

upon an inquiry into the whole business of the integration of our energy resources into the markets that may be available to us on this continent. Had I proceeded with my motion and had the house given its authority to proceed and to follow through with the investigation, we would thus have been competing with those other bodies for the experts who would be available as witnesses and for the assistants necessary to such an investigation. This would have meant an unnecessary duplication of work, the results of which would be available to us later in any event.

But the motion moved by the honourable Senator Langlois is nothing but a hollow and obvious attempt to close this subject out. It is now May 26. The committee that has been suggested we set up here could not be in operation by the time the house adjourns for the summer recess. But even if people were to stay here and we were able to set the committee up, we could hardly begin hearings at that time.

**Hon. Mr. Langlois:** It is a standing committee.

**Hon. Mr. Prowse:** The standing committee is there all right, but the standing committee will hear what? The standing committee of the other place has been concerned with this subject matter for the last five or six months. Are we merely going to duplicate what they are doing now? How could you justify the expense of bringing the witnesses? How would you justify the use of people's time in doing something that has already been done? We could achieve the purpose of the amendment which is put in here simply by reading through the reports of the committee in the other place.

All my honourable friend from Saskatchewan wanted to do was to have us give an expression of opinion which might be helpful to those people. He was not suggesting that we should get into the expensive kind of investigation which would be involved here and which would be not simply a duplication but a quadruplication of the work that is already being done. I say it would be a quadruplication because we have first the Prices and Incomes Commission, then the National Energy Board, then the committee of the other place, and now you are asking for the same thing to be done here to cover the same ground. By what possible justification could we explain that quadruplication of expense to the public or even to ourselves?

Honourable senators, this is a hollow and shallow device for shelving an opportunity for this house to express an opinion on a matter of importance to Canadians. A line to Churchill, as the honourable Senator Manning mentioned, would not pass through American territory; a line to Prince Rupert would not endanger any American territory, but a tanker route from Valdez to Anacortes, coming in through the narrow Juan de Fuca Strait, around the south of Vancouver Island, not only ends up going through Canadian waters but ends up threatening the finest beaches and recreation areas we have in this country.

Do not be deceived by the "man of straw" that is being thrown at you. Do not be deceived or led astray by the

[Hon. Mr. Prowse.]

unwillingness of people who should be able to face simple facts, and let us remember that an expression from this house would be welcomed and considered carefully by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States. Because we are the ones who are threatened most, we would merely be joining with the conservation people down there in attempting to see that we keep this country for ourselves and protect it for our children.

**Hon. Mr. Rattenbury:** I would like to ask my honourable friend a question. I believe that he failed to make one point, or if he made it I did not understand it. Is he putting the kiss of death on any method of getting the oil out, or just on the one that would move it through Canadian waters?

**Hon. Mr. Prowse:** We are saying that we oppose the presently proposed route from Valdez straight down the coast. There are two alternatives. First, they could follow the meridian, south to a point 400 miles off Seattle and come straight in, because the line runs through Honolulu. If they stayed well away from Canadian waters and came into an American port so that they did not threaten us, this would not cover the situation. Or, when we find out how to build a pipeline down the Mackenzie Valley, they could use that route, because a pipeline using that route is going to be built eventually. The question is as to when and how.

They do not need the oil today in the United States. They are getting by very well, and if they are really stuck they can buy more of ours and they will get it at a cheaper price than they would have to pay for Alaskan oil in the long run.

I am suggesting that right now we have the right to say we are opposed to what they intend to do, moving the oil from Valdez down to Anacortes, because they cannot get into port without presenting a threat to us, one which will increase as these ships become larger and as the traffic becomes heavier. In a speech I made a short time ago I pointed out that one-seventh of the ships on the high seas are involved in collisions every year. As increasing volumes of oil are moved, this threat becomes greater. Why should we expose ourselves to this threat when it is not necessary so to do?

**Hon. Mr. Rattenbury:** I would suggest to the honourable senator that he still has not made a good point, in my opinion. Among the most difficult waters of the world to navigate are the English Channel and the North Sea. The largest ships in the world go into Holland; and Bantry Bay is not any picnic from the navigator's viewpoint. Indeed, the Bay of Fundy is a rather hazardous stretch of water, and some of the larger ships in the world navigate that stretch. Even if you go out around Hawaii, you would still have to come inshore some time, and the danger arises when you do that, not when you are off the coastline.

**Hon. Mr. Prowse:** If they come into Seattle they miss Canadian waters. Anacortes is south of Vancouver, and you get into it by coming down around Vancouver Island and going up Juan de Fuca Strait. Any pollution there is