



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 15

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas

Wednesday

13 April 1988

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Menihek on a point of privilege.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, my point of privilege concerns proceedings in the Committee on Government Estimates yesterday, a Committee I attended but was not a member of, and it concerns the difficulty I had in order to ask questions within the Committee itself, and in order to get recognized on a regular rotation. The reason I raise the question of privilege is because this is the first opportunity I have had, and also because I think it is extremely important to clarify what the rights are of ordinary members when they are on Committees, especially when the ordinary members are on Committees that they have no caucus representation on whatsoever, which is the case with both my colleague and myself.

The details, Mr. Speaker, are that at that Committee meeting two rulings were made by the Chairman and supported by the members of the Committee, which I felt violated my privileges as a member of the House. The first ruling was made by the Chairman of the Committee, that members of the Committee itself would be recognized before other members of the House who were not specifically members of the Committee. When I asked the Chairman for his authority for making that ruling, he indicated

that Section 86 (b) would be the section that governs, and I will agree with the Chairman and with yourself that that certainly is the article that I wish to have interpreted by the Speaker in this particular instance. What eventually happened was that the Committee, since it sustained the Chairman's ruling, did not allow me to present my questions until all the regular members of the Committee had their say, at which point I had a chance to ask ten minutes worth of questions to the minister concerned, and then another member went and asked his questions.

At the end of the proceedings, at ten-thirty yesterday evening, the second occurrence, in my opinion, which violated my privileged occurred. At that time, I wished to continue on with my questioning, since I did have a number of questions to ask of the minister that remained outstanding. At that time, the Chairman of the Committee called the subheads, at ten-thirty, insisting that the ruling had been made by he and supported by the Committee, which indeed it was, that the Committee end its proceedings at ten-thirty and call the subheads, which, as the Speaker will realize, meant that I would not have a further opportunity of questioning the minister in the Committee itself on those particular issues.

Mr. Speaker, the question of privilege revolves around the interpretation of Clause 86 (b) which states: "Any member of the House who is not a member of a Standing Committee, may, unless the House or the committee concerned otherwise orders, take part in the public proceedings of the committee, but he may not vote

or move any motion, nor shall he be part of any quorum." I point that out, Mr. Speaker, because in the past when we have been denied membership on the committees that we have asked for membership on, the Government House Leader (Mr. Simms) and the Speaker, and others, have indicated that this is the clause that would give us access to the Committee, allow us to participate in it, and do everything but vote, move a motion or be part of a quorum.

We have felt that if that was the case and we did have full participation under those circumstances, then that would be acceptable. In this particular situation, it is my interpretation, and I would argue this interpretation for the Speaker, that the wording 'Unless the House or committee concerned otherwise orders' means whether or not the member himself has the right to take part on those activities which are left to him, which are primarily to speak in the Committee, to ask questions in the Committee, but not to do the other things.

I would argue, Mr. Speaker, that the Committee Chairman's ruling, which was that the individual has only the right to speak if the Committee itself wishes to allow him the right to do so, is clearly a violation of my privileges as a member allowed to ask those questions.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would end with a motion which is appropriate to the motion of privilege and my motion would be -

MR. SIMMS:

You do not put the motion. It has to be ruled on.

MR. FENWICK:

Well, Mr. Speaker, what I would ask you to do is to have a look at that article which has been a bone of contention, to consult the appropriate authorities and to see what the proper interpretation of this particular article is. Because what it means is that I may or may not participate in the Committees as a result of the Committee's decisions. That is one thing. But if the Committees themselves can then vote and determine which members of this House can actually speak or can ask questions, I would suggest to you that it is not only an abrogation of my privileges, but of the privileges of every other member of the House who is not a member of that Committee itself. That, Mr. Speaker, is my question of privilege.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege. To be perfectly frank with Your Honour, I must say I am getting a little fed up with the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). He is an absolute whiner. Every time he does not get his own way with something, if he does not get put on a committee or he does not get enough salary, or he does not get enough staff for his office, he generally runs to the press, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member's childishness is becoming so obvious and evident all throughout this Province today that I do not know if the point he raised is even worthy of response.

Now Your Honour knows, and every member of this House knows there

are private members on that side, there are private members over here, many of whom are not on committees. The hon. member says he could not speak in the Committee. That is not true. The hon. member did speak in the Committee. He knows he spoke in the Committee. Yet, he is misleading the people of the Province by suggesting that he was not allowed to. That is absolute nonsense and he knows it.

But more important, Mr. Speaker, is the relevant ruling that we always use and that is our practice, that the Committees are the masters of their own procedures and rulings.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

They handle the debates on the Estimates, not the hon. the member for Menihek.

So, clearly, Mr. Speaker, what the hon. member has done here is try to take up the time of the House on Private Member's Day, which is so very important, with a silly, silly point that is not a point of privilege but a point of nonsense.

DR. COLLINS:

Sanctimoniously.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford).

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I want to take the opportunity to clarify something

about the hon. members down back. It is not very often that I agree with the hon. the President of Council, but this is one time I have to agree with the comments he made.

I will give two points on how two members in a caucus could disagree on the same issue in a totally different concept. The other evening, in the Health Estimates Committee, the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) sat back in his chair and complained because he was a member of the Committee and other members were coming in and not asking questions and he could not get his question on. Now, he is a member of the Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Now we had the Leader come in last night - he is not a member of Committee - and he complains because the members of the Committee are asking questions and he cannot get to ask any questions, yet, he very clearly got his allotted time last evening, equal to everybody else, to ask questions of the Minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have heard enough on this particular point and I am prepared to rule that there is no prima facie case of breach of privilege. I would like to refer hon. members to Beauchesne, 5th Edition, page 190, paragraph 569, subsection (3) "The Speaker has ruled on many occasions that it is not competent for him to exercise procedural control over the committees. Committees are and

must remain masters of their own procedure."

I would also refer hon. members to page 196 of Beauchesne, 5th Edition, paragraph 608, "Procedural difficulties which arise in committees ought to be settled in the committee and not in the House."

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister for Forest Resources.

MR. R. AYLWARD:
Mr. Speaker, by leave of the House I would like to offer our congratulations, and I am sure everyone in the House of Assembly will join with me, to the St. John's All-Star Bantam Hockey Team who, first of all, won the All-Newfoundland Bantam Hockey Championship when they represented our Province in the Atlantic Hockey Purolator Bantam Tournament last weekend in Nova Scotia.

That team won the championship game and the double overtime game against Prince Edward Island, Mr. Speaker, the first time in the history of Newfoundland that such a team won this trophy. I am sure we would all like to congratulate the team as a whole, their coach, Mr. Len Hynes, and also, Mr. Speaker, Francis Power, from St. John's, who was the tournament's best goaltender, and Craig Brocklehurst, who was named the tournament's most sportsmanlike player, Mr. Speaker. I am sure everyone in the House would like to join with me in congratulating this team.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to add our comments, as well, to those of the minister.

MR. TOBIN:
Maiden speech.

MR. GULLAGE:
Just last year I had the privilege of officiating when medals were given out for the Newfoundland section of this particular tournament, and last year they were unfortunate enough to lose when they went to the Mainland. But it is, indeed, a real pleasure to offer congratulations, particularly when the Purolator Cup was held on the Mainland; it is always more difficult to win away from home. This Purolator Cup, of course, has been ongoing for some years now, with a fine calibre of bantam players. It is a very difficult tournament to have won, and I would like to congratulate them, as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Before calling for Statements by Ministers I would like to welcome Mr. Stirling Thomas, Town Councillor of Grand Falls, and also congratulate him on being declared Citizen of the Year.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

Statements by Ministers

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, within the past hour the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn), and the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Dawe), along with the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), have been at the Piccadilly Parish Hall, in Piccadilly, on the Port au Port Peninsula, joining Mr. David Welton, Chairman, and Mr. David Finch, President of the Newfoundland Resources and Mining Company, to officially announce the start-up of the Lower Cove Limestone Quarry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

The provincial government, and all these individuals in particular, have worked closely with Mr. Welton and his company in making today's announcement a reality. In fact, it was only because of our Government's action, last May, to amend the Unimproved Lands (Redistribution) Act that this project was able to move at all. This enabled the company, at that time, to proceed with its share offering on the London Stock Exchange, as members opposite will recall, because I believe they supported it.

Since then, the environmental Assessment process has been completed, royalty arrangements have been agreed upon, and the Quarry Lease has been draw up. Last September, Federal assistance provided under the Atlantic Canada Opportunities Agency was announced. The Newfoundland Resources and Mining Company has worked closely and cooperatively

with both levels of government in preparing for this development.

I understand, as well, there will be a public forum this weekend in the area to provide an opportunity for company officials to answer questions from residents, now that the details of the project have been finalized.

We are confident that the Lower Cove Limestone Quarry will become a significant contributor to the economy of the Port au Port Peninsula and, indeed, the entire Bay St. George region.

Site investigations at Lower Cove were completed last Fall, engineering work is in place and market studies have been carried out. The project itself will consist of an open-pit quarry with processing plant, shiploading facilities and deep-water docking facilities. The operation will have a production capacity of 4 million tonnes of limestone aggregate per year. It will have the ability to meet a large variety of specifications required by customers, with ocean going vessels transporting the product to markets primarily in the Eastern United States.

Limestone aggregate is a basic industrial material used in construction, chemical, metallurgical, mining and other industries. The market for mineral aggregate materials along the Eastern United States, and as far south as Houston, is expected to remain very strong due to a reduction in local availability and increased demand. This is a prime example of Newfoundland's strategic geographical proximity to the Eastern United States facilitating economic development in our Province. Moreover, as

development of our offshore oil fields take place, and if the Prince Edward Island fixed link should proceed, significant regional markets will be created.

We have known for a long time, Mr. Speaker, that the Port au Port Peninsula contains some of the highest grade and largest deposits of limestone on the East Coast of North America. Limestone had been quarried at Aquathuna from 1913 to 1965. Today, at an overall capital cost of some \$20 million, the Lower Cove Limestone Quarry will reopen the exploitation of this tremendous resource.

I am pleased to say also, Mr. Speaker, that construction of the project will commence in the very near future, with over 100 construction jobs created. Operations are scheduled to begin late this Fall, with shipments beginning in April, 1989. Quarrying and processing operations will be seasonal, from April to December, while shipping is expected to be year-round. In early production, approximately 25 to 30 people will be employed full-time, with up to 40 full-time jobs created as production reaches higher levels.

Combined with the revenues and economic spin-offs such developments generate, this marks the start of a stable, long-term contributor to the provincial economy. In particular, it marks a major contribution to the economic stability and prosperity of the Port au Port Peninsula and the entire Bay St. George region.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I must say we welcome the announcement. Everybody has been expecting it for some time, they have known it was coming, and it is nice now to hear the formal announcement.

I was on the Port au Port Peninsula last weekend. Maybe all hon. members are not aware, but there is not another district in this Province in greater need of that kind of development than the Port au Port district. The biggest and most reliable employer in the whole district is the School Boards. That is the situation in Port au Port. The fish plant employs between sixty and seventy on a seasonal basis, when fish are available. Other than that, the maximum number of employees anywhere is ten. There is very high unemployment. This is a relatively small operation, but it is commendable. I commend the government for any effort they made in bringing this into operation, and in assisting the people to get this programme started.

While it is small now, there is also the possibility that it may well expand in the future and it is a good start. I commend the government for their efforts, and I know the people of the Port au Port Peninsula welcome the announcement. We share in their pleasure, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my neighbors, on behalf of people that I have known for the last twenty years, I can say unequivocally that we are certainly looking forward to the thirty-five or forty jobs that are involved here.

I would like to say also, Mr. Speaker, that wherever we have had mining communities, we have tended to do quite well. So I am looking forward to Port au Port becoming a mining community once again, so that we will again be able to do quite well there.

In listening to the minister's statement, a copy of which, by the way, was not forwarded, and I assume that it was just an oversight, the proposal is for an aggregate quarry. The limestone deposits in the Port au Port Peninsula, as I think all members should know, is some of the highest quality limestone in the country and obviously has many more uses beyond just use as an aggregate to build a fixed link to P.E.I. or to use as aggregate in the Eastern United States.

Hopefully, in the future we will be able to develop additional mines, or at least develop this mine to the point where it can start producing the ingredients required for the making of cement and the other additional industries that we want to base on that kind of a resource. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, the 80 or 90 per cent unemployment rate in Port au Port, that has been the habit for the last ten years or

so, will continue. Thirty-five or forty jobs is a nice, welcome addition, but when you consider that there are 5,000 or 6,000 people on the Port au Port Peninsula itself and there are enormous levels of unemployment, it is only the beginning of an initiative in order to provide the kinds of jobs that are required.

Nonetheless, we welcome the statement, we look forward to Port au Port becoming a mining community, and on that basis I would like to congratulate the mining company for coming in and setting up operations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to advise hon. members that the community of Monkstown, Placentia Bay, will be interconnected to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro's main hydro-electrical transmission grid tomorrow, April 14.

The forty householders and seven commercial customers at Monkstown have up until now received their electricity from diesel generators. A new 14.4 kilovolt distribution line has been built for the six kilometer distance from the Paradise River hydro development to Monkstown, and a 25 kilovolt distribution line has been extended for the fourteen kilometer distance from the existing substation to Hydro's new Paradise River development.

