

Government Orders

What they wouldn't do for the folks in Prince George, I say to the minister. His heart must be touched that this bunch of fearless fighters are out there fighting for people up in Bulkley Valley. It is exciting, isn't it? My wife comes from that valley. It will tickle the cockles of her heart when she knows these people are really just separatists in disguise. They were fighting for the Annapolis Valley all the while, as well as Bulkley Valley and the other valleys and hills in this great and beautiful country. The Ottawa Valley, God knows, needs some people fighting for it. To say it one more way as we are still talking about the bloc—

Mr. Lapierre: Do you support the amendment?

Mr. Simmons: Mr. Speaker, that gentleman has actually spoken more since he has been back there than he did all the while he was down here with us. Did you notice that, Mr. Speaker? He has finally found his tongue. If he could only find his head—

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. Simmons: To say it one more way, the fearless fighters for Bulkley Valley, Annapolis, the Codroy Valley in Newfoundland, and all those other places—

Mr. Boudria: And the Ottawa Valley.

Mr. Simmons: The Ottawa Valley and the Bow Valley. I must not forget the Bow Valley near Calgary. To say it one more way for them, the arsonist has become chief of the fire brigade.

Now that we have dealt with the new kids, the new heads on the block, now that we have dealt with the "have your cake and eat it too" New Democratic Party, let us come to the question of closure. Closure is put in the rules for a very good reason. Its beauty is that it must be used sparingly, very rarely, only in the most extreme of circumstances.

I can understand the anger and the frustration of my good friend, the minister of energy, when he yields to the suggestion that maybe closure would be a weapon to be used here to try and beat down the closet Canadians who call themselves separatists. I understand that, but I want to say to the minister of energy that maybe there was another way. I say to him that if his problem is the new heads on the block, then that is a problem we can deal with very quickly in this House, because this House by its

very nature is for people who believe in Canada. That is what it is all about.

I will vote for a motion any day at all that runs this crowd clean out of this place once and for good. I will go for that motion because they do not belong here. They do not belong here, Mr. Speaker. If he wants to get this bill—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member's time has expired. On debate, the hon. member for Richelieu has the floor.

Mr. Simmons: By leave, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Is there unanimous consent to hear the hon. member for Burin—St. George's?

Some hon. members: Yes.

Some hon. members: No.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I do not think there is unanimous consent. Is the hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca rising on debate?

Mr. Barrett: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The hon. member for Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca has the floor on debate.

Mr. David Barrett (Esquimalt—Juan de Fuca): Mr. Speaker, I wish to speak to this debate on the basis of some comments by my good friend from Newfoundland and some comments about other members in this House.

My good friend speaks about the business aspects of this deal. He condemns my colleagues, suggesting that we would hang, draw, and quarter business persons who are involved in the great enterprises here in Canada.

An hon. member: Who said that?

Mr. Barrett: My dear friend is obviously one of those great corporate social workers who hands out welfare in the billions of dollars. If this deal is so good and this government is so business attuned, and if that group over there of handout artists wants to present itself as an alternative to the Canadian people as a government then it should take an equity position for the taxpayers of this country who are putting up the money for this operation.

Some hon. members: Hear, hear.