

Government orders

Madam Deputy Speaker: In my opinion the nays have it.

And more than five members having risen:

Madam Deputy Speaker: Call in the members.

The House divided on the motion, which was negatived on the following division:

(Division No. 296)

YEAS**Members**

Duceppe
Leblanc (Longueuil)
Rocheleau

Lapierre
Plamondon
Tremblay (Rosemont)—6

NAYS**Members**

Blenkarn
Clark (Brandon—Souris)
Cooper
Gauthier
MacDougall (Timiskaming)
Riis—11

Campbell (Vancouver Centre)
Collins
Dorin
Kempling
Mifflin

[*Translation*]

Madam Deputy Speaker: I declare the motion lost. The honourable member for Chambly.

Mr. Edmonston: Madam Speaker—

Mr. Lapierre: Madam Speaker, there was no quorum!

Madam Deputy Speaker: The hon. member knows as well as I do that we had a quorum. Seventeen members thought fit to vote, and that is good enough for me. The hon. member for Chambly.

Mr. Phillip Edmonston (Chambly): Thank you, Madam Speaker, for recognizing me after all this time.

I simply want to support the amendment put forward by my friends of the Bloc Quebecois. I think the amendment to the amendment presented by our Liberal colleagues does not really solve anything. You have to understand that we want to get the most benefits out of this Bill for the Canadian people. I understand what the members of the Bloc Quebecois are trying to do. I think their proposals are desirable and very important. I want to remind you though that we are facing a huge deficit, so huge that the government of Canada spends at least a third of every revenue dollar just on the interests. The Conservative government talks about deficit control, but at the same time, like my NDP colleagues and the

members of the Bloc québécois pointed out, they are writing a blank cheque for this Hibernia project. I find this Bill very dangerous, because it is, in fact, a blank cheque. I am not against Hibernia. I am not against the project as such but this bill is risky. And I will give you a few reasons why I think we cannot accept that legislation as it is now.

Firstly, we will be handing out roughly \$2.7 billion on what guarantees? I am talking about firm and concrete guarantees. There are not many. What will be the actual windfalls of this project? What we usually call equity.

[*English*]

What will be the equity that we will be able to have out of this project? When we are talking about investing, we usually talk about what we will get, what guarantees of what we will get, as Canadians, across the country.

[*Translation*]

So, as far as guarantees go, that is a return on our money, I see none of that in this bill. That problem has not been resolved in that bill.

Second, I heard that it would cost \$900 000 for each and every one of the 1100 jobs that will be created, and I mean long term jobs.

An hon. member: Shame!

Mr. Edmonston: My colleague just said that it was a shame!. That is so true, especially when we consider that this government keeps saying that there is no money left to spend. But it wants to spend \$900 000 to create one job. Of course that is a shame!

• (1730)

Third, about the environment, this bill amounts to giving a blank cheque. What guarantee do we have that the environment will be preserved and that it will not be contaminated from carrying out the project itself? None. So, for the people who really care for the environment, and I think people do, this bill bring no answer. It does not provide them with the reassurance they are looking for. Instead, it makes them worry because it does not take the environment into account. That is the third reason for finding this bill faulty, to the point of being unacceptable.