



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 49

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

27 May 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Before calling for Statements By Ministers, I would like to welcome to the public galleries fifty-two students and four adults from St. Edward's School in Placentia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
I would also like to welcome Mrs. Sheila Ryan and the staff and residents of ACCESS Home who are visiting St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, I was wondering if the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) is available today? I have a question for him.

DR. COLLINS:
He is out of the Province.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
He is out of the Province.

Well, I will go to whoever is acting for the Premier today, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), I assume. There is a major issue in this Province, Mr. Speaker, on which I think a question should be put to this government. As

matters now stand services for battered women are terribly inadequate and we have had the recent tragedy of the Judy Ryan case with the resultant loss of life to remind us of this. Is government on a priority basis committed to increase funding for improved and adequate programmes for this grave social crime? Will we hear from the minister today a commitment that more money will be put into relevant programmes on an urgent basis?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, if my memory serves me, there were no particular programmes for this particular social problem before this administration came into office. We have taken significant initiatives not only in St. John's, where, I guess, there is the largest concentration of population, but we have also taken initiatives in other parts of the Province. This is a matter that we have a lively concern in and, to the extent of our financial resources, we will do everything we can, and our record has demonstrated that.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, one of these days they are going to start acting

like a government, because they have had fifteen years to take on the problems of this Province.

A supplementary to the acting minister again. In light of the Judy Ryan case, which was a brutal education for us all, what effort is government making in this critical field of post-transition housing for women? Absence of housing, after spending some time in a transition house, is one of the central reasons why many women end up back in the problems that they had to face before. Are we going to see a programme to deal with that housing situation which affects these women?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I presume the hon. member knows that this is an extremely complex problem, and there are no simplistic answers to it. Now we have a Department of Social Services in this Province. There has been an enormous increase in the staffing of this department and they amongst many duties, have responsibilities in this area also, and they are dealing with it, I think. Certainly there can be improvements, there can be improvements in everything, but I think they are dealing with this problem, as they are with other social problems, quite adequately. We have put a lot of resources at their disposal in order for them to do so.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, laying off thirty-five social service workers around the Province is not dealing with the problem.

A final question to the minister. Not only are women suffering because of this problem, but the group that we have here today from ACCESS Home have also told me about the housing problems they have when they get out of ACCESS Home, having dealt with their problems and moved on into society, and they had the same problems as women do in trying to get adequate housing to deal with their problems. So, would the acting minister take it upon himself to tell the Minister of Social Services and the Cabinet to look at at least doubling the funding or looking at more funding to resolve this social crime that is on the go these days, which government is not attacking and not addressing?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I have absolutely no problem in passing to my colleague legitimate concerns. This is a legitimate concern and I will certainly pass it on to him. I know his answer will be that he is well aware of the problem and he is doing everything he can about it.

Now, insofar as this government not actually discharging its responsibilities, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr.

Doyle) has just given me written information that the Department of Social Services has spent over \$1.1 billion since 1979 when this administration came into office, \$1.1 billion. If that is not performance I do not know what is.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I had a series of questions for the Premier, who is not here, obviously, or for the Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward). We saw him in the precincts of the House, so I wonder would he be available? If not, Mr. Speaker, I have much delight in putting the questions to the hon. the Parliamentary Secretary (Mr. Warren), soon to be minister, in the absence of the minister. It is about the Sprung fiasco. I could tell him some of the latest stories out there, which is not in order, of course, but some of the latest public ridicule on this issue. He is aware that he, the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) and others are a laughingstock on this matter. The Premier himself, Mr. Speaker, has admitted to some middle of the night tantrums on this particular issue, a sign that it is getting to him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the hon. the Parliamentary Secretary. In the absence of the minister and the Premier, I am sure this gentleman for Torngat Mountains is able to answer these questions. The Premier has been indicating that we ought to go to particular officials in the National Research

Council and at the university. I have some news for him, we have done that, and in case he does not take my word for it he can read the media reports. And the people in the National Research Council are saying things to the effect -

MR. J. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. J. CARTER:
The Leader of the Opposition is good with words, he speaks well, he is interesting to listen to, and his speeches are sometimes worth attending, but this is Question Period and I think it is incumbent upon the Leader of the Opposition to phrase his question and not to make a speech which is more like a diatribe than a speech.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, I would ask the Leader of the Opposition to please pose a question.

MR. SIMMONS:
I admit, Mr. Speaker, to a certain stalling tactic. I looked around and saw only seven and a half ministers here and I was waiting for a full minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Now, Mr. Speaker, if the half would shut up I would get on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development has done us the favour of coming into the House so I will put the question to him. The Premier has been saying we should ask the National Research Council people, we have asked them, and they say they are not very sure, they have no documentation on the success of this technology, that is what they say. We have asked the people at the university, and they will not even be interviewed on it because they do not know enough about it they say. Now, Mr. Speaker, we cannot get the information from the sources that the Premier and the minister identified. Will he now, Mr. Speaker, give -

AN HON. MEMBER:
Is this a question?

MR. SIMMONS:
This is the question.

Will the minister now give the information to the House on which this decision with Sprung has been based? Would he provide the information? The marketing information, the information on the success of the technology, will he now provide that information to the House?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for the question. I apologize to hon. members that I was not here when Question Period started but I was in the back

there eating my lunch. I am sorry I was late.

MR. TULK:
Cucumbers and tomatoes, no doubt!

MR. R. AYLWARD:
I had a very good cucumber salad for lunch, Mr. Speaker, with some tomatoes and some milk.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, if you saw the press release and the statement that the Premier made at a press conference, he gave the exact names of people you could contact to get this information. Each of those people has knowledge about this technology in the world, each of those people is very knowledgeable about it, and if anyone wants to contact them and get some information from them, the same as we have done, it would be quite acceptable. They would get the information that this Sprung project, a project which mixes a special type of structure, Mr. Speaker, with a very special type of hydroponic technology, is a very good project. Newfoundland is an ideal place to try to experiment and start this type of project so that we can produce good, fresh quality food for the people of this Province.

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:
The minister says it all with a straight face. The truth is that he himself does not believe in this project. The truth is, Mr. Speaker, that he subscribed to the recommendations made to him by his own officials and he is putting on

a very brave front. Mr. Speaker, Calgary is suing this company for \$400,000, the feds have turned it down, and four provinces have turned it down.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

Will the hon. member please pose his question?

MR. SIMMONS:
Why, Mr. Speaker, is the government embracing this foolhardy scheme? Why, Mr. Speaker, are they doing it? Will the minister undertake to table the information, the reports from his officials, which reports recommended against this, which expressed some very serious concerns about it? The minister alluded to this yesterday, so will he table that information and will he answer the questions being asked all around this Province as to why the government is committing public funds to this before it is tried and tested?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for his second question. First of all, in his preamble he suggested that I was not supportive of this project. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many times I must say this, but I am very delighted to be the first minister contacted last Fall, the Fall of 1986, when someone gave me the idea that this project was available in Calgary. We have spent seven months investigating the project, Mr. Speaker, and I am very delighted to say that we have been able to attract this high

technology business to our Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, we will be the only part of the world, not Canada or Eastern Canada, we will be the first in the world to have this technology operating. Mr. Speaker, we will be able to do some research and development into producing not only the type of product that was produced very successfully in Calgary, Mr. Speaker, but we will also be able to produce more fresh foods, vegetables in particular, for our local market, Mr. Speaker. That is why I am very excited to have this project in Newfoundland.

MR. SIMMONS:
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:
He contains his excitement well, Mr. Speaker, I will say that for him.

Mr. Speaker, I asked the minister another question he did not respond to. I would like to ask him formally -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask one of the Pages to take the request to the minister. It is for him to respond to a request, under the Freedom of Information

Act, that he provide the information given to him by his officials, the reports in which, Mr. Speaker, the officials expressed some very serious concerns.

Now, yesterday the minister, in responding to a question, Mr. Speaker, admitted that his officials had some concerns. He said that yesterday. Now, Mr. Speaker, will he indicate -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, will the minister tell the House the nature of those concerns and what the response was to them? What were the particular concerns?

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, since it is my final supplementary, would the minister also indicate where are all those markets? The DRIE official on television again yesterday, said there is no indication that the markets are adequate. Will he dismiss that criticism too, Mr. Speaker, in his response?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, for the fiftieth time, I am sure, some staff in my department had concerns about marketing and about production levels. The statistics on marketing are readily available through Statistics Canada or through Ag Canada. Any request, I am sure, they could answer through

the local office in two days. One specific figure that I remember from looking at the Stats Canada computer sheet is that New Brunswick alone, in 1985, imported - not with their own production, imported, and this is a Stats Canada figure which has nothing to do with our government or anyone else - 9.5 million pounds of cucumbers and tomatoes from the United States and Mexico. That alone is a market, Mr. Speaker. New Brunswick imported 9.5 million pounds in 1985. That was not a blip. Stats Canada has the stats for 1984 and 1983 and 1982, and I saw them all, Mr. Speaker. One letter would solve that concern.

Mr. Speaker, the other concern that my department had was the production levels that were claimed by the Sprung Corporation. The Sprung Corporation ran their facility in Calgary at the production levels that they claimed.

MR. TULK:

Did they pay their bills?

MR. R. AYLWARD:

They paid all their legitimate bills, Mr. Speaker, until the site they were given and assured was cleaned up was proven not to be cleaned up and caused a failure in their plant.

Mr. Speaker, the plant in Calgary operated with the production levels claimed by Sprung without any grow lights, Mr. Speaker, in the production levels. So because of the concern the staff in my department had about production levels, we, as a government, insisted that Sprung, separate from the joint venture, would make a deal with an electrical company to provide \$3 million worth of lights for this Sprung greenhouse,

Mr. Speaker. That in itself would satisfy the concerns of my department about production. Not only that, Mr. Speaker, but there will also be a part of this agreement that if the Sprungs use more electricity than was used in Calgary they will pay for the electricity costs separate, again, from the joint venture, which is another plus for our joint venture.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday in his berating of the press in the Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order!