Residents of Monkstown will now

come under the interconnected system and will therefore be able to add appliances or electric heat which up to now has been restrictive under the diesel rate. The two diesel plant operators at Monkstown have been granted voluntary retirement.

The Monkstown interconnection is possible because of the Paradise River hydro-electric project scheduled to come on stream early in 1989. Interconnection of Monkstown to the Province's main transmission grid is a continuation of Hydro's policy to bring as many communities as possible under the main hydro grid when it is economical and possible so to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, we are pleased to receive this announcement from the minister today. We thank him for a copy of it beforehand. I am particularly delighted, because I represented the community of Monkstown at one time, and I was very pleased at that time to be able to assist the community in obtaining a road link with the main highway system of this Province. It is now, I think, another momentous day for the community, when they finally get linked into the main hydro grid.

It is a community which showed its metal in stating very plainly that they had no intentions of resettling. They are a community

that are very comfortable where they are. There are very good people produced in the community of Monkstown. Not only has it been a great reservoir for supplying officers for the Salvation Army - I would say, on a per capita basis there are probably more officers in the Salvation Army that came out of Monkstown than any other community in this Province.

Also, many of them, Mr. Speaker, are renowned for their small boat building skills. I am delighted to see, with the addition of this interconnection with the main hydro grid to their community, that there will now be greater convenience for the citizens of the community of Monkstown to carry on their day to day activities.

So, I am very, very pleased to see this. I think another thing should be noted here, another benefit from development. There is always a concern with respect to environmental matters, and we always have to make sure we have proper environmental assessments carried out, but we see here, with another hydro development in this Province, the same type of benefits flowing as flowed to Burgeo from the Hope Brook mine, where the economics of a hydro interconnection changed overnight once a decision was made to go with a new industrial development.

So, we should always be aware that there are these spin-off benefits to various industrial projects and they should be scrutinized very closely and added to the equation when we decide whether or not we should give approval to a project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I think we welcome the fact that the interconnection is brought into the Monkstown area. However, the forty householders and seven commercial customers are connected up in this release with, 'the interconnect is possible because of the Paradise River hydro-electric project scheduled to come on stream in early 1989', and, Mr. Speaker, I think that that is probably the sneakiest way I have ever seen anybody try to explain the devastation of one of our tourist gems in this Province. There is an argument for connecting up Monkstown, there is an argument for giving them the same electricity rates as the rest of the Province, and that should be one argument, but to try to sneakily say that the only way that could have been done is by destroying Paradise River, perhaps one of the tourist development gems that we had in our Province, is, in my opinion, one of the shoddiest ways of doing it.

As the member for Mount Scio so correctly states, last year we should have had a lot better representation, a lot better defence of that system by the Minister of the Environment who did virtually nothing - obviously it is not the same Minister of Environment who is there now but the previous one - to bring to the attention of the public of this Province the absolute treasure that was lost as a result of this very, very small hydro-electric project. What we need is much better action on the part of the new minister in that area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members that it is now three-thirty and Private Member's Day.

MR. WINDSOR:

By leave, Mr. Speaker, to read this last statement?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister, by leave?

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

We have no objection as the official Opposition to giving leave, providing that when it reaches four o'clock, which is also part of the Standing Orders, that the Government House Leader will agree that whatever time is used now for this Ministerial Statement we can then add onto Question Period - take up that much time after four o'clock. We would have no objection to it on that basis. But if it is going to cut into Question Period, then there is no leave.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Just so it is clearly understood, what he is saying is that if it takes ten minutes to do the statement and the responses, we would add ten minutes on to make

sure we get the thirty minutes for Question Period. The point is to make sure we get thirty minutes for Question Period. That is the real point?

MR. TULK:
Yes.

MR. SIMMS:
We have no objection to that, Mr. Speaker, which is a quite reasonable approach.

MR. SPEAKER:
By leave, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, I thank hon. gentlemen opposite.

The statement, really, is to clarify a question that was raised here yesterday, and, of course, was raised in my office by a number of phone calls over the last day dealing with permits for farmers, fishermen, and loggers to purchase tax exempt gasoline for those purposes.

We have been aware that these permits have been used of course to purchase tax-free gasoline and diesel fuel for uses other than those for which the exemptions were intended. Our tax administration branch conducts a continuing review of the procedures affecting the issue and use of these permits in an effort to minimize any revenue losses arising from their improper use and to ensure that only those persons who are legitimately entitled to such exemptions actually receive them.

Because of the numbers involved, there is obviously less difficulty in controlling the use of permits to purchase tax-exempt fuel by

farmers and loggers than in the case of fishermen.

For the year commencing April 1 1988, new application forms were designed which require additional information to substantiate the applicant's entitlement to a permit.

The gasoline tax legislation provides two criteria for the use of tax-exempt fuel in fishing, and I quote from section 13 of the regulations:

"Gasoline consumed or used in vessels or boats registered under the Atlantic Fishing Registration and Licencing Regulations (Canada) used solely for the commercial catching of fish...."

What we are saying to applicants is that they must have a commercial fishing vessel licence issued by the federal government and the fuel must be used in a boat or vessel used solely for the catching of fish for sale.

It is not the mandate nor the intent of the Department of Finance to regulate who can or cannot catch fish. It is, however, our duty to ascertain that each applicant for a permit is fully entitled, under the Gasoline Tax Law, to obtain one.

In the process of preparing forms and letters some misunderstanding may have occurred as to the definition of a registered fisherman and the words "full-time" were incorrectly used in one form letter giving reasons why a permit was not issued. In order to eliminate any uncertainty, we will allow the existing 1987/88 permits, which technically expired on March 31 1988, to remain in force until May

31 1988. That is an additional two month period, so that we can deal with the misunderstanding. In the meantime, all applications which have been returned will be carefully re-examined. If the applicants meet the requirements of the regulations as I quoted earlier, a permit will be issued, regardless of whether the applicant is a full-time or part-time commercial fisherman.

I want to once again assure this House that absolutely no changes have been made to the eligibility criteria and every effort will be made to ensure that all eligible persons are issued licences.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This matter was brought up in the House a very short time ago by my colleague from Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), I believe, and it had to do with fishermen who felt they were being short-changed. I am very happy to see that the minister in looking at this has realized that there was, in fact, a problem, that there was a problem within the department that meant that a tax form was released that asked for information that was incorrect. We are very pleased to see that, and the member for Twillingate is to be congratulated for bringing this up in the first place, for pointing this out.

We are comforted by the minister's assurance that people who fish full-time or part-time to sell fish and are properly licenced

will, in fact, receive that tax exemption.

For instance, if I were to hold a part-time fishermen's licence and I get a full salary from somewhere else, there is no reason why I should get any exemption. That is absolutely true. So we agree with that, Mr. Speaker. But I would like, in the limited time available to me, to remind the Minister of one more thing, one more inequity that we on this side have wanted him to straighten out, and wanted his predecessor to straighten out, and that is the inequity in the federal situation whereby farmers in Western Canada get a greater rebate than fishermen in Newfoundland. If the Minister really has the interests of the fishermen of this Province at heart, he will make sure we get the same deal as the farmers out West get from the Federal Government. We are looking forward to seeing, in the near future, proof that the Minister of Finance has indeed put great pressure on the Federal Government to make these changes in the federal tax laws.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, it is refreshing to see the Minister of Finance admit that his Department has made mistakes, because that is what I read into this. Obviously, if forms and letters going out use the definition of full-time fisherman instead of registered fisherman, his Department has made

a mistake. I am hoping that the Minister will be as gracious in admitting that the Speech he made yesterday to the Murray's Pond businessmen was as big a mistake, where he tried to pass off inconceivably the fact that our 17.7 per cent unemployment rate is actually an 8 per cent rate. Somewhere along the line, I am hoping that the Minister of Finance can tell us where these magic figures come from.

I certainly appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister recognized one mistake that he made and, since he made another one yesterday, we are hoping sometime in the near future he will recognize that he made a mistake there, as well.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
At this stage I would like to welcome to the galleries Dr. Gary Best, President of the Newfoundland Association of Optometrists, and Dr. Hiscock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

0 0 0

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:
The Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor) has some reports he has to table today, I think, as of this day. It is a simple tabling. We will not reach that

item under the Orders of the Day. Would the members opposite permit this? It will only be thirty seconds, if that.

MR. SPEAKER:
Agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Agreed.

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

MR. WINDSOR:
Mr. Speaker, once again I thank hon. gentlemen opposite for their indulgence. There are a number of things I have to table to be strictly in accordance with The Financial Administration Act and, of course, I would want to do nothing else.

One is a list of government guarantees for which government was required to pay out some funds over the last twelve month period. There were three, Mr. Speaker. The total amount was about \$500,000, including the total for all three of them.

I also table a list of Statement of Overdrafts as required for the period 26 February to 10 March, and a Statement of Temporary Borrowings for the last year, for the twelve month period from June to June.

I also table in great detail a list of eight pre-commitments made in accordance with The Financial Administration Act for expenditures of government required early in this fiscal year.

I thank hon. gentlemen opposite.

Oral Questions

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, my question was intended for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doyle), but in his absence I will direct the question to the President of Treasury Board (Mr. Simms). The President of Treasury Board may or may not be aware of the delicate and volatile labour situation related to the upgrading and major improvements being done to the Trans-Canada Highway at the Gambo intersection. The major problem is caused by the fact that few of the unemployed workers from the Gambo area are members of the union involved, and further complicated by the government's own hiring practice. My question to the President of Treasury is this: I am wondering if in such circumstances, with no union membership or low union membership and excessive unemployment, where there is a major government construction job, in order to give these area residents a fair opportunity to get a job, whether the President of Treasury Board and government would not consider initiating a local preference policy, particularly for laborers, on the condition, of course, that such workers be required to join the appropriate union, and especially in a case where a department of government itself is required to hire workers in relationship to a particular construction job?

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, the question, of course, should be properly directed I suppose, to the Minister of Transportation, who is not here unfortunately. There is a death, I think, of a friend or somebody that he had to attend the funeral of.

The best thing I can say to the hon. member is I think what he is suggesting, if I heard him right - and perhaps I did not hear him right and he will have an opportunity in a supplementary, I suppose, to repeat it - May be the type of question that might very well open up a can of worms, so as to speak. I mean, we have as a government the responsibility of representing all the people in the Province. We have a local preference policy as it applies to provincial labour, but when you start isolating it so that it applies to only a specific area I think that is a very, very sensitive area in which to tread.

So I would not want to give a commitment here today that we would be prepared to do that. I will take the question as notice, though, and have further discussions with the Minister of Transportation to see if there is anything else that might be able to be done in order to encourage contractors or whatever, if you wish, to hire people from the area, that kind of an approach. I do not know if that would be too outlandish or not. That may be a reasonable and fair approach. But to do specifically what the member is asking, I think we may be wading in dangerous waters.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

I would like to remind the President of the Treasury Board that out of a total workforce of twenty-two workers, to be increased to thirty as the job progresses, only three workers come from the Gambo area. Bearing this in mind, is the President of Treasury Board aware that while I discouraged unemployed workers from conducting protest demonstrations and picketing the job site to allow me sufficient time to carry on discussions and negotiations with both the union and the company in an effort to get three or four workers from the Gambo area hired, that the Provincial Department of Transportation added insult to injury by secretly and swiftly hiring two non-unionized labourers.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

- from a neighbouring PC district? I wonder if the minister -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This is a supplementary question. I ask the hon. member to go ahead with one.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

My question, Mr. Speaker, I started off with, 'Is the minister aware.' I will do the question again: Is the minister aware that

while I had discouraged unemployed workers in the Gambo area from protesting and demonstrating and picketing the particular job site that the Department of Transportation hired two non-unionized labourers from a neighbouring PC district, thus nullifying and discrediting my sincere and honest negotiating efforts? Is the minister aware of this most unjust and most unfair and most discriminatory action to the unemployed workers of Gambo?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, first of all may I commend the hon. member for Bonavista North for the very responsible approach that he says he has taken. I am only listening to what he has said himself, I do not know, but I commend him for that approach. It is a very responsible and rational approach, and I would commend it to other members of this hon. House. It is the right approach to take, in my view.

Secondly, with respect to his specific question, "Am I aware?": No, Mr. Speaker, I have to admit and confess here today I am not aware that there were two people hired from another provincial district, but I am also not aware that people from other districts are not eligible to work in this Province. My understanding is that people from all over the Province are eligible to work anywhere within the Province. I think we all would encourage that. But I am not aware specifically. He did not go on to

ask me if I would check into it or anything, unless that is his next supplementary. If it is, maybe I can answer it now and say I would be happy to take it up with the Minister of Transportation and try to provide further information for him.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LUSH:

I would ask the President of Treasury Board: In view of this invidious and insidious treatment of the unemployed workers of Gambo, whether he will inform this House what is the hiring procedure by the Department of Transportation in such circumstances? What is the hiring procedure should these jobs not be advertised? So if he can he precisely address: What is the hiring procedure? Who hires these workers? Is it a board? Is it a single person? Or is it a member sitting on the government side of the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member now has deteriorated his approach considerably by making these nasty insinuations in the House. We hear them from time to time from members opposite, but they are figments of their imaginations, unfortunately, which they continue to talk about.

