



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 16

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Monday

23 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

ooo

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, on a matter of privilege, if I might.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

I wish to inform the House of Assembly that I have notified the other members of the Liberal Caucus that I am resigning effective as of this moment and I have requested that Your Honour, the Speaker, be informed at the earliest possible time of the name of the interim Leader of the Opposition pending the Liberal Leadership Convention to be held the last week of May or the first week of June.

Because there have been mistaken comments in the media on the matter, I want to state that I have not resigned as Leader of the Liberal Party and do not intend to do so until the grass roots of the Party have assembled once again in Convention.

I have announced my intention to run again as a candidate for the Liberal Leadership and my decision to resign as Leader of the Opposition is based upon a desire to avoid having any unfair advantage over any potential candidates.

All members of the House will I know be looking forward to the results of the decision to be

taken soon by the grass roots of the Liberal Party. Let me say simply that I want to acknowledge with thanks the cooperation I have received in the past from all Honourable Members of This House in performing my duties as Leader of the Opposition and I look forward to being able soon to resume the responsibilities of that office.

MR. MORGAN:

He has his red shoes on.

MR. MATTHEWS:

You have the your shoes on, boy. You have the old shoes on.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, I have suitable colour footwear, Mr. Speaker, and I have copies of this for the assistance of Hansard and the media.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of this side of the House we would like to thank the hon. the former Leader of the Opposition for bringing this matter to our attention. We were completely in the dark about it for the last week and did not know what was going to happen, but we now all know and the Leader of the Party and now former Leader of the Opposition has made that formal here in the House, which I think is only appropriate to do. I want to thank him for his words of thanks on the cooperation that he has received over the past number of months while serving as Leader of the Opposition, and we look forward to a very interesting political time in the history of the Liberal party over the next

couple of months.

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:
To that matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker, I want to inform this House that it is the intention of the members of the official Opposition to choose an interim successor to my friend and colleague from Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Et tu Brute.

MR. BAIRD:
Before the cock crows twice, thou wilt deny me thrice.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, if we could get some order here.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. DECKER:
Mr. Speaker, we expect to do so within the next day or so, as soon as we convene a full caucus, and the House will be informed accordingly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would like at this time to welcome to the gallery Mayor Clyde Belbin of Glenburnie in Bonne Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, I believe all parties have met today with representatives of the Women's Lobby, women representing various groups and in some cases present in their own capacity, who have raised a number of issues. I would like to ask first the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge) on one of these points whether her department is prepared to consider proposing recommendations to the Government of Canada which would provide for a minimum sentence with respect to convictions for the sexual assault of children?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I informed the Women's Lobby, when they addressed this question to me at the meeting with the caucus on this side of the House this morning, that the Crown Attorneys in my department have already recommended to their counterparts with the Federal Justice Department that certain changes be made in the Criminal Code of Canada related to sentencing of people convicted of sexually

assaulting children.

One particular recommendation relates to removing or lessening constraints now on probation periods. Now a probation period may be given only when a term of imprisonment is for two years or less and the probation period may be only up to three years. It has been recommended that probation periods be possible regardless of the length of the term of imprisonment, and that probation periods be possible for very lengthy periods of time since it is known that treatment for pedophiles must be extended for lengthy terms, perhaps for a whole lifetime in some cases.

As to recommendations for minimum sentences, our people are now looking at formulating recommendations that will have to do with provisions for convictions of people who are in a position of trust relative to child victims and distinguishing accused people who were in a position of trust relative to the child victim from other convicted people, and perhaps looking at imposing a minimum for a person in a position of trust convicted, and looking at minimum sentences for any conviction but it has to be remembered, at least with the present definition of sexual assault, that there is a great range of types of incidents and there has to be a balance, and it has been considered important in the criminal justice system of Canada to give judges broad discretion in dealing with particular situations.

But the short answer to the question is, yes, Mr. Speaker, I and my department are looking at making recommendations, in some cases reiterating recommendations

made earlier, relating to sentencing of people convicted of child sexual assault.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:
Before the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) leaves his seat, Mr. Speaker, perhaps he might keep in mind the short version rather than the long one, since I would like to ask the Minister of Labour, on another women's issue, whether his department is prepared to recommend to Cabinet that domestics be put in the same category with respect to the minimum wage as other workers?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:
Mr. Speaker, at the present time the Labour Standards Board is having some hearings and they are going around the Province trying to determine what the majority of people want with respect to minimum wages and other matters in relation thereto. We will be looking at their recommendations on that matter as well as others when we get the report.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:
Regrettably, Mr. Speaker, that minister is more typical of the members opposite than the first

minister to speak, refusing to deal with the question directly, which was, 'Would the minister recommend?'

As a final supplementary, I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) whether he is prepared to recommend to Cabinet that government implement a system of licensed family child care units as well as recommending universal access to a federally funded day-care programme? Where does the minister stand with respect to the licensing of these smaller child care units which are going to be necessary for some time, until we get a more generously funded universal day-care system from the federal government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I think I should point out right at the very beginning that the Province is not, certainly at this point in time, in favour of universal day care. And even if we were I would suggest it is going to be a long, long time before this Province will be able to afford that type of day care unless there is a large influx of dollars from the federal government. I should point out to the hon. member that we have not exactly been asleep in the last few years, but we will be the first to acknowledge that we have not done as much in day care as we would to see, but I think we have done as much as we can do considering the fiscal capacity of the Province. We did, last year, bring in for the first time a new start-up allowance of \$1000 and we have made available a small grant for supplies to each day-care

centre. We have increased the number of spaces throughout the Province, again, not as much as we would like to see but we have increased the number of spaces. There was a new day-care centre or child care centre opened at the Cabot Institute just a little while ago, and we will soon be opening one here at the Confederation Building. We are conducting a feasibility study to see if it is feasible to open a similar centre at Goose Bay. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is generally known that we have been negotiating with the federal government. I have been at meetings with the federal government and other provincial ministers of Social Services, and the federal government is in the process of announcing some new initiatives for child care and it is hoped by all and sundry across Canada that this announcement will come in June. Until such time as we get that announcement to see exactly what they are prepared to do, then it is very difficult for us to make any kind of announcement in our shop. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, the new initiatives would have to include better cost sharing than we have now.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is a short one to the same minister. The minister asked for a proposal on family child care nearly a year ago. I understand this proposal for a pilot project has been in the minister's hands since May of 1986. I would like to ask the minister why has he not responded to the committee with respect to this proposal, this pilot project for family child care, in light of

the fact that the minister himself sought that proposal?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

I guess, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of dollars and cents more than anything else. We agonize almost daily in the department as to what the priorities are going to be. There are lot of pilot projects that I would like to bring onstream, and this is one of them. Again, Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of priority, as to where to you find the dollars or where do you put the dollars that you have. I guess the bottom line is dollars and cents.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Surely, if the minister and his Cabinet can find more money to renovate the Premier's office in a whole year than they spend on child care, you can find the dollars for the children of this Province.

I would like to ask the minister, why has the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador not fallen in line with eight other provinces with respect to licensing family day care systems within the family unit, that is one care giver to four children, that ratio? Why are they not licensed as they are in eight other provinces in Canada?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social

Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, this Province does not really take a back seat to any other province in Canada in the field of social welfare. The hon. member will recall a headline last year, in I am not sure what paper or what magazine, which indicated that we were way out in front with programmes in the field of mental retardation, and we are, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact we had people coming from all over Canada. This is a fact. We do have people coming down here from New Brunswick and from Nova Scotia - we might have even had people coming here from Ontario - to look at some of the programmes that we have.

I get back to what I said to the hon. member's first question. I guess it is a matter of priority. I would like to have more dollars for the widows of this Province. I would like to have more dollars for paraplegics in this Province, and on and on it goes. I would like to have more dollars for all of these people out there who have to depend on the department. But, unfortunately, there is no more, and we have to try to put some priorities on what we have.

MR. FUREY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I understand what the minister is saying. I commend him in those other fields that he raised. But we must come back to child care. I do not think he really addressed my question, Mr. Speaker. Why has

this particular administration, this particular government, not addressed the problem of licensing family child care centers in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, I guess the answer is the same. I could add to that that we have known for some time that the federal government was prepared to take some new initiatives in child care. We have been more or less waiting to see exactly what the new initiatives might be, whether it will be new dollars, whether it will be a better cost-sharing formula, or whatever.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I say to the Minister of Social Services that is part of their problem, to know the problem and still do nothing about it. Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Justice. The minister will be aware that the nightmare faced by so many in this Province and across Canada triggered by the difficulties in enforcing maintenance orders is one that we ought to address and soon. The minister will also be aware that the federal government has committed funding towards the cost of information exchange, including the cost of technology. And the matter, of course, cannot be really expedited, as she will know, until the provincial decisions are taken. I ask here,

therefore, Mr. Speaker, when can we expect a decision from the government on this important issue of funding for information exchange related to the enforcement of maintenance orders so this urgent matter can go forward?

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, this whole area of enforcing court orders for the payment of child support and maintenance for separated or divorce spouses, almost always women, has been a priority of this administration. We have been working very actively and will very shortly be in a position to begin development of a system within our Province, within Newfoundland and Labrador, for automatic enforcement of orders, a programme whereby the burden of enforcing court orders and collecting money will be shifted away from the beneficiaries of court orders, almost always women, for themselves and their dependent children, and some that burden will be assumed by the government, by the court staff and essentially by the state.

Mr. Speaker, the priority of this administration is helping people within our own Province who now are not enforcing their court orders and collecting money to which they are entitled. And hand in hand with that effort will be facilitating enforcement of orders directed to people who have moved to other jurisdictions. So our Province's efforts will dovetail with efforts of other provinces in the country and will benefit from

some recent initiatives of the federal government.

MR. SIMMONS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I do thank the minister for her first answer. She would be aware also, as I implied in my question, that it is a matter of dollars and cents, it is a matter of shared funding, and it is a matter of getting the undertaking of several governments. We have got the federal government undertaking and some of the provincial government undertaking, and I wonder would she address herself specifically to that issue? And, specifically, can she give those most directly concerned some date, not in terms of Wednesday, the So-and-So of May, but rather can she say it is going to be a couple of weeks, a couple of months? Can she hold out today some hope to those people who are victimized by the lack of action on this matter?

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I can say to this hon. House and to the people directly affected that their will be some relief. There have been some improvements through the Unified Family Court for people in the St. John's area, and there will be improvements for people throughout our Province over the next year or so. We have a commitment from the federal

government now for cost sharing of the start-up of a Newfoundland and Labrador Automatic Maintenance Orders Enforcement programme.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Social Services. I would like to ask the minister what is the policy of his department as far as the hardships endured by people at this time of the year, who are on low unemployment payments or on social services in paying the high electricity bills that they are forced to pay over the last two or three months of hard weather?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately I do not have the figures, but this government has paid out millions of dollars over the last, I say, two years, since I have been back here now, to pay people's light bills, I guess to put it simply. Last year we simply paid the light bill when the cut-off notice was received, but we found, of course, that people were using the system, and I am saying this because I know this is what the hon. member is getting at, I think we have found that people were using the system and ended up not paying the light bills because they knew that Social Services was going to come through and pay them anyway. The thing started to snowball.

MR. EFFORD:

What are you doing?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BRETT:
I am telling you if you would listen.

So what we are doing now is we are still continuing to pay light bills when people receive cut-off notices; the only thing is if it happens more than once we will pay the light bills directly to the utility company so that people will not misuse the system. Meanwhile, we set up an overpayment so that any bills that we pay can be collected over a period of time.

MR. EFFORD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
I have some figures for the minister, although, unfortunately, every time you ask him questions he cannot provide any figure. I have a figure that I would like to ask the minister to explain. Would the minister explain why a single parent with two children receiving income of \$432 for a month, with a light bill of \$275, went to receive some help once this Winter from the Department of Social Services and was refused and nobody in that department could tell her what the policy was or why she was turned down?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. BRETT:
Mr. Speaker, I said what the

policy was it was very clear, and anybody in the House who had their ears opened knows what the policy is. Now the hon. member is asking me to comment on an individual case. Let me tell this House that at on any given day out of the 365, there are in excess of 20,000 people in this Province on short-term social assistance. Now if the hon. member expects me to be able to answer a question on any one of these 20,000-plus then I am sorry but he will have to remain disappointed. Because it is physically impossible for me to know every single case of the 20,000-odd cases that are on. I do not know why the case was refused. Social Assistance is based on need, there is a needs test taken. I do not know the history of that case. Obviously the hon. member does, and he is famous for that. He gets up and he got all his facts written down on paper and he thinks it is real funny because he knows and I do not.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member would tell me the case that he is talking about, then I will go and check the facts. Then I will have them as well as he does. But as long as he keeps up this little game, whereby he goes and he gets all the information on one case out of 20,000-odd and comes in and expect me to answer it, then I cannot, Mr. Speaker. There is no way I can answer it.

