation in my new job was not going to change, so I phoned Liliane saint pierre, a director I had worked for in another government branch. I was under a lot of stress at the time. I wanted to see if I could get back to my old organization. I remember telling her there were problems. I felt that she didn't want to hear about the situation. She told me there was no work in her area. I tried to confide in her, but I got nowhere. There was no suggestion to phone her again or meet for a coffee to discuss my concerns. I just knew that's where it ended, so I never phoned her again.

Since the government was downsizing significantly, there was nowhere to turn for another job. I tried watching for job competitions, but there was nothing. I discovered later, and I don't know whether it happened deliberately or not, that jobs were occasionally posted, but they were not – we're talking before electronics – put up on a bulletin board I accessed. I was not willing to quit my job, so I was stuck. As I was unable to move, I had to cope with the job I had. I started documenting the evidence of questionable actions and building a case. I was under a lot of stress. I went on stress medication.

It got worse as time went on. I would go home every night stressed with headaches. Linda, my wife, knew what was going on because we talked. She fully supported me. Our children, who were young at the time, never knew, but they were not naïve. What may have helped me keep some of my sanity was volunteering at night. While I was going through this disaster during the day, I was at least respected at night. Volunteering was a way to reaffirm who I was.

Blowing the Whistle

What they didn't realize was that I had already made a special effort and photocopied everything when nobody was around. I did this because I was concerned with the extent of the anomalies I was seeing and to protect myself. If everything disappeared it would simply be my word against theirs. My job was in jeopardy. Without evidence I was sure I would lose my job. I didn't have everything I wanted, but I photocopied everything that I could copy.

I finally blew the whistle in April 1996. I had moved from just accumulating documents to becoming reactive. Everything I did was reactive. I couldn't think straight and I was living day to

day. I kept building the case, getting the evidence, but I hadn't done anything with it. I could have reported the problems three months earlier or later than I did. When I first started building the case in February 1995, I knew I couldn't speak up because if I did Guité or Parent would just say they had made several small errors. I knew I had to build a substantial case with a history of the systemic situation so those involved couldn't just weasel out of it. I didn't have a fixed deadline about when I was going to act. But I knew I was going to do something.

My decision to report was made one day when I was sitting in Parent's office and he started telling me that Guité was pissed off because I would not sign anything. Then he told me that I would pay a penalty because I refused to sign. As I saw it, I would pay a penalty for doing the right thing. Refusing to sign was doing the right thing. For the second time, I was being threatened personally. That was the trigger.

The next thing I did was phone the union and report the situation. The union staff recommended that I speak to staff in Internal Audit, which was Norm Steinberg's department. I met with Janet Labelle in Internal Audit and gave her about a quarter of all the documents I had. I did not give all the documents I had because I wanted to see what would happen. I felt Internal Audit had to earn my trust. They went through the documents. They said what I had was very credible. They eventually wrote a memo to Jim Stobbe, a person higher up in the organization (higher than Guité and Parent). The memo indicated that my concerns were valid. Unbeknownst to me, while the Internal Audit Department was looking at the files, Stobbe wrote to Ran Quail, further up the chain of command. His letter stated: "We have a staff relations issue in APORS." I had become the problem.

In early June 1996, I was hauled into Guité's office. When Guité asked me if I could meet with him, I replied that I wanted someone from the union present at the meeting. He agreed, so I had a witness at the meeting. He also had a witness, so there were four people in the meeting. Guité was on his best behaviour. He told me that I was being declared surplus. He said that this decision had been discussed months ago. This was a five-minute meeting. He just told me these facts: The department didn't need a PG-05, so they didn't need me. Guité said it had nothing to do with the reporting I had done. He reiterated that the decision to make me surplus had been made months before.

I was being threatened with being declared surplus, so I filed a grievance through the union. The grievance prevented Guité from implementing the plan to make me surplus. The Internal Audit group had promised me protection when I brought forward my evidence. The second Guité came down on me, they vanished. I phoned them to tell them what was going on and that's the last I ever heard from them. They disappeared. No protection was provided at all.

I did not leave my job, as I had no other job to go to and, if at all possible, I did not want to be forced out. But I sat for almost three months with no work. All the work bypassed me. The department locked the storage room with all the documents related to procurement. They gave a key for the room to one person and if an employee in the area wanted to get in, they had to go and ask her to gain access. It was odd, because this person was a temporary employee, yet she was holding the key for government employees. A memo was sent out about the key and locked room. Guité and Parent thought that would stop me from collecting proof of other irregularities in the procurement process.

