

think that we must see to it, the Minister and both of us, that they be fairly allocated in those sectors.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member for Richmond-Wolfe (Mr. Tardif) on a supplementary question.

Mr. Tardif: Mr. Speaker, this morning the Minister mentioned the fact that the Government was not in a legal position to overrule the recommendation of the Anti-dumping Tribunal. I know that the Hon. Member for Sherbrooke (Mr. Charest) is a prominent lawyer, and I have in front of me a number of legal opinions stating unanimously that the Government was indeed legally entitled to overrule the recommendations of the Anti-dumping Tribunal, and I would like to know, in the light of his statement a few moments ago to the effect that if conditions change, it will always be possible to back-track and review the decision, how he reconciles his own assertion, his own statement, with a statement by the minister this morning in which he said that in this matter the Government was not legally empowered to overrule the recommendations of the Anti-dumping Tribunal?

Mr. Charest: I do not think people should be misled either. There is nothing cast in concrete forever, and since there was a decision by the Tribunal, since it was given that mandate once, I presume it could be done another time. You have done it as a government. So why should we prevent it from doing so another time in another context? If the Minister does come to the conclusion that it has to be done, I suppose that at that time the legal problem you mentioned will easily be overcome.

But before concluding, I would like to tell you just one thing. By drafting your motion as you did, and I feel this is unfortunate, you, as a lawyer too, missed a golden opportunity to rally a number of members who would have supported it if you had drafted it in a way that would have allowed many of them to support it. Even the whole Government might have supported you indeed if you had introduced a motion that really was in favour of footwear workers. But you chose differently, you decided to be downright partisan—without being concerned with workers, and in just taking into account your own political assets and your own interests, as the drafting of the motion eloquently illustrates in saying that this House regrets that the Prime Minister has once again failed to maintain quotas and broken . . . Once again it is the old Opposition rhetoric.

Well, let me give you a good piece of advice, my good friend, three years is a short time. You may think that it is by yelling and doing what you are doing that you will be reelected, but in spite of whatever may happen in this House, it would come as a big surprise to me if people in the eastern townships were to

Adjournment Motion

vote for people who have nothing else to do but whine around because times have changed, and I think they will continue for a long time to cast a conservative vote. And I for one shall vote against that motion.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): Order. Questions and comments are now over.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*Translation*]

SUBJECT MATTER OF QUESTIONS TO BE DEBATED

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): It is my duty, pursuant to Standing Order 46, to inform the House that the questions to be raised tonight at the time of adjournment are as follows: The Hon. Member for Broadview-Greenwood (Ms. McDonald)—Health (a) Request for ban on cigarette advertising. (b) Anti-smoking advertising contract; the Hon. Member for Davenport (Mr. Caccia)—Environmental Affairs (a) St. Clair River—Control of industrial pollution. (b) Provincial environmental security fund.

• (1640)

[*English*]

Mr. Gauthier: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order. You have just announced the adjournment debate. In my experience when there is an opposition day and a vote follows, we have, I thought, always suspended the adjournment debate. You have though just told us there would be an adjournment debate tonight.

Would you look at the rules and can you reconcile for us Standing Order 19(4) and Standing Order 46(7). We need to understand clearly that on an opposition day with a vote that we should not expect the adjournment debate.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski): The Hon. Member has been here for quite a few years. He realizes that Standing Order 19(4) and Standing Order 46(7) are new rules that have been implemented for the last period of time.

I am sure this point is being considered under the new rules to come into effect after we recess. I think the Hon. Member should bring it to the attention of people in the House who are responsible for the changes to the rules. I agree with the Hon. Member. I hope he gets the ear of other people in the Chamber.