

ported the report of its Special Committee on Environmental Pollution.

If the roles were reversed it would be as though the United States Senate, the United States House of Representatives and the President and his cabinet unanimously asked Canada not to take an action that would endanger and ruin the American coastline but to use instead some other alternative safer method. I am sure that in light of such a unanimous request Canada would comply.

I hope that in light of this unanimous opposition by the Senate, the House of Commons and the Canadian Government, President Nixon and his administration will abandon the proposed Valdez Seattle Tanker route.

Why should the United States ship its oil through the Straits of Georgia and Juan de Fuca when it will inevitably result in oil spills and the destruction of hundreds of miles of Canada's coastline?

Canada is a nation of 20 million alongside the giant United States, a nation of 200 million. If the United States proceeds with this proposed route without consideration for Canada and the damage to our coastline and our environment, it will, I am convinced, fly in the face of world opinion. It will bring discredit to itself amongst the international community. If it proceeds with this proposed grave mistake, against the wishes and interest of its small peaceful neighbour Canada, it will have adopted a ruthless, illogical course that will damage its own prestige, reduce its good will and influence among the nations of the world, and make it necessary for a future administration to reverse this tragic error.

This is a unique day for Parliament. This discussion in the Senate follows the unanimous adoption last Wednesday of the report of the House of Commons Special Committee on Environmental Pollution which states:

—your committee concludes that the proposed tanker route is detrimental to the Canadian national interest, and unanimously recommends that it be vigorously opposed by the Canadian Government.

Mr. David Anderson, M.P., Chairman of the Commons Committee, showed courage, ability and initiative in taking the case against the pipeline to Washington, in speaking out frankly in face of opposition within his own party, and finally in bringing in a report that received the unanimous support of the House of Commons.

In a sense there has been a parallel in the Senate. I moved the original resolution, seconded by Senator J. M. Macdonald (Cape Breton), on April 1. There was considerable support in the debate. However, Senator Langlois, as Deputy Leader in the Senate, moved that this motion be not read a second time but that the subject matter be sent to the Standing Senate Committee on Transport and Communications. I feared that this was a move to kill the resolution. I opposed the amendment, as did fifteen other senators. However, witnesses called before the committee supported the substance of the motion and opposed the pipeline. A proposed star witness, the Honourable Mitchell Sharp, who it was rumoured would enter serious reservations, reportedly changed his mind and declined

to appear. Happily, he was in the House of Commons on Wednesday last when the report of the Commons committee was carried unanimously.

As was intimated to me by one of the witnesses before our committee, the Senate motion has two advantages over the Commons action. First, it not only opposes the Trans-Alaska pipeline and tanker project but proposes action toward an acceptable alternate route. Secondly, a motion passed by the Senate of Canada will carry a major political wallop in the United States where its Senate plays such a powerful role.

Honourable senators, in adopting this motion the Senate of Canada is taking the correct step. As one who has had the good fortune to travel to the United States often, to meet with many of the American congressional leaders, and as one who realizes the powerful influence of anti-pollution groups in the United States, I personally am confident that this proposed pipeline route will be abandoned and that our good normal relations with the United States will continue undisturbed.

Motion agreed to.

ADJOURNMENT

Hon. A. Hamilton McDonald: Honourable senators, with leave of the Senate and notwithstanding Rule 45(1)(g), I move that when the Senate adjourns today it do stand adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 30, 1971, at 11 o'clock in the forenoon.

Perhaps a word of explanation would be helpful. It is my hope that this afternoon we can clean up all the work that is before the Senate at the moment. However, there is a possibility that one or more bills, particularly the Judges Act, may come to us from the other place late tonight, in which event it would be wise for us to meet at 11 o'clock tomorrow morning.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: Do you know whether it is the intention to have royal assent before one o'clock tomorrow, as originally planned?

Hon. Mr. McDonald: The only information I have at the moment is that if it is possible for the Senate to get the bills I have alluded to in time, we could adjourn as originally planned. However, it is more likely that we will have royal assent later tomorrow afternoon at approximately five or six o'clock.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: Does the Deputy Leader know what the intention of the other place is so far as adjournment is concerned? Do they intend to adjourn tomorrow at noon? I had heard that they wanted to conclude at approximately one p.m.

Hon. Mr. McDonald: That was the original plan, but it was hoped at that time that the legislation I have referred to would be before the Senate today. As that is not the case, I doubt that either the House of Commons or the Senate will be able to complete their work until some time later tomorrow afternoon.

Hon. Mr. Flynn: Do I understand that the budget debate in the other place is to be concluded before one