So I sat for three months with nothing to do. People wouldn't talk to me because they feared becoming tainted by association. Everyone went around me. I was not given work. Based on my grievance claim, Public Works was supposed to move me to another position in government within three weeks, but that did not happen. The department didn't support me or assist me in finding a new job, as was expected with the grievance.

I sat in a cubicle in an open office. People could see me when they walked by. I had a phone, but I wasn't allowed to use it for personal calls as I was being watched. I worked my regular hours – I was on time and didn't leave early. Nor did I take time off. I could not take an extra long lunch hour or long breaks as I was being watched. They could be watching to see if I did something that could get me in trouble, allowing them to use insubordination as an excuse to fire me. I was sitting as an outcast – the tainted whistleblower. I felt like my coping skills were running thin. What kept me going was my refusal to give in, but I knew I could not tolerate this situation much longer.

Finally, after three months, I was moved because Noel Bhumgara offered me a job when nobody else would. Bhumgara and I had known each other for 25 years and he didn't know about my work problems. Had I known I could approach him for work, I would have phoned him sooner. He was higher up than L. saint pierre in another part of the organization. I probably would have had a good career after this transfer, except that he retired and L. saint pierre took his job. So suddenly I was reporting to L. saint pierre. I couldn't believe it. My career came to a screeching halt. But I had gotten out of Guité's organization.

I later learned that when I arrived in my new work area, people in the area had been warned that I was a troublemaker. The adjustment to the new job was hard on me because now I was reporting to a manager who was doing no more than the job I had been trained to do and had done for several years. I had at least as much knowledge about the job as her. But as I was placed in purchasing again, I had to refer things to her that I used to make independent decisions about. The only real blessing for me was that I had known about half the employees in this small group that I worked in for more than 20 years. As a result, rather than them believing me or accusing me of being a troublemaker, they were supportive and asked me what had happened. The job was uninteresting, but the work environment was fine, so I survived.

In my new job, I only discussed in a limited way what had happened to me. As soon as I mentioned advertising or Guité, some fellow employees indicated they understood. When I tried to find a job in other areas in government in an effort to find more challenging work, any discussion about my previous work or reference-type calls to Guité would end my hopes of moving. It became very simple – don't try for a promotion.

In 1997, APORS was absorbed into the new Communications & Coordination Services Branch under the Ministry of Public Works and Government Services Canada, with Alfonso Gagliano as minister and Guité as director. Guité retired in 1999 and was replaced by Pierre Tremblay. All those who worked with Guité have either retired or been promoted and are still getting lots of credit for their work. Nothing happened to them. But me, I am still paying and supposedly I did the right thing by flagging the problem. Everybody who had been at my job level back before the

move to the Government Operations Sector moved up except me. I concluded this was because of my whistleblowing.

Years Later... Public Scandal

In 1998, the department gave me a letter thanking me for reporting the anomalies in procurement and apologizing for what occurred. The letter said Guité's actions were inappropriate and that the problem had been solved and would not reoccur. It was signed by Michel Cardinal, Assistant Deputy Minister of Human Resources, on behalf of the Deputy Minister. Based on the letter, I withdrew my grievance of disguised discipline.

In 2002, we again started hearing rumours about the things that were going wrong in Guité's organization. In May 2002, Auditor General Sheila Fraser released a report stating that federal bureaucrats did not follow the rules in dealing with ad agencies, and in September the RCMP became involved (CBC, 2006). Then, in 2003, the Auditor General asked public servants who had knowledge about problems in advertising from 1997 to 2003 to please come forward. I was sitting there with all my records, and I didn't know if what I had was relevant because my documents dated back to 1994-96. I looked up who I had to make the request to in order to submit documents to the Auditor General. It was Norm Steinberg and Janet Labelle of the Audits and Ethics group. In 1996, they were the people to whom I had presented my concerns on procurement. I had given them extensive proof. They had validated my concerns back then, but they had vanished two months later when I was declared surplus by Guité. And now, before going to the Auditor General, I would have to go to them? It was like a recurring nightmare.

