

be completed by the target date of July, 1982 as promised by the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development. Construction was to have commenced by July, 1981, but innumerable bureaucratic delays have held up the project.

The petitioners hope in your examination of the petition, Madam Speaker, that you will find it in order and that you will exercise the discretionary powers vested in the office of Speaker of the House to allow discussion and referral to the appropriate committee at the earliest possible time in order that the continued danger to the students' health and safety may be minimized.

* * *

QUESTIONS ON THE ORDER PAPER

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): Madam Speaker, the following questions will be answered today: Nos. 1,621, 2,806, 3,892 and 4,034.

[Text]

EXPORT DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION

Question No. 1,621—**Mr. Cossitt:**

With reference to the answer to question No. 76 in which it is stated, "Parliament has traditionally recognized that . . . it is not in the public interest for EDC to discuss the terms of its export transactions . . ." (a) what are all the references in *House of Commons Debates* where Parliament as a whole has agreed to such a tradition?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of State (International Trade)): In so far as the Department of External Affairs/Export Development Corporation is concerned:

(a) As to references in the *House of Commons Debates* where Parliament as a whole has agreed to a tradition that it is not in the public interest for EDC to discuss the terms of its export transactions, it is suggested that in the true sense of a tradition as a "custom or the like transmitted by practice, without writing", once any such agreement had been recorded, the custom would have become more than a tradition. In any event it is unlikely that agreement has been given by Parliament as a whole such as by way of resolution or unanimous consent.

There are, however, references in the *Debates* to publication of documents and details of operation of Crown corporations.

In the *House of Commons Debates*, 1955, second session, Twenty-second Parliament Vol. I, pp. 892-3, there is quoted a statement by the Speaker on a motion for the production of papers in relation to the operation of the Canadian National Hotel in Montreal. It reads in part "... but all leaders of parties, in or out of power, have always agreed that they should not insist upon production of papers which are declared not to be in the interest of the House to get—"

In the *House of Commons Debates* 1960-1, fourth session, Twenty-fourth Parliament vol. II, pp. 1187 and 1629, a minister, in response to a member's statement that "the representatives of the people are entitled to know down to the

Order Paper Questions

last detail what is happening within Crown corporations," stated "that is not the policy . . . of this government" and the Leader of the Opposition is quoted as adding "Nor of the opposition."

The government considers that in export transactions certain information furnished to EDC by exporters and certain information on export financing, such as the rate of interest, must be treated as commercially confidential in view of the intense competition that exists between competing exporters and among exporting countries.

ARCTIC PILOT PROJECT

Question No. 2,806—**Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich):**

1. Did the government of Denmark make representations on behalf of the government of Greenland concerning the sea route to be followed by the ships of the Arctic Pilot Project and, if so (a) on what date and what was the nature of the representations (b) was a reply given at the time or at any time since and, if so, what was the reply?

2. Does the Arctic Pilot Project envisage off-loading its liquefied natural gas (LNG) at Port Hawkesbury or Gros Cacouna?

3. At what location are the LNG ships to be built?

Mr. David Smith (Parliamentary Secretary to President of the Privy Council): I am informed by the Departments of External Affairs and Transport as follows:

1. Consultations with the government of Denmark have been proceeding for several years on a number of marine environment matters of mutual interest including the Arctic Pilot Project and a possible marine environment co-operation agreement between the two countries. The concerns of Greenland with regard to the sea route to be followed by the ships of the Arctic Pilot Project have been conveyed by the government of Denmark during those consultations. The last formal round of discussions was held in Copenhagen from July 30 to August 1, 1980.

Since that date a joint working group of experts comprising representatives of the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Petro-Canada, the Danish Ministry for Greenland and the Greenland home rule authority has met several times to study potential environmental implications for Greenland. The Canadian government has also kept the Danish government informed of developments relating to the Arctic Pilot Project through the Canadian Embassy in Copenhagen and the Danish Embassy in Ottawa.

In a diplomatic note dated December 23, 1980, to the Department of External Affairs, the Danish Embassy expressed the concerns of the Danish authorities over possible adverse impacts which the Arctic Pilot Project could have on Greenland interests. The note drew particular attention to concerns over the location of the route to be followed by the Arctic Pilot Project vessels in the waters between Canada and Greenland, and indicated the importance of continuing consultations between Canada and Denmark on the subject.

In a diplomatic note dated March 13, 1981, to the Danish Embassy, the Department of External Affairs reaffirmed the commitment of the Canadian government to the preservation