



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 20

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas

Wednesday

20 April 1988

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, with the concurrence of members opposite, I would like at this particular time, and with a great deal of pride, to welcome to the galleries today the first Newfoundland Bantam A All-star team from this Province to win the Purolator Cup.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

I know that my colleague, the member for Kilbride (Mr. R. Aylward), officially asked the House to send its congratulations to this team a few days ago, but I thought it would be appropriate today, while they are in the galleries, for us to recognize their presence here and their contribution to sport, and the honour and privilege they have brought to all of Newfoundland and Labrador in their very, very significant achievement in Sydney, Nova Scotia, during the Easter break.

I am sure members will also appreciate the fact that I am a little bit personal about this, in that my son happens to be a defenceman on that team.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

He is in the gallery. He is in the gallery.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Stand up, Terry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

I will probably be disowned this evening when I get home, Mr. Speaker, but I am sure members will join with me in welcoming the team to the House. I would like to say, for the benefit of hon. members, that this is, in fact, the first time, even though Newfoundland has taken part in the Purolator Cup before, that a team from this Province has won the Atlantic Championship.

It was a real bang-up of a hockey game, I understand. In fact, they went into three overtime periods before, with one minute and thirty-one seconds left in the game, I think, a young fellow, a Mr. Roach, was able to score the winning goal so that Newfoundland was able to bring home the Purolator Cup, seven goals to six. So, it is with a great deal of pleasure, both as a member and as a parent, I ask all colleagues to join with me in welcoming them here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I rise in my place and take great pleasure in joining with the hon. the Minister of Fisheries in congratulating the team for winning the Purolator Cup. I have been involved very heavily in hockey over the last fifteen or twenty years, coaching, and again this year I had the

great pleasure of coaching a team that won the Intermediate Championship in our district. I have been very heavily involved in minor hockey in my district, because I, like the Minister of Fisheries, have two sons who are involved in hockey.

It is indeed a pleasure for us, on this side of the House, to pass our congratulations on to the Bantam A All-star hockey team. We, the Liberals on this side of the House, are very proud of the fact that they did win the All-star Championship.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We also welcome the opportunity to add a note of congratulations. On a personal level, I would also like to say, as a person who not too long ago also played Bantam All-star hockey for the St. John's Caps, at the time I played we were beaten by other stronger teams in the Province and were not able to go on and represent the Province. I am sure everybody in the Province, and particularly the Minister of Fisheries, takes pride in congratulating this team.

I would have to say further, given the personal note that the minister has made a point of making, that when the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth comes to the Cabinet table looking for funds for the High School

Athletic Federation and other amateur sporting groups in the Province, days such as this, when all members in the House take pride in congratulating a championship team representing our Province, should be a reminder that the government needs to do more to make monies available, and support, to all amateur athletic groups in our Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, today I would like to give hon. members an update on the Newfoundland Enviroponics Limited project at Mount Pearl.

There are now 100 production workers on staff. These people are tending the plants, harvesting the vegetables, and preparing them for shipping. In addition, there are still sixty construction employees on site putting the finishing touches to various aspects of the project.

As of today, zone eight is still producing. Zone one, which the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells) and the Leader of the New Democratic Party (Mr. Fenwick) saw

being planted during their visit in early April, is now producing commercially.

Zones two, three and four are now planted and will come into production on schedule.

Zones five and six will be planted during the week of April 25.

All of these zones will be producing cucumbers, and zones seven and eight will be planted during the week of May 9, which will produce tomatoes.

Newfoundland Enviroponics will continue to hire production employees until they reach their projected maximum of 150 employees. In fact, Mr. Speaker, and hon. members, employee levels may well exceed this number if initial production levels continue to be matched.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

Newfoundland Enviroponics has sold all of its initial production within the Province and has yet to meet the local demand. With the complex coming into full production it expects to be able to start shipping produce outside the Province within the next two to three months.

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.

I would like to thank the minister for an advanced copy of the statement. I am a little surprised to see him rise in his place, because when questions are put to him on this particular project he usually refers them to the Premier or to Mr. Frank Petten. But I guess he has been allowed to make some comments, and this is supposed to be good news.

It is a pleasure to see that there are a number of Newfoundlanders working on the project, so that somebody besides the Sprung family is getting some benefit from one of the biggest rip-offs and shams that I have ever seen perpetuated by the Provincial Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Do you ever look at yourself in the mirror?

MR. KELLAND:

When you are talking about the Sprung project, Mr. Minister, I have also viewed the project and I was impressed by the structure. But I was not impressed by the hidden subcontract figures which denies us the knowledge of how much profit is being ripped out of the people in Labrador for this particular project. And I still say that you have no markets. If you had them, you would say so. You have nowhere to send the damn produce, when you make too much for what Newfoundlanders can consume.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. KELLAND:

You expect to be shipping outside of the Province. Where are you going to be shipping outside of the Province? Who are you going to sell it to?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday we experienced a day that most of us would like to forget, I am sure. It was nothing to be proud of. Now I hope we are not beginning to get off on the wrong foot again today. The hon. member in his comments just then, and I am not certain if the word he used was unparliamentary - it may or may not be - but certainly because of the tone in which it was used, and in view of the guests who are in the gallery, I believe, the comment used was rather inappropriate. If it is not a point of order, at least ask him and beg him to temper his language?

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. I did hear the comment. I think that particular word, if I heard it correctly, is not one that is acceptable. I would ask the hon. member if he would withdraw it.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker, certainly if I have said anything unparliamentary, I immediately withdraw. But I am so disturbed by the whole thing, the Sprung project. I suppose you get

caught up in the whole thing.

I have yet to see any proof that there is a market outside this Province. You cannot compete economically, Mr. Minister, outside this Province against similar operations, and there are similar operations.

I will say one thing in conclusion, Mr. Speaker. When he says the crews are putting the finishing touches on the various aspects of the project, I suggest to you, unless you can prove otherwise, that the Sprung project is putting the finishing touches on the Tory Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, in looking at this, what is interesting about it, of course, is that when the Leader of the official Opposition and myself and a couple of others went through the project it was about the last week in March, and that was the time when the tomato crop was starting to go into marketing.

We have heard this last week that the tomato crop is actually complete. Mr. Speaker, I can tell you, as an individual who has grown tomatoes in the past, that if you only get three weeks production out of a plant, then you have a real crop failure on your hands. Any other members who have ever tried to grow tomatoes realize that that does not work.

The question, of course, has to be

asked, Mr. Speaker, whether the Greenhouse is capable of growing tomatoes in the Summer. My information suggests that it is much too hot, it is not a structure for it, although it does seem to be reasonably successful in the growing of cucumbers.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I think the only question that has to be asked at the end of all of this is can the \$18 million, \$20 million, \$22 million that has been sunk into it be recovered by the cost of the produce that is being sold. I have the same reservations I had back last May, and I will continue to have them until I can see some figures to indicate that we have bought a good deal.

I do not believe we have, and I am waiting to see exactly what the numbers will be.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like, before I begin the statement, to inform hon. members that the statement I am about to read to the House now is being concurrently presented at this time by my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Northern Development (Mr. Warren), to the annual general meeting of the Torngat Fish Producers Cooperative, which is being held today, in Makkovik.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce today that the Department of Fisheries has been authorized by government to enter into a lease agreement with Torngat Fish Producers Cooperative Society Limited, to lease our fish plant at Makkovik as well as the feeder plants at Hopedale and Postville.

A tentative agreement had been reached by my Department and the Cooperative in early 1988 after several months of negotiations, which were very constructive and obviously required mutual co-operation combined with give and take on both sides.

Mr. Speaker, the highlights of the agreement are as follows:

First, the Co-Op will lease the facilities for one year with an option of first refusal, to operate for an additional year;

Secondly, recognizing the economics of operating fish plants in Northern Labrador, the Department of Fisheries will provide a subsidy on losses incurred to a maximum of \$430,000. Government and the Co-Op have agreed to a sharing arrangement on losses with the Co-Op's share being a significant portion, representative of their ability to pay;

Thirdly, to assist the Co-Op with start-up operations, government will advance to the Co-Op \$130,000 by July 1, 1988, representing partial payment of government's anticipated subsidy for year one of the lease;

Fourthly, additional payments by the Province will be based on monthly financial statements with the necessary holdbacks which are

standard in these types of arrangements. The final settlement from the Province with respect to any losses will be based on audited financial statements.

Mr. Speaker, as the Department of Fisheries is acutely aware, the nature of fish plant operations in Northern Labrador is such that the period of July to September accounts for approximately 90 per cent of processing activity. During this timeframe, plant operators must cover the costs of fish purchases, processing costs as well as plant overheads. While there is a rapid outflow of cash, it is not until November or later that revenues begin to flow back to the operation.

Mr. Speaker, in order to meet peak cash flow requirements under such an operating scheme, to take into consideration the timing of the Province's payments of its share of any losses, and to continue with assistance with respect to the Co-Op's Rigolet operation, government has also approved a \$750,000 loan guarantee on behalf of the Co-Op. This guarantee will meet the peak operating requirements for the Makkovik and Rigolet operations, particularly as they relate to the crucial July to September period. This guarantee will lessen as the Co-op realizes revenues and sales and receives subsidy payments from the Province.

Mr. Speaker, government's approval of the lease arrangement with the Co-Op and the provision of a \$750,000 loan guarantee as well as a \$430,000 subsidy, clearly demonstrates, in my opinion, our commitment to Northern Labrador while, at the same time, recognizing the legitimate

aspirations of the local people to have a greater say in their major resource industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:
We clearly recognize the need to maintain, as long as necessary, a commitment to subsidize these operations.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that the Torngat Fish Producers Co-operative Society will take up the challenge and operate these plants to the benefit of their members as well as to the benefit of the people and fishermen who rely on those operations for their livelihood. I am hopeful that the initiatives we are announcing today will be successful to the extent that the department will be able to privatize all of its Labrador operations in the not too distant future.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me say this: This agreement represents a bold new step in our relations with the fishery on the Labrador Coast. For some time now, government has recognized the necessity of placing control of the Labrador fishery in the hands of Labradorians, thus giving them the opportunity to manage their future and to control their own destiny. I view this agreement as an exciting pilot project for future co-operative Northern development, and one which can serve as an example for similar agreements in the years to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am sure this announcement will come as good news to the fishermen and plant workers in the Makkovik, Hopedale, and Postville areas.

Mr. Speaker, I have some questions to ask with respect to the announcement:

One, the one-year term with an option to renew for an additional year, that, to me, seems to be a rather short period.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is what they wanted.

MR. W. CARTER:

That is what they wanted. Well, I wish them luck, because it is obvious that you cannot do very much in one year in proving the viability of a fish plant, especially in Northern Labrador.

I understand these are plants, by the way, that were initially, I believe, owned by Labrador Services and were handed over to the Province in 1979. The Co-op, itself, my understanding is that they were receiving royalties, I believe, from shrimp being caught by foreign ships, but because of a new regulation, Canadian bottoms must be used now. Is that correct?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, maybe the minister could indicate, too, what they will be processing. For example, the plants, I think, were processing salmon, Arctic char and

groundfish. They will still be processing the same fish?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes.

MR. W. CARTER:

All right.

I note with interest, Mr. Speaker, the amount of subsidy that is guaranteed. I welcome the news that there will be a subsidy, if and when it is needed, but is it wise to announce at the outset even the amount of the subsidy?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Do you know what our losses were last year?

MR. W. CARTER:

Yes, I have an idea what your losses were last year, and I am not suggesting that government should not cover the losses this year or the following year, but is it wise to start off telling any company, whether it be in Torngat or in Makkovik or in St. Mary's - The Capes, that there is going to be a certain subsidy available to them? That, in my view, does not generate the kind of enthusiasm in a fish plant, for example, in Northern Labrador, that is necessary to make such an operation viable. I am not at all against, as I said, the government guaranteeing their losses or paying a subsidy toward the very substantial financial assistance that you are making available to them.

