

was the most recent question on this subject put by the hon. member. I hope to put all of those down and give answers to them in the House at the same time, if that is satisfactory to the hon. member.

**Mr. Cossitt:** Madam Speaker, I rise on the same point of order. I appreciate the forthrightness of the parliamentary secretary but I must bring out the fact that his statement is completely demolished by the fact that the government has answered four of the questions already. So his contention that they were waiting to answer them all at once is hardly appropriate or accurate. Therefore, I suggest to him that he has been misinformed by someone, either by his superior, the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Pinard), or by someone in the cabinet, because although he has named correctly the numbers of the unanswered questions, they have answered four or five others, so there was no question of waiting. The four or five other questions were answered after the minister said, "I have signed them all." So they were not held back, four or five of them got through. Perhaps it was because the other answers are too embarrassing to the government where it involved, perhaps, the use of public funds for purposes for which they should not be used.

**Mr. Collenette:** Madam Speaker, I am sorry to prolong this debate but we do not want to give the impression of being surreptitious in the answering of these questions. Once we realized that more questions were coming, we felt it would be better to hold back all of the answers so that the hon. member could have all of the information at once. I think he will recognize that to table one or two answers on a particular question might shed light on only one aspect of the total subject being considered and that we need the full dimension or the full scope of all the answers to accurately reflect both the intent of the questions and the intent of the government in answering them.

**Mr. Knowles:** Madam Speaker, may I ask the parliamentary secretary if he could see whether the answer to question No. 1,640 can be brought down soon?

**Mr. Collenette:** I will look into that, Madam Speaker.

**Madam Speaker:** We have not yet had the agreement of the House that the remaining questions stand. Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

\* \* \*

#### MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

**Mr. D. M. Collenette (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Madam Speaker, I ask that all notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand.

**Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton):** Madam Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There is notice of motion No. 24

#### Motions for Papers

standing in the name of the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty), dated July 11, 1980, which reads:

That an order of the House do issue for a copy of the contract entered into between the government and the Canadian Media Corporation to perform its duties as agency of record for the government.

The hon. member referred to it last week. He has had to go to committee and he asked me to see whether or not something could be done about that. Has the government formed any intention with respect to that matter, whether it is an order or otherwise, because there was—I would not want to call it an undertaking—an expression that there would be some answer immediately with respect to the propriety of that matter?

● (1540)

**Mr. Collenette:** Madam Speaker, I hope to table the reply to notice of motion for the production of papers No. 24 next Wednesday afternoon if all goes well.

While I am on my feet, and if the House does not mind, the hon. member for Wellington-Dufferin-Simcoe (Mr. Beatty) is concerned about question No. 1,449 on the order paper. So that he can read the record in *Hansard*, let me indicate that this is a shared reply; I am awaiting the other part of the answer, and I hope to table it soon.

**Mr. Tom Cossitt (Leeds-Grenville):** Madam Speaker, I hesitate to rise once again, but this can be done only on a Wednesday when the House deals with notices of motions for the production of papers. Briefly I refer to motion No. 2 which I put on the order paper on April 14, almost eight months ago. It deals with a request that the government produce correspondence, documents, etc., in regard to the Taschereau papers between the Prime Minister's office and/or the Privy Council office and the Public Archives. Particularly it refers to the letter or the correspondence of Mr. Michael Pitfield with the Public Archives when, on someone's instigation, he was instructed to return these papers and have them resealed for a further ten years, whereas in reality they should have become public property at the end of the 30-year limit.

These papers concern the national security of the country. They contain a very great deal of information which Canadians have the right to know. I am sure some members of the House know something of the content of those papers, as I do and as I am sure the Solicitor General (Mr. Kaplan) does.

Members on the government side talk a great deal about freedom of information, though they will not bring in the bill, as was pointed out by my House leader. Nevertheless, they do talk about freedom of information. Why then, can we not have such a simple request as this answered? Will they give us the information as to why they are hiding the Taschereau papers for a further ten years, or will they simply stonewall this matter, hoping that nothing will happen and no one will raise any points of order? The ten years will go by, and if they happen to be in power—and God knows I hope they are not, for the good of the country—they can bring in another stonewalling for a further ten years. This is becoming absolutely ridiculous. I should like the parliamentary secretary to tell me