

Mr. MacEachen: An honest admission.

Mr. Towers: Madam Speaker, I have two questions on the order paper to which I would like answers. They deal with the Metric Commission and are very important to me. The questions are Nos. 810 and 811, and I simply want to bring them to the attention of the parliamentary secretary.

* * *

SPORTS

DISBURSING OF FUNDS FROM LOTTERIES

Hon. Steven E. Paproski (Edmonton North): Madam Speaker, this is the first opportunity I have had to stand in the House after reviewing a question that I posed on Friday to the minister of sport and his subsequent answer. I know that the minister would not want to mislead the House in any way. He said in part on Friday that in return Loto Canada will receive \$24 million from the provinces. That \$24 million is geared to the CPI. There is also the fact that we had to look after a promise made by the previous government with regard to two NHL hockey arenas. We also looked after the arena in Olds, Alberta. I am sure that the minister, when he comes into the House, will be able to rectify that particular error in his reply.

Madam Speaker: The hon. member should know that he has obviously raised a point of debate. If he is not satisfied with the answer that he has received, he should take advantage of other procedures to make his point in front of the House.

* * *

[Translation]

MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

Madam Speaker: Shall all motions for the production of papers stand?

Some hon. Members: Agreed.

[English]

Mr. Cossitt: Madam Speaker, I rise with regard to notices of motions for the production of papers. I understand that the parliamentary secretary has said that there are none to be produced today. I would refer him to motion No. 2 which I put on the paper at the beginning of this session. I will not take the time of the House to outline all the detail therein. The question concerns the Taschereau papers which deal with matters of national security. These papers were sent back to the National Archives by Mr. Michael Pitfield after the usual time at which they would have been made public, namely 30 years. Presumably they were sent back on the orders of the Prime Minister (Mr. Trudeau) or the security committee of the cabinet.

I have asked that all copies of documents, letters, conversations and so on between the Prime Minister or the Privy Council office and the archives be produced to show why this

Production of Papers

was done. In other words, I want to know exactly what Mr. Pitfield said in his letter to the National Archives. I should think that it would be very simple for the government to say, "Yes, we are going to do it" or "No, we are not going to do it". However, nothing has happened.

This is a matter which concerns in particular Canadian historians, if no one else. The importance of this question is to learn the espionage history as to what has been going on in this country, the knowledge of which this government has continually attempted to block from Canadians. By hiding the Taschereau papers and not enlightening us, the government is obviously hiding the names of some people of prominence. Some of us have knowledge of who those people are.

I believe that it is a disgrace that the government will not say one way or the other what it intends to do. If it does not intend to produce these papers then it should say so, so that the matter can be transferred for debate; then those of us on this side of the House who wish to pursue the matter would be able to do so. Rather, the government is trying to hide the situation by saying nothing at all. Could the parliamentary secretary tell the House when notices of motion for production of papers No. 2 will be answered?

Mr. Collette: Madam Speaker, I stand to be corrected but I believe this matter was debated in the House last Thursday evening. Under the rules, I believe that there are 130 minutes or 140 minutes for such a debate. I understand there are 90 minutes for debate. If indeed we did deal with the matter last Thursday evening, and I think we did, then I find it somewhat impertinent of the hon. member to try to ask a question of me when he should be posing it to the President of the Privy Council during the question period.

● (1510)

If he wants to use the route provided by the rules, which is to lay down a motion for the production of papers, he should follow it through to its logical extension. It would then be debated and come to a division at the appropriate time.

That is all I have to say on this particular matter, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Order, please. Is the hon. member rising on a question of privilege?

Mr. Cossitt: Yes, Madam Speaker. The parliamentary secretary has made a statement which I think is a reflection on me as a member of the House, and I must correct it.

Nothing of the sort happened last Thursday. He may not have been in the House. The debate at that time dealt with moving the Department of Veterans Affairs to the maritime provinces, to Prince Edward Island in particular, and had nothing whatsoever to do with the Taschereau papers. The notice of motion I am referring to has never been answered.

The parliamentary secretary has said that I should put the question to the President of the Privy Council and not to him, but he is here representing the President of the Privy Council. If he cannot answer it, will he guarantee that he will ask the