Mr. Speaker, I noticed the total loan guarantee is for \$750,000, and I presume that \$450,000 of that will be written off, or, at least, the \$450,000 subsidy will be applied to the \$750,000.

MR. RIDEOUT:

No.

MR. W. CARTER:

That is not the way it works.

MR. RIDEOUT:

It is in addition to.

MR. W. CARTER:

It is in addition to. So there will be -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER:

I will conclude, Mr. Speaker. So, there will be approximately, then, exposure of - what? - well over \$1 million on the part of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I hope it works. There is no part of Newfoundland that deserves a break more than the areas mentioned. It has been a touch-and-go operation, and I recall very well, in fact, when those plants were taken over by the Department of Fisheries from Labrador Services. It is a touch-and-go operation, and it is one that has never really done justice to the terrific potential that exists in that area. I think they are proving it now in the way of shrimp. I wish them well, and I commend the minister for entering into this agreement. If you give those people a chance, I believe they will make it, and I think, to some extent, the minister is now giving them that chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, we would like to also congratulate the minister for getting his department to negotiate an agreement with the Co-operative. The only thing I would like to say, though, is I take exception to the word used to say that he has privatized the operation, since it is my concept that a co-operative is a people-owned institution. It is one that is more locally and more regionally operated, but it still is a co-operative and on that basis, Mr. Speaker, it is an initiative that we applaud, even though it may look like a privatization effort.

I think it is extremely important to realize that the Coast of Labrador and the Northern Peninsula, as stated in the Kirby Task Force of a number of years ago, is the last great undeveloped region of the Province. It is unfortunate that the kinds of initiatives that were called for in that report, I guess about five or six years ago, have not been brought to fruition; we have not seen the initiatives called for in terms of a corporation specifically dedicated to improving the lot of Northern Labrador.

I believe this is a positive move. I believe that giving more control to the individuals on the Coast of Labrador in the long run will mean that they will adapt the fish plants to their best possible use, and they will, in the long run, I think, be able to support the people on the Coast of Labrador hopefully at a much better level than they are currently.

Mr. Speaker, with those comments, and specifically asking the minister to remember that we still have a commitment by the federal government to go ahead with more initiatives in Labrador and Northern Newfoundland, then I would say that this is a very good initiative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

At this stage I would like to welcome to the gallery twenty-four students from the T.I. Murphy Centre and twenty-four students from Queen Elizabeth Senior Secondary of Surrey, B.C., accompanied by their teachers, Mr. Royce Shook and Mrs. Maureen Cobb.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

My question is to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). I do not know if the minister has read the article or not, but in The Globe And Mail this morning there was an article that has to do with a French company. The headline is, 'British, French spend \$2-million in bid to win' - the \$8 billion - 'submarine contract'. That article goes on to say, Mr. Speaker, that the spokesman for a large French company is now in the process of preparing a bid and promoting a bid to be made on the

upcoming \$8 billion submarine contract.

Mr. Speaker, given the minister's statements in the House, and I think in the news media over the past year, suggesting that Ottawa use trade sanctions or pressures on France to settle the St. Pierre - Miquelon boundary dispute, does the minister still stand by that position? If so, would he now communicate to the appropriate minister in Ottawa his feelings that we are not in favour of Canada accepting bids from a French company for such a large contract? Would he make that point known to his counterparts in Ottawa? Of course, the reasons for the trade sanctions are obvious. I am sure he can again reiterate that to his federal counterparts.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, let me, first of all, thank the hon. gentleman for the question and say categorically to this House and to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that the position of this government has not changed one iota, and that position is simply this: That the Government of Canada when it comes to an issue of sovereignty relating to the country's boundaries ought to use every lever that is available to it in dealing with the adversary, which in this case, is France. We have articulated a position both inside this House and outside the House, all over the Province, that every lever available to us ought to be used and not just fish alone. In fact, that has been one of the criticisms that this government has levelled at our political colleagues in Ottawa, that they

have not utilized all of the levers available to us as a Nation to solve this particular difficult problem. We have not changed our minds on that. We do not intend to change our minds on that. That has been communicated to Mr. Siddon. It has been communicated to Mr. Crosbie. It has been communicated to the Prime Minister. And it will be communicated to the Vatican, Mr. Speaker, if that can help out.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

I thank the minister for his answer.

Mr. Speaker, my supplementary question will go to the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett). Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago, I believe around the end of February, a contract was awarded by the Department of Development in the amount of, I believe, around \$900,000 for the design and model testing of structures unique to Newfoundland waters concrete production system for offshore oil. That contract was awarded by the Minister of Development around the end of February in the amount of approximately \$900,000.

The catch is, Mr. Speaker, that contract was awarded to a consortium of companies.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER:

My question is: Given the fact that that contract was awarded to

a consortium of companies, the parent company of which is a French company with its headquarters in Paris, how does the minister square what his colleague has just said and what the Premier has said, and the position we have taken with having awarded the contract to a French company? Now, granted, there are two Newfoundland companies involved with that company, but the principal of that consortium is a Paris based company.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, the information, as is normally the case, is partially correct. This department of government certainly did award a contract with respect to floating production systems. It was necessary that it be done in a very timely fashion and that we acquire the absolute, best possible expertise that was available in order to carry out that project. And one of the elements of the project team is, in fact, Bouyges Offshore, which is a company that has some French association. There are a number of elements to that whole project and that just happens to be one of them.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, indeed the company does have some French connection. Indeed, the company is headquartered in France, let me remind the minister. My question

to the minister, Mr. Speaker, is: Given the fact that there are companies affiliated with Newfoundland companies, including Norwegian companies and Swedish companies that could have very well had done that work and have affiliates here in this Province, why did not the minister call tenders for that contract and allow these companies the opportunity, for example, to bid on them? By the way, the contract was awarded without any tender call. Why did he not call tenders and give these other companies, which also have the expertise necessary, a chance to bid on them rather than going and giving the contract to a French company without the benefit of a tender call?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRETT:
I think it is appropriate to restate what I said when I began the answer to the last question, that the member is still only speaking from a partial element of awareness. This department did in fact solicit globally for proposals to produce a report for government with respect to new concepts in floating production systems.

There was an evaluation process that went beyond government in its evaluation, and there were a great many more than one company that responded to that proposal call. It was after an evaluation by very senior people, both within and

without the public service, that the consortium in question was the one that was appointed to carry out this work.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins). It is in relation to the recent increase in the cost of hospital beds.

MR. TOBIN:
Are you prepared to report this outside the House.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
I would like to ask the minister number one, did his department implement the cost and is it going to effect all the hospital beds around the Province?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, I believe the hon. member is referring to private and semi-private beds.

Yes, there was an announcement made in the budget that the cost for private accommodation in hospitals would be increased. I think I have the precise figures here somewhere and if the hon. member wishes me to get them I certainly will, but they were announced in the budget, and this will apply to all private and semi-private beds throughout the Province.

As hon. members know, it is in normal circumstances elective whether a patient wishes to go into a ward or into a private or semi-private room. Having said that, sometimes there are not ward beds available to ordinary, admissions to people who normally do not elect to go into private or semi-private rooms. If that is the case, they can be accommodated in the private and semi-private rooms without additional cost. But if there is election on the part of the person going into hospital to have a private or semi-private room, they do pay a surcharge. It is quite open to us to determine the level of surcharge, which does not contravene the Canada Health Act. Our surcharges are quite modest compared to many other provinces. It was determined in this budget that it would be desirable to increase the surcharge over last year.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me say to the Minister of Health that there are two things in the budget that we have seen now. We have seen the cutback in the cost of eye care, where it is going to be once every two years. Now we have seen the cost of beds in hospitals go up to \$50 a day. I ask the Minister of Health why was the increase put on the cost of beds at this time? And as far as being modest by comparison to any other province, let me say the rate of unemployment in the Province of Newfoundland is not

modest when compared to the rest of Canada. The incomes of the average family in Newfoundland is much less.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
My question to the Minister is: Why at this time does he see it necessary to put the extra charge on the backs of the people of this Province when we have such high health costs in our Province and such low incomes? That is the point I am getting at, the low incomes of the people of this Province. Why does the Minister see it necessary to do it at this time?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Well, Mr. Speaker, I am quite sure my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor), would wish that we had no taxes, no fees, no charges in this Province. I mean, that is something that we all desire, but I am afraid the reality of the situation is that public services require funding and we have to spread the pressure or the burden of funding as evenly as we possibly can.

And we determined at this time, that those who elect - as I say, it is not obligatory - when they go into hospital special accommodation - that is private and semi-private accommodation - should bear a bit more burden this year rather than last year. But the burden this year is not an excessive burden if you compare it to the burden that is borne in other provinces in similar circumstances.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would ask the Minister of Health how can he justify putting this expense on the backs of the people - he says it is to get extra money - when at the same time we are spending \$23 million of taxpayers' money on the Sprung operation, and now today we find that \$2 million of taxpayers' money is going to be spent in building a liquor retail outlet in Mount Pearl? How can the minister justify those kind of expenditures on the backs of the sick when the taxpayers' money is being thrown away on foolishness such as that?

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

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has not had the opportunity to partake in the process of government, so one has to remember that when answering his questions. In government there are many, many requirements, those of a social services nature, including health, of an educational nature and of many other natures. There is also economic needs for funding. There are a wide range of needs for funding in government. We cannot just limit our expenditures in one narrow area. The people of this Province do not want that. I do not know if that is the policy of the Liberal party; if it is, it is news to me.

I thought the Liberal party, which is a great institution, had a broad concept of how to run a

Province, and, indeed, run a country. But from what the hon. members says, they have a very narrow, very distorted, very focused view of how to run a province, and I am surprised to hear this. I am really startled and disappointed to hear this, because I thought the party opposite might have been an alternative to this administration, but, clearly, if they have no concept of how a government is to be run, we have to rethink this whole approach.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:
I had a question I was going to put to the Minister of Finance, but I do not see him here, so perhaps I will put my question to the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge). It concerns the situation with The Public Utilities Act in which one consumer representative and member of the Public Utilities Board has called for changes to the legislation to disallow Newfoundland Light and Power from cutting off services to clients during Winter months.

I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if she has advised the minister responsible for Newfoundland Light and Power whether, in fact, that might be a course of action the government should take, to bring in legislative changes to disallow this action by the utility?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I am the minister responsible for the Public Utilities Board. There is no minister with particular responsibility for Newfoundland Light and Power. Since the Minister of Finance just came in, I can defer it to him. But I can say that the matter of any legislative change is one that the Cabinet as a whole will be looking at. I have not received a particular suggestion for legislative amendment from any member of the Public Utilities Board.

MR. LONG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

I will put my supplementary to the Minister of Justice as well. In view of the suggestion that she has not received representation, would the minister consider the public statements that the consumer representative on the board has made as adequate representation for the Cabinet to give consideration to introducing changes to the legislation to disallow such action by Newfoundland Light and Power as cutting off services to clients during the Winter months?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I have certainly been following the news coverage of this issue, and there are different legal opinions about what the present legislation

provides and allows. The Department of Justice has given one opinion, which would not warrant any change along the lines of what the member for St. John's East is suggesting.

MR. LONG:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the Minister of Justice, in asking her a final supplementary, that there is indeed a lot of uncertainty out there and that the minister could take positive action to clear up a very uncertain situation in responding to the concerns that have been brought forward by the consumer representative on the Public Utilities Board by making a commitment to bring in legislative changes.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LONG:

Will the minister give to the House today a commitment to bring in changes to the legislation to disallow Newfoundland Light and Power from taking such action during Winter months?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot give any such commitment. I have already said that the matter of bills being put to the House of Assembly are for Cabinet as a whole. Secondly, there may not be a need for any legislative change to meet the representations of the consumer representative on the

Public Utilities Board.
Certainly, I will be happy to entertain various suggestions for improvement to our public utilities legislation.

