

to obtain the kind of financial recompense we should have received soon after the disaster occurred.

I was in New York when the tanker *Manhattan* returned from its supposedly successful Arctic voyage. When the *Manhattan* was put in dry dock, two huge holes were found in its storage tanks. Under normal conditions those tanks would have been loaded with oil. That voyage would have been an ecological disaster for the Arctic. One hole was so large you could drive a truck through it, yet many people hailed the trip of the *Manhattan* as a success. It is one of the largest tankers in existence today. It has very thick plates. However, it returned from this Arctic safari with two serious gashes in its hull. This would have been disastrous had the ship been conveying oil.

I shall not continue any longer. I know that other members, particularly from the west coast, want to speak on this issue. I appeal to all members of the House of Commons, and through them to the Canadian people, to recognize the ecological and environmental disaster facing the west coast of Canada if we fail to act. Any measure which is going to stop, halt or hinder the possibility of a tanker accident along Canada's west coast, indeed the east coast and any coast because we are all Canadians and all interested in this problem wherever it exists in Canada, deserves the support of Members of Parliament and the Canadian people.

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Erik Nielsen (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, what a spectacle we have been treated to today; a government in disarray! The speech made by the hon. member for Burnaby-Seymour (Mr. Perrault) reeked of phoniness and hypocrisy. He appealed to this House to do something about the disaster on the west coast. He is a member of the government that is not doing anything about this problem. On the basis of a deal with the Social Credit party no doubt, the government today staged a play with the Secretary of State for External Affairs (Mr. Sharp) making a statement of which no copies were provided in advance. We now know the reason for that. This was immediately followed by a motion moved by the hon. member for Fraser Valley (Mr. Pringle). The same motion was made twice on Tuesday and once more on Wednesday.

• (1610)

Mr. Sharp: That is not so.

Mr. Nielsen: The minister says that is not so. Let me refer to *Hansard*, page 2879, June 6.

[Translation]

Mr. Fortin: Mr. Speaker, I am rising on a question of privilege.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please. The hon. member for Lotbinière is rising on a question of privilege.

[Translation]

Mr. Fortin: We, Creditistes, have been accused by the hon. member for Yukon (Mr. Nielsen) of plotting something in co-operation with the Liberal party in connection with this motion.

Oil Pollution

Mr. Speaker, I would like to set the record straight immediately and I ask the hon. member to withdraw his words because this accusation is utterly dishonest and I should even say a blow below the belt.

Mr. Speaker, everyone knows that the Creditistes are now the victims of people who abuse a stupid provision of our rules, namely Standing Order 43. It is also known that this is a misuse of our rules and perhaps Your Honour might allow me to guess what you think of it. We are the first victims of this ridiculous provision and we agreed that this motion be debated because of its urgency. We demanded that our motion be studied because it is important and included in the orders of the day.

Consequently, we cannot tolerate such language from the member for Yukon, or any member, accusing us of utterly ridiculous and alleged plots—

Mr. Rondeau: Dishonest.

Mr. Fortin: —and I respectfully request through Your Honour that this member withdraw his words immediately.

[English]

Mr. Nielsen: Mr. Speaker, I accept the hon. member's statement that there is no deal between the Liberal party and the Social Credit party. I am bound to do that under the rules of the House. But one can only speculate as to what goes on. If the hon. member opposite has something to say, then let him stand up and say it instead of interjecting cowardly from his seat.

The Secretary of State for External Affairs says that I am mistaken that two motions were made last Tuesday. As reported at page 2879 of *Hansard*, we find the hon. member for Egmont (Mr. MacDonald) rising under the terms of Standing Order 43 to move a motion in a case of urgent and pressing necessity. The subject matter had to do with the oil spill that occurred last Sunday at the ARCO oil refinery at Cherry Point, Washington, which he said is now being carried by the tides and currents into Canadian waters and polluting Canadian shores south of Vancouver. He requested unanimous consent to move as follows:

That the Standing Committee on External Affairs and National Defence be empowered to examine and inquire into the oil spill at Cherry Point and the consequent infringement of Canadian sea and territorial sovereignty; and to relate its findings to studies on public hearings conducted on the west coast into the TAPS oil tanker route and oil transfer and refinery terminals; and to have power to travel from place to place both in Canada and elsewhere.

You will recall, Mr. Speaker, that on that occasion he drew the attention of the House to the fact that the standing committee was on the west coast at the time. It was the Liberals on the other side of the House who denied the hon. member for Egmont debate on a motion that now, suddenly on Thursday, is considered a matter of urgent and pressing public necessity.

Mr. Sharp: It is not the same motion at all, not the same substance.

Mr. Nielsen: Why is there not that same denial forthcoming from the other side today? The Secretary of State for External Affairs says that the substance of that