MR. EFFORD:
What a shame, 'Charlie'.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). In view of a recent press report, if not press reports, which quoted the minister as saying that the House of Assembly should be the first to know the date of the budget, I wonder if the minister can today indicate to the House when he does intend to bring down the budget?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to the embryo Leader of the Opposition, the budget will be brought down in the very near future, either towards the end of the current month or in the early days of the following month. In other words, within this fiscal year or in the early days of April.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why is it the minister is being evasive on naming the date. We are very close to the end of the month, and it seems that the minister should be able to name the date. Is it because again, according to recent press reports, the Province is in such a abysmal financial condition that the minister is pleading and begging with his federal counterparts to bail him out, to try and get some money before he brings the budget down? Is that the truth?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. member knows that three provinces have now brought down their budgets, Manitoba, Alberta, and B.C. In each case they had to present very, very difficult budgets. The hon. member may also know that there are a number of provinces which are going to put off their budgets for some considerable time. For instance, Ontario, I understand, is not going to bring it down until May or June. Saskatchewan will be quite late, and so on and so forth. The reason for all this is that this is a very difficult time, not only for this Province but for all provinces and, indeed, for the whole country and the Canadian economy. So it is not an easy task to put together the best possible budget. We are working very diligently on it. We have done a lot of work. We are getting near the time when we will be able to give a precise date. But I can assure the hon. member that at the very earliest time we can put the whole thing together - and it will be very soon - we will let him and his other colleagues know.

MR. LUSH:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, is this delay now giving credence to the statement by the Premier that the Province is, indeed, on the verge of bankruptcy and that the minister is delaying because he is trying to beg and plead and get more

money from the federal government?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, obviously I cannot answer that question in detail or I will be starting on the budget speech. I will just say again, the point is it is a time when it is not easy - and no province finds it easy, indeed the federal government does not find it easy - to put together a budget. We are doing extremely well in putting together our budget. In terms of going to Ottawa, every province worth its salt goes to Ottawa to plead its case immediately before a budget, not only this year but every year. Certainly we would be remiss and irresponsible if we did not go to Ottawa to make them fully aware of the situation here. As I point out, the other Finance Ministers and Treasurers throughout Canada do it all the time.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle). I guess he is around here somewhere, I saw him a minute ago, so I will give him a second to get back.

Mr. Speaker, the minister made a statement that the capital funding requests from communities in Newfoundland had increased by \$30 million this year, from \$180 million to \$210 million. Now is this an indication that the

capital works programme put forward by his government is totally inadequate to meet the requirements of Newfoundland communities for water, sewer and roads upgrading?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is. Each year over the last four or five years we have had a steady increase in requests for capital projects from the various councils all across Newfoundland. Since 1979, Mr. Speaker, we have demonstrated more than once our commitment to municipalities in that over \$250 million has been provided in water and sewer services to communities.

MR. MORGAN:

How much?

MR. DOYLE:

\$250 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE:

That is \$250 million, Mr. Speaker, since 1979, in water and sewer services alone, and an additional \$80 million has been spent upgrading 500 kilometers of municipal road in the Province. Also it should be noted that in 1979 the operating grants to municipalities were in the neighbourhood of \$26 million, and since then they have gone to \$80 million, which is an increase of 180 per cent over that seven or eight year period.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think we have demonstrated our commitment to councils and we will continue to

do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

It is fine to hear the minister say that they have given \$330 million since 1979, but when there are \$210 million in requests a year, there does not seem to be much progress to me. However, the supplementary is that the minister announced that he kept the commitment he made at the Federation of Mayors and Municipalities Convention last year by appointing a Capital Projects Board. Now will the recommendations of this new Capital Projects Board be made public, or are they going to be torn to shreds by the political patronage of his colleagues and then thrown in the garbage?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I heard the hon. gentleman make a statement a couple of weeks ago asking me to put in place the Capital Projects Board which we put in place about three months ago, so he should be aware of the fact that we do have it in place. And the Capital Projects Board has been meeting over the last couple of months, they have made recommendations on \$210 million worth of projects to the minister, who will in turn be taking that to Cabinet within the next couple of weeks so that we

can keep our commitment of having the capital programme announced before March 31. As always, Mr. Speaker, that will be done in the light of available funding as to what projects will be approved.

MR. GILBERT:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. GILBERT:

What I asked the minister was were the recommendations of this new capital projects going to be made public? He did not answer that. So is the minister saying that the recommendations of the new board are not final? Are we going to find that political pork barrelling is alive and well in the distribution of municipal funding again in Newfoundland this year?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DOYLE:

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe the hon. gentleman in his district has too much to complain about. He has five councils in his district and every single one of them has been provided with water and sewer by this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

No thanks to the member, no thanks to you.

MR. DOYLE:

But again, Mr. Speaker, insofar as the listing of the capital

projects is concerned that is a Cabinet document and the hon. gentleman does not have access to Cabinet documents.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Finance and it has to do with the request being made by the Nurses Union that time spent in training in hospitals, in their regular training programme, where they are working side by side with other nurses, be creditable for purposes of pension calculations. I am sure the minister is aware of the problem. Today I would like to ask him what progress is being made in that direction or is there any intention on the part of this government to include that kind of training service for pension purposes?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, many members on this side of the House have been also approached by the Nurses' Union and other people in the nursing profession and they themselves have brought this to my attention. I also received representation from the same people and they have discussed it amongst themselves and so on and so forth, so it is an issue that is very alive on this side of the House. We have to look at it in the context of our total pension responsibilities. As hon. members will remember, I am sure, we have had a new actuarial study done on

our pension responsibilities. It was a very detailed and complex document and it has been under study by a group of officials in discussion with people in public service unions, and so on and so forth, for the last number of weeks. The question that the hon. member asked, as well as many other questions relating to our public service pension and similar types of pension schemes for which the government is responsible, will shortly be addressed in the context of that whole study. I have indicated in writing to the Nurses' Union, and so on, that as soon as possible we will get back to them as a result of that study.

MR. FENWICK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
My supplementary to the Minister of Finance has to do with the ever-expanding number of individuals in the public service who are working on a part-time basis as well, which is one of the questions the Nurses' Union wishes to have an answer to as well. Could the minister indicate to us whether any method is being worked out to bring part-time employees, casual employees, or any of the other classification of less than full-time employees, within the ambit of The Public Service Pension Act?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, this question was also brought up when we met with the women's group this morning and the answer given to them was, yes,

indeed, that is part of the study that I have already mentioned.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

I would like, at this stage, to welcome a former member of Parliament for Bonavista - Trinity Conception, Mr. David Rooney.

I would also like to mention Mr. Calvin Brophy, the Mayor of Jackson's Arm.

And I would like to welcome Myra Kearns, executive member of the Corner Brook Status of Women Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Presenting Reports by
Standing and Special Committees

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, as required by the Financial Administration Act, I would like to table copies of Orders in Council related to precommitment of funds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
What?

MR. SIMMS:
Routine stuff.

Petitions

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from 316 individuals from the Bay St. George area. The petition, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the very severe question that has been raised over the last couple of weeks with regard to the level of sentencing for individuals who have been charged and, indeed, found guilty of sexual offences, especially against youngsters. Mr. Speaker, I am going to give this petition immediately to the clerk because there are a few irregularities with it, and I would like for you to have a look at it before you rule it in order. I would like to say that I believe these are sincere people in terms of the fears and concerns they have. My statements in the House today are to do with the Department of Social Service and other departments of this government which do have a responsibility in this area, but I will await your ruling on whether or not the petition is admissible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Perhaps in an attempt to helpful, it may be very difficult for Your Honour to decide on the spur of the moment whether a matter is in order or not and I do not think there will be any great disservice done to anybody if the Speaker wishes to take it under advisement and rule on it tomorrow, but that is merely a suggestion.

MR. SIMMS:
That is fine. That is acceptable. That is reasonable.

MR. SPEAKER:

This is signed by a large number of petitioners. I will read it. 'We, the undersigned, would like to express our disapproval at the Newfoundland Supreme Court's reduction of the five year sentence imposed on Dr. Steven Collins. The sentence does not reflect the seriousness of the crime perpetrated against the victims. We further believe that treatment without due punishment is unacceptable.'

This is not in order, as it is not addressed to the House of Assembly.

MR. BARRY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

I am not sure, but I received a call from one of the members of the group that met with us this morning saying there was a petition on the way but that it had gone astray in the process of delivery and I understood it would be coming tomorrow. I am not sure if it is the same one or not, but I, with respect, believe that we should not dwell upon technicalities with respect to the actual framing of the petition. It was delivered to a member of this House of Assembly for presentation -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have already ruled on that particular petition. Is that what the hon. member is referring to now?

MR. BARRY:

No. What I was going to suggest, Your Honour, was, if all parties

agree, that we treat the subject matter of the petition as though it were properly framed and that we have a few moments as we would in the case of a properly drafted petition to deal with the subject matter. There is an issue here contained in that petition, whether framed properly or not, which is worthy of comment and worthy of some discussion, and it would be regrettable if the issue was not discussed because of the technical wording of the document.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I appreciate what the member for Mount Scio is saying but, by the same token, there are rules and regulations that govern this House. I guess every issue that comes up in the form of a petition which is ruled irregular by the Speaker is just as important - all the petitions that come here - and if we do it for one issue then, obviously, we will have set a precedent to do it for others. I am sure it is possible for the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) to go back to the people who framed this petition and have it framed properly and then present it to the House and have the petition dealt with in the normal fashion. That is not to say we are not interested in debating the issue or having it come forward in a petition manner, but I think we would be setting a dangerous precedent. Because any member of this House when they bring a petition here considers the issue that the petition addresses to be extremely important and I would

not like to see us suddenly divert from that just because there is this current, very big problem as it relates to sentencing, as it relates to child abuse and the like. So I would not go along with what the member for Mount Scio says, but try to keep the rules of the House in order. I am sure the group that have made this petition will very, very quickly, in the next day or two, frame it in a way which is acceptable to the House and we can all debate it at that time.

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, in response.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:
Your Honour, what the Premier says is correct for the normal course of events of operation in this House. We should abide by the rules and it is very important that we do.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

I must say the hon. member is out of order. He asked for leave and leave has not been granted.

MR. BARRY:
I was responding merely to the -

MR. SPEAKER:
Leave has not been granted so there is no point.

MR. BARRY:
Well, on another point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

I would ask the Premier, and I would submit that in terms of the way in which we operate with respect to petitions and solely with respect to -

MR. SIMMS:
This is the same point of order.

MR. BARRY:
No.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Now, see, talking about observing the rules of the House.

Mr. Speaker, there is just a brief point I would like to make. In the area of petitions alone, members of this House should bend over backwards to avoid dismissing the subject matter of the concern -

MR. BAIRD:
That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker, it is a speech.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
- because, Your Honour, of the way in which they originate; they originate without any direction or control or guidance from members of this House, they originate by individuals who, like all of us should be, are more concerned with substance than with form. I would submit, Mr. Speaker, it is very dangerous and it is ignoring the time-honoured century-old tradition of members in society to be able to bring their grievances to this House of Assembly, regardless of the form in which they are contained, and that is a very important principle.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, actually the matter has been ruled on, but just to make a brief reply to what the hon. gentleman opposite said, there is no doubt that this House is very solicitous with respect to petitions. Indeed, our practice and procedure with respect to petitions, I think, is unique and there are, no doubt, more petitions aired in the House of Assembly in Newfoundland, I am sure, than in any other Legislature in Canada. There is no doubt that members are very pleased to have petitions on a broad variety of topics.

I think, however, looking over our precedents in the past number of years it will be shown that the House has required that petitions be in the proper form. If it were the case that the only way this matter could be aired within the very near future would be to allow an irregular in form petition, that would be a different matter. But there is no question at all that a petition in appropriate form on the same subject matter can be organized with very little loss of time, and I would suggest that it would be very dangerous if we were to ignore those rules which are quite clear and on which the Speaker has already ruled.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Very briefly I will hear the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I really cannot believe what I am hearing. Indeed, I would submit to you, Sir, that a petition with the proper wording, a very archaic wording, as you will agree, is the exception rather than the rule of petitions that have gone before this Chamber.

The gentleman for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) is right that we have preserved this time-honoured tradition and we are one of the few Houses to have done so, and for good reason, because the people of Newfoundland and Labrador look to this House as a place where they can have grievances redressed. Surely goodness we are not going to say to people who signed that petition, Because the wording ain't exactly right, would you do the whole thing all over again?

Many people who sign petitions about roads and sentencing and other matters, Mr. Speaker, do so not because they are university graduates but because they are citizens who have a need that needs to be expressed. And that is the burden of that petition, they want a redress of grievance. That is what the petition procedure is all about.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, if I may, one final sentence?

MR. SPEAKER:

Just one final word.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Sir. I was going to suggest that in view of having allowed different wordings over the years, if we are going to cut it off and

now insist on proper wording that we not do so with retroactive effect for a petition that has already been circulated, that we give notice that as of now or as of a month from now the wording must be proper and then we, as members, can take that to the people who are circulating petitions and see that is observed in form.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I have already ruled on that particular petition. I think the rules are quite clear. They are in our own Standing Orders, we have Beauchesne to guide us in this matter and the precedents of the House, also. The hon. member knows the process he has to go through if he wants to have the petition presented to the House.

Orders of the Day

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Motion 1.

MR. SPEAKER:

Motion 1, the hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to speak to this motion today which is a motion which is very similar to one that was on the Order Paper and which was passed unanimously by this House, I think it was last year, in the last session. It has to do with the whole question of military activity in Labrador.

We have tried, I think, before the session began today, to get unanimous approval for this motion to go through very quickly, within a very short period of time. As I understand it, the member for

Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) do not agree and want to use their full thirty minutes of debate time. We on this side are prepared to just have fifteen minutes, and I think the same is true for the Liberal Party, but the New Democratic Party will not agree to have this passed.

