



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

---

Volume 1

1st Session

Number 24

---

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

Wednesday, June 7, 1972

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I would like to welcome Councillor Don Pomeroy of St. Anthony and indeed any other visitors who might be in the galleries today. I trust that your visit here is most enjoyable.

HONOURABLE JOHN C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement on behalf of the government with reference to Newfoundland Farm Products Limited. With reference to the strike of employees at Newfoundland Farm Products Limited the government is very disappointed that the majority of the employees have rejected the latest government offer towards achieving a collective bargaining agreement. I think it has been reported in the press that the results of a secret ballot were forty-nine rejected, sixteen accepted, so we are informed.

The latest offer of the government made an attempt to reach settlement because of the effect of the strike upon certain broiler and hog producers in the province, of a further two cents per hour, making a minimum increase of twenty-two cents per hour and an increase of two further statutory holidays for the present year bringing the number of statutory holidays to thirteen. It was rejected by the union, apparently because the union believes that further concessions can be forced from the government because of the plight of the broiler and hog producers.

The government wishes to make its position very clear to the employees involved in the strike of Newfoundland Farm Products Limited. The government has made its final offer and it is a very generous and reasonable offer. This is the final, final offer, the last offer. The government has decided to assist the farmers who are now suffering as a result of the strike so that those farmers

will not suffer financial ruin as a result of the strike. The government has requested the broiler producers to cancel any further orders for replacement chicks until the strike situation is resolved. The government is extremely disappointed to find that despite the tremendous improvement in wages and working conditions at Newfoundland Farm Products Limited during the past eighteen months and despite its generous proposals to the workers involved, they have chosen to attempt to force further concessions from the people of Newfoundland, hoping to use the damage caused to farmers, as the innocent third parties, to bring about the results they desire. The government will not bow to this pressure and will do what it can to assist the farmers affected to withstand the financial consequences of this irresponsible action of the union involved. Copies here for anyone who wants them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable minister said that he was disappointed that the employees of Newfoundland Farm Products had rejected the latest government offer. I might say, Mr. Speaker, that I am disappointed in the last statement that the honourable minister made, as the chief spokesman for the government, that this was an irresponsible action on the part of the employees of Newfoundland Farm Products, Sir, I want to point out to this honourable House that this is just a normal bargaining process, normal bargaining that takes place between an employer and the employees of any company, Mr. Speaker. I am rather disappointed that the Minister of Finance has again reverted to taking the hard line with the employees of Newfoundland Farm Products. I prefer the position that the Minister of Mines, Agriculture and Resources took in this matter, not negotiate in public.

I was pleased to hear the minister say that the farmers would be assisted for any losses that they might incur as a result of this

strike but the minister -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, please. I intended to mention this a few days ago but I would like to bring it to all the honourable members attention now that Standing Order 91 of Beausiesne says that when a minister makes a statement on government policy or ministerial administration, either under routine proceedings, between two orders of the day or shortly before the adjournment

of the House, it is now firmly established that the Leader of the Opposition or the chiefs of recognized groups are entitled to ask explanations and make a few remarks, but no debate is then allowed under any Standing Order.

I realize the importance of this topic but I just hope that this does not become a habit of persons other than the Leader of the Opposition speaking on a ministerial statement.

MR ROBERTS: A comment on that, Your Honour: It is true that Beauchesne, in the 1958 edition, makes reference to the Leader of the Opposition or the leader of a group in the House but I understand and perhaps Your Honour would ask the clerk to check, the practice in Ottawa, in recent years, has been that only one person for each group is the essential point but the leader, not being omniscient, often one of his colleagues will speak in reply to a ministerial statement. That seems to be the practice. I think it is a good practice. I think it is an improved practice over the practice of former years in this House. But I wonder if Your Honour could check the point. The honourable gentleman from Bell Island is commenting for the Opposition. There will be no other comment from the Opposition and, of course, there will be no attempt to debate. So I wonder if perhaps Your Honour could ask the law clerk or the clerk of the House to check into that. That, as I understand it, is the practice that is developing in Ottawa in the last few years.

MR CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on this point that you brought to the attention of the House, I would like to say that the practice in this House which was unalterably observed last year and the last several years and very clearly laid down by the previous Speaker; that following a leader of the government or a government minister questions were allowed to be asked and that was it. Perhaps a few stray remarks. Certainly not a debate. The tendency has been in recent days in this House for far more than that to be said by opposition spokesmen on this point, and today the honourable

gentleman opposite is not asking for any clarification of the government statement, but rather he is debating the matter. I think that this should be more strictly observed.

MR. SPEAKER: On this matter, and under these conditions I will allow the honourable member to continue.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. minister if he would clarify his statement regarding assistance to the farmers who will incur losses as a result of a prolonged strike. What kind of assistance is it that the hon. member referred to? I would also like to ask the hon. minister, Mr. Speaker, if he will take the necessary steps or the appropriate steps to hold another round of negotiations and perhaps invite the officials of the Department of Labour to come in because the hon. minister is inexperienced in employer - employee relationship, and ask the officials of the Department of Labour to help him, to help Treasury Board to try to bring about an agreement? In the final analysis, Mr. Speaker, not only will it be the farmers and the employees who will suffer, but the general public will suffer if this strike is prolonged for an indefinite period.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman is not just asking questions. Now, Mr. Speaker, to deal with the questions he did ask. The nature of the assistance that we are prepared to give the farmers we cannot state in any detail now except to say that it is the government's policy that we are going to see that the farmers directly affected who have broilers now on the way here and who have broilers that they have not been able to process through the abattoir in the normal course of event, we are going to see that as a result they are not financially ruined. The nature of

Mr. Crosbie.

the assistance we will explain to the House in detail when this is all worked out. This is our policy and this is what we will do. This is what is being done. The statement I have made, Mr. Speaker, it is a statement of policy on behalf of the government, which matters and not what minister announces this policy. The government have considered this very carefully. This is the government's statement of policy on this matter. Our position, we tried to make clear that we are not prepared to make any further concessions in this matter. We have gone as far as the public chest can be expected to go. We are prepared to assist the innocent third parties who are being affected by this strike.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as experience of myself goes in labour relation matters, that may be true. I can assure the House that the Collective Bargaining Branch of the Treasury Board is not inexperienced and has done a magnificent job in the last eighteen months of collective bargaining. This is the first time that there has been a strike. I think it indicates something about the reasonableness of the other side in this dispute.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: With the exception of the teachers. At that time that matter was dealt with firmly and we are taking the same position in this.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, did I understand from the hon. minister -?

MR. SPEAKER: It is out of order, you have to wait for Questions.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, I would like to refer to an item contained in the paper, "The Daily News" of today, Wednesday, June 7, 1972, where under headlines: "May Impose Time Limit On Petitions, Questions." The paper states: "A government backbencher

Mr. Barry.

dropped a hint Tuesday that anticipated changes in the rules of procedure may impose time limits on presenting petitions and the question period. " The article goes on from there and it is a very brief article but the number of errors contained in it, to say the least, are amazing, Mr. Speaker. I wish to comment on a couple of them. First of all if there is an inference there that I was hinting as to what had taken place in a select committee of this honourable House, then I would ask for an immediate retraction. I do not know if this is what the paper is imputing here. If it is, I would ask for a retraction. Secondly, I wish to point out an item where it states: (this statement is attributed to the hon. Leader of the Opposition ) "the hon. Leader of the Opposition said that the government plan to establish a committee to review the rules of the House but to date committee members have not been appointed." As I understand it, there is a notice out on the notice board and there has been a committee appointed.

MR. ROBERTS: I did not see it. A committee has been appointed?

MR. BARRY: This I just want to clarify again. It is obviously another error in the article. Finally with respect to the entire proceedings, Mr. Speaker, the reference is to debate here in this honourable House on yesterday afternoon. The paper quotes a statement made by myself: "Leo Barry, Chairman of Committees, started to ask for the unanimous consent of the House in presenting a petition when he noticed that 'time for presenting petitions had just about run out.'" It is mentioned that the hon.



MR. BARRY: The Leader of the Opposition was quick to point out that the rules do not lay down a time limit for petitions to be presented in the Legislature and it later states that Mr. Barry acknowledged his error. I have to point out, Mr. Speaker, and if the verbatim transcript is checked, I am sure that this will confirm what I am about to say, at no time did I acknowledge my error and Mr. Speaker, at no time in my opinion did I make an error. Although, I, of course, hope I will be quick to withdraw or acknowledge any error which I may make in the future.

However, Mr. Speaker, I think this matter requires a little more explanation. My reference that the time for presenting petitions have just about run out, I was referring to the informal accommodation of the honourable House Leader and I got into this explanation, I had reached the stage where I had pointed out that the honourable members on this side of the House are more cognizance of the need for expediting the business of this House to see that the business of the province is run in a planned, rational manner rather than on the haphazard, illogical and at sometimes stupid manner that -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, if I may please? May I read the point of order? The honourable gentleman, Sir, stated the question of privilege, the rules are quite explicit on a matter of privilege, there must be a motion to deal with the matter.

I had an occasion the other day, Your Honour, to check into it again in Beauchesne, when the gentleman from St. John's made a reference which he did withdraw. We have a practice in the House, Your Honour, that, to state, ministers or members get up and if they feel that they have been misquoted they make a brief explanation.

Sir, I submit it is a point of personal explanation -

AN HON. MEMBER: That is privilege.

MR. ROBERTS: But also I submit the honourable gentleman is going too far beyond that, Sir, unless he has a motion. He is going far beyond that. Sir, what he is doing is getting into a debate now and if he wishes to debate it, let us have a motion where we can both debate. If he merely feels that he has been misquoted, as have I, but I did not intend to raise it.

But, Your Honour, my point of order is what is the honourable gentleman doing? He seems to be making a debating speech, not raising a point of privilege, which must be either his privilege as a member or one of the privileges of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Followed by a motion.

MR. ROBERTS: Followed by a motion.

MR. BARRY: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I might say there is no such thing as a point of personal explanation, there may be at times traditional or customary leeway given to honourable members to make explanations. There is no such thing, procedurally, in the Standing Orders usages of this honourable House or any other honourable House, as a point of personal explanation.

With respect to the matters of privilege there are two matters in what I have already referred to, Mr. Speaker, and one reference would be in Beauchesne on page 100, where it states: "The Journals of The United Kingdom House of Commons give the following examples of speeches and writings which have been held to constitute breaches of privileges." I am merely bringing this to the attention of this honourable House so that if the honourable House wishes to take action on it, then it may do so.

The first item I referred to is imputations against members serving on private bill committees and again these first references are by analogy, and I would submit the same thing applies to a member of a select committee, reflections upon the conduct to the Chairman of a Standing Committee. Finally, this is on the second point where

MR. BARRY: It is a matter of privilege, wilful misrepresentation of the proceedings of members is an offense of the same character as a libel.

Now all I am stating is that I believe I was misrepresented in the proceedings as reported.

MR. ROBERTS: Wilfully or unintentionally?

MR. BARRY: This is a question which only the paper can point out.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: If the honourable gentleman will permit me to finish, I wish to table the paper containing the offending material and I would ask the newspaper concerned to take note of the points which I have raised and to indicate whether there is error on their part or just what the intent was, if any, in stating what was stated.

I would also like to point out that of course, whether or not the committee as sitting decides

as to whether or not there will be a time limit set on the presentation of petitions is not for me to say nor for any hon. member of this honourable House, until the Select Committee brings this report before the House.

MR. SPEAKER: During yesterday afternoon's sitting, a question arose as to whether or not debate was permitted on the presentation of a petition. I promised, at that time, that I would take the matter under advisement and rule on it later. I propose to give my ruling now. The custom of presenting petitions to Parliament goes back to the earliest days of Parliamentary history. Sir T. Erskine May refers to this but notes that as time went on the number had very much increased and the business was so much interrupted by the debate which arose on receiving petitions that Standing Orders dealing with the matter were adopted in 1842 and 1853. Under the Standing Orders of the House of Commons at Ottawa, no debate is permitted on the presentation of petitions. Standing Order 67(3) reads and I quote, 'On the presentation of petitions, no debate on or in relation to the same shall be allowed.'

Our Standing Order 97 reads and I quote, 'There shall be no debate on a petition unless the House has it under consideration.' I do not feel that this can be interpreted as allowing debate on the presentation of the petition.

The ordinary procedure in presenting petitions in this House is covered in Standing Orders 90, 91 and 92. These indicate that a petition may be presented and that the person presenting it may make a brief statement not to exceed five minutes on certain aspects of the petition set forth in Standing Order 92.

