

than on the roads of Newfoundland, the narrow gauge railways of Newfoundland or in other port, rail and road facilities that are required. I am amazed that the Hon. Member for Comox-Powell River has never been to Atlantic Canada and therefore cannot know of our transportation problems.

Before I am criticized for my next remarks, I would ask you, Mr. Speaker, to refer to the remarks I made on the borrowing Bill. I must briefly address the problems in the administration of the bilingual policy of the Government. While there is a contractual option in most contracts for private enterprise on federal Government property which may demand bilingualism, I must say that it has not been nationally demanded. However, it is being demanded in New Brunswick. People who presently hold jobs there will find themselves unemployed because of a very harsh interpretation of the capability of the Department of Transport and other Government departments to enforce bilingualism in Quebec City versus how it is enforced in other areas of Canada.

Let me give the most recent example. A young lady who has been a temporary employee of the Department of National Revenue has applied for a permanent position which is becoming vacant. As a temporary employee she has attempted to get bilingual training. It was not available. She has privately undertaken to become bilingual and has gone as far as she can with records and tutoring. She was asked to take a bilingual test and was told that she failed. Having failed, she was advised that she will not have another opportunity to take that test.

Since time is short, Mr. Speaker, I ask you to refer to my remarks on the borrowing Bill before criticizing my remarks. This is not an equitable application of the bilingual policy. As I said in the debate on the borrowing Bill, unilingual persons from St. Quentin, New Brunswick or unilingual persons from Florenceville, New Brunswick should not be denied opportunity in the public employ if they merit the job. If we are to have a bilingual civil service capability, the onus is upon the Government of Canada to train those people to be bilingual and to make sure they are posted within their capability. It is not right to say to a person from St. Quentin that he cannot work for the Government because he does not speak English. It is not right to say to a young lady in Woodstock that she cannot work for the Government because she cannot speak French.

Let us get away from the heavy-handed application of bilingualism. Let us be realistic. I was promised in 1972, 1973 and 1974 that the Government would not delineate between applicants with bilingual and non-bilingual capability. I was betrayed. The little girl in Woodstock is betrayed because I told her years ago she would have the opportunity in the federal service to become bilingual and that she would not be denied a job. I was betrayed, Mr. Speaker.

● (1510)

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): Questions, comments, debate.

Supply

Hon. William Rompkey (Minister of State (Small Businesses and Tourism)): Mr. Speaker, it is a pleasure to take part in the debate. I have read the motion. I feel that the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) is not really serious in this motion but has simply put it forward in order that we may put on the record the needs of the Atlantic Provinces and the responses to those needs. I feel there has been a response, and a good response, to the needs of the Atlantic area.

I want to start by talking about the fishery.

Mr. Forrestall: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a question of privilege. When an Hon. Member suggests that something is done in this Chamber facetiously and without seriousness, particularly when it is directed at me, I must take some exception. Could the distinguished Minister from Newfoundland reconsider the allegation that motions put forward in this Chamber by Members of Parliament are not, in fact, put forward in anything other than under the most desperate and serious of situations.

The Acting Speaker (Mr. Blaker): There is no doubt that Hon. Members ought not to ascribe motives to other Hon. Members; but I want to point out to the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East (Mr. Forrestall) that it is a common characteristic of debate in the House of Commons that some Hon. Members will refer to a motion as specious or something in that order. I do not want to find a question of privilege at this moment. I will leave it to the Minister to see whether and how he wants to handle the issue. But if the Hon. Member for Dartmouth-Halifax East persists, then I will give due consideration to his question of privilege.

Mr. Rompkey: Mr. Speaker, let me clarify my remarks. I have no doubt about the serious intent of the Hon. Member to draw attention to the needs and the need for long-term solutions to the economic difficulties facing Atlantic Canada. I recognize that we should be talking about that. I recognize that is a serious motion. I recognize his sincerity in bringing it forward and encouraging this debate. I welcome that and I congratulate him for doing so. However, the line with which I had some problems is the one that reads "partisan advantage rather than need". What I want to show, if I can, is that we have addressed needs. They have been real needs and we have addressed them, I think, in depth.

I want to talk about the fishery first. I am sorry the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans (Mr. De Bané) is not here because I want to pay tribute to him. I had thought that we were not going to find a worthy successor to the Hon. Member for Westmorland-Kent (Mr. LeBlanc), the former Minister of Fisheries and Oceans, but I feel we have. If we read the press coming from Newfoundland, people are saying much the same thing. Negotiations have been going on in the past few days between the Newfoundland Minister of Fisheries and my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries and Oceans for Canada, with regard to restructuring. The Minister announced recently \$100 million for the Atlantic fisheries. This is probably the