

Government Orders

In spite of the bombast, the member failed to deliver like his party.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): In his my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 38, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight as the time of adjournment are as follows: the hon. member for Burin—St. George's—Fisheries; the hon. member for Don Valley East—Buy Canadian; the hon. member for Calgary Northeast—Thalidomide victims; the hon. member for Edmonton Southeast—Natural gas industry; the hon. member for South West Nova—Fisheries.

• (1640)

For those who are listening on television, perhaps their secretaries could advise members that it may be possible to enter into the adjournment debate much sooner than later. Maybe they could have members here as soon as possible so we can carry on.

Mr. David Dingwall (Cape Breton—East Richmond): Mr. Speaker, it is a wonderful opportunity here today. I am sure the hon. member will return to the Chamber, because he will want to ask me a number of questions in terms of public policy to which I would be happy to respond at any time anywhere in this country.

It is the height of hypocrisy of the NDP, particularly the hon. member from Saskatoon who is trying to leave the Chamber.

Mr. Skelly (North Island—Powell River): I rise on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I know it is a long established practice in this House and I am hoping the member will apologize—

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I really did not hear what the hon. member had to say but, whatever it was, if he wants to leave the Chamber that is up to him.

Mr. Dingwall: Mr. Speaker, the hypocrisy of the New Democratic Party is evidenced once again in this Chamber as we have seen across this country and in provincial jurisdictions. Its members are the first group to stand in their place to criticize each and every one who

occupies a position of responsibility, whether it be at the federal level or at the provincial level.

However, when it comes to its bailiwick in terms of provincial jurisdiction, we could take for instance the province of Saskatchewan or the province of Ontario. Look at the broken promises that have occurred in the province of Ontario under the leadership of Bob Rae.

Mr. Keyes: It is a litany.

Mr. Dingwall: My colleague has made reference to it being a litany. There is no question that it is a litany of broken promises by the NDP. Its new-found interest in Atlantic Canada—and I am sure the hon. Minister of Veterans Affairs will want to agree with me because he is a reasonable man—shocked me. It really shocked me to find that the NDP, a land based party as referred to by an hon. member on the opposite side, now has a new-found interest in Atlantic Canada, and in particular the province of Newfoundland and the fish stocks off its coast.

What a hypocrisy. It is unbelievable to think that New Democrats would raise that particular issue when they have been asleep at the switch for the last number of years as it affects the fisheries.

The hon. member talked about trade and our policy as it relates to trade and the free trade agreement. We have said clearly on the record that as a government, should we be given the opportunity to form the next government of this country, it will be our public policy to renegotiate the free trade agreement because that is in the best interest of Canadians.

It is not an irresponsible position like that of the New Democratic Party after the consummation of this agreement which many of us, in fact all of us, have opposed. Nevertheless it has been consummated by two sovereign nations: Canada and the United States. Business people have made substantial investments in order to try to gear their particular business and their sector to this free trade agreement. I do not like it, but that is the reality we have in Canada.

They say: "Now we are going to abrogate. We are not going to renegotiate". They are dreaming in Technicolor. We are dealing with the United States. We are not dealing with some banana republic where we are going to