No. First of all, I am not aware that the incident that occurred was insidious or invidious. I was not aware of that at all, because I am not aware, as I said, in answering the supplementary question, that the situation occurred at all. So how could I very well be aware that it is insidious or invidious if I had already answered in the last question that I was not even aware that it had occurred, nor would I be expected to be. The hon. member is nodding his head. Maybe the Minister of Transportation is.

I can only tell him that the policy of the government is that hiring is done in accordance with the regulations under The Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, as always fair, equitable, and reasonable to the best of my knowledge.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin). I want to be very brief with the question, with very little preamble. The fact is that in the time of the year we are into a lot of people, dependent on Social Services for their income, are finding it very difficult to pay their electrical bills because of the high cost of heating. I ask the minister, very briefly and very quickly, have there recently been any changes in the policy of the Department of Social Services for paying the light bills of people who get in

trouble this time of the year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Social Services evaluates every case that comes before a social worker based on its own merit, and the decision is made accordingly.

MR. EFFORD:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I assume, from what the minister just said very clearly, there has been no change in policy. I assume the minister is saying that because that is what I understand from his answer. And I also assume that the minister, being a new minister, is in charge of his department and knows what is going on. I would ask the minister is he aware, or has he heard any of his people who are running the department, make a rule in the Department of Social Services to tell social workers that they are not to pay any more light bills in arrears to Newfoundland Light and Power for the next while, it could be weeks and it could be months?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, knowing the hon. member, when he said weeks and months I am wondering why he did not go on and say years.

MR. EFFORD:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:

It is absolutely unbelievable that a Minister of Social Services, a former social worker, could be so irresponsible in performing his duties to the people who need him in this Province. Let me ask the minister, will he check out with the Department of Social Services in Bay Roberts and the Newfoundland Light and Power in Carbonear who gave them a direct order not to pay any more light bills to anybody who is depending on Social Services whose bills are in arrears to Newfoundland Light and Power in Carbonear? Obviously the minister is not aware of that order which obtains until the court decision comes on the present case brought by Newfoundland Light and Power in justification of either cutting off or not cutting off individual homes.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services:

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has just made a very serious allegation, that the Department of Social Services has issued instructions not to pay any more money to Light and Power until a decision is made as it relates to Light and Power's case.

Mr. Speaker, I certainly will check it out. But I am sure, as his colleague, a former Chairman of Newfoundland Light and Power, (Mr. Wells), a man whom I am sure derived much benefit from Newfoundland Light and Power knows, that the Department of

Social Services never dealt that way with the division before.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is for the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor). It has to do with a speech he delivered yesterday to the Business Association of Newfoundland and Labrador at Murray's Pond as reported in The Evening Telegram. In it the minister makes the remarkable statement that our real unemployment rate is actually half, or perhaps ten points lower than the 17.7 or 17.8 per cent that has been reported by Statistic Canada.

The Minister of Finance, in giving arguments for this rather remarkable and novel viewpoint, says that if a fisherman's wife works at the fish plant for a few weeks, then is laid off and collects unemployment insurance, she would be part of the workforce.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

My question to the Minister - his final comment was, 'If she wasn't working, she wouldn't then be (an unemployment) statistic.' is: Does this mean that the Minister views fishermen's wives working in the workforce as just one way to swell the unemployment rates for our Province and is not a real contribution to either our economy or her family?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor).

MR. WINDSOR:

Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how the Socialists in this Province can twist and turn facts and figures and play with statistics. All that I said, Mr. Speaker, was something very simple. Our Statistics Canada figures are based on practices that are applied all across Canada, and I have no quarrel with them. And I do not question the result, the figure of 17.7 percent, I think, is the latest rate as determined by those statistics. All I am trying to do is to put in perspective that a large percentage of our workforce is employed on a seasonal basis, and, therefore, for a large portion of the year they impact and they reflect as unemployed in the employment statistics. In effect, that is their way of life. A fisherman, for instance, who is unemployed for a large portion of the year and collecting unemployment insurance, may be unemployed, but is he actively looking for employment? Of course not, because he is working on a seasonal basis and that is the way of life in rural Newfoundland.

I made the point that traditionally in rural Newfoundland, and it is changing in rural and urban Newfoundland, fishermen's wives played the role of staying at home, looking after the household and raising the kids and all that sort of thing, looking after vegetables and chickens and so forth. There is nothing wrong with that. Obviously, today that is changing, and many of these women, who previously were not employed at all during the course of the year, now are finding employment for ten or twelve or fourteen

weeks in a fish plant. And so we have ten or twelve or fourteen weeks salary coming into the family that did not come in before. The fisherman is still working, his lot has not changed. The family now has an additional twelve or fourteen weeks salary that they did not have before, but for the balance of the year that person is now an unemployment statistic.

They were not unemployed when they were not working at all, but now that they are working for ten or fourteen weeks they are unemployed. And there is absolutely nothing wrong with that person being employed for ten or fourteen weeks, I am delighted that our economy and our fishing industry has now reached the stage where it is offering that kind of employment to some 15,000 people, if I am not mistaken, in the fish processing sector alone. Some 15,000 people have found employment in that area and I am delighted with that.

The point that I made, simply, Mr. Speaker, is that that artificially inflates the unemployment statistics during certain periods of the year.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, in looking at the historical statistics of Newfoundland and Labrador, which were provided very generously to me by the President of Treasury Board, they show in one of the tables that over the last ten years the greatest increase in

employment has been amongst women. As a matter of fact, a remarkable increase, from 47,075 to 72,000 now, and only a moderate increase in employment of men.

The question I have for the Minister of Finance is: Is he saying that this is a bad thing to have happened? Is it, as a result, now responsible for us having the highest unemployment rate in the country?

The other question, as part of what I have to ask him, is: Since our participation rate for men, and for women especially, is the lowest in the country - in other words, less women are working out of the entire workforce available - would he not admit that this is a spurious reason for trying to downgrade our unemployment statistics, and, in fact, the unemployment rate, if it were accurately calculated using the discouraged workers, would probably be in the 25 or 35 per cent bracket rather than in the 17 per cent bracket?

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

MR. WINDSOR:
First of all, Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to downgrade the statistics. There is no reason that I would want to downgrade the statistics. I am simply trying to put them in perspective. I find absolutely no fault, as I said a moment ago, with these people entering the workforce. In fact, I am delighted that they have an opportunity to enter the workforce, and in that regard and are making a very real contribution to the fishing industry or other industries. That is only one example, Mr. Speaker. There are many other

examples I could use of temporary employment that people are getting, short-term employment. I am absolutely delighted with the figures, that so many women have entered the workforce. That simply substantiates what I am saying, that these women who were not, perhaps, employed in the workforce before and now are, therefore for a large portion of the year impact on the unemployment statistics, and that artificially inflates the figure.

As I said last night, if the hon. gentleman had read all of the article in the paper, since that is his source of information, which correctly quoted me, I made it very clear that I am not saying we do not have an unemployment problem. I made it very clear that the biggest problem we have in this Province is to find jobs for people who are actively looking for them. I am simply saying that if we go around continuously saying that we have such a serious problem, we will soon convince ourselves that we do.

MR. FENWICK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

My final supplementary is: The minister has quite accurately said it should be put in perspective. Mr. Speaker, another page from that same fine document that the minister provided me with indicates that back in 1971, when this government took over, there was 8.3 per cent unemployment.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

Ask the question?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Would the hon. member please sit down?

MR. FENWICK:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

I was going to draw to the attention of the hon. member that in his supplementary he was tending to make a speech in between his questions, and he certainly is doing that now. I would ask him, in the final supplementary, just to ask the question alone.

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

My final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is this: The unemployment rate over the last twenty years has gone from 6 per cent to 20 per cent.

I have checked with Statistics Canada and they have calculated the same way for the last twenty-two years. How can the minister then stand there and say that the unemployment statistics are inaccurate now when they were much lower before - even when Liberals were in power, quite surprisingly - and were calculated exactly the same way? In other words how can the minister explain his original assertion that the unemployment rate is double what it is supposed to be when in fact the same ruler has been used for the last twenty-two years?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

First of all, I did not say - in fact I very clearly said just the opposite - that the unemployment rate statistics are not accurate. I will have to send him over my hearing aid. What I said was obviously they are accurate and I do not question them at all. I do not question the fact that they are applied equally in this Province as they are in very other province in Canada, and therefore that gives you an indication. All I am saying is that there is probably a higher percentage of persons in this Province who are employed on a seasonal basis and therefore if you really look at a proper comparison of it you would find we are closer to the national average than the normal pattern of statistics indicates. I do not question that they have been done in a similar manner for many years and therefore that is a good comparison. All I am saying is that, if you really look at the real unemployment rate, you will find it is something different than the 17.7 per cent.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister Responsible for Wildlife (Mr. Butt). I would like to remind him first that I have sixteen full-year courses in biology.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

I have participated in biological research and I have analyzed hundreds, if not thousands, of scientific documents and biological studies. I want to ask him a question concerning this

study on the Mealy Mountain caribou herd. I have had time to have a look at it. I ask him a question about Table 12, which I will table, Mr. Speaker. The calculations on this page are detailed and they are scientifically accurate. This study is supported, by the way, by forty-nine other studies. Does the minister agree with the figures in that table, that without any legal hunting the population of this herd will at worst decrease by ten animals and at best increase by ninety-nine animals? If he does agree with that report, then how can he possibly allow a hunt of 175 animals?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. BUTT:

The party opposite put the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) in a terrible bind yesterday, because he had to put his party before his constituents, so he gets the hon. member for Gander to get up, who tells me about his background. Well, I will take that into consideration because the hon. member will be looking for a job after the next election.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

You can apply and I may consider you for some junior position in the department to help one of the more qualified biologists, because you will surely be looking for it.

Now, before I make an announcement of a kill of 175 animals in the Mealey Mountain caribou herd, Mr. Speaker, I took the advice of a

lot of people, some of whom came from Labrador, some of whom are in Labrador right now, and I took the advice as well of people whom biologists report to, and so on, in making this conscious decision, a good decision, Mr. Speaker, one that is applauded by most people in Labrador except, and I repeat, except for a few people who had the financial resources and the machinery and so on to prosecute the hunt of the George River herd or the spinoff on the Churchill Falls road, whose deep freezers are overflowing with caribou. But, Mr. Speaker, this government came down on the side of ordinary people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

We put ordinary people first and sports hunters and rich people second, unlike the hon. gentlemen opposite, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

So I made a decision based on the best advice that I could get. Mr. Speaker, I have no regrets about making that decision. The fact of the matter is, and I will repeat it for the advantage of the hon. member for Gander who has taken up the John Hickey cry now from Goose Bay, because it is too embarrassing for the two members from Labrador on the other side, I will tell the hon. the member for Gander that we made a conscious decision based on good advice, and that decision, Mr. Speaker, was made looking at what has happened historically in this Province with caribou herds, the Avalon herd, which was much smaller when we implemented a sustaining hunt.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Keep going!

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, one that has been ongoing ever since and the Avalon herd has prospered, Mr. Speaker. It has grown -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!.

MR. BUTT:

- it is now in excess of 5,000 animals, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

The minister made the decision on political grounds. The scientific grounds are right here and they are solid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BAKER:

The comparison between that herd and the Avalon herd is ridiculous, because there are no wolves, and so on, preying on this Avalon herd. A total, complete, absolutely wrong comparison. The minister knows it and he can laugh all he wants. If the minister wants to talk some sense behind the scenes, then, because obviously all he wants to do here is posture -

MR. SIMMS:

Oh, yes.

MR. BAKER:

- I will make him an offer.

MR. SIMMS:
What do you do?

MR. BAKER:
Will he arrange a meeting, himself, his biologists, who have given him this advice to go hunting, and myself, and we will sit down somewhere so that I can show the minister and convince him, with the help of his own biologists, that he is wrong. I want to table some more figures here, Mr. Speaker; these are calculations based on this study that have two columns in them. The population estimates without hunting, the population estimates with hunting. Will the minister arrange this meeting? I want to sit down with him and his biologists so I can convince them that he is systematically destroying this herd.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker, the cyphering member for Gander, the Jethro Bodine -

MR. SIMMS:
He is the Finance critic.

MR. BUTT:
Yes. The Finance critic from Gander all of a sudden now wants to become the Wildlife critic. Well, I tell the hon. member for Gander that I do not set my schedule here in the House for him or any other biologist or anything else. Mr. Speaker, I work sixteen hours a day, about six days a week, and if the hon. member wants

to call me and arrange for a meeting then I am sure I would be accommodating to the hon. member.

As for biologists, biologists have been known from time to time, Mr. Speaker, to change their mind on matters as well. In fact, biologists from time to time have been known to play a bit of politics as well.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Yes, yes.

MR. BUTT:
Imagine that, yes, imagine.

But to get back to the reason, Mr. Speaker, for opening the Mealy Mountains to a limited caribou hunt for this year, after which an assessment will be made, this government and this minister has absolutely no apologies to make to anyone.

