

would do me the kindness of waiting, I will look into it and give him a more considered answer tomorrow.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I believe I said at the beginning that the application had not been received; I should have said it had not been heard. I understand the application in relation to Kitimat has been filed.

* * *

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

REQUEST FOR EQUIPMENT TO CLEAN UP OIL SPILLS BE STATIONED AT WHITE ROCK, BRITISH COLUMBIA

Mr. Benno Friesen (Surrey-White Rock): Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary question is directed to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources in the absence of the Minister of the Environment. Since I believe the nearest equipment for combating oil spills is in Vancouver, will the minister give us the assurance and will he urge the Minister of the Environment to see to it that there will be standby equipment in place in White Rock to serve the south coast areas in emergencies because that would be the first beach to be hit in the event of an oil spill?

Hon. Alastair Gillespie (Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources): Mr. Speaker, I will be very pleased to pass on those representations to my colleagues.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS

NEGOTIATIONS WITH UNITED STATES CONCERNING COMPENSATION FOR DAMAGE FROM OIL SPILLS

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. In view of the fact that no Canadian institution has legal jurisdiction to deal with the threat to the Canadian environment arising from increased marine traffic to the superport at Cherry Point because the National Energy Board can only deal with a pipeline over Canadian soil and the proponents need not file under the Canadian interdepartmental committee known as TERMPOL with regard to marine environmental risks, and in view of the fact that several weeks ago the Secretary of State for External Affairs responded positively to suggestions in this House that he enter into discussions with the United States government with a view to formulating a bilateral agreement—they may be the same discussions the minister referred to in his reply to the hon. member for Surrey-White Rock—can the minister confirm that the discussions he referred to a moment ago have been entered into with a view to getting a bilateral agreement that will deal with such things—not just compensation but also the risk factor involved in terms of increased marine traffic and the superport at Cherry Point?

Hon. Donald C. Jamieson (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Yes, Mr. Speaker, I repeat my answer. The hon.

Oral Questions

member is quite right; it was the same matter that I answered a moment ago. Those discussions are going on both bilaterally and as they relate exclusively to the tanker route. I might also point out that the whole question of pollution control and responsibility is also an element in the negotiations between Canada and the United States over border questions or boundary questions, for example, and also in the multilateral context in the law of the sea conference so that there are a number of fora in which this matter is now being discussed.

* * *

TRANSPORT

STUDY OF RISK OF SITING DEEPWATER OIL PORTS ON WEST COAST—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): A supplementary question to the Minister of Transport, Mr. Speaker. Since December 1976 a publication has been available entitled "An Environmental Risk Index for the Siting of Deepwater Oil Ports" which only pertains to oil ports on the east coast. May I ask if a similar study is being conducted or has been conducted that will indicate, if it is tabled in the House, the risk of siting deepwater ports on the west coast? This is particularly important now in view of the announcement last night about the abandonment of the Kitimat proposal and the prospect that Cherry Point would become a very vulnerable area?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, that type of study has not been completed in connection with the west coast. That was one of the reasons for engaging the services of the Thompson Commission, in order to look at the specific question which would have come before us in connection with the Kitimat application.

SUGGESTION THOMPSON COMMISSION INQUIRE INTO CHERRY POINT PROPOSAL

Mr. Bill Jarvis (Perth-Wilmot): A final supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, in view of the minister's reference to the Thompson inquiry under the Public Inquiries Act, and having regard to the limitations that we now experience vis-à-vis Cherry Point being an existing port on United States soil, will the Minister of Transport consider amending the reference to Professor Thompson, having regard to these limits and his structure already being in place, so that he might pursue, in so far as he is able, a study into the marine aspects and environmental risks as far as Cherry Point is concerned, at least in the Canadian context? In other words, Dr. Thompson has a structure in place ready to go. It would be abandoned because of the abandonment of the Kitimat proposal. Can we make use of his good services as far as the Cherry Point proposal is concerned?

● (1420)

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, the terms of reference were broader than just Kitimat in that they refer to the movement of oil by tankers through Canadian