I sent an e-mail to Labelle, requesting permission to take what I had to the Auditor General. What I got back, was: "We have to first see what you have before we can advise you." When I had originally blown the whistle to Labelle and Steinberg in 1996, I had only given them about a quarter of the documents I had. So there was this underlying issue about my initial refusal to give them all the documents. They knew I had documents, but not what I had. When they requested to see the documents, I sent an e-mail saying, "No." There was no way I was sending documents to them, given how they had previously treated me. The trust was broken.

In 2004, things were heating up as the Auditor General continued to pursue this issue. In February, she released a report that showed that, between 1997 and 2001, the federal government had mismanaged millions of dollars related to the Sponsorship Program (CBC, 2006). I was set to go public with everything I had, but before I had a chance I got a phone call from a reporter, Robert Fife of CanWest News. He had received a brown envelope describing me as the whistleblower who knew a lot about the Sponsorship Program, Guité and what had gone on in Guité's organization. He asked me a series of questions and he got a series of "no comment" responses from me. If I said "No," it would shut him down. I could not say "Yes" because I was a public servant, but I could say "No comment" to him. Robert was not dumb. He understood what I was saying and why. Robert then read to me over the phone what was said in the brown envelope. After we got off the phone, I sent an e-mail to address protocol in government that I had been contacted by Robert Fife about this situation and that I had said "No comment." Robert then went public with my name as the whistleblower for what became known as the Sponsorship Scandal (Fife, 2004).

When Fife's article ran, suddenly all hell broke loose. The department finally acknowledged me; they sent a lawyer to talk to me. In the end, I would not accept the lawyer offered me, so the union paid for a lawyer of my choice, Dougald Brown. He was excellent. He knew how to prepare me, how to coach me so that I was able to answer the questions.

I testified in March 2004 before the Public Accounts Committee. I identified Guité as the "controlling influence" of the sponsorship program. In April 2004, Guité testified and denied any wrongdoing. But in May, Guité and Jean Brault, founder and head of Groupaction Marketing, an ad agency that received funding from the Sponsorship Program, were each charged with six fraud-related charges by the RCMP. The two men pleaded not guilty.

In September 2004, the public inquiry began hearing testimony. When I was asked by Guité's lawyer if Mr. Guité personally instructed me to complete the paperwork incorrectly, I looked at him and said, "I am quite content to let the signatures speak for themselves." And he shut up after that. Because he was trying to get me to say, "No, I had not talked to Guité." And it's true, I hadn't, but the individuals involved and their actions were very clear in the paperwork.

Proof of the misappropriation of funds in the Sponsorship Program became known through the inquiry. For example, in April 2005, Paul Coffin, head of Coffin Communications, a recipient organization of the Sponsorship Program, "told the inquiry that he repeatedly produced fake invoices, over-billing the federal government for thousands of dollars for work that was never done on sponsorship projects. Coffin admitted to defrauding the federal government by taking \$1.5 million for doing little or no work. He said much of it was at the request of Chuck Guité" (CBC, 2006). Guité denied these allegations. Bernard Thiboutot, who worked for Groupaction advertising executive Brault, told the inquiry he masked payments to the Liberals by "funneling five cheques worth \$57,000 to Liberal Party organizers through an employee's consulting company" (CBC, 2006).

In February 2006, Justice John Gomery released his final report. The Gomery Commission found "political involvement" in the administration of the Sponsorship Program and "insufficient oversight at the very senior levels of the public service." There was also evidence of reluctance to speak up against managers who were circumventing established policies due to a fear of reprisal by virtually all public servants involved. There was evidence of gross overcharging by communication agencies, kickbacks and illegal contributions to a political party. There also was a "culture of entitlement" among political officials and bureaucrats involved with the Sponsorship Program" and a refusal to acknowledge responsibility for the mismanagement of the program (Gomery, 2005).

In 2006, Coffin was sentenced to 18 months in jail, Brault to 30 months. Guité was arrested for fraud by the RCMP and convicted on five counts on June 6, 2006. On June 19, 2006, he was sentenced to 42 months in prison. After appeals were rejected, Guité started serving his 42-month sentence in jail on August 5, 2008. On February 15, 2009, Guité was placed on parole after serving six months of his 42-month sentence.