The Standing Orders do not require a motion that the petition be received, nor is a motion required that it be referred to the department to which it relates, since this is covered by Standing Order 95, in the case of petitions requesting expenditure of public money; which most, if not all, of the petitions presented in this House

do involve. Standing Order 97 says there shall be no debate unless the House has the petition under consideration. This should be read with Standing Order 96 which provides for a procedure to be used only in cases of urgency.

From the above it seems clear that debate is not permitted on the presentation of a petition, and I so rule.

I should note, however, that over the years the custom of certain members sometimes making brief comments on the petition has grown up in this House. This is not sanctioned by any rule, but occurs only by leave of the House and might be said to exist as courtesies that Honourable Members accord each other. I do not propose to interfere with the extension of such courtesies at this time, but should the matter of speaking on presentations of petitions appear to get out of hand, I may have to reassess my position.

I would like to add that in future, persons presenting petitions perhaps should not make a motion that they be referred to the department to which they relate, but merely say, 'I now present the petition.'

AN HON. MEMBER: No motion!

MR. SPEAKER: A motion is not required.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS:

HON. R.L.CHEESEMAN (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, in answer to question (70) on the Order Paper of June 7 asked by the hon. member for Fogo, the answer to (1) is Miss Bernice Power; the answer to (2) is clerk typist II, \$4,200; the answer to (3) no; the answer to (4) Miss Power was employed on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission.

HON. J.G.CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Mr. Speaker, this is in reply to an oral question of the hon. member for Labrador South.

MR.CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I have not been in touch with but my officials have been in touch with Mr. Harold Ford who is the personnel manager of Labrador Linerboard Limited. Hiring procedures are as follows: Under a union agreement with the loggers, Local 2564, Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, the company is first of all required to recall all loggers by seniority that worked there the previous year. Once this is done the company is required to recall loggers who had worked the previous year but quit around October to go home for the winter. The company is then free under the agreement to take men from anywhere but it is their policy to accept union members first. It is also their policy to hire unemployed persons in Labrador first, then the island part of the Province. Then only, so that men from the island part of the Province will only be engaged after men in Labrador.

In 1971, 97.8 per cent of the men hired were Newfoundlanders the same should be true in 1972. Use is made of Canada Manpower and the unions and their hiring procedures: I also want to get the number of men now working there and the number they will be needing during the year - I do not have that yet.

MR.SENIOR: Question No. 78 on the Order Paper June 7, the answer to this question is quite lengthy and contains a considerable amount of detail.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if this could be tabled. The Government House Leader tells us we are running out of time -

MR.SENIOR: My next sentence Mr. Speaker, was that in view of the detail in this particular answer I would suggest that it be tabled rather than take up the time of this honourable House by giving it to the honourable members on the other side.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR.WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, before you get into the Orders of the Day I rise to ask the honourable Minister of Finance: I was under the impression that the 300 loggers required at Goose Bay were in addition to the ones that had

been previously there.

MR.CROSBIE: I do not have all the details I should have that tomorrow.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, due to the unfortunate accident at the Phosphorus Plant at Long Harbour yesterday, sending five workers to hospital, the same day the Minister of Labour gave the plant a clean Bill of Health as far as working conditions and safety hazards are concerned, would the Minister wish to rephrase the ministerial statement made in this Honourable House yesterday? Would the Minister indicate to the House whether further consideration would be given to the union's request for an industrial enquiry to investigate all aspects of this most serious problem in the Phosphorus Plant at Long Harbour?

MR.MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, first of all I did not at any time in my statement yesterday give the Plant at Long Harbour a clean Bill of Health. I said that progress was being made and I still say that progress is being made, a lot of the items that were outstanding back in February are cleared up.

I was not, I have no intention of rephrasing the statement of yesterday, as an answer to the second part of the question. To give you some background I was not notified of the accident until a newsman called me in the early hours of the morning. This morning the people from the Workmen's Compensation Board safety division went to Long Harbour, They have made a preliminary inspection.

They are now making a detailed inspection of all the pumps and valves and whatever is surrounding the location of the accident. The inspection is being made in conjunction with the company representative and the union safety representative. I will have in my hands a detailed report of the exact nature and cause of the accident tomorrow morning.

It appears at this time that there was no mechanical failure of any kind involved and this is substantiated by all three people, the Workman's Compensation Board person, the company supervisor and the union representative. However, they are doing a detailed inspection of the whole thing and I will consider what further action may be taken and this would include any possible action as far as an industrial enquiry commission is concerned, after I have received the full details from the inspection that is being carried out at this time.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Finance. Is the two cents per hour increase to the plant workers in the abbatoir and also the two days holidays, the two yearly holidays, are they in addition to the two cents and the two extra holidays that were offered by the Treasury Board on May 1, as was stated by the Minister of Finance in the House on May 1? Also is this the final offer, as the minister stated? Is this the last offer? Will the minister not sit down again with them and at least bargain with them?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, with reference to the first part of the question. I am referring to the offer that was made last week and which was voted on in the secret ballot yesterday. This is not the full offer but it is twenty-two cents an hour minimum for all of the employees down there and two additional statutory holidays making thirteen in the first year of the agreement. That is the offer I am referring to, that had been rejected by the employees yesterday. As far as offers are concerned this is the government's final offer in



connection -

AN HON. MEMBER: You said that before.

MR. CROSBIE: I said that before, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: You said that before and backed down on it.

MR. CROSBIE: Can I answer the question or do we have to have a debate?

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. CROSBIE: I said that before, Mr. Speaker, and because it was intimated to us that a face-saving further offer would be acceptable to the union, we made a face-saving further offer to the union which was then rejected by the union. We therefore state now our quite irrevocable position that as far as the monetary terms -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CROSBIE: Can I explain the government's policy without interruption? That as far as the government's monetary, the terms of this situation are concerned, we have made our final offer. Now if the union wants to come in to discuss anything or if they have any suggestions to make or any other points to make certainly we are open to discuss anything they want to discuss with them. But the government has gone as far as it can go. The government is going to assist the farmers affected so that they are not ruined, the broiler producers involved are not ruined by this situation or innocent third parties. That is all I can say on the matter.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could I ask the honourable minister if the union has been in touch with anybody on Treasury Board within the last twenty-four hours?

MR. CROSBIE: No, they have not. They may but there may have been some speaking, but you know I do not know.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, in the House yesterday I ask the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing a question concerning the

river bank erosion in Happy Valley and the water supply to the town.

I am wondering if he do have an answer to that question.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I indicated yesterday that I was investigating this. There are a lot of departments involved and just as soon as we get the information together we will let the honourable member know.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Could the minister inform the House when the vacancy on the Town Council in Pouch Cove will be filled? The vacancy occurred as a result of Gerald Sullivan resigning in March past. Could the honourable minister tell us when that by-election will be held?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that that is a question that could go on the order paper. I do not have the details of it but I could take it and advise him.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker, could I direct a question as a follow-up to a question I ask the honourable Minister of Provincial and Labrador Affairs a couple of days ago, last week sometime I think? The question is what luck are you having, Mr. Speaker, in trying to get an icebreaker to the Labrador Coast? I understand there are people up there who still cannot get out fishing and the CN boats are trying to bang their way through up there with passengers and supplies and things. Have you done anything about it,

done anything about my request for an icebreaker, you said you would, what is the story on it?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, an answer to the honourable member we have been trying, but the feeling is that now nature will look after this matter and they are not too inclined to send an icebreaker in at this time. If there is anything further develops I will be only too happy to let the honourable member know.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, you mean nature is going to take care of this ice situation. They are going to wait - did this come from the Minister of Transport?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, this is what we are given to understand from the department, about the icebreakers.

MR. HARVEY: Nature will take care of a lot of things.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the honourable Minister of Education. On Monday I asked him if it were true that during a panel discussion on Memorial University approximately a week before the last provincial election that the minister assured that the students would not be required to borrow any more than \$400 under the Canada Student Loan Plan in order to qualify for provincial assistance. I was wondering if he has attempted to find the answer to that question?

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the answer to that, and also enough information to handle any subsequent questions arising out of it is extremely complex because assistance to Memorial Students is given on the basis of a very very complex formula. At the moment I am having a - what I can only call a dossier prepared with all possible relevant information on that, which I will then table in this House.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Did he or did he not make this statement to which I referred?

MR. CARTER: A supplementary answer, Mr. Speaker. I can only repeat that the whole question is extremely complex one, I am taking it under notice, I will give all possible information to this Honourable House in a very few days.

MR.F.ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, was the honourable Minister at that meeting at the University at that time?

MR.CARTER: I do not know how to define a supplementary to a supplementary answer Mr. Speaker, but in any event I was at that meeting.

MR.F.ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker, can the honourable Minister remember being asked the question?

MR.CARTER: A point of order Mr. Speaker, this has gone far enough -

MR.ROBERTS: What is the point of order, Mr. Speaker, let the honourable gentleman rise and state his point. Point of order paper, paper point of order is what I get.

MR.CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have a little girl at home with a doll that if you pull on a string, it is rather like a puppet, the same sort of stuff comes out of it. I would suggest that if the honourable Leader of the Opposition would remove his coat he might find a similar device.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. Would the honourable gentleman - the honourable gentleman stood in this House, I have to call him an honourable gentleman, for that reason alone I do. It is hard to find any other reasons to call him an honourable gentleman. Would he state his point of order that is all that I asked. He raised - now if the honourable gentleman does not wish to answer a question Your Honour that is his right, Indeed the answers he has given he would be wise not to attempt any further answers. But all I asked, would he state his point of order, Sir, instead I get this torrent of personal abuse.

MR.CARTER: My point of order, Mr. Speaker, quite clearly was that the whole thing was becoming quite tedious, I felt that I had given sufficient answer. I cannot see any further point in continuing.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, could we then have a ruling on the point of order as to whether or not the honourable gentleman is feeling that something is tedious constitutes a point of order. I would like a ruling from Your Honour

on that whether, when a minister says something is tedious does that therefore make it out of order, or does it merely make the minister out of order.

MR. BARRY: Speaking to the point of order, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Minister also said that he felt that he had answered the question and it was not -

MR. ROBERTS: But that is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The present ruling is that the honourable minister did answer the question.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, may I now put a question to the Minister of Finance? It is the same question. Is it true that during a panel discussion at Memorial University approximately a week before the last election that the Minister of Finance assured the students at the university that they would not be required to borrow any more than \$400 under the Canada Student Loan in order to qualify for provincial assistance, if in fact, the Progressive Conservatives were elected?

MR. CROSBIE: Frankly, Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether it is correct or not. I certainly do not remember stating anything, as the honourable member suggest. On the other hand, I will not say categorically, I did not. If the honourable member wants to produce me some evidence that I said it, I would be prepared to consider that.

MR. ROWE, F.B. Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question, can the minister remember referring to such rumors as rotten Liberal rumors being spread by the University Liberal Club in connection with this \$400?

MR. CROSBIE: There were rumors that the Liberal Club is spreading that the whole programme is going to be wiped out. I certainly remember referring to that, there was not a word of truth in it and there is not a word of truth in it.

MR. P. S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing - have the application by the residents of Benton for incorporation as of today been approved?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, that is a question which could quite easily go on the Order Paper. We have about thirty or thirty-five applications down there which have been reviewed and just as soon as a decision is taken the people in Benton will be advised.

MR. GILLET: Again I have to ask a question of the honourable the Minister of Highways and perhaps I should rephrase the question in

MR. GILLETT: this way that in view of the announcements made by at least by the candidate who was running for the Progressive Conservative election in Twillingate, that the honourable the Minister of Highways told him that the causeway to Twillingate would be completed this year. In view of that may I ask why it is taking almost a week for this decision to be made at this crucial time in the budget?

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: It was only started last year that is why.

MR. GILLETT: It was only started last year.

MR. CROSBIE: It should have started five years ago.

MR. ROBERTS: Right or 105 years ago.

MR. EARLE: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Is the minister going to answer it, Mr. Speaker?

MR. GILLETT: I was wondering if it was torn down or not?

MR. MAYNARD: As to why a decision has not been made is simply a matter of money. Whether there was a verbal promise made or not, I do not know. I cannot substantiate that but I promise the honourable gentleman that I will have a definite conclusive answer within a twenty-four hour period. Is that helpful?

MR. GILLETT: Thank you. I would like to thank the honourable gentleman, very much indeed.

