

I have run in five elections and have been elected in four. If they want to find out the great degree to which I have supported my friends on the Liberal side—there are a lot of them in the House tonight—they can ask them whether I have spent the last ten years supporting them. They can ask some of their colleagues who are no longer sitting because they cannot get elected in the lower mainland of British Columbia whether I have been supporting the Grits.

I see them smiling. I know the answer they will give. Sometimes we get along very well personally, but there is not a member on that side, including the minister, who is ever going to accuse me of unduly supporting the Liberal Party, and they do not expect me to.

What I do not expect are cheap shots from those fellows in the New Democratic Party. I do not expect that from them and I do not have to put up with it. We can just see how sincere the members of the New Democratic Party are. I believe it is fair to let those who have been watching know just what kind of a game they have been playing. I do not know who will rise following me. It may very well be a member of the Conservative Party. It may as well be a member from any other party because time is running out.

• (2110)

I say seriously to the minister that this bill is defective. It does not set out even the so-called \$5,000 maximum amount. It is very limited with respect to the amount of money the minister has been able to persuade the Treasury Board to commit to this very urgent and serious problem. We do not have the regulations in front of us, although I understand there are some drafts of regulations. By merely reading the bill we cannot tell what it will do until we see the regulations. However, the minister is here, and we could ask these questions of the minister, if my hon. friends in the New Democratic Party would allow us to get to that stage of our procedure in which we would be allowed to ask questions of the minister. Ordinarily, if there was not a House order made yesterday, I would not care. Members of the New Democratic Party could talk as long as they wanted at second reading. That would be their choice. If they wanted to talk all this week and all next week, they could continue to talk at second reading. If that is what they wanted to do, why did they agree yesterday to a House order which, I think Your Honour would probably rule, makes it mandatory to end all debate on this bill tonight by 9.45? Members of the New Democratic Party cannot have it both ways. The only thing I can conclude is that the New Democratic Party does not want to give hon. members a chance to get up in the House in the special Committee of the Whole for which we have been waiting and ask the minister questions. Not only do I as a Member of Parliament have the right to ask questions, but the minister also has an obligation to try to answer them. There may be government members who would like to ask some questions too. They are entitled to do so. I see some hon. members opposite nodding. I will not continue any further. I am deeply sorry—

Urea Formaldehyde Insulation Act

Mr. Deans: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, I think the House leader of the New Democratic Party has thought up another point of order.

Mr. Deans: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has indicated that somehow or other we are abusing debating time. On a point of order I want to ask him if he is aware that it was at my insistence that there was a debate. The Tories were prepared to let the bill go without debate.

Mr. Fraser: Mr. Speaker, my response to the hon. House leader of the New Democratic Party is that if he thinks what he has been playing around with for the past couple of hours is a debate aimed at eliciting any answers, that is a fraud on the public watching this debate.

I do not like this bill for many reasons. I do not like the way this whole problem has been dealt with, but I want to ask some questions. What we are really getting down to is that if the New Democratic Party wants to carry on speaking for the rest of the evening, there will be no questions asked. The whole Committee of the Whole stage will have to be forced through in the last couple of minutes because that is the House order to which the NDP agreed. It will be on the heads of members of the New Democratic Party when we start to get telephone calls in an hour or so from people all across the country asking how the dickens this happened and why we did not get any answers from the government.

Mrs. Mitchell: Talk about the issue.

Mr. Fraser: Members of the New Democratic Party are very jumpy. They come in wearing fancy T-shirts bearing slogans. I do not quite understand why that is suddenly all right for some people to do but not for other people to do—

Some hon. Members: Hear, hear!

Mr. Fraser: —but I do say that there is a serious problem connected with this bill. The bill is not adequate. We do not have the regulations. The minister has an obligation to answer questions, and the intention of members of the New Democratic Party to talk this bill out to the last minute and to depend on the terms of a House order is a cheap fraud on Parliament.

Mr. Sid Parker (Kootenay East-Revelstoke): Mr. Speaker, in my opening remarks in this debate on Bill C-109 with regard to urea formaldehyde foam insulation I want to say that I think what we just heard was one of the poorest examples of an elected member. An hon. member stood in the House and almost pleaded with Liberal members to stand up and take their places here so that the debate could swing to the other side of the floor because of some kind of mechanism worked out between the two parties.

Some hon. Members: Oh, oh!

Mr. Parker: Last August I sent out a questionnaire to people in my riding because I was concerned about this matter, and I would like to read that questionnaire into the record as follows:

Urea Formaldehyde Foam Insulation