

15. Did Loto Canada pay General Instruments to remove itself from its contract for computers, terminals, programs and other equipment for use in Loto Select and, if so, in what amount?

16. Were meetings held between Loto Canada or the government and General Instruments to resolve the dissolution of the contract between Loto Canada and General Instruments and, if so (a) in which cities and on what dates (b) what individuals were negotiating on behalf of Loto Canada at each meeting (c) what were the expenses paid by Loto Canada in travel, hotel accommodation, meals and any additional expenses for its negotiators?

17. Did Loto Canada or the government employ any person, partnership or company to negotiate on behalf of Loto Canada with General Instruments and, if so (a) what are the names of those employed and on what date did they join the negotiations (b) what fee did they receive?

18. Did Loto Canada dispose of any articles, goods, products or services it acquired for use in the Loto Select game through selling them to Crown Assets Disposal Corporation and, if so (a) what were they (b) what was the original cost to Loto Canada of each item (c) for each item, what was the disposal price received by Loto Canada from the corporation (d) has the Corporation sold any of them and, if so, at what price?

19. Are any of the leases entered into by Loto Canada as part of its preparation to set up a computer lottery gaming system (or Loto Select) still continuing and, if so (a) what are the rental charges for all properties, services or products under lease (b) is Loto Canada in the process of finalizing all such lease agreements?

20. Was Loto Canada or the government, before it entered into a contract with General Instruments, aware that General Instruments or its subsidiaries was forced into a position of renegotiating its computer lottery contract with the State of Maryland Lottery Corporation because of excessive profits for servicing the operation of the Maryland State Lottery?

Return tabled.

● (1510)

[English]

**Mr. Speaker:** The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Is it the pleasure of the House that the two questions, No. 325 and No. 326, be deemed to have been made orders for return if the returns are tabled forthwith?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

### Motions for Papers

[Translation]

### MOTIONS FOR PAPERS

**Mr. David Kilgour (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council):** Mr. Speaker, notice of motion No. 20 for the production of papers is acceptable to the government, subject to the usual reservations concerning confidential documents and the authorization of the government authorities concerned.

I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the other notices of motions for production of documents be allowed to stand.

[English]

STE. ANNE DE BELLEVUE, QUEBEC—RELOCATION OF FISHERIES RESEARCH STATION

Motion No. 20—**Mr. Herbert:**

That an Order of the House do issue for copies of all minutes of meetings, documents, telegrams and letters relating to the study of the relocation of the fisheries research station at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Quebec.

Motion agreed to.

**Mr. Speaker:** Shall the remaining notices of motions for the production of papers be allowed to stand?

**Mr. Herbert:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order, of which I gave you notice. It may also be a question of privilege. I refer to the production of documents on October 31, when the Parliamentary Secretary to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Kilgour) said that motion for the production of papers No. 29 was acceptable to the government. At page 811 of *Hansard* Your Honour put the motion and indicated it was deemed to have been adopted and the House agreed. A week later on, on November 7, I brought to the attention of the House that it had not been possible for me to have access to these documents. In fact, they had not been tabled, as I assumed they would have been, by the parliamentary secretary.

Following my interjection of November 7, the parliamentary secretary was kind enough to tell me that he had experienced some difficulty. The difficulty was that the material I had requested had been sent for translation.

My point of order is in two parts, Mr. Speaker. First of all, motion No. 29 reads as follows:

That an order of the House do issue for copies of all regulations and instructions dealing with the publication of tender calls in the Department of Public Works, including all references to the amount and form of deposits that may accompany such tenders.

I was somewhat amazed on November 7 to be told that such documents had to be translated. I did not inquire whether they were being translated from French into English or English into French.

At a later stage I may raise this point again, once I find out what the problem was in not having these documents, which should surely be in the public domain anyway, in both official languages. More important to me now, is that some three weeks later these documents still have not been tabled. I