

*Government Orders*

cent of Canadian light and medium oil production by the year 2000. I think that is a valuable undertaking.

Also what should be kept in mind is that all estimates indicate that we are to have 10,000 person-year jobs in Newfoundland or 50 per cent of the total of the project is employment. Only 70 per cent of all the Canadian jobs is expected to be created under this project, so the benefits are going to be distributed not only throughout the maritimes but I dare say through all the adjacent provinces as well. This includes, I might add for those whose geography is falling by the wayside, the province of Quebec.

If we are to talk about substance and about whether or note we want this bill, what we should be doing is directing our attention at criticizing the bill itself, clause by clause, on each point of substance in the debates. We should be talking about whether or not this is the best deal.

Quite frankly what I have heard all along is that because it is not the best deal for Newfoundland, it is not a good deal for any part of Canada at all. The fact of the matter is that it is a good deal for Newfoundland, for maritime Canada. It is a program to diversify the economy of depressed regions in Canada.

I might remind the House that Newfoundland currently has the highest unemployment rate in the country. A good portion of that unemployment rate is structural. It is nothing else. Until we change the structure of the economy in provinces like Newfoundland, we have a very poor hope of trying to buttress the employment rate.

If we are to be talking about those items in this bill which say that we cannot have this because it is not the best deal and therefore we do not want anything but the best deal, then let them say that. However, if there are movements in the direction of creating long-term employment and creating an environment whereby the structure of that province and the provinces adjacent can look toward a different type of industrial economy, I think we owe it to the people of Newfoundland to say that we support that bill.

If they do not want to support it, let them be honest. Let them stand in their places and say: We from the bloc Quebecois, we from the bloc NDP do not want this bill for the province of Newfoundland and for maritime Canada. Let them have the courage to say that.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Manicouagan):** Mr. President, I had no intention to get involved in this discussion, but after hearing the comments expressed earlier by my honourable colleague for Mégantic—Campton—Stansstead, I have decided to say a few words in order to clarify certain matters.

I must say, Mr. President, that when I worked with the Legislative Committee responsible for the review of bill C-44, my colleague blamed me for speaking too little or too briefly. I must remind him that I was the only member on that Committee who requested that witnesses be heard by the Committee, and indeed, the object of having witnesses appear before the Committee was to bring out—

**Mr. Gérin:** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of order.

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** The Hon. Member for Mégantic—Compton—Stanstead rises on a point of order.

**Mr. Gérin:** I think that there is a provision under our Standing Orders whereby, whenever the House deals with a Bill, the Minister who introduced the Bill is under the obligation to be present, or at least two ministers must be present in the House, because I suggest there is no point—

[*English*]

**The Acting Speaker (Mr. Paproski):** On time allocation, there are two ministers in the House. In fact, there are three present. Debate, the hon. member for Manicouagan.

[*Translation*]

**Mr. Charles A. Langlois (Manicouagan):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, calling witnesses would have made it possible for committee members to assess the opportunities for economic spinoffs from the Hibernia project not only for Quebec, but for Eastern Canada as a whole.

I should also like to comment on the remarks the Hon. Member for Edmonton East made when he blamed the committee for too quick a study. May I remind my hon. friend that he was one of those committee members who recommended that the committee should proceed quick-