MR. W. N. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, before the honourable member gets going. Let us be very clear. although there is no problem today because of the friendly atmosphere that we have developed on both sides of the House, let us be very clear on what the Standing Orders say about private members' day or questions or motions on the Order Paper.

Standing Order 16 (a) says, "All items standing on the orders of the day (except Government orders) shall be taken up according to the procedure assigned to each on the Order Paper."

MR. ROWE, W.N. Now, Mr. Speaker, what that means in effect, is that all government orders, all matters brought into the House by the government or upon those matters the government has the undoubted right to call the order of their being brought before this House and



Mr. Rowe (W.N.).

being debated in the House and, of course, the House Leader is the one who represents the government in that regard. All other matters, Sir, all other motions, all other orders, are not under the direction of the House Leader, the Government House Leader but they have, according to Standing Order 16, "The Speaker himself must call the orders in accordance with the order in which they appear on the Order Paper." Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no problem today because behind the Speaker's Chair the honourable gentleman and I and others agreed that this order would be called first. With the consent of the House, of course, it can be called first. But, Sir, there may come a time when everything is not friendly and when it may be a matter of some importance as to what order is called on the Order Paper. I would ask Your Honour to make a ruling on the point of order that I am now raising, either now or at some subsequent event or on some subsequent occasion, in anticipation of any problems arising on this particular matter.

MR. MARSHALL : On that point of order, Mr. Speaker, before we proceed. The hon. member for White Bay South has indicated that the spirit of friendliness pervades and hopefully it will pervade for a while as a result of the democratic government we now have. However, Mr. Speaker, the request that has been made by the hon. member for White Bay South I would submit, Your Honour, that you cannot rule upon it. There is no need for the hon. member for White Bay South or any one getting up and lecturing with respect to the rules of this House. The fact of the matter is that the hon. member for White Bay South is asking Your Honour to rule on a hypothetical question that does not now exist and hopefully it will not exist.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, to the point of order, I submit, Sir,

Mr. Roberts

that it is not a hypothetical question. The fact remains that Your Honour called Orders of the Day. The hon. House Leader made a request which has the form by practice of a motion. He does not say that I move order so and so. He just says order so and so. That is understood to be a motion. My friend and colleague from White Bay South has raised the point that the honourable gentleman has no right to make that motion at this time. I submit, Sir, that that is not a hypothetical question. I submit that we are within our rights in asking Your Honour for a ruling. As my colleague said, Your Honour may wish to consult upon the matter and give us a ruling at a later moment. There is no problem there. I do think it is an important point. It is not a hypothetical question.

Sir, with respect to the honourable gentleman's comments about lecturing, I have listened to more lectures from him Mr. Speaker in the last two or three weeks than I have from all the other honourable members of the House put together, including people like the hon. gentleman from St. John's Centre who sat here for a considerable while.

MR. MARSHALL: Let us get on with the business of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we are getting on with the business of the House.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I have the right to continue with my point?

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, continue.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you Mr. Speaker. As I was saying before I was so rudely interrupted by the gentleman from St. John's Centre. Even the gentleman from St. John's Centre with all his presumptuousness and his nine years in the House, Sir, has not lectured as often as the House Leader.

Mr. Roberts

I submit, Sir, that it is not a hypothetical question. I submit that my colleague has raised a point on which he is entitled to a ruling. I submit further that this point is well made. I would ask Your Honour for a ruling, either at this moment or later should Your Honour wish to consult with Your Honour's advisers.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker on the point of order, I did not make any such motion as a matter of right in any event and, therefore, it is hypothetical. Nobody is disagreeing in substance with what the hon. member for White Bay South says. If, however, the hon. members of the opposition represented by the various members on the other side wish to continue on with this tenor and comments, they may do so. I just brought up the point that there was no such motion made in this House as a matter of right. There was no such motion made. Nobody is quibbling with the stand of the hon. member for White Bay South. I think it is a very important principle, Your Honour, that Your Honour not be called upon to make rulings with respect to hypothetical matters. I have no interest in - there is nothing to be gained from prolonging this discussion nor the type of discussion that has gone on in this House before. All we want to do is to get on with the business of private members' day and of the government itself.

MR. SPEAKER: I shall take the whole matter as notice. I will make the ruling later.

MR. J. G. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, based on the presumption that it is safe to bring my head above desk level, I am very pleased to place this resolution before this honourable House today. Sir, I believe that this matter is sufficiently urgent to warrant the immediate attention of this honourable House. I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that this matter is of sufficient urgency to the people who may be affected either directly or indirectly, by

Mr. Rousseau

any eventual change in status in the United States Air Force Installation at Goose Bay. I had intended to and I will do so now, to thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. House Leader and the hon. member for Bell Island for their graciousness in allowing my resolution to be placed on the Order Paper this afternoon. Their magnanimity does not leave me untouched I assure them.

I feel confident, Mr. Speaker, that before this day is out, approval will be given to this resolution. I hope, Sir, that the approval is unanimous. Before proceeding with my opening remarks, I would like to make a suggestion. This resolution, Sir, is not prompted by any politically oriented motivations but rather, Sir, out of a deep sense of concern for those people who may be affected by the change or any proposed change in the status of the installation at Goose Bay.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make it abundantly clear that I have no intention of interfering with any negotiations being carried on by the United States Government and by the Government of Canada. I know, Sir, that there are many members of this honourable House concerned with the matter. I know the hon. member for Labrador North who will in all probability be speaking on the resolution, will have some pertinent comments to place before this honourable House. I am sure that the hon. member for Labrador South will also have some comments to make. I know the matter is of grave concern to the Minister of Labrador Affairs, the hon. member from St. John's Centre who has become quite a friend to the people of Labrador in the past four and a-half months. I am aware, Sir, that outside this House our federal member, Mr. Ambrose Peddle, the member for Grand Falls, White Bay, Labrador, has also been actively concerned with the matter of a possible phase-

OUT AS

Mr. Rousseau.

down of operations at the United States Air Force Installation at Goose Bay. Mr. Peddle and his cohorts in Ottawa (I take this opportunity to welcome Mr. Lundrigan who is in the gallery today) have worked very hard in an effort to secure some information for the people of the area regarding the status of the Goose Bay United States Air Force Base.

Sir, to phase out or not to phase out, to close down or not to close down, to negotiate or not to negotiate seems to be the question that has been pervasive to the people of the eastern portion of Labrador especially but indeed to all this province for the past couple of years.

In looking, Sir, at this resolution, we might recall during the past few years rumours, counter rumours, gossips, speculation of all kinds with regard to the possible close down of the United States Air Force Installation at Goose Bay. It would appear at times, Sir, that the people appear to be resigned to an eventual close down of the base. They are, Sir, in a state of constant flux surrounded by clouds of uncertainty causing deep mental anguish and anxiety. The question now appears to be Mr. Speaker not "if" but "when the base will close down?" There are rumours rampant, small rumours which I am sure the hon. member from Labrador North, in his remarks, will allude to, the rumour that no liquor has been ordered after September and the rumour that no flights

no flights have been booked after such and such a period.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible

MR. ROUSSEAU: And no investment in the area and so on and so forth. These rumours certainly have had quite an effect on the people in the area. I believe all these factors are causing undue hardship to the people and I would like to have the matter clarified on their behalf. And I would like to have them be able to sleep nights and to be reassured as to the status and the future of this installation. Grant it, Sir, some sting has been removed in the event of possible phase-down, as a result of the recent Linerboard decision. We must remember that should the base close down and the Labrador Linerboard Limited become a successful enterprise, then the area is still tied down to one industry. The hope would be, of course, that the continuation of the base and the augmentation of it by the Labrador Linerboard operation would produce a second industry in the area and thus give the people a much more secure feeling in the future. The possibility too, of course, of the operation in the Lower Churchill area may be considered in the future. Certainly any area that depends on one industry is an area which at any point in time can be grossly affected, its people and its economy, by the shut down, the close down, the phase down of this industry.

But, we must remember that there are people involved in this operation. The resolution here today is not an attempt to find out from the United States Government nor from the Canadian Government whether this base is going to be continued for political reasons, but rather to find out so as to let the people know so that they can plan their future, so that in the eventuality of a phase-down the people concerned would be in a position to step in and to provide some alternative so that the people would not be caught in complete despair at that point in time.

I notice, Sir, in the Verbatim Report, Vol. I, Number 2, the hon. member for Labrador North directed a question to the Premier and

he mentioned and I quote, "Because of the anxiety and demoralizing effect caused by the uncertainty of the future of Goose Air Base", and I think he reflects accurately the feelings of the people in the area. I refer also, Mr. Speaker, to Vol. I, Number 6. Friday, April 28th, in this very effective Throne Speech delivered by the member for Labrador North when he talked about the Goose Bay Air Base and the possible repercussions to the people of the area should a phase-down occur. I think he is concerned. I think all members of this hon. House should be concerned. We must show the people of this Province that we care. Laws of common decency prevail here. They should have some awareness of future prospects for the Base.

Mr. Speaker, before moving to Labrador some ten years ago I was a resident of Corner Brook. Although I was not directly involved with the operation at Stephenville, I did have quite a bit to do with the Harmon Complex there at the time, mostly through sports activities. I know it was quite a shock to the people of the Stephenville area when this base was phased out. The same thing happened at Pepperrell here in St. John's. Argentia right now is leaning in that direction. So we have a possible situation which is not unlike others that have occurred previously.

Now, in the last few days, Mr. Speaker, we have noted, and I have a few clippings here which I am sure everybody has looked at, that the Base has been given a temporary extension of one year through June 30th, 1973. It is beginning to sound a little familiar maybe, Mr. Speaker, with the announcements we heard on previous military installations in the Province.

My hope, Sir, and I hope this remark is taken in the way in which it is given. It is not meant to be politically oriented. I hope, Sir, that there is not being given to the people of Labrador, Eastern Labrador, and to the people of this Province, a cause for optimism when really there is none. And, Sir, I hope that the announcement of this

extension is not made on political grounds. Now, I am not for one minute suggesting that it is. But, I cannot help but confess that the thought has crossed my mind with an impending Federal election within the next year that the suspicion is there that possibly this may be a postponing of an eventual decision until after a Federal election. The thought has crossed my mind and I think I would be less than honest with this hon. House if I did not mention it. I hope this is not the case. It is merely a lingering thought and I would think that maybe many other people have had the same thought. I hope not, Mr. Speaker. Personally I cannot believe the government of this great nation of ours would resort to such a low tactic and I am sure that the government of the great nation to our south would not have any complicity in such a matter either. So I am sure that the postponement has been solely for negotiating purposes.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, I held a very courteous and amicable meeting, very informative, with Mr. Richard Straus, the U.S. Consulate General, resident in St. John's. I notice Mr. Straus is in the House today and I wish to thank him very much for his graciousness this morning. He was very informative and I assure him that I appreciate it very much. Mr. Straus was most courteous and most cooperative and was of immense help, Mr. Speaker, in giving me some background information on the problem.

Now, the original agreement was signed in 1952 and was to expire on December 5th, 1972. It stated, and I quote, "The United States of America may by notification in writing to the Government of Canada not less than six months prior to the expiration of the lease request an extension of the term." This request was made subsequent to the agreement and the extension, of course, has been granted through June 30th, 1973. This request for extension of the lease was made to enable both parties to continue negotiations. Negotiations, Sir, I am led to believe have been tough. I guess will always be difficult when two nations, two great nations, sit down and discuss dollars. More so perhaps, Sir, in view of



the existing monetary situation, in view of the tremendous expense that the United States is presently incurring in the Viet Nam War, and in light of the present Federal Government's cut back on Canadian armed forces expenditures. So it would be proper to say, Sir, that these negotiations have been hampered by budgetary considerations.

Mr. Straus did assure me of his concern for the civilian employees at the Base and I believe, Sir, that he was very sincere in his concern. We discussed very courteously the continued need for an operation such as Goose Bay within the total concept of

1780

MR. ROUSSEAU: existing U.S. military policy.

The United States Airforce installation at Goose Bay provides an integral function to the U.S. striking force, that of refueling D-52 long-range bombers. As long as this mission has not changed and there appears to be no existing reason why it should, then there cannot be any major change in the functions of the United States Airforce installation at Goose Bay in relation to its need insofar as total U.S. military policy is concerned. It does serve a need and in the foreseeable future, as I understand it, it will continue to serve a need. And, of course, if it continues to serve a military need there will be a continued need for non-military personnel to augment the military personnel stationed at the Base.

