

Hon. Mr. Flynn: I hope that Senator McDonald does not interpret Senator Fergusson's question as limiting the hiring of females for the job of page. I think there are other jobs that would better suit them.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: That is true. In the event we have both male and female pages we will be faced with a problem of space. The suggestion was made that perhaps some of the messengers should be female, which again presents the problem of space. It was further suggested that an appropriate solution would be to have only female pages and only male messengers. One of our committee clerks is a lady, and I know there is active consideration to giving the ladies a more equitable share of the jobs available in the Senate.

Hon. Mrs. Quart: I would like to ask Senator Fergusson if she has any age limit in mind?

Hon. Mrs. Fergusson: There is an age limit now for pages.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: A minimum age.

Hon. Mrs. Quart: I am thinking of the maximum?

Hon. Mrs. Fergusson: There is an age limit for male pages, and I presume it would be the same for female pages. I do not know what it is.

Hon. Mrs. Casgrain: Would it mean equal pay for equal work?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: Yes, definitely.

NORTHERN OIL AND GAS

GOVERNMENT TRANSPORTATION STUDY URGED— MOTION IN AMENDMENT CARRIED

The Senate resumed from Wednesday, May 26, the adjourned debate on the motion, in amendment, of Hon. Mr. Langlois to the motion of Hon. Mr. Argue:

That this house opposes the Trans-Alaska pipeline and tanker project and urges the Government to proceed with the various economical and ecological feasibility studies of alternate routes and to report from time to time upon the most appropriate steps that in the Government's opinion may from time to time be taken to accomplish the prudent and efficient transportation of northern oil and gas; that the motion be not now adopted, but that the subject-matter thereof be referred to the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications for consideration.

Hon. John M. Macdonald: Honourable senators, I wish to speak for a few minutes this afternoon to indicate my support of the position taken by Senator Argue in opposition to the amendment proposed by Senator Langlois.

It is not my intention to repeat the arguments which have been placed before you in support of the motion, or those advanced against accepting the amendment. So far as I am concerned I believe Senator Argue gave a power-

ful speech against the amendment and he was most convincing. I agree with him that the proposed amendment is simply a polite way of defeating the motion. I do not understand why this should be done. If for some reason or another, even if it is not a good reason, the motion is not acceptable to the Government Leader, then I think it would be a better policy and a better procedure for him just to have the motion defeated.

After all, Senator Argue is a man of intellectual maturity, one who would I think prefer to have a clear-cut and definite rejection of his motion rather than this disguised, indirect method of killing it with kindness.

I do not understand why the Government Leader is so opposed to the motion. Indeed, I would have expected the Government to welcome it and encourage its supporters to vote for it. After all, adoption of the motion might very well strengthen the position that has been taken by the Secretary of State for External Affairs over a period of time. Only the other day he said that officials of the Government had met with officials of the United States Government to express the concern of the Government of Canada about the ecological dangers of the proposed Trans-Alaska pipeline and the tanker route. He added that he expected to have another—and I stress the word "another"—opportunity on June 10 of making the same point to his opposite number in the United States. I should think the passing of Senator Argue's motion by the Senate would reinforce and give added weight to the representations the Secretary of State for External Affairs is going to make in the United States on June 10. He could then tell his opposite number that the Senate of Canada, representing all regions of Canada, has shown in no uncertain terms that it is against the proposed pipeline-tanker system, and has registered its views without any promptings from or inducement by the Canadian Government.

I do not know whether the Government Leader has discussed this motion with his colleague the Secretary of State for External Affairs. If he has not, perhaps he would do so before having his supporters kill this motion by passing the amendment. The amendment would refer the subject-matter of the motion to the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications for consideration. If this were done I believe it would only be an exercise in futility.

Honourable senators, you have heard the arguments put forward in support of the motion. To me they are very convincing, and I can see no need to amend it or any beneficial purpose in doing so. Indeed, I believe it is too late, even if it were desirable. In my opinion, only high level discussions between governments, our Government and that of the United States, can prevent the Trans-Alaska pipeline and tanker system being put into operation. I believe that such discussions would have to be held in the very near future, otherwise it would be too late.

I noticed an interesting article in the *Ottawa Citizen* of last Monday, which I should like to quote in part. The headline says:

First sales of oil, gas from Alaska.