MR. TULK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will put my question when I get the chance to put it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Yesterday in his berating of the press the Premier made the statement that the public media -

MR. SIMMONS:

The unsprung Premier.

MR. TULK:

The unsprung Premier made the

statement that the public media of this Province had not gone to correct sources. As I understand it, at least one of the media in this Province made an attempt to go to one of the places that the Premier asked them to go, namely the National Research Bureau, who, while they said they approved of the structure of the Sprung project, they were not at all convinced that the technology was what Sprung said it was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:

I ask the minister in view of that, and in view of the fact that he is spending the money of the taxpayers of this Province - \$13.9 million, some 75 per cent of the cash involved - will he not now respect the rights of the people of the Province to hear the facts on the technology of Mr. Sprung before he signs away their cash? Or does he, like the Premier, believe that you sign the kind of secret deal that was signed with Newfoundland Energy Limited? For all we know Sprung may be registered in Bermuda.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural Agriculture and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not really know what difference it makes where Sprung is registered. They are a Canadian company as far as I know. I do not know what relevance that has.

Mr. Speaker, if they want to listen to the facts -

MR. MATTHEWS:

What about Panama?

MR. DINN:
Where was John C. Doyle registered?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please! We have half an hour for Question Period Time and there seems to be a pattern developing that two or three hon. members on my left are almost continually interrupting; one member on my immediate left here is doing it practically every day. I think the only recourse the Speaker will have is to name members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Name them! Name them!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Rural Agriculture and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, if a person wanted to look at what the government has put into the Sprung Corporation, in actual fact we have \$2.5 million cash and \$1 million worth of land, and for that, Mr. Speaker, we get 50 per cent of an \$18 million project. That is not a bad deal, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DINN:
That is a little better than Shaheen.

MR. TULK:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, let it be noted that the minister again gave some wrong information. The truth of the matter is, in the same way as the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) guarantees funds for

municipalities, you have guaranteed \$7 million of public funds of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Prove it. Prove it.

MR. TULK:
Why does he not go and use the same kind of guarantee to do away with some of the water and sewer problems in the Province?

MR. YOUNG:
You will be flushed down the toilet after the next election.

MR. TULK:
Let me ask him another question, Mr. Speaker. The minister himself on public television - I know he feels this just as sure as I am standing here - admitted that there was a risk involved in this project. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister about a very basic belief about this project. He may be right in doing what he is doing, but does he not believe that the private investors in this project, who are the people of Newfoundland, by and large, since 75 per cent or more of the investment is their risk, should at least know where, if this technology is successful, the minister and Sprung plan on selling the produce, the cucumbers and tomatoes, before he signs the deal? Or is he going to act, I ask him again, in the same manner that we have seen the Premier act of late, which is to close the government of this Province to the people they govern? He should answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member obviously is hard of hearing. I just showed him one specific area, New Brunswick, where we could sell more than we can produce in this greenhouse, Mr. Speaker, since New Brunswick imports 9.4 million or 9.6 million pounds of cucumbers and tomatoes - not what New Brunswick produces, or not what Nova Scotia produces - from the United States and Mexico. That is a market in itself, Mr. Speaker, and we will produce a better product and it will be fresher. That is one area, to explain very simply, where this project can be sold. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that the public of Newfoundland have an equity investment in this programme, a plan that is recommended by the Newfoundland Economic Council and by the Doug House Commission. We have investment in an equity position in a corporation. Mr. Speaker, we have attracted an advanced technology to our Province, a better technology than exists anywhere else in the world, and these are some of the reasons why the government of Newfoundland is very anxious to have this Sprung greenhouse built here and see it operating in the near future, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me ask the minister a very simple question and see if he will give us this piece of information. I think the minister has said that approximately 80 per cent of the produce of this project, the

cucumbers, the tomatoes and I suppose the ketchup and the pickles, will be exported out of the Province. Let me ask the hon. gentleman if he has signed contracts of sale or if Mr. Sprung has signed contracts of sale, or is he going to find himself in competition with other provinces which grow tomatoes and cucumbers? Is he going to find himself in competition with them? Does he have those contracts? Will he sign them? Will he tell us what political pressures the federal minister was operating under, which the Premier told us about yesterday? Does he have proof of that, or is that just the Premier, as we saw him yesterday evening, snarling at somebody else in the Province rather than the press?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, this corporation, or this joint venture will have less Canadian competition in the Eastern part of Canada than it did when operating in Western Canada, Mr. Speaker. Even at that they marketed it in the North Eastern United States, they were competing in the United States market, Mr. Speaker. We will have less competition on this end because there is less production in the Eastern end of Canada.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

The Minister of Agriculture is himself a farmer and a good

farmer. I am sure that as a private businessman, Mr. Speaker, he would not put out a great deal of cash for a new piece of high technology equipment in the farming industry without inspecting it, without going over it with a fine-tooth comb, without trying it out, without going through all of the possibilities.

I would like to ask does he not similarly believe that the people of Newfoundland, whose money is at stake here, deserve the right to read these studies, to look at these documents, to explore this technology to see if they are getting a good, fair, decent bang for their buck?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I have looked at all of this, as I would have done in any private firm. I have looked at all of this, Mr. Speaker, and I am very confident that it is an excellent project to bring to Newfoundland, a Province that has a very harsh climate for food production or any agricultural activity. We have a high unemployment rate, Mr. Speaker, we have a need for a technology transfer in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and this project will bring each of these into this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, if the minister has

absolutely nothing to fear, if he is frightened of nothing in those private studies and in those documents and in his own department's advice, why does he not show us these documents that no Newfoundlander, no private citizen out there in the private sector, would be afraid of? Why does he not do that?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the biggest fear I have in this whole project is the negative reporting and the negative attitude of the Opposition -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

- with the chance, Mr. Speaker, of us losing this project for Newfoundland so it will go to Nova Scotia or some other Province. That is my biggest fear, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

The Premier has said, Mr. Speaker, publicly that he is waiting for the final little bit of legal work to be done, and then he would table and show every Newfoundlander and Labradorian what it is we just got ourselves into. Can the Premier tell us what legalities are holding up this agreement? Is it the Justice Department's lawyers? Is it

private sector's lawyers? Who are these lawyers who are holding up this agreement? Are they lawyers in your own government or private sector lawyers? What are the legalities that are holding up this document?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, in any business deal, for any corporations or for any government, there comes a time when you agree on principles, which we have done, and then there comes a time for the legal people to get these principles into contracts. Mr. Speaker, that is what is happening right now.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Agriculture, if you could keep those hon. cucumbers quiet long enough for me to ask the question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I ask the Minister of Agriculture would he advise the House of what is the cost of producing a pound of cucumber using the same Sprung method?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural,

Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the estimates that we have, the figures that we are working on, is that not only will we provide the Newfoundland consumer with a much better quality cucumber and tomato that they have right now, but we also expect that they will be some 10 to 20 per cent cheaper than they are on our present market.

MR. DECKER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Has the hon. minister made arrangements for special freight rates for the export of cucumbers to New Brunswick, for example?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the minister.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, that again is another advantage of having this facility built in Eastern Canada. Right now we have containers on our railway and containers on our trucks that come down here with imported produce and we have no control over what the cost will be. They are going back empty, and any businessman who can fill them up, it does not matter whether it be with cucumbers, fish or whatever, can get back-haul rates, standard practice in the business. They can get back-haul rates.

MR. DECKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Has the Minister of Agriculture studied the local market to ascertain what percentage of the production will be sold in Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, it is expected that the local market initially will absorb maybe some 20 per cent of this produce. One fact with the local market is because of distribution and quality Newfoundlanders consume only about 20 per cent of the national average, Mr. Speaker. So there is a lot of room in our own industry, if we provide a quality vegetable at a reasonable price, for expansion in our own market, Mr. Speaker, seeing that we only consume 20 per cent of the national average right now.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, this deal seems to get bigger every day. The minister said in answering an earlier question that Sprung has negotiated a \$3 million deal with some electrical company to supply electrical lighting. Could the minister tell the House what company that is and what the annual electrical consumption of the Sprung project will be?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

The company that is involved is a national company, - I do not know what it is, Mr. Speaker - and any business that wishes to start up a greenhouse or hydroponics operation, of which there are several in the Province now, makes a contract with the companies that supply these type of lights and go to the company that will give them the best deal, Mr. Speaker. It has nothing to do with electrical rates, Mr. Speaker. They go and make a deal with an electrical supplier to supply grow lights for their facilities.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

I would like to welcome to the gallery Dr. Ronald Sparkes, Superintendent of the Labrador East Integrated School Board.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

Today is Private Members' Day.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, on a point of order?

MR. SIMMONS:

No, Mr. Speaker, I rise under

Standing Order 23. Under Standing Order 23, Mr. Speaker, I request leave to debate a matter of urgent public importance. The government, Mr. Speaker, has given notice that it intends to invest considerable sums of public money without the direct approval of the House, without any debate in this Chamber on the issue and, in view of that, I would request that leave be granted under Standing Order 23 to debate a matter of urgent public importance, namely, the stated intention of the government to commit substantial sums of public funds to the Sprung hydroponics project.