This motion was put on the Order Paper again for debate, Mr. Speaker, because even though last year we had unanimous support for a resolution supporting military activity in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, in particular the NATO tactical training base, it has come to our attention that the National New Democratic Party in convention a week or so ago passed a resolution which said that they demand that the Canadian Government in all low level flight training in Canada oppose the establishment of NATO operations in Canada, including a tactical fighter and weapons training center at Goose Bay, Labrador. Therefore, in light of the National New Democratic Party's recent acceleration in the polls and the fact that they are now obviously being supported, at least in the interim between federal elections, by more people, or it would seem that way - I do not know what would happen if an election was called -

MR. TULK:

I wonder if our provincial representatives voted against it?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I do not know. We will hopefully find out.

- we thought it important to reaffirm where this Legislature stands on the matter. This side of the House is adamant. We have

been working with the federal government for the last number of years, and members opposite have been working. The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), in whose district these communities are, has been working diligently on it for a long period of time, as various groups in Labrador have. We just do not understand what is going on with the National New Democratic Party and, as we understand it now, with the local New Democratic Party, because there seems to be some relaxation in their support. As a matter of fact, not only relaxation, there seems to be a reversal in their position. Before they supported the NATO base coming to Labrador, and now they are wishy-washy on it and are ambiguous on it, and we do not know for sure whether they still support this going on.

Mr. Speaker, this hurts our case. The Minister of Defence (Mr. Dick) in Ottawa, and the ministers from this government have travelled overseas to all the NATO countries arguing our case, inviting all of them over here to Happy Valley - Goose Bay and to St. John's, making presentations to them, and when you have a split like this within our own Legislature and with a major political party in Canada, that will not help our chances of competing successfully with the site in Turkey, to beat them in getting the site established in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

Mr. Speaker, it is rather ironic. I was able, over the last five or six days, to find out - I would like the member for Menihek to listen closely to this - that one of the founders of the New Democratic Party of Canada, since it moved from the CCF to the New Democratic Party of Canada, is

none other than the hon. Tommy Douglas.

MR. TULK:
Who?

PREMIER PECKFORD:
The hon. Tommy Douglas, who was Premier of Saskatchewan and later, Leader of the New Democratic Party of Canada. I have a document in my office, I have not got it brought here but I am prepared to give a copy of it to the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), where he signed an agreement with the federal government allowing missile training and low level flying over Saskatchewan when he was Premier of Saskatchewan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:
He was one of the founders of the New Democratic Party in Canada.

And to add insult to injury, or to add more fuel to the fire, later when that agreement expired and had to be renewed, the then Government of Saskatchewan was still New Democratic and Premier Blakeney, who is now the Leader of the Opposition and the heir apparent, Roy Rominow, that great constitutional expert who had nothing at all to do with the Constitution -

MR. BARRY:
Now, now, Brian.

PREMIER PECKFORD:
Yes, it will be written up some day. It is now coming to light all across Canada, by the way.

Mr. Blakeney and Mr. Rominow signed a new agreement allowing for the military testing to continue in Northern Canada,

including low flying missiles like the cruise missiles, to be tested by the U.S. There was an agreement between the Government of Saskatchewan and the Government of Canada which allowed the testing to proceed.

Now we find it is later in the evolution of the New Democratic Party. We still have Mr. Rominow around. I supposed he is some kind of important member in the New Democratic movement in Canada, as is Mr. Blakney. In our province, the NDP here are taking a position that is completely contrary to another of their colleagues, brothers and sisters, if I may say so, in Saskatchewan. Besides going against their own position last year in this legislature, it looks like they are going in opposition to other New Democratic Parties in Canada.

Mr. Speaker, if we want to reinvent the wheel; if we want to suddenly blind our eyes and say we do not have a defence policy; that we are not part of NATO; that we are not part of NORAD; that we do not have any defence dollars to spend when, in actual fact, New Brunswick is getting \$460, \$480 per capita and we getting \$25 to \$40 per capita in this Province; if they want to go back and reinvent the wheel and bring in a peace process and start from Eden and come on forward, that is one thing. They should start articulating that right now.

We are where we are. It is national policy that we have a Defence Department. It is national policy that we are partners in NATO and that we have to contribute to NATO and contribute to NORAD. That being the national policy and that being the national will of the majority

of people in Canada, as represented in the House of Commons by two of the major political parties, I think it is ostrich-like for the New Democratic Party of Newfoundland or the New Democratic Party or any party in Canada to suddenly hide their heads in the sand and watch other parts of Canada benefit from military activity like NATO, while we down in Newfoundland, because of the way we are being perceived and behaving, we lose again to other parts of Canada and other parts of the world.

The New Democratic Party is taking a very, very dogmatic approach. The majority of people in Labrador, if you are talking about democracy, and the majority of people in Newfoundland support the application for Canada to try and persuade the NATO leaders to put that base in Labrador.

We already have military people from the Canadian Forces here in St. John's. We have an Argentia Base still alive at Argentia, which does valuable tactical and satellite work for the U.S. Navy. What the New Democratic Party has to say is, "Close it down." You cannot have it both ways.

If you are going to be, as this resolution says, "WHEREAS the New Democratic Party wants new Canadian initiatives for peace, security, disarmament rather than NATO operations which support a "deep strike" strategy, escalating rather than reducing the chances of...", and on they go. It is unbelievable, "to redirect federal funding commitments." There is a policy in place.

To suddenly try to turn that completely around would mean we would have to close down all

military activity here, the military activity in Gander and the military activity in Argentina. That is what the New Democratic Party are saying. Close all those down and redirect the money.

Then I heard - I do not know if I heard it correctly or not, from the Leader of the NDP Party - that 'we are against NATO, but you can have Canadian military people in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.' Now, how many fine hairs are we going to split, Mr. Speaker, so you can be half in the war and half out? It is an unbelievable position. Have some military spending, but do not go all the way. We are not a part of NATO. We do not want any part of it. How can they justify that kind of a position? I just, for the life of me, cannot understand it.

Mr. Speaker, it is extremely important. We have a little period of time now to lobby again because a decision has been delayed by the NATO leaders. We have a little period of time to put more pressure again, both on the federal government and on the NATO countries, especially countries like the United States and Britian. The United States and Britian are very important in this decision. West Germany has a problem and, perhaps, France has a bit of a problem in going along with Goose Bay. But the United States and Britian and some of the smaller countries, and even Italy, Spain and Portugal, can be very beneficial to us in making this decision the right one for Canada.

But we do not have time to be fighting rear guard actions with our own people. We do not have time to be doing that. The rear

guard actions are over. We should be united in going forward to get that kind of a base with the thousands of jobs and the economic activity that is going to ensue from it.

So, Mr. Speaker, this side of the House strongly endorses the initiatives that have been taken by the Government of Canada, by the Happy Valley - Goose Bay people themselves, by the other people of Labrador, by members of the official Opposition, by the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) and the other members on this side. The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) has been very involved in this. The Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) has been very involved in this.

MR. TOBIN:

The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren).

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Yes, the member for Torngat Mountains has been overseas fighting for it as well, and I have been, in writing and talking to the Prime Minister and the other ministers.

The other thing that the New Democratic Party says is: 'Take the money out of defence and put it into something else.' No, Mr. Speaker, we want more money in community development projects, plus the NATO base, both. It is not either/or.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Let the money that is for defence go into Happy Valley - Goose Bay and let us get more money to put into Nain. Let us get more money

to put into Mud Lake. Let us get more money to put into Makkovik. It is not an either/or proposition: Nain, you starve because we got the base, or Happy Valley - Goose Bay, you do not get the base because Nain is going to get the money. It is not an either/or proposition. It is both.

Sometimes we have got to live in the real world, and the real world is that we are part of NATO, we are part of NORAD, whether the New Democratic Party likes it or not, and we are going to be for a long period of time to come. If there is a pot of money there that is available to us, let us go after it so that we can have our share of the defence dollar in the same ways that other parts of Canada and other parts of NATO have it.

To put their heads in the sand and to think that suddenly we are going to be able - that is the other myth about it all. Is it realistic to say, 'Do not go with the NATO base and take the money and so something else?' You are not going to get the money because the Defence Department is still going to be there spending it somewhere else. So, it is not realistic. Is the Department of Defence and NATO going to say, 'Okay, you do not want the base so we will give you the money for other community development projects?' No, the money stays in defence, goes somewhere else for military activities and we lose.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is a naive, ill-thought out policy based on blatant dogmatism. One of the worst things in this world, Mr. Speaker, in any subject matter is dogmatism. As many political parties have learned, you cannot

succeed as long as you live in your little hut of dogmatism. You must be practical.

We live in a real and practical world where people have problems like unemployment; where people have problems like those brought up in Question Period about Social Services. They have to live and make a living.

When you are in that hut of dogmatism, do not peep out because the sun may blind you. The sun of reality might blind some of the members of the New Democratic Party. They have been doing a fairly good job over the last year splitting hairs. Of course, CBC radio, especially, and sometimes CBC television and some of the others love it, by saying, 'Do not put it here, put it over here. Well, that is really good now, Mr. Fenwick. Now, does that not make an awful lot of sense?' And it does not make one bit of sense, Mr. Speaker, not one bit of sense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

People in glass houses should not throw stones. In their little middle-aged, middle income mentality, where they can get up and drive to work every morning and not worry about what goes on in Toogood Arm on New World Island, what goes on in Conche, or what goes on in Parson's Pond.

MR. SIMMS:

It is an Upper Canadian mentality.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is an urban, centralized attitude. They almost feel guilty for the fact that they are living so well off the defence establishment, off all the things

they are against. Living off all the things they are against, and then their twinges of conscience are strong enough to make that kind of a comment and to be those kind of commentators in some of our national newspapers and on national radio broadcasts. It would almost make you, Mr. Speaker, at least intellectually, puke.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

They are doing an injustice because they are perpetrating something that does not work. It sounds good and for somebody is listening to it, they make it sound good, but they are practicing a terminological inexactitude upon the people of the Province and upon the population at large. It is utter craziness; it is silly, foolish and not part of the real world.

I would appeal to the new members of the New Democratic Party who are in this Legislature to come clean and say to their own party nationally, 'if you want to drive down the road of dogmatism, you do so at your own peril. We live in the real world and we have a very fundamental situation on our hands in Newfoundland economically and financially. We have it in spades exacerbated in Labrador where they have such a hard time of it, in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and Northwest River. We have a chance to do something significant to change economically and financially the situation, and not only in Labrador but throughout the whole Province.' That kind of development will have such a fantastic impact all over the Province that it will really do a lot.

This NATO base thing shows the same approaches factually as those who will come out non-factually on, for example, spray programmes. It is the same kind of thing. We went through to a Royal Commission with reputable people on it and scientific information coming out off your ears. What a debate, not a debate, what a perpetration of untruths upon the people of Newfoundland several years ago about the whole spray programme, all done on emotion!

We had some people around the Province who were running into their houses and calling forestry and calling the Department of Health to say they were sick and they got sick from hearing on the radio somebody telling them they were sick. It could not be clinically proven. Here were the trees dying all over the place and here now are some of the companies trying to get into retarding the growth of the aspen and the birch, which we cannot use all that much of, to ensure that they do not take up too much room for the balsam fir and spruce that we can use. Now, we are into it on that, Mr. Speaker, trying to sustain a given industry in the forestry while the New Democratic Party and other left wing commentators perpetrate untruths upon the population of Newfoundland and Labrador.

How much time do I have? I thought I only had fifteen minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. J. CARTER:

Forever, by leave.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, no.

The note I had here from my good friend opposite said there are some federal NDP members who have bases and do not want these closed but are opposed to Goose Bay. So there you go, and on the story goes.

Just to sum up, Mr. Speaker, and say no more about it. This is an important issue for Newfoundland and Labrador, and especially for Labrador. We have been pushing it and we detest and abhor those in this Legislature or outside who are trying to undermine the opportunity for the growth in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

As impressed as I always am with the Premier's delivery, I wonder if he is not considering also declaring his candidacy for this side of the House as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Ha, ha!

MR. KELLAND:
That was a bit of tongue in cheek, of course.

I do rise in support of the resolution put forward by the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) and so ably explained, defended and spoken to by the hon. the Premier. Yes, he

does indeed hit home when he is talking about the things and the misdirections as presented by the New Democratic Party in this Province and at the national level.

It is totally inconceivable to me that a House that spoke unanimously last year in support of NATO, can change. By the way, when you speak in support of NATO, you are speaking in support of my district and the majority of my district which supports the thing. So, when you say anything against that, which now appears to be the case, then you are speaking against the people in my district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker, if I can just digress for a brief second. A little while ago I took the opportunity to provide all members in the House with buttons which say, 'We support NATO in Goose Bay.' These buttons were being circulated by the Public Servants Alliance of Canada. I provided thirty-five buttons over there, fifteen over here and two for the New Democratic Party. Those of you that have them and support NATO, please pin them on at this point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
Now I take that utter silence as a clear declaration.

What bothers me about all of this, Mr. Speaker, is that last year when we unanimously passed that resolution, members who were in the House at that time will graphically recall the member for Menihek's (Mr. Fenwick) attempts to get out of this House so he

would not have to vote. Now, I do not know if I can paraphrase but I call that chicken crap. Is that parliamentary, Mr. Speaker? The hon. member tried to get out of this Chamber, tried to avoid a vote and when he was forced back in his seat by the rulings of the House, he voted in favour of NATO. In voting in favour of NATO, he voted in favour of Naskaupi district and the people of Naskaupi district, he voted in favour of Labrador, he voted in favour of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, the people of Canada and the people of the NATO Alliance.

