

Oral Questions

President that there had been no cabinet agreement not to test the Cruise. But I doubt whether the Vice-President will argue the contrary. After all, the Americans have signed an umbrella agreement which makes it quite clear that, if they want to test certain arms systems, including the Cruise, they would have to come to us and ask for it.

INQUIRY RESPECTING CANADIAN COMMITMENTS

Miss Pauline Jewett (New Westminster-Coquitlam): Madam Speaker, I specifically asked the Prime Minister if in the event of such a request, and assuming Canada refused it, in refusing the request to test would the Government in no way at all be breaching any of its commitments. It is on that specifically I hoped to have an answer since the U.S. Ambassador to Canada has suggested we would be breaching our commitments.

While the Prime Minister is on his feet, would he be good enough to explain a response made by the Deputy Prime Minister yesterday. In conversations with the U.S. Vice-President tomorrow on the Geneva negotiations, the Secretary of State for External Affairs said Canada would be putting forth its views? Could the Prime Minister tell us what those views are? Does Canada now agree with NATO Secretary General Luns that the zero option is unattainable? I would like to know what Canada's views will be in these discussions with the U.S. Vice-President.

Right Hon. P. E. Trudeau (Prime Minister): Madam Speaker, on the first part of the question I can reassure the Hon. Member that if a case arises I would say that I am prepared to say publicly that, if we do not agree to test the Cruise, there will be no reneging on any commitment, because I have said repeatedly there is no commitment to test the Cruise.

As to the second part of the question, there are many aspects to the views that we will be putting forward. Some of them are contained in statements made by myself or by the Secretary of State for External Affairs. I made some in the course of last year, on disarmament. I made some at the United Nations and some at Notre Dame University. They all emphasize the importance for both sides to be negotiating very seriously toward disarmament, in other words, that the first track of the NATO decision of December, 1979, was extraordinarily important to us if we were going to be expected to look at the second track.

In so far as the zero option is concerned, I remember arguing at Bonn that the Canadian position was not necessary that the zero option had to be the result of the negotiations. It was a starting point. It was ideally, probably the best, that there be no weapons on either side. But we staked out our position quite carefully that it was not the only position and that it should not be used to prevent a meaningful negotiation.

Miss Jewett: Unattainable.

INDUSTRY

ALBERTA EDIBLE OIL PROCESSING FACILITY

Hon. Don Mazankowski (Vegreville): Madam Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce. The Minister has been considering an application under the nutritive processing agreement for an edible oil processing facility in Wainwright, Alberta. Could the Minister tell us whether he has completed his assessment of that application? Could he tell us when a decision will be made and, if a decision has been made, could he indicate to the House the status of his decision?

Hon. Ed Lumley (Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce and Minister of Regional Economic Expansion): Madam Speaker, the nutritive processing agreement has been an excellent example of the co-operation between the Province of Alberta and the Government of Canada, creating something like 1,500 jobs over the past six years and over 300 applications. The application on whose behalf the Hon. Member, both in the House and previously, has made recommendations, as well as his provincial colleagues, the Minister of Agriculture and the Minister of Economic Development, is one on which I hope we can have a positive solution in our negotiations this week.

* * *

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

PREPARATION OF DEPARTMENTAL GUIDELINES AND PROCEDURES

Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, my question is for the President of the Treasury Board. It has to do with the implementation of the Freedom of Information Act, namely, Bill C-43. Is it the intention of the Government to allow each individual Department of Government to prepare its own directives, guidelines and procedures, or will those guidelines and procedures be prepared by the central agency, namely, the Treasury Board? If the latter is the case, when they are prepared will the hon. gentleman arrange for their tabling in the House of Commons?

Hon. Herb Gray (President of Treasury Board): Madam Speaker, the approach I am taking is to have a high degree of centralization of the rules and procedures. I will get to my hon. friend as soon as possible about the possibility of tabling the information.

PROCEDURES APPLICABLE TO REGIONAL OFFICES

Hon. Walter Baker (Nepean-Carleton): Madam Speaker, one of the problems one can foresee is the fact that a great deal of the information under the control of a Department or Government is in the regional offices and other components which are spread across the country. Can the hon. gentleman assure the House that steps are being taken so that information in the regional offices of Departments and agencies will be