Mr. Speaker, I submit, in making this request, that there is no opportunity on the Order Paper to deal with this. As an Opposition, we have attempted for a number of weeks to get some answers on this. We are not getting the information. In terms of public interest, Mr. Speaker, I submit to you it is one of the highest interest items out there. You can hardly talk to anybody in this Province who is not aware of this and wants some answers on why the government is committing over \$13 million to this particular issue.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that there is no opportunity on the Order Paper otherwise to debate it, and unless we can do it under Standing Order 23, then there is not a reasonable opportunity within the foreseeable future to have this issue debated, to get some answers. We have devoted the whole of Question Period today, essentially, and we have devoted other Question Periods to it. I believe, Mr. Speaker, it would be imminently sensible for the Chair to find that this is a matter of sufficiently urgent public importance to allow debate to go

forward today. I think public interest would be well served by it, Mr. Speaker, and I ask you to so find.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member has just stated, this matter has been discussed very frequently in this House. There have been news releases about it, there have been press conferences on it, and there are opportunities on the Order Paper, in the Budget Speech and in the Throne Speech, where it can be discussed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the particular rule that the hon. member is referring to refers to the urgency of debate. There has been much information given out already. The hon. the Premier has stated that he will table, when it is appropriate and when it is proper for him to table it, all the information that is required, but that it would not be appropriate and would not be proper to table it at this time for very clear, cogent reasons. I submit that there is no urgency of debate and that we can have Question Period on this every day of the week, if you wish. And certainly when the Throne Speech and the Budget Speech are up for debate there are all sorts of opportunities.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Rural Agriculture and Northern Development.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

I have one short comment on this, Mr. Speaker, to point out the hypocrisy of the Opposition in this House of Assembly. We are presently debating the Concurrence Motions. My department was one of the departments discussed, and there was not one single question in that debate about the Sprung deal, Mr. Speaker. Not one!

MR. MORGAN:

And now they want a special debate.

MR. TULK:

On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, while the hon. gentleman, I know, is hurting under this - I do not know what to call it - he must be under a tremendous burden in replying to the request of the member for Fortune - Hermitage, the Leader of the Opposition, to have an urgent debate on this very vital matter. He referred to the hypocrisy of members on this side. Let me refer him to page 107 of Beauchesne which says that the word 'hypocrite' is not allowed in this Legislature.

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

He is on a point of privilege, boy.

MR. TULK:

I am on a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT:

He is on a point of privilege. Sit down, boy.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman obviously cannot do through the backdoor what he is not allowed to do through the front door. So I would ask him to stand up and withdraw this and, in the process, to agree that this is a matter that is urgent in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no prima facie case of breach of privilege, but there might be a point of order in what the hon. member rose on.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, if I said anything unparliamentary, I withdraw it unequivocally.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, if I may respond briefly to the acting Government House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

He said, first of all, that we could devote any number of Question Periods to it, and that is true. But, of course, he shows a less than perfect knowledge of the rules when he implies that Question Period would be a debate, because that is the one thing that is precluded. As much as we try, the one thing that is precluded from Question Period is debate. I think Mr. Speaker will agree that

we have not had any debate on this issue.

The minister also mentions that there has been a lot of information. Now, that is a matter of opinion. He also went on to say that there had been press conferences and news releases. Now, he must know, Mr. Speaker, that this Standing Order 23 relates to the opportunity of members in the House to deal with a matter in the House, not to read newspapers or to go to press conferences. It deals with our obligation to debate issues in this Chamber.

In raising the issue of press conferences, of course, he does rub salt in the wound; he does remind us that the issue itself was announced by the Premier at a press conference instead of in this particular House.

One final point, Mr. Speaker, and it bears directly on the reason we find ourselves here, it has to do with accountability to the House. Certainly the principle of accountability implies, Mr. Speaker, that it is accountable at the House's time not at the government's time. The government cannot choose when it will be accountable to this Chamber. It has been said 'In due course the government will lay down the documents.' That is not good enough. Government cannot decide the time it will be accountable, that is for the House to determine.

DR. COLLINS:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS:
Well, I know the minister is surprised to find the government is not accountable to the House.

Mr. Speaker, the House dictates as a House -

DR. COLLINS:
Who decides when (inaudible)?

MR. SIMMONS:
There you go!

Mr. Speaker, it is the House that determines the length of life of the government. It is the House that calls the government accountable on issues, and we want it to be accountable on this issue, and it is for that reason, Mr. Speaker, among others, that I put down this request.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final commentary, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:
I know Your Honour is ready to rule on this point, but I really must counter that last remark, that the House can demand that the government do certain things. The government is elected to conduct the business of this Province as it sees fit, and it will bring before this House the public business when it thinks it is proper and appropriate to do so. The Leader of the Opposition should go and read Beauchesne. If he thinks that the Opposition can say to the government 'I now want you to do this sort of thing to conduct public affairs', that is ridiculous! Mr. Speaker, I just had to make that comment.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, just one brief point to that.

MR. SPEAKER:
I have heard comments enough from

both sides. I would like to say on this point of order, I am going to recess the House for a few moments and look into it.

Recess

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, you will recall that some time ago there was a debate allowed on the budworm spraying because of the fact that the spraying was about to take place the following day and there was extreme urgency in that particular case. In the case that we are referring to now, there is ample opportunity to debate this matter in the Concurrence debate, in the budget debate, and then in the Address in Reply. There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
I call on the hon. the member for Menihek.

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

Maybe I had better start by reading the resolution into the record so that all members would be familiar with it, and those in the gallery. The resolution says:

"WHEREAS increased military activity in Labrador is interfering with the traditional pursuits of the Innu and the Inuit; and

"WHEREAS increased military activity may make the full development of tourism, forestry and other industries in Labrador much more difficult; and

"WHEREAS the military is now asking for dedicated areas for practice bombing ranges and other military uses that will preclude other uses for this land; and

"WHEREAS no full investigation has been made of the "opportunity costs" of dedicating so much of Labrador to military purposes; and

"WHEREAS the last time we committed so much of Labrador to a mega project such as this we ended up with the famous "Churchill Falls" giveaway; and

"WHEREAS government does not have any comprehensive policy for the long term economic development of Labrador;

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House strike an all-party house committee to investigate the opportunity costs of increased military activity in Labrador so that we know the "real costs" of proceeding with this development option; and

"BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Committee report back to this House its findings so that decisions may be made on Labrador military activity that will be in the best long term interests of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians."

That, Mr. Speaker, is the resolution. In a sense, Mr. Speaker, this is an aspect of the debate on developments in Labrador which I would put forward is an area that has not been explored to any significant degree. It is not a question of land claims per se with the Innu and with the Inuit, because that is another area, and that one, I would hope, in the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office panel study, will be addressed. So, in that sense it

is not trying to do the same thing as that. It is not addressing the destruction of the environment in the sense of exhaust emissions, what they might do in terms of polluting lakes and so on. It is not a question of that, Mr. Speaker.

It is also not talking about human rights issues, which were addressed in the International Federation of Human Rights report, which are significant and important and I think we do have to take into account. It is not meant to address that part of it. It is not a question of peace issues versus war issues, it is not bread and butter issues versus guns and those kinds of considerations, which I believe are important. Mr. Speaker, the whole purpose of the resolution is to try to focus down on one issue, and that is land use. We, as members of this House of Assembly, are the stewards for the land of the Province and we have an obligation, I would believe, to the citizens of our Province to make sure that the developments that we go ahead with, that we approve are those which are in the best interests of us today and of ours descendents in the future. And it is from that particular perspective that I want to open this particular debate.

Back in 1979 and 1980, when the West Germans started up probably the new round of economic activity, and I know there had been low level flying prior to that, the number of low level flights started to increase on an exponential basis. Up to that time, the assumption had been made that we were talking about a small number of flights, and although they were an extreme inconvenience to people who were over-flown,

that, in the long run, Mr. Speaker, 110,000 square miles of Labrador was large enough to accommodate activities of that kind. Well, in the last six or seven years, the number of flights have increased substantially. Last year, we had approximately 5,200 flights, according to the latest information I have from the military in Goose Bay, and, this year, we are looking at, I think, around 6,500 flights, given that the military have informed us that instead of 5,200 flights, 'we will have about a 25 per cent increase in the number.'

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, the report put out by the Canadian Public Health Association just a week or so ago indicated that there is a possibility, with the expansion that is occurring there, that we may see 40,000 flights by 1990, which is just three years from now.

If it were the case that these were flights similar to what the American Air Force did in the fifties, sixties and seventies, in which a large cargo plane might land in Goose Bay and then take off later on, I do not think any of these figures would be particularly alarming and I do not think there would be any need for this debate. But one of the arguments I have to put forward, Mr. Speaker, at this point, is that a low level training flight is inherently different in the quality of how it effects the landscape and the people who live there, that it must be considered as an entirely new phenomena, or at least the expansion of it over the last seven or eight years must be considered as an entirely new phenomena that we had little or virtually no experience with in the 1960s or 1970s, in the times

we have had before.

For example, a low level flight going over the range takes about fifteen minutes to go from Goose Bay until it gets into the low level area, and then flies for approximately an hour and fifteen minutes at a height as low as about 75 feet to 100 feet above the terrain, depending on what the terrain is like and so on. As a result, this kind of activity can affect people over that one and a quarter hours of flight time and going at an average speed of 400 or 500 miles per hour. Mr. Speaker, it covers a territory of 400, or 500 or 600 linear miles by whatever width the effect is.

So, Mr. Speaker, we are not talking about a plane just landing in Goose Bay and just taking off, which does affect, obviously, the people at the both ends of the runway, we are talking about an experience which is prolonged, lasting for an hour and fifteen minutes or so, and which affects a very large area of land. And that, I think, is one of the reasons why we have to address it from this particular perspective, and that is the perspective of what is the effect of any development of the land underneath these jet fighters if, indeed, we see the expansion that has been projected?

Now, the number given in the Canadian Public Health Association report was approximately 40,000 flights. We know that if there is a massive expansion of the base over the next five or ten years that that may not be the maximum, that we may see more than that. But some of the information that we have available suggests to us that Great Britain alone, in 1983-84, had something like

125,000 low level flights. Obviously not all their training is being done here, but if they were to move it all here, then we might see considerably more from that country alone, we may see more from the West Germans, we may see more from the Dutch, and so on and so forth.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying to you is that that level of flying and that number of flights is quantitatively and qualitatively different than we are talking about back in the 1960's, and I think it is important to recognize that point.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, that I think has to be taken into consideration when we are talking about this is the fact that we will have, hopefully, within five or six years, a road connection between Happy Valley - Goose Bay and the rest of North America, one that does not have a toll paying ferry on it. I think all members representing Labrador are very eager to see this road completed. When the end of this current agreement comes, the \$25 million project that is on now, we will be something like 100 kilometers short of having the complete road connection from Happy Valley - Goose Bay down to the Quebec North Shore, to Montreal, to Toronto, and, indeed, to the rest of North America.