Now, as a delegate to Ottawa just recently, he sat there, I wonder what he did say in Ottawa, but he sat there and allowed the federal NDP to dictate to the provincial party who tried to deny us the right for an honest living in Labrador and I strongly object to that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
Now, if he is flip, he has flop with him so now we have two over there in the same boat.

Just recently I made a press release about which outlined what I thought was the flip flop policy of the NDP and I suggested in that press release that the NDP cannot have it both ways in this Province or both ways in this country. Now, are they Canadians or what?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
Are they not in support of their country or are they against their country being able to mount an

adequate defence with aggression threatens us? That is what I have to ask. Or is it purely Upper Canadianism that we hear from the hon. member for Menihek district, which I suggest it is?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
I am a Newfoundlander by birth and a Labradorian by choice and I want the NATO base in my district. I want it for this Province and I want it for this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
I am extremely upset that the members would even attempt to try to deny people that I represent a right to make a half decent living.

When the Public Service Alliance of Canada so ably came and supported NATO in Goose Bay, as the buttons indicated, they represented 600 people presently employed. In the event that we no longer have NATO or no longer have military bilateral agreements between NATO countries and Canada, we are in danger of losing those 600 jobs, let alone the 1,500 we might get if we get the NATO base up there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
It is a bloody shame on the head of the NDP in this Province and in Canada to have that sort of a situation exist.

As always, I am very pleased to see that we can operate in a concerted effort. I do thank the

government members, all of them, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and all the rest who support this because it means so much to our future, not just from an economic point of view obviously, but from the fact that must, as Canadians, play our role and our part in the NATO Alliance and protect the free world.

You know, it is interesting that a little while ago in the media, just prior to and during the federal NDP convention in Montreal, that the news media were carrying stories and carrying reports that the NDP may be prepared to sacrifice their principles for popularity.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, oh!

MR. KELLAND:

Sacrificed their principles for popularity! I heard it on the news several times.

Now, are these two hon. gentlemen not made of principles? Did not the leader of that party vote in favour of NATO in the House last year? Would not his flip or flop or whatever, come and support him in the House on that particular question? Are they going to tell me that he is going to be more popular by being against NATO up in the Menihek district, which is basically and strongly a labour-oriented district, two communities, Labrador City and Wabush, miners who are part of the labour force, two town councils, with the exception of one member, all voted strongly in favour of NATO coming to Labrador.

I do not want the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) or his colleague for St. John's East (Mr. Long) to try to imply that I do

not have concerns about the native people of my district because I can guarantee you that I do. I correspond with them continuously. I am in contact with them continuously.

I realize that in the recent episode, let us say, with the Mealy Mountain caribou herd, for example, that caught in a certain or present situation that they are trying to make their own form of a political statement to draw attention to whatever their concerns are, and I am concerned for them, as I know members on the other side are. The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has a community of Innu people in his district and I have a community of Innu people in my district. Where I do not, and neither of us have supported the illegal hunting of caribou, for example, we certainly are very concerned about the welfare of the native people who are in our districts. I can say that quite clearly.

You can think about some of the positions that the NDP have flip flopped on over the years. Do you recall Howard Pawley, for example, being very disturbed over the fact the F-18 construction might go to the Province of Quebec. Did he not want it up in his own Province? And what is Howard Pawley? What is his political philosophy? Now what does he think F-18s are used for, harvesting bakeapples?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha!

MR. KELLAND:

They do not fly quite that low, you know. F-18s are a defensive weapon or an offensive weapon, if needed. But when the contract of the F-18s was going to go to

Quebec, Howard Pawley suggested that it should go to his province. Come on, what are we going to have? We are going to have an NDP group, 50 per cent of which in the House last year - he was a 100 per cent at the time - he voted in favour and now he has a 50/50 situation there, Howard Pawley wants to build F-18s up in his province, Prime Minister Mulroney wants to build them in his province, Quebec got it. But the end result is that those F18s will be used in Goose Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Come on now, one of your NDP buddies want to build F-18s to be used in Goose Bay and you guys are saying, 'Oh, do not take any F-18s up to Goose Bay.' Mr. Speaker, I am at a loss for words to try to explain it.

Perhaps when the hon. member gets on his feet, and obviously speaks in support of this resolution, he is going to explain why the boys at the meeting in Montreal were able to dictate to him so now he has changed his position. He will not pin on this button. That is a clear, absolute, abject retraction of what he did in this House last year. Mind you, he tried to get away, but he did vote, and he did vote in favour.

I am not going to take a lot of time on this, Mr. Speaker. I think I have had most of my say, and I do want to give the other members an opportunity. I will say one thing: Because of the flip-flop policy, because the provincial NDP, who, by the way, also voted seventy-some-odd per cent in favour of NATO last year following the vote here in the

House - you might recall that. Let me go back to that one a little bit.

You recall the fact that the member for Menihek voted in favour of NATO. He tried to get away from doing that, because he said, 'Well, our convention is this weekend. I would like to get some direction from the party.' My information is when their convention started here last year on the weekend following that vote, the first several speakers who rose to their feet at the NDP convention spoke against NATO. Then Ricky Cashin - I am sorry, Mr. Richard Cashin, we used to call him Ricky when he was a kid.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Tricky Dicky.

MR. KELLAND:

I think it is Rickety, no, Ricky. Mr. Cashin saved the hon. member for Menihek's bacon there at that convention, because he got up and, in effect, said, "Boys, look, in the House of Assembly, the entire House of Assembly sitting at that day voted in favour of NATO. Now here is a bunch of you guys and women getting up speaking against NATO. In effect, if you do not vote in favour of NATO, it is the same affect as a vote of non-confidence in our leader. Now, we have nobody else in the House. So we have to keep him for a while." We have lots over here. So then, on the strength of Richard Cashin's lamentations and support of the untenable position that that would put his leader in, the convention got up and voted, I think, something like 70 - 75 per cent in favour of NATO.

So here we are now going to Ottawa because of the Upper Canadian mentality. And I do not blame

him. He made the right choice in provinces. He probably made the wrong choice of provinces in which to spread his bile, and to shoot down the labour force, while at the same time trying to pretend his is on the side of labour. You know, he picked the right province from that point of view. But, you know, we are a bunch of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians here who want to ensure our economic future and want to ensure that we play a meaningful role and a equal part in the NATO Alliance. Are we not defenders of the free world?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
If we are not defenders of the free world, what are we? But because we have spoken in favour of NATO, while at the same time addressing the concerns of Native groups, we have indicated that we are defenders of Canada.

Those, then, if you carry that particular thought out, who are against NATO might very well be against the protection of Canada. It could be construed to be that way. Surely the members to my right are not going to stand on their feet and say that they are against defending Canada in the event of aggression.

MR. SIMMS:
They are not today, but they might be tomorrow. You can never be sure.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker, as I indicated, I will wrap it up now and give other members an opportunity to speak. Hopefully, the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) or the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) will

rise and support this resolution, as this party on this side wholeheartedly does, no question about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:
If I can wrap it up with one little sentence, perhaps to paraphrase something or other, but to make a point in a bit tongue in cheek fashion, I suppose, I would say that because of the indecisive or flip-flop actions of the provincial NDP members in the House of Assembly, as against and as opposed to what the federal NDP convention did, we can say that the NDP in this Province has bombed out and they never will again fly in Labrador or anywhere else in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Menihek.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, just a slight question before I start. Do I have half an hour to speak here?

MR. SPEAKER:
That is correct.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I have two parts to my speech, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DECKER:
One for and one against.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

The first part of the speech will be to explain the resolution put forward by the federal party and its implications for this Province. The second part of the speech will be the position of the provincial party which I think it is important to put on the record and which I will put on the record.

Okay, what happened in Montreal? What happened in the convention? One of the long standing policies of the Federal New Democratic Party is in opposition to military alliances of all kinds. That policy has been in effect for at least twenty-five years now. It is put forward by the New Democratic Party federally because of a major concern for international peace. The argument that the party has used time and time again is that the Warsaw Pact is a destabilizing pact; that NATO itself is a destabilizing pact. As a result, having two major blocks of nations standing eyeball to eyeball with thousands of nuclear weapons, it is not the kind of situation that will last forever and as a result may end up in accidental nuclear war in which the entire planet will die.

I put that forward because I want to give you the background of where the federal party comes from. I think nuclear war is a legitimate concern. I think the development of peace is a legitimate concern and the federal party's position is a reasonable one among many others.

By the way, I should also mention that the federal party's position of withdrawing from NATO is not a unanimous one. I have pointed out many times within the party that

the implications of withdrawing from NATO in some instances will mean much more military spending within our country than it would as part of the military alliance. For example, now we have the partners of NATO in order to defend us. Outside the military alliance, we would have to build up our own defences in order to defend us. And I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is a legitimate conclusion or corollary to bear from that particular principle.

What has happened in the last year or so is that the party, because it has been doing extremely well in the polls, has had to grapple with the problems of success, and what kind of a policy a government should have if it is indeed committed to withdraw from military alliances.

I was, as I think every member of this House is aware, extremely concerned about resolutions coming through from the federal party that would appear to undercut the employment base of places like Goose Bay or anywhere. I did not want to see any kinds of resolutions like that come forward. But, unfortunately, the federal party said that the provincial party has no right in determining international policy or defence policy, and quite frankly, they are correct. We have no role in producing defence policy. That is the federal party's perspective.

So, Mr. Speaker, my question to the federal party was, 'Well, if we are withdrawing from NATO, what does that mean in practical implications for Goose Bay, and in a broader context, what does that mean for the Island part of the Province and for Labrador?'

Mr. Speaker, the three major objectives of an NDP defence policy are, peace keeping and a very high priority on that; secondly sovereignty, the exercising of sovereignty in the Arctic; and thirdly, offshore patrol to make sure that we never have the humiliating situation where the France come in and tell us that they are going to fish in our waters and we do not have the resources to even kick them out, or tell them that they have to get lost.

I think you will find that the degradation and the shame that we went through in the last couple of months because of a French fishing dispute was directly connected to the fact that we had enormous resources in Europe defending France and NATO, and no resources here to defend us against our NATO partners like France. What I am saying to you, Sir, what I am saying to the House, is the facts of the matter are that if we would put our own sovereignty and our own interests in perspective and bring back our resources, we would have had the resources to do that.

What are the implications for the Island part of the Province and Labrador? Well, if you look at a map of Canada, you will see that Goose Bay is an extremely strategic position. It is actually in the spot that controls the approaches to the Arctic, one of the highest priorities of an NDP defence policy, and would be a location for considerable military activity in the future. I am not promising anything. I am not saying to you that there will be as much military activity as if, in five years from now, we had a base. I am not saying to you there will be as much activity as their is now. There may be more.

There may be less. What I am saying to you, Sir, what I am saying to this House is that the policy, as being expounded by the party, would not undercut Goose Bay. On that basis, it seemed to me that it was not objectionable in that regard.

The second thing, Mr. Speaker - and this is an important point - is that it redresses the complaints that the Premier just outlined in his comments. There is only \$25 worth of spending per capita in Newfoundland and Labrador in defence spending, and \$400 or \$500 in New Brunswick. Given the strategic position, given there are no NATO allies to defend us, it is quite conceivable that considerable additional spending would occur in places like Argentia, Botwood, St. John's, Gander, Stephenville, and other places on the Island part of the Province, maybe up to the level of what is being done in New Brunswick. Because if you look at a map, the strategic position of Newfoundland and Labrador is extremely important. So, Mr. Speaker, that is the federal position.

Is it a position that I adopt? Well, that is immaterial. The position though, when it is clearly explained, as I have explained now, does not undercut any attempt to provide employment in Goose Bay, and, in fact, has a number of major advantages to it. One of which is, of course, that we may see some investment in defence spending on the Island part of the Province. Secondly, the very negative side effects of a NATO base in Goose Bay - and there are a number of them, and I will get to them in a minute - would be eliminated because you will be talking about a base that

would not end up using up half of the countryside in Labrador itself. So, Mr. Speaker, that is the position.

My argument to the federal party was, you would have to say that, you would have to explain it, and you would have to tell people what it meant. I was not going to be a party to any policy that would deliberately undermine the security of the employment of people in Goose Bay, and that is it. Now, you can say what you will about it, but it certainly does have a lot of promising aspects about it.

The other thing that could happen - and I mention this, Mr. Speaker, because I think that there is a possibility - other social democratic parties in Europe have had the same non-military alliance position and when they formed a government were forced to price it out, to cost it out, to say how much it would cost to go ourselves, to have our own military, how much would it cost to come out of the military alliance? What they found, in some cases - and there have been a number of them - is that it was much too expensive and, therefore, they had to stay in the NATO Alliance.

I am not suggesting to you that that will occur when the federal New Democratic Party forms a government federally, but I am saying to you that that has happened in other instances, in which case the kind of undermining of any possible developments in Goose Bay would not be there. I just mention that in passing.

Now, getting back to the resolution itself on the provincial position. Mr. Speaker,

I have a large number of submissions that I am going to put into the record here and table, but I am going to table them at the end because there is a whole bunch of them and I do not want to start putting them in one by one. So the Clerk can stay where he is for the time being.