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Development and Tourism. Considering the pending sale of Newfoundland Hardwoods, if news reports are correct, and the untenable position of the employees with some seventy jobs at stake - at least, originally there were seventy jobs, we understand that some layoffs have taken place and others are reported to be pending, based on some calls from union members who are concerned about their jobs - considering that situation, would the minister like to comment on what steps are being taken by the government to guarantee that the seventy original jobs will be maintained if a sale does indeed take place?

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism.

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, government has indeed moved towards the divestiture of the Mount Pearl Division of Newfoundland Hardwoods and the media presentation of that information is indeed correct. The process that is to be followed is that a statement of the assets and a request for proposals will be sought from the private sector with respect to their interest in that operation, whether it be in

whole or in part. With respect to the people who were employed at that facility, one of the things that this government has achieved in its labour legislation is successor rights of workers in the eventuality of a new owner taking over an existing plant, so there will indeed be protection for those workers should a new operator be sought and be found.

It is difficult to speculate as to what the process will be exactly because we have not as yet sold the property. We have to wait for proposals, and these proposals, as I explained in response to one of your colleague's questions some weeks ago, could take many forms. Until such time as we know what the various options are that we have before us, it is very difficult to know what the end result will be with respect to the employment of those who are affected.

MR. GULLAGE:
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary, the hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:
In light of what you just said, will the government continue then to maintain a position, shares in this company, at the time of its transition to private business, for the sake of the employees primarily, to ensure that the transition is properly carried out and the business, ongoing for a period of time continues to interact with the business community, other manufacturing firms, and the numbers of employees at seventy, as it was, could be possibly maintained as in the past with a proper transition into the private sector?

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of
Development and Tourism.

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, as is usual, I guess, the message that comes through from questions from the opposite side of portrays the negative position of most initiatives that government would wish to undertake. I think the same kind of thing is occurring here, and that the member opposite has not anticipated that this sale, this disposition of an asset by government, could in fact be an extremely positive initiative, not just, Mr. Speaker, for the perservation of maybe fifty or seventy jobs, but possibly an opportunity fom some potential investor from the private sector to create a facility that will be competitive, that will be up to date, utilizing the expertise that exist at that plant to create probably job opportunities for several hundreds of people.

That is one of the things that government would expect to see in response to its requests for proposals from the private sector - get it away from the constrictions of government interaction. Everything to do with business development and delivery is better in the private sector. Time and time again examples are there to suggest that the private sector runs business better than government. Here is a prime opportunity to take a facility, deliver it to the private sector, and provide an opportunity to expand the role, to provide new opportunities, new challenges for the people who are presently employed at the

facility, but also open it up to a great many more opportunities for other Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. GULLAGE:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount.

MR. GULLAGE:
Why did the minister wait until the firm is practically bankrupt to decide to put it on the market for private sale, to a private developer, a private owner and leave the other manufacturing firms that interact and do business with Newfoundland Hardwoods in such a position? And not only do we have Newfoundland Hardwoods in great difficulty, but we have other firms, which interact and do business with them supplying the local market, in difficulty as well. Will the minister answer why it has been left to such a late date? And, in fact, will a window be left open so that the purchaser of this particular property, when the sale does take place, will have an avenue, will have a way to deal with government, with government, perhaps, as I suggested, maintaining some share so that we do not see the firm taking this over left in a position of having to compete with Mainland suppliers, as in fact they now do, and left in such a position -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. GULLAGE:
that they are unable to carry on and conduct a profitable business?

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism.

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, government has not as yet made any decision as to how it is to dispose of that asset. But first of all let me enlighten the hon. member opposite, that Newfoundland Hardwoods is not in a deficit position. Newfoundland Hardwoods is in a very positive cash position. It is one element of Newfoundland Hardwoods that government is intending to dispose of, and that is the Mount Pearl Division of Newfoundland Hardwoods, nothing else.

Newfoundland Hardwoods Limited is a very viable operation that has provided a strong economic base to several parts of this Province. We are divesting of one element, the Mount Pearl Division of Newfoundland Hardwoods. There are no creditors unsatisfied as a result of government's role, nor, are there any creditors left out in the cold as a result of that particular Division of Newfoundland Hardwoods having successively lost money on its own operations. None, absolutely none!

If there are certain private sector companies which might have made several investments to accommodate and be a part of the supply process to that facility, then government cannot accept any responsibility for it. The member opposite should know that the private sector expands its operation and modifies its operation at its peril, but also at its profit - also at its profit. If there are companies

that might have done something to accommodate something that might have been, that could have been doing business with that Division of Newfoundland Hardwoods, then I have no doubt that those companies can change their marketing techniques, change their customer relations to accommodate that particular investment. I have no problem with that.

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:
Who is the question for?

MR. TULK:
If the hon. gentleman had been listening he would have heard.

I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and it concerns the enforcement of regulations on our salmon rivers as they are being enforced by the Federal Department of Fisheries.

The minister will recall that over the past eight to ten months that there have been a number of pieces of correspondence between himself and myself and the Federal Minister in Ottawa concerning the fact our salmon rivers, in terms on surveillance of them, are perhaps being treated a little better than a ten week unemployment insurance scheme to

make work for the river guardians.

The minister will also recall, I believe in a letter of December 17 which he wrote back to me supporting what I had said, and I appreciate his support, wrote that he would be meeting with Mr. Siddon-

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. gentleman is making a speech.

MR. TULK:
I would ask the hon. gentleman has he met with Mr. Siddon and what the results of that meeting were?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Yes, Mr. Speaker, I certainly can inform the hon. member for Fogo that I carried through on the commitment and had the meeting with Mr. Sideon, and again, I guess for the third year since I had been in this department, made the case that the surveillance programme on salmon rivers in Newfoundland is totally inadequate, that more staff and resources need to be dedicated to it, and requested that that be done.

I think the answer to all of us is obvious, it has not been done, but the fact that it has not been done has not been for a lack of representation from this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:
Do I understand the Minister to say - I have got the correspondence somewhere in the binder and I will table it in a minute, - that in spite of all of the representation that has been put forward by himself, by Newfoundland's federal minister in Ottawa, by Rod and Gun Clubs in this Province, by concerned individuals, that the federal Minister of Fisheries, in spite of all of that representation, is going to allow the salmon rivers in this Province to be raped by poachers - and that is all you can call it; the minister knows the facts as well as I do, and be the subject of a ten-week employment programme so that river guardians can gather unemployment insurance in the Winter? Do I understand the hon. gentlemen to say that that is going to be the case?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
I am always more optimistic than the hon. gentleman in everything that I do. But, nevertheless, the fact of the matter is that I am not aware that there is going to be any increase in the programme, and I agree with him that that leaves many of the rivers in the Province open to excessive poaching, and that is not a desirable position for us to be in in terms of that resource or any resource, and that is not a position that we support and it is not a position that I support. But when it comes to providing the additional resources to have a more enhanced supervision role, then perhaps the hon. gentleman

could convince his leader that one of the things we want to accomplish under the Meech Lake Accord, if we can accomplish anything, is more jurisdiction as it relates to inland fisheries, and inland fisheries would certainly fall under that particular clause, and we might be able, if we had some legislative responsibility, to force the issue a bit more than in the consultive way that we have had over the last several years. We might, I do not know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me remind this hon. gentleman that in August and September of 1984, the Premier of this Province conducted a crusade of prosperity and the Prime Minister of this country promised to inflict prosperity on us. Let me ask him how does he square having a discussion of the fisheries on the agenda of future constitutional conferences with the promise that they made to us in 1984? What he is telling us in effect is that this minister is being ignored by his Tory counterpart in Ottawa while--

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question! Question!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

- the fishermen of this Province are being told to cut back on the commercial salmon fishery. I

ask the gentleman once again--

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question! Question!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

- will he rise in his place and now tell us that the truth of the matter is that the federal Minister of Fisheries is ignoring him, that our salmon rivers are being depleted, that they are being raped and pillaged by poachers, and the people in Ottawa, his Tory counterparts, are just not listening to him?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I will stack the results of the Campaign for Prosperity against the twelve or fourteen years that preceded that when the party that the gentleman opposite supports were in power in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

We, on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, and in this government, did not roll over and play dead because our political confreres were the Government of Canada, when the rights and the responsibilities and the desires and the objectives of Newfoundlanders were at stake, Mr. Speaker. You never heard any screams from that hon. crowd, Mr. Speaker, when Trudeau and the other people up there were crucifying Newfoundland and Labrador, but you hear it from us when the present government tries to do something that is not in the

best interests of Newfoundland and Labrador.

That was what the campaign for prosperity was all about, Mr. Speaker. It has not been 100 per cent successful, but 99.99 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given

MR. MATTHEWS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. MATTHEWS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I wish to supply the answer to a question on the Order Paper, by the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), to ask the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

a) Invoices, vouchers, receipts, etc. to cover the cost of accommodations, travel, car rentals and entertainment incurred by the Minister, Parliamentary Assistant and/or Parliamentary Secretary and other members of the Minister's staff in the Province, between the dates of November 25 and December 13, 1987 inclusive.

b) List regions visited during that period and for what purpose.

The answers to both, Mr. Speaker: There were no expenses incurred by the minister in any region of the Province.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, Question No. 28 on the Order Paper of opening day, March 15, from the hon. gentleman for Twillingate requesting a list of grants given to various fishermen's committees and other organizations around the Province. The list is here for all the districts, Mr. Speaker, around the Province. We provided grants to fishermen's committees, development associations, all kinds of people, Mr. Speaker, in St. Barbe, Mount Scio - Bell Island, Port au Port, Port de Grave, Eagle River and Baie Verte - White Bay; I got a few dollars for my own district and one thing and another. But it is all there, Mr. Speaker.

DR. COLLINS:
St. John's South?

MR. RIDEOUT:
St. John's South? I think we missed it.

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, in response to a question from the hon. the member

for Port de Grave who asked me to lay upon the Table of the House:

a) Invoices, vouchers, receipts, etc. to cover the cost of accommodations, travel, car rentals...incurred by the Minister, Parliamentary Assistant... between the dates of November 25 and December 18, 1987 inclusive.

b) A list of regions visited during that period and for what purpose.

Mr. Speaker, at that time I was Parliamentary Assistant to the Premier. I notice it is the same time that the Windsor - Buchans by-election was on, Mr. Speaker. I can say to the House that the answer to the question is that I travelled at no cost to government as it relates to that, and at no cost to government did I visit any regions of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I say that, of course, recognizing that probably the Leader of the Opposition would like to answer whether or not his party incurred any government expenses during that period. I notice it is not on the Order Paper whether or not there were any government credit cards used.

To the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, the answer is no, no, no!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

It is now four o'clock and it is Private Members' Day.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:
A point of privilege, the hon. the

Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, Your Honour will no doubt recall that yesterday in Question Period there were a series of questions directed to me by the hon. gentleman from Port de Grave. Today there was a press release issued to the media in the Province by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition as it relates to that particular series of questions that were asked yesterday. It is in that context, Mr. Speaker, that I believe, and of course Your Honour will rule once you have heard the evidence, that there exists here the basis for a case of privilege, certainly my privilege, as a member of the House and the context of the questions yesterday and the context of the answers that were given in a press release relating to the activities of this Chamber on yesterday.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition says in his statement that was issued today, and I quote, "The thrust of the question was not directed at the MHA for Bonavista South but at the Minister and the Department of Fisheries on the basis that..." and then it goes on to outline the basis. Now, I refer Your Honour to Hansard of yesterday, Tape No. 716, Page IB-2. The first question from the hon. gentleman from Port de Grave was the following, and I quote:

"Mr. Speaker, my question was not how the money was paid - excuse me, Your Honour, it is IB-1, the first page, that I want to refer to, Tape No. 716. The hon. gentleman from Port de Grave, and I quote, "My first question to the minister is: Was the minister aware that a member of his

government was involved in marketing when he announced the subsidy of last year. If he was not aware that a member of his government was involved in the marketing, when did he become aware of it and did he agree that this was a proper procedure for him to be involved with." I have to ask Your Honour, what is the thrust of that question? Is the thrust of that question not directed at somebody in the House other than me? I have the responsibility as minister to answer, but what is the thrust of that particular question? I would say Your Honour would have to agree and the House would have to agree, that the thrust of that particular question is directed at somebody in this particular House who happens to be a member of the government.