I think if we had our own resources to put at it, we would probably be well advised to make sure that that is finished as quickly as possible so that the road connection is there. When it is, Mr. Speaker, what I would suggest to you is that we will see an opportunity to increase at least one of our industries tremendously, and that is the

tourism industry. As most people are aware, for many years the Yukon has been primarily dependent on mining. In the last number of years, its tourism has actually brought more into the economy of the Yukon than has mining, and it has done that primarily because people are interested in the Northern experience - they have developed their tourism and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I think that one of the major secondary industries that we can develop in Labrador is tourism, but I have some very serious questions about whether, if there are 40,000 flights a year, we will be able to draw to Labrador, at least that part of Labrador, tourists who are interested in the kind of wilderness experience we are talking about. After all, if they want to hear planes taking off and landing or flying at a low level, they can go to the end of the runway in Toronto or Montreal or wherever and get that particular experience.

Mr. Speaker, think about it. You are talking 40,000 flights. Generally they are done in a forty week period, and they only fly about five days a week, or six days sometimes. I was up there on Sunday and I noticed that they do not fly on Sunday, or at least very rarely.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about are several hundred sorties per day, 200 or 300 per day, of low level planes going out. I would suggest to you that you are talking about them taking off at a very continuous rate off the runway, and then flying over the wilderness in a very saturated manner, and I think that that is one of the important attributes that we have to think about.

Mr. Speaker, there has been some discussion about what impact a low level plane has on the individuals below it. The Canadian Public Health Association was charged with looking at the health aspects in general. One of the things they did look at specifically was the hearing loss to individuals who were flown over on a rapid basis. Their argument was that they really do not have the information to be able to demonstrate that with any conclusive certainty. Mr. Speaker, that is an indication that they have not proven it, but it is not an indication that low level flying over individuals is a particularly healthy exercise.

As most people know, the amount of noise that comes from a low level plane goes up in excess of 125 decibels on a plane that is not using its afterburner and is not going supersonic. But that 125 decibels, from a background level of about seventy decibels that you would have in the forest, is so strong and so pronounced that anyone flown over emits what is called the startle response which, the best way I can explain it, is, if you look at those cartoons that you see on Saturday morning on television, a loud noise is made and the person jumps about three feet in the air and flips over. As I understand it from talking to people who have been flown over, the reaction that you have when you are over-flown is that you dive for the ground as though you were being shelled by some large scale gun. That clearly, if you are there for a fishing experience or a hunting experience, is an unlikable experience. But if it were to occur 300 times each day and a number of the flights were close enough to you to interfere with it, I would suggest to you

that it would very seriously impact on any attempt to develop the kinds of tourism that we are looking at up there.

In looking at the independent studies that have been done on it, there are three major ones and I want to quote all three, not from the point of view of where they originally started, but just to make some basic points. The first is that the International Federation of Human Rights, Mr. Speaker, sent an international panel in there and came back with a number of recommendations, some of which I do not endorse nor does my party endorse, at least the provincial party, one of which was that all military activity like that should cease and that the land claims settlement should go forward before anything else continues. I recognize, and I think everybody else does, that that is a problem in the sense that it would devastate the Happy Valley - Goose Bay economy, and it is not the kind of thing that I, personally, would like to see.

But what the International Federation of Human Rights did say is that low level flying, that experience, is so significant that it must be seriously taken into account as a factor in the ability to use that land for any other purposes. And that is the important point I want to take out of it, not the fact that it asked for the cessation of the flights themselves.

The second report is from the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office. This is the Federal Department of the Environment which was asked by our Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, was asked by our government to do a

federal environmental assessment of all the impacts of low level flying. The panel was set up and it did some hearings on its terms of reference and so on. I dropped in at one of its hearings to listen to what was going on and I was appalled with some of the limitations to its terms of references. But in general, Mr. Speaker, it does seem that the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, its panel, has been taking its job very seriously. In its first series of hearings along the Coast of Labrador, and in other points in Labrador, it had, I believe, eighteen different hearings. In January of this year it took the unprecedented step of producing an interim report, and that interim report said they were so concerned with what is going on now, and the acceleration of what is going on - the 5,000 flights, the 6,500 this year, and the possibility of 40,000 at the end of the decade - that they asked that the Department of National Defence would not increase the number of low level flights while they continued their study on its impact on caribou, on small animals, on native people, and so on and so forth.

That, Mr. Speaker, was an unprecedented action on behalf of a panel like that. It is one that this provincial government has not yet responded to, although I would suggest that it should at least say something about the particular report itself. To this date I have not seen any response from either the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, his Parliamentary Assistant, the Premier or anyone else on that particular recommendation. I do know that the Department of National Defence has not taken the recommendation

to heart, because they are continuing to sign up more countries and to increase the bilateral agreements in terms of the amount going on.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the last study is the one commissioned by our own Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), our own government, and it is commissioned by the Canadian Public Health Association, which was itself asked to go in and investigate the health aspects of the situation. What it came back with, and the reason I am quoting it here, is that is said that low level flying and the experience of being over-flown at that level is such a significant experience that it seriously impacts on people who are there. And I do not want to go into any more details of the report, because I do not think it is necessary for the point I am trying to make, which is that all these bodies say that that kind of low level flying has a very significant affect on the use of the land underneath it. Mr. Speaker, that is what I am trying to get at, the use of the land underneath that territory. What can it be used for if you have the ranges tied up with this amount of low level flying? That is the difference, Mr. Speaker, between what we were experiencing in the 1960s, when there was no low level flying, it was just going into the airport and going out, and what we have now.

Another question that could arise from critics of arguments that I am making here is, well, this is just low level flying. You can always take the jets and you can move them somewhere else, or you can put them somewhere else and they do not have to fly over the same land and all that sort of stuff, and that is quite true.

But the problem is, Mr. Speaker, that we are signing long-term contracts with these countries. It is my understanding that we have just signed a long-term contract with the Netherlands, with the Dutch.

Four minutes? I thought I had a half an hour in introducing it.

MR. SPEAKER:

No, twenty minutes.

MR. FENWICK:

Okay.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that we are talking about something substantially different than what we were before, we are talking about ten year contracts with the bilateral agreements. If we go for the NATO base, the ministers have told us we will have \$400 million, \$500 million, or \$600 million worth of development. I am trying to suggest to you that if you do commit \$500 million, it is not the kind of thing you can back out of two years later when you find out that you want to do something else with the land. It is very important to find out ahead of time if that is compatible with the other things you want to do. In other words, Mr. Speaker, it would be very difficult to renege on any of these contracts afterwards, and I am sure that members of the government are quite aware that we do not intend to renege on these contracts. So, I think it is important to do the studies ahead of time, before we do it.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, there are a couple of other things I would like to hark back to. It goes back to 1961, because I do not really believe that the arguments I am making here are impressing

members of the other two parties in the House. Back on February 21, 1961, in this very chamber or at the Colonial Building, depending on which one we were in at the time, we passed a piece of legislation that established BRINCO and in that legislation we gave them the right to enter into long-term agreements for the sale of electrical power in Labrador, and the Premier and every member of the government has repeatedly said that that was the biggest sell-out in Newfoundland's history.

Mr. Speaker, I have gone back to the debate that occurred between February 21 and March 11, when it was passed, as it was in eighteen days that that legislation was put through, and I tried to find in that debate anywhere where somebody from the PC Party, who claims it was a mistake, stood up and said, look, you have to have a reopener clause when you sell the electricity, you have to make sure that we do not sell our birthright in Labrador for dozens of years and not end up anywhere. Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in there whatsoever. As a matter of fact, the PC Party was laudatory of the scheme itself and did not ask any of the difficult questions. What I am saying to you here is that I am asking you one of the difficult questions today. If you can demonstrate to me that the studies have been done on the impact and other industries in Labrador, if you have those, show them to me now because I would be glad to look at them. But it is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that we have not done the study and because we have not done the study we may be stumbling into another Churchill Falls agreement, we may be in a position where the decisions that we make now in terms of those long-term agreements

may bind us so heavily that a lot of developments which could produce a lot of jobs a decade from now in Labrador will not be possible because we have not gone through the proper studies. That, Mr. Speaker, is my argument.

MR. WARREN:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess I may as well say, Mr. Speaker, that the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) is waiting to speak after me, and I suppose I should tell the hon member for St. John's East that another capable member is coming after him, so there is no doubt we will be in discussion for the rest of the evening.

I should begin by saying that I will be voting against the resolution and subsequently, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make the following amendment to the resolution as presented by the member for Menihek: After the last whereas all words will be deleted and the following words added: That is moved by me and seconded by the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland).

Therefore be it resolved that all members act as a unifying and coordinating force for all groups and organizations supporting expanded use of the airport facilities; to liaise at the political level and all other levels, to facilitate, expedite and promote the expanded use of the airport facilities to reach the common goal.

MR. FENWICK:
A point of order.

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

MR. FENWICK:
I ask the Speaker to examine that. I do not believe that is in order, Mr. Speaker. As I understand amendments to resolutions, they can modify the resolution itself but they cannot go and delete complete the intention of the resolution itself. So I would ask the Speaker if he would have a look at it.