In December 2008, 19 criminal charges, including fraud, were filed against Gilles-André Gosselin, the former high-ranking ad executive at Gosselin Communications. In 2007, "Lafleur

faces a 35-count fraud indictment over allegations related to 35 contracts worth \$1.6 million for his alleged role in the sponsorship scandal” (CBC, 2006). The commission concluded that the Sponsorship Program had been “seriously mismanaged” (CBC, 2006).

Stress and Early Retirement

“I, like many other whistleblowers, bear psychological scars from the aftermath of speaking up.”

The worst stress I experienced was during the time I worked with Guité. The following 10 years, the frustration level was up, but the stress level was down. I was coasting because I was capable of doing my job with my eyes closed. During the inquiry, my stress level went up, and afterwards I ended up being off work on stress leave. My doctor ordered it. Shortly thereafter I retired. I retired sooner than expected, on October 15, 2004, at 55 rather than five years later. I'd had enough. What happened is that, when I went back to work after the stress leave, my boss didn't know what to do with me. I had a number of people coming by saying “good job,” but they didn't know what they could give to me because they were concerned about what I might say about their work given my status as a whistleblower.

I remain proud of what I did and would do it again if put in the same situation, but I paid a substantial price for taking a stand, for doing my duty. When I eventually retired, my pension was less because of this event. I have calculated that the financial cost of being a whistleblower in the Sponsorship Scandal was a minimum of \$250,000 to \$300,000. The end result was that I paid a penalty financially (and emotionally) for doing the right thing. But at least I can sleep at night.

2014-06-12

Appendix 1 Sequence of Events

Nov 17, 1994	Met with Guité and others re problems in procurement
Dec 5, 1994	Procurement reports to Guité
Feb 2, 1995	Started keeping journal due to problems
Feb 28, 1995	Met Guité, ordered to report to Parent
Feb 29, 1995 to Apr 17, 1996	Problems continued
Apr 18, 1996	Parent informed me that I will pay a price for my resistance
Apr 22, 1996	Wrote to union
May 13, 1996	Union wrote to J. C. Stobbe
May 28, 1996	Met with J. Labelle from Internal Audit
Jun 11, 1996	Guité advised me that I will be surplus (fired)
Jul 17, 1996	Formal grievance filed
Sept 3, 1996	Secondment started in different procurement area
February 24, 1998	Grievance settled
May 27, 2002	Request permission to contact Auditor General
February 27, 2004	Robert Fife article in print media
March 11, 2004	Testimony to the Standing Committee on Public Accounts
September, 2004	Gomery Commission begins hearings
September 28-29 th , 2004	Allan Cutler testimony to Gomery Commission

Appendix 2

Excerpts from Computer Log Kept by the Whistleblower

February 2, 1995: “In the two months since I have been reporting to Guité, I have discovered that I am expected to cover up deals made and not use good procurement practices learned over twenty years... As I report directly to Guité, it is impossible to refuse his orders without leaving myself in a vulnerable position. Therefore, I am starting this log in order to develop some “protection” by documenting some (but not all) of the things I have to do.”

March 1, 1995: “... I am to report to Parent... The alternative Guité gave me yesterday was to... put me on the priority list if this change in job status was not acceptable. Some choice – Accept Parent or be out of a job. Guité frankly stated my chances of maintaining a government job would be slim under the present government situation. With the government cutbacks, I agree with him. I am obviously trapped and have no choice but to accept the situation for now. I just wish he had said this in front of witnesses.”

March 3, 1995: “... Guité told me I was spending too much time ‘down the hall’ in office doors and that people had told him that I did this even when he was out of the office. No mention that these were almost all business discussions... and no opportunity for rebuttal with the big stick being waved. It was a monologue, not dialogue. However, now that I know there are office spies (and I know who they are), I am staying in my office on a fulltime basis.”

March 10, 1995: “Here we go again. The AOR contract being drafted is not what I believed was pitched on by the firms. The billing and payment conditions are being drastically modified. In any case, I have some major reservations about the whole process. Too loose for my liking. No clear RFP produced which allows for misinterpretation and change. However, it is not my place to criticize. Guité would just threaten me with being placed surplus (again)... Needless to say; I am trapped... and feel the stress everyday of watching every word I say and what I do.”

March 15, 1995: “... Yesterday Parent told me to backdate contracts on file C2876-4-2508 to March 1 even though we received the requisition on March 7, and he had it on hold till March 14. I had the documents backdated to March 7 but, to protect myself, and leave a clear track record, there is a note on file showing that I booked the order on March 14 with company.... Also, Guité has instructed that the commission to be paid company DEF is to be progressive. While I agree that this is a simpler formula than the one I wrote, it is not what the firm had originally agreed to. This change could easily represent over \$1M more paid to the firm...”