In talking with Mr. Straus this morning he brought it to my attention, a report by Mr. Melvin Laird, Secretary of Defence, in the Annual Defence Department Report, National Securities Strategy of Realistic Deterrence, in discussing the topic; strategic number of nuclear forces for deterrent stated and I quote, Mr. Speaker. "No major change in deployed U.S. strategic retaliatory forces will be evident in the fiscal year 1973. It starts on July 1, 1972. Although we are continuing to make qualitative improvements in our forces, at the end of that fiscal year the Strategic Offensive Force Levels will continue to include" and here, Mr. Speaker, the report mentioned a number of military weapons which include 455, D-52 bombers, the equivalent of twenty-six squadrons.

So that in the foreseeable future this strike force will be continued. This strike force, of course, will need refueling.

In the same report Mr. Laird also stated and I quote he proposes a so-called airborne warning and control system, which involves, Mr. Speaker, airplanes which need refueling. Again the need for refueling indicates the need for tankers and, of course, the present refueling base for tankers in this section of the world is the installation at

MR. ROUSSEAU: Goose Bay.

I then proceed to put Mr. Straus in a rather embarrassing position, I suppose, in asking him directly whether he was cautiously optimistic or optimistic with regard to the continued operation of the base at Goose Bay. Now I guess this was an unfair question but I must say the gentleman was very gracious and he suggested to me that he himself was optimistic of the continuation of the United States Airforce installation at Goose Bay.

I do not think, Sir, it was motivated by any political things he was trying to hide but I think he was trying to give me a sincere answer insofar as he was able to determine. I acknowledge the fact before this House, of course, that Mr. Laird may not be in possession of facts, of decisions that may have already been made, (or I am sorry, Mr. Straus) But to the best of his knowledge he assured me that he is optimistic as to the continuation of this installation at Goose Bay.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member permit a question.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, certainly I will permit a question.

MR. WINSOR: With the honourable member's reference to the conversation between the American Consul General, Mr. Straus and himself, was this on a confidential basis? It appears to me that some of the information which now the gentleman has given the House seems to be of more of a confidential nature than for the public.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, the information that I was given, as I understand it, Mr. Straus was quite open. Is that correct?

AN HON. MEMBER: Was correct.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman was it correct.

MR. WOODWARD: It was quite correct.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We had a little conversation on it and then we were on the record and I am not giving out any military information. The report that I quote from Mr. Laird is a public report, an annual report of the Department of Defence.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, would the honourable member just yield once more? My reason for asking I would not want the honourable member to be accused outside of the House of giving some confidential information. So I am glad that it is not confidential information.

MR. ROUSSEAU: All right. I had my note book out and Mr. Straus was very gracious I think. This is why I suggested he was most cooperative and most cordial and gave me answers to questions that I had asked. I was very pleased with this because, as I said before, I thank him very much for it. The figures are though not confidential because the quotes I made were figures that were in the public report for the Department of Defence of The United States of America.

Now some figures also that I was given as of January 1, 1972 - and there has been no appreciable change since that time. There are 737 non-United States civilians employed at the base in Goose Bay - 737 non-U.S. civilians employed at the base. Now these of course are not all Newfoundlanders, there is a mix, there are recruiting offices in Montreal and St. John's. These are Canadian, non-U.S., Canadian civilians, 737. This compared, Mr. Speaker, with 815 Canadian military personnel in our province and 135 Canadian civilians employed in military establishments in our province.

The annual payroll, Mr. Speaker, for these 737 non-U.S. civilians is \$7,462,648.00 and I would assume some change - \$7,462,648.00. The commissary purchases in the area and surrounding is approximately \$600,000 per year. The supply of auto parts and other general merchandise is approximately \$200,000 a year. Construction projects during the second half of the present fiscal year, that would be from December 31 through to date, is approximately \$1,400,000 and the

MR. ROUSSEAU: expenditure that has been approved is \$2 million, so there is present projected expenditures to the end of this year which should be in the vicinity of about \$2 million, if the expenditure has been approved for this construction phase of the present fiscal year ending June 30 of this year.

I was also informed that \$2 million for the coming fiscal year, beginning July 1, through to June 30, 1973 has also been approved for construction purposes. Thus the economic benefits, Mr. Speaker, directly, directly per year, \$7,462,648 for salaries to non-U.S. civilians, \$600,000 for commissary purchases and \$200,000 for auto parts and other general merchandize and \$2 million on the construction projects, comes to a total of \$10,262,648. This, of course, Mr. Speaker, does not include the indirect spending by the U.S. personnel at the various business establishments in the area.

I bring that point out, Mr. Speaker, to give some indication of what the area of Goose Bay/Happy Valley stands to lose in the event that this base is phased out. Its economy presently is almost solely supported by the American installation.

We hope, we hope the Linerborad Mill will be a success. There is no guarantee that it will be. Should it be a success, then I think the benefits that accrue to the people of Labrador will be extremely useful

in the coming years. The possibility again of the Lower Churchill is a moot question at this time and certainly is worthy of consideration. Whether or not it will go ahead in the near or distant future is something that remains to be seen.

The status for some of the civilian employees at the installation, the non-U.S. civilians, may change in some instances. Here we are thinking about where individuals are now employed by the United States Government. Contracts could in all probability and may well be let to Canadian concerns, which would in turn employ the people who were previously employed directly by the United States Government. Of course, this question would be entirely at the discretion of the contractor. For example, the cafeteria and snow removal or services of this nature could be let out so that there is a possibility of a change of status for some of the Canadian or non-U.S. civilians at the base.

On the basis of what I have come by informationwise, it would appear logical to assume that the United States places some priority right now, at this point in time, on maintaining its installation at Goose Bay. For how long, Mr. Speaker, nobody can accurately foretell and therein, Mr. Speaker, lies the problem. One could guess, generally speaking, that as long as planes need fuel the United States will need a refueling station somewhere. Why not Goose Bay? I have been privileged to live on the West Coast of the province and further privileged to have lived in Labrador and presently to be living in Labrador, which I think are two of the areas that are probably amongst the leaders if not the leaders in open-sky-flying weather for military installations. I know Stephenville was amongst the best and Labrador, Goose Bay is now presently amongst the best.

It would seem then, that based on these small things, that the United States Government might be in a position to say: "Look, here is a desirable location, why move?" They have the installation there,

They have the installation there, to relocate it of course is going to be a monumental expenditure in dollars to them, at a time when budgetary considerations have to be of prime concern.

I say now, to these two governments, to sit down in the next year to negotiate with a feeling of compassion and sympathy, and I mean that sincerely, a feeling of compassion and sympathy for the people of Eastern Labrador whose very futures are at stake in the decision that may be taken.

Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I would like to just look at my resolution here. What the resolution in effect states is this, whereas (1), that the economic and social welfare of the area involved is very important in the continued operation of the installation at Goose Bay. The United States status there has been determined only through June 30, 1973 and it is imperative for the stability of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Area that they have some indication of just how long in the future this installation will remain operational on a full scale, Sir. It is no good for somebody to come (and I am sure the hon. member for Labrador North agrees with me here) and say; 'Look, we are going to continue the operation for one year or two years or three years.' We are talking here in terms of a long-term lease. "Whereas there is no effective military presence of our Nation in this province; (I quote it to you that the United States installation at Goose Bay employs more individuals civilian-wise than do all civilian employees employed by the Canadian Forces in this province)" Be it resolved that this House in Legislative Session convened secure the economic and social future of residents of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Area as quickly as possible by negotiating long term arrangements suitable to the Governments of Canada and Newfoundland, of not less than twenty years duration."

My personal feeling is - I hope that my hon. friend from Labrador North agrees, that anything shorter would be almost useless.

"In the event that a satisfactory conclusion cannot be reached between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States, then that the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada negotiate with regards to having Canadian Armed Forces man the operation at Goose Bay, and that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to the appropriate official or officials of the Government of Canada, forthwith." Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move that this resolution be adopted.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, on the resolution so ably put by the member for Labrador West, I appreciate his concern as I am sure the people in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Area of Labrador appreciate his concern as well. Had he not put this resolution before this House today, or a resolution of similar nature, Mr. Speaker, I would have had no choice but to have done it myself.

It is not spilled milk, I suppose that he has had the advantage, having been in the government, but I support the resolution to a degree, Sir, and I would like to acknowledge the Consulate General of the United States who is present in the House today. The United States Government Forces in Goose Bay, as I agree as hon. member from Labrador West in his resolution stating, they have contributed materially and economically to the social welfare of the people of the Province of Newfoundland, and I suppose it is more pronounced in the Goose Bay - Happy Valley Area.

As he goes on to state, Sir, the usage of military installations at Goose Bay have been determined until the end of June '73 which is correct. I attended a press conference with the hon. Don Jamieson, the Minister of Transport from Ottawa, a few days ago and they were kind enough to call me in on the conference when they made the press release concerning the extension. At that time, Sir, there was no mention of, and I hope there is no mention of this being a political gimmick to extend, to deal with the welfare of the people in our area for a short period of time. I do not think that we can



June 7, 1972, Tape 577, Page 4 -- aph

afford to let politics deter the livelihood of the seven hundred and  
thirty-seven people that are employed at Goose Air Base.

1788

Not only that, Sir, the number of other people who are directly depending on the spin-off industry that have developed - what I mean by spin-off industry is in-service industry that have developed as a result of the employment at Goose Air Base. I do not think that it is the wishes of our Federal Government in Ottawa to use this as a political football, at least I heard no mention of it and I hope that this is not the case.

As it goes on, Sir, "to bring stability to the Happy Valley-Goose Bay Area, that its long term future be determined and secured as quickly as possible," This I support and I am sure that the residents of the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area support this as well. But as the resolution goes on, and I may read from here, Sir, that "by this Honourable House of Assembly in Legislative Session convened that the Government of Canada be urged to secure the economic and social future of residents of the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area as quickly as possible by negotiating long term arrangements suitable to the Government of Canada and Newfoundland of not less than twenty years duration with the United States," I think, Sir, that I will move later on that an amendment be made to this, "the United States of America or by providing for the operation of this strategic military facility by Canadian Armed Forces."

I will move an amendment to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, as I go on but first I would like to bring in a few details and submit to this House some of the changes that have taken place over the years at Goose Air Base, Labrador. I have had a lot of experience with it. I have lived in that particular area and at one point in time was employed for a short period of time with the United States Air Force at Goose Bay, going back to 1957. Since that time and since 1939 when Goose Bay was first started by the Canadian Forces or by the RCAF as a steppingstone or a jumping-off place for the ferry command at that time, to make the stretch when we were ferrying aircraft, Hudson bombers

and aircrafts of that nature over to Europe. This is the prime reason for having Goose Bay there. As the years developed and the Second World War continued the Canadian Air Force did develop and along with the Canadian Army at that particular time, Sir, was in Goose Bay on training manoeuvres for troops going overseas and they did at that time develop a RCAF as it was known at that time which is now Canadian Armed Forces, a detachment at Goose Bay, and then the American Air Force moved in across the way from where the RCAF was and they developed accordingly.

So from 1941 and progressing along to 1945 and going into the time that I moved into Goose Bay in 1957 there were a number of people and the Royal Canadian Air Force played a very important role as indeed they do now, Sir, in the operation of Goose Bay. There were a number of civilian employees, if I quote figures maybe they will not be quite accurate, Mr. Speaker, but up until 1967 when the Canadian Armed Forces phased down at Goose Bay and then their presence was replaced by the Ministry of Transport with a small segment of Canadian Armed Forces people controlling the runways and the tower and the other aids to navigation, some of the aids to navigation at Goose Air Base, up until that time the Canadian Forces had some three hundred odd civilians employed on the base.

It was consequent to this that they themselves developed the housing area which we refer to, along with the Ministry of Transport, at that time the Department of Transport, a housing area to house some, over two thousand citizens. Those citizens were not local people from Newfoundland, Sir. They were dependents of the Canadian Armed Forces families. So in 1967 when the RCAF decided to phase back these facilities were passed over to the Ministry of Transport in Goose Bay, who had then assumed the role of administering the Canadian portion of the thing along with the Canadian Forces Base.