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, the next question, the first supplementary following the main question from the hon. gentleman, is the following on the bottom of page IB - 2. The hon. gentleman says again: "Mr. Speaker, my question was not how the money was paid. My question very clearly was: Was the minister aware at the time that the programme was put in place, was instituted, by his department, where the fishermen did not get a great deal, about five cents a pound, that a member of his own government was involved in the marketing of this product?"

I ask Your Honour what is the thrust of that question? The thrust of that question has to relate - again it is very clearly asking me if I was aware that somebody over here was involved in this particular programme before it was announced.

I refer Your Honour finally to the

second supplementary, the third question on the bottom of page IB - 3 where the hon. gentleman says: "I would ask the minister: First part of the final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, Why was \$750,000 approved by the budget for marketing in his department? And the second part: Did not officials of your department, at the same time this was going on, completely go against the fact that an MHA was involved and told you so and told the Premier?"

Again, for the first time in this whole series of questions the budget of the department, the \$750,000 budget of the department for marketing, was raised, but the second part of that final supplementary again refers to some particular individual in this House and advice that I had or did not have on the programme.

So, I say to Your Honour that it is very clear from Hansard, the official record of this House, that the thrust of the questioning - the thrust of the questioning - was just as it is here in Hansard.

Now, the second thing I would like to bring to Your Honour's attention is page 3 of the hon. gentleman's press release for today on the subject, where he says: "The minister must explain to the people of this Province whether or not he knew, before the subsidy programme was announced, that the producers would be using some of the subsidy to pay a marketing commission, to any marketing company..." and it goes on from there.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it from producers in this Province, and there were two or three various

marketing companies involved in marketing that particular fish, that it was not a commission that was paid. The marketing companies, Morgan International and others, purchased the fish from individual fish plant operators and sold it. Whether they made money on the deal or lost on the deal I have no way of knowing, but the marketers did that.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT:

In conclusion, Your Honour, I think it is very, very clear that the Hansard of yesterday, and the statement by the Leader of the Opposition, are totally at odds and it certainly, I think, infringes on the privileges of all members of this House. If Your Honour so rules, I am prepared to move the appropriate motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition to the point of privilege.

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, there obviously is no question of privilege. The questions as set out in Hansard speak for themselves. The question being asked in each of the first two questions put by the hon. member is: Was the minister aware? The thrust of the question cannot be anything other than the minister's awareness. Was the minister aware of a stated

position? That is clearly the thrust of the question, and it is quite an appropriate question. How this gets to be stretched as a question of privilege, I will never know.

The third question clearly relates to the expenditures of the minister's department, the management of the Marketing Division of the minister's department and the expenditure of funds for marketing in the minister's department. Was the minister aware that funds would be spent on marketing this when he had a Marketing Division spending public funds to market fish that was processed with subsidies provided by the minister's department, where subsidies were intended to be given for fishermen? That is the thrust of the question. It is clearly not a point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. YOUNG:

Tell us about your hand-delivered -

MR. SIMMS:

Explain your press statement.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I have no problem. I will take the time of the House, but it would be a trespass on it, Mr. Speaker. But if the hon. gentleman wants, I have no problem explaining the press statement. There was a great hue and cry about the comments made by the hon. member. I will tell you this, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member

not only did that which was right, he did that which it was his duty to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:

His proper duty to do. That is what he did in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN:

Smear and innuendo?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries rose on a point of privilege and stated his case without any interruption. I would ask hon. members to extend the same courtesy to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition in his reply.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, hon. gentlemen opposite have, in this context, asked me to deal with this statement. That is the subject of the minister's point of privilege, and I will deal with it. The statement was made, Mr. Speaker, because a great hue and cry was raised that the hon. the member for Port de Grave did something improper in asking this question, or had an improper basis for doing it.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, I submit the hon. gentleman has a concern. The hon. the member for Bonavista South telephoned me this morning at about eight thirty or quarter of nine, somewhere around that

time, and told me he felt the hon. gentleman for Port de Grave ought to apologize for the comments in the House yesterday, and gave me some explanation for it on the telephone. I said to him, 'I assure you that if anything improper was said or anything unfounded was said or implied, the Liberal Caucus will apologize for it, but I suggest you come and meet with me. He did. He stated certain facts. They are spelled out in this news release. There are a couple of fundamental facts. He told us he had been involved with marketing fish in various parts of the world over the last couple of years. I commend him for it. I commend him for it. He said he has marketed about 4 million pounds in the last year. I commend him for it. He said that he marketed on behalf of the producing companies in Newfoundland - he emphasized that and I agree with him, I understand that to be the case - a significant portion of the fish that was produced in respect of which the subsidy was paid by the Department of Fisheries to those fish producers.

MR. TOBIN:

Do you commend him for that?

MR. BAIRD:

Do you commend him for that?

MR. WELLS:

He also said he received no payment of any kind directly from the government, nor any other assistance of any kind or knowledge or information, in connection with the herring or mackerel subsidy. I accept his word for it. I do not question it. He received commissions, was my understanding from him. I may have misunderstood him. He talked about commissions of 3 percent to

5 percent is the norm, as low as 3 percent on occasion, never more than 5 percent. Maybe commissions is the wrong word. If it is incorrect, I certainly withdraw it and apply the right word. But I took it from the information given to me by the hon. gentleman that it was in the neighbourhood of 3 percent to 5 percent, whatever that meant.

He received those payments from the fish producing companies who did receive the subsidies from the government. Now, it may be that he lost a bundle of money on it for all I know. I have no way of knowing, and I do not suggest one way or the other. Then, when I saw these statements from the hon. member, I looked again at Hansard and, having put that together, I say, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Port de Grave would have been derelict in his duty to his constituents and the people of this Province if he had not asked the minister the question he asked him. And the question was, clearly it is set out in Hansard, his first question, "Was the minister aware that a member of his government..." Now, I have talked to him about that. That is incorrect. It is not a member of the government. It is a member sitting on the government side of the House, the hon. member for Bonavista South, not a member of the government.

"Was the minister aware that the member was involved in marketing when he announced the subsidy last year? If he was not aware that a member of his own government was involved in the marketing, when did he become aware of it and did he agree that this was a proper procedure for him to be involved with?"

Now that is a proper question for him to ask the Minister of Fisheries, and the Minister of Fisheries ought to answer it. Because, Mr. Speaker, this House voted \$750,000 of taxpayers' money for the department to spend on marketing.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am trying to make up my mind where the privilege comes in, the privilege of hon. members, so I will ask the hon. member if he could briefly make the point.

MR. WELLS:

I will clue up, Mr. Speaker.

I was asked to deal with the press statement and I have done it.

The simple position set out in the press statement is this, that that is a valid question. The minister has to account to this House for the expenditure of public money on marketing even if he is not going to have his department involved in marketing fish that his department is subsidizing going to a market that his department knew about and was subsidizing because it was part of the Third World and they could not afford to pay the commercial prices for it. That is the thrust of the question. I would say, Mr. Speaker, that the minister should still answer it, and there is no privilege involved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Before recognizing the hon. member for Bonavista South, I have heard the hon. the Minister of Fisheries and the hon. the Leader of the

Opposition and I am going to study this matter tonight. I think it is only reasonable that I would hear what the hon. member for Bonavista South has to say, as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition has referred to their conversation in statements today.

The hon. the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for giving me the chance to speak on this point of privilege raised by my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries. Because if I had not been allowed to speak on this one, my intention was to raise my own, which would tie the two together.

It is a most serious situation, Mr. Speaker. The last time I stood in this House and raised what I thought a most serious breach of privilege - in fact Your Honor, from the Chair, made the decision that I did establish a prima facie case. That was about two and a half years ago, and that was the first time in the history of this Assembly here in Newfoundland that a prima facie case was ever established. It was done by this member, here.

Maybe it is ironic that it comes at a time when I just announced that I was not going to seek re-election again to this House of Assembly in Bonavista South, but it is a very, very serious matter.

Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, what happened was this: It was implied that in my role as an MHA, as a result of my being a member of this House, I somehow benefitted in my own personal business. That

was the clear implication left yesterday in the House, and outside the House, in comments to the media made by the member for Port de Grave. No question about that, that I somehow improperly received something from government, whether it be information or finances or some other thing, to benefit my personal business because I happened to be a member of the House of Assembly. That, Mr. Speaker, is a most serious charge to be made against a member of the House of Assembly. It was because of that, Mr. Speaker, that I felt compelled this morning, after seeing last night's news, based on what happened in the House yesterday, to call the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. I said to him on the phone, "Mr. Wells, in the name of common decency, will you arrange to have a member of your caucus, John Efford, apologize for the damage he did me yesterday in slandering my name and casting innuendo?" His reply was, "Well, if you feel that this should be done, let us meet and discuss it."

Mr. Speaker, we met. And today I am going to throw a shocker on this House of Assembly, a shocker! We met and the Leader of the Opposition, as he said today in his statement, now released to the public, clearly wanted to leave the impression that the whole thrust of the question was on the Minister of Fisheries and not on me. He went so far as to say that in the name of common decency, yes, if necessary he would call a press conference this morning to clearly indicate and clarify the whole matter as it pertained to me. But - but, Mr. Speaker, following immediately after that statement the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, and this

is going to be seriously damaging to him, said in the same breath, "I will arrange that, Jim, if you will arrange to stop making your criticisms of me in the House like you made yesterday."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Shame! Shame!

AN HON. MEMBER:
No way!

MR. MORGAN:
Mr. Speaker, I am standing on the factual truth, and Mr. Efford was there as a witness. Mr. Speaker, they cannot deny it. I said to the Leader of the Opposition, 'What comments are you talking about?' 'The comments you made yesterday in the House.' I said, 'What comments?' 'You know what I am talking about. Now, you stop making these comments and we will deal with this issue.' Now, Mr. Speaker, that is blackmailing a member of the House.

Is he now saying to me that I cannot attempt to criticize the Leader of the Opposition or the Opposition party, I cannot do that because they will find a means of trying to attack me and use that kind of blackmail? That, Mr. Speaker, is nothing short of blackmail and very seriously interfering with the privileges of a member of this Assembly. That is a most serious thing, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I again appeal to the hon. member, as I did this morning. The facts speak for themselves, and any innuendo or any comment I have made across this House in debate or otherwise, I will stand by outside the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

I am not going to hide behind the curtain of immunity like some people do, like the member for Port de Grave did yesterday when he passed his innuendo against me, Mr. Speaker, then went public and did not have the courage to even mention my name, afraid of a court action, in his comments made to the media. I will not hide behind the curtain of immunity, Mr. Speaker. What I say today in the House I will say outside, any time after the House closes or after this debate is over.

Again, I say, Mr. Speaker, that political blackmail was attempted on me this morning, in that he would arrange to turn this around to an attack on the minister, as he has now tried to do in this press release since that time, sweep it under the carpet and attack the minister in order for me to be nice to him in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. MITCHELL:
The press is not laughing.

MR. MORGAN:
Hon. members of the caucus on that side may very well laugh, but, Mr. Speaker, I have heard the same members laugh on other issues, and other things this hon. gentleman has said over the years.