March 31, 1995: “I was ordered by Parent to backdate three or four contracts...”

March 5, 1995: “Once again, I am backdating contracts. File B9574-4-0054... Who do they think they are kidding. The dates of approval and fax dates clearly tell when the file was received. To try and pretend the contract was placed earlier is a farce.”

March 18, 1995: “Parent gave instructions on B9574-4-0054 for two contracts to be prepared and placed.... Although I realize that I will not get into trouble over the backdating since it comes

from Guité's level on down, I am very uncomfortable with doing it as it goes against twenty years of doing the job right."

May 12, 1995: "Since I am on stress medication, things do not bother me the same.... K0381-5-0014 for \$1,685,200 received from Environment Canada on May 1. Contract is dated May 1 but approval was given on May 10."

June 20, 1995: "... I am still on stress medication. The Tourism files have been backdated to April 1 and Health Canada to mid-April... The casual way in which backdating is discussed is further evidence how common the practice is here."

July 4, 1995: "... Generally the attitude is to give the contractors what they want, and don't look too closely at costs. I wish I knew what the government gains by this attitude. In a time of restraint, it appears that advertising is the exception. Give more money to the firms, not less..."

"Parent just came charging into my office demanding to know why I was delaying the ... contracts. I was able to prove to him that the delay was with ... and not with me. I find this insulting.... The feeling that I am given is that they are watching and just waiting to catch me. Only because I know what I am doing have I stayed one step ahead of them... but I cannot keep this up forever."

Sept. 7, 1995: "Back from a long vacation. Feeling better until now. Contract integrity is definitely in peril. Parent asked me to go to his office and he shut the door. I am assessing the National Standing offer bids on EN771-5-CB08 in an all-day meeting tomorrow. He mentioned ... two companies competing for this requirement and requested that, if necessary, I help ... during the assessment in interpreting information in favour of the firms... This is completely counter to principles of honesty and fairness."

Sept. 8, 1995: "Today we assessed the RFSOs for the National POR requirement. As it turned out, both firms qualified under their own merits. Relief... I would have had a problem because I would not have compromised contracting integrity or my own principles in order to qualify a firm unfairly."

Sept. 26, 1995: "I no longer record as much, just significant instances. There are just too many occurrences and I am concerned with keeping my stress level down. However, the file mentioned (31922-5-0001) is a prime example of playing with contracts. The fax was received September 11 advising the signed requisition would follow. Due to the advice of this office, the original requisition has been backdated to August 1, 1995 and the 'orders' are for the contract to be dated August 1. I cannot make an issue each and every time. It is a losing battle. Parent will always do what is politically expedient (or what Guité wants), and is not concerned with doing the job properly, he knows what should be done, but in this office they just don't care."

Oct. 4, 1995: "EN771-5-U144 contract issued to ... company. I have authorized the contract dated July 4, 1995, but not signed the approval... The reason is simple. The requisition was actually prepared in October.... It is also easy to see that Parent has changed his date of approval and I have kept a photocopy showing this."

Dec. 21, 1995: "... Guité has approved and signed this file EN771-5-U136 as of December 13, 1995 even though the financial authorization was not received. Now they intend to back-date the contract to October 1, 1995. I have copies of the original document..."

Feb. 8, 1996: "It is still going on. I have a list and copies. I just don't make the notes as often or detailed. The records I have accumulated can speak for themselves and I know what to look for to explain each case. There is now a case involving the Department of Justice. Backdate contract tile December 18th to cover up."

References

- CBC (2006). "[Indepth: Sponsorship Scandal: Federal Sponsorship Scandal](#)," CBC News Online, October 26, accessed April 11, 2013:
- FIFE, Robert (2004). "Public Works Whistleblower Speaks Out," *National Post*, February 28, 2004, A4.
- GOMERY, John (2005). [Who Is Responsible?: Summary](#), Ottawa, ON, Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- PUBLIC WORKS (1994). Advertising and Public Opinion Meeting Notes, Meeting between Public Relations and Print Contract Services Sector and the Advertising and Public Opinion Research Directorate, November 17, PW-000766.