MR. RIDEOUT:
To that point order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Further to that point of order, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, if you check with Beauchesne and check with our own precedents over the last five or six years in this House, I think you will find clearly that a number of private members resolutions have been amended and some of them amended drastically in terms of the original wording, WHEREASES and the THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED sections. I would submit to you that the purpose of this resolution, which is clearly in accordance with the rules of the House and with Beauchesne, is to make it more acceptable to a larger cross section of members in the House. That is clearly, Sir, within order and we would submit to you that the amendment is therefore in order.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:
I support the arguments put forward by the Minister of Fisheries on his point of order. I believe it is quite well taken, as Your Honour will probably determine. I believe that we should leave the decisions of this House to the democratic process. If the amendment, which in my view is acceptable -- I think that is obvious as I am the seconder -- if it is more acceptable to the House in the context as put forth by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), then the democratic process will decide by majority vote -- for a change Peter -- how the thing should go. I think it is quite acceptable in my opinion.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point or order, there is no point of order. The amendment is in order.

Is the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment?

MR. WARREN:
I would like to speak to the amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think if we recall five or six weeks ago we debated a resolution on NATO here in this House. The hon. gentleman who just spoke, when we were cluing up, we had a standing vote, and I do not think the hon. gentleman was in the Chamber at the time. I believe his colleague, his side-kick from

St. John's East (Mr. Long) was just like a jack-rabbit going back and forth through the door. I believe, Mr. Speaker - and there the jack-rabbit goes again. So you can see, Mr. Speaker, when you talk about NATO, when you talk about jobs for Labrador and when you talk about the member for St. John's East, he takes off.

Mr. Speaker, looking down through the resolution, there are some parts in the hon. the member for Menihek's whereases that I have no problem with. In fact, his first part, although the first whereas is not completely correct and I think hon. gentlemen realizes this, not even close because he said, "WHEREAS increased military activity in Labrador is interfering with the traditional pursuit of the Innu and Inuit;"

All together, there are roughly 3,000 Innu and Inuit people in Labrador and that first whereas, I would venture to say to the hon. gentleman, if it applies to 10 per cent, that is the most. I say to the hon. gentleman and the hon. member for St. John's East, when they get up in this House and talk about the Inuit people, talking about their traditional, cultural pursuits, I have yet, Mr. Speaker, to see a Mary Brown's Chicken store in the woods in Labrador. Mr. Speaker, that is not traditional. I say to the member for St. John's East, if we are talking about traditional living, let us go back to our traditional living.

Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. gentleman that the last time he spoke here the hon. gentleman was cocky enough to challenge me. I said 'Okay, we will go to Rigolet for a debate.' When I went to Rigolet, he would not come. Last

week I went to Davis Inlet and the hon. gentleman still would not come because the hon. gentleman is afraid to go outside the overpass.

MR. KELLAND:

You talk about a chicken.

MR. WARREN:

As the hon. gentleman said, you talk about chicken. There is a Mary Brown's chicken.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us go back to the Report of the Task Force on Health Effects. One of the concerns that came out from the health report was that there was no evidence of hearing loss suffered through military activity. Just listen to this, Mr. Speaker, the two hon. gentleman representatives, one from St. John's East, one area of our Province, another person from the other extreme end of our Province, and Mr. Speaker, on page forty-seven of the report, here is what Dr. West in his report says.

"The Innu consider the presence of the military in Labrador as an intrusion on their land and a disregard for the perceived sovereignty of the area. They do not trust the military and would like them to depart."

I say to the hon. gentleman, do you believe that? Do you believe what the Innu are saying? Do you want the military to leave Labrador? Do you believe that the military should leave Labrador? I say that to the hon. gentleman.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No.

MR. FENWICK:

Well therefore, why in heck are you supporting Ed Broadbent and his cronies up in Ottawa against

the military? This is what you are doing, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman then spoke about land claims. I think the Premier already tabled a letter that was written to Bart Jack on November 28. I will table it again for the information of members opposite. The last paragraph said, "If the NMIA wished to pursue the idea of a meeting with the officials of the government, then I would suggest you put your request in writing and clearly state the purpose and objective of the meeting. I can assure you that such a request will be given every consideration."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that it takes a while for the mail to go from St. John's to Labrador, I know that. Subsequently, I had the opportunity of giving copies to other members, so I am sure that the correspondence got to the NMIA. But as of today's date, which is May 27, Bart Jack and the NMIA have not requested a meeting. Now, how can you talk about land claims when they will not request a meeting.

Furthermore, on page 53 of the report, here is what Dr. West says again: "The Innu of Labrador are not actively advancing their land claims with the federal government at the present time."

Now, Mr. Speaker, how clear can we be? They believe that the land is their land and they have the right of self determination. Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe too that land out over the Foxtrap Overpass, I believe I could own that too. I mean, we are all part of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and I am sure that we can come to a consensus.

I say to this to the hon. leader of a political party in this Province: If we are elected by the people of the Province, the least we can do is try to come to some kind of consensus with individual groups. That cannot be achieved if you have a political party fighting against coming to a consensus, which the hon. gentleman is doing. The hon. gentleman does not want consensus.

I say to his hon. sidekick there from St. John's East, I am amazed with his lack of knowledge of the Innu or Inuit people of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What does he know about the Innu?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I fail to say other things.

Now, let us go back to other comments from Dr. West. I have already said what the Inuit said about the land. "While the LIA, the Labrador Inuit Association, has some concern about the possible long term affects of low level flying on the caribou herd and the environment, they are apparently more concerned about socio-economic issues and its land claims."

What do the settlers in Labrador say? "The settlers have some concern about the long term effects of overflights on wildlife and on the environment. They are more concerned about socio-economic issues." There is not very much difference in the LIA's position and the settlers' position.

What does the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador say?

Their concerns are socio-economic and they support increased military activity in Labrador.

Now, add the three of those together and then we have the Innu which is way off in left field.

MR. LONG:

Are these people in your district?

MR. WARREN:

Are these people in my district! My friend, I should tell the hon. gentleman, I am quoting from a book by Dr. West and these are the comments that he has found in his findings. I understand that the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Fenwick), when the book came out he came up here and asked the question of the Premier. Does he believe what is in the book? I ask the gentleman to wake up.

MR. LONG:

Who is representing the Innu, the people in your district?

MR. WARREN:

Who is representing the Inuit and the people in my district! I tell the hon. gentleman, it is not the NDP Party. Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. gentleman, -

MR. LONG:

It is obviously not you.

MR. WARREN:

- never will a person with your caliber be a representative of the Innu people in Labrador. I am sure of that, Sir.

MR. LONG:

Speak for yourself. I do not live there, you do.

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, this also talks about land claims. "The Inuit people are in active discussions

with the federal government and the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Currently, there is no dialogue between the Innu people." Now, what else can you do?

I say to my hon. colleague the Inuit people are in my district, the Innu people are in my district, and the settlers are in my district. So I have the three groups of people, as referred to in this book, in my district. I tell the hon. gentleman too, if he does not already know, that I can count on my - I was going to say on my two hands but I have not got ten fingers - two feet the total number of people in Davis Inlet who are against this issue, ten is the maximum.

Let me tell the hon. gentleman, when this controversy with the wildlife in the Mealey Mountains was ongoing, there were arrangements made to bring a number of Inuit people out from Davis Inlet out to Goose Bay. They took them into the country where they were illegally killing caribou. What did the Inuit people from Davis Inlet do? Did they take part in the illegal killings? I ask the hon. gentleman, did they? No, he does not know the difference. That is why. No, they turned around and went back to Davis Inlet. They would not have any part of the illegal killings.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. gentleman that they believe that all this is law. They may not agree with the law, but at least they did not disobey the law. They observed the law. That is not what I can say about the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I can only say what I guess is fact.

MR. LONG:

What is a fact?

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at it further. It says here "the Canadian Health Association has no clear position on militarization based on conventional weapons and its potential detrimental health affect on achieving peace." They say they are concerned about a nuclear strike in the event of war.

You know, there is not a member opposite over there, and I am sure hon. gentlemen here too or anybody in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador who is not concerned about nuclear war. We are all concerned about nuclear war. We are living in a peaceful, democratic country and Province, and we are trying in all ways and means to prevent nuclear war. We support those findings.

Mr. Speaker, I have to take strong exception to the report on page 61, because this is the kind of statement that gets people irritated. Here is what was said on page 61: "Yet a significant number of people on all sides of the issues express considerable hate, anger and hostility towards those on the other side." Now I think that is ridiculous for a professor in such field to come out and make those statements, even if he himself believed it. I do not think there is hatred, this hostility, or there is anger.

MR. LONG:

We are seeing it all the time.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, look at the hon. gentleman and his comments just then. This is where the anger and hostility is coming from, it is coming from the members of the New Democratic Party. Those are the people who are putting the hate, the anger and the hostility into the minds of Labradorians and on other people. Since the hon. gentleman - I better withdraw from what I was going to say. Since the hon. gentleman came into this House, he has bestowed, he has planted more hatred, more hostility, more anger with minority groups in this Province against government, against other individuals and it is a cause - this gentleman here is the cause of half of that, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

Well, if you want to take credit for all of it, sure, why not admit something for once.

Now, Mr. Speaker, they used a Gillett Syndrome as an example of using Goose Bay. Now what is further from the truth? They said, "The type case of the Gillett Syndrome involves expansion of an existing relatively small community through rapid development of a resource-based industry in a relatively political atmosphere."

The hon. gentleman went back to 1961. I should tell the hon. gentleman I lived in Goose Bay in 1965, 1966, 1967, 1973 to 1979 -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. WARREN:
I have five minutes, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:
By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member's time is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
By leave! By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No!

MR. SPEAKER:
No leave. Leave is not granted.

MR. WARREN:
I would only be too glad to give up for the member for St. John's East.

MR. BAIRD:
You do not nod your head. You cannot be recorded on tape if you just nod your head.

MR. WARREN:
By leave?

MR. SPEAKER:
If the hon. member wishes to speak, he has to stand up to be recognized.