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I direct my question, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister Responsible for Wildlife, who is now being called a political poacher in many parts of Labrador. I would like to have him explain this to me, again: Can he tell me why he deliberately ignored the advice of two professional wildlife biologists and went ahead with the hunt? Are both these individuals still employed by your department? Will they be expected to do future similar studies, which the minister may very well chose to ignore?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker, on the decision, I will go into it again if the hon. member wishes me to, because this takes a little time, Mr. Speaker. These questions require detailed answers. The decision was made to have a limited hunt in the Mealy Mountain caribou herd after a lot of discussion with biologists in the department, with senior staff resource people in the department, based on the fact there were 2,000 animals in the Mealy Mountain caribou herd, we also looked at that in considering what has happened with other herds in the Province - it was a consideration for me anyway - what has happened illegally in Labrador, where we had Innu hunters, hon. members' constituents, as a matter of fact, last year, based on what I would call the main resident biologist of Labrador, what he told me and my predecessor, and higher echelon civil servants - I am talking about ADMs, plus other ministers; - lots of witnesses to this by the way -

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, politics?

MR. BUTT:

No. Because, you see, if I were doing this for political reasons, of which I am accused of, Mr. Speaker, I would have given the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), the Tory member for Torngat Mountains, the large bulk of those licenses. But instead the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), the now threatened member for Eagle River, by his own party, because he was embarrassed yesterday by his own party for having the gun put to

his head to ask those questions, and the people of Cartwright, except that they are so kind to the hon. member, they would head him and gut him.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask the hon. minister to confine his answer just to the question asked.

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. BUTT:

Of course I will, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, this government, after careful consideration of all the evidence, made a careful and conscious decisions, and I stand by that decision today.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is just time for a final supplementary.

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

The minister said in the House yesterday, notwithstanding everything he has said so far, that one of the two biologists involved told him later - after the report done in December, 1987 - that 200 animals could be taken from the herd. I wonder would you care to say which of these two that might be? Because it sort of, in my mind and the minds of a lot of Labradorians, casts aspersions on the other person. Why would a professional, who puts his name on a professional report, verbally tell the minister something different some time after? Do you expect us to

believe that, Mr. Minister?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. BUTT:

Both of those people happen to be on my staff, so it is none of the member's business, obviously.

The other thing is the hon. member knows anyway. He knows full well, because he was told. So I see no reason to answer that or to give the gentleman's name. As a matter of fact, they all know who the gentleman is, so why should I put it on the public record? If they want to put it on the public record, Mr. Speaker, then let the hon. member put it on the public record.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

I would like to welcome to the galleries the Chairman of the Economic Council of Newfoundland, Mr. Harold Lundrigan, and a member of the Economic Council, Father Kevin Malloy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This is Private Member's Day and I now call on the hon. member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford).

The hon. the member for Humber Valley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, for the purposes of the record, I would like to read the resolution:

WHEREAS the air forces of various NATO countries have found Labrador to be an ideal training area; and

WHEREAS NATO has stated its intention to build a major low-level flying training base;

AND WHEREAS the Governments of Canada and Newfoundland have been working to have NATO establish such a base at Goose Bay, Labrador;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this Honourable House go on record as encouraging the Governments of Canada and Newfoundland to continue their efforts to have NATO establish its training base at Goose Bay.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that social and economic development be an integral part in this promotion.

Mr. Speaker, last year, if I can recall, this resolution was included in the resolutions to be discussed on Private Member's Day. What happened last year, Mr. Speaker, was to my mind rather despicable in a certain case.

I looked over earlier and I thought I would see the two members of the N.D.P. wearing sneakers or maybe even helmets because last year, if I am not mistaken, they sort of synchronized it so that there would only one there at a time so they would not bang into each other when going through the door.

Just to touch on the history of Goose Bay itself, Mr. Speaker, Goose Bay Airport was built in 1941 as a support base for the aircraft enroute to Europe. It was expanded in the 1950s to accommodate the United States and Canadian forces that gave it very significant use during the late 1950s. It peaked in the 1960s, and approximately 10,000 people were living on the base, especially in the later part of the 1960s. Mr. Speaker, 10,000 people were living on the base in Goose Bay.

We do not have to tell any hon. members in the House what that meant to that community, what it meant to the economic stability of that community and how it was perceived at that time. Goose Bay was one of the more affluent areas of the Province primarily because of the air base.

Because of technology, the United States Air force started to move out of Goose Bay in the late 1960s or early 1970s. The impact on Goose Bay, referring back to the 10,000 people I just mentioned, I do not have to explain that either. It was devastating.

It did to Goose Bay what ASARCO did to Buchans. It was no different. It was the same thing, except it was a bigger population, smaller community, but it had the same devastating results. And what Bowaters did to Corner Brook, if the government did not have to step in and ask for a few people to come in. Kruger was good enough to come to Corner Book, with government help.

In 1979, Mr. Speaker, West Germany started to train people for low-level flying in Goose Bay. After that, by 1986 there were

approximately 500 airmen trained in Goose Bay; by 1987 there was approximately 800 airmen trained in Goose Bay and a total of 4,900 ground crew. The economic result and the spin off from 1979 to 1987, climaxing last year, is unreal.

All you have to do is visit Goose Bay and look at the economic activity. The housing need, for instance, is unreal; Something like 30 to 35 the businesses were established in 1987 alone.

I talked about my district yesterday in Deer Lake, the Deer Lake, Jackson's Arm, White Bay area, right on through the Humber Valley to Corner Brook, and what the announcement of a \$6 million air terminal for Deer Lake did for the whole valley. You could not sell a house in Deer Lake. All of a sudden, they are at a premium. So just imagine the comparison with the 800 individuals there and personnel, 800 airmen and 4,900 ground crew.

There were 300 military and 800 civilian personnel there besides that who were local people, comprising almost half the total employment in the Goose Bay area.

In 1986 the U.S., Great Britain and West Germany signed a ten year multi-national Memorandum of Understanding with Canada for the use of the facilities at Goose Bay. The limits on that were 1,200 military personnel and approximately 69 aircraft.

Going back to 1979 when West Germany first started training their men, last year West Germany announced a \$40 million project to build a new hangar in Goose Bay that will accommodate approximately 32 planes at any

given time; \$40 million just from one member of NATO to start something in Goose Bay.

The federal government has given its commitment by three initiatives:

Firstly, a ten year development plan for Goose Bay, what I mentioned earlier;

Secondly, the promotion of Goose Bay as the site of a NATO tactical fighter and weapons training centre; and

Thirdly, the construction of the North warning system.

Under this programme, by 1995 approximately \$93 million will be spent.

Why, Mr. Speaker, do the NATO allies recognize a first class opportunity when they see it? Why? Because NATO sees we have a terrain and flying conditions for low level flight and training which is second to none.

Secondly, they see that we have good existing facilities, backed by a strong commitment to expand, improve and maintain those facilities.

Third, they see a skilled and experienced work force and service infrastructure within the community, and

Forth, they recognize that we have a strong commitment to the NATO alliance and Mr. Speaker, we do.

But there is one party in this Province and in this nation who do not and it is the NDP. They are negative towards NATO; they are negative towards anything to do with arms.

Just last year, Mr. Speaker, after the election in Britain, if you might have noticed, the Labour Party in Britain took a very strong stand against NATO, in fact I believe they said they were going to pull out of NATO, if elected. What happened? The Thatcher Government, a Conservative Government, was on the way out. All of a sudden when they put this out, overnight they were gone.

When Mr. 'Leftbent' saw the results of the election, he automatically switched and said, 'Look, we had better put a committee in place to study the effects that this would have on our party in the nation.'

Over the last seven or eight months it was firmly believed that the NDP was going to change their policy with regard to the pulling out of NATO and the gradual decline of the forces in NATO.

Last week they reaffirmed their position that they were going to keep the original position. They were not going to change. Now I could be corrected on that. I do not know, but I know they were going to put out a report last week with regard to a reaffirmation of their stand against NATO.

Last year, here in the House too, I believe the two members, I do not know, maybe they did not, it was believed that they did reaffirm that position. But there were some signs around Confederation Building that read, 'Demonstration Against The Base in Labrador, Wednesday, April 8, Confederation Building 12 to 2 P.M.'

Why do we have to fight, Mr.

Speaker, for just about anything that we go after in this Province?

The NDP in the past year, NATO is a small part of it. There were some objection to certain things regards to Kruger. Come By Chance, because we had non-union personnel go into Come By Chance and start it, they objected. The workers in this Province are not segregated or differentiated for being bad or good workers because of the fact that they are union or non-union. There are just as good non-union people that can work as well as union.

If the NDP philosophy and policy is to support the workers in this Province or nationally, they should support all workers, not just the ones who are working, the ones that are without. If it is the case that they are always saying that we have such a high unemployment rate, why support just the workers? Automatically you are working 23 or 24 per cent off your results in an election campaign. It does not make sense. It is hypocritical.

Mr. Speaker, the submarine port for St. John's announced last week saw mayor against it. Up in the House just a couple of weeks ago the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) got up and asked questions on the submarine base for St. John's Harbour and the environmental repercussions from that.

Mr. Speaker, the nuclear submarines are the cleanest boat or ship in the ocean. There is nothing sailing going through the water anywhere else that is cleaner than a nuclear submarine. Absolutely nothing! They are nuclear powered, they are not nuclear armed.

We were talking about the Canada - France deal. We are going to stop them. We got it on the news here just a couple of days ago. They are saying there is a trawler in St. Pierre - Miquelon that is going to fish Canadian waters and they were going to provoke an international incident.

What are we going to stop them with, bows and arrows? We have nothing else to stop them with. You go back to 1965 and 1966 and 1967, Mr. Speaker, and Canada was one of the leading nations in NATO. They led in four different departments in technology and one of the ones that they led in was sub detection, they led in the sub detection area about 19 to 20 years ago.

Today, because of the downgrading of our national defences, Mr. Speaker, we would not stop - the only thing we can do is have a snowball fight. We have absolutely nothing.

Where are our defense dollars spent? Somewhere else and very little in Newfoundland. Now we have a commitment by the federal government of approximately \$93 million over the next few years to put into Goose Bay, in turn generating revenues and expenditures from the other NATO countries.

I never heard the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Fenwick) say anything about the announcement last week in the hon. the member for Stephenville's area about the sub base for the Coast Guard. Nothing whatsoever. Why, I wonder? It is close to Port au Port no doubt. You cannot say there are no arms involved because it was only last they were looking for some trawlers out on the Grand Banks.

and we had to put some so-called gattling guns on them. They are armed, but there was not a word.

Last year Stephenville almost had and probably should have had a Sea Cadet base. You know, what is the difference? We are starting at the bottom. We have to train and we have to keep on until we get to the top.

Mr. Speaker, the NDP on pretty well everything - I mentioned Come By Chance and some of those other things - they were all labour intensive industries we have been trying to get started over the past couple of years in this Province, and there is always an impediment put in your way.

Konya in Turkey, our NATO competitor, must be smiling. We have to give \$500,000 to the Mokami Project group in Labrador to try to help us, the provincial government and the federal government, to try to convince the people of our own Province that we should establish a NATO base in Labrador that is going to generate probably 3,000 or 4,000 in actual jobs and spinoff. Why?

The bulk of the capital expenditure is for non-military facilities: \$9 million for housing; \$5.3 million for schools and hospitals; \$4.1 million for roads; and \$21 million for a new terminal and utilities. The spinoff, Mr. Speaker, is tremendous.

Why do we want the base? Because we believe that we have a future that should include the NATO Training Centre and we should do everything we can to convince our NATO allies to come to Goose Bay;

We want the NATO Training Centre

here because it strengthens our collective defence capability and helps preserve international peace and security;

We want the NATO training centre here because of the natural advantages offered by Goose Bay;

We want the NATO training centre here because the people of Happy Valley - Goose Bay have exceptional skills and experience in aviation support systems; and

We want the NATO training centre here because of the jobs and prosperity it will bring to Labrador and the Province, as a whole.

To me, Mr. Speaker, these are mighty good reasons, but for the NDP these reasons are not good enough.

We do recognize the concerns and the potential hazards. Yet, the NDP struck the public stage as if they had a monopoly on social concerns, as if they had a sense of responsibility towards health, the environment and the citizens of this Province. They are not the only people in this Province who care for the citizens. Every member of this House has the same care and responsibility towards the citizens as the members of the NDP. They do not have to strut the public stage based on one particular issue that they get in their craw every now and again. We, in turn, have to take the time of the government and the time of this House debating something that should be just a stroke of the pen, Mr. Speaker, more jobs, and more spinoff. But instead of that we have to come in here and waste the public's time and waste our own time in dealing with something like this.

MR. LONG:

Why do you do that?

MR. WOODFORD:

We do it because of the fact that we have to try to overcome the objections of a party that is -

MR. LONG:

You do not have to do that?

MR. WOODFORD:

It is a remarkable position, Mr. Speaker. It is remarkable because it breaks a trust. It is remarkable because the NDP has no responsible alternative to our alliance in NATO, none whatsoever. And it is remarkable because your position would put our Nation's defence almost entirely in the hands of the U.S.

Sovereignty over the North just last year came up again. What did we have to send in there? Absolutely nothing. What could we say? Nothing. We had to go and negotiate with the U.S, one of our allies. It is a good thing it was. What if it was in Norway close to the Soviet border? What would it be then? We would have absolutely nothing to defend it with.

The Department of National Defence, Mr. Speaker, expected to spend approximately \$128 million in 1987. This year they expect it to go to \$200 million, which will include services. That is not including salaries for the military personnel or the civilians or anything else. That is just direct input from the Department of National Defence.

