

How in good conscience can Canadians and Members of Parliament stand in their place to vote in support of this particular agreement without that major provision?

Even the negotiator, Simon Reisman—

Mr. Crosbie: Let us hear it for Simon Reisman.

Mr. Dingwall: —said in 1984 to the Brookings Institution that a trade disruption insurance program would go a long way to removing fears about commercial policy instability that inhibit investment and trade.

Where is the adjustment program? There is none. This agreement has a major flaw and individuals to whom Members opposite point as authorities on a comprehensive Free Trade Agreement say there is a major omission, yet Members opposite refuse to take action. It is irresponsible behaviour on the part of the Government.

An Hon. Member: You are full of wind.

Mr. Dingwall: We are supposed to allow the Government to take our concerns to Washington and debate with the United States the limitations and definition of subsidy. When I asked the Minister today for the position paper of the Government of Canada with regard to the parameters of its position on the definition of subsidy, all we heard was a huff and blow scenario from the Minister. There was no substance or detail. There was absolutely nothing.

However, Canadians somehow are to trust the Prime Minister and the Government opposite. They are the same ones who told Canadians to pass Bill C-22 and drug prices would not rise one cent. There is conclusive evidence throughout the country that drug prices have gone up substantially. It is the same Government we are supposed to trust which said it would privatize Canada Post. Yet, it is privatizing Canada Post. It is the same Government and Prime Minister who said in 1987 that we need secure access to the American market. Yet we do not have secure access in 1988. They talk about adjustment programs one day but the agreement is devoid of any adjustment programs. It is no wonder—

An Hon. Member: What are you going to do?

Mr. Dingwall: It is no wonder that Canadians, including people from Atlantic Canada, rejected the major economic thrust of the Canadian Government with regard to free trade. I call upon the House to reject this agreement outright. It is bad for Canada and bad for the Atlantic region.

Canada-U.S. Free Trade Agreement

Mr. Dionne: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. I thought it has always been a principle of the House that one had to be in the House in order to speak. I suggest that those who are making a racket from behind the corner cease and desist or go out in the lobby.

Mr. McDermid: That is the first speech he has made in 10 years.

Mr. Crosbie: That Hon. Member was outside the lobby for four years. He better watch it or he will be out another four.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): I do not know what has happened. The debate has proceeded quite well in the last 20 minutes. There is still four hours to go. I can see that some have caught a second wind. I will recognize the Hon. Member for Capilano—Howe Sound.

Mrs. Mary Collins (Capilano—Howe Sound): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to participate in the debate. First I want to compliment you and the others as our Speakers of the House. You have an onerous job as we get into these late night debates. We know you will be successful.

It is also my first opportunity to thank the voters of Capilano—Howe Sound for their confidence in me and for their reaffirmation.

Tonight feels somewhat like *déjà vu*. It is the same old voices singing the same old songs of doom and gloom rather than the songs of joy and prosperity and the songs of Christmas we should be singing tonight. Hopefully we will sing those Christmas carols before too long.

It was only a few months ago that I rose in this Chamber to speak on second reading debate of the Bill. I recall going through that second reading debate and sitting with my colleagues during the summer listening to all the witnesses on the free trade Bill before coming back here for third reading debate.

The House will recall that there has been something in the order of 331 hours of debate on free trade, which is 64 days during which we have heard the arguments over and over again. I hope we can now get on with the job of assuring that free trade is brought to fruition so Canadians will know they have these new rules in place to ensure our future prosperity.

In addition to those weeks spent debating the free trade legislation, my colleagues and I have spent seven weeks on the campaign trail knocking on doors, speaking on the telephone and debating the issue. It was different