When I voted for the base on June 4 of last year -

MR. PEACH:

You were very reluctant.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, I was. I was very reluctant for a good reason too. I was reluctant because, Mr. Speaker, I did not have a huge amount of information about what was going on. We had had, at that point, if you recall, the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) informing us that there was a Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office panel that would address the concerns of the people in Labrador. I did not know what the dimensions of that would be. I did not know whether it would be a good study or bad study or whatever. As it turns out, it turned out to be half and half. But I felt at that time that some of the concerns that we felt, as a Province, would perhaps be addressed there, concern for Native peoples, concern for the environment, and so on. Well, Mr. Speaker, that was the reason that I voted for it at that time. If I had my time back, I would not have done that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh! Shame! Shame!

MR. FENWICK:

I tell you that now because, quite frankly, I believe that this House has made a terrible mistake by

endorsing that kind of a development with the tiny amount of debate that was done, not knowing all of the implications of what is going on.

I want to give you some of the information that I have had privy to since last June 4, and how they have effected my thinking on it. The first thing I would like to table, Mr. Speaker, is a letter from the Labrador/Schefferville Roman Catholic Diocese. This is the Roman Catholic Diocese that represents all the people up there. It is a letter between the person who is in charge now that the Bishop is gone to Daniel Ashini and councillors of the Innu Band Council.

Mr. Speaker, what it clearly indicates is the Roman Catholic Diocese in Labrador/Scherfferville is opposed to going ahead with this development now, and fully supports the native people against it. Now I am telling you this. This is the major religious denomination in Labrador that has said, on record, that they opposed the development as it stands.

MR. WARREN:

It is not true. It is not true.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:

The letter is here.

Well, continuing on with the religious theme. I have here a copy of an article that appeared in The Monitor in July of 1986. This article in The Monitor says, 'The promotion of a NATO training centre for Goose Bay, Labrador is an assault both on Catholic people and on Catholic values.'

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who wrote it?

MR. FENWICK:

It is written by a fellow by the name of James Maclean.

MR. TOBIN:

What part of Canada is he from?

MR. FENWICK:

'Those who would suffer the most from a NATO base, the Innu or Nasakupi Montagnais of Labrador and Quebec, have for centuries been loyal members of our Catholic family. They deserve the support of other christian communities in the Province at a time when a few surviving remenants of their way of life and economic base are being threatened by powerful forces of destruction.'

In the case of Labrador -

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Order!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, I can say that the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is misleading the House, although it may be inadvertently, because he was talking about the Ministerial Association in Labrador.

MR. FENWICK:

No, I was not.

MR. KELLAND:

You were not talking about anything about the ministers in Labrador?

MR. FENWICK:

No, I was talking about the Roman Catholic Diocese.

MR. KELLAND:

He was talking about the representation of the ministers, the clergy in Labrador. That is my understanding, and when they did speak, the Ministerial Association locally - this is for the clarification of the House - they did speak with some concern about NATO.

However, when asked a question on it, Mr. Speaker, by other groups who are pro-military, they made the statement that they were speaking as themselves, as individuals, a small group that make up the Ministerial Association, and they were not speaking for their congregation of which, of course, is by far the largest population of the churches.

MR. DECKER:

A good point.

MR. HEARN:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. HEARN:

I might have to agree with the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) because there is no doubt about it that the individuals who have made those statements are speaking entirely for themselves or a selected group and certainly not for the Catholic population of

that area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Just continuing on with the article that appeared in The Monitor, this is the Catholic magazine in St. John's: 'In the case of Labrador the Innu have never ceded a single inch of land to any foreign authority through treaty, land claim settlement or any other process. The censure and exploitation of historic Innu land is a violation of both natural law and explicit Catholic moral teaching.' I just wanted to enter those on the record. I thought it was appropriate.

MR. SIMMS:

Table it.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, the next piece of information comes from the report of The Canadian Public Health Association Task Force on The Health Effects of Increased Flying Activity in the Labrador area. I have a copy of the report here. I am not going to table it as all members, I think, have access to it. But I will just read to you from the press release that they put out when the report was released. This is an interim report too, by the way.

"The task force believes there is potential health problems which could result from the development because," and it goes to list five different things.

Three, for example, "Low level flying could have some direct health effects. The question is whether this is measurable and/or significant.

"Number four, the settler population does not generally recognize the health impact on itself which will come about when the military base is developed;

"Five, there is a potential effect on the environment and wildlife of the area."

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I refer you to a reference from Beauchesne's Fifth Edition, paragraph 332 on page 117, that reference says, in part, "The rule is quite clear, that the quoting of a newspaper, an author or a book which reflects upon debate before the House, either directly or indirectly is entirely out of order, because Members are here to give their own opinions and not to quote the opinions of others."

Mr. Speaker, what we have seen for the last ten minutes is the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) getting up and quoting the opinions from other authors rather than his own. I, for one, would like to hear his position and his arguments, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Further to that point order, the hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, it is not often I deign to disagree with my friend and cousin from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) but I would ask his indulgence for a moment. Would he agree with me that perhaps in the interest of the larger objective here, that is to say, allowing the member for Menihek his democratic right to say where he stands and in how many places he stands on this particular issue. In the interest of that, we could, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, with your indulgence, Sir, allow a little leeway in terms of the application of the rules if it helps facilitate his getting into the record on this particular issue.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, I must agree with the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, that it is unparliamentary to read from the newspapers which you have already done.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, what I am going to table is the news release from the Canadian Public Health Association, which, by the way, was commissioned by this government to do the study in which they have at least indicated there are five significant health problems and that they are there and therefore they were possible.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Possible.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes. Possible. I agree.

Mr. Speaker, the next document that I would like to table - and we will table them all at the end - is one from an Ian Goudie, a biologist in Labrador. I take this one and I will have to go from memory since you have that interesting rule there, but what the letter says is that the low level flying in certain areas of Labrador over a number of years clearly affected the water fowl in a certain area. It clearly made the move to new locations.

Mr. Speaker, I am not using this as any substantive to try to argue that all the water fowl are being badly affected. What I am trying to suggest to you, though, is that it, along with a whole bunch of other information, clearly indicates that the low level flying is not the benign activity that the minister opposite would have you believe.

The next thing, Mr. Speaker -

MR. KELLAND:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Again, I believe the hon. the member for Menihek is attempting to mislead the House, even though he is not fully aware of what he is doing. He is talking about the affects of low level flying on wildlife. Without giving exact figures, in which I can make reference to from a document or documents, I say the Royal Air Force has been flying in Labrador

for somewhere between twenty-five and thirty years, low level flying with Vulcan bombers and now the newer Tornado.

Now, back twenty - twenty-five years ago, the George's River caribou herd probably numbered something like 100,000 animals. Right now, while this twenty-some odd years of low level flying was going on, they have increased from approximately 100,000 animals to something estimated between 600,000 and 800,000 animals. Perhaps the member would explain that.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

It is very clear, Mr. Speaker, that they do not want to hear anything and they are giving these spurious points of order as we go.

The next thing to occur was that the FEARO panel finally was established and started working on its draft Terms of Reference. Mr. Speaker, at the end of September I had a chance to go to the first FEARO hearing in Wabush and actually have a look at the Terms of Reference that they had. The Terms of Reference were in two major categories.

The first area was that they were to look at the low level flying and see what mitigation could be done, but they had no right, no right whatsoever to say that the low level flying should stop if they found it impossible to continue with what was going on. Mr. Speaker, I think that was a grave mistake on the part of the federal Department of the

Environment for not giving them the wider mandate because it just cripples that report from both sides, the pro side and the con side. It does not have credibility since it does not have the terms of reference.

Mr. Speaker, later in January of this year, that same FEARO panel clearly pointed out that it did feel that that was a major deficiency and has decided to expand its terms of reference, or at least has asked for an expansion of its terms of reference, but has not received any reply yet. I will get to that in a few minutes.

The other thing it had was a draft terms of reference on the base itself. Those terms of reference were quite good. They were broad. They said, Mr. Speaker, that if it felt that the NATO base was not an appropriate development, given the environmental considerations, then it had the right to recommend to the minister that it not go ahead. It was, in other words, an unfettered series of resolutions. I think that that is appropriate.

So it started that Fall. It had, I think, eighteen hearings along the coast. My friend here will enter some of the testimony that was brought in at those hearings. But, suffice it to say, that it finally drafted up a terms of reference for the military to follow in making their Environmental Impact Statement.

Now, the interesting thing about it was that its draft recommendations, tabled on January 27, 1987, called for a whole bunch of things. One of the things it did call for was a freeze on the number of low level flights for

the next couple of years until such time as it has its environmental assessment process completed. Now, I believe that last year there were something like 5,500 low level flights through Labrador. What they said was that that number of flights should not increase, that the 5,500 should stay next year and the year after, but not go to 6,000 or 7,000 or 10,000 or 12,000 or 15,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the panel appointed by the federal Department of the Environment. I am assuming that the federal Department of the Environment knows what it is doing. What did the federal panel do? It felt so strongly about the representation it had that it asked for an intermediate step to be taken by the Department of the Environment and the Department of National Defence. That is almost unprecedented. It never occurred before.

The question we have to ask ourselves in this House, and the question I ask everybody to think about, is why did they ask for it. Obviously, they must have found out something that suggested to them that this flight training may not be the benign thing that we have assumed it to be, there may be problems. There may be problems.

Mr. Speaker, I have additional material and additional letters. Here are two letters from an individual in Goose Bay who wrote me after I appeared on a television programme complaining about the terms of reference for it, indicating a degree of support. I will table those as well. One of the letters I wrote back to him said: - this is a

letter I wrote, by the way, so I assume it is alright for me to read it - "I have read all the information that I have been given from both sides on the proposals, and quite frankly do not know the implications of it. I was hoping that the FEARO study might answer them. It is extremely disappointing to me that the FEARO panel was not given the widest possible terms of reference so that they could establish answers to basic questions."

What followed after that? Well, Mr. Speaker, there was -

MR. SIMMS:
What date was that letter?

MR. FENWICK:
October of last year. Mr. Speaker, the next thing that appeared is this excerpt here from the Sunday Express. It is titled, "Pilot Co-operation Lacking: Caribou Study Jeopardized." What it indicates, Mr. Speaker, is that the doctor, who is appointed by the minister's Wildlife Department there -

MR. MATTHEWS:
Who wrote the article?

MR. FENWICK:
A guy named Peter Gard.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Who is he?

MR. FENWICK:
I do not know. He is a reporter for the paper. But, Mr. Speaker, the point is that what he indicates in this article is that the Caribou study is being jeopardized because of a lack of co-operation between the fliers and the people doing the study. I will return to that afterwards, because I talked to Colonel David

about that when I visited Goose Bay at the end of January.

Mr. Speaker, the next item is a press release from the Newfoundland and Labrador Human Rights Association. The press release from the Human Rights Association goes in conjunction with this report here. Mr. Speaker, up to that point, I was worried about what was going on. But the fact of the matter is, when this report came out, the worrying got even worse and I felt it was important to find something out.

Mr. Speaker, this is a report from the International Federation of Human Rights. It is a report on the mission of low altitude jet flights over Labrador and Northeastern Quebec in Canada. The study was done in May of 1986. The report itself was made public in November of 1986.

Mr. Speaker, the report is quite a long one. I am not going to stand here and defend every section of it because in reading it, I have seen some parts of it that I, quite frankly, do not think will prove a heck of a lot.

MR. WARREN:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, the overall conclusion made by the international federation is that the low level flying is clearly severely altering the ability of the Native people to enjoy the wilderness in the way in which they have been traditionally accustomed to; that it is severely effected. This, Mr. Speaker, is with a little over 5,500 flights a year.

The question, of course, that the international federation has asked in this is, if a little over 5,000 flights are making it very difficult, what happens when we go up to the projected 50,000 or 60,000 flights that might be there over the next number of years? What happens if we take, for example, all the low level flights in Britain and bring them here, of which there was 120,000 in the last couple of years?

The point they made in that is it is going to be extremely difficult in the wilderness of Labrador for any kind of other development to occur if we have huge numbers of low level flights like that which will be associated with any NATO base as well.

Mr. Speaker, I should also point out one interesting thing. This federation report was subsequently examined by the Newfoundland and Labrador Human Rights Association and the association, on the last page of its press release, stated, "The Human Rights Association of Newfoundland and Labrador, in support of these rights, recommends that a meaningful consultation mechanism be established and maintained which will allow the full participation of the aboriginal people. It also recommends that there be no military activity in Labrador until a federal environmental assessment review process is undertaken and completed." Mr. Speaker, what they said was it should cease. By the way, it is a position which I find a little bit hard to take, but that is the one they have.

Just to finish, Mr. Speaker, in about five minutes, what I then did is go to Labrador in order to try and sift through the

countervailing claims. They were claims by the Mokami Project Group. I have here a report which I am willing to table so I will give copies to the media as well. I do not think it is any surprise because I believe I have seen it on the desks opposite. I understand that other individuals have.

Mr. Speaker, it is an eighteen-page report summarizing my observations on a two or three day trip to Goose Bay in order to talk with people. The people I did talk with are here. First, Colonel John David and his information officers. Mr. Speaker, I brought up to him a number of complaints that I received from various individuals, a number of inconsistencies, and a number of problems. I tried to contact representatives of the Public Service Alliance. I could not contact the officers in the short period I was there but I did manage to talk to one individual who was an officer in order to establish contact with them.

