

Supply

that he missed while he was doing whatever he was doing.

Mr. Ronald J. Duhamel (St. Boniface): I listened very intently, very carefully, to what my colleague had to say. While I was of open mind and wanted to be generous, I was disappointed that he would cast negative aspersions on the attendance of one particular Liberal member. In terms of attendance, I could mention a member from his party who has got a better record. The singling out of my colleague from Winnipeg South Centre was inappropriate.

He talked about the Liberal corporate backers. Well, I have got to tell you, my backing is from the people. He does not talk about the unions. He does not talk about the greatest credibility factor that the NDP has, and that is the lack of economic policy. He suggests that the Liberal statement to sit down and renegotiate is not an honest one. I am terribly disappointed that he should say that. I will tell you why.

I have an article here from the *Financial Post* dated October 28, 1991. It says of the leader of his party, and I quote:

She now says she would try to renegotiate it first.

It refers to the Canada-U.S. trade agreement. It goes on to say:

If elected, we will sit down with the Americans and say how can we make this thing work? If not, we would give them six months notice, she said.

Is that not renegotiation? If it is not, then tell me what it is. I am disappointed that my colleague would not have acknowledged this position on the part of his leader.

Mr. Blaikie: You can always tell when you have hit something after you throw a stone in a pack of dogs and they start to yelp.

An hon. member: Are we a pack of dogs?

Mr. Murphy: On good days.

Mr. Blaikie: On good days.

Mr. Duhamel: I tried to be generous. I tried to be gentle. I tried to ask a responsible question and the member refers to tossing a stone among a pack of dogs. I resent that kind of statement and I would ask for an immediate withdrawal, please.

Mr. Blaikie: This is a common parliamentary analogy. I am sorry if the member is so sensitive that he cannot even stand such an analogy. I have no intention of withdrawing it because it is not out of order at all. I was simply drawing an analogy.

The member talks about how disappointed he is. I am sorry, but it would have been out of order to have referred to the absence of a particular member on a specific day, i.e. today. I had no intention of doing that. I do find it odd. I am sorry if the hon. member finds it offensive that the former leader of the Liberal Party could be involved in the fight of his life in 1988 and continue to be a member of Parliament and hardly ever show up here to continue the fight of his life and this country against the Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement and the North American free trade agreement.

I had a great deal of respect for the leader of the Liberal Party who I am talking about now, but I have to say in all honesty that I am disappointed in him, if you want to pursue the matter, the fact that he is not here to carry on that fight of his life. With respect to the member for Winnipeg South Centre, I said that with the greatest of respect. But I am trying to draw you out.

• (1040)

An hon. member: Tell us where you stand.

An hon. member: This is really bad.

Mr. Mifflin: Madam Speaker, on a point of order. I want to say that this is the first time since I have been in this House that I have risen on a point of order. I cannot sit here and see the rules of this House that I respect very much being denigrated.

An hon. member: Who is breaking the rules?

Mr. Mifflin: I am not breaking the rules. If you would listen long enough, you would hear what I have to say. You people should pay attention once in a while.

Madam Deputy Speaker: Order, please. This is Friday the 13th and it is early in the morning. Let us not make it a long painful day for anyone. I know where the hon. member for Bonavista—Trinity—Conception is going.

Mr. Mifflin: And I would like to get there, Madam Speaker.