But, Mr. Speaker, it is a most serious thing. There were witnesses. The walls of the member's office, I would say, are not that sound-proof; the conversation that took place in

the member's office this morning had to be heard by all the secretaries around. Why did he lose his temper and lose his control in the office? Why? Because I told him what to do with his little blackmail tactic. That is why he was so mad. That is why he was so mad.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:
I wish to conclude, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
All right.

MR. MORGAN:
What I want to say is, I can see it now. Jim, stop casting those comments at me like you made in the House yesterday. What comments did I make yesterday? Did I speak in debate yesterday? I did not even speak yesterday in debate. What is he worried about? Something that I know that he knows I know. What is it all about?

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for your patience. I am going to conclude by saying again, I appeal to the Leader of the Opposition in a most serious way to, in the name of common decency, have courage enough to say it was a mistake made by his caucus. There is no foundation. It is not substantiated. As he says in his press release, and as he told me this morning, he did, and he quotes it in his press release: "I told him at the meeting that the Liberal caucus would apologize for anything said or implied that could not be substantiated." This cannot be substantiated, so let

them apologize, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

If the hon. the member for Port de Grave has some comments to make I will hear him, otherwise, I have heard enough on this matter and I would like to study it and rule. The hon. member had his opportunity of speaking, so did the hon. the member for Bonavista South and the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. If the hon. the member for Port de Grave has a comment to make, I will certainly listen to that.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Just a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, the MHA for Bonavista South need not call the Leader of the Opposition to ask this member to apologize. I will very clearly apologize to anybody in this hon. House, or outside the House, any time I make an incorrect statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. EFFORD:

Make no mistake about it. But, Mr. Speaker, the facts very clearly speak for themselves, and I want to clarify the misleading information given by the MHA and the Minister of Fisheries. Fact number one very clearly stated a question to the Minister concerning, was he aware of the marketing done last year? Fact one.

Fact two, that my concern was the fishermen of this Province did not receive a decent income last year. That is the reason why the money was put in place.

Fact three was there was already a market set up and approved by the budget and the Estimates Committee of this House for that purpose.

Fact four is that I have no reservations about the fact that the MHA for Bonavista South was involved in the marketing in that herring and mackerel fishery.

There is absolutely no case here, Mr. Speaker. The MHA got up and totally misled this House again this afternoon in his reference to the meeting that took place this morning, and he knows it full well. And I will, if any time I ever make a statement anywhere professionally or unprofessionally, apologize.

In this particular instance, Mr. Speaker, my questions were very clearly directed to the Minister of Fisheries and he has an obligation to answer those questions.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think I have heard enough on this matter. I am going to study

the Hansard of today and yesterday, and also the statement that was made, and I will seek advice from other sources. I should be able to have more to say on this matter in the next day or two.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. WELLS:

I will only take a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker. It is improper to use the word 'liar' in this House and I will not use it. I will just say to you, Mr. Speaker, that in the statement just made by the hon. the member for Bonavista South, I do not know what meeting he attended this morning, but his description of it does not match any meeting that he attended with the hon. the member for Port de Grave and myself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

The other people around heard what was said.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, I will not dignify it with any more, but I want the record to indicate that the total statement was without any accuracy whatsoever. It is just totally without accuracy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

To the point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition kept it brief, so I will keep it brief.

Two points I will make: First of all, the approach by the Leader of the Opposition, we are all very familiar with it and the people of this Province are very familiar with it, but they are not going to be fooled by it, his pious approach.

"Mr. Speaker, he says, starting off, "it is improper to say 'liar' in this House. Mr. Speaker, it is also improper to say indirectly what you are not allowed to say directly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

That is a breach of Parliament. That is a breach of the rules. If he is supposed to be so knowledgeable, he should also know that. So he said indirectly what he is not permitted to say directly.

The other question I want to ask him, Mr. Speaker, is very simple: Did he or did he not offer to make a deal with the hon. the member for Bonavista South? That is the question.

MR. WELLS:

Absolutely not! Never for a moment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of privilege raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I cannot see any prima facie case in that.

Today is Private Members' Day and I now call on the hon. Minister of Forest Resources. He has nine minutes left.

MR. SPEAKER:

He has nine minutes left.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

Wheeler, dealers.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to have a few more words on the proposal put forth by the member for Humber Valley (Mr. Woodford) on the establishment of a NATO base in Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, Mr. Speaker. Once again I want to state that me, as a member of this House, and I know the Government of this House, are very supportive of the establishment of a NATO training centre in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area.

Mr. Speaker, we did see a couple of amendments put to this House last week, one amendment and one sub-amendment. On the

sub-amendment, given by the members for the NDP here, I understand why they are having so much trouble with the problem of a NATO base in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, Mr. Speaker. There was quite a good documentary or a news report done on it last night on CBC and I would not hesitate to criticize what CBC has said when I do not agree with them. I will congratulate them on a show that I think they did a fair job on explaining the position of the local NDP on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, they are for it and they are against it. They are for it and they do not know where they are right now, Mr. Speaker. According to this amendment, they are partially for it or partially against it, but I am still not sure, Mr. Speaker.

It is easy to understand why they are confused on the matter because their own national party, where they get their direct guidance on this issue, is itself in disarray on the establishment or the acceptance of NATO within a Canadian system. They are against NATO one day. Their leader came out and said that he is not fully against NATO. He will wait a year or so if he ever makes a government, which will never happen anyway. He thinks he might have a chance at it now, so he is not fully against NATO. He will probably wait until the first term is finished before he would withdraw Canada from NATO.

But then, when his supporters or some of the people in his own caucus wanted to come on, they say, 'No, this is a cop-out. We should be out of it right away. As soon as we get a chance, we should drop out of NATO.'

So, Mr. Speaker, I do understand why the two members in our House have difficulty in supporting or not supporting or maybe they are for it or maybe they are not for it. When they get their directions directly from Ottawa and there are such confusing signals being sent from their national party, and the NDP or the Socialists factions in this country, Mr. Speaker, are directed, lean towards more than any other party, a centralist philosophy and that is where they get their direction from, the central party in Ottawa or the Ottawa thinking people, I guess, within that social group.

Mr. Speaker, there is one other thing before I finish my remarks. I do want to congratulate the Mokami Project Group on the efforts they are having in not only the NATO development in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, not only promoting the NATO development, but promoting other things in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area.

Mr. Speaker, they have done a good job in giving the advantages, I guess, of development in Labrador, especially in Central Labrador, Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. But they have also taken on other projects besides the NATO base and they have made presentations on behalf of the Innu in the Sheshatshit area to get some economic development stimulated for the Innu people in their general area. I know there was good co-operation. They did make a presentation to ACOA in Labrador West and on behalf of the NMIA Council for Sheshatshit and Davis Inlet. They are doing a good job in promoting the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area and Labrador, generally, through their

organization.

Mr. Speaker, not only are they promoting NATO, but somebody in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area has to represent the view of the vast, vast majority of Labradorians when they suggest that they want this development to occur in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

It is easy for people who are against this project to get press coverage. The peace groups, the anti-nuclear groups, or the anti-NATO groups can get coverage by sticking two people, with a couple of plaques in their arms, around the War Memorial down on Water Street and they will get television cameras coming out off their ears and radio and newspaper people to come down to interview two or three, maybe half a dozen of them.

Any peace demonstration that I have seen against this NATO base, every one of them that I did see personally, and did see on television, I figured they were two different groups. Every one I have yet seen there were more media people there than there were active participants. There was one held here, I believe, on the lawn with two or three camps put up out there one day, and at that time I counted the demonstrators, I guess, and I counted the media people at the time and there were as many media people at that one as there were demonstrators. Mr. Speaker, it is easy to get recognition to be against something.

The Mokami Project Group is making an effort to represent the vast majority of people in Labrador. From my last portfolio, I talked with many of them, Mr. Speaker,

even the people from the riding of the district of Menihek, who were very, very supportive of this particular development in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. I do commend the Mokami Project Group on their efforts, not only their efforts to attract the NATO facility to Goose Bay, but also their efforts to encourage as much, even with the development that is there now, the low level training, to encourage as much local benefit to local businesses and local operations as is possible, even with the present setup as there is in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. They are trying to maximize job opportunities for the local people in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. They are working on these efforts. They are trying to get as many local supplies come into the base as they can from the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, or the general Newfoundland area.

One amazing figure I did see recently is that the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area is being serviced more from Halifax, Nova Scotia than it is from stations in St. John's, which is not very acceptable and the Mokami Project Group are making efforts to change this around.

One of these efforts recently was where the Chairperson or the president of the Mokami Project Group came to St. John's and spoke with the St. John's Board of Trade which has initiated a trade mission now coming from the Island part of our Province to go to Happy Valley - Goose Bay and see what benefits the Province can have by supplying the market demands that are existing and expanding in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area by the military activities that exist there.

Happy Valley - Goose Bay is prospering. There is quite a bit of construction going on in the area now. They are developing a considerable service centre, even moreso that they ever have been, for other parts of Labrador, particularly Coastal Labrador. Happy Valley - Goose Bay is becoming a service centre for the rest of the Labrador area.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to mention one sub-amendment that we have here. There was also an amendment put forward by the official Opposition party in this House, Mr. Speaker, and before I sit down I do want to say that I can see that I could personally support the amendment that was moved by the Leader of the Opposition and I do plan to vote for that amendment as it is put forward.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, very much.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is a pleasure today to rise and debate on the Private Members' motion put forward by the MHA for Humber Valley. It is a motion that I think all hon. members are pretty well in support of. I also support the amendment put forward by my colleague, the member for Naskaupi, in whose district this development mainly lies. I think it is a development which we in the provincial House of Assembly should support, taking into account the concerns of all peoples that are to be affected in

the future.

One thing about the democracy we have, Mr. Speaker, is it allows the views of all peoples to be taken into account in the development of a policy or in any future developments that occur, and how these developments affect our people. So the concerns of Native peoples, the concerns of people in the Labrador area, the concerns of all Newfoundlanders and Canadians, whenever a decision is made, are allowed to be passed on to the people who make those decisions and their case put forward in whichever way and however they want to do it. They can do it in a strong manner. They can do it by lobbying. There are a whole variety of ways to do so. In our country with our good democracy, we allow that and I welcome it. I think it is the best democracy in the world and I think it is something we should be thankful for.

When we look at bringing a development into Goose Bay and into Labrador, when we say we want to support it, we are also saying we want to make sure that all of the effects, be they good, bad, or whatever, be looked at, be analyzed, and we take into account the concerns of these people, no matter how large or small they number. I think that that is being done, and, from what I have seen of the reports that have been put forward and the many views that have been put forward, those concerns are being addressed in the best possible manner.

Mind you, some people and some groups may not be satisfied that all of their views are all taken and encompassed in various reports, but, at the very least, their opportunity to present those

views is there and, I believe, they have an impact on the decision that is made, and what conditions are put on that decision.

So I welcome the resolution. I think this development would be good for all of Newfoundland and Labrador. I do not feel that the Government of Canada has recognized also that Newfoundland and Labrador has a strategic position and that we are a place that should be looked at for defence monies in Canada. I think it is shocking to see how far they come down, Mr. Speaker.

They come down to Halifax and they stop and they seem to think we do not exist out here, especially when it comes to DND spending. It is unfortunate. It is something that has existed for many years, but I think our Province and our people are starting to say we want to be part of the protection of Canada, especially with our location, and that we should get a share of this social spending that is spent in other parts of Canada.

Our unemployment rate and the economy of the Province are in desperate need of such expenditures which would help people in our Province stay here and help develop the economy, which we have been trying to do for many years. So I would welcome and I would hope that Newfoundland and Labrador will get its chance to access these monies and to be able to take its rightful place in this Confederation when it comes to the defence of Canada.