The fire hall was just announced last year. The hon. gentleman from Goose Bay knows all about this one. They have nineteen people working there. They are

going to cut that to six and let the rest be civilians.

Last year the Dutch Airforce had twelve aircraft in there. Italy has shown some interest now. The U.S. are going to keep on going with approximately 2,000 or 2,500 flights a year passing through Goose Bay with heavier lifts. All of this, Mr. Speaker, lends to the economic stability and the social economic life of the people of Goose Bay and the Province as a whole because the spin-off comes right on back to the Province in the sense of revenues and monies that can be spent somewhere else.

Those people have committed somewhere in the tune, well, the Royal Air Force has \$11 million already committed. We do not even have the decision made. West Germany, \$46 million; Royal Netherlands, just came in last year, \$10 million; and the United States Air Force, \$13 million. Now, we are only talking about the military and the civilian working there. We are not talking about actual construction. I do not have to tell anybody what construction means to this Province.

We start up in the Spring of the year just on highway construction, and in the Fall, when there are layoffs, automatically the unemployment rate jumps 6 per cent. Construction is one of the main things. A lot of our construction workers are employed on permanent seasonal jobs.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave, by leave.

MR. WOODFORD:

Mr. Speaker, in this case I have to end again on the NDP because it gets to me. On a matter of principle, stand like a rock, and on matters of taste, swim with the current. Mr. Speaker, the NDP have been swimming with the current.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My purpose in rising to speak today is to support the private member's motion of my colleague for Humber West (Mr. Baird). The motion is similar to others we have debated in the House at earlier times which we also supported, and quite strongly so, I believe.

Perhaps back then the purpose was to try to flush out or determine the actual position of the third party here in the House. That is not my intent today but rather to speak on the benefits of the establishment of a NATO facility in Goose Bay. I believe there is no longer a need to flush out the third party, the NDP, or determine their position. They have not been able to do that that well themselves. We have seen a variety of poses taken on the question at earlier times and finally, I guess, no position at all, for which time they were ejected from the House by Mr. Speaker.

I should mention this. I have consulted with my colleague for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford), the mover, and, with his agreement, I intend at the end of my comments to propose an amendment to the motion. It is not my intent or the intent of the official Opposition, the Liberal Party, ever to attempt to destroy or tear apart a private member's motion. I think they are a very important part of the House of Assembly and the activities in the House of Assembly. Our intent is to compliment and enhance, perhaps, wherever we can, the spirit of any particular effort in which our own policies allow us to support.

We have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting motions put forth by government members that are of benefit to the people we represent. That is the spirit in which I will propose the amendment with the understanding, of course, that I will get support for that from the mover and his colleagues from the other side of the House, the government side.

I should mention that the hon. member did a good job in detailing some of the statistics that relate to our economy and some of the historical data about Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

We are, at this stage, a one-industry town, as he has indicated in his way of phrasing the detail. Without the airport, we may very well disappear and become a ghost town, as has happened to a number of one-industry towns before.

But there is a certain strength of character, I think, and moral fiber in the people in the area that I represent in that despite the changes and the loss of the

American base back in the early 1970s and the withdrawal of linerboard as a viable operation they, with the help of levels of governments, were able to maintain a community that has now become a very viable community with a vibrant economy which is growing, with plenty of meat on the table, just for the information of the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

There are concerns within the community, and it is quite understandable -

MR. BUTT:

What did you say, 'Jim'. I did not hear you. Sorry!

MR. KELLAND:

I said, "with plenty of meat on the table," for the information of yourself, Mr. Minister.

There are some concerns. Within the business community, for example, they have expressed the concern that with a larger military establishment, some services which are provided by the military - and I am specifically talking about CANEX - that CANEX may grow in size, perhaps triple or quadruple in size, and would then be in a position to provide services that may now be being provided by private enterprise. They have a fear of that, although those fears, in statements I have heard from the Commanding Officer and others, are not really founded in actual fact, but there is a fear there. We should, in our efforts and our deliberations and our attempts to encourage NATO to set up in Goose Bay, be aware that those concerns exist and we should do all we can to protect the business community. That is the first of the two concerns I want to mention.

The other concern rests with present civilian employees or those civilians who might seek employment as a result of an expanded military facility in Goose Bay. There is a fear that has been expressed that too many positions - I use that in quotations - may be filled by military personnel and there might not be as much of a requirement for civilian personnel as we might hope to see. Again, we have expressed these concerns, most of us have, in whatever forum we have, and I would like to suggest to the government and to members of the House that they make every possible effort and expend every effort to make sure that a good level of civilian employment is created and maintained.

We have been successful over the years. I went through this whole thing starting about 1974 with municipal involvement. We went through the business of integrating the military and civilian communities. We are indeed, Happy Valley - Goose Bay, a fairly well integrated community, and we would not like to see anything come along and disrupt that. So our efforts should be towards obtaining the greatest possible good for the most people while we try to minimize any possible ill effects that the establishment of a NATO base may cause.

At the moment, and it was detailed by my colleague from Humber Valley, there are a number of bilateral agreements in place and they provided a kind of a side benefit that may not be immediately noticed, but it allowed a more gradual integration of the military presence in Happy Valley - Goose Bay with the West Germans and with the Dutch, along

with the interest from others like the Italians and so on. People were able to see in the local areas the benefits as they grew as opposed to sort of a cold junk appearance of NATO and a relatively non-military atmosphere changing to a very strong military atmosphere. I think the bilateral agreements have been good from the point of view but they have also been economically good as well. These will continue and they will continue until and maybe even after the establishment of a NATO Tactical Weapons Training Centre in Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

With the coming or the potential of having the NATO facility established there comes a lot of other benefits because I think it is fairly well recognized that when there is a large project or proposal underway which may inject a billion dollars or so into our economy, it tends to speed up the acquisition of other infrastructure and other services and facilities that a community may need in that we now need a new hospital. I think that has been recognized by everybody. We need a new hospital in Happy Valley-Goose Bay and the Liberal Party supports the concept of regional hospitals. We do see a regional hospital for a large part of Labrador being established in Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

Now the military people who may come and those who are already there will need the services provided through a hospital. I would suggest perhaps, and the government has had thoughts along these lines, that this may very well be a means, because of the bilateral agreements or perhaps because of the NATO establishment, it may be a means of having our NATO allies contribute perhaps to

the establishment of the new \$20 million or whatever the cost hospital for Happy Valley-Goose Bay quicker than we might normally expect to get it.

It goes beyond that. There is continual talk about the Trans-Labrador Highway and parts of the Trans-Labrador Highway and finding ways and means of getting money for the Trans-Labrador Highway. It would strike me that a major military facility in Happy Valley-Goose Bay would have need of a surface, land transportation system to the outside and that has to do with the movement of not just personnel - that may not happen in that sense - but certainly the movement of goods that are required. And it has side effects because it does provide a social and economic link to the outside from Labrador which we do not have completed at the moment.

Another aspect of transportation which may be speeded up, and there have been some studies and experimentation done already, is the establishment of a year round port in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. This is another thing that a NATO establishment or growing or continuing bilateral agreements may very well speed up and it might come into place a lot sooner than we might normally expect to see it happen.

I would suggest also that it would stimulate the development of the Lower Churchill hydro in that a NATO base, a military facility, must have a secure source of power. They would of course become a customer and others who may get into the service sectors and so on would become customers. I suggest that establishment or the continuing or growing

bilateral agreements and the establishment of a NATO facility would very well go towards speeding up the development of the Lower Churchill which would be a benefit to all of us and will provide needed power, not only to Labrador and any military facility, but to other parts of our Province as well.

We cannot ignore the fact that Canada has a very important role to play in NATO. For the most part when we talk about the establishment of a NATO base, a large part of the conversation revolves around economic benefits and there are many. There would be increased employment, quicker infrastructure installation will be realized, things that I have already mentioned. But Canada does also have an important role to play in NATO, and I and we, our party, supports Canada's role in NATO and the support to and from our NATO allies.

Neither I nor the Liberal Party are proponents of development at any cost; neither do we support nuclear activity that would cause ill effects to ourselves or to the world. But we do believe, I do believe, in maintaining a balance whereby we can be in a position to defend our country and help defend the countries of our allies, as they would with us. We are not supporters of being an aggressor in a nuclear holocaust, or anything like that. We are not looking at anything like that. Anyone who would suggest that the Liberal Party has ever said that we are in that role, in the mildest form I could use, would be very misleading, if anyone has ever said that. The implication has been made a number of different times that we are war mongering and things like that.

Nothing could be farther from the truth.

We believe in our role in NATO, our partnership in NATO, our commitment and our obligation to help defend the free world and, by the same token, while that is going on, and while we do that and play our role to the fullest possible extent, we can reap the economic benefits and the social benefits of the establishment of a NATO base in this Province, and of course, in Happy Valley-Goose Bay.

It has also been mentioned by my colleague from Humber Valley that we are nowhere near receiving our fair share of defense spending in this Province. Others may speak on this a little later on, but I recall the Premier, I believe it was last year, gave us statistics, which I do not happen to have, but I think he said that within our Province the defense spending dollars were perhaps on a per capita basis something like \$25 to \$40 something in that area. I believe we could check the exact figures. It was something like that. Other provinces may be benefiting from per capita expenditures of several hundreds of dollars, \$300, \$400, \$500 or \$600.

Now that is neither fair in my mind, nor acceptable. I would have to question anybody with an open mind, at least, would not investigate and support the possibility of seeing more of the defense dollars spent within our Province.

A NATO base and bilateral arrangements in Happy Valley - Goose Bay will not only benefit Happy Valley - Goose Bay and Labrador, but will certainly

economically benefit the entire Province. We could even go further and say that it would benefit, for different reasons, Canada and the rest of the free world, our partners in NATO.

So I can totally support the motion put forth by my colleague from Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford). I know he and his colleagues, as we do, have a deep commitment to seeing the establishment of the NATO base for the reasons I have given, economic and for a very meaningful role in NATO.

I would like, in my closing remarks, Mr. Speaker, to propose an amendment to the motion which I have already said is with the intent of enhancing and complimenting that which has been put forward by the hon. member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford). I have adequate copies to provide to the House.

The following amendment is moved by the member for Naskaupi, myself, "To add after the last 'BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED' the following: 'AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a Committee of the House be put in place whose membership shall consist of representatives of all parties who support the NATO proposal and whose activities and mandate of operation shall be determined in consultation with, and at the discretion of, the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs for the purpose of further promoting the establishment of a NATO facility at Goose Bay.'"

If I can make just an explanatory comment, if this amendment is accepted by the House and the mandate is to promote the establishment of a NATO facility

in Goose Bay, there will be absolutely no need to have someone on the Committee who does not support NATO in Goose Bay, because they could not adequately carry out the mandate of the Committee to which they would have been appointed.

I will close with that, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):
The amendment is in order.

MR. BUTT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth.

MR. BUTT:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to begin my few remarks and comments today by commending the hon. member for Humber Valley in putting forward this very important resolution. I also want to commend him on the excellent remarks and comments he made about NATO activities and the proposed NATO activities in Newfoundland and, more specifically, in the Labrador portion of our Province.

I also find no fault whatsoever in what the hon. member for Naskaupi has said in his remarks on this important matter. I think for most of the issues he raised he will find that this member would be in total agreement with him.

I seriously wonder if, in fact, the amendment was necessary in

that it would be difficult, I think, if we were to have a resolution from the House that all members - I do not think you could do it in exclusion of the socialist party, even though they do not necessarily share our view on this, or they did not last year, but maybe they will now. Maybe they have had a change of heart.

I know for a fact that last year when this matter was raised, because it was raised, I think, in a private members' resolution put forward by the member for Naskaupi

MR. SIMMS:

No, the Premier.

MR. BUTT:

Oh, the Premier raised it last year. Anyway, the member for Naskaupi also had some valued input into it at that time, but I distinctly recall that members of the third party in the House, the socialist party, were not present and did not wish to be present for the voting and so on.

Nevertheless, I think if you are going to add on, support, give more credence to the democratically elected government, then I think if you are really going to add a lot of weight to that by having the full Legislature endorse it, then you would have to do it with all and sundry, including members from the socialist party and I doubt very much if we could get the two members present from the socialist party to endorse this initiative to have a greater NATO presence in Goose Bay.

Mr. Speaker, I think the member for Naskaupi raised a question surrounding some important

statistics because the Department of National Defence could, and should, increase expenditure in Newfoundland. This is one of the main areas where the federal government could, in fact, substantially improve the economic climate in the more depressed areas of Canada.

Just let me give hon. members present some very interesting statistics. We do not have to go far away to make a comparison. We do not have to go to British Columbia. Let us make the comparison with our sister province of Nova Scotia, just next door, where National Defence expenditure in 1986-87 was \$1,423 per person, per capita, for a total of \$1,242,700,000. When you compare Nova Scotia to Newfoundland, you have National Defence expenditure in this Province at \$217 per person, which is about seven times less. The expenditure from National Defence here in this Province was \$123 million, as compared to \$1,242,700,000 in Nova Scotia, in 1986-87.

I researched this today because I wanted to make a few positive comments as to why we should use every lever at our disposal to encourage more military and more defence spending in this Province. Goose Bay looms very large on the horizon.