As I understand, Sir, the Canadian colonel whom we have had over the years and his presence has been felt in Goose Bay, is the sovereign landlord of both the American and Canadian Base at Goose Bay. So they phased in 1967 for a short period of time and this year, Sir, there has been some great activities taking place as far as the Canadian Forces are concerned, along with the NORAD sector which has its headquarters in North Bay, Ontario. I understand, for the Canadian sector, that they have moved back in and they have taken over the communications at the Pine Tree Site, what we call Melville Air Station, in Goose Bay. This, as I understand now, is fully manned by the Canadian Armed Forces and since then they have hired up to sixty, seventy civilian personnel to work at that site.

Along with the other things that have taken place, Sir, they have moved into the American sector of the base some 130 families. These 130 families are now living in housing that has been provided by our good friends, the American Air Force, to our Canadian Forces.

So, Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make is that I do not think we can merely look at the surface of this thing, look at it on a surface level. I think what we have to do is we have to access what has been taking place and I suppose despite what we say is happening the American Forces have been phasing down since 1967. I have great knowledge of this because in my work I dealt with the American Air Force, I have worked with them and I am more than privileged to have worked with them. But there has been a gradual phase back in the total operations of Goose Bay since 1967. It has been well noticed. It has been well pronounced throughout the communities of Goose Bay, Happy Valley. So what are we asking them to do?

The question is this, are we asking them to remain on when there is no need or they feel there is no need? Maybe there is a need. So

June 7, 1972

Tape 578

JM - 4

the question I am asking is this that now that they are phasing back we have a facility in Goose Bay possibly that is worth, and maybe the Consulate General here will correct me on this, but I venture to say it is worth well up in the hundreds of millions of dollars, Sir - I understand during the early construction days in Goose Bay one particular contractor alone

1792

did spend \$107 million in contract work in Goose Bay or did get this much for the contract that was let by the United States Air Force. So, we have a very valuable asset Sir. The aspect of the whole thing, as the honourable member for Labrador has said, if we are not going to maintain the present status that exist today, we question the fact if it is worth it, as a civilian community or the civilian population, is it worth it to have a caretaker staff at Goose Air Base. I am sure that if we phase down to a caretaker staff that a number of people will be forced to leave the community and will have to come outside.

So, in this respect Sir, may I speak briefly on the town of Happy Valley and the origin of it. Happy Valley is the town that sprang up on the perimeter of Goose Air Base. I mentioned this in my maiden speech here in my Address in Reply to the Speech from the Throne, Sir. It sprang up on the perimeter of the Air Base about seven miles away. A number of people, at that particular time people were discouraged to go and live in the community of Happy Valley. But as people moved in from the Island of Newfoundland and secured good jobs, saw a means of providing for their families, not wanting to be separated from their families, Sir, they decided to move into the - it was not then a community - it was not even then a local improvement district, it was a squatters or settlers settling on the banks of the Hamilton River with no control by any type of government.

Our own government at this time, Sir, being a national government, decided that we shall not have a settlement of Happy Valley. But fortunately the provincial government said, "yes, we would like to," Although it is a military reserve, most of the land as you can see here in this lease, Sir, most of the land in the Goose Bay- Happy Valley area, other than what has been passed back to the municipalities, is military reserve.

So, the provincial government saw fit to go to the, I think at that time the Department of National Defence, and ask for a small parcel

of land so that a number of people could settle on the banks of the Hamilton River. People first moved in there in 1941. As a result of that a number of people moved, built homes, Now the community of Happy Valley has a total population, although the census of Canada says different, it has a population of some 7,000 people, Seven thousand people, Sir, not only with jobs but with investment in homes in that community of Happy Valley.

So, it is of grave concern to those people, ninety per cent of those people, Sir, are depending directly on employment from the Goose Air Base. This is a very important question, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that they are there, they have seen fit to invest money into their homes, very few people have money, people that have been moving into the area are young people. People that have been newly married have seen fit to bring their families in, as I said before, and settle on the banks of the river.

So now we have a community of 7,000 people with no other means of support other than Goose Air Base. Today we have discovered, or a couple of days ago, going back to Monday the 5th., the lease has been extended for one year which is good news. We welcome this news. But my own personal feeling Mr. Speaker, is that the lease has been extended for this period of time merely to have to supply the United States Air Force with sufficient time to make arrangements to move out of the area.

Now, after the - after attending the press conference, listening to the press conference and listening to the questions of the honourable Minister of Transport, Don Jamieson, that it was expressed at that time the USAF would like to remain, they expressed the desire to remain in Goose Bay as a tenant of the Canadian Forces.

The Canadian Forces, Sir, have over the last year made their presence more than felt in Goose Bay. I suppose with the sovereignty rights over

the Arctic and utilizing the great facilities that we have at Goose Bay for reconnaissance aircraft, maybe it is an ideal situation for our own Canadian Forces to utilize this particular base.

But, Mr. Speaker, can the Canadian Forces totally use this great facility that we have? These are the questions that I am asking. Will they merely take over jurisdiction of the facility and protect that facility without any other utilization of it. I think we have a similar situation, I would not like to see this situation to develop in the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area, that we have at Argentia today. Other members of the House are more familiar with it than I am. We have a facility that is merely maintained by a housekeeping staff. If the province, in conjunction with the Government of Canada, had jurisdiction over a facility of this nature, the question is; could they make greater utilization of it?

I think, Sir, with the Labrador Linerboard and the number of industries or the number of - the Labrador Linerboard in conjunction with the Hydro Development on the Lower Churchill, maybe if we did control some of those facilities we could offer those facilities to attract those great industries to the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area.

The Minister of Transport stated in his address or after his address, in the question period after the release, that the M.O.T. (Ministry Of Transport) that is responsible for providing aids and navigation to the airport would probably play a greater role. I have no doubt that there is a potential for this Sir, when we think in terms of the number of Trans Atlantic Flights that have made requests to use Goose Air Base. I am sure most of the members of this House heard going back a couple of days ago that the promoters of this supersonic jet, the "Concord" were asking for quarter rights or Canadian air space to use from Goose Bay to Montreal.

So, before I put the amendment in, I ask myself the question and ask



this House if, in the event that we do extend this lease, or the Canadian Government and I hope in conjunction with the Newfoundland Government

1796

Mr. Woodward

in their wisdom see fit to extend a lease to the United States Air Force. I do not think the people of the area would like any more than have the present status maintained. If it is maintained maybe for a period of twenty years, I am sure that our people would be very happy with it. In the event that it is going to be on a reduced basis, Mr. Speaker, there may be some other alternate means we can find.

Sir, I would like to move the amendment to the resolution, seconded by the House Leader, the hon. member for White Bay, and the amendment is: to strike the words beginning with "the United States of America" and ending "Canadian Armed Forces" and replace them with the following words: "to ensure that the level of employment offered to the residents of Happy Valley - Goose Bay area does not fall below its present level, whether the facilities are operated by the United States of American or by an agency of the Government of Canada or by a commercial agency. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador develop the necessary plans to provide the additional employment which is needed to ensure the economic stability of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area."

Speaking a few words on the amendment, Mr. Speaker, I have had visions of speaking in this House.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: I would just like to read the amendment to the House.

"Strike the words beginning with "the United States of America" and ending "Canadian Armed Forces" and replace them with the following words: "to ensure that the level of employment offered to residents of Happy Valley, Goose Bay area, does not fall below its present level, whether the facilities are operated by the United States of America or by an agency of the Government of Canada or by a commercial agency. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador develop the necessary plans

to provide the additional employment which is needed to ensure the economic stability of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area."

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, going through the Harmon Corporation Act and seeing the lovely brochure that was presented by the Liberal Administration on promoting the development of Harmon Field, after the phase out of the American Forces, I have often wondered possibly if (it may be a little premature now but at some later date and after we see how the negotiations are progressing, which we have a deadline date for June 30, 1973) the Government of Newfoundland, the present government would see fit to think in terms of maybe developing a similar corporation for the Goose Bay, Happy Valley area. We had a sad experience, Sir, ( I am sure that the hon. Minister of Provincial and Labrador Affairs is quite familiar with this one) with the phase down of the facilities of the Department of National Defense at the Canadian side of the base in Goose Bay. Some of those facilities, Sir, after they had been abandoned for a couple of years literally went to pot and had to be destroyed. I think that if some attention had been paid to them, through a Crown corporation, that they would have been very useful to the Labrador Linerboard Limited today. I am sure the honourable minister is familiar with this.

So, Sir, the period of time between the phase out of an air base and the time when you decide or government decide when they are going to do something about it, is the time when all the great harm is done. We have been given sufficient notice, Sir. I do not know and I do not suppose any one does know what the results of this are going to be. Will there be a total phase out? I am lead to believe, Sir, and I will speak from my own personal experience, that the United States Air Force - watching them over the period of the last four or five years - will merely become a tenant of the Canadian Armed Forces. I do not know to what degree the Canadian Armed Forces will maintain the air base at Goose Bay. I do not think, Sir, that they will maintain that great air base to the degree that it is maintained by the present United States Air Force.

Mr. Woodward.

I have had the pleasure of sitting down with the Wing Commander - I might add Mr. Speaker that we have a very good relationship. We are very happy and live happy together with our American friends in Goose Bay, both the Town of Happy Valley and the Town of Goose Bay. They have been more than good to us, Sir. If they do go, we are going to miss them, as I am sure they are good to visitors coming in from the Province of Newfoundland. Every one seems to want to go over to the Officers' Club for a steak or to the N.C.O. Club for a steak or to the N.C.O Club to get a cheap drink or to play the slot machines or something of that nature.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODWARD: They are not allowed in the BX. In this case, Sir, I do not think the Canadian Forces will. That air base going back (I can be corrected if I am wrong) to 1968, having the Wing Commander attend a Chamber of Commerce Meeting, did give us some statistics on what was taking place and some of the expenditures on the base. The total operating costs of that air base, Sir, for that particular year as I recall was somewhere in the vicinity of \$47 million which is a great big industry, Sir. Will our Canadian Forces maintain this particular facility or will they merely take over the facility, keep it under the jurisdiction and restrict it to commercial use, if I may use that word, Sir? Those are the things that our government or our Provincial Government are going to have to deal with. We have brought the question up on numerous occasions. We have had on numerous occasions, as I stated before, requests from commercial air lines wanting to use Goose Air Base. They have been permitted to use it as a paper alternate and nothing else. In the event that they are overhead and develop trouble or they run short of fuel, they come in. We do get the odd one, Sir. We have a lovely air field. We have a lot of good navigational aids. We have one thing I suppose that no other airport in Eastern Canada has and that is an all-year round, weather free airport. I do not think, if my memory serves me right,

Mr. Woodward.

that over the period of the last twelve to fifteen years has Goose  
Air Base been closed for any one particular day, not for a full day,  
not for a twenty-four hour period

1800

because of bad weather. We are very fortunate in that respect, Sir, and because of this there is a big demand and a lot of our commercial people who are travelling the Atlantic would like to use this airport.

I would like to say, Sir, that there have been a great many changes. If I may refer to a few things that I have noticed on the cut back of Goose Bay. When I first went into the airport, there was the Fifty-fourth Rescue Squadron, there were two Fighter Squadrons, there was a Helicopter Squadron, there were a number of B-52's and B-47's that frequented the base. Prior to that we had, I do not know how many, but we had a great number of KC-97's, the tanker refueling aircraft. Today, Sir, we see very little activity in and out of that airport, very little activity indeed. We did have up to thirteen KC-135's and today we are merely seeing seven of those KC-135's.

I think it is inevitable, Mr. Speaker, that despite the fact that we may try to keep something alive, with the change, I suppose, the great change that has been brought about as in industry by mechanization, the same thing has happened to the military airport. When we think in terms of the number of men that were employed on the Dew Line, on the Mid-Canada Line, we find that those men have been replaced by sophisticated electronic equipment, and there are very few people employed today, Sir, in that respect. So, with this changing aspect I wonder if we can possibly hope to maintain that base as a conventional base at the present status that exists today.

Mr. Speaker, although our people in the Towns of Happy Valley and Goose Bay have been depending on U.S.A.F for a number of years, we feel, Sir, and feel deep down that we cannot forever depend on a military economy. We would like to think in terms of a Harmon Corporation in the event that there are facilities provided. We would like to see our government, or think that our government is going to play an active part in developing the natural resources of this

particular area. I do not oppose the resolution, Mr. Speaker, I support it, but I support it with the amendment. Thank you.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I think we in this House are greatly indebted this afternoon to the mover of the resolution, the member for Labrador West, and also to the member for Labrador North for his speech on it and his very able explanation, both of their very able explanations of the situation at Goose Bay.