In looking at the development a little closer in Labrador, I think my district of Stephenville, which is a former American base, had

good things and bad things, Mr. Speaker, in terms of the effects on the people there. But the overall impact is that Stephenville is a town that is a stable town. It has a good population. They have a good economic base because of defence spending. So, Stephenville has been able to grow. It has been able to stride ahead and to make its future.

We were not able to do that before because we did not have an economic base. We have learned our lessons from previous times. The overall benefits are there. The overall costs, and the things that you want to watch out for, we can look at and watch for. But that is no reason, Mr. Speaker, to proceed with development.

We are in need of development in this Province, and defence spending is the way to go. Because we support such a development, Mr. Speaker, with NATO coming into Newfoundland and Labrador, that does not mean that the members of this House are warmongers, Mr. Speaker, or they want to beat everybody over the head with a stick.

What it means is we temper our support with making sure that everybody's opinions are able to be taken into account and we are able to address concerns that are put forward. We all want peace, Mr. Speaker.

As a matter of fact, on the world front last year we saw efforts by the two super powers that are seen as the first positive sign that there is going to be some more disarmament. There is an effort, and hopefully a sincere one, to address this world problem. We have seen those things happening

and going on and that is a good sign.

It does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that you do not look at the reality of the world. We have to make sure we have protection, that our interests are insured and that we are able to defend ourselves. We would welcome peace as everybody welcomes it. Canada has been a country that pushed for many years, with its leaders, the former Prime Minister, Mr. Lester Pearson, former Prime Minister Trudeau, and indeed all the previous Prime Ministers and the present, I think, pushed Canada's image as a country which likes to mediate and likes to promote world peace.

While we have done that, we have also to be aware of the reality that we are participants in NATO. We have to put our resources forward as a participant in this group, which is for an overall defense of the Western World. I think, for us not to do that, for us not to address that concern and address a need of NATO, is shirking our responsibility as being part of it.

While I can look at concerns that are addressed, we also have to look at a reality, Mr. Speaker. We are a participant and one where we have benefited a great deal from NATO. We also have to sacrifice somewhat. The question, Mr. Speaker, of course, is is this a real sacrifice? I do not think it is overall, I think it is going to bring tremendous benefits to this Province and I think it is time we all got together and pushed as much as possible in a coherent fashion the policy of this government, the policy of the federal and provincial governments, in trying to get the

NATO base. We should all take into account what concerns people have, but to make sure that we are on a concerted effort and a concerted path to attract this development.

I would commend the efforts of my colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) who has been involved and, indeed all Labrador members, including my other colleague. I feel that they have done a good job in putting forward the views. There is now the Mokami Group in Labrador that is based in Goose Bay which has been formed to put forward a lobby and to put forward a strong case for this development. I will support that group. I know they have been very active, Mr. Speaker.

One of the things that must also be brought to the attention of the people of the Province is that, in getting our fair share of defense money we, at the present time, are experiencing a problem in Labrador with people working on Department of Defense contracts, federal government contracts. In Cartwright and Saglek in Labrador we have a third year coming up of construction and we have trades people in this Province who are unable to get work on these projects, Mr. Speaker, in coastal Labrador.

There has been a great deal of correspondence going on. There has been a great number of telephone calls made and concerns expressed but, Mr. Speaker, it is incumbent on the federal government and indeed the province to make sure that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians work on these projects, Mr. Speaker. These are projects being developed in Newfoundland, defense contracts are being put here and our workers

are not getting their shot, they are not getting their fair shake.

We brought those concerns to the Provincial Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard). They were brought to him again last night in Estimate Committees. They tell me that they are working on this. But, Mr. Speaker, the time is getting short. I have talked to some people in the labour movement who are very concerned that our Newfoundland and Labrador people are not able to avail of these opportunities. I think that is something that has to be addressed, especially if we are going to try and welcome and try to push for a future development which we would see defence spending in the Province.

If that is to occur, then the benefits should accrue to Newfoundlanders first and as much as possible since our employment and our development in this Province is not at all at a high level. We would want to see the benefits as much as possible brought to all people in this Province.

This is a problem that is presently going on, Mr. Speaker. It is a problem that has not been addressed. I recently got a letter back from the federal Minister of Supply and Services (Mr. Jelinek), who indicated they were making their best efforts to try and straighten out the situation. But, Mr. Speaker, there is an easy way to do it. All they have to do is tell the contractors to start looking at Newfoundlanders and Labradorians for employment. The problem is, it does not seem, Mr. Speaker, that the will is up there. That is something that we as a Province and a House of Assembly have to

bring home to the hon. members in Ottawa. I think it is time that they realized what our plight and our situation is down here. It is time, Mr. Speaker, because we are in desperate need of development and we are in desperate need of seeing things happen when it comes to defence spending.

I welcome a policy that would see us get more monies down here. We lobbied for a Sea Cadet base for two years. We lost out because there was a Halifax firm that did a report. The Halifax firm recommended a site in Nova Scotia, which is understandable, Mr. Speaker, being from Halifax. The problem is that there was no case for Nova Scotia, there was a great case for the Province, and we lost out. That sends to me and all of us warning signals about whether or not our concerns are being addressed, Mr. Speaker.

I think it is time that the province made their views known more strongly in Ottawa. We have a good case, Mr. Speaker, for more defence money. We have a very good case for the NATO base.

We are also want to make the federal government aware we are a part of the Confederation and our geographic location was good enough for the Americans, Mr. Speaker. They came here and they put three bases in Newfoundland. Here in Canada we are not too sure about whether or not they want to put anything. When it comes to developing economically, that is one of the things that can be done, one of many, Mr. Speaker, mind you, but it is something that should be looked at.

Mr. Speaker, last week there was a well known speaker internationally here in our Province, and she

spoke on disarmament. Helen Caldicott I believe her name is. Unfortunately, I could I could not get there, Mr. Speaker, due to a previous engagement, but I saw the news report. It was welcomed to see her talk about disarmament and the need to seek peace.

Mr. Speaker, I, for one, want to see peace, but you also have to face the reality of what you are dealing with, Mr. Speaker. Unfortunately, you have to jive both things together and you have to come up with a policy. You have to deal with the real world. You have to deal with the fact that we are a part of a group of nations that have formed themselves together during the recent past to protect themselves. We have a role, we have a responsibility with that and it is time that we helped and fulfilled that role. It does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that we are advocating nuclear weapons all over Canada. It means that we advocate participation in such a thing. I believe we should support that concept.

I notice now that the NDP federally have reviewed their policy. I am still not clear as to what that policy is, Mr. Speaker, but I would hope that that policy will be straightened out in the reality of this world that we work in. I think that there should not be a question, Mr. Speaker, as to everybody, especially in this House of Assembly and, of course, in Canada, working towards a peaceful solution, because I think our country has gotten a great reputation for that and has been very effective in pursuing that, Mr. Speaker. So nobody should take it upon themselves to indicate or say that because

members support a development that they are against peace or whatever else.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that takes the argument out of logical persuasion and puts it into another realm. We can all wrap ourselves up and say we are against this because we are all for peace, but we also are for peace, Mr. Speaker, and this is one of the ways, I think, that can help promote peace, as a matter of fact.

I would like to see more monies spent on other projects for employment, Mr. Speaker. But we also have the responsibility that comes to the defence of NATO and the defence of Canada. We have to work towards that end and fulfill that responsibility. So we should welcome and take into account all concerns, Mr. Speaker, including the major concerns of Native peoples and their rights - that has to be a major concern and has to be addressed - and other concerns of other people. They have to be addressed, because, if we are going to have a development, we should try and make sure everybody who is involved with this development and who are going to be affected by it, that their concerns are addressed by the policy that will be put down by NATO and by the federal government.

I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, what our chances are. I hear that we have a pretty good chance. At other times you hear that we are not so sure. But I hope that all members and all people across Canada are on a concerted line to see that this development occurs. I do not think that we who support this, are people who advocate military spending all over the

place, and that we are for building up the world with arms wherever we can do it. We are, Mr. Speaker, for peace, but there is a way to achieve that peace and there is also reality that you have to deal with.

I would hope that the hon. members from the NDP will consider that in their discussions of their position due to this fact. Mr. Speaker, I am all for peace, and I will borrow the line from my colleague from St. Barbe, 'but I am not for Greenpeace.' So I hope that the policy they advocate, Mr. Speaker, will be something that deals with the reality because, like I said, we can all go along and preach and preach and preach, but one of these days you may get there and you may have to do something about it. What you are going to have to do about it becomes the reality, and you have to deal with that reality.

I would rather, Mr. Speaker, be constructive about what I am going to do than say something that is not going to be what I am going to do. You want to advocate your position on a matter. You want to say what you would do if you were there. I would hope that all members of this House will carry out that responsibility, take it seriously, and take it upon themselves to make sure that when they are putting forward this position that they understand what the reality is, Mr. Speaker.

I again say that all members are very concerned about the ramifications for such a development, but the benefits, I think, Mr. Speaker, far outweigh the costs.

This House has a social conscience just as big as any, or bigger than

any in this country, Mr. Speaker. I would hope that people will recognize that and not impute to this House and members of it because it supports a proposal which would see many benefits, both social and economic to this Province, and impute motives that were against peace, Mr. Speaker. I believe that that is the farthest notion from what the reality is, Mr. Speaker. Reality is something that we have to deal with.

I look forward, Mr. Speaker, to seeing this proposal adopted, I hope by NATO countries, and that all concerns are addressed by the federal government in the development of the policy which will be forthcoming. I also hope to see, Mr. Speaker, that future defence spending will come forward. Also, that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians will be employed in these defence contracts.

I think it is something that we have to get straightened out and I hope that the Province undertakes to get the matter underway and straightened out.

Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution put forward by the hon. member for Humber Valley and our amendment put forward by the member for Naskaupi.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

There is time for another speaker.

MR. LONG:

Let me go and you go next.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me begin my few remarks on this important resolution today by complimenting my colleague, the member for Humber Valley, who brought in this resolution.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, is very timely. We have been engaged in debate about internally within the Province, within the country, and internationally, over the last several years on this particular issue, trying to attract to Canada, first of all, and secondly, trying to attract to Newfoundland, a very, very large economic development.

Now, I know that there are those, Mr. Speaker, who oppose it. There are those who oppose it for political purposes, I suppose. But, I was thinking this morning, I think it was about twenty after six or so this morning, as I was dressing I was listening to The Morning Show on CBC.

AN HON. MEMBER:

You do not get up that early.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Well, I did this morning because I had to drive somebody to the airport.

But, I was listening to The Morning Show on CBC, Mr. Speaker, and I believe, again, like I said yesterday, maybe it is the history training coming out in me, but I always pay a little bit of extra attention to This Day in History.

This morning on the CBC morning show, the article, This Day in History, pointed out that today, 99 years ago at 6:00 p.m., Adolf Hitler was born. The greatest scourge, the greatest cancer, I suppose, ever inflicted on humanity was born on this day 99 years ago. He was a socialist, Mr. Speaker. He led a socialist movement in Germany.

I would not make that comparison, but he led a socialist movement in Germany.

MR. FENWICK:

What! He moved the socialists to the gas houses.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, what is operative, what I am trying to say is that as I was listening to this particular part this morning, it occurred to me, trying to collect my thoughts for speaking on this particular resolution today, that we do not have the luxury, living in the kind of world that we are living in, to take positions that are so extreme as to not be able to defend democracy and to defend ourselves. That was the operative phrase that was going through my mind while thinking about this debate today, and thinking about that particular programme. We do not have the luxury.

I notice the party that continues to oppose this particular development, the NDP, have tried to double talk this last number of days, this last number of weeks, and, in fact, I believe it is fair to say, this last number of months. The socialist hoards, Mr. Speaker, have begun to realize that they have to modify their extreme positions.

The Leader of the NDP, Mr.