MR. FENWICK:
If anyone else wishes to speak, (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER:
Is leave granted?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No leave.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Lord must listen to us poor Liberal members, Mr. Speaker, because I was praying for another opportunity like this.

AN HON. MEMBER:
God is good.

MR. KELLAND:
God is good and we have the opportunity.

In looking over the resolution or the motion put forward by the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), I have to say in my true opinion I am deeply concerned with everybody in Naskaupi district and in Labrador, and I would like to hear a challenge otherwise from any members here, but I am not concerned about everybody who lives in my district and all of Labrador and all the Province. I was impressed only by the fact that that has to be one of the most insidious and misleading documents that I have ever seen written by a member of the House of Assembly. Now, I will tell you why. Let me give you a couple of brief examples.

In the first whereas and in many other parts in this particular resolution the hon. member keeps referring to military activity. Now, that maybe construed to be a true statement unless you consider that what is really happening, and which will continue to happen up there for a great number of years, is military training activity. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and the members of the House that there is a vast difference in what the member is implying by military activity and the actual fact of

the case, which is military training activity for the purpose of defending our country because when you use, in the member's typical manner of, I call it, I guess, emotional negativity, because that is what it really is here looking through all parts of his resolution, military activity. Nowhere does he say military training that I can see which it is all about, the defence of our country and defence of the free world.

The member says, "WHEREAS increased military activity in Labrador is interfering with the traditional pursuits of the Innu and the Innu." Now, that is a statement because I presume it is the belief of the member for Menihék (Mr. Fenwick) that that is the case. He originated that thought. Now, what does he really know about the traditional pursuits of the Native peoples of Labrador? What does he know about them?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Enough.

MR. KELLAND:

For example, I recall him speaking in defence of Father Jim Roche not all that long ago and perhaps on several occasions. Let me tell you that the start of the deterioration of traditional lifestyles by Native people, the start of it came from the state and from the church. I am not casting aspersions when I say the state on any particular political belief because, I think, the state, in a general sense, government, but initially the Innu of Labrador were nomadic people. They never lived in Sheshatshit and they never lived year-round in North West River. So their traditional way of life was not to

live in a permanent community. However, by the church wanting to bring the Innu people to their form of Christianity they convinced them to settle in permanent settlements. Now it almost seems to me that the church, in supporting illegal activities, is really on a bit of a guilt trip. They are trying to compensate for a very serious mistake in the destruction of the lifestyles of Native people in Labrador.

I am glad to see that the member for Menihék (Mr. Fenwick) is agreeing with that. I am not too certain where he is coming from when he talks about traditional pursuits of the Innu and the Innu in Labrador.

In reading the resolution I was tempted to put forth an amendment which will change quite a bit of the wording of the motion of the member for Menihék. I can touch on some of them. I do not intend to put this forth as an amendment but this is just a sort of guideline as to how my thoughts were going.

Anywhere he said military activity I would have changed it to military training activity for the purposes of defence.

It is certain that military activity will have an effect on the development of tourism, forestry and other industries in Labrador, but not for the reasons that the hon. member would like to have us believe.

He talks about tourism, as one example. If the military are in Labrador it will be a negative thing with respect to tourism. He said that. If you are fishing, you do not want to hear a plane

going overhead and all that sort of thing, that innuendo, that suggestion, that implication is there that the military presence in Labrador will cut back on tourism. But let us look at it in a more basic sense.

There are roughly 350 West German airmen in Goose Bay who are tourists, and who rotate every two or three weeks with a totally new crew coming in. We are seeing businesses expand and new ones opened in Labrador to serve the tourism needs of those people, and more could be done. Now we have the Royal Netherlands Air Force and any other visiting military force are not tourists that you have to bring in, that have to spend a lot of money to get there, which is one of the reasons why our tourism is not booming as it should, the high cost of getting there, these people are brought in free by their own country. Here they are willing to spend dollars and visit the countryside and look at our points of interest and learn more about Labrador.

MR. TULK:

By the way, (inaudible) co-ordinator of the day.

MR. KELLAND:

It is a little hard to say.

The word of mouth effect of course of military crews that change that frequently, that number of people going through in a Summer, has quite an effect. There is a desire by other Europeans and other people in other parts of the world to come in and visit Labrador as tourists, but good heavens, let us not kick out the guys who are already there, that are brought in free and there to spend money and learn about our culture, as it seems sometimes the

member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), and the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) want to do one week, which often changes the following week.

The member for Menihek tries to make us believe that the real intent of his motion is to focus attention on the fact that flights over Labrador will prevent other land use. Well, my friends from Menihek and St. John's East, if you carry that argument to its logical conclusion there would be absolutely no commerce or no industry on 75 per cent of North America and a good few other parts of the world, if flying over the land prevents it to be used for something else. That is utterly ridiculous, utterly misleading. I believe the member for Menihek is using that to try to get his few little points in there, and to mislead this House into believing that he is saying something that he is not saying. It is as simple as that.

He talks about there are other things we can do, like the development of the Trans-Labrador Highway. Does he not know that any project such as a NATO Tactical Weapons Training Centre, or continued bilateral agreements by Canada and our NATO allies will bring about development of highways and other infrastructure much more quickly. It makes sense to have a more comprehensive transportation system in there when you have a need for it. The NATO Tactical Weapons Training Centre and continuing bilateral agreements would put more bucks into the scene. When more bucks are there, more bucks are available to develop.

So you know let us get rid of NATO, let us do this, that sort of

thing, so we can have other development. What other development for love and honour? I mean, what is he talking about?

The member for Menihek likes to mislead I believe in this House. For example, he casually brushes over what kind of an activity the low level planes carry on at. He says 75 feet to 100 feet. Let me tell you, that is a 25 foot difference and I can tell you that the technology in low level flying is at such an advanced state, and you cannot depend on the human mind and the human body to control things as accurately as they should be controlled, there is a lot of electronic let us say paraphernalia that cannot allow a 25 foot difference. Their lowest level, in my understanding, is about 100 feet. Now he says 400 or 500 miles an hour. Tornadoes fly at 420 miles an hour in normal operation and the others at about 450. There is talk about afterburners, supersonic flight, and live ammo. Come on, it is all in the CPHA which almost appears as if it was written by Cle Newhook, to tell you the truth. There is no live ammo being used in Labrador, nor are there any plans to use live ammo in Labrador, no plans at all! It is practice ordinance. That is what it is. Supersonic flights do not occur, emphatically do not occur during low level flight training! There are no supersonic low level flight training flights in Labrador. Nor are there any planned, to my knowledge.

He talks about live ammunition. There is an army base in Wainwright, Alberta and they have a licensed live ammo practice area. Do you want to know about the effect on wildlife? Contact Wainwright, Alberta, Mr. Speaker,

and you will find out that in that area, using live ammo, much more dangerous than any dummy loads that they may use in the practice areas in Labrador, the wildlife has increased to such an extent that wildlife officials have to periodically open a hunting season in that practice area in Wainwright, Alberta. The biggest fight in Wainwright, Alberta, is to see who can get a license to go in and take advantage of some of this greatly increased game in a preserved area because it is preserved for military practice purposes.

Everything that the hon. member for Menihek puts in his resolution is intended to mislead and intended to give him the opportunity to get up and spout forth his flip-flop attitude on anything that will help the economy of Labrador and help the economy of this Province. He says in here that the government has no plans for this and that and so on. There is a need for a comprehensive policy for the long term economic development in Labrador as an integral part of this Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

- with respect to a fair share of the defence spending that is done in this country.

I think it was the Premier who pointed out some time ago that on a per capita basis Newfoundland and Labrador received probably something like twenty-five to forty dollars per capita of the defence spending dollars and that other provinces perhaps, like New Brunswick, for example, may be getting as much as \$400 or \$500

per capita.

Now, we all believe in defending our country. Even our Socialists believe in defending our country, presumably. So, therefore, they would like to see our country defended and they would do anything they can to ensure that we have effective defence. Surely they would like to see, from a purely economic point of view, a larger share of the defence dollars that will be spent in Canada anyway come to our Province. Is that not of benefit to us?

MR. LONG:

Not nuclear powered subs (inaudible).

MR. KELLAND:

Nuclear powered subs, says the member from St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

We do not want them.

MR. KELLAND:

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the two NDP members live in a dream world. They cannot face reality. They cannot even face the House of Assembly. They cannot even vote on a question. They both ran out of here!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

They have not got the guts, they have not got the strength of their convictions to vote for their Province and defend their country. There is more guts in one small caplin than there is in the two of them put together, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

- if guts is not unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible) fish offal.

MR. KELLAND:

There is nothing to do with bait in any of my comments.

The majority of the people in our Province, and in Naskaupi district and Torngat Mountains districts and Menihek district and Eagle River district in Labrador, the vast majority, support Canada's role in NATO, continuing bilateral agreements and more of them and the establishment of a NATO tactical weapons training center in Labrador because of the benefits and because we must maintain our presence and do our fair share in the NATO Alliance.

MR. DINN:

You have to remember now, they have to tow the line.

MR. KELLAND:

Well, the minister makes a good point because that did cause part of the flip flop that we have witnessed here in this House. It is like when Mr. Broadbent and his colleague said, 'We do not want NATO! We certainly do not want a training base in Gosse Bay.' What did he do? Did he argue against it? 'Good Heavens, Mr. Broadbent, that is my problem you cannot tell us that.' Did he stand up for his adopted fellow citizens? Did he stand up? Did he stand up and say 'I represent a district in Newfoundland and Labrador and we will not necessarily take your advice, Mr. Broadbent and colleagues and cronies unless it is of some benefit to our Province.'

Now what bloody benefit, Mr. Speaker, is turning down a chance to have a NATO tactical weapons training center and bilateral agreements in our Province? I cannot believe some of the things the NDP members have been credited with saying. It is unfortunate that he chose this particular method.

MR. DOYLE:

How much would it cost for that base?

MR. KELLAND:

We are talking about \$1 billion project.