I talked with representative of the Sheshatshit Innu Band Council, representatives of the Naskaupi Montagnais Innu Association. I talked with Father Jim Roach. This, by the way, is the priest who is in jail right now, the parish priest in Sheshatshit, and a representative group from the Ministerial Association of Happy Valley - Goose Bay. Unfortunately, there was only a couple of them there but I have letters from them.

In addition, meetings were arranged with the Mokami project group and, finally, with William Anderson the third, the President of the Labrador Inuit Association.

MR. WARREN:

Tell us what he said.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, what William Anderson the third said, since you want a response, is, I asked him what was his position with regard to low level flying? He told me, at that time, that the position of the LIA was that they wished to see the number of flights frozen to the current level and that they would make up their mind on whether they were in favour or against it, at a later date, after they had seen the Environmental Impact Statement.

Now, I say that, Mr. Speaker, because, quite frankly, I have their submission here and it does not say that. It says they are totally opposed but my friend also has dialogue or taped information from the hearings themselves which indicate that the position is more negative than the one I have there, but I am just giving you our observations.

Mr. Speaker, after getting all that information, the next question I asked myself was what is the responsible position? Never mind the federal parties position, what is the responsible for myself and for the provincial party?

What I then did is proposed to my district association that we endorse the LIAs position as explained to me, that we ask for a freeze on the amount of low level flying and that, quite frankly, we await the results of the rest of these investigations before we make a statement one way or the other. My executive in my district association agreed with that suggestion and passed it by resolution.

The next thing we did, Mr. Speaker, is we had a provincial council meeting, which is one of the policy-making organs of our body, of our party. I have been listening to the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) too long. At the provincial council meeting at the end of January, I proposed that resolution to our party provincially. I said the position that I would like us to take is to await the results of the FEARO study before we make a decision on either low level flying or on the NATO base. That position was adopted by our provincial party. So what I am telling you today is the position of the provincial party is to await more information which I would imagine from all the information I have given you, is the sound, responsible thing to do.

I would like to mention one more thing.

MR. SIMMS:

(Inaudible) organization now.

MR. FENWICK:

No, I do not have enough time so you can keep your mouth shut for now.

Mr. Speaker, before I finish I would like to mention one other thing. I have a resolution on the Order Paper for sometime in June where I want this party -

MR. KELLAND:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

A point of order, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

If the hon. member for Menihek will permit a question.

I could not quite hear what his

response to me was, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

What I am saying to you is this, back twenty-five years ago in this very House, we approved a BRINCO deal that set up the biggest mega project in Labrador history. The Premier over here has continuously said that that is the biggest giveaway that this Province has ever made and the biggest mistake we have ever made. I looked back on the transcript of it and I found that the official Opposition at the time, which was only three or four people, virtually said nothing about looking for more details of this deal. As a result, as the Premier said time and time again, we sold away our heritage.

What I am saying to all of you members right now is if you vote for the resolution without knowing what you are giving away, then you are making exactly the same mistake that was made in this House about twenty-five years ago. We refuse to make that mistake.

The other thing we refuse to do, Mr. Speaker, is I refuse, quite frankly, to vote on this motion. It is, in my opinion, premature to vote for it and premature to vote against it until we have the information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:

On that basis, directed by instructions from my own party, I

intend to abstain from the voting here. If you want to take your resolution and play games, play games with it yourselves. But I warn you, in twenty-five or thirty years from now, when you find you have a massive military reserve up there and you can do nothing more with Labrador, then I told you at this time. I am not particular about what the lumps are now but I am saying to you, you have an obligation to be stewards of this country and if you do not do it, then you are denying your duty.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

Now we will hear it.

MR. LONG:

I do not know how much the member opposite will hear because any time that I have made an attempt to be heard in this House, he does not seem too interested in listening. It is partly my experience in the last couple of weeks since I have been in here that I too am going to read for the record. From my experience of not being taken very seriously when I speak, I do want to refer to other materials and enter them into the record, and I will do that in the interest of bringing

information to the House and putting information on the record because I share the position that this motion being brought before the House, if it is not out of order, it is certainly inappropriate.

I want to direct my comments to the third "WHEREAS", the "WHEREAS" in the motion which says, "AND WHEREAS the Health, Environmental and Wildlife concerns are being addressed by both the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador;" and then it proceeds.

I intend to argue that that is an absolutely false proposition. The motion is based on a false premise, that neither the Canadian Government nor this government has been addressing environmental, health or wildlife concerns and it will be on that basis that I will argue that this motion simply cannot be supported because the motion itself is based on a false premise.

I do think it is necessary to go back over time in the period that has elapsed since the House last dealt with this motion. Questions were raised at that time about when the government would respond to concerns that were being brought forward by various people both in Labrador and on the Island portion of the Province. It was just prior to the vote in the House the last time that the FEARO panel was established.

MR. KELLAND:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:
My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that I believe the member for St. John's East just indicated his belief was that the resolution was out of order. As it is being debated in this House, one would have to assume that it is in order because Mr. Speaker has accepted it as a resolution or motion for debate. So perhaps we could ask the member for St. John's East to clarify. Is he now questioning the Chair's decision to allow that on the Order Paper?

MR. LONG:
To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
It demonstrates my concern about being listened to in the House. I chose my words carefully and did not say that I thought the motion was out of order. I thought it was, at least, inappropriate, and, at worse, based on false premise. So I believe the motion is in order because it has been accepted here, and I am speaking to it in those terms.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker, one more point to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order.

MR. KELLAND:
I believe Hansard will show that he used the term 'out of order'.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So, I was beginning to address myself to the process that was established by the federal government in response both to concerns being raised in the Province and also in a traditional form when dealing with such a proposed development, calling on the Department of National Defence to submit to an environmental impact process.

One of the first things that was brought to the public's attention at that time was a statement by the Ministerial Association which the member for Menihek has referred to. I would like to quote one key concern that they raised about the environmental assessment process itself.

This is from the Happy Valley and District Ministerial Association: "We are concerned with the scope of the environmental assessment review process which excludes any discussion of Native land claims or Canada's defence policy. Native peoples of this region and peace groups locally and nationally have raised serious concerns about the proposed military development. Under the terms of reference for this review, these concerns will not be considered -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member is reading from some outside document. I think the hon. member should be expressing his own views.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:
Okay, I gave notice that I was wanting to read some material into the record.

MR. BARRY:
A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of order, the hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:
With all due respect, the only problem is, while I agree the rubbish that is being put into the record should not go in, I do not think we should start setting precedents that are going to handicap all of us. My understanding is that you are allowed to read into the record from any document provided you are prepared to table the document. So, if the member is prepared to table the document, he should be given the opportunity of reading it into the record.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I suggest that is why we have a Speaker here. I think there is a fine distinction here. It is all very well to read into the record and then table something that is factual. As members of the House, we are not here to parrot some other peoples' opinions. That is what the hon. member is doing now. If it is fact, sure, read it and table it.

But if it is just mouthing what other people have said about an issue under debate here, I think it is quite improper and quite out of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there is no point of order.

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

I will continue to try and use my time as best I can and hope that there are not endless points of order on whether I have a right to read for the record or not.

What I was reading, in that case, was a statement by the Ministerial Association. It is partly to illustrate the absolute disrespect that has been shown throughout the process of reviewing the concerns by both levels of government towards people who have been raising concerns, both Native and non-Native. I think it is being continued here in the Chamber here today. Also, I will come to the comments that the Premier has made in that regard.

Shortly after the FEARO process was established, I would like to draw to the attention of the House a resolution that was passed by a Standing Committee on Environment and Forestry in the House of Commons in June of last Summer. In issuing its first report, its title was "Forest Resources and Industries in Eastern Canada." There was a resolution that was part of that report as recommendation number three.

The recommendation read: "That the Ministry of National Defence should immediately halt all North Shore and Labrador low-level

military air flights and assess the effects of such flights on the environment in the regions as soon as possible."

That was adopted last Summer. There were members of both the Liberal Party and P.C. Party sitting on that Committee as a Standing Committee of the House of Commons. It was the Standing Committee dealing with the base in Labrador with the ongoing low level flight training and said, until a complete review is done on the project, all low level flight training should be stopped. This position was taken last Summer and it is a position that has been echoed, as the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) has suggested, and will continue to be echoed by many others, not only in Newfoundland and Labrador, but across the country.

In this same period, toward the end of the Summer, the report of the International Federation of Human Rights was released. The report makes for fascinating reading. The documentation that was produced, not just the concerns as they were expressed by Native people, but the actual impact that low level flying was having the lives and daily routines of Native people, the horrific stories that were accounted in that report, should be required reading for this House.

The recommendation that the federation made was simply that low level flying be stopped in Labrador as it constituted a violation and an infringement of the fundamental human rights of Native people in this country. That position was endorsed and supported by the Newfoundland and Labrador Human Rights Association,

another very reputable and prominent association in our Province that should not be so flippantly dismissed by hon. members of the House and certainly not treated with such disrespect as the government has shown. Another group that has put forward serious concerns is the Newfoundland and Labrador Human Rights Association.

I would like to also refer to a letter that was copied to our office, as the NDP caucus, from a constituent from the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), a person who was wanting to present a proposal for the development of what is called a burm, which was an imaginative idea that this person had to mitigate against noise level problems that were being created by low level flying. So this is a constituent of the member for Naskaupi who copied a letter of concern to our office saying, "With the ever increasing air movement to Goose Bay Airport comes a corresponding increase in noise levels, particularly from military aircrafts such as the F-4 phantom and F-16s. The shock waves created by these aircraft during the run up to break release and the first part of the take off roll can do actual damage to property such as loosening windows, etc., apart from the obvious physical discomfort of the ears.' So that is to suggest that there are non-Native people living in Happy Valley - Goose Bay who share concerns, perhaps from a different perspective, but not dissimilar to the concerns that are being put forward by Native people.

So I would now very quickly like to come to the question of reality. The Premier raised it in

his own remarks. I would like to by reading from testimonies given to the FEARO panel in the Fall when it travelled the Coast of Labrador and called for submissions and for evidence to be given to support concerns that were being raised about low level flying. All of the people that I will be quoting are people who come from the Native community, both Innu and Inuit.

I would like to begin by referring to the Deputy Mayor of Nain, Mr. William Barbour, who appeared before the FEARO panel. I think this is very important to introduce into the record of the House because it seems that the concerns that have been coming forward from people from the Coast have not been taken seriously. So that is my purpose in bringing it to the House today.

The Deputy Mayor of Nain says, 'It is believed that most people in Nain are opposed to it,' the development. 'It is a fact that military are already straying from their training areas and are flying over bays and rivers in close proximity to Nain. Such activities seemed to be explained as sightseeing tours by military personnel. Air and noise pollution will affect the environment. These activities and the explanation for them are not appreciated.'

This person goes on to raise for some time, over three or four pages of testimony, concerns from his perspective as a municipal leader in the town of Nain. This certainly lends substance to the suggestion that there is vast concern among various sectors of the population of Labrador and would actually suggest that the contention by the Premier that the

vast majority of the population is in favour of the base is something open to question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LONG:

Also appearing before the FEARO panel to present submissions of concern about the development in Labrador was William Anderson the third, President of the Labrador Inuit Association. I would like to quote from his submission in which he says, "The military flying activities represent a project based in Labrador; it is a project heard, seen and felt by Labrador Native people; a project whose prime impact will be in Labrador. A process which distorts this to allow priority consideration of Quebec interests is unacceptable to us, and it should be unacceptable to our government as well.

"The position of LIA is clear. The public review process must be fair and honest in order to be meaningful. LIA is not prepared to legitimize this process by participating in it as it is currently established. We believe that it is not an honest one. Our participation is, at this stage, done under protest."

It goes on to talk about the difficulties in actually having an open and genuine and real meaningful input into the development. He continues to say on their position on low level flying, "The LIA is opposed in principle to any military activity on or over or above land, water, ice in our claimed area. Labrador Inuit history and experience with

military presence and activities in Labrador give us every reason to continue this opposition."

He talks about the difficulty of native people having respect for the Department of National Defense because of the lack of effort by the department to conduct impact studies over the last twenty years on low level flying.

I would also like to continue with further information from Mr. Anderson's submission and deal in this light with a comment that he made about our federal representative in Cabinet, Mr. Crosbie. This is another illustration of the native people pleading to be heard and pleading for their concerns to be taken seriously.

The then "Justice Minister, John Crosbie was quoted in The Evening Telegram on the 12 of October as saying, 'Low level flying makes caribou macho. It makes them more potent.' I think it is irresponsible for federal ministers or officials or any person to make jokes of not only the wildlife we have in the area, but it is an insult to the people. We do not want a process that is an insult. We want to process that is going to determine what the final outcome of the project is going to be, whether it is recommended by you or whether it is accepted by the federal government."

The Inuit people are saying they do not want to process that as an insult. Before I finish, I would like to try and continue to argue that that is exactly what has been happening throughout this whole hype with the demands for support for this project. This process is being continued in the House here

today and it is an insult to the people who have been raising concerns.

Another person who submitted concerns to the FEARO hearing was a lands claim negotiator for the Labrador Inuit Association, Toby Anderson. He also made a point of commenting on Mr. Crosbie's demonstrated disrespect for the concerns of the Inuit people.

