

*Point of Order*

mer's renovations to the Peace Tower, the general contractor, Fuller, subcontracted to Karmash, who contracted Ray Wolfe to do masonry work. Wolfe's female engineer, Anne Raney, was subsequently harassed off the job by Karmash.

• (1500)

Given the government's commitment to equity in the workplace and given this workplace is within the jurisdiction of Parliament Hill, literally outside our doors, why did the minister of public works subsequently reward such unacceptable behaviour by granting Fuller and Karmash contracts for the rest of Centre Block even after the Raney incident?

**Hon. David Dingwall (Minister of Public Works and Government Services and Minister for the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his question.

The hon. member will know that our contract is with the main contractor and not with the subcontractors. There is no what they call in law privity of contract between the Government of Canada and the subcontractor. However I instructed my deputy minister to apprise the main contractor to try to resolve the issue as expeditiously as possible. We have sent communications to him and we are hoping the matter which occurred will not occur again.

With regard to subsequent contracts I assure the hon. member as well as other members of the House that notwithstanding it is beyond the legal ramifications of the Government of Canada in terms of the privity of contract we will ensure this kind of behaviour is not tolerated. Therefore we will have to look at all contracts awarded in that manner.

\* \* \*

**PRIVILEGE**

## QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. John Richardson (Perth—Wellington—Waterloo, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege. The member for Red Deer referred to the Canadian soldiers that we send abroad as "big, bad junk yard dogs". What a terrible and unfair characterization of the members of the Canadian forces who have served our country and the UN for decades.

There seems to be an attempt by the members of the third party to smear the Canadian forces.

**The Speaker:** That is not a point of privilege. The hon. member for Red Deer has been named and I saw him getting to his feet. Does the hon. member have something to add to the point before the House?

**Mr. Bob Mills (Red Deer, Ref.):** Yes, Mr. Speaker. I quote the minister of defence when he said: "Our force would have to be robust and tough".

In my question I said we were not sending peacekeepers, which is what the defence minister went on to say. The U.S. defence minister said that the force has to be the biggest, baddest junk yard dog.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**The Speaker:** Once again I urge members to be very judicious in the choice of words we use in the House of Commons as they can be interpreted in various ways.

I believe the House of Commons is a place where we have very strong feelings and from time to time we use very strong words. I would hope this is not an indication of things to come and I would like the matter to rest where it is. It is not a point of privilege.

\* \* \*

**POINTS OF ORDER**

## QUESTION PERIOD

**Mr. Fred Mifflin (Parliamentary Secretary to Minister of National Defence and Minister of Veterans Affairs, Lib.):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on what I think is a genuine point of order. It is on the same subject with a slightly different twist.

**Some hon. members:** Oh, oh.

**Mr. Stinson:** You are twisted.

**Mr. Mifflin:** I beg your pardon?

**An hon. member:** I heard that.

**Mr. Mifflin:** The hon. member for Red Deer in his question to the Prime Minister in the context of another country used the term "meanest junk yard dogs" in reference to members of the Canadian forces.

• (1505)

My concern is not just that he used that term; but in reference to the tenor of the questions from the third party that morale in the Canadian forces was so bad that perhaps we may not want to send the troops, this was totally out of context. In that context I ask the member to withdraw that statement.

**The Speaker:** We had a point of privilege which I ruled was not a point of privilege. The hon. member for Red Deer rose to his feet to give some explanation. I said I wanted to let the matter rest there.

The hon. parliamentary secretary raised the same point on a point of order. I would rule at this point at least—I do not want to