I want to join with them too, before making my remarks, Mr. Speaker, in welcoming the Consul General of the United States to this House.

The whole question I suppose, and I will not go in, I do not propose to have the temerity, Mr. Speaker, to try to deal with the practical problems in my remarks, of the citizens of Goose Bay and Happy Valley. If that facility were to go, I think it is obvious that it would impose a very great hardship and our colleagues have outlined to us the nature of the impact on the economy. In fact, the economy of Happy Valley is really built around that base. It is obvious and clear that if that base is to go, that there would be a very, very grave detriment. We have suffered that in other parts of Newfoundland and dependent on the size of the particular community in which a base was, there was a relationship between the economic harm done, if you like, and the size of the community. In other words, when Pepperrell went from St. John's it was a bad blow, but in a town of this size, a city of this size, it was able to be absorbed, although the human cost was quite great. There are still people in this city who worked at Pepperrell who have not yet found permanent employment and I suppose it has been over ten years since Pepperrell was phased out.

The effects in Stephenville were even greater and the effects in Argentia were greater. Of course it is a matter of considerable concern to everyone in this House, I am sure, the

possibility of the going of the very major base, what has been the very major base at Goose Bay.

It is obvious I think, Mr. Speaker, that the commitments of the United States insofar as defence is concerned, the defence of their own country and its various military operations, the emphasis has gone from this Northern Hemisphere to Southeast Asia. It worried me a bit to hear my colleague from Labrador North speaking about it in the sense that I believe, and correct me if I am wrong, but I believe the hon. member feels that it is going one way or another. I had hope that it might not be as bad as that. We all know that the United States major commitment is in Southeast Asia, but I had the feeling, perhaps arising from lack of detailed knowledge, that perhaps the United States would want to keep at least one base in this part of the world - at least one major base. I hope that the hon. member is wrong and that I am right, but I bow to the hon. member's knowledge of things in the area.

Of course there is one other thing I think, one point which ought to be made, that the influence which the Province of Newfoundland can have on the Government of the United States in decisions of this sort is limited. The influence which Canada can have on the decisions made by the United States Government in matters like this, is much greater than our influence or possible influence. But even so, the Dominion of Canada also has a limit on the influence which it can have on the United States of America in matters involving its own jurisdiction and what it does militarily or otherwise.

I think, as I understand the guts of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, it is that we register our concern and register it not only with the United States Government, through the appropriate channels, but register it also with our own government. Because what ever influence we might have with the Government of the United States, which as I say is limited, extremely limited, we ought to and I hope we do have a considerable influence with the Government of our own country.



I think the idea of the resolution is good. I think the idea of influencing the United States of America insofar as we can is excellent. I think if they were to retain that base, not on a caretaker basis, not with two or three people, or one hundred people manning the installation which really would mean nothing to the economy, but as a going viable military concern, I think if they can be persuaded to do it, or if their long term plan can be revealed to us, that they intend to do that, I think that would be the best possible outcome. But assuming our colleague from Labrador North is right and assuming that it is about to be phased out, that it is only a matter of a year or two years or something of that order, and assuming all the representations that we may make cannot alter that, cannot change that, then I think we have a very serious duty in this House and in this province to bring our thoughts and our views to bear on our own government, on the government of our own country to keep this installation open as a military installation.

We have all, Mr. Speaker, as citizens of this

1804

Province heard from time to time people with some knowledge of military matters, some knowledge of defense commitments and some knowledge of defense spending, make reference to the fact that Newfoundland receives almost nothing from the Canadian defense dollar. Now I know that strategic positions change from time to time. We know that historically our position outside the mouth of the St. Lawrence River has been extremely important. Perhaps now that we are in the age of missiles, our position is not so strategically important. I do not know. But the point is, Mr. Speaker, that Canada despite the reduction and the streamlining of the Armed Forces by the Government of Canada in recent years, Canada still will continue to maintain military forces. I think we can take that as a stated position. There will be Canadian Armed Forces in the foreseeable future. That means there will be a military budget. There will be moneys spent every year. There will be planes, ships and the rest of the military paraphernalia. I think it disturbs all of us. It certainly disturbs me, Mr. Speaker, as a member of this House. I am sure for my colleagues who have spoken and others who have not yet spoken that Newfoundland does not get a proportionate or adequate share of the spending of that defense dollar. I think we should be heard on this. I think we should make sure, along with the representatives of Newfoundland in Ottawa, that this is borne in very clearly upon the Federal Government that Newfoundland expects and demands a share of the Canadian defense dollar. Location aside, I think we have a right as citizens and taxpayers to see that that is.

The reason I have mentioned this thing in principle, Mr. Speaker, is that if our colleague from Labrador North is correct, and if it turns out unhappily and unfortunately that the American Base is phased out or the American presence is phased out, then I think that is where the main thrust of our argument and our pressure, and I use the word pressure unashamedly, should be on to make sure that the defense dollar or that a considerable share of the defense dollar of Canada is spent by use of that base.

Now whatever the emphases is placed, in keeping our military spending in Canada, we know this much, that the air plane, the modern jet plane is going to be part of it in the foreseeable future. Therefore an air base and in particular an air base, as my colleague or our colleague says, from Labrador North, that this is a good air base, it has adequate equipment, it has adequate run-ways and other ground control devices, I understand from what he says that make it a viable thing. In other words it is not an obsolescent or obsolete air port. Am I correct? It is far from it. So here we have a worthwhile piece of military installation, Mr. Speaker, and I think that the greatest pressure from this House and from Newfoundland and from the community up there and from all of us completely united should be upon, if it is necessary, to use this installation as part of the Canadian defense installation in the over-all. I think that is where the main thrust of our argument should be. Our argument, obviously, Mr. Speaker, can be heard more forcefully and can be put more forcefully and has a right to receive greater credence in Ottawa than it does in Washington. That is not to say that I do not agree that we should be heard in Washington to the extent that we can.

So, where does that leave us, Mr. Speaker? I think the position is this. I believe, no doubt, that our two colleagues in a sense are in agreement in principle. I believe that our colleague from Labrador North probably has less faith in the future of this installation as a military installation than perhaps our colleague from Labrador West. But, I think that the first thrust, and this is why my feeling is that the motion, the original motion, I have heard our colleague's motion from Labrador North read but I have not seen it in print yet and perhaps I might not have grasped the full implications of it, I believe it is clear that the first motion, the motion itself, the resolution I should say, is that the pressure, for want of a better word, be placed on the American Government and/or on our own Government. I believe that the amendment would say something to the same

effect if I am correct but that also the Province of Newfoundland should enter into the thing and if necessary put something there like the Harmon Corporation.

Now that, Mr. Speaker, I think in a sense is not there, perhaps by my learned colleagues from White Bay, but is not there a legal expression to do with the drafting of, pleadings; "Do not leap until you come to the style." I seem to recall that. Well, I think, I do not want to upset our colleague from Bell Island, I believe there is such a maximum in the matter of pleadings. I think that the member for Labrador North in a sense, and I certainly agree with him in principle, but he may be in a sense leaping before he comes to the style. In the sense that if the thrust of our argument to Washington, if the thrust of our argument to Ottawa should absolutely fail, if the Federal Government and if the American Government say no, we just have no concern with this, we are going; if the Federal Government says no, we do not want this as a military installation, we are just not concerned with it, then of course what the hon. member for Labrador North says or indicates is absolutely true. We will be thrown back on our own resources. Then the Province of Newfoundland will have to take steps. It must take steps more particularly because that town, that beautiful area of this Province; I must say I have a very soft spot for Labrador from the visits I have made there, that part of the Province is going to be dependent entirely then, if all else fails, on action by the Province of Newfoundland, to keep it alive and to keep it viable. I for one, as strongly as I can say anything, would say that it must be kept alive and viable. I would and do, Mr. Speaker, agree in the first instance with the resolution as put by the member from Labrador West, that our thrust should be in the first instance towards Washington and toward our own Government to influence Washington, so that this can be maintained either as an American military base of significance or a Canadian military base of considerable significance and reflecting a goodly share to this Province of the defense dollar of Canada. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the amendment, the time to strike surely and with all respect to my hon. friend, learned friend, the time to strike is at the time disaster looms or even before the time disaster looms and not at the time that disaster descends upon us. Now in saying that I would like to commend my hon. friend, the member for Labrador West, for bringing this resolution into the House. I would like to commend my friend from Labrador North for making the amendment to the resolution brought into the House. The resolution is excellent as far as it goes, in our estimation an excellent resolution and a resolution which should be debated and upon which certain and sure action should be taken.

Our submission, Sir, is that the resolution does not go quite far enough. Our submission, Mr. Speaker, is that we should not put all our eggs in one basket or even in two baskets, but we should try to spread our very fragile merchandize around as broadly as possible so that if a shock does come the damage is as

little as possible and the shock can be absorbed as well as possible. The options that are open to the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada are, I suppose, three-fold. One is to restrict our energies and our actions towards negotiating with the Government of the United States to maintain that military presence there and to continue the employment and the input of money into the economy of the area. The other would be to negotiate with the Government of Canada for a Canadian military presence in the area either in conjunction with the American Forces or by ourselves. The third, Sir, would be a combination of the two I have already mentioned plus a third, and that would be to start planning now for something which may or may not occur. We do not, nobody on this side of the House least of all my honourable friend from Labrador North, nobody on this side of the House or on that side of the House hopes in any way that the Americans ever pull out of the Goose Bay Area.

They have been a source of employment, a source of a lot of things in the area and nobody wants that to happen. However, and I would not put so much stress on the honourable member's words as the honourable for St. John's South did, I do not think that he is certain in his own mind, certain that the Americans are going to pull out of that area but I think that as a realistic man and as a member for that district, looking ahead to the future he has to be as pessimistic about it as he has shown today because otherwise, Sir, it is whistling in the wind, it is whistling going passed the graveyard hoping against hope that the possible is impossible in fact or that the probable is impossible and that the probable or the possible certainly will not happen.

I think he is taking a realistic approach to it. I think it is an approach which might be tinged with some pessimism but, Sir, a pessimistic approach at this stage in the proceedings of the province

might be well-founded and well-based because the Government of Newfoundland in conjunction with the Government of Canada should be prepared well beforehand for an eventuality happening, namely the Americans pulling out of the Goose Bay Area, which we all hope will not in fact happen. We should be prepared for that, Sir. We should continue to negotiate with the Americans and the Government of Canada to keep them there as long as possible. We should also, if we get some indication from them that they are going to phase out slowly or quickly, we should make sure that what happens is a Stephenville situation rather than an Argentina situation although there are special reasons in Argentina for that peculiar situation.

I say that, Sir, because in Stephenville, as my honourable friend for Port au Port will state and confirm, in Stephenville we have one of the great success stories of Newfoundland where because of the facilities being made available to the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada, I believe we were able to attract a great deal of industry there, commercial enterprises and industrial enterprises, to more than take up the slack left by the abandonment of that area by the American Forces. In Argentina we have a situation where for peculiar reasons, reasons peculiar to that area, we have not been able to do that, largely because, I believe I am being correct when I say that it is impossible for the Americans or for the government or for anybody else to give any commercial entrepreneur or industrialist a long-term lease or a fee simple on the premises in the particular area, and it is going to be very difficult I think to attract an investment into such a situation.

So what we should do in hoping against hope is we should try to make certain that all eventualities are covered and that is why, that is the only reason why the honourable member for Labrador North extends the excellent, the good resolution of the honourable member

for Labrador West. His resolution takes into account as many eventualities as may occur. Certainly we should continue on a broad front. We should continue to press the Government of Canada to negotiate hard with the Government of the United States. We should continue to press our own government to negotiate with the Government in Canada to put their own military presence there and we should in this House continue to press our own government and the Government of Canada under DREE and other departments to come up with contingency plans to take care of a disaster situation if and when such a situation should occur.

Sir, I submit further, before I sit down, that if the American Government and I believe our friend, Mr. Straus will bear this out, if the American Government decide in their own best interest that they are no longer going to continue their operations in Goose Bay because there is a need, a greater priority, a greater need in other areas of the world well then, Sir, I would submit that without being unfair to them or unfriendly to them I would submit that our feeble pleas or even the pleas of the Government of Canada will have very little effect on their ultimate decision. Certainly they will have compassion and sympathy but, Sir, when it comes to a matter of dollars and cents, when you have a congress in a cut-back mood, when you have a president who does not wish to continue inflationary spirals and this sort of thing, when the economy of the United States is involved, when the military of the United States is involved, our efforts to continue the American operations there on a social basis or an economic basis, which is in our own best interest, will I think fall on if not deaf ears well then ears which do not hear those pleas too loudly.