"The hon. John Crosbie, the federal representative for this Province in that meeting, said 'Low level flying aircraft did not have any more affect or was no louder than a skidoo'. I do not know what kind of skidoo Mr. Crosbie has. He probably never, ever drove a skidoo. But to us who have to take a skidoo from here and travel to Nain, as far as 160 miles inland to bring back caribou, from an hon. federal minister, that is a slap in the face, because we depend on those machines. It is absolutely foolish to say that they are as loud as a low flying aircraft. It is crazy. Mr. Crosbie, I know, is known for his little cracks in the House of Commons and everywhere else, but I think that is a foolish one."

That is the man who is involved in ongoing negotiations representing the Labrador Inuit Association with the federal government and he is echoing the sentiment of the President of the Inuit Association saying that the whole process is an insult. Basically they are saying that there is racism from one end of the line to the other when it comes to government and military officials dealing with this development, hyping the development to no end and ignoring or actually showing disrespect for the concerns that are being

brought forward.

The final person I would like to mention who made a submission to the FEARO hearing is another important person in coastal Labrador. He is the Mayor of Makkovik, Gary Mitchell, who said to the Commission during its hearings last Fall, "For the record, we do not like the idea of Garfield Warren, our MHA, telling the House of Assembly that his district supports the base or Steve Michelin, the President of Combined Councils of Labrador, stating that all the combined councils favour the base".

That is the last quote I would like to make from submissions that were made to the FEARO hearings. I hope that I have introduced enough evidence to suggest that this idea that the vast majority of people in Labrador are in favour of the base is a false one. And further I would argue that what these testimonies represent is an indication of the immense frustration that is being felt, not only by Native peoples, but others as well, in that concerns about this development are not being listened to.

That is why I would argue that the unlying premise of this motion being brought to the House of Assembly, that "Health, Environmental and Wildlife concerns are being addressed by both" levels of government, is simply not true. I think the testimonies bear that out. I think that is something that is going to continue to provoke confrontation in this Province.

People who have legitimate concerns, from religious leaders in the community, from people who are working on human rights

questions, from Native peoples themselves, from people who are concerned about noise levels in the community of Happy Valley, people who are concerned about environmental questions, and people who are also concerned about what role Canada is playing in the international situation, that these concerns must, at some level, be taken seriously.

I think it is with this dynamic occurring that actually prompted the FEARO panel just recently to insist to the Department of National Defence that proposed increases in low level flying for the Summer of 1987 not go ahead. There are indications that the Department of National Defence is not going to accede to the request by the FEARO panel, and what we are faced with is an absolute contradiction in purpose in which the federal government has two departments, one the FEARO Department through the Department of Environment and the other, the Department of National Defence, at loggerheads about this development.

The debate about this development is a lot bigger than what some of the simple-minded remarks that have been made in this House would suggest. The debate about this development goes beyond this Assembly, goes beyond this City, goes beyond the communities in Labrador, has been taking place across the country and, indeed, has been happening internationally.

I would like to note that recently there was a news item showing that in the Federal Republic of West Germany the Parliament unanimously adopted a resolution calling for a freeze on low level military training within the country. What we are seeing happen is the need for West German pilots to conduct

their training exercises and the population of Germany will no longer stand for the intrusion and the difficulty that is being caused by these low level training exercises. They now want to find an open space, somewhere on the globe, and it just happens that Labrador sits, not only strategically in the middle of the North Atlantic, but also is supposedly an open, unpopulated space that can be turned over to the NATO forces. The population of West Germany has demanded that its own Parliament call an end to low level flying, so what the German air force is now doing is trying to take Labrador as a place where it can -

MR. KELLAND:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

The hon. member is again attempting to mislead the House, maybe inadvertently but nevertheless. If I am not mistaken, was there not information in this House and otherwise that the West German Government has made a statement in support of Konya, Turkey over Happy Valley - Goose Bay. So how can they be in favour of Konya getting low level flying when, as the member has just said, West Germany has come out against low level flying? Do you not find that a little confusing?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, there is obviously a difference of opinion

between two hon. members. There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. But I will take the liberty, in the time I have -

MR. WARREN:

Could you rebutt that?

MR. LONG:

Yes, I will. I will do that as well.

But to address the question that has just been raised, there is a lot of confusion about this issue and it is happening on an international level. Recent information has come out to suggest that the site in Turkey is built on a fault line, and people in the United States Defence Planning Department, who have been pushing the Turkey site because they have a close military relationship with that government, are terrified of putting this big tactical fighter weapons training center there because of the difficulties with the land itself.

In addition, all the NATO partners of Western Europe are having difficulties in giving the nod to Turkey because Greece has promised that if Turkey gets its base, it will pull out of the NATO Alliance. All of which suggests that there are very major international considerations with this development, and which would also suggest to my mind, as a Newfoundlander, that we are ready to prostitute ourselves when there are people all over the world calling for the demilitarization of the world's resources.

We are being forced, in the face of economic difficulty, in the face of distorted development over the years, maldevelopment, under development, to look at ourselves as a Third World people in which the only way that we can move forward is if we are given military development. That says nothing about the security and environmental protection and development at a community level, all it does is prostitute local populations and offer them no other choice.

I would suggest that members of both parties in this House are fairly easily able to come together with such profound commitment on this issue because both parties have difficulty dealing with Labrador. The Liberals a long time ago signed away a fiasco, sold away Labrador and have never been able to recover from that difficulty. And this government has been promising, ever since it was first elected in 1979, to deal with Churchill Falls, to deal with the developmental difficulties of Labrador, and have produced nothing.

What we are being left with, what we are being asked to support, is a situation in which Labrador be given over to NATO. Now, who is NATO? There is a question of sovereignty that is very germane in this. As a Newfoundlander I feel very close personal strong objection to the idea of giving this very important resource-filled piece of land over to the NATO Alliance. In the meantime, we are probably going to lose jobs at the airport, we are probably going to lose civilian jobs because NATO will be in control. The question is who is in control.

I would like to suggest to the Premier, in light of some of his remarks that he made when he first appeared here for the first time in some time to speak about this issue in public, that it is not either/or, it is exactly the concern that is being put forward. If the NATO base proceeds and if the low level flying continues, it will indeed mitigate against other kinds of development in Labrador. That is what testimony to the FEARO hearings on the record are saying. People are saying, 'We are being prevented from doing our hunting and fishing and trapping.' People are being prevented from seeing other ways of developing their communities because of the interference and the imposition of the low level flight training exercises.

As the leader of our party so eloquently suggested in the closing of his remarks, that is exactly what is on the agenda for the future of Labrador. Other development will be stalled in the face of this kind of military intrusion.

I would also like to comment on the Premier's suggestion that we do not have to fight rear guard actions. What I have tried to put in the record here today is that what you call rear guard actions are actually the concerns of ordinary people in this Province and of Native people who have had a bad history of being treated by Newfoundlanders. It is a very sensitive thing that we should keep in our own minds, our history as it relates to the indigenous people of this land. The concerns that are being presented by those people, religious leaders, human rights advocates, environmentalists, women raised it

this morning during Women's Lobby Day, people who are concerned about peace in the international situation, do not represent a rear guard action. They actually represent mainstream concerns and that is the problem with the resolution. The resolution says, 'WHEREAS we are addressing these concerns,' and the Premier comes in and suggests that anybody who is raising concerns is working for Greenpeace or the KGB or some other preposterous notion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LONG:

I will call on the Premier actually to withdraw his remarks in which he said, "I detest and deplore the people who are trying to undermine progress." You detest and deplore, well, you are going to at some point soon, Mr. Premier, have to take seriously the concerns.

And if that is all you are going to say, that you detest and deplore the people who are raising concerns, then you can be assured that this question is far from being resolved. It is not going to be resolved. You do not have unanimous support for this resolution. The debate will continue outside the Chamber and it will continue outside the Province. There will be more said on this issue.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest

Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to take a few minutes to say a few words. The member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), I gather, is going to speak for a few minutes and then I think the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) will clue this up.

I had not intended speaking in this debate at all, but I must say, after hearing the garbage and the quotations of members of the NDP Party, I was forced to stand on my feet to throw in my two cents worth. It is great to have the NDP in the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker. They never use common sense to any approach, it is all ideology. That is all you ever hear from them. That kind of stuff is great in certain places, but I really do not think it is very appropriate in the Legislature where members are elected to express their views and their opinions on issues.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure we all listened intently to what the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) said. They did not have anything to say, as a matter of fact, all they did was quote from everybody: the federal New Democratic Party, the clergy, authors, the Germans. I do not know who else they quoted from, Mr. Speaker, but I would like to know what their view, what their opinion is on the issue? Neither of them gave us their view or their opinion on the issue so we have, as has been alluded to in this House on several occasions now, Flip and Flop. It is easy to call them political whimps. That is a very accurate description. Some people call them political

misfits and we see that happening more and more every day. The member for St. John's East says, 'Oh, because one of the whereases says this or says that, then we cannot support it.' Mr. Speaker, where does he stand on the substantive issue, the resolution? Do you support the NATO training centre in Goose Bay or do you not support the NATO training base in Goose Bay, that, Mr. Speaker, is the question.

MR. TULK:

They are going to abstain.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, that would not surprise me. Or they will leave the House before the vote. I notice the member for St. John's East has already skivvered out of the House, so his vote will not be on the record, I suppose.

MR. DAWK:

Slithered, I think, is the right word.

MR. SIMMS:

Skivvered or slithered, whatever. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, as usual the NDP are overstating their case, trying to put the fear of God in people, turning their backs on the Province, on Newfoundlanders and Labradorians in particular, trying to court political favour with minority groups and so on, as is their wont. Mr. Speaker, I am not surprised that the member for Menihek and the member for St. John's East have put forth two positions on this issue. Now, the member for Menihek says that his position is based on principle.

MR. FUREY:

'Peter Principle.'

MR. SIMMS:

'Peter Principle,' as the member

for St. Barbe says. Well, I do not know what his position is, but I do know what the Mokami project group in Goose Bay said about the position of the member for Menihek. And since both hon. members quoted from articles today in their comments, I hope I will be permitted to make a brief quote from what the Mokami project group said. They said this, and they were talking about the debate on the issue: 'However, when a so-called single-handed and unscientific investigation by the leader of a political party, i.e. the NDP, into the complex problems surrounding a development in the Upper Lake Melville region takes place in such a biased and false manner, then it is in the reactionary role that this particular group had to respond.' Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a condemnation by a group in Goose Bay, a group in Labrador, a non-partisan group involved in the project who said what I just quoted. They said what many people around Newfoundland are saying today. Mr. Speaker, the member for Menihek, I think, would have been well advised to have been in his riding this past weekend, during the Winter Carnival. He was not there and they were looking for him. My colleague, the President of the Treasury Board, was there representing the government and, by the way, spoke to literally dozens of people, and that is not an exaggeration, all of whom, to a person I suspect, explained that they were very dissatisfied with the member generally speaking, but they were very, very dissatisfied with his position on this NATO base, Mr. Speaker, and I suspect the member is probably trying to think of ways to overcome that.

Just briefly to conclude, Mr.

Speaker, on the one hand the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is in Montreal supporting Canada's withdrawal from NATO, when his hypocritical colleagues out on the West Coast of the country, NDP members, are lobbying to have the polar sea icebreaker built on the West Coast.

As the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) pointed out, Premier Pawley is out there crying for the CF-18's to be built in his Province. Last year the member for Menihek, himself, voted for the NATO base and two or three months later starts softening his position and talks about his position being based on a question of principle. Now, Mr. Speaker, we all know that the Winnipeg Free Press had to say about the member's principles. Sometime ago, when he was commenting on another issue, the Winnipeg Free Press said, "Mr. Fenwick's Principles? Premier Howard Pawley is fortunate that he does not have as a member of his caucus Peter Fenwick, an NDP member." So much for the hon. member's principles, Mr. Speaker.

They are so pious in all issues, they are so high and mighty, or try to portray themselves as being high and mighty, they are sanctimonious, they are haloistic - if there is any such word - and they sit on the fence day in and day out and talk about supporting international peace. You would not know, by God, but we do not support international peace. What a bunch of foolishness and silliness!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame! Go! Go!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, now we see their

strategy. They are clearly chickening out. Perhaps the members will be back.

MR. WINDSOR:

Say it for the record.

MR. SIMMS:

The member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) and the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), a half hour before the vote is to be taken, have left their seats so they will not have their position on the record. That is a shameful thing!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shameful! Shameful!

MR. SIMMS:

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I wanted to address my few remarks to the member for Menihek and the member for St. John's East, but since they have left the House, I am going to adjourn my few remarks, I have nothing further to say.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

Mr. Speaker, I want to speak to this resolution because it is very important. The President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor) said, 'Have the vote now.' The people in the district of Eagle River also want to have their say.

It is quite true that there is a feeling in Labrador which is regrettable now that we have found that one of the ways to alleviate unemployment is by having a military presence. That is depressing, because if Churchill Falls had not been nationalized, if the government had not spent

fifteen years negotiating with Quebec, we would have the Lower Churchill developed, we would have the aluminum smelter, we would have other jobs and we would not have to rely on the NATO base.

MR. DINN:

What is the matter with having the military?

MR. HISCOCK:

Could I be heard in silence, Mr. Speaker?