I will just run down through this very quickly. On a per capita basis Nova Scotia, of course, tops the list in all of Canada with \$1,423 per person, Prince Edward Island \$692, New Brunswick \$574, Manitoba \$392, Ontario \$322, Alberta \$319, British Columbia \$305, Newfoundland \$217, Quebec \$181 and Saskatchewan \$152.

If you look at the total amount of money spent by the Department of National Defence, of course, ours is the lowest in all of Canada, except in Prince Edward Island, but their per capita spending is three times more than here in this Province. In Quebec in excess of \$1 billion is spent. In rich Ontario, \$3 billion, and, of course, Nova Scotia, \$1.25 billion is spent. Of the total of \$8.25 billion, \$123 million, a mere pittance, is spent in this Province. That is an interesting statistic.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, I think, to point out that in fact Goose Bay is a relatively new place, except for the old trappers of Labrador, who used the Terrington Basin or the Churchill River Basin. It was used for trappers and the odd explorer but back in the late 1940s, Goose Bay became a base and at one time, of course, it was one of the bright lights in the Newfoundland economy.

It is getting back that way again today because of NATO activity with the West Germans, the Netherlands, the U.K., the United States and Canadian Forces. There is still lots of room for expansion. It has created in recent times an excellent economic climate in Happy Valley, Labrador.

I heard an interesting statistic come out of Labrador the other day where there has been more new businesses established in Labrador in the last six or seven months than anywhere else in North America, all because, Mr. Speaker, there is the potential of a NATO base there.

It is extremely important for

members elected to this Legislature, I think, regardless of what party, to support wherever possible that kind of initiative for the good of the people in that area and, of course, for the provincial economy on the whole.

I will be interested to hear what the hon. gentleman has to say today, but one of the gentlemen who was opposed to this in the past represents a Labrador constituency. The Leader of the socialist party here represent a Labrador constituency.

DR. COLLINS:

That does not say he represents the constituents.

MR. BUTT:

No, no. He represents that geographic area of Newfoundland and Labrador, but does not represent the views certainly of the vast majority of his constituents when he approaches NATO activity in this Province in a very negative vein.

Mr. Speaker, the projected capital cost associated with this base would be about \$400 million. That is a substantial amount of money, with another \$100 million basically per year for operation and maintenance costs.

The spinoff for Happy Valley - Goose Bay from that activity can be tremendous. The potential is staggering, particularly from a tourism point of view.

I want to now commend the Mokami Group, a promotional group in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

MR. WARREN:

An excellent group.

MR. BUTT:

Yes, they are an excellent group with limited resources, who are doing an excellent job in promoting and responding to the negative comments that seem to come from the socialists in this Province. So I want to commend the Mokami Group today, Mr. Speaker, for the excellent work they are doing in promoting NATO activity in Labrador. I think they deserve a word of praise from all of us. They are made up of good Labrador people. I think one of the key figures in it Mrs. Rudkowski was born and raised in North West River and is a good product of Labrador. She is doing yeoman service to her country and to our Province and particularly to the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area.

The decision as to whether Goose Bay will get NATO status should come in the Spring of 1989.

AN HON. MEMBER:

No, do not believe it.

MR. RUSSELL:

You do not want it. It is not that you do not believe it, you do not want it.

MR. BUTT:

The decision should come in 1989. I look forward to the day when we can hold our heads high and say, 'Yes, the countries involved in NATO have made a wise decision in selecting Goose Bay for a full-fledged NATO base.'

I think when that decision is made, and if it is made in our favour, and hopefully it will be, it will be a red letter day for Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. RUSSELL:

Aided and abetted by John David.

MR. BUTT:

Yes, you are quite right. The other person I would like to single out as well for his good work and for being a good ambassador of the military, and a good ambassador for Canada, and in particular of Goose Bay, is Colonel David who has been there for about four years. He was extended a couple of times and in fact somebody must have heard my words from last year because when he was a Lieutenant-Colonel at the time, I said if there was any justice in this world he should be a full Colonel. In fact, that has now come about. So let me say today, the following year after that, in fact, he should be a general. I hope if this dialogue goes on for yet another year, I hope it does not in the same vein as we are doing now, looking hopefully to Goose Bay, that we can talk about Colonel David as General David by that time.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is interesting to read this resolution into the record.

WHEREAS the air forces of various NATO countries have found Labrador to be an ideal training area; and

WHEREAS NATO has stated its intention to build a major low-level training base;

AND WHEREAS the Government of Canada and Newfoundland have been working to have NATO establish such a base in Goose Bay, Labrador;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House go on record to encourage the Government of Canada and Newfoundland to continue their efforts to have NATO establish its training base in Goose Bay.

AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED - I

think this covers it all in sundry. I do not think is necessary to get into the amendment by the member for Naskaupi. AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the social and economic development be an integral part of this promotion.

Mr. Speaker, this is my second time around speaking on this resolution, or a similar one of last year. I do not intend to take much more time from the House. There are several people I know on both sides who want to add their words of wisdom to this debate. Suffice to say it would help this Province if every single member in the House stood in their place and voted for a full-fledged NATO base for Labrador.

It is extremely important that we send the right message to the European community. It is extremely important that we enforce as responsible people and as legislators, our commitment and our country's commitment to NATO. It is a little bit broader than the Newfoundland Legislature. This is a national commitment as well.

I will be interested to see and to hear from hon. members opposite, particularly those from the socialist party, on how they feel about this. I hope they will get up and endorse the efforts of this government, and in fact of most members opposite, even though I have not heard from most of them, but I believe that most of the members in the Liberal Party, in the official Opposition, are in fact belly to belly and cheek to cheek with us on this matter.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I commend the member for Humber Valley for bringing this

resolution forward. It is extremely important to our country, it is extremely important to our Province and, of course, it is all important for the Happy Valley-Goose Bay area.

Thank you very much.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

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

Just a few minutes ago I sent a copy of a proposed amendment to the amendment to the Speaker in order to get a chance to have him look at it to see whether it would be in order or not. I would like to know if it is.

MR. SPEAKER:
The amendment to the amendment is in order.

MR. FENWICK:
Thank you very much.

That will be the text of my speech, so if one of the Pages wishes to come over, I will provide some additional copies so any members of the House who wish to may be able to follow along with the amendment to the amendment. I will move it right off the bat.

I move, seconded by the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long), that the amendment, as written here and as will be read into the record over the next ten or fifteen minutes, be attached to the motion and the amendment in whichever fashion is most appropriate. If the Clerks will come, I will give it to them.

Mr. Speaker, I actually welcome the opportunity to bring further the debate that has occurred over the last two years in this House with regard to military developments in Labrador. I do that because there has been a change occurring over the last couple of years, and it is appropriate that we look again at the positions we have taken in the past and that we see which are good positions and which were taken in the past which were not appropriate and so on, and that we bring our thinking up to date on where we are and where we should go from here, and that the consensus that is growing in parts of the country be also reflected in it.

So this amendment to the amendment, which my colleague and I have spent some considerable amount of time drafting, more accurately reflects exactly where we are as a caucus in this particular Legislature with regard to the whole question of military activity in Labrador. I will start reading it and explain it piece by piece.

The first 'WHEREAS' says, "WHEREAS defence policies adopted by the federal government call for development of military facilities in Labrador."

Mr. Speaker, that first 'WHEREAS', I think, is important, because the one thing that is common to the White Paper put out by the P.C. government administration federally and the NDP response to that White Paper of last Summer is that Happy Valley - Goose Bay in the Labrador area does have a role to play in terms of military preparedness both for Canada and also for other opportunities, for training purposes as well. We

recognize that.

We realize that that kind of activity is, under certain circumstances, reasonable and, quite frankly, we indicate in this resolution the circumstances in which we think it would be appropriate to go ahead with it. So that is the important thing, I think, to remember. This is a positive resolution. It supports a lot of the activity that is going up there, but it just clearly puts forward what we think are the important considerations that have to be addressed in order to do it properly.

Secondly: "WHEREAS an environmental impact study is being done on the effects of low level flying in Labrador, and on the establishment of larger military bases in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area." Mr. Speaker, I think that is important.

An environmental impact study, which is something that we requested several times in the past of the Minister of Environment and eventually was arranged on a co-operative basis with the federal government; instituted by the federal government under the Federal Environmental Assessment Review Office, and indeed is going ahead at this time, is an important element in this whole process.

As members may know, the FEARO panel had two initial objectives. One was to look at the low level flying that was currently going on and to make a decision on what mitigated things should be put in place in order to accommodate other land use and the Native people in Labrador. Secondly, that there be a decision made on whether or not a NATO base be

proceeded with. These were the two questions that were put to the panel.

When we saw the Terms of Reference, Mr. Speaker, we objected strenuously to the first one. We argued that the FEARO panel should have absolute control of its own decision-making. Whether the military or the Department of Environment federally would take their recommendations afterwards was immaterial. But they should not have their hands tied in the beginning.

We are pleased to note that just several days ago, as a matter of fact on March 30, the Minister of the Environment, Tom McMillan, in a letter dated March 21, 1988 to David Barnes, Chairman of the Environmental Assessment Panel, indicated that the restriction which was originally in the Terms of Reference for the panel had been removed.

I can quote just a small section of it. I am not quoting but paraphrasing it. A copy is available if members wish to have a look at it, because it is an important document. What he says is that it is up to the panel to decide whether or not it is appropriate to continue on with the low level flying. Their recommendation will then obviously go to government and will be proceeded with in subsequent deliberations.

So on that basis that is an important basis. It does remove what I think is one of the major objections to the credibility of the panel in the past and that was that it was not allowed to recommend everything it thought was appropriate for the

developments there. Now it clearly can and, as a result, my support for the process is much stronger than it has been before because I think the report will be credible.

Do not forget, if you have restricted Terms of Reference and all you can do is recommend medication on the low level flying, then clearly a problem exists in terms of your credibility with groups that are now asking questions of what is going on there. The question always would have been asked, 'Would they have said that it should have been stopped?'

Now that this objection has been removed, Mr. Speaker, we feel that the panel is much stronger, its recommendations will be more credible and will be more acceptable everywhere in the country and everywhere in the world which is indeed, where the considerations must best be heard.

The third WHEREAS says: WHEREAS the Innu and Inuit peoples in Labrador have never, by treaty, given up claim to the land mass of Labrador.

Mr. Speaker we think that is an important point. There is a substantial argument in international law that the Labrador land mass is owned by the Native people who have occupied it for the last 20,000 years, in the case of one group, and in the last several thousand years in the case of the other group. Nowhere has there been a treaty signed with either the Innu or the Inuit, or any other Native groups or groups claiming to represent Natives in Labrador saying that they have given up claim to this land. That is important. It is important in

international law; it is important in the respectability that we bring to asking European countries if they wish to come here and train their pilots in certain procedures.

So that point, I think, cannot be over stressed. Our claim to that land is a damage claim. We, if we went to international courts and we are bound by their decisions, may eventually be in a position where the Innu and Inuit would have a very considerable say over what happens in that region. As a matter of fact, they might have all the say, if we were ever to bind ourselves by those international conventions.

The fourth WHEREAS, Mr. Speaker, says: WHEREAS no proper assessment has been completed on whether or not the low level flying and major military developments like this are the best way to exploit the Labrador land mass.

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a WHEREAS that should be very carefully looked at.

One of the questions I asked our ministers here over the last three and a half years has been, 'Have you asked yourself what else can be done in Labrador besides this low level flying?' More particularly, 'Have you asked yourself what cannot be done if you commit yourself to long term contracts for low level flying and for a base, the likes of which you are proposing?' That never has been answered in the affirmative by any of the ministers on the other side. In other words, no study has been done on alternate land use, if indeed this activity would preclude it.

Mr. Speaker, I refer you to another instance when no study like that was done, and that was back in the 1960s when the Churchill Falls contracts were signed and it is an important parallel to make. It is in the same area of the Province and it is the same kind of mad rush towards development that looked great at the time and was supported by the Liberal government at that time under Mr. Smallwood, and perhaps by the Leader of the official Opposition, although I think he was in the House after the decision was made to give Brinco the rights and, therefore, should not be held personally responsible for those decisions.

But the important point to make, Mr. Speaker, is that the Liberal government of the day decided to go ahead and give these water rights to Brinco, and the P.C. Opposition at the time never objected. As a matter of fact, if you look at the Hansard of the time you will see them applauding the development.

Yet, the Premier of this Province consistently slanders Mr. Smallwood's name by saying that he was the one who gave away Churchill Falls, when the P.C. Opposition, who responsibility it was to stand up at the time and say, 'You have not looked at all these considerations,' did not do so. I say to you, if they did not do it then, it is pretty cheap of them to make cracks about it right now.

On that basis, I think the analogy is appropriate to made between the Churchill Falls development and the fact that we did not look into the alternate uses, we did not look into the power contract and

the fact that we would be locked in for what is, forty, fifty, ninety years on that particular power contract. We, this legislature, our predecessors of thirty years ago, are responsible for that contract. We cannot blame it on Mr. Smallwood because the Opposition did not raise it at the time it should have.

We do not want to be responsible for the same kind of thing happening again.

