

will continue to be for a very long time to come, on crude oil from Venezuela to supply its industries and its whole petroleum market.

Because of the pollution hazard are we willing to close the Atlantic seaboard and the St. Lawrence seaway to all vessels carrying crude oil?

**Hon. Mr. Flynn:** May I ask the honourable senator a question? Does he realize that in his remarks he opposes the substance of the main motion and that consequently he contradicts to some extent the motion that he has proposed as amendment, and that we will finally question the validity of this amending motion if he believes that the main motion should not be amended?

**Hon. Mr. Langlois:** My colleague and friend, Senator Flynn, has just prefaced his remarks by saying that he would like to ask a question and, as the house may realize, he has really attempted to refute what I said by anticipating what he thought I was going to say. I am only trying to refute the arguments put forward by my colleagues who objected to my motion and I am not disavowing what I said when I introduced the motion. I only mentioned that the motion would have to be thoroughly discussed and, moreover, I think that it is the Leader who added the other day that it was impossible to consider the motion without examining all the proposed alternative routes for the shipment of crude oil on the Pacific coast. I am only commenting on the statements made in the present debate.

To get back to what I was saying, is it because we fear pollution that we will paralyze the economy of the country? In my opinion, it is not the right solution. I add that when we protest about the eventual policy of our neighbours, we are setting up a line of conduct for ourselves—and we can expect that our neighbours, the United States, will from now on object to tankers bringing us the oil we need from Venezuela going through their territorial waters to reach the Canadian ports on the Atlantic coast or the Great Lakes.

That is why we cannot vote on that motion without thoroughly considering all possible aspects and alternatives.

In addition, if we are afraid of pollution from tankers, I think that the solution would not be to forbid them from going through our territorial waters, but rather to take preventive steps, in order to avoid accidents such as those in which tankers have been involved. When I refer to preventive steps, I mean legislation such as Bill C-2 against maritime pollution which was passed last fall. Within the next few days, we will have the opportunity to study another bill on similar preventive measures, namely, Bill C-246, an act respecting pilotage, through which we will be asked what we think of a proposed completed revision of our Pilotage legislation, which would provide for a new pilotage system in Canadian territorial waters. We will then have a chance to suggest measures to prevent, in the future, those tankers from being a pollution hazard, and to recommend navigational

security measures for the conservation of our territorial waters. It is as simple as that. I am not of those who believe, although I respect the source of the precept, that "if thy right eye offend thee, pluck it out". I do not believe in the efficiency of such drastic remedies.

Still, I would not have the whole economy of our nation destroyed in that fashion. Moreover, for those who might still have doubts and fears concerning the purpose of this motion, and suggest that the purpose of the present debate was that the Government hoped the bill would be killed by someone in this house, I refer to page 6161 of the House of Commons *Hansard* for May 28, where our Secretary of State for External Affairs, who at the time was also Acting Prime Minister, gave an answer to the member for Fundy-Royal, Mr. R. Gordon L. Fairweather, who had asked whether the Minister of Fisheries had stated government policy when he spoke of the possibility of preventing some oil companies from using the Strait of Georgia for the transportation of crude oil. Here is what the Honourable Mr. Sharp said, and I quote:

[*English*]

I join with the Minister of Fisheries, who will be responsible for the environment, in saying that our particular concern about the movement of oil down the Pacific coast relates to those narrow waters of the Strait of Juan de Fuca and the Strait of Georgia. This is the area about which we have the most concern and on which we will be making the strongest representations to the United States government.

[*Translation*]

Reading this, I have the impression, not to say the certainty, that Mr. Sharp was formulating government policy, since he was speaking, as I said a short while ago, not only as Secretary of State for External Affairs, but also as Acting Prime Minister, in the absence of the Right Honourable Mr. Trudeau, on an official trip to Russia.

I would add, and I have already said it, I am merely repeating this, that it is the intention of the Government Leader in this House, as it is my personal intention, in as much as I have the authority to do so, and I have it, to get the Senate Committee on Transport and Communications to consider that motion without delay.

The other day, my colleague Senator Prowse raised objections which I have noted by the way, but which did not appear that important. First, he raised the objection that the Senate Committee on Transport and Communications would not be prepared to operate forthwith. He had certainly forgotten that this committee is a standing committee of this house, which can be appraised of this motion as of tomorrow, if it is passed today. He also raised another objection to the effect that, since the same matter had already been considered by a committee of the other place, there would be duplication should our committee consider it anew. Is there any objection to this house discussing the same question as was discussed in the other place? Is this house to be a mere reflection of the other one? Are we willing to accept everything