importing our sugar from Africa, crossing the Atlantic in one direction, while the Caribbean countries were sending their sugar across the Atlantic in the other direction to England.

I asked a question back in the fall of 1974 about the import of sugar from the Caribbean countries and the effects of transportation costs. The answer I received was that the transportation costs of sugar from any country of origin are not taken directly into account. The price of sugar in Canada is linked directly to the London daily price. In response to some further questions on tonnage, I was told again in the fall of 1974 that, whereas Canada was importing some 4,000 metric tons of sugar from Barbados, that country was sending 102,000 tons to the United Kingdom, and Jamaica was sending about 10,000 metric tons to Canada and 158,000 metric tons to the United Kingdom. Also in the same response, when I asked about the estimated percentage of Canadian sugar imports being received by Canada Sugar and Dominion Sugar, which was at that time and presumably still is a subsidiary company of Tate & Lyle Holdings Ltd., I was told that 37 per cent of our raw sugar imports were being brought into the country by that company. I did note that some 105,000 or 106,000 metric tons of sugar was coming in from Cuba, which would indicate there was no reason why there should not have been some agreement with the other Caribbean countries.

I have mentioned Tate & Lyle Holdings Ltd. and that is going to be part of the reason for discussion this afternoon. Tate & Lyle Holdings Ltd., which has an operation in some 24 countries including Canada, is obviously a giant multinational and effectively controls the sugar market of the world.

In February, 1975, we read the report that Redpath Industries Limited, a subsidiary of Tate & Lyle Holdings Ltd., was criticizing politicians and it suggested that politicians were becoming instant experts on sugar matters. I suggest we have not taken enough interest in this subject.

In April, 1976, Redpath Industries Limited issued a news release and I quote from this release:

Redpath Industries Limited has been awarded a contract to construct a major agro-industrial sugar complex by the government of the Ivory Coast in Africa. Total cost is estimated at $155 million—

The Export Development Corporation gave a boost to Redpath Sugars Limited, and this is probably why the contract was signed, by helping finance the Canadian sugar complex on the Ivory Coast. The Export Development Corporation kicked in, according to the report, $88.3 million in the form of a ten-year loan. I also read that some $10 million was expected to come from the Canadian International Development Agency in the form of a concessionary financing loan. I am not particularly opposed to the co-operation between CIDA and EDC. In fact, I have suggested we probably do not do enough of this type of thing. If we follow the example of West Germany as a case in point, we might find it somewhat easier to increase our export business.

However, the repayment of this Export Development Corporation loan was to be in 20 semi-annual instalments beginning six months after completion. The Export Development Corporation also provided a guarantee for loans by banks of up to $5 million. The terms under which the agreement was made were not disclosed, and I do not take great issue with the reasoning given.

I discussed the matter in the House in December, 1977, and the following month received a letter from the chairman of the board and president of the Export Development Corporation, Mr. John A. MacDonald. I am digressing somewhat, but I mentioned Mr. John MacDonald last week in this House when I was speaking of the reorganization of the Department of Public Works. Back in the late 1960s he was the deputy minister of that department. If I can read from his letter, and I have read this into the record before, he says and I quote:

Only by guaranteeing commercial confidentiality will clients of the corporation be prepared to disclose the kind of information necessary to ensure viable transactions and serve the Canadian interest.

Further on in the letter we read and I quote:

—you and other interested Canadians . . . cannot become party to information which, if released, might put Canadian firms at a competitive disadvantage.

The difficulty I am running into will become apparent. In a letter dated May, 1979, from the then minister of industry, trade and commerce there was some discussion of the commitment by Tate & Lyle Holdings Ltd., the parent of Redpath Sugar to which I have previously referred. He said in his letter that the commitment, that is to divest itself of its interest in Redpath, will be implemented as soon as the financial position of Tate & Lyle Holdings Ltd. recovers sufficiently.

What bothers me somewhat is that if we are waiting for the share price to improve so that Tate & Lyle Holdings Ltd. can put its shares on the market for Canadians, it means in effect we are waiting for a time when Canadians can be expected to pay more for those shares.

● (1710)

I understand why the Foreign Investment Review Agency may have some reason for extending the original agreement, but once again this question of disclosure is looming large. What we do not know makes us ask questions.

In November, 1977, talking about this undertaking by Redpath Industries and its U.K. parent, Tate & Lyle Holdings Ltd., we note there were two investment proposals which were allowed under the Foreign Investment Review Act. The date of allowance was October 7, 1976, and the undertaking was that Redpath and its parent, Tate & Lyle Holdings Ltd., would increase the participation by Canadians in the capital stock of Redpath to 52 per cent, and the fulfilment of this undertaking was not required until September 30, 1980. At that time it was some three years after the date of the letter I received from the then minister of industry, trade and commerce.

The legally binding undertakings made by a firm in the course of winning approval from the agency are in most cases not published. There is no public accounting of how well companies have fared in meeting the undertakings to provide significant benefit, and the agency at one time estimated that approximately 20 per cent of the cases failed to meet the original undertakings.