

too in the public mind if we took this position. I think we would get many commendations, and letters, wires and telephone calls in support of our position, and very few criticisms. But if we waffle, if we procrastinate, if we kill the terms of my motion by this fine, well known parliamentary procedure of sending not the substance but the subject matter to a committee, then I think we should, and will, receive some very sharp criticism from many parts of the country.

I remember an occasion some years ago when the other place decided to take a position on a very controversial question affecting Canada's relations with the United States, and I should like to read from the *Journals* of the other place of Wednesday, May 5, 1953. On, I believe, a supply motion, Mr. Donald Fleming, supported by the Mr. E. Davie Fulton—two prominent front bench Conservative members of Parliament—moved:

That all the words after "That" to the end of the question be deleted and the following substituted therefor:

"in view of the impending departure of the Prime Minister to Washington this House desires to record its opinion that further vigorous efforts should be made by the Government to bring about the removal of the restrictions imposed by the United States on the importation of Canadian Agricultural products, in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade."

A far-ranging debate took place, and that motion received the support of members from all sides of the house on that day, even though it was highly critical, and in strong terms, of the American position of restricting the importation of certain Canadian agricultural products in violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade.

Here I quote in part the remarks of the Right Honourable Louis St. Laurent, then Prime Minister. He is talking about the terms of the motion and there was a slight amendment later on. He said:

I take it this was not intended to be a motion of no confidence;

It was on a supply bill.

—it was intended to be an expression of the feeling of all members of Parliament that further vigorous efforts should be made by the Government to bring about a removal of these restrictions which are causing serious concern and even embarrassment.

He went on to say:

It would be quite helpful if a unanimous expression of opinion were registered in this house before I have these interviews that I am looking forward to with the President, the Secretary of State and perhaps other members of the Administration and, I hope, some member of the United States Senate and Congress.

I think the House of Commons was wise in the action it took that day, and in the motion it passed.

[Hon. Mr. Argue.]

I presented this motion in a responsible way. I think the motion is a good one. Not many senators have spoken on it, but those who did spoke favourably. They represented both parties. I think it would be a constructive move, helpful to the Prime Minister in dealing with the United States Government, to pass the motion in the terms in which it was presented to the Senate, and not allow it to be shunted off and killed by this well-known parliamentary device of moving that the subject matter, rather than the motion itself, be referred to a committee. If the administration in the Senate should persist in carrying out its stated intention to send it to the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications I hope I may be placed on that committee.

Hon. Mr. Martin: Yes.

Hon. Mr. Argue: I know it will be tough, but I will do everything I can to have that committee come to a conclusion—

Hon. Mr. Langlois: That is the way we want you to be.

Hon. Mr. Argue: —in a relatively short time, and report its conclusion back to the Senate, and thus let the Senate take a position on this question. Let us hope that we can come together with the people who are protecting the environment around this continent, and make a constructive contribution to what I believe is the Government's general policy in this connection.

Hon. Ernest C. Manning: Honourable senators, in view of the proposal we have heard this afternoon, and particularly the comments of Senator Argue, I would like to suggest that the manner in which we dispose of this question should be decided by the objectives that we want to accomplish. If our intention is to do nothing more than make a meaningless gesture that may be politically popular, but which will not accomplish anything beyond that, the motion as it is before us could be proceeded with and passed.

Personally, I could not support the motion as it appears on the Order Paper, not because I have any less concern for the ecology of the west coast of Canada than anybody else, but simply because in my view this is not the way we are going to resolve that problem.

First of all, we must keep in mind that what is proposed by the Americans is the building of a pipeline entirely within their own country and, therefore, entirely within their own jurisdiction. Its terminal outlet is at an American seaport, where the oil can be loaded into American or other tankers which can move to the high seas and transport the oil to another American port to be unloaded and used for domestic consumption. If in the route they choose they decide they want to use Canadian territorial waters, then that is another question because Canada has complete autonomy to deal with any shipping within its territorial waters. But Canada certainly has no authority to deal with the shipment of any cargo once it is on the high seas. This makes it clear that, if we want to do something constructive to alter the proposed method of moving North Slope oil from Alaska to a