

—while industries and governments were prepared to proceed with Hibernia on the basis of the \$5.2 billion estimate, we would all feel more comfortable at a lower cost.

To this end Mobil Oil Canada, the leader of the four-company consortium that has agreed to develop Hibernia, is completing a redesign of the project's massive production platform. Needless to say, this new redesign causes the almost certain prospect of fewer jobs in Newfoundland.

This is of grave concern to the province of Newfoundland because under the statement of principles this platform was to be assembled in that province. It guaranteed the province three million man hours. Now it appears that this new platform may be assembled elsewhere.

If that happens Newfoundland stands to lose two-thirds of the original planned construction work. There is no doubt that the industrial benefits of Hibernia should be maximized in Newfoundland.

Based on the original technical requirements of the project, Newfoundland would have been the location for construction and the mechanical outfitting of the concrete gravity based structure. The general management of the project was to be located in Newfoundland as were the important aspects of the design of the gravity based structure and the topside facilities.

The mating of the topside and base, the assembly and outfitting of the main support frame, the hook-up and the commissioning of the topside were also to take place in Newfoundland. All of these activities were expected to generate approximately 10,000 person-years of employment for the residents of the province.

But the minister's June statement, however, has changed the province's employment prospects. It is no wonder that the government of Newfoundland is concerned. With the new design planned by Mobil, the number of permanent jobs created by Hibernia may only be as many as 1,600. This is a large reduction indeed from the estimated 3,500 permanent jobs summarized in the statement of principles. The fact is that this represents a reduction of 54 per cent.

There is no doubt that regional development concerns are part of the incentive push behind Hibernia. We must ensure that the industrial benefits promised to the

province, which are briefly mentioned in this bill that we are now discussing, are met. We cannot ignore the disastrous state of employment conditions on the east coast. Certainly the present conditions in the Atlantic fisheries have created a frightening crisis. Tonight we in this House will be discussing that problem in an emergency debate.

Atlantic Canada does need employment opportunities. Hibernia will answer part of that need.

Energy is the lifeblood of a nation. National energy security must be the long term strategic objective when your country is one of the largest per capita users of energy in the world. Energy policy must anticipate future disruptions at world energy markets. It must be sufficiently flexible to endure those shocks with minimal disruption to the lives of Canadians.

Although energy security is a necessary part of policy, it is not sufficient to build energy policy around this concern alone. Energy development must also be environmentally sound.

**Mr. Cooper:** I rise on a point of order, Madam Speaker. I apologize for interrupting the member, but I believe that the time allowed her would take us beyond six o'clock.

I think you will find consent amongst the members in the House, Madam Speaker, to allow us not to see the clock, to allow the hon. member to finish her speech and the NDP critic in the area of energy to finish his speech. The House would then suspend at that time until the 8 o'clock emergency debate.

• (1800 )

**Mr. Boudria:** Madam Speaker, I just want to make it clear to the hon. member across the way that we are giving unanimous consent to do this. There is an understanding that the government would not move to extend the hours while the hon. member for Malpeque is completing her remarks, or during the comments of the hon. member from the New Democratic Party. In other words, there is an understanding that there will not be a motion, during the rest of this day, to extend the hours without unanimous consent.

**Mr. Cooper:** Madam Speaker, obviously we agree to that. We are prepared to say that there will be no further dilatory motions for the rest of the evening.