Those are the reasons, Sir, and those are the only reasons why my honourable friend beside me and why I second his amendment. We want to continue on a broad front. We should continue along the lines submitted in the resolution; as suggested in the resolution, but we should also make



contingency plans and we should also make plans which may come into effect in the event that the Americans do not phase out of the base in Goose Bay and Happy Valley. A whole area of planning should take place for that region of our province and it should contain as many feasible economic, commercial activities as are humanly possible.

This government, Sir, has gone on record both in election campaigns and subsequently for long-term planning, looking ahead, not being caught with their pants down, not being caught in a situation where we have to solve a disaster and, of course, solving a disaster always takes more money, there is always a sense of panic and there is always a sense that we have to bail out. What we should be doing is some long-term planning in the area of Labrador North and other areas of course to take care of the eventuality which may occur and to take care of a normal growth rate in population and labour force. This is the only reason why my honourable friend has moved his amendment. We should make some long-term planning. We should look ahead. We should anticipate disaster without necessarily desiring disaster, obviously, but we should anticipate it and we should have several contingency plans ready, we should have several options at our disposal that can go into action well before the total impact of any economic disaster is felt.

That is why, Sir, I support wholeheartedly the amendment as I do the resolution because the resolution I believe is now contained as one of the items of the amendment. We should continue with our negotiations with both levels of Government and with the Government of the United States but we should also make our own plans. I support the amendment wholeheartedly, Sir.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to compliment the member for Labrador West for bringing forth a resolution of this nature, before this House, because this is a resolution directed to a

specific action to ask the House to take a specific course of action as a part of the overall plan of the present government of this province. Now much has been said, the honourable member for Labrador North in his amendment, which I am not in favour of

with respect to this particular resolution because of the fact that in effect it deletes reference to the urgency and it is an urgency of the Federal Government, the Government of Canada in negotiating with the United States of America and determining as a part of the long term plans, the overall plans of this entire area of determining the future of the military installation at Happy Valley. Planning we are doing. But Mr. Speaker, with respect of this particular great input into the economy of Happy Valley our hands are completely tied.

Negotiations with respect to the continuation of this facility are entirely within the jurisdiction of the Federal Government. We note from the statement made by the honourable Mr. Jamieson the other day, on behalf of the Parliament of Canada, the Government of Canada, that the lease which was due to expire this December had now been extended until June during which time further negotiations will take place.

It was, I might say, a matter of some concern, a grave concern to this Government, I know as well for the honourable member for Labrador North. When 1972 rolled along, we found that the resolution of the continued presence of the United States, Happy Valley-- Goose Bay Area had not been resolved. At that particular time, negotiations were being carried on it is true. We made representations and we will continue to make representations to determine what is going to be the future of that base and to get that question resolved as quickly as possible. Because Mr. Speaker, we cannot make long-term plans until we know the outcome. The amendment given by the honourable member for Labrador North, as good as it is, does not do the job which I suggest the honourable member for Labrador West intended. Because it deletes any reference to the military base and it makes a statement that we take steps to insure that the level of employment offered to the residents of Happy Valley - Goose Bay Area does not fall below its present level. It is obviously what we are going to strive to do. I might

say we have striven to do it in the past few months, I would think with much more of a determination than the previous administration had done so.

Then "be it further resolved that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador develop the necessary plans to provide additional employment which is necessary to insure the economic stability of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Area." That is of course admirable. That of course is necessary. That of course is what is being done by this present Government and it will continue to be done. But one of the items that has to be settled, I think the honourable member for Labrador North will agree, that one of the items that has to be settled first is the fate of this major installation in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Area.

It is not enough Mr. Speaker, just to make general words, just to change the resolution to make it general. We want this specifically directed to the authority concerned. We want this specifically directed to the Government of Canada to indicate to the Government of Canada that not just the people in Labrador North but that all Newfoundlanders are concerned, that only a year, a little bit more than thirteen months now remains, with the extension, within which to negotiate with the United States Government and determine what is going to happen. And after you determine what is going to happen, if there are any changes, how the economy of the area is going to adjust to these changes and so forth.

It is rather humorous in a way to hear the honourable member for White Bay South, "humorous" is not the word, really, but "puzzling" I think would be a better description, to hear the honourable member for White Bay South say that "the time to strike is when disaster looms" Mr. Speaker, disaster loomed for this military facility some three years ago. It just has not been known in the past few months that this lease was going to expire. We have known this for quite a period of time. Questions were posed in this House of Assembly before, with respect to, last year

and the year before, with respect to the fate of the Goose Bay facility, what steps the Government were taking, the then government were taking with respect of same. We were told in general terms that measures were being taken, that it was being looked into, but they were obviously ineffective when we got to the stage of January of this year with the awesome prospect of this lease expiring at the end of December and all of the residents of the Goose Bay - Happy Valley Area not knowing the fate of this major employer.

No, indeed, Mr. Speaker, we can agree with the honourable member for White Bay South that we do not want all our eggs in one basket or even in two or three. This Government, in conformity with its intention to draw up overall plans, long range plans, not only for Labrador but for all over the Province, over four year basis, is going to strive to do it. I compliment the member for Labrador West because this is one of the first and most decisive moves that must be taken in the area of Labrador South, with respect to the long range planning.

We have a right to know what the Government of Canada is doing on our behalf. We have a right to know and the residents of the area have a right to know what the future of the Base is and this resolution will indicate to the people in the Federal Government or representatives in the Federal Government that this Province when it went into Confederation in 1949 and

MR. MARSHALL: gave over certain rights to the federal government, and allocated certain rights to the federal government did not then embrace another kind of colonialism but requires the federal government to act and act directly and energetically on our behalf and this government and I am sure the honourable member for Labrador West and all members in this House will want nothing else. For this reason, for reason of bringing to the attention this serious problem in Happy Valley, by reason of the necessity of determining the outcome of this base, what the future of this base is and for the very reason, in making the plans which the member for Labrador North so admirably desires and wishes, for these reasons we have to vote I would say, Mr. Speaker, for the specific resolution so admirably drafted by and presented by the member for Labrador West. Thank you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the resolution so ably put by my honourable colleague from Labrador North. But, Mr. Speaker, I do I think agree with the original resolution in principle. I really believe, Mr. Speaker, that when the honourable member for Labrador West said that he was not trying to play politics with the situation in Goose Bay, I believe that the honourable member was genuinely sincere, Sir. Maybe a little bit naive, but I think he was sincere.

In the debate this afternoon, which I followed very, very carefully, I was rather pleased that politics did not enter into the debate until we heard from the honourable member for St. John's East. The honourable member could not resist, Mr. Speaker, the temptation to make a partisan political speech on this serious situation that we have today in Goose Bay.

Mr. Speaker, how can the honourable member who just spoke in this House, how can he justify voting against this amendment, when we have heard the new government talk so much about long-range planning? So the honourable the Premier the other day set up a committee, a planning committee of members of the inner cabinet, to recommend a long

MR. NEARY: range plan to the government, through the decade ahead, I think he stated in his remarks.

So, Mr. Speaker, how can the member who just took his seat vote against this resolution, when all the honourable member for Labrador North is trying to accomplish is to get a fact-finding authority or a task force of some kind establishment, maybe along the same lines as the task force in the Argentinia Area, to try to establish a long-range plan for the Goose Bay Area.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, I think the honourable member for Labrador West was sincere when he said that he did not want to bring politics into this. But it strikes me, Mr. Speaker, as being rather strange that the honourable member did not have the courtesy to approach the member for Labrador North, who was more familiar with the situation in Goose Bay than any other member of this House. Apparently, Mr. Speaker, the honourable member did not approach the cabinet on this matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did.

Mr. Neary.

We hear the hon. member for St. John's South standing in his place in this honourable House and telling us that we are not getting our share of the defence dollar, which is probably true. If the honourable member had approached the cabinet, then I am sure that the hon. member for St. John's South would have stood in his place in this honourable House and take a more positive approach and he would have outlined a plan whereby the government would approach Ottawa and persuade Ottawa that for strategic reasons, for defense purposes, that they should take over this installation at Goose Bay.

Mr. Speaker, what I am trying to say is that neither the Government of the United States nor the Government of Canada are patriotic enough just to go into Goose Bay to create employment. They have to be there for a specific reason. My honourable friend knows what that reason is. I would have appreciated his remarks a little more, Mr. Speaker, if he had stated specifically what it is we were going to ask Ottawa to do, not just go up and say, (any province could probably make the same claim Mr. Speaker) "why are you not spending more of your defence dollar in Nova Scotia? Why are you not spending more of your defence dollar in Newfoundland? Why are you not spending more of your defence dollar in British Columbia?" They would probably give the honourable member a good reason why they are not spending more of the defence dollar in any of these provinces or any of the ten provinces for that matter. We have to sell Ottawa on the idea of spending more of the defence dollar in the Goose Bay area. I do not know what the honourable member had in mind. Perhaps he could enlighten his colleagues. Then they could go off to Ottawa and make a good case. I hope they can. I have grave doubts, Mr. Speaker, whether they can or cannot. I would say that the honourable member probably made these remarks with tongue in cheek. I will tell you another thing which surprises me greatly, Mr. Speaker, and I really have



Mr. Neary

to bring this up and I had no intention of bringing partisan politics into this situation at Goose Bay - We went through this situation on Bell Island and all throughout the Bell Island crisis I tried to keep the situation above politics. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this situation at Goose Bay will be kept above politics. I remember several weeks ago, Sir, and this struck me as being rather strange, several weeks ago the honourable Premier of this Province stated publicly that he was asked by the Town Council in Goose Bay to stay out of the negotiations between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States on the renewal of the lease in Goose Bay.

I met Mayor Brett of Happy Valley one day at the Holiday Inn, Mr. Speaker, and I said to Mayor Brett: (I think it was the next day the hon. Premier made that statement) "Is this true?" I said, "it cannot be true. When we were in power, when Fort Pepperrell closed down, when the Americans pulled out of Stephenville, when they scaled down the operation at Argentia, when DOSCO pulled out of Bell Island, when all these things happened, when these tragedies, when these disasters took place in Newfoundland, we were under continuous pressure, continuous attack from the Tory Opposition at that time to do something. "Why do we not do something?" They never did tell us what to do. Why do you not go out and do something. We tried to do the best we could.

1820

MR. NEARY: I said, "Mayor Brett, do you mean to tell me that the Town Council in Happy Valley has asked this government, this new government to stay out of the negotiations between the Government of Canada and the Government of the United States in this matter?" He said, "No, that is not true." He said, "I am going to the honourable Premier's office tomorrow morning and I am going to demand," he said, "that he apologize to the people in Happy Valley for making that statement because it is just the opposite," Mr. Speaker, he said, "We have asked the government to interfere in these negotiations and see what the future of the United States Airforce Base at Goose Bay wants."

I did not hear any retraction of the statement, Mr. Speaker, so I can only assume that either Mayor Brett did not get to see the honourable the Premier or maybe the honourable Premier when he went to Ottawa with a battery of ministers did discuss this matter with the Prime Minister of Canada. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that he did during the time that they had lunch together. Maybe the honourable Premier can stand in his place in this House this afternoon and speak on the resolution, speak on the amendment, if he wants too or he can speak on both and tell us if there was any discussion about Goose Bay when he and ten or twelve ministers went off to Ottawa there a couple of weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I do not want to prolong the debate but I do want to say this, I do appreciate the honourable member bringing this resolution into the House. As I say, I thought it was rather strange that he did not consult with the only man in the House that really knows about the situation in Goose Bay. That strikes me as rather strange, Sir. At least he could have done him the honour and the courtesy of taking the honourable member for Labrador North to dinner or maybe a drink. Say, look, I am going to introduce a resolution into

MR. NEARY: the House of Assembly about this serious situation at Goose Bay. No, Sir, he did not do that. No, Mr. Speaker, no politics in this.

I did start off by saying that I thought the honourable member was sincere and I really do. I think he is trying to do the best he can in this honourable House. Probably a little bit naive, Mr. Speaker, because the honourable member knows full well and so does the honourable member for St. John's South that the resolution is dealing with a matter over which we have no control.

