

2. Yes. The cost was charged to the information directorate, corporate systems and services, Public Service Commission.

- (a) 2,275 copies distributed to the employees of the National Capital Region.
- (b) Canadian government printing office, \$34.94.

#### CONCORDE LANDING RIGHTS

Question No. 2,391—**Mr. Wilson:**

- 1. Were arrangements made to provide for landing rights for the Concorde aircraft at airports in Canada?
- 2. Were discussions held with British Airways, Air France or Japan Air Lines regarding Concorde flights to airports in Canada?

**Mr. Robert Bockstael (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** 1. No.

2. No discussions were held with British Airways, Air France or Japan Air Lines regarding Concorde flights to Canadian airports.

\* \* \*

[Translation]

#### STARRED QUESTION

**Mr. John Evans (Parliamentary Secretary to Deputy Prime Minister and Minister of Finance):** Madam Speaker, would you be good enough to call the starred question?

[Text]

\*TRANSPORT OF DANGEROUS GOODS—EMERGENCY CALLS

Question No. 2,315—**Mr. Knowles:**

- 1. Did the transport of dangerous goods branch of the Department of Transport receive 13 emergency calls between July 3, 1979, and November 30, 1980, and, if not, what was the number?
- 2. What were the emergencies and into which categories did they fall?
- 3. How many of the emergencies occurred in urban centres?
- 4. In each case, what substance was involved and which railway company was involved?
- 5. In the case of any of the emergencies that occurred in Manitoba, was the government of Manitoba notified and was the Emergency Measures Organization advised?
- 6. Was the Canadian Transport Commission asked to investigate any of the emergencies other than the MacGregor spill and the methanol spill of April 6, 1980 in CP Rail's Winnipeg yard and, if so, did the commission make any recommendations and what were they?

[English]

**Mr. Robert Bockstael (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of Transport):** 1. Yes; 13 calls were received from Manitoba from July 13, 1979, to November 30, 1980. Five were transport emergencies, six non-transport emergencies and the other two calls were from Manitoba agencies simulating an emergency for training purposes.

2. The 11 actual emergencies were: a leaking tank car of flammable liquid, Class (3); a leaking tank truck of flammable gas, Class (2); a tank car fire of flammable liquid, Class (3); a box of radioactive material found on the highway, Class (7); a

#### Order Paper Questions

leaking container of the poison in a truck, Class (6); a burst bottle of chlorine, a poison gas, Class (2); a grain elevator fire involving herbicides, Class (6); a leaking storage tank of poison gas, Class (2); a grain elevator fire involving fertilizer, Class (5); a forest fire being reported; and a request for information on handling a poisonous product, Class (6).

3. Eight.

4. The products involved were methanol, liquid nitrogen, hexene, radioactive material, cresol, chlorine, herbicides, anhydrous ammonia, fertilizer. The CPR was involved in two of these incidents; the other incidents did not involve a railway company.

5. Two were reported to the environment agency in Manitoba, five to the provincial EMO and four were not reported to any provincial agency.

6. The Canadian Transport Commission was not asked to investigate any emergencies other than the MacGregor spill and the spill of methanol on April 6, 1980.

[Translation]

**Madam Speaker:** The questions enumerated by the parliamentary secretary have been answered. Shall the remaining questions be allowed to stand?

**Mr. Evans:** Madam Speaker, I ask that the remaining questions be allowed to stand.

**Madam Speaker:** Shall the remaining questions stand?

**Some hon. Members:** Agreed.

[English]

**Mr. Beatty:** Madam Speaker, I apologize to you and the House for rising again with regard to question No. 1,852 which I put on the Order Paper on December 9. As you will be aware, prior to the Easter recess, on April 23, I brought this question to the attention of the parliamentary secretary who responded as follows:

● (1520)

Madam Speaker, following my conversation with the hon. member this morning, I am checking on the matter. I fail to understand why an answer had not been transmitted through the Privy Council office to be presented in the House. I will do my best to have it as soon as we return from the recess.

That was on April 23. It is now May 21. A month has gone by and we still do not have an answer to that question.

On Thursday of last week, I again rose on a point of order bringing this matter to the attention of the government House leader, who gave this undertaking, as reported on page 9586 of *Hansard*:

Madam Speaker, I shall take notice of the recommendation made by the hon. member concerning his question. I shall consult the parliamentary secretary and ensure that he can provide the hon. member with an answer as soon as possible. There are undoubtedly very valid reasons to justify this delay, and we shall try to give them to him as soon as I have talked with the parliamentary secretary.

I placed this question on the Order Paper on December 9. It deals with the government's conflict of interest regulations,