

not to reflect upon my facial movement in the house. I know he did it, as usual, in the best of spirits.

I think part of the problem was that in the confusion at the end of question period, with members leaving, the Secretary of State (Mr. Fox) was engaged in a conversation; I then alerted him to the fact that the question was being addressed and, perhaps, the purport of the question of the hon. member for Burnaby (Mr. Robinson) was lost. I regret that we were sidetracked a little.

As to the question of the business before the House today we know what is before the House, it is the Petroleum Administration Act. We also know that the government House leader has outlined certain priorities for the government, one of them is the access to information legislation. When that measure comes before the House it will be discussed in the usual way.

**Mr. Knowles:** Madam Speaker, I rise again on the same point of order. May I point out to the parliamentary secretary that we will not be sitting tomorrow afternoon, which is when we usually receive the Thursday bill of fare for the next week. Why not tell us today that the order of business on Monday will be the second reading of the freedom of information bill?

**Mr. Collette:** Madam Speaker, at this stage there have not been discussions among the parties, and I think, perhaps, we should wait until a bit later. I am not in a position to state what the position on Monday will be but there will be discussions over the next few days, I am sure, between the parties and a decision will be arrived at.

**Mr. Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** With respect to that matter, there is some implication that our party will not agree to deal with the freedom of information measure in one day. That is quite right. We do not agree to deal with freedom of information in one day. I want to make that clear publicly because of the difficulties I have had before, not with the Minister of Communications (Mr. Fox) from whom I have had very little communication. But so the government House leader will know, if he is counting on one day's debate for his legislative program, I have a number of speakers, as I said earlier, who want to deal with the bill on its merits or demerits with a view to improving it. I want it clearly understood that there is no agreement to get that bill through in one day.

I also want to indicate to the government House leader, the House, the minister and my friend from Winnipeg North Centre that I undertake that all speeches with respect to this legislation by our members will be to improve the bill. We do want to lift the government up, even by its own bootstraps.

**Mr. Robinson (Burnaby):** Madam Speaker, on this same point of order. First of all, I hope the Secretary of State will answer the first question which I asked. Perhaps I might just repeat that under the spirit of Bill C-43 cabinet discussion papers are to be tabled at the time a bill is tabled. The minister will recall, in fairness, that he did, indeed, table the cabinet discussion papers on Bill C-43. Since that time three bills have been tabled, two of them, Bill C-45 and Bill C-46, on Monday of this week. No cabinet discussion papers were tabled with

those bills. My question very simply was: when will we see those cabinet discussion papers in line with the spirit of the new legislation?

Second, I want to indicate my regret at the decision of the Conservative party not to expedite this bill in one day and to get it into committee where the bill can be properly studied. I think that is an unfortunate decision.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Fox:** In the first place, Madam Speaker, as the hon. member pointed out himself, as far as Bill C-43 is concerned, we have issued the cabinet discussion papers on which the government policy on information has been based. I will have to check the precise terms that have been used. I am under the impression that we are committed not to table the said papers in the House, but to make them public. I should like to have the opportunity to review the situation. However, I understand that there is a whole series of such discussion papers which have been made public without having necessarily been tabled in the House. However, I should like to check what was the nature of the commitment. I believe it was to make those papers available, and I think that the Privy Council will be in a position to give to the hon. member a list of papers which are now available as a result of papers or bills being tabled in the House.

**Madam Speaker:** I think that we can dispose of both questions raised on the same point of order, namely, the publication of some papers. Hon. members know that their private arrangements or agreements concern only themselves and are not covered under our rules. Consequently, I cannot compel the minister to table such papers. Anyhow, I think that he got his answer during that short exchange.

The second question raised has to do with the order of business of the House in the next few days. This is a question which should be discussed at the appropriate time; hon. members now have their answer.

\* \* \*

● (1520)

[*English*]

#### BUSINESS OF THE HOUSE

**Mr. Knowles:** Madam Speaker, my other point of order also relates to House business, but it is one concerning which we have had discussions, and I believe the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council will be able to deal with it.

When we discussed the other day the order which provides for the House not to sit tomorrow afternoon, it was our understanding that even though we are sitting only in the evening the usual adjournment debate, or late show, would take place. The officers at the table have said to some of us that because of the way the order was worded we would have