

ENVIRONMENTAL AFFAIRS

KITIMAT PIPELINE CO.—REQUEST THAT DECISION ON APPLICATION BE DEFERRED

Mr. T. C. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of the Environment, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources relating to the decision by the Kitimat Pipeline Company to reactivate its application for the construction of a pipeline from Kitimat, British Columbia, to Edmonton, requesting that the capacity of the pipeline be doubled to one million barrels per day. The west coast oil ports inquiry hearings headed by Dr. Andrew Thompson were postponed. Are they now to be resumed? If so, when will they be resumed? Also, will the minister assure the House that no decision will be made by the National Energy Board, or approval given by the government, until such time as the phase two hearings have been completed by Dr. Thompson?

Hon. Otto E. Lang (Minister of Transport): Mr. Speaker, when the inquiry was interrupted it was noted that the proceedings might have to be brought forward again at a time when a live Kitimat application came forward. This matter will now be considered with Dr. Thompson and a decision on how to proceed will then be made as soon as possible. As to the other part of the hon. member's question, I think perhaps the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources should respond.

Mr. Douglas (Nanaimo-Cowichan-The Islands): Mr. Speaker, I would be glad to hear the response of the Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources, but I would like the Minister of Transport to answer this question. In view of the fact that when the inquiry started, the government quite properly decided that public interest groups should have the opportunity to present their views and funded some of those groups, will this funding be carried on during the additional inquiry by Dr. Thompson and his group, and for what period of time?

Mr. Lang: Mr. Speaker, the question of funding public interest groups, and other questions relating to cost and the time of the inquiry, are among those things we will want to discuss with Dr. Thompson to ensure that all proper steps are taken in connection with any possible pipeline.

* * *

IMMIGRATION

QUEBEC SELECTION CRITERIA—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Jake Epp (Provencher): Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Immigration. It has reference to the tentative agreement between the government of Canada and the province of Quebec which would enable Quebec to establish its own points system for the selection of immigrants to that province. In view of the fact that the selection criteria would not be the same as for immigrants to other Canadian provinces, will immigrants qualifying under Quebec selection criteria have the right to interprovincial

Oral Questions

mobility? If so, has the government received the concurrence of the other provinces to accept immigrants who have qualified under Quebec's criteria?

● (1452)

Hon. Bud Cullen (Minister of Employment and Immigration): Mr. Speaker, we have an agreement in principle with the province of Quebec, at least at the ministerial level. It remains for the Quebec minister to obtain the concurrence of his cabinet colleagues. The details of the program which I have seen so far were mutually beneficial, so that not only Quebec but all the provinces will be able to accept responsibility under the BNA Act for co-determination and the participation they should have in the immigration field.

Mr. Epp: Mr. Speaker, the minister chooses not to answer my question but to bypass it. In view of the far-reaching implications that this agreement has in principle, and in view of the assurances which the minister gave to the Standing Committee on Labour, Manpower and Immigration that the committee would have an opportunity to study the regulations flowing out of the new Immigration Act, would the minister now fulfil his obligation and refer both the immigration regulations and the tentative agreement on immigrant selection to the standing committee for study and report back to the House?

Mr. Alexander: That is a good idea.

Mr. Cullen: Under the agreement there will be full mobility in the country: that is absolutely essential. Also, the agreement will be subject to the immigration laws. I have done more than a second mile, I think, by sending out to members of the committee the regulations as they are drafted, and I have asked for their comments. I have done that, also, in so far as provincial cabinet ministers who have this responsibility are concerned, so that they will note the message. I have also sent my provincial colleagues, in draft form, the kind of immigration agreement that I would like to see us enter into with Alberta, Saskatchewan, British Columbia or Quebec. However, full mobility will be there.

* * *

ENERGY

NORTHERN PIPELINE—PREBUILDING OF SOUTHERN SECTION—GOVERNMENT POSITION

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the President of the Privy Council. As I noted yesterday, the U.S. President's decision and report to Congress on the Alaska natural gas transportation system states repeatedly that there is a possibility of prebuilding the southern section of the line. I find it difficult to believe that the President of the United States would rely solely on the musings of the NEB for the statement. Therefore, I ask the President of the Privy Council for clarification. Was the prebuilding of the southern