Speaker, in this Province is, on this particular issue, in a very uncomfortable position. CBC, last night, I thought, did an excellent exposé to explain to the people in Ming's Bight, or Harbour Round, or Brent's Cove that we do not have the luxury of supporting this kind of extreme political naivety. CBC did a fantastic job on that exposé last night.

What the NDP had to do here, Mr. Speaker, on this particular issue is nothing short of scandalous. They have tried to adopt a policy provincially that says we can speak out of both sides of our mouths; we can be for the military use of Goose Bay, but we can put so many restrictions on it that we cannot allow it to happen. That is exactly what this particular political party is trying to sell to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador as their policy.

MR. LONG:

It is a popular position, boy.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Yes, it is a very popular position, Mr. Speaker. It is a very, very popular position and I have no doubt that the people in Naskaupi district and in the Eagle River district, and other districts in Labrador and on the Island, will speak to that popular movement at the appropriate time, and they will be so justly rewarded, Mr. Speaker. I have no doubt about that.

The other part, Mr. Speaker, of the double-talk approach is what the NDP nationally is now trying to tout because they were up there in the polls. They had this vision of glamour, this vision of grandeur that they may have an opportunity to form a government nationally.

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are many, many more decades before that calamity is going to be inflicted on Canada.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

But they had the political grandeur, when they were riding relatively high in the polls, that the only thing that was keeping them from the corridors of power nationally, the only thing that was keeping them from the Cabinet room in Ottawa, was their particular policy on defence. They were getting the vibes, Mr. Speaker, from all across the country that if you had a defence policy that was not so anti-NATO, then maybe, just maybe, the people of the country might be so naive as to give you a shot at the reigns of government.

So they performed another great verbal and intellectual gymnastic trick, Mr. Speaker, another great flip flop perpetrated on the body politic of Canada by those socialist hordes who are knocking on the doors of power those days, or thought they were knocking on the doors of power, they performed another great intellectual exercise, Mr. Speaker.

It was not a very new exercise. It was not something that had not been tried, and with some degree of success, in Canada before.

They adopted the Parti Quebecois policy, Mr. Speaker, that in our first term we will not change anything. That is what Rene Levesque went to the voters of Quebec in his first general election that he won back in 1979, Mr. Speaker. He said, 'Elect us, but we will not take you out of

the country in the first term that we are in office.' The people of Quebec took him at his word and elected him.

Those people are so desperate, Mr. Speaker, that they are proposing now to go to the electorate of Canada and say, 'Elect us, but in our first term we will not dare take you out of NATO. We will not take you out of NORAD.' This is the infantile, childish, political policy, Mr. Speaker, of the socialists.

If you are going to have a policy, have a policy, Mr. Speaker. If you are going to stand for taking Canada out of NATO, then stand for it. Do not try to hoodwink and blindfold the people to think that you do not stand for it, but after you get one term in office, you will reconsider it again. That is the PQ approach. That is not the approach of this party, Mr. Speaker. It is not the approach of the official Opposition. That is the wimp approach. That is the socialist approach, Mr. Speaker, blindfold the people, do not tell them exactly what you are going to do, and when you get in there, if ever you get in there, then we will do something else.

That is the approach, Mr. Speaker, that was politically used in Great Britain for several years of socialist government. It has taken that country now almost a decade or more to recover from the economic straits that they were put into by the socialist policies. Mr. Speaker, the approach on NATO is the same kind of approach that those hon. gentlemen are proposing to take today on this resolution with their sub-amendment on the military use of Goose Bay.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the original motion, it says: "AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that social and economic development be an integral part in this promotion" in promoting the use of Goose Bay as a military site. The very sensible amendment proposed by the official opposition only further enhances that. It only further enhances the objective of the resolution which is to promote the social and economic development of the Goose Bay area. So, the official opposition amendment, Mr. Speaker, is sensible. It gives a bit more teeth to the motion and it allows for a committee of this House to join with government, an all-party committee, to join with government in promoting -

MR. SIMMS:

Not all parties, all parties that support the resolution.

MR. RIDEOUT:

All parties that support, yes, to join with government in promoting the bringing to Newfoundland and Labrador, the bringing to an economically deprived part of our Province a very, very good development. So the Opposition amendment is sensible. It is supportable, Mr. Speaker, and I do believe that most of us on this side of the House will be able to support that particular amendment.

Now, then, of course, then you come to the sub-amendment, as put down by the Leader of the NDP. The sub-amendment does not add anything to the objective of the original resolution which was to get this development for Goose Bay, for Canada and for Newfoundland, but to do it in such a way that you protect the social and economic development of the region and of the people in the

area. It does not add to that, Mr. Speaker. It does not add to anything that the official Opposition amendment tried to accomplish.

What it does, Mr. Speaker, is to make sure that you will never live long enough in this country to see, in an official way, the military use of Goose Bay Airport. That is what the sub-amendment, if it were passed and accepted by this House, would do. That is the effect that it would have, Mr. Speaker, and that is why the NDP down in the corner here, the socialists down in the corner, Mr. Speaker, they have been on that sticky-wicket since the first resolution was brought into this House a couple of years ago, on this particular item. They were forced, Mr. Speaker, to act like school children. Yes, I am in the House. No, I am not in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They voted for it the first time.

MR. RIDEOUT:

They voted for it and then when there was another vote called they made sure they ran out through the door and into the corridors so that their names would not be recorded, Mr. Speaker.

Now you have this other unique approach, consistent, I might say, Mr. Speaker, consistent with the NDP philosophy nationally on defence.

If you cannot develop a position on this particular issue that is supportable by the masses, that is supportable by the majority of people out there, well try to fudge it with this kind of an amendment. So, it is a 'but' approach.

MR. FENWICK:

(Inaudible.) You should mention that.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is exactly what I mentioned a short while ago, in this global community that we are living in, Mr. Speaker, - and I think the hon. the gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) put it very well - none of us are warmongers. None of us want to learn from experience the horror and the misery and the torment and the chaos of war.

The NDP do not have a monopoly on that kind of thinking, Mr. Speaker. That is not their monopoly. There are just as many Liberals or just as many PCs who believe in that overall philosophy. But we have to as well, Mr. Speaker, be conscious of the reality and the reality, Mr. Speaker, as it has been on this planet for centuries, the reality is that there is our side and there is another side.

MR. FENWICK:

Reality changed in 1945.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, if this party can do so much to change reality, then maybe they should arrange some kind of an international summit so they can bring everybody together, whether they are government or not, bring everybody together, get everybody to sign on a piece of paper that all nuclear weapons will be done away with, all conventional weapons will be done away with, the armies of the world will be disbanded, and when they reach that golden summit, Mr. Speaker, then and only then will they have the right to be able to be so pious in their manifestations on the use of

military equipment and/or the use of Goose Bay as a training centre. That is all this is, Mr. Speaker.

We as a government and as a people are cognizant of the rights of the Native groups, the aboriginal groups in Labrador. We have said publicly on numerous occasions that we are prepared to sit down and negotiate their land claims with them. We have said that, Mr. Speaker. We are not prepared to accept a back seat to anybody when it comes to being fair and reasonable and equitable to the first inhabitants of this land. It takes two, Mr. Speaker. You cannot sit down and negotiate with yourself. It takes two to come to the table. It takes two to get the process working, and I think that over the last several months there have been some progress made in that regard.

So if you are going to say to the world that we are not going to let this development go until land claims are satisfied, I mean, you could be talking several years.

MR. FENWICK:
(Inaudible).

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman never negotiated a thing in his life. He does not know what negotiations are all about, Mr. Speaker. So he has no right to expect the people of this Province or the majority of members in this House to believe that he has some kind of a gift that no other person has.

MR. SIMMS:
On the other hand, he did negotiate himself out of prison earlier than he would normally get out.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Yes.

Has he some kind of a magic wand that he and his party can raise that is going to solve all those major questions overnight? The first question you have to get resolved and in terms of the LIA, the Labrador Inuit Association, is resolved. They recognize the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador as a legitimate government. They are prepared to sit down and talk.

The Innu, on the other hand, have consistently said they do not recognize us. How can you sit down and begin negotiations and that kind of a process?

What the NDP have done here, Mr. Speaker, is an attempt to do nothing only try to stay on the side of the saints. They are trying, Mr. Speaker, to stay on the side of the saints and the angels by trying to ensure through the method of a sub-amendment to this resolution that this project is effectively scuttled. That is the bottom line of their approach. That is the bottom line of the approach of the party nationally.

MR. FENWICK:
That is not so.

MR. RIDEOUT:
Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman protests too much. He can say, 'It is not so' all he likes, but if this particular sub-amendment were accepted by this legislature today, you could kiss good bye to NATO involvement in Labrador for decades and decades. That is the bottom line, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

On the other hand, if the very sensible resolution and a very sensible amendment that was made by the official Opposition is accepted by this House, as I have some reason to believe it will, then it will enhance the ability of Canada and enhance the ability of Newfoundland to bring this development, with all of the economic spin-offs that it will bring, to this Province.

Mr. Speaker, none of us are for militarization. All of us are against nuclear weapons, but I cannot understand how in the reality of our times a Newfoundlander who knows that we get the lowest per capita defense spending of any province in Canada, how a Newfoundlander worth his salt could attempt to blind fold the people of this Province into trying to believe, if this does not go to Goose Bay, it is going somewhere, Mr. Speaker! If it does not go to Goose Bay, it is going somewhere. In this particular case, the odds are that it will go to another country; to Turkey, to a foreign country.

In this Province, where we have the lowest defense spending of any province of Canada, to try to get the people of Newfoundland to believe that it is for their future benefit and their future advantage that they scuttle this project is nothing short of madness, Mr. Speaker. It has no common sense, it is only a socialist's mentality that would try to perpetrate that kind of a position on the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

This sub-amendment, Mr. Speaker, deserves exactly what I suspect it

will get at six o'clock, and that is the Royal Order of the Boot, out of here and never to be heard tell of again.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long).

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the short period of time that I have to make an intervention on the debate, Mr. Speaker, I will try and address a number of issues that have been raised by other speakers, and also initiate perhaps some new points that should be considered by all hon. members both in reference to the sub-amendment and the main motion.

I would like to begin, Mr. Speaker, by saying that the sub-amendment that we proposed is not to be taken as a nuclear sub-amendment. It is just a sub-amendment. There is nothing nuclear about it.

The first thing is there has been numerous references both last week and today about the position of the federal New Democratic Party and its proposals for a new and imaginative defense and security policy for Canada as we go into a federal campaign. I think all hon. members, no matter what their position on any of these questions would have to agree that, if nothing else, Ed Broadbent and the federal New Democratic Party have placed the issues of defense and

security on the agenda of this country in a way that it has not been done in twenty, perhaps forty years.

I would like for the purposes of this debate to table a document which was adopted by the Federal Council of the New Democratic Party, Canada's Stake in Common Security: A Report by the International Affairs Committee of the New Democratic Party of Canada. It is now available to all the hon. members of the House to study and examine so that any time they stand in the House to talk about the policies of the federal New Democratic Party, they have something to refer to, something concrete in front of them to examine. We would appreciate that the debate happen on the actual substance of what the policy of the federal New Democratic Party is, rather than what the members and even people outside the House, in the media or in the business community, might like to make of the policy.

The federal New Democratic Party has not done a flip-flop, as has been suggested. The policy was adopted this past weekend and both the member for Menihek and myself attended and participated in a very lengthy and wide-ranging debate.

MR. FENWICK:

It is a good policy.

MR. LONG:

The document represents a very exciting departure in the development of a proposal for a new foreign policy for this country. It is something that we are quite proud of.

The issue of Canada's membership in NATO is not the only issue that

is addressed in this report, but certainly many of the issues that are talked about, many of the commitments that the federal party will make in the upcoming federal campaign, is something that we will be pleased to bring to the public of this Province, and to play our part in the national debate when we engage a national campaign to get rid of the present government of this country.