MR. LONG:
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
Because if a contract for twenty, thirty or forty years use of a NATO base in Happy Valley-Goose Bay is signed, then we have committed that area, that territory, that town to that particular use for a period of time and we want to know what else we cannot do as a result of it. Maybe nothing, but since the studies have not been done, it is important that we think that they should be.

MR. LONG:
Right on!

MR. FENWICK:
Finally we get to the resolves.

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House go on record as supporting" note that word and this is our resolution that this House go on record as supporting "military development in Labrador only on the following conditions:" So this is a positive resolution. We are saying military operations in Happy Valley-Goose Bay of various kinds, unspecified at this time, are possible, are legitimate, but there are certain conditions that must be met. Let us get to the

conditions: Number one, "That the Innu and the Inuit peoples of Labrador agree to the development as part of a comprehensive land claims settlement with them."

Mr. Speaker, we are saying that the Innu and Inuit of Labrador should have a veto on military development. We are saying it flat out. We do not apologize for saying it. We think that since it is their land and they have a legal claim to it, that they have to agree with that development. If they say no, they want another kind of development for their home land, then that is it. That is what we accept.

We are standing 100 per cent behind the Innu and Inuit communities of Labrador in defence of their rights to have some say in their future.

MR. LONG;
Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:
We say, on a development of this size, they have an obligation to be consulted and to agree to it and that a lands claims settlement be put into place so that they have the resources to live in a manner which they themselves decide is appropriate for their future. So that is the first thing, that the Native groups do have a veto. That is one of our conditions.

Secondly, "That the military developments being proposed be clearly shown to be, through the environmental impact study, compatible with other land uses in Labrador that may eventually be put forward." That refers back to the WHEREAS that I had in there.

The question, Mr. Speaker, is: Are

we blocking the door to other kinds of development that are appropriate, absolutely appropriate in Labrador and would maybe create additional employment, as a result of committing ourselves to low level flying - a very disruptive activity on certain kinds of other development - and a massive NATO base, if indeed that is what eventually is put there?

Mr. Speaker, the development potential for Labrador for tourism is infinite, absolutely infinite. In the Yukon, which I call the Labrador of the West, the major industry over the last couple of years has contested between mining and tourism. They have had as much revenue and as much income and as much employment from tourism as they had mining in a number of those years.

MR. LONG:

A good NDP government.

MR. FENWICK:

I ask you seriously, once we have completed the Trans-Labrador Highway and it goes all the way up the Coast of Labrador, how easy is it going to be to bring tourists into Labrador if, during the time that they are there, camping in the wilderness and enjoying the wilderness experience, they are being buzzed by jets that are less than 100 feet above them?

I think it is very important to take these considerations into account and to make sure that we do not sell off all of Labrador for this activity.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, the other thing I should mention is that every study that I have seen about the development indicates that we have got about three times as much

land tied up for these low-level ranges as is absolutely necessary under either of the contracts that we have bilaterally or under the NATO development project.

The other question I always ask and keep on asking is, why do we give them three times as much land as they need? Quite frankly, it would have been a lot better to have less. That, Mr. Speaker, is the second one, that we make sure we know what other uses are possible and that we do not preclude them.

Thirdly, "That the environmental impact study demonstrate the military uses of Labrador be environmentally sound."

I think that that is something that everybody in this House can fully support. The argument is that we want to make sure they are environmentally sound. We do not want people having their health destroyed as a result of these activities. These studies have to be done and be done reasonably to show that there is no damage to the Native population; there is no damage to the settler population, and there is no damage to the animals that are in the area. I think it is very important to take those into account as well.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the fourth condition, and it is an important one from my perspective: "That the military activities so planned not be supportive of activities that would lead to nuclear war."

MR. LONG:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

That is subject to interpretation and I will spend a few seconds explaining it because I think it

is very important.

Mr. Speaker, if the military activity for Happy Valley-Goose Bay was to be a site for missiles that would carry nuclear weapons and provide 100,000 jobs, I would say no. If it provided a million jobs I would say no.

I do not see how any reasonable, rational, thinking person in this society today can argue that we should place nuclear weapons on our territory at all, ever. The evidence is conclusive that that kind of activity is going to lead to the annihilation of the human race and there is no other place it can go.

Mr. Speaker, in looking at the activities being planned up in Labrador, the low-level flying and so on, there is some question that some of it may eventually be used for nuclear warfare. We have had in our own caucus many arguments about whether the low-level flying and the deep strike techniques and so on are those which would lead to it.

I argue back and forth and say, "Look, if you have a Piper Cub you can stick a nuclear weapon in it and drop it." On that basis I think you have to be very lenient about it.

It is my own feeling personally that the kind of low level activity that is going on there is not the kind that is primarily for nuclear weapons deployment and so on. On that basis, that is not an area that I have an argument with. My colleague, however, is much more skeptical of it. But, Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely critical that we as a Province, we as a people do not support the argument that nuclear war and

nuclear weapons are possible within a society that has any sanity whatsoever.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, I would like to propose a little ad for Helen Caldicott's visit tomorrow evening. I understand every member of the Legislature has an invitation. I, personally, ask you to please come and see Dr. Helen Caldicott. She is a world-wide peace activist and was involved in that very famous National Film Board film, *If You Love This Planet*, which won an Academy Award and was then banned in the United States as being propaganda, which tells you a lot about the Academy Awards down in the United States.

But I suggest to you that if we want to talk about nuclear weapons and nuclear submarines, even if we want to get into that area, on our own soil, that Helen Caldicott is the kind of person who has to be listened to before you make your decision. You can ignore her advice, I do not care what you do at that point, but I think it is important to listen to her because she has done the research and she has a feel for all the kinds of environmental problems that are there.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the fourth condition, that it not be a nuclear facility under any circumstances, whether it is our nuclear facilities, the American's, whether it is NATO, whether it is NORAD, whether it is the Warsaw Pact, or whether it is anybody.

Mr. Speaker, just to summarize, I have put on the record by form of an amendment what we think is the rational, intelligent way to develop Labrador in terms of its

military future. It is that it should be done only under certain circumstances, and these are that the Innu and Inuit have a comprehensive land claims agreement in place, that they have a secure future, and that they agree to that kind of development. And we stand behind them in that respect.

Secondly, that environmentally there be other options available in the Labrador landmass that can be gone forward with and we do not preclude them. Thirdly, that the environmental impact study give a clean bill of health not only on humans but also on the flora and fauna as well. And, finally, that it be an non-nuclear development.

On that basis, Mr. Speaker, both my colleague and I are quite supportive of whatever military developments should occur in Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, that is somewhat of a change of position. I do not condemn the hon. member for changing his position; anybody who sees the light ought to change the position.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to support this resolution. I think it is essentially a sound resolution. But I do not do it blindly. I do not take the position for or against the resolution blindly. I think all hon. members ought to

consider the issues that are involved in this resolution and assess the proposal from the various points of view that are raised in it.

You have to take into account the National Defence aspect of it. The Government of Canada, which is responsible for the defence of this nation, is not about to involve itself in a major facility like that without it serving a national defence purpose. All of the provinces have to play their roles and make their contribution to the defence of this country, so that is a matter that we have to take into account. We have to take into account the provincial concern. There are issues that arise that concern this Province, among them, of course, the defence aspect of it. The economic aspect and the economic consequences of proceeding with this development or not proceeding with it is important to this Province. We have to take into account the concerns of the local municipality, the area around and the impact on them, economic and social. We have to give serious and thorough understanding and consideration to the rights of the Native peoples affected. We cannot ignore those rights and we cannot just simply discount them; we must give genuine and full consideration to them. But I do part company with the Leader of the NDP, who would surrender to them complete sovereignty over Labrador, and that is totally unacceptable.

There are rights that have to be protected and those rights must be given every fair, full and proper consideration. And if those rights are so adversely affected, then it may well be that the proposal ought not to proceed.

But you cannot say an absolute no to it without considering that amongst all of the other things.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I believe you have to give full and thorough consideration to the environmental impact of such a development, whether it is in Goose Bay, in the Labrador part of the Province, or on the Northern Peninsula, or the Avalon Peninsula, or anywhere else. No one of those issues is absolutely determinative of whether or not that establishment ought to be developed at Goose Bay, and that includes the Native rights thing. That does not override everything else, you take a look at the whole of it.

To look first, in some detail, at the national aspect of it, from a national defence point of view and from a point of view of discharging the international obligations of Canada, we have to take a look at Canada's responsibility under its NATO agreement. We cannot be a hypocrite. There are some in Canada who take the position that we want to be defended, we want to be protected by the U.S. defence umbrella, but we do not want to sully our clean hands with a rifle; we cannot be participating in military matters, but we want to be defended and protected. Now, that is what I call monumental hypocrisy, and there is no place for it here.

We have to recognize that Canada has a responsibility under its international agreements to make a contribution toward the preservation of world peace. At the same time, we ought not to be promoting turning Canada into a warmongering nation. That is not the objective. Anybody who promotes capability in defence to

ensure that we are protected is not, of necessity, a warmonger.

Canada's role and Canada's record in promoting peace is a very good record. Nobody in this House would for one minute dispute or disagree with a proposal to have total nuclear disarmament immediately - total. Eliminate all nuclear arms in the world immediately! Nobody can disagree with that, but, equally, nobody with a modicum of common sense could agree that the proper way to achieve it is for one side to immediately surrender, which is what essentially is proposed and that is madness. We all ought to work toward the total elimination of all nuclear arms.

Control of nuclear material is so important, and the possibility of accident is there and the consequences of such an accident are so significant, that we ought, perhaps, to seek the ultimate elimination of that if we can find an acceptable alternative. There are some very good signs internationally, at the moment, that there is likely to be a significant level of disarmament in the next ten to twenty years, but, in the meantime, Canada does have a defence responsibility to its people, and to share its burden with the rest of the Western World. So, we have to bear in mind our responsibility as a Province of Canada to have an input into that.

Then we have to look at it from a point of view of provincial concerns. Now, they are largely economic. That is where our focus has been. But we do have legitimate concerns about defence as well. Everybody knows that every other week there is a Russian plane off our shores and

it really is somewhat embarrassing to have to scramble plans from Maine to mount a defence. That really is an embarrassment to Canada, even though we are part of NORAD and we operate under the NORAD arrangement. But, still, that there should not be a major defence establishment at the Eastern most extremity of Canada, stuck out into the North Atlantic Ocean, does not make much sense in military terms, so that we do have an interest there, as well. But, largely, our interest in it as a Province has been economic.

There should be major defence establishments in this Province, Navy, Army and Air Force, and there were until the mid 1960s. We have to remember that in 1949, when we became a Province of Canada, it was unnecessary for Canada to immediately set up defence establishments because the Americans operated three fairly large facilities - four counting Pepperrell. There was an operational facility at Goose Bay, a massive operational facility at Stephenville, a very large operational facility at Argentia, and Pepperrell was the headquarters for the Northeast Air Command, which added Thule and Narssarsuaq, in Greenland, to the bases in Newfoundland. So those facilities were in place and functioning and they served the defence purpose. But they also contributed massive sums economically to this Province, from 1949 until the mid 1960s when they were phased out.

When they were phased out a void was left, a void that had two facets. One was a defence facet, because the defence capability of this part of Canada was diminished by the phasing out of those facilities, and the other void

created and was an economic void. There was no substitute. Canada never filled those voids, and to this day Canada is deficient in her obligation to this Province from those two points of view.

Canada as a whole, like the Government of Newfoundland, must recognize that governmental activity is a significant economic factor, it generates a great deal of economic activity and contributes greatly to the economy. It is wrong for Canada to make decisions on defence and other matters where there is not an overriding defence factor involved that would deprive one province of the economic benefit of the expenditure of defence dollars, just as it is wrong for the government of this Province to use its tremendous economic power without regard to the needs of the various areas of this Province to benefit from that economic power. Canada has the same obligation to the provinces as this Province has to its different areas, and both have failed up until now.

In this regard, Mr. Speaker, I would strongly endorse the comments of the former Minister of Finance in his budget of last year when he referred to this item: He referred to a table that was attached and he said, "Table II, depicting per capita expenditures by the Federal Department of Defence in each of the provinces of Canada, underlines a situation which speaks for itself, and which has caused this government to protest vigorously to Ottawa for a number of years, so far with little success. The table clearly demonstrates what can only be termed a completely unacceptable and inequitable deficiency of defence spending in this Province." I support fully the

comments of that minister and the position of the government in seeking to pressure the Government of Canada to pay greater attention to both the defence of this part of Canada and the fair distribution of the economic benefit of expenditure of defence dollars.

The member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Butt), the minister, spoke about the economic impact on Nova Scotia and he drew attention to the differential between Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, and that is immense and unjustifiable. Yet, Mr. Speaker, last year, when the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) was making a tremendous personal effort to try and have the sea cadet base established in Stephenville, which would have been a relatively modest but nevertheless a welcome contribution to the economy, the government, as I recall, really did not give him any support; there was no indication of significant support coming from the government to try and achieve the objective so ably worked on by the member for Stephenville. The result is, Mr. Speaker, that sea cadet base is established - Where? In Nova Scotia. If we are not careful, Nova Scotia is going to think it is Mount Pearl pretty soon.