I do not care what the two NDP members say, you tell me tomorrow that if Perrin Beatty and whoever, the powers that be, say, 'Well, Goose Bay is not that suitable, however the Wabush airport, now there is a great spot.' The hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) he would not wait for the aircraft, he would be running to Labrador to make the announcement 'We are getting it in Menihek and not in Naskaupi.'

At the same time the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Long), Mr. Speaker, he does not expect us to believe that he would turn down a \$1 billion project in his district. He is saying that he would turn down a NATO base in St. John's East, a \$1 billion project, for the purposes that have been stated?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. KELLAND:

You would turn it down. Well, I know your voters would be happy to hear that, those you have left, the ones that still support you. If there ever was a fluke in the

House of Assembly, it is sitting over there at my extreme right.

The member for St. John's East has not got one hope in hell of re-election in any district in this Province. If he believes most people in Labrador are against NATO come up and run against me in Naskaupi District and any votes you get -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

I give my blood for this as you can see.

- any votes you get in Naskaupi district, I will take a few off of mine and double yours and I will still beat you sitting down because people want that project in Labrador. Newfoundlanders want it in Labrador, the majority, and the majority of Labradorians want it there. I would venture to say that any of my other colleagues in the House, any of them, my colleagues in the House, any of them, if they had that opportunity for their district, except for these two gentlemen representing Menihek and St. John's East, any other member would welcome that kind of a project.

I do thank him again for giving me the opportunity because people should be made aware. The word is getting out. Go up around Menihek district now. 'Peter who?' is a common phrase. I would not even bother to answer. They are supposed to know who he is. Talk about unions, the voice of labour, the NDP as the voice of labour in this Province. What a laugh! The Public Service Alliance of Canada have 600 or 700 members in Goose Bay. They will tell the hon. member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick)

where to go, and I will help them. We want NATO in Goose Bay. They wear buttons. They wear placards. They think the member for Menihek is cracked. And what they say the member for St. John's East is, well, not even me, with all the licence in the House that I can get would even dare to repeat what they think he is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, it is so unusual to see people, a townie, and I am an ex-townie, I was born here, but I spent eighteen years of my life here, twenty-one years in Labrador. I have a pretty good grasp of what goes on in both areas.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I knew there was something wrong.

MR. TULK:

What do you mean, you are only thirty-nine?

MR. KELLAND:

I remember the hon. Minister responsible for Housing (Mr. Dinn), I can remember him when he was knee high to a grasshopper running around the Battery, you know. I lived in St. John's East. I appreciate seeing him in the House on the same side of a question that I am, probably because it is the only sensible side of this question.

I am not saying they are not concerned. I am not saying the Innu and the native people of Labrador do not have concerns. But what we should look at, if I could suggest, let us say, and I am not putting this forth as an amendment, but the kinds of thoughts I had to replace his

second AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED. Let me read it, but I am not proposing this as an amendment. BE IT RESOLVED that this Committee report back to the House its findings to assist in decisions to be made on Labrador military training activity that will maximize the benefit and minimize the disruption of traditional lifestyles in the best long term interest of all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. Why did he not use those phrases? I might be able to support it.

MR. SPEAKER (Mitchell):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave!

AN HON. MEMBER:

No leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave has not been granted.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for your indulgence and members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question! Question!

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment? Those for 'Aye'.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, before you call the question, it is traditional to allow the member who proposed the motion to speak. I was just waiting in case there was any other members who wish to speak, but since there are not any, I wish to sum up the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, if you read the Standing Rules of the House it says, 'At twenty minutes to six the Speaker shall call upon the member proposing the motion to conclude the debate. The Speaker shall call upon the person proposing the motion.' I think that is the Standing Order.

As I understand what just occurred in this House, the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) sat down after his time had expired, and then anybody at all could have stood up in this House to speak. Having failed to see that, the Speaker called for the question, and it was only after, and it is not incumbent, I believe, if you read our Standing Orders right, for the Speaker to call upon the member for Menihek to close the debate. The Speaker having called for the question, I submit to Your Honour that the question has to be now put, and I submit that the member for Menihek rising in his place after Your Honor had called for the vote out of order.

MR. KELLAND:

On that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, just a brief point. I totally agree, of course, with the Opposition House

Leader. I suppose the reason why there was not a jumping up of several members is simply to give the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to the member for St. John's East. But it would seem now obvious to me, as he did not rise, that he does not support his own leader's motion. What else can you believe, Mr. Speaker?

MR. WARREN:

It is unreal. It is unreal.

MR. FENWICK:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek, to the point of order.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I was quite happy to allow any other members to speak and I was waiting for them to rise. When it was obvious they were not rising, I rose at the same time as you called for the question. But it took a couple of seconds for you to recognize me after you said it. So I just say to you, Mr. Speaker - I am trying to find it in here under Private Members' Day - it is tradition in this House on Private Members' Day that the person who leads off the debate, whose motion it is, closes the debate. If you are going to establish a new rule for it, then I suggest you confer with the Speaker. Because it would be unfortunate to establish a new precedent here when neither the Speaker nor the Deputy Speaker is in the Chair.

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is quite clear that an hon. member, if he brings in a Private Member's motion, does have the right to close the debate but he has to exercise that right. The right is there, but he has to do something to exercise the right. Otherwise, if the right is there and the member does not have to exercise it, we could never conclude a debate because he just would sit in his seat and then what could you do? So it is up to the hon. member to be aware of his rights and then to exercise them in the proper fashion.

Now, Your Honour said that the question was called. He looked around, there was no one standing, and then he proceeded to put the question. Now, I guess it is up to Your Honour to judge to what extent the hon. member had given up his right. He certainly did not exercise it in a way that it is normally exercised in this House, that a person gets to his feet as soon as he feels it is his chance to get into debate. He gets to his feet, he does not sit around and wait for the Speaker to get halfway through the question and then decide to exercise his right.

MR. TULK:

To that point order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would like for the record, and perhaps for Your Honour's judgement, to read the Standing Order that I am referring to, 53 (3). It has to do with Private Members' motions. "The member introducing the Private

Member's motion has the right to close the debate and if at 5:40 p.m. on the second day of debate on the motion the debate has not been concluded the Speaker shall recognize that member who shall then close the debate." We are not on the second day of the debate, Your Honour did not recognize the member and he was not forced to recognize him until after he had called for the vote.

So I would ask the Speaker, before he passes a ruling on this, that he pay particular attention to this Standing Order and that, indeed, if the hon. gentleman has the right to close the debate, then he be given it, if he does not, then he should not. It is as simple as that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The Chair has heard argument from all three parties in the House. The Chair may have been a little lax in making a decision right away. Being in the Chair, I wanted to be fair to all members of the House on this particular question. I gave ample time for the member for Menihek to stand on his feet and to show that he wanted to conclude the debate. After a certain period of time elapsed, I called the question. In order to be fair in this Private Member's debate, the Chair will give the member the opportunity to close the debate if he so desires.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I agree with your ruling, if not the logic, but that is beside the point.

Just a few points, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I respect Your Honour's ruling. It is a ruling that was made, as he said, out of what he considers to be fair. I would also like to point out to Your Honour that the rules of this House were designed to be fair to all members of the House.

Without questioning Your Honour's ruling, I think I have to point out that you have set a precedent and that any time a vote is called I will now have the right to stand up and ask the Speaker to change his mind because I wish to speak on a particular issue in this House. Without questioning you I have to put that to you, because I think it goes right to the heart of this Assembly.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I support Your Honour's ruling because I think Your Honour does look upon this as a sort of marginal thing. I think if Your Honour had ruled one way it would be very difficult to argue with it because it is marginal. Now, Your Honour has bent over backwards to make sure that no one could complain about the fairness of the Chair, and I would support Your Honour's ruling on that. I do not think the hon.

member need fear, because clearly if Your Honour had completed putting the question I do not think Your Honour would have the option of changing his ruling. But Your Honour felt that he had not quite completed it, and to leave no doubt as to the fairness of the Chair Your Honour ruled as you did and I certainly support it.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order, just a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, just a few bits and pieces that were raised in the debate. I felt a little disappointed that the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development did not take part in the debate, because after all, Mr. Speaker, he should be the individual who is most concerned with land use. Obviously, he did not have any of the studies to indicate to us that any of the alternates have ever been looked at, so on that basis, maybe, he had nothing to say and that may be the problem.

But just a few items that were also raised in debate. There was a question brought up about Father Jim Roche, an Oblate Priest working at Sheshatshit at Our Lady of the Snows, I believe is the name of the mission. Jim Roche is an individual I have met about two or three times, Mr. Speaker. The last time I met him was in the West Coast Correctional Centre, in Stephenville, when I visited him and I think five of the Innu who are in prison there because they were caught up in a dispute that had to do with illegal hunting and had to do with their land claims

and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I am not willing to say that perhaps a mistake was made back in the forties and fifties when the Innu were settled in Sheshatshit on a permanent basis. It is obvious in hindsight that the Innu's lifestyle, the lifestyle that they pursued up to that time, made them much more independent, and it is obvious that if they can access that lifestyle today to as much as possible that it continues to make them more independent and, what is more important, more satisfied with the way of life that they have. In other words, they feel that their identity and their meaning as a people comes from being able to use the land, being able to hunt. I think that that lies at the heart of the situation with regard to the Innu.

There are about 600 or 650 Innu in Sheshatshit and there are about 350 in Davis Inlet, about 1,000 all told in those two communities. There are maybe 3,000 Inuit, although that number is a variable one, depending on who you talk to and how you define people.

But, Mr. Speaker, the one thing that I would like to say now is that I visited Jim Roche in January of this year because I was very concerned about the studies that I had seen that called into question whether or not it was compatible to continue to have low level flying and the kind of activities that they pursued. In talking to him for about a couple of hours one Sunday, what he told me was that the Innu in Sheshatshit live a very poor existence, that there are a lot of social problems, and people are aware of the social problems:

There are housing problems, there are problems with family violence, there are problems of alcoholism. Mr. Speaker, it is an unpleasant, unhappy existence, using the words that Father Roche had used himself. But what he did say was on the occasions when he has gone on the land with the Innu himself, and he has done that on several occasions now, including, of course, the illegal hunt in Mealey Mountains, the Innu were transformed in the sense that the social problems that beset them in Sheshatshit are no longer there. In the twelve camps that they had last Fall, in the Fall of '86, there were approximately 250 to 300 of the 650 Innu in Sheshatshit on the land and at that time the fabric of their society healed to the point where they felt very good about what they were doing, there was a sense of purpose, there was a sense of themselves as a people.

Mr. Speaker, that is an important consideration. It is not germane to the central part of the resolution that I have tried to bring in today, because I am talking about land use in a wider context, not just for Innu, but for Metis and for Inuit and for white settlers and for newcomers, of which I would certainly be classified as one. I think the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) is classified as one, although eighteen years might give him some of sort of seniority rights.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear that 40,000 flights a year, which it is possible we may reach in a couple of years, will very seriously impact on their way of life and on attempts to use that land in other ways which may be beneficial economically to the people of Labrador.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

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

MR. KELLAND:
He is implying in his statement, Mr. Speaker, that there are 40,000 flights a year over Indian/Innu encampments and that is utter hogwash.

MR. FENWICK:
To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that. It is not a point of order anyway.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Just to repeat it so the member for Naskaupi can hear it, there were 5,200 flights last year, there will be approximately 6,500 flights this year, according to the best information we have. The report that the member for Torngat Mountains was reading from clearly states, the information that he had from the military, that by 1990 they expect to have upwards of 40,000 flights. Now, where they got the information I do not know, but I would assume they have credentials for it.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. FENWICK:
No, I cannot, because I do not have enough time for it.

What I am saying to you, Mr. Speaker, is this: If the 40,000 flights, if that is what we are going to get to, and quite frankly it could be more, will mean to 200 to 300 low level flights per day in the flying season, which may be forty weeks of the year, that clearly -

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

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

MR. KELLAND:
He is misleading the House again, Mr. Speaker. No matter whether it is 5,000, 6,500, or 40,000, is he telling the House that there are that many planes, 4,500 or 6,500 flying over Innu encampments?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

To that point of order, it is immaterial whether the hon. member agrees or disagrees.

MR. KELLAND:
Anything he says is immaterial, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:
Just to mention a few other points that were brought up. The member for Naskaupi mentioned the 350 West Germans who are stationed there who are tourists, and they are, I agree. They are.

MR. KELLAND:
So are you when you go there.

MR. FENWICK:

Yes, very much so, including the money I pay at the Labrador Inn to stay there, and at the restaurants to be fed, and so on and so forth.

What I am suggesting to you, Mr. Speaker, is if we rely on a tourist potential of 350 for the West Germans and a like amount, I guess, for the British and the Dutch, then we are talking about 1,000 tourists at any one time. Mr. Speaker, the Yukon has upwards of 30,000 or 40,000 tourists per year.

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 continuing to mislead the House. I said there were 350 West German airmen, so many Dutch and so on, but they rotate every two or three weeks. How he can add that up to make only 1,000 escapes me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is out of order in interrupting the hon. member for Menihek.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what I do want to go over is what I said in the introductory part of the statement. I have in front of me the Hansard which goes from February 21, 1961 and concludes on March 11, 1961. Mr. Speaker, this

Hansard covers the debate on the setting up of BRINCO and giving it the water rights to Labrador. In that eighteen day period, this House, this Legislature gave away a resource that costs us, by the Premier's own estimates, \$400 million a year. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have gone through this debate very thoroughly, and I have gone through it because I wanted to see if anybody who was in this House in 1961 foresaw that by giving BRINCO carte blanche to develop Labrador we would lose the chance of gaining additional revenue from the Churchill Falls project and from the electricity which is being sold. Mr. Speaker, I have looked over the comments by the then Leader of the official Opposition, who was a PC, and I can find nowhere in there where it was pointed out that we may be selling our birthright and that over a period of ten years or so we would be losing upwards of \$3 billion or \$4 billion. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because we did not anticipate the implication of the action we were taking back then.

What we said was, 'BRINCO is not charging us a lot of money, we will give them the power to do it, let them go ahead and do it', and they did it.

DR. COLLINS:

There is nothing wrong with the project.

MR. FENWICK:

Oh, there is nothing wrong with the project, what was wrong was the contract.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:

Yes. Exactly. But you are

talking now about ten year contracts for low level flights. You are talking about spending \$1 billion in order to put in a base, all of which will imply massive contracts going maybe forty or fifty years. Because if I was a NATO country and I put \$1 billion into Goose Bay, I would make darn sure that I would have the thing going over a period of time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, can you give me a little bit of protection here?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

I would ask hon. members on each side to allow the hon. member for Menihek to continue.

MR. FENWICK:

In other words, Mr. Speaker, we did not know back in 1961, and I argue to you that we do not know in 1987, what the implications of this is. By the way, that resolution that I put forward is not incompatible with a NATO base or with low level flying. All it says is that we examine the uses of land in our Province. That is all it says, and these individuals in the House refuse to do it. As a matter of fact, the minister over there does not even have a single study to indicate that these implications have been looked at, otherwise, he would have stood up in his place and said, yes, these are all the studies we have done on it, what the impact will be, and whether or not we will be able to develop it elsewhere. He could have tabled the studies, he could have shown them, but there is nothing, absolutely nothing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Studies are being done.

MR. FENWICK:

No, not on the alternate land use. The studies that are being done are environmental concerns only, none of them are on the alternate land use.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Peter, what happened to your \$3,000 allowance?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

The final reason why I would like to put this forward, Mr. Speaker, is because I believe in the comments from the member for Naskaupi he has shown the worst kind of a lack of faith in the future of Labrador that I have ever heard from any member here. By continuing to insist that this is the only development option, military training, and I will even use his words, by continuing to insist that that is all we can do there, he sees no future for tourist development, he see no future for any of the other things. He is grabbing at the first thing he can get his hands on, a thing that we have done in the past and we have lived to regret in terms of our power contract, in terms of all the development projects we have had before.

Mr. Speaker, all I am saying in this House today is that if we do not examine it, five, ten or fifteen years from now we may desperately regret the commitment we have made of that enormous land mass of Labrador to a project that we will not be able to extract ourselves from. I am saying it not to these members because they

are deaf to what I am saying, I am saying it to the media who are willing to listen, and I am saying it because I want it in Hansard. Because ten years from now, Mr. Speaker, when we have this problem, I want to be able to dig up Hansard and say, 'I was a responsible member of this House. I stood up and asked questions, but this government refused to answer any of them,' and my conscience, at least, will be clear.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour of the amendment 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the amendment 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment is carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Division, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Is the House ready for the question?

All those in favour of the amendment please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout); the hon. the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn); the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins); the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young); the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews); the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle); the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward); the hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett); Mr. Baird; Mr. Greening; Mr. Patterson; Mr. Reid; Mr. J. Carter; Mr. Peach; Mr. Parsons; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Morgan; Mr. Warren; Mr. Mitchell; Mr. Woodford; Mr. Hiscock; Mr. Flight; Mr. Tulk; Mr. K. Aylward; Mr. Kelland.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the amendment please rise:

Mr. Fenwick; Mr. Long.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The amendment carries. Twenty-five votes for, two votes against.

All those in favour of the resolution as amended, 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the resolution as amended, 'nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Nay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Division.

MR. SPEAKER:
Call in the members.

Division

AN HON. MEMBER:
Mr. Speaker, we are ready.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
We are ready, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Ready? All those in favour of the motion as amended please rise:

The hon. the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn); the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins; the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young); the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews); the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle); the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward); the hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett); Mr. Baird; Mr. Greening; Mr. Patterson; Mr. Reid; Mr. J. Carter; Mr. Peach; Mr. Parsons; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Morgan; Mr. Warren; Mr. Mitchell; Mr. Woodford; Mr. Hiscock; Mr. Flight; Mr. Tulk; Mr. K. Aylward; Mr. Kelland.

MR. SPEAKER:
All those against the motion as amended please rise:

Mr. Fenwick; Mr. Long.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The motion as amended is carried, twenty-five for, two against.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, on occasion in the past, on Private Members' Day with unanimous consent we have often gone into legislation. Now, that is open to the House because the House is master of its own rules. That is open to the House if they want to decide today by unanimous consent that now that we have completed this motion, we would go into legislation. Now, I do not know how the House would like to decide on that.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I will be quite frank with the hon. gentleman. I cannot remember that happening on a Private Members' Day since I have been the Opposition House Leader. It is Private Members' Day and we regard the Private Members' motions on this Order Paper, and there are several of them. I know the Legislature is probably going to be in session until July 15 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
At least.

MR. TULK:
- and if we are to get through those Private Members' motions, we think we have to keep Private Members' Day as Private Members' Day. So, if hon. gentlemen are ready on the other side, the next

motion on the Order Paper for Private Member's is their's: "Mr. Parsons (St. John's East Extern) - to move..." - I will not read the resolution. We are prepared to go into Private Members' motions, but into legislation? No, nay, never,/ No, nay never, no more.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Well, that is fair enough. It obviously needs unanimous consent, so clearly we are not going to go into legislation. However, I do not think the hon. member for St. John's East Extern fully expected to get into his motion today.

MR. TULK:

We will agree to call it six o'clock, then.

DR. COLLINS:

Unless the hon. member is insisting on it, and I do not think he is, we could call it six o'clock if the House agrees. Is it agreed we call it six o'clock?

MR. TULK:

In the interest of fairness, Mr. Speaker, we agree with that.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is agreed to call it six o'clock.

The House stands adjourned now until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 p.m.