

Is this what Canadians want their hard-pressed tax dollars to do? The government says we do not have any money for child care. But when Mobil Oil wants \$100 million or \$500 million, or when Chevron wants a half a billion dollars, then we have lots of money, and we do not want to debate it in the House of Commons. We say that is wrong, undemocratic and flies in the face of the parliamentary system in Canada. No, this has come as a surprise to us. Of course, it does.

Here is a government that is prepared to stack the Senate, to knowingly violate the Constitution of Canada simply to be able to jamb their goods and services tax down the throats of every single Canadian. Eighty-five per cent of Canadians say they do not want this tax, they do not need this tax, they cannot afford this tax. It is the wrong tax at the wrong time hitting the wrong people. But, does this government listen? No, it knows best. It is the "Father Knows Best" parliamentary system. Our Prime Minister knows what is best for Canadians. It knows that Canadians need to entice the multinational oil companies to our east coast to the tune of \$2.7 billion. For that there is all kinds of money. For child care there is no money.

I listened to my hon. friend from Newfoundland. If he is so interested in Newfoundland then his motive is probably legitimate, that he is concerned about the people there, as we all are. Why then did he cut back transfer payments to Newfoundland? Why did he change the Unemployment Insurance Act against the people of Newfoundland? Why is he taking step after step after step that makes the life of Newfoundlanders more difficult today than it was two years ago and four years ago if he is so concerned? What has the government done to the fishery?

Let me quote the Premier of Newfoundland. Premier Clyde Wells is quoted in the *The Financial Post* as saying that the number of permanent jobs generated by Hibernia would be the size of the workforce of two fish plants. That is \$2.7 billion for two fish plants' employment. That is what we are talking about. This is outrageous! The Premier of Newfoundland says that this is a very expensive job-creation program, and it will cost millions and millions of dollars to create a single job. Who will benefit in the long term? Will Canadian firms? No. Will Cana-

dian refineries? No. Will Canadian employees in the oil business benefit? With a handful of exceptions, no.

Mr. Speaker, when we say this time allocation is inappropriate, what we are saying is that we want to find ways and means to provide jobs for those people in Newfoundland and throughout Atlantic Canada that will be permanent and long-lasting, not the kind of employment opportunities that will have the one time only construction aspect of this project and not be there in perpetuity. I think that the people of Newfoundland want jobs, not only for the short term but, indeed, for the long term.

[Translation]

Mr. Gilles Rocheleau (Hull—Aylmer): Mr. Speaker, I think we are witnessing here today something very important that we could describe as an absolutely incredible machination where the Bloc Québécois is effectively becoming the official opposition in this House with regard to the Hibernia project.

Mr. Speaker, at the moment there is no Liberal Party member from Quebec in the House, only one Conservative member from Quebec as compared with six representatives of the Bloc Québécois. Mr. Speaker, we are not against the Hibernia project as such, but we resent the fact that once more Quebec is being shortchanged. And particularly when we see the official opposition agreeing with a closure motion. This is the first time in all my political life that I see the official opposition, namely the Liberals, agreeing with a closure motion.

Mr. Speaker, the Bloc Québécois, through the hon. member for Richelieu, clearly put forward an amendment in this House last week at the report stage.

• (1750)

An amendment whereby Bil C-44 would include and confirm the Canadian content! The Separatists which they say we are standing up for Canadians and trying to look after their interests by urging the federal government to set the amount of Canadian content in the legislation. Mr. Speaker, it is the world upside down!

Recently, the Newfoundland Premier, Mr. Clyde Wells was reported as saying that this was a routine matter, that the federal government was ready to go ahead with Hibernia, and that the official opposition was in agreement. Today, I realize that Mr. Wells was right when he said that. I understand also that last June, the hon. member for Bona Vista—Trinity—Conception told