

It is a CP dispatch from Calgary. It goes on:

The first sales contracts for the purchase of Prudhoe Bay crude oil and natural gas have been completed by Standard Oil Company (Ohio) and the Columbia Gas Systems Incorporated, Standard has announced. Under the agreement, Columbia is to purchase \$200 million worth of crude oil. Deliveries are to begin with the start of production from the north Alaska reserves and the crude is to be valued at the market price of the day.

The first payment by Columbia, about \$60 million, is to be made around the end of June with additional payments after a permit is issued for the construction of the Trans-Alaska pipeline. Production would follow construction.

I take it from that news item that time is of the essence. That is why I believe it would be of benefit if we passed Senator Argue's motion now. It is my conviction that if the amendment is carried the committee should also include in their study ways and means of trying to clear up huge oil spills, if it is possible to do so. If one of these huge oil spills occurs, there would be tremendous damage done to our marine life and all the industries that depend upon it. I would go further and say that, in my opinion, by the time the committee completed its study, if this amendment is passed, the members of the committee might well be able to arrange to have a passage on one of these huge tankers carrying that crude oil, when they would be able to learn at first hand just what dangers would be encountered.

Feeling as I do about this matter, I must vote against the amendment and in favour of the motion.

[Translation]

**Hon. Léopold Langlois:** Honourable senators, in view of the debate which took place at the beginning of this sitting, I want to inform honourable senators that I wish to close the debate now.

[English]

**The Hon. the Speaker:** Honourable senators, I understand that the honourable Senator Langlois is indicating he is going to speak now, and that it is his intention to close the debate. Is there any other honourable senator who would like to speak at this time? Honourable senators understand that if the honourable Senator Langlois speaks now his speech will have the effect of closing the debate.

[Translation]

**Hon. Mr. Langlois:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Honourable senators, I must admit I was much surprised by the position adopted by my colleagues in regard to the motion I submitted the other day in amendment to the main motion submitted by Senator Argue.

[Hon. Mr. Macdonald.]

However, I feel there has been misinterpretation of my motion as being intended to delay voting or decision by the Senate on the main motion, thus applying here a practice which to my knowledge has never become established in the Senate, although it has been used and is still being resorted to in the other place, that is to say, in the House of Commons. Furthermore, had honourable senators taken the trouble to study my remarks when submitting the motion and my further comments, they would promptly have seen that my purpose was not to delay or kill the motion, as has been suggested, since I went out of my way to state repeatedly that such was not my objective, but that those on this side of the Senate wanted to submit the motion, within the shortest possible delay, to our Committee on Transport and Communications.

The other day, Senator Argue himself quoted an extract from the House of Commons *Hansard* for 1953 recording the argument used on that occasion by the Right Honourable Louis St. Laurent, former Prime Minister of Canada, who was speaking on a motion in amendment to a budget resolution. On that occasion, the former Prime Minister clearly stated that, although a fairly substantial motion in amendment to a budget resolution was in question, it was the intention of the motion and of its movers that was important, and as soon as I explained in this house the intention of this motion, it was impossible to doubt that my objective was not to kill the main motion.

First of all, I believe that here in Canada our attitude on pollution is the result of a certain feeling of guilt, because, for many years, we have completely ignored the pollution problem that is caused by the modern inventions of which we now make use. We have forgotten, for instance, that not only do tankers pollute the oceans, but, every day, industry pollutes the air we breathe in our homes and outside.

Would anyone in this house be ready to shut down industrial plants because they pollute the atmosphere?

Has anyone ever suggested that planes should be grounded because they pollute the air?

Has anyone ever suggested that our highways should be closed to motor vehicles because they cause pollution and fatal accidents every day?

Those questions show the absurdity of such an attitude and of what amounts to an obsession about pollution resulting from a feeling of guilt which we have acquired because we have, for too long, ignored the problems of pollution.

I was listening earlier to Senator J. M. Macdonald (Cape Breton) who was speaking of the possible pollution by tankers which might sail along the west coast of Canada. Is Senator Macdonald (Cape Breton) ready to suggest that Port Hawkesbury should be abandoned and closed because supertankers are likely to navigate in the vicinity and might constitute a pollution hazard in the Atlantic ocean? If we set up a rule for the Pacific coast, why not set up the same one for the eastern seaboard?

In this connection I must point out that the Atlantic coast—all eastern Canada—is entirely dependent, and