

proceed in an orderly fashion with debate. Hon. Members may agree or disagree with what is being said, but traditionally we must respect the Hon. Member's right to submit an opinion to the House. He was recognized to make a speech and I invite him to continue.

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying a moment ago, during the nine or ten months the Tories were in office, despite their pontifications about what needs to be done for search and rescue, they did not use that golden opportunity to put their money where their mouths were. They did nothing. They did absolutely big, fat zero.

The Hon. Member for St. John's East has just indicated that in making this statement I am misleading the House. I challenge him to demonstrate how that is true. I challenge him to tell the House and the people of Newfoundland, for whom he pontificates so loudly about search and rescue, what he did when he had a chance to do something about it. I know the answer to that question but it is best coming from him because he is an honest man. He will tell the truth if put to the test. Let him tell the people of Newfoundland what he did. If he tells them what he did and documents the facts, and if I have in any respect misled the House, I shall be the first to correct the record, Mr. Speaker. The issue is—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. The Hon. Member for Esquimalt-Saanich (Mr. Munro) rises on a point of order.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): Mr. Speaker, on the West Coast at least, search and rescue is in the hands of the Department of National Defence.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. I must invite the Hon. Member to state his point of order. He is indulging in debate at this stage.

Mr. Munro (Esquimalt-Saanich): I was stating a fact.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Corbin): Order. This is beginning to be an abuse of the rules. Hon. Members should not rise on points of order to participate directly in debate. Surely if they have not already spoken, their turn will come eventually, I trust.

Again, it is incumbent on the Chair to protect the right of the Hon. Member who was recognized to make a speech. I say that it is incumbent on the Chair to allow him to proceed and to make sure that the proper rules of debate are respected. He should not be interrupted, as is very clearly indicated by the Standing Orders.

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, the resolution would call for another study. If the Hon. Member for St. John's East has in his possession a study that was done two or three years ago, why is he not advocating some of the solutions presented in that particular study? Surely he has found something. Surely the Cross report found something. Surely the *Ocean Ranger* inquiry will find something. Do we need another study? If we believe the drafter of this resolution, he wants a study for the

Search and Rescue Services

West Coast and, I presume, another for the East Coast and perhaps another for the Arctic. We do not need more studies, Mr. Speaker. We need a little dialogue around here.

● (1750)

In the last few minutes we have demonstrated that none is so deaf as those who will not hear. On the benches opposite the whole game in the last few minutes, on a quiet Wednesday afternoon, is to interrupt and prevent a Member of the House from saying what needs to be said in the debate.

Mr. Taylor: Don't start crying.

Mr. Simmons: I do not expect the Hon. Member for Bow River to get excited about search and rescue, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe he can get excited about many things.

Mr. McGrath: Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Member accept a question?

Mr. Simmons: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. McGrath: The Hon. Member is determined to deal with the past. Perhaps as spokesman for the Government he can explain to the House why it has refused to accept the recommendations of the Mahoney inquiry commissioned by the Government into the sinking of the *Arctic Explorer*. That report called for adequate deployment, for fixed-wing aircraft, and it made a number of recommendations which have been ignored. Perhaps the Hon. Member would address that question.

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, as recently as last Spring when the then Minister of National Defence was in St. John's, he announced a new deployment and there have been a number of new deployments since that particular report. The capability available to the Government through DOT and DND is constantly being redeployed. That is not to say that the redeployment, however adequate or brilliant, will ever have the approbation of the Hon. Member for St. John's East, because once he gives that, he removes the whole basis of his argument. He removes his entire platform. He has the village reputation of a crusader—not a doer, Mr. Speaker.

I know he does not want to hear about the past, even the recent past. I have challenged him and I do so again, now that I have answered his question. Again I ask him where the proof is that the Government of which he was a senior and prominent member did anything to address the very concerns he now raises and has raised for a number of years? That is the acid test.

On a continuing basis the Government has deployed and redeployed. If the Hon. Member is asking whether the system is perfect, the answer is no, it is not perfect. No matter what the resources or how many dollars are applied to this particular activity, there will always be room enough to point the finger. This motion is another finger pointing exercise. As soon as a Member on this side of the House tries to put the other side of the argument, Hon. Members opposite do not want to hear.