

Inquiries of the Ministry

minister check the records to see if the facts stated yesterday are correct?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not think I should comment on what may have been said outside the House by the Solicitor General. I am sure that if the hon. member wishes to put the question properly to the Solicitor General when he is next in the House, it will be clarified.

Mr. Woolliams: Mr. Speaker, I now rise on a question of privilege. The Minister of Justice, having said that I garbled the facts—

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Woolliams: Just a minute. Take your time and don't get excited. The Minister of Justice said I garbled the facts about the Solicitor General going outside the House and stating what he would not say inside the House. The minister not having checked the facts, I ask who has garbled the facts? When it comes to a question of credibility, the ministers have the records and we do not. Let us find out whether they are prepared to check these facts and give them in the House rather than on television like the Prime Minister does.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. Of course that is debate.

* * *

POLLUTION**CHERRY POINT OIL SPILL—INQUIRY AS TO STUDY OF COST OF CLEAN-UP AND STEPS TO PREVENT FUTURE OCCURRENCE**

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed either to the Minister of Transport or to the Minister of the Environment. I am not certain which minister is responsible. It concerns the Cherry Point oil spill of a couple of weeks ago. Has either the Department of Transport or the Department of the Environment initiated a study of the recent oil spill to indicate the cost of clean-up, the adequacy of the clean-up and the adequacy of protective measures? If so, will a report of the results of this study be made to the House as soon as possible?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Minister of Transport): Yes, Mr. Speaker, a study of this type is now a routine measure in such incidents in order for us to accumulate a body of additional information. There is no good reason why, once the facts have been assembled, they should not be made public.

CHERRY POINT OIL SPILL—UNITED STATES POSITION AT STOCKHOLM CONFERENCE REGARDING SIMILAR OCCURRENCES IN FUTURE

Mr. Mark Rose (Fraser Valley West): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Minister of the Environment concerning the deliberations at the Stockholm Conference. Did the United States commit itself at Stockholm to any future position which would apply in situations similar to the Cherry Point oil

[Mr. Woolliams.]

tragedy? Also, can the minister say whether the conference altered in any substantial way the United States policy, and what was the substance of the change, if any?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of the Environment): Mr. Speaker, a number of the principles endorsed at the conference would have a bearing on circumstances similar to those at Cherry Point both in anticipation and prevention of such incidents in the future, but certainly in respect of contingency plans, clean-up and compensation.

UNITED STATES REPLY TO RESOLUTIONS PASSED BY HOUSE OF COMMONS

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a supplementary question to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Has the minister received any reply from the government of the United States on the resolution passed by the House on June 9 in respect of the oil spill at Cherry Point, on the motion of the hon. member for Fraser Valley East, and also on the resolution unanimously passed by the House on May 15 on the motion of the hon. member for Skeena? If so, would the minister undertake to table copies of the replies from the government of the United States?

• (1510)

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, the last time I was in the House I did say we had received a reply to the representations which the government made, supported by the resolution of this House, that the question of the movement of oil in the narrow waters of the Pacific coast should be referred to the International Joint Commission. That was turned down by the United States which instead has suggested it be referred to the committee on trans-border environmental problems, which will be presided over by my colleague, the Minister of the Environment, and the chairman of the council on the environment in the United States. So far as the resolutions of this House were to that effect, this is the reply from the United States.

Mr. Douglas: I have a supplementary—

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The Chair will recognize the hon. member for a last supplementary, but there are only three minutes before the end of the question period and we must try to move along.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the minister whether he or the Minister of the Environment can give the terms of reference of the committee on trans-border environmental problems. Can the minister tell us when the committee is likely to meet, and will Canada insist that the question of the Cherry Point-Valdez route be an item on the agenda?

Mr. Sharp: My colleague can perhaps answer part of that question, but since he has been away I have had access to the messages received. The United States would like to refer to this committee what we had intended to refer to the International Joint Commission, which does include the question the hon. gentleman mentioned. We are concerned about present and prospective movements