Mr. Speaker, like so many other decisions that have had such a drastic effect on Newfoundland that have left hundreds and thousands of our people economically marooned, these are decisions that are taken outside of the boundaries of Canada. It is well and good, Sir to try and put a little pressure on the Government of the United States and say, "Well you know, during the war years we gave you these bases in return for a few obsolete destroyers. You have been here now, you have been good for the economy."

But, Sir, the people of the United States, the Government of the United States are not going to keep a base in Goose Bay just to create employment. They are not that patriotic no more than the Government of Canada will go down and operate a base in the United States just to create employment.

But nevertheless, Sir, what do we have to lose? Nothing. Nothing to lose, Sir. This is what makes the amendment so important. The amendment is probably more important than the resolution itself. Because the resolution is just a lot of words. A lot of words, Sir. The amendment asks

Mr. Neary.

that the Government of this Province take a good hard look at the Goose Bay area, try to determine what the long-range future of the area might be. Maybe it has no future, Mr. Speaker. Maybe it has no future, but I think it does. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the linerboard operation down there will be good for that area. I think, Mr. Speaker, that eventually the Lower Churchill will be developed. If the Lower Churchill development goes ahead that will be good for the Goose Bay area. I think what needs to be done now, Mr. Speaker, is that the Government of this Province immediately implement a fact-finding authority or a task force, set up a task force and take a look at the overall picture down there. Maybe the base will play a role in the future of the Goose Bay area. It may be a minor role. It may be a major role. At this moment nobody knows. At least there is a breathing spell Mr. Speaker. We have a year ahead of us. We know that the base is secure for a year. So, therefore, there is no need for panic. Now is the time, Mr. Speaker, for the government to show their interest in long-range planning. I say now is the time, not to wait until the disaster hits. I hope that it does not. I think the government should act now and do something. They have ample precedence, Mr. Speaker. They have it out in Stephenville, Mr. Speaker, the Harmon Corporation. They have it in Argentia, the task force that was set up between the Government of the Province at the time and the Government of Canada. They have ample precedence, Sir, in Stephenville. I hope that the Government of this Province will take swift action, not delay another day to set up the machinery whereby the overall future of the Goose Bay - Happy Valley Area can be studied and recommendations made to the government and ultimately brought into the House of Assembly at as early a date as possible.

If the hon. member for Labrador West accomplished nothing else during this sitting of the House, Sir, he has given us the opportunity

Mr. Neary

to see now just how the government are going to go about long-term planning. I think they should use the Goose Bay-Happy Valley Area as a pilot project. I hope, Sir, that they will not let partisan politics enter into this situation at all and that they will start cracking immediately. If the hon. Premier will rush out of the House this afternoon and turn this matter over to the planning committee that he set up the other day and let them go to work and see just what the long-range future of the area will be, Sir.

MR. HARVEY: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to give my congratulations to the hon. member for Labrador West for bringing in this resolution and my colleagues and the hon. member for Labrador North for bringing in an amendment. I would also like to pass along my congratulations and thank you's to the Consulate General, Mr. Richard Strauss, for his contribution to the hon. member for Labrador West in preparing the background for the presentation of his resolution.

I would like to add, Mr. Speaker

1824

that I do not think the people of Happy Valley and Goose Bay are concerned with whose fault it was when danger loomed or disaster loomed, whether it is looming or whether it is on top of them, what government was to blame, whether it was the past government or this government. I would say that they are more concerned with the government that they have in office today getting something done and getting something done now. Forget this blaming the past government and start doing something on their own.

I would certainly agree also with the views expressed by the rest of the hon. members of this House that the United States Government have more on their mind than probably the economic future of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Area. They have right now a possible changeover very soon in Presidents, the war in Viet-Nam, the riots, their own economic future, they have to think of that. I agree with the other hon. members that they are not going to just keep the Goose Bay Base open for the sake of hiring on seven hundred and twenty-odd Canadian workers. Therefore, I have to congratulate the member for Labrador North for bringing this resolution to keep our options open and not just negotiate with the U.S. Government.

I sympathize with the people of Goose Bay and Happy Valley. I understand the hardships they must be going through not knowing whether when they get up in the morning they will find that their jobs have disappeared. We saw that happen on Bell Island, at Pepperrell, at Stephenville, in the District of the hon. member for Green Bay when the mines closed up there, the Whalesback in Green Bay. I sympathize with the people in Goose Bay. They must have this on their minds continually, whether the base is going to be open, whether somebody is going to move in, what the options are, whether the U.S. Government are just going to say; "Well, to --- with it."

I do not think that politics should come into it. It was mentioned by the hon. member for Labrador West that possibly this

might be. The extension to the base might be brought in for political reasons. I cannot see who would benefit by such a move. Mr. Ambrose Peddle, the P.C. member in Ottawa, represents the area. I would no doubt think that he would benefit most from a move like that if it is to be political. I doubt it very much and I go along with my colleague from Labrador North in expressing that it was not a political move.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HARVEY: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HARVEY: Yes, right it may have, but as I say I do not know who would benefit the most from a political move like that.

I suppose we could mention also, it does not really concern my area that much, Mr. Speaker, but by virtue of my representing a Labrador District I have to speak on it. I know the concern that my hon. colleague from Labrador North has for the area and nevertheless I share that concern too. Some of the men from my area although not involved on a full time basis at the base, they do find temporary occupation there in the winter time. The people in my area fish for a living along the coast of Labrador for very small returns. They indeed supplement their income occasionally by going to Goose Bay and securing work on the base in wintertime. I would hate to see this cut out as well. Of course it is overshadowed by the seven hundred and fifty workers that are on the base right now full-time workers, indeed the whole population of Goose Bay - Happy Valley.

I suppose I could mention too the concern for the Ethnic population in the Happy Valley-Goose Bay Area. I would suppose they would have considerable hardships in adjusting to another location away from the North and out of their own environment in case the base would close down. I understand there are a lot of the Ethnic population working in and around Goose Bay and who live there who had moved from the North. An annual payroll of \$7. million in a community of 7,000 people is, as the honourable member for St. John's West would say, "not savoury," but I would hate to see that disappear especially when it is the only economic base they have, the only industry they have, if you want to call it an industry, in the community other than the Labrador Linerboard and if that goes, which I certainly hope it does, and the base is kept open, which I certainly hope it is, also, that should even boost their economy more. But the concern now is that something be done, I suppose immediately on keeping that base open. I agree with my colleagues from the opposite side and I also agree with my colleagues on this side that indeed something should be done immediately and if that is negotiating with the US Government then by all means negotiate with the US Government. If it means right now to negotiate with the Canadian Armed Forces, as my friend and colleague amended, then by all means do that. All I am saying is that whatever steps need to be taken to keep that base open immediately or keep it open right now or forever or whatever the time limit is on it, then let negotiations start and start immediately.

If I were in Goose Bay or Happy Valley Area right now today. Mr. Speaker, I would be very concerned about the future of the area. Like my honourable colleague from Labrador North has stated many young people have moved in there and not only working around the



base area but now that the old Javelin operation, now called the Labrador Linerboard Mill, is in operation a lot of people have moved in there, young couples set up housekeeping and so on and so forth. It would be an awful crash to them to have to start all over again.

I know I cannot really express the urgency of the matter as well as my colleague from Labrador North because he represents that area and I certainly sympathize with the people there and like I said before I know what they must be going through. So I have to support, Mr. Speaker, the resolution and the amendment also. If the amendment has to go through to get something done immediately or if that is the case then I support the amendment but I think it is a very good resolution and I congratulate again the honourable member for Labrador West for bringing it to the House of Assembly.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I realize the time is getting short

but still I feel, as Minister of Labrador Affairs, being very closely connected, not as closely of course with the honourable member who has to live with this problem day by day, but very close indeed, the worries expressed by the people in the Goose Bay Happy Valley area of the phase out or the fearful thought of the phase out of the base and the stability and the employment that went with that.

I feel, Sir, that I must rise and speak in support of the resolution as submitted because I was not aware that there would be an amendment until some time this afternoon after listening to the honourable member for Labrador North. I have a copy of the amendment now. When I read the amendment the emphasis seem to be on trying to pressure, if that is the word, the United States Government to continue, if that were possible.

In the advent, Sir, that the U.S. Air Force must vacate Goose Bay, due to reasons affecting their own policies, foreign policies, I would very much like Sir, to speak on the second part of that resolution dealing with a presence here of Canadian Forces. I can go back Sir, six years in this honourable House, as I sat on the other side, I spoke of the same matter, our share of the Canadian defence dollar.

I remember now, Sir, I researched the spending of Canadian dollars for defence purposes, particularly referring to the Maritime or Atlantic Provinces. This was some six or seven years ago Sir, Newfoundland represented twenty-five per cent of the population of Atlantic Canada We were receiving four per cent in the form of defence dollars here in this Province, four per cent. I believe Nova Scotia was receiving the greatest portion of that dollar. Also, Prince Edward Island received a fair portion due to their air forces bases on the Island.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this base at Goose Bay has to be one of the most strategic in North America today. My associations, Sir, with the people in Goose Bay goes back some twenty years when I was visiting that base twice a year, made friends at the time with a great

many people who not only regard Goose Bay today as a place to work but as their home, where they brought up their families. They are no longer transient workers, Sir. They are Labradorians in the sense that they have been residing in Goose Bay for the last fifteen, twenty years.

1830

MR. MURPHY:

Mr. Speaker, I am all for this resolution because if we, as Newfoundlanders and we as elected representatives of the people of this province, do not show our concern, Sir, particularly to the federal government, then who do we expect to fight for our rights: Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick? That is why, Mr. Speaker, I am so happy to see this resolution brought before this House and the eloquent way in which it was introduced by the honourable member for Labrador West and very sincere and effective way that it was seconded by the hon. member for Labrador West and very sincere and effective way that it was seconded by the hon. member for Labrador North. He and I have had discussions during the past several months. I have only been in this portfolio for about four and a half months, Sir. I visited that area about five times in that period of time. As I say I renewed many old acquaintances and met many people whom I did not know before. The great concern is there, Sir, for the phasing out of this base. Millions upon millions, upon millions of dollars worth of facilities are there, Sir. I believe it could be carried on if we were shown some consideration by the Canadian Forces.

We have the amendment, Sir, and after reading the resolution our intent, what we had planned to do, what we had hoped to do, what we had hoped this House would do and then read this amendment, Sir - as far as I can see it is entirely something different. It could be a resolution in itself beginning with the fact that "BE IT RESOLVED this government ensure the level of employment." This is entirely a new resolution as I see it. I do not know how the legal and great minds look at it, Sir. It does not refer at all to representations to be made to the parties concerned and that these parties are the Armed Forces. I am sure with all the slurring remarks passed by an honourable member on the other side that this government, this Premier, our members have not in any way forgotten the Goose Bay, Happy Valley Area as the rest. Planning has been continuing, Sir. I have had as many consultations with Mayor Brett and all the council down there. They are very much concerned.

As a matter of fact, this government two months ago sent in a member of the Justice Department with a highly experienced life underwriter, Sir, to hold meetings with the civilian group on the base to advise them as to their rights under the pension plan. This is an on-going thing, Sir. There is not a week passes but I do not receive some representation from this group with reference to their rights there. I feel, Mr. Speaker, that as far as this government are concerned, we brought this resolution forward. I think this amendment is just another means, an afterthought if you like or a forethought by the opposition, another (we are not talking on fisheries) red herring to draw the emphasis away from the resolution. I think, Sir, I feel sure that the government are as much

concerned with the long-range policies of Goose Bay - Happy Valley of what will happen eventually to this area, Sir, after we have explored the logical and the only logical way to treat such a gigantic air base, Sir, is by conferring and having an on-going relationship with the U.S.A.F. and also with the Federal Government and with the Canadian Forces.

This is one year now, we are given this year, we did an awful lot of things in a few short weeks with this country. We can do an awful lot with this base in one year.

I suppose the Leader of the Opposition has the greatest record of achievement. One session of the House and he lost eleven, twelve, thirteen members was it? Imagine if we had to give him a week. I see it is now six o'clock, Sir.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Point of Order if you will allow, Sir. Is the hon. member adjourning the debate so that he can speak again next day or is finished his remarks, in which case one of us would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. MURPHY: On a point of order, Sir, I did not get a chance to adjourn, I did not get time to speak another word, His Honour stood up and I had to sit down. When His Honour resumes the Chair on next Wednesday the speaker who is on the floor still carries on.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is what we want to know then.

MR. MURPHY: I must follow the rules as laid down by the Parliamentary System, not by the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 6:00 p.m. I do leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday at 3:00 p.m.