

Mr. Speaker, one wrong does not make it right; two wrongs do not make it right; and three wrongs certainly makes it very wrong for this Parliament and for this government to proceed the way in which it is proceeding here today.

In closing, in the few minutes that I have before it reaches the hour of six, there are other things that have to be stated and put on the record, which my leader will do tomorrow, because I presume we will be proceeding directly to second reading. But there are issues of great importance. The government House leader has talked about the issue of contracting out, or has refused to talk about contracting out. Bill C-26, which was passed by this House, provides for layoffs in the event that work loads are contracted out. Well, last year five billion dollars—five billion dollars—was spent through contracting out.

Now, I ask this House, do they think it is a political slush fund? Are there any Tories who have benefited from the contracting out?

An hon. member: You had better believe it.

Mr. Dingwall: Have the young workers across this country who are within the Public Service and elsewhere really benefited from this?

Some hon. members: No, no.

Mr. Dingwall: I suggest to this House and to the viewing public here tonight, Mr. Speaker, that the five billion dollars which has been spent on contracting out is another form of the Brian Mulroney patronage that we have seen in this country and are sick and tired of in this country.

The government House leader makes no reference whatsoever in terms of what the conciliation boards have said, and I will close with this quote, Mr. Speaker. Here is what they said on all monetary issues and rates of pay. Here is what the conciliation board reported—duly appointed by the government as well as appointed by the union representatives—and I quote:

All of the above issues are directly monetary matters. Obviously, the key to their solution is an agreement on basic wage increases. However, while the union positions on wages are flexible, the employer's position is presented as being totally inflexible.

Adjournment Debate

What nonsense this government is trying to put forward today in the House of Commons.

• (1800)

I argue through you, Mr. Speaker, that we will not be a part of a government which is selecting individuals who are members of unions and are suffering because of the incompetence of the government opposite.

I wish to call it six o'clock, Mr. Speaker.

[*Translation*]

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

Mr. Speaker: I have the honour to inform the House that a message has been received from the Senate informing this House that the Senate has passed Bill S-2, An Act to implement conventions between Canada and Finland, Canada and the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and Canada and the United Mexican States for the avoidance of double taxation with respect to income tax and the prevention of fiscal evasion and a convention between Canada and the United Mexican States for the exchange of information with respect to taxes.

PROCEEDINGS ON ADJOURNMENT MOTION

[*English*]

A motion to adjourn the House under Standing Order 38 deemed to have been moved.

MINISTERIAL RESPONSIBILITY

Mr. Tom Wappel (Scarborough West): Mr. Speaker, on June 11 of this year I put a question to the Right Hon. Prime Minister in connection with ministerial responsibility. This question arose around the drama of the Al-Mashat affair, as it has now come to be called. We did not have an opportunity in the close confines of Question Period to address some of the points that I mentioned in the question.

I do not wish to talk about the Al-Mashat affair specifically. What I want to concentrate on is the issue of ministerial responsibility. What I would like to do is try if at all possible to put my point succinctly and if possible to get a straight answer from the government.