

Inquiries of the Ministry

attention been drawn to the fact that a United States official has stated in Washington that a survey is now being made of the waters adjacent to Cherry Point to a depth of 90 feet with a view to accommodating oil tankers of some 500,000 tons? In view of the fact this survey is being made, is the Canadian government now prepared to change its position and to ask the U.S. government to join with Canada in making a joint submission to the International Joint Commission with respect to the entire TAPS program?

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): Mr. Speaker, I am familiar with some of the representations that have been made and the work that is going on. The view of the Canadian government is that the moving of oil to Cherry Point is not an essential part of the TAPS program. We have been urging upon the United States, if it does decide to go ahead with the TAPS program, that the oil should not be brought into Cherry Point. The government has made this position very plain and it is well known to the United States. Of course, they make the decision since the oil will move through American waters only and not through Canadian. On the other hand, I suggested to Secretary of State Rogers when he was here that there might be a joint reference to the International Joint Commission on the whole question of pollution in that very beautiful vacation land that none of us want to see despoiled. That is under consideration. As I said to the hon. gentleman, it is not possible, of course, to make a recommendation unless we do have the support of the United States. This we are trying to obtain.

Mr. Douglas: Mr. Speaker, while undoubtedly the minister is correct that the Cherry Point refinery can get crude oil from other sources, in view of the fact that a survey is now going on which would indicate that a decision has been made to use Cherry Point as the terminal for the TAPS program, may I ask the minister whether he has made any formal application to the United States government asking them to join with Canada in a reference to the International Joint Commission?

Mr. Sharp: Surveys do not imply decisions. There have been many surveys made which were aborted by later decisions. I have made formal representations to the Secretary of State that he should join with me in making a reference to the IJC. I have not yet had a response.

* * *

EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**SUGGESTED RECOGNITION BY CANADA OF JERUSALEM AS CAPITAL OF ISRAEL**

Right Hon. J. G. Diefenbaker (Prince Albert): Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Secretary of State for External Affairs. Having regard to consideration that is being given to this question in the United States, I ask the minister whether or not Canada has given or will give consideration now to recognizing Jerusalem as the historic and lawful capital of Israel and accept Israel's right to designate her capital city, and in so doing would he move our embassy from Tel Aviv to Jerusalem?

[Mr. Douglas.]

Hon. Mitchell Sharp (Secretary of State for External Affairs): The kind of considerations that are now weighing with the Canadian government are exactly the same as weighed with my right hon. friend when he was the Prime Minister of Canada. We do not want to jeopardize in any way the possibility of a peaceful settlement of the dispute. I am sure he would join with me in that wish.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, the minister always goes back to other days. I am asking him about today. Is he aware of the fact that the Republican House Leader, Gerald Ford, in the United States, has proposed that this be done now—not ten years ago but now—and will the minister say therefore that consideration is being given to this matter? I ask that because of his pretended affection for Israel.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Sharp: Of course consideration is being given constantly to this question because I do know the views of the government of Israel, but, like many other countries, we have not felt it desirable to complicate the negotiations for a peaceful settlement between Israel and her Arab neighbours, just as my right hon. friend seems to have taken these considerations into account when he had the responsibility of office.

Mr. Diefenbaker: Mr. Speaker, I now rise on a question of privilege. As usual, the minister manufactured an answer. The matter never came up nor was it ever suggested during that period of time.

* * *

FISHERIES**ATLANTIC SALMON FISHERY CLOSURES—TAKING OF PARALLEL ACTION BY QUEBEC**

Mr. Thomas M. Bell (Saint John-Lancaster): Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. Has the minister been in touch with the province of Quebec this week, and can he say when parallel action will be taken by that province with respect to the ban on salmon fishing that has been applied in other provinces?

Hon. Jack Davis (Minister of Fisheries): I had discussions with the province of Quebec about two months ago. The substance of the announcements of the last few days has been transmitted to that province but I have not heard from Quebec in reply.

• (1440)

ATLANTIC SALMON FISHERY CLOSURES—SUGGESTED TRANSFER OF JURISDICTION TO OTHER PROVINCES IN ADDITION TO QUEBEC

Mr. John Lundrigan (Gander-Twillingate): Mr. Speaker, I wish to ask a supplementary question. In view of the minister's statement yesterday that the province of Quebec will take similar action on its salmon rivers can the minister indicate whether that province has been given jurisdiction and control over its salmon fishery? If so, will similar consideration be given to the provinces of