

Oral Questions

As to the other part of the question, I only retain that "it was the action of the prime minister which prevented the release" of the documents. I think the answer to that is linked to the first one. When papers are classified, either in the national interest, for security reasons, or in the national interest for other reasons, such as I have said, privacy of individuals, it is done on advice from officials. That was stated quite clearly in a written answer which appeared on the Order Paper—

Answers to questions from the hon. member for Leeds-Grenville were given as to who were the officials involved in this matter.

I think the Leader of the Opposition asked if I had satisfied myself that it was a matter of privacy only rather than of security. I was given this information by the Solicitor General, and I did not look beyond it. The Solicitor General is present in the House. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to ask him whether he is satisfied, if the Leader of the Opposition wants that further answer—

Mr. Hnatyshyn: Who is running the show?

Mr. Trudeau: I do not know what is wrong with the hon. member for Saskatoon West. Has he woken up since yesterday?

QUERY RESPECTING BRIEFING BY BRITISH AUTHORITIES

Right Hon. Joe Clark (Leader of the Opposition): I should like to ask the Prime Minister whether he received any briefing from Britain after the investigation in Britain in the period between 1970 and 1974 into the activities of Sir Roger Hollis, and whether that briefing was delivered to the Prime Minister personally or to any of his officials, with the idea that it would be transmitted to him. I am speaking here of a briefing after an investigation in the period between 1970 and 1974 in Great Britain, into the activities of Sir Roger Hollis. Was there a report on any aspect of that meeting to the Prime Minister, or to officials who could be counted upon to report the contents of that briefing to the Prime Minister?

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, in so far as briefings of our officials are concerned, I do not know the answer; I will have to inquire. I can say without equivocation that, as far as I am concerned, I have no recollection of briefings in that period. Certainly if it had been a serious briefing on a matter about which I was supposed to know, I would remember it, but I have no recollection of any such briefing. However, perhaps the Leader of the Opposition received briefings during that period from Great Britain or other countries. I do not know about that. If he has briefings that should cause us to worry, I wish he would inform the House, and I wish the former solicitor general would inform the House. They were the government, after all; they have been concerned about the Gouzenko papers for years and they had questions on the Order Paper. I would have thought that, if they had doubts about the whole matter, they would have made it their duty to inquire into it.

METRIC CONVERSION

REQUEST FOR EXTENSION OF APPEAL DEADLINE

Mr. Bill Domm (Peterborough): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and it stems from the fact that in the year 1871 the metric system was recognized as a legal form of measurement here in Canada. I regret to point out to the minister—and I will ask him a question as a result of this—that I learned from *The Canada Gazette* just a few weeks ago that they have made, by order in council, Canadian units of measurement in Canada illegal as of certain dates in 1982. Is it the government's intention to make Canadian units of measurement illegal? The deadline for appeal to his ministry is April 29. Would the minister at least extend that date so that people in the retail food sector who are opposed to this order would have an opportunity to respond to the order in council making Canadian units of measurement illegal as of 1982?

[Translation]

Hon. André Ouellet (Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs and Postmaster General): The answer is no, Madam Speaker. I believe that those who want to express their views have ample time to do so before 1982.

[English]

Mr. Domm: Madam Speaker, I have a supplementary question for the same minister. Since, through the same process of order in council, the government has decided that, starting on a certain date, it will impose fines up to \$1,000 by order in council on merchants who use any other than metric weighing scales, with or without a conviction, I ask the minister whether, in the interest of democracy, he would agree to remove that fine of \$1,000 for the use of imperial weighing scales starting on a date in 1982 and, if he will not do so, would he at least agree to listen to the retail merchants and consumers of Canada and take a look at the test centres, which had the metric system forced on them and which have all reverted back to imperial measurements? Would he or the Minister of State for Small Businesses for once listen to the consumers in the retail food sector in Canada?

[Translation]

Mr. Ouellet: Madam Speaker, I have much more confidence in the public spirit of citizens and tradesmen than the hon. member seems to have. I do not believe that these fines should be removed because I am convinced that the tradesmen will obey the law and there will be no need to fine them.

* * *

[English]

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

ALICE ARM, B.C.—DUMPING OF TAILINGS BY AMAX—
APPLICATION OF OECD CONTROLS

Mr. Jim Fulton (Skeena): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans. I am sure that the