I am sure, I am quite confident, having read the report and participated in its adoption, that the proposal for a new foreign policy to deal with Canada's defence and security needs, as presented by Ed Broadbent and the federal NDP will become a very popular proposal as we get into a federal campaign. Clearly Canadians, again and again, opinion polls show, want their federal government to adopt policies that will work toward nuclear disarmament that will rid Canada of the testing of cruise missiles, that will work toward establishing Canada as a nuclear weapon free zone, that will work toward the development of new proposals in the Arctic, that will work toward freeing Canada of the obligations of the NORAD Treaty and the imposition of rule by the United States that is now the essential function of the NORAD agreement, all the things that Canadians time and again show that they are wanting their federal government to take clear action on. We will see, as we go into a federal campaign, that there is only one party that clearly speaks unequivocally to the need for a new departure in Canada's international relations.

To the question at hand, Mr. Speaker, I return to the motion that has been brought forward by

the member for Humber Valley and say a question must be asked: What happened to the motion that was presented last year in which the government went to great pains to say that this government and the federal government were addressing all social, environmental, and economic concerns through wildlife studies and the federal environmental assessment process, and that, given that both levels of government were addressing those concerns, the House should be in favour of the proposed NATO base?

At the time we argued, during debate on that resolution, that the premise was false, that it was not clear by any means that both levels of government were indeed addressing those concerns, especially given that the reports that had been commissioned on wildlife and environmental impact had not yet been published. So we refused to acknowledge the validity of the motion.

This year, Mr. Speaker, the government has again introduced a motion, no doubt simply for political purposes to try and engage in game-playing in the House, to try and attack the New Democratic Party. It is quite noticeable by its absence, Mr. Speaker, that the government no longer even pretends to be addressing the serious social and environmental concerns that are being brought forward, concerns of the Native people, and others. The government is now simply asking that the Legislature, without any real attention to the those concerns which were debated at some length in the Legislature a year ago, parrot again a resolution that has been passed on two occasions now.

Mr. Speaker, in this context it is appropriate that I draw the attention of the members of the House to recent developments that have occurred since a similar motion was introduced this time last year. One would have to be the publication of a report by the Canadian Public Health Association which did a lengthy investigation into the health concerns of the proposed development and low level flying.

Mr. Speaker, that report, when it came out after the debate had taken place in the House, confirmed exactly what we, in this party, had been saying during the debate. It called for a moratorium on all further increases in low level flying until there had been a full environmental impact assessment, until the federal environmental office was able to complete its work and publish a report, and that there should be no continuation or extension of low level flying. That, Mr. Speaker, was exactly what we, in this party, had been saying in the debate a year ago.

Then, Mr. Speaker, another significant event, which the member for Menihek referred to last week when our amendment was introduced, the FEARO office has received from the federal Minister of the Environment an assurance that the mandate of the panel which is doing a full impact assessment - and I am pleased that the Minister of the Environment is in his seat to make note of the very critical issues around the environmental impact hearing and the full process that is taking place with this proposal. The Minister of the Environment was essentially forced by legislation and by all due process to retract

statements that he had made and to essentially eat his words when asked in earlier interviews about the independence of the FEARO process. He gave an assurance to the FEARO panel, to Dr. David Barnes, who is the Chairman of the Environmental Assessment Panel, that, and I quote, Mr. Speaker, "I consider the independence of a panel to be a key component of the environmental assessment and review process and nothing I have said should be construed as restricting its obligation to follow its collective conscience."

Mr. Speaker, that is a very significant gesture by the federal Minister of Environment, to acknowledge the right of the FEARO panel to recommend a moratorium on low level flying and, indeed, to recommend a cessation of flying activities if the panel finds that the impacts of such activity would be so negative as to call for a cessation of activities.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that is a significant development which, again, lends strength to the arguments that we, in this party, and many others outside of this House, have been making, that in order to do a proper, independent, objective, environmental assessment of the low level flying activities and the proposed NATO base, the FEARO process must be allowed to run its due course; that it is premature to prejudge the situation and for the governments at the federal and provincial level to demand that everything possible be done to increase the flight activity and to increase the military development of the region when, in fact, all such decisions should be pending a full environmental assessment review.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have seen, since the debate happened in the House a year ago, a number of events and circumstances that have tended to confirm that there are very serious concerns on environmental and social impacts and on the position of the Native people.

The sub-amendment to the resolution that we have presented says that the development of military activity in Goose Bay must be contingent on a number of conditions. The first, Mr. Speaker, is "That the Innu and Inuit people of Labrador agree to the development as part of a comprehensive land claims settlement."

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that such a condition is an absolute necessity in the efforts of the provincial and federal governments to promote a development. Consistently, in the last three or four years, we have seen a number of occasions on which the proponents of military development in Labrador and the activities by the foreign forces have represented what is essentially, to the Native people who live on the ground, as it were, in Labrador, and throughout Labrador, a racist proposition.

When I spoke in the House a year ago, I spoke about the federal Minister of Transportation as being a front man in promoting that this development and the kinds of remarks and attitude that he showed toward the concerns of Native people have confirmed in my own mind that to the Native people the way in which this development has proceeded is essentially caught up in a very racist process. It is one that they have seen too many times in their

dealings with both levels of government and one which speaks to the history of the white peoples on this continent.

Our relations with the Native people is something that members of this government should be ashamed of in the way that they have continued to pursue relations with the Native people in what are essentially very racist terms. The kinds of disrespect that have been shown to the concerns of the Native people is nothing short of shameful.

Mr. Speaker, references have been made to the Mokami Project Group and we have seen in the budget that was brought down a couple of weeks ago that this government has now given them a grant of \$100,000 to do their propaganda work, and they received not too long ago a grant of \$500,000 from the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

This, of course, is the group that likes to proclaim its independence and non-partisan orientation, but in byelection time last Summer was taking out full-page advertisements in newspapers here in St. John's and promoting the development of the base in what I would say has been encouraging the racism that has been exhibited by both levels of government and by the military, an absolute disrespect for the concerns that have been shown by Native people. The Mokami Project Group is one other institution that is now being funded to the tune of \$600,000 by both levels of government to carry on a propaganda campaign which is essentially designed to minimize

the concerns of the Native people. It is full of the language of confrontation. It is full of innuendo and campaigns that are directed against the concerns of the Native people.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that when you combine the efforts of this government, the military proponent and the federal government with the likes of Clarice Rudkowski and the campaign that her project group has been undertaking on behalf of these governments that the very sensitive process of negotiating land claims with the Innu and the Innu of Labrador has been prejudiced by this development.

I entered into the debate last year excerpts from the hearings that were held on the Coast of Labrador by the FEARO panel in which the president of the Labrador Innu Association said, and I quote, "The Labrador Innu Association is opposed in principle to any military activity on, or over, or above land, water, or ice in our claimed area. Labrador Innu history and experience with military presence and activities in Labrador give us every reason to continue this opposition."

This opposition is continuing, Mr. Speaker, and I would suggest that the land claims process has been prejudiced in a very serious way by the manner in which the proponents of this development have proceeded to slander and misrepresent and engage in name calling directed toward the Native people who I am sure will continue to represent their concerns about the development.

Mr. Speaker, the second aspect of our sub-amendment calls for the

military development to be shown to be compatible with other land uses in Labrador that might eventually be put forward. The member for Menihek spoke quite eloquently in his intervention last week and raised the concerns of the potential developments of tourism, hunting, and fishing throughout Labrador and how such potential alternative uses of the land might be prejudiced by this development.

I think that is a very fundamental principle that we have been trying to make clear in our contributions to the debate and we would stand, we believe, Mr. Speaker, that this should stand as a guiding principle in the drive to push forward with this development, that there be clearly shown that this development not interfere with the potential for other uses of the land base in Labrador.

The third clause of our sub-amendment, Mr. Speaker, calls for the environmental impact study to show that the military uses of the land be environmentally sound.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make one reference here to the Canadian Public Health Association report which I have made a reference to earlier in which they talk about the certainty that a tactical weapons fighter training center will bring in terms of the newer kinds of advanced training activity. They are assured by studying other such bases in the world, particularly in the United States, in the Nevada Desert, that there will be sound booms created as flight activity and the type of combat training undertaken by these pilots occur, and the CPHA makes a specific reference that sonic boom will be detrimental to

the environment and to all wildlife and human inhabitants of the area.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, our sub-amendment says that 'Military activities not be supportive of activities that would lead to nuclear war.' Mr. Speaker, I only have a couple of minutes here, but I want to draw to a conclusion by speaking to this as quickly as I can.

I am personally convinced that the kind of training that is presently underway in Labrador, and I understand the flight training season opened in the last two weeks and is going to run from the middle of April to the end of October, that what we see the fighter pilots of the Dutch Air Force and the Royal Air Force engaging in in the air space of Labrador are strategies and war fighting doctrine that are essentially designed to test the capability of fighting a nuclear war.

The deep-strike strategy that these pilots are engaging in, as a testing ground for NATO war doctrine, is essentially of a dual capability, both conventional and nuclear. The Torando jets that are being flown by the Royal Air Force pilots, the F-16s that are being flown by the Dutch pilots, if you read Janes Defence Weekly, if you read any independent assessment of the kinds of activity that is going on there, these are clearly intended to test the capability of NATO pilots to engage in war-fighting strategies with nuclear intent.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read quickly into the record a response that was given to such a question in the Parliament in the United

Kingdom in which the Secretary of State for Defence said, and I quote, "The Royal Air Force aircraft, including Torandoes stationed at Goose Bay in Canada, are flown on a wide range of training sorties to ensure that pilots have the necessary expertise to enable them to fulfill all possible war time roles.' That was in response to a question on the nuclear aspect of the training and essentially the minister confirmed that yes, they were dual capable training flights and that there is a nuclear component.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to refer to another excerpt from Hansard in the federal House of Commons in which Mr. Harvie Andre, then the Associate Minister of Defence said, in 1984, and I quote, "In Goose Bay, Labrador year round they practice aircraft strikes using various missiles, some of which are simulated nuclear tipped.'

What we can see, Mr. Speaker, is what Helen Caldicott last week, when she spoke here in St. John's, called 'the economics of death.' This is what the people of Newfoundland are being invited into. We are being promised a point of entry into a global militarization of the world's resources in which people, especially in Third World countries and underdeveloped areas, such as this region of Canada, are being promised military activity as a way to resolve economic difficulties. That is the promise that this government continually speaks to.

It tries to ignore the realities of NATO integrated nuclear strike capability and the actual kind of war fighting games that are being

played in Labrador and calls on Newfoundlanders to ignore such realities and to accept the development without question because it will be good for the economy.

What is good for the economy in this case, Mr. Speaker, may indeed, - the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) brought up Hitler and Nazi Germany -

MR. SPEAKER (Parsons):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, if I may conclude?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. LONG:

The ovens in Nazi Germany, Mr. Speaker, also put people to work.

MR. FENWICK:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Humber Valley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When I introduced this resolution last Wednesday I figured that it certainly would be a motherhood issue. No matter when we come into this House, Mr. Speaker, or outside of it, there are always references to the high unemployment rate in the Province, the 22 or 23 per cent or what have

you. But, in any case, I figured for sure this would be a motherhood issue and there would be no problems whatsoever in getting any member of the House or any party, all fifty-two members, if they were present, to vote in favour of such a motion.

Now, after the resolution was introduced, Mr. Speaker, we had an amendment by the member for Maskaupi, Mr. Kelland. Now, that amendment, Mr. Speaker, is a positive one. It adds to the resolution and it, by no means, takes away any of the content or the meaning that you have in the resolution.

Another thing I think I stated last week is that there should be no need for the resolution. There should be absolutely no need to bring a resolution like this into the House, except for the semantics of the thing, just bring it in, discuss it for a few minutes