Goose Bay started out as a military base. When the member for St. John's East says that the Liberals and the Progressive Conservatives sold out Labrador, I would recommend to everybody in this House, particularly the Minister, that they read the book by Dr. Gordon Thomas, *From Sleigh To Satellite*, which tells about Northern Newfoundland and Labrador. If I may just quote a couple of paragraphs, Mr. Speaker: "On our visit to parts of Labrador, people were actually starving last Winter owing to a bad fishing season, and many would have starved altogether if it had not been for a steamer wrecked on the coast loaded with bullock and flour." One would assume it was back in 1881, Mr. Speaker, but we are not talking about Dr. Grenfell or Dr. Curtis, but Dr. Thomas who was there in the '30s and the '40s. He talks about the various diseases, beriberi and diphtheria, and said that T.B. basically infected all along the Labrador Coast and that Labrador had the highest rate of T.B. in all of North America. Those hit hardest by this disease were the Inuit of the North, and it was with the coming of Confederation that they received help and progress was made.

Again, I read a book by Senator Rowe recalling the Smallwood era. At the National Convention the only ones supporting Confederation were Mr. Smallwood, Senator Bradley, and the United Church clergyman from North West River, in Labrador.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:
Eli Curtis?

MR. HISCOCK:
Yes.

MR. WARREN:
No, Lester Burry.

MR. HISCOCK:
Lester Burry. He realized the benefits Confederation would bring, Mr. Speaker, because in those days widows had to give up their children, married couples had to give up their children and send them to orphanages. Conditions on the Labrador Coast and in Northern Newfoundland at that time were unbelievable.

It was also stated in one of those books that when the radar installations were done in St. Anthony and all along the Labrador Coast it was the first time people had money in their pockets. The same thing applied to the Placentia/Argentia area, to Stephenville, to Gander, to Goose Bay and also to St. John's. The first time all of Newfoundland and Labrador every crawled out of poverty was with the coming of the military bases. After the war was over and these bases were closed, we fell back into poverty again.

It is not an easy thing to stand in this House and say that after so many years of Confederation the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) cannot bring in a budget because he needs \$150 million from the

federal government.

But I want to address another issue and that has to do with the hypocrisy, and I use the word 'hypocrisy', of the NDP in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:
The member for St. John's East said that the Province was prostituting itself for the military. The point I make is this: When Spain decided to become a democracy, the Socialist Party of Spain wanted to pull out of NATO. And that was their platform, to pull out of NATO. That was the Socialists' platform! Once they were elected, what did they do? They held a referendum and the same party that was saying 'Pull out of NATO' told their people to vote for NATO and the people voted for it overwhelmingly.

When I was travelling in Greece, Afghanistan and the India area in 1974, after taking a year off from teaching, in Greece, Mr. Speaker, Popadapolous, another socialist, said, 'Let us take Greece out of NATO.' That was their campaign platform, they were elected, and then what did they do? They renegotiated the contract with the United States and got more money to keep the NATO bases in Greece.

France did the same thing. A socialist government was elected and then what did they do? They withdrew from NATO, but they still have a military presence and they still have low-flying aircraft.

Take the Labour Party in England. When they were the government they supported NATO, they supported

low-flying missiles, the cruise missiles and X number of other things. When they were defeated they went to the populace again and played on their fear and insecurity because of nuclear war and nuclear fallout, but they were unsuccessful in their attempt to again become the government. And what are the people in the Labour Party doing today? They are saying, 'Let us pull out of NATO.'

The point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is that the socialists have an attitude of purity which is, when we are not the government take the high road, but when we are we will deal with reality.

If anybody in this House or anybody in this Province thinks that the NDP in this Province or internationally are voting to withdraw from NATO, to not have a military, they will find that if the NDP do form the government they will have to live up to their obligations as a civilized Western democracy. We cannot hide our heads in the sand, wash our hands of the whole affair and let America look after us.

There are no monuments in Labrador to those who travelled by dog sled or by boat to the Island part of the Province to join the military to fight and die in the First World War and the Second World War. Nobody wants war. Nobody wants it, but we realize we have an obligation and that obligation, Mr. Speaker, is to defend this world we have.

When I was in Afghanistan in 1974, walking through the markets you would see all the communist propaganda. What is happening in Afghanistan now? Over 6 million people are refugees from their own country. And if anybody in this

world or in this Province thinks that it is not the objective of the Communist Party of Russia and the Soviet Union to one day advance their cause by infiltrating other groups and using their propaganda to reach its goal of one world government, and that under socialism, then people are naive.

And that is what happened in Angola and South Africa. Everybody is against apartheid. There is no question that everybody is against apartheid, but what is the Soviet Union doing with regard to South Africa and Angola? They are saying, 'Throw off the cloak of imperialism, throw off the cloak of colonialism, and put on the cloak of communism.'

Mr. Speaker, the people of Labrador realize that there is a military base there. They do want jobs. They would much prefer to have a paper mill there, they would much prefer to have an aluminum plant there, but they remember the days when the radar stations were built on Spotted Island, on Seal Island, Cutthroat Island, St. Lewis, and all along the Coast.

Anytime the people of Labrador, Northern Newfoundland and the rest of the Province had cash in their pockets, it was because of the military presence. I can say to the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) that if it was not for the military in Argentia, there would be poverty on top of poverty in Placentia, and if it was not for the military in Stephenville, there would be poverty on top of poverty on the West Coast. There is still quite a lot of poverty on the Port au Port Peninsula. But nobody wants to have the base for war purposes.

To go back to Dr. Thomas again he says about the people in St. Anthony, 'When the Americans pulled out of there, all the able-bodied men who had had jobs for the first time in their lives all year round had to go back to hauling water by dog team, had to go back to cutting wood, and had to go back on welfare.' What is comes down to, Mr. Speaker, is if the NDP are not in favour of NATO, what are they going to recommend if they form the government? And one of these days, Mr. Speaker, they will.

MR. DAWE:
Never!

MR. HISCOCK:
Mr. Speaker, history proves that if you cater to the whims of various pressure groups they consolidate and get elected. And one of these days they may, and then we will have to put up with what England has had to put up with and with what B.C. has had to put up with.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this resolution I cannot help but say that we on this side of the House feel that if NATO is going to be in Goose Bay there has to be an environmental impact study, the environment has to be protected. This government, which has been in existence for the past fifteen years, has procrastinated and dragged its feet on letting Native people have control of the fish plants in the North and settling land claims.

When the Premier was talking about land claims a few moments ago the member for St. John's East said, 'Indigenous Aboriginal people', to which the Premier answered, 'I am indigenous.' How can you try to negotiate land claims with

aboriginal people when you have the Premier of the Province basically not in favour of it?

As I have said to this House many, many time before, when we talk about land claims and granting land, let us not forget the people of Paradise River, Cartwright, Black Tickle and other southern areas of Labrador. When Cartwright came out he brought his men with him who married the Inuit, the Indian and Eskimo. There is also a Metis presence in Labrador. Black Tickle, for example, in the district of Eagle River, was a native community, but in 1980 it was switched around and it was no longer a native community. Actually, the people of Black Tickle could have been designated as an indigenous aboriginal people at one time, therefore, there are people in Southern and Northern Labrador who have a claim to their birthright, to the land, just as much right as any other indigenous aboriginal people.

Mr. Speaker, as to this resolution, I find it the height of hypocrisy that a member of the NDP who voted for this in the beginning has now backed off because of his party. If the NDP do not want to have NATO in Labrador, or do not want to have NATO in Canada, fine! That is their position. I can respect that. I can respect that because it is their philosophical position, but let us not have this hypocrisy that is going on here, coming in here and speaking and then not having the backbone or the gall to stand up for their philosophy. I mean, how jelly-like, how wishy-washy can you be, Mr. Speaker? So I would say they are doing a disservice to their people who brought the

resolution to their own convention, and by not standing up and representing their constituents they are doing a disservice to them.

The member for St. John's East said that the Liberals raped Labrador. If it was not for the Liberal Party the member for Menihek would not have a seat, because Labrador City and Wabush would not have been created. And you can say the same thing for Churchill Falls and other areas around that great part of our Province.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is regrettable that the NDP are doing this summersault and taking the position, 'Do not support it. Abstain. The people in the Province will not know what is really going on. We will not upset our own group of people.' I will say to the people of our Province remember what Spain did. They said, 'Pull out of NATO', but when they were elected they voted to stay in NATO. Remember also what Greece did. The point I am making to the people of Sheshatshit, the various church groups, the authors, the intellectuals and others, is I have great problems myself philosophically with the idea of the military. I would like to have a nuclear free world. Would not we all? But we are not living in that type of ideal world. We can work toward it. And that was why the great Liberal Prime Minister, Lester B. Pearson, got the Nobel Peace Prize, for bringing groups of idealistic differences together, dictatorships, military governments, fascist governments, communist governments and democracies, so that they could talk and not have an explosive

situation in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I have in my district, in Cartwright, one of the radar sites that are on the go. Over \$300 million will be spent there. Last year sixty local people were hired, and contracts will be let again. What it comes down to is this: If that was not there, what would there be? The fishery has failed. The federal government has cut back the \$1.5 million that was supposed to be spent in Smokey, they have cut back the \$15 million that was allocated for the Northern plants, so, Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is, do we want people working for ten weeks in order to get UIC, do we want people to lose their dignity and pride by having to go on welfare, or do we try to find a sound economic base? The economic base for Happy Valley - Goose Bay, Mr. Speaker, has always been its airport and the military presence. When Goose Bay started originally, people from Cartwright, Bloomfield and other areas of the Province went there and got jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution. But this House and the people of this Province have to realize that the Aboriginal people of this Province have been given a raw deal by this government in the past fifteen years. Land claims have to be entered into seriously and the environment has to be protected. Passing this resolution does not mean that the military and NATO can move into Labrador and take over carte blanche.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding I just want to say that I do not think the NDP has the backbone they were thought to have when they were elected. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Housing.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, maybe I can speak to this resolution with some background in the military, in the sense that I was a member of the Royal Canadian Air Force for ten years. I think that sometimes military people are thought of as almost warmongers in the sense that whatever they are, I guess, they are considered to be the ones who would first participate in war. But I can assure hon. members that in my ten years as a member of the Air Force, and living on an air force station, I met very few members who appreciated anything like the possibility of a war. God help us all, but I guess we were all, to a man, against the possibility of that happening.

We were involved in peace keeping throughout the world. I remember one little sojourn I made. Although I was not in a war theatre at anytime, I was in the armed services during peacetime, when we took a group of people who were involved with the Canadian Peace Keeping Force over to Cyprus. The closest I came to bullets was the firing range in Greenwood. That was one of the stations I was at, Greenwood, Nova Scotia. The only other time I came anywhere close to bullets, outside of hunting, and I have only gone hunting twice, was when we landed at Cyprus and were unloading this Argos aircraft - we were transporting the peace

keeping force to Cyprus in the '60s - and I heard this wierd sound, a kind of ping. I wondered what it was for a while, but one of the guys said that it was somebody on a hill about a half-mile away firing.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Was it an NDP fellow after you?

MR. DINN:

And I looked over and, sure enough, that is what it was. So we sent out a couple of jeeps and secured the hill and then proceeded to unload. So, I mean, I do not have a lot of experience in any kind of a war theatre.

But I would like to say that military people, generally, are not war-minded, especially Canadians. Canadians have a very good reputation throughout the world for their peace-keeping roles in Cyprus and other parts of the world.

Now, I have listened to the NDP this afternoon, and I guess they are going to have to wrestle with their own consciences, if they have any. As the Premier outlined, Tommy Douglas, of course, supported missile flying over his province, and he was one of the signatories to that agreement. Blakeney was another, and Roy Romanow, and so on. Pawley, of course, wanted the F-18 contract. What, in the name of heavens, did he want F-18 built for if it was not for low-level flying somewhere in Canada, presumably?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

The federal NDP members could maybe bring military bases into their districts, could they not?

MR. DINN:

Yes. And, of course, federal NDP members who have military bases in their province or in their districts -

MR. R. AYLWARD:

They suggest we close them, I guess.

MR. DINN:

- certainly would not want to see their bases closed. Why would the NDP in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, where the biggest problem we have is jobs, be against this? If anybody did a poll - of course, you do not need to do a poll, you just have to listen to your own constituents - but if anybody were to do an accurate poll in Newfoundland, the poll would come back and I would say a minimum of 70 per cent would say that the biggest problem in Newfoundland today is the lack of employment. Here we have the possibility of employment. Now, is there any problem with sound from aircraft? Yes. I lived on a military station. I know that it is a bit disconcerting at 3:00 a.m. for a jet to take off or land, or a four-engine Bristol Britannia, an Argus aircraft, to take off and land with four piston driven engines lumbering over your house. And yes, the windows do shake, I can testify to that because I lived with it for ten years. But, really, can we, as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, throw out the possibility of 1,000 or 1,500 or more jobs in an area that is depressed since military activity declined in Happy Valley - Goose Bay? Can we turn a blind eye to the unemployed people, not only in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area but in the Province of Newfoundland, because we might suffer a little discomfort with aircraft taking off or landing or flying low? I mean, what kind of

people would we be if we were to do something like that? Mr. Speaker, it is one thing to have this holier-than-thou attitude, to be able to take the position that the NDP in this Province are taking but, Mr. Speaker, I suggest it would be another thing if they were in government or if they were, in my opinion, responsible members of this legislature, to take the positions that they are taking.

Mr. Speaker, I have a few other words to say on the resolution. It is 5:58 p.m. I suggest I adjourn the debate and and get on with it tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House adjourn until tomorrow at 3:00 p.m., and after we complete the resolution, we will be back on Interim Supply.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m.