The NATO base at Goose Bay is a chance to catch up, a chance for the federal government to make amends. We should probably also seek others as well, but we have to bear in mind that if we are seeking defence establishments for economic purposes, we severely limit our ability to say to the Department of Defence, you cannot put there anything that we do not think is going to be pretty or anything that we think may sully

our very clean hands. We may well be in a position where the Government of Canada will be asking Newfoundland to provide space for the nuclear powered submarine fleet, and we cannot blind ourselves and immediately say an absolute no. Nor should we blind ourselves to the economic benefits and immediately say an absolute yes, no matter what, we should do a very thorough assessment and recognize that this is not a nuclear armed fleet, it is a nuclear powered fleet. There may well be harbours in Newfoundland that would be eminently suited to such an establishment and where the people may greatly desire such an establishment. The mere fact that some, or a significant number of the members of the St. John's City Council would oppose it should not block it totally from Newfoundland. We should give it full and fair consideration, and if on balance, when you take all aspects of it into consideration, it seems the appropriate thing to do, then I see no harm in it.

We must also take into account in dealing with the Goose Bay matter, Mr. Speaker, the local point of view. Clearly, Happy Valley - Goose Bay supports the proposal. I think that is clear from the comments of the member for Naskaupi. There are some concerns that I have heard voiced about an extensive military takeover of existing civilian jobs. Well, I would say to the member for Naskaupi and to the people of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area generally, that they really ought not to be too concerned. It may well be that certain particular jobs in terms of airport control and air traffic control and that kind of thing may be taken over by military personnel, but if anybody

will look at the record, you will see that the larger the number of military, the greater the proportion of civilian people employed. When you look at bases throughout Canada, or provinces in Canada where, for example, there are under 2,000 military personnel, you will see that additional civilian employees are hired to about 25 per cent of the number. Where there are between 2,000 and 8,000 military personnel in a Province, there is about one-third of that number more in civilian personnel. Between 8,000 and 10,000, you will see that the number goes up to about 40 per cent, and over 10,000, you will see that the number is about 50 per cent of that number in additional civilian personnel.

So, I say to the people of Goose Bay, do not be unduly concerned about the number of civilian jobs that may be taken over by the military. There are likely to be certain jobs that are very sensitive and may well be taken over, but, on the whole, the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area can expect a significant increase in the level of civilian employment if such a base is established there.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another major matter is the concern for the Native people. It is clear that the Native people of Labrador have a kind of special status. While they are part of Canada and part of the people of Canada, of the country Canada, they nevertheless have a special status that we, who are descendents, largely, of European settlers, do not have. It is clear that there was not a conquest in the conventional sense that an international law would give territorial and other rights. That did not occur. There was a kind of acquiescence

and, in some cases, treaties, although not with the Native people of Labrador. But those concerns of the Native people of Labrador should receive special attention. That is not to say that they are the final and absolute word, as the Leader of the NDP says, and I disagree with him. We cannot diminish the sovereignty of this nation. If the Government of Canada in the discharge of its constitutional responsibility to defend this nation is of the view that a military base should be established in Labrador, then that ranks ahead, the sovereignty of this nation ranks ahead of the rights of Native people. But you do not ride roughshod, you try and achieve it in such a way that there would be no impairment of those rights. And if those rights must of necessity be impaired, then there must be fair and proper compensation for such impairment.

Those are the ordinary principles and we cannot diminish the sovereignty of the nation on that whim. But the issue should be addressed fully and the apprehensions of the Native people should be relieved. Solutions should be found. I am told there are two minutes remaining, so I had better wind up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. WELLS:

Well, I will not be much longer anyway, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, it is too important to the country in terms of the discharge of its responsibility to NATO, it is too important to the Province in terms of the economic development of the Province and in terms of getting Canada to

contribute through defence expenditures, it is too important to the majority of the people in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, and it may, in the end, turn out to be too important to the Native people to simply blindly say no, and say if any one group just says no it is an automatic end of it.

Finally, the environment must be considered. Now, one of the things that man has been doing on this planet for a long time is dirtying his house. He has destroyed a great deal of his environment, and it is only in recent years that we have really come to recognize just how irresponsible we have been, particularly since the industrial revolution. For the most part, prior to that time we did not do such offensive damage to the environment. But in more recent years, we have been severely mistreating the environment. We are now coming to our senses, fortunately, and it is time that we took a long, hard look at what we are doing. So an assessment of the impact on the physical environment as well as the social and economic environment of the area concerned must be a significant factor. It would be wrong to destroy the animal herds of Labrador by low-level flying, if that was to be the result. But do not jump blindly at the conclusion that that is absolutely the result and say, 'Cut it off! Do not even think about it. Do not even look at it,' which many people have done. We cannot blindly say no to everything. We cannot blindly say no to development.

I heard an interview on the radio the other morning with a man who made a lot of sense, and he was talking about development. It was

a man who is involved with the Heritage Foundation, Shane O'Dea I think his name is, and he was commenting about a number of houses that had been designated as Heritage areas. The interviewer said to him, 'I guess the word you hate to hear most is development,' thinking that he would come right back and say, 'Yes, we do not want to see development. We want to keep things as they are.' And the man said, 'Absolutely not. It may be so in St. John's that we are concerned about development, but our problem in the rest of the Province is the lack of development, and everything is falling down around our ears because there is no cause to use it, nothing that needs it. There is no economic activity there, so there is no basis for preserving it. It is the lack of development that causes the destruction of historic buildings.'

Well, similarly, Mr. Speaker, in areas like Goose Bay and other areas, the lack of this kind of development may be more destructive of the overall environment, social and economic, in the end than the development itself. So we have to look at it with open eyes, take a look at it, and not go into the room with prejudices one way or the other.

On everything that we have heard to date, Mr. Speaker, when those things are considered, when everything is considered, it appears to us to have been established that it is reasonable and desirable. If the environmental assessment indicates clearly that it will not adversely impact on it, then clearly we ought to proceed with it. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, we strongly support the resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I wish to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition on that speech. It was a very good speech. He made a lot of sense, and certainly I can agree with pretty well everything he said.

Last year, we had, as was mentioned already, a similar motion on the Order Paper. I did make my comments and my views known at that time on the development of a NATO training base in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area of our Province. I did not come to my conclusion quickly, I gave it some thought. I was Minister Responsible for Northern Development for three years, in my last portfolio, Mr. Speaker, and I knew this issue would be a very important one for the Labrador area, both for the settlers, as they are called, the white people who are in Labrador, and for the Native people who live in that part of our Province.

What I did first, Mr. Speaker, was look at the history of the development of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. It is very obvious to see that the history of the development of that area is based on the development of the Goose Bay airport, more particularly when the American Air Force moved in there and developed that site and created a lot of

jobs and a lot of activity in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. As far as I know, as a little sidebar, it was the first hydroponic operation in Newfoundland. In 1942 or 1947, they did have a hydroponic operation in the Goose Bay area.

Mr. Speaker, when you follow along the history of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, you see, in the 1960s, what an active, thriving community was developed in that area, 90 per cent of it based on military activity. Then, when the Americans pulled out of the air force base not only in Goose Bay but in other parts of our Province, you can see the tragedy, the devastation, and the lack of employment that was left in these very areas.

Mr. Speaker, there is a resource in that area, a very important resource, which happens to be a fairly modern airport facility. One of the ideal activities in that airport facility would be a training centre for people involved in the aeronautics industry, I would imagine, and one of the biggest developers of the aeronautical industry is the military. The military have shown an interest in moving back into the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, a very strong interest in the last few years. That has developed to date in the low-level flying activities that are there. There are at least five countries actively pursuing this development right now. Canada, obviously, is there as the host country, and the Canadian Government has signed memorandums of agreement - I believe that is what they were called - with other countries which are operating in that area; the American Air Force has activities in that area; the U.K.

Air Force has been practicing in that area for quite some time; the West German Air Force has built up quite an activity there and are investing large amounts of money in the Goose Bay area, particularly with the new hangar that they are building now. The Netherlands Air Force has also moved into the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area in the last couple of years. I know for a fact, from my last portfolio, that there are other NATO countries interested in moving into the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area.

Mr. Speaker, the great advantage of this type of military development for our Province and our country, particularly the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area which will be the main beneficiary, will be that not only Canadian money is being spent to create this development, we are importing money from other countries. It is not just the recirculation of our own money, which is primarily what is happening in the Nova Scotia area, it is the development of a resource. It is the same as if we develop a mining resource in Western Labrador and we sell our commodities to foreign countries and attract foreign investment. This is the great advantage of the type of development that we are having.

Now, the decision for the training centre has not been finalized yet, but it is my opinion, from the information that I have seen and from the trip that I made two years ago, I believe, to some of the NATO countries, that it is to our advantage that the decision has not been made just yet. The more settled the NATO countries are in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, the more used to that

area they become, and the greater the number of these people who see the advantages of using the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area as compared to the site that is proposed in Turkey, will make the decision easier for them, I believe.

When myself and the present Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and the present Minister of Northern Development visited several of the NATO countries, we met mostly with military people and occasionally with political people. The military people seemed to give us the impression that from a military point of view Happy Valley - Goose Bay would be their preferred site. There are some problems from the political point of view, from a European political point of view. The West Germans have a lot of Turkish people in their country, and they are looking for development in Turkey so that these people can find employment back in their own country - I believe there are 5 million of them. But, from a military point of view, Happy Valley - Goose Bay seems to be the preferred site for the NATO training center. This is very encouraging from my point of view.

I do not think the media coverage of this development, Mr. Speaker, has been very fair. If there were some documentaries done on the benefits that could arrive to this Province from the development in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, I believe that it would show clearly that bringing this development to our Province and to our country would show great economic and social benefits.

People seem to ignore the social benefits of economic activity, particularly socialist type

people. Unemployment, I would say, has a greater negative being than does a slightly risky development, whether that be a mining development, or whether it be spraying the forests, or whatever. You have to weigh off the risks compared to the negative effects that would be created by unemployment in those types of areas.

Mr. Speaker, I listened to the Leader of the New Democratic Party when he proposed his amendment, or sub-amendment, whatever it might be called. It was another of the ridiculous, silly types of amendment that they usually present. The last part of their BE IT RESOLVED reads, 'That the military activities so planned not be supportive of activities that would lead to a nuclear war.' Sure, what person with their sanity would even dream of doing such a silly, foolish thing? It is the type of suggestion that the socialist people who are involved in this tend to try to portray, that they are the only ones who are concerned about the possibilities of nuclear war in our Province. One of the biggest factors that could lead to a nuclear war, I would say, would be the national and federal NDP policy of withdrawing from NATO and letting our defences drop. Mr. Speaker, that would lead to nuclear war more than having a defence system that people can look at and respect.

The resolution also refers to environmental impact studies, as if the members of the Socialist Party in this Province were the first to ever think of such an environmental impact study. Mr. Speaker, this study was planned when the initial proposals were put forward, and they were

supported and financed by the federal government.

Mr. Speaker, it being near six o'clock, I wish to adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It now being six o'clock, the House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 p.m.

CONTENTS

Wednesday, 13 April, 1988.

Point of Privilege:

Mr. Fenwick.....	763
Mr. Simms.....	764
Mr. Efford.....	765
Mr. Speaker, Ruling.....	765

Congratulations to local Bantam Hockey Team, Winners of an Atlantic championship.

Mr. R. Aylward, Mr. Gullage.....	766
----------------------------------	-----

Statements by Ministers

Limestone Quarry opened at Piccadilly:

Mr. Simms.....	767
Mr. Wells.....	768
Mr. Fenwick.....	769

Monkstown connecting to Provincial power grid:

Mr. Windsor.....	769
Mr. Barry.....	770
Mr. Fenwick.....	771

Permits for tax exempt gasoline:

Mr. Windsor.....	772
Mr. Baker.....	773
Mr. Fenwick.....	773

0 0 0

Reports tabled in accordance with the Financial
Administration Act, including Statement of Overdrafts,
Statement of Temporary Borrowings and guarantees.

Mr. Windsor.....	774
------------------	-----

Oral Questions

Transportation:

Local preference hiring policy. Mr. Lush, Mr. Simms.....	775
Hiring from neighboring P.C. District. Mr. Lush, Mr. Simms.....	776
Hiring procedure. Mr. Lush, Mr. Simms.....	777

Social Services:

Policy of paying electrical bills for recipients changed. Mr. Efford, Mr. Tobin.....	777
Ministerial awareness of policy change. Mr. Efford, Mr. Tobin.....	778
Alleges policy changed pending resolution of court case. Mr. Efford, Mr. Tobin.....	778

Finance:

Fishermen's wives in the workplace swell unemployment rates. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Windsor.....	779
Such participation responsible for highest unemployment in Canada. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Windsor.....	780
Accuracy of unemployment statistics. Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Windsor.....	781

Wildlife:

Mealy Mountain caribou hunt statistical base. Mr. Baker, Mr. Butt.....	782
Alleges decision politically based. Mr. Baker, Mr. Butt.....	783
Advice of professional biologist ignored. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Butt.....	784
Which biologist changed opinion. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Butt.....	785

Private Member's Day

Mr. Woodford, proposes resolution.....	786
Mr. Kelland, proposes amendment.....	792
Mr. Butt.....	796
Mr. Fenwick, proposes amendment.....	800
Mr. Wells.....	807
Mr. R. Aylward.....	813
Mr. R. Aylward, adjourns debate.....	815