

committee members agreed to. All we needed was one day.

Therefore, I found a time warp from June 13 to this very day and last Wednesday I found some interesting positions being changed. Some of the members who are now proposing amendments to this particular project previously, at least on June 13, were quite happy to support the project as it stood. I find it very strange that now, when we are ready to pull the trigger on this highly technical and valuable project, they complain that they want all kinds of amendments made to the bill. They want amendments that essentially would make the project not viable if we were to invoke those measures.

The subamendment that I speak to does a number of things. I have to speak about that subamendment in the knowledge that there was a 20-year passage since the Hibernia field was discovered and the development in eastern Canada, indeed across Canada, and the increase in the sophistication in the supply, in technical knowledge and in the skills of offshore drilling. This project is certainly the first offshore oil project that will come into production in Canada and it takes a long time to develop expertise.

We do have a lot of expertise in Newfoundland, in eastern Canada, Quebec, all over Canada, but it has taken 20 years to develop it. This is why the Canadian content in the entire project is between 60 per cent and 65 per cent. It is not 100 per cent, but 60 to 65 per cent is more than twice as much as there was about 20 years ago when the Norwegians and the British became involved in the development and production of North Sea oil. That is a quantum jump, to say nothing of the fact that there are certain elements in the highly technical nature of the concrete structure, the five modules, the delivery systems, and perhaps even the tankers themselves that are going to deliver the oil.

I do have some knowledge of the shipbuilding business. I have some knowledge of marine things. I can assure you that as a ship's captain and overseeing staff, we could not produce in Canada all the items we needed to build a ship. Perhaps it is too long ago for me to count the number of years, but the point is that had we relied on 100 per cent Canadian content for our radar, machinery and in the case of the older destroyer, for our Y-100 machinery, the valves, the seam stops in our submarines,

Government orders

making sure it was safe to go to sea and to die, we would have had to shut down the navy. There would be no navy. There would be no ships. There would be no repairs.

If my choice as a parliamentarian, politician, Newfoundlander and as a Canadian is to look for the perfection in this particular project that my NDP colleagues are looking for with respect to Canadian content, including their reluctance to spend \$2.7 billion on this very worth-while project, it would never leave the ground, as the hon. member for St. John's said a couple of days ago. We would be here arguing, cajoling, debating, amending, putting motions and all these kinds of things about Hibernia when we are all old men. That is unsatisfactory. That is unacceptable.

We have 42,000 unemployed people in Newfoundland right now. I am prepared to get up here and talk about any amendment for the rest of my life to get one more job, because one more job is another person who will have some measure of satisfaction and dignity and can make one more contribution. It is not that people in Newfoundland do not work. The jobs are not there. To me every single job counts.

When I get people looking for perfection but that search impedes a project that will employ 10,000 people in eastern Canada, a lot of Newfoundlanders and permanently employ 1,100 people, considering the number of people who are unemployed, I will go to any length to fight the amendments that slow it down and I will support the amendments that speed it up.

We have been talking about this Hibernia project for a long time. It just did not start with the first reading of this bill. It has been going on for 10 years.

• (1650)

As I said the other day, how many times do we have to sign this? How many times do we have to debate it? How many motions do we have to have?

Madam Speaker, I am aware of the work my friend from St. John's East has done on this project and I know how close it is to him. Indeed, I know I speak for the majority of the members of this House who have had enough of the i-dotting and the t-crossing and who want to get on with getting this project under way.

I believe, Madam Speaker, our motion is a way to facilitate that. It is a great opportunity for us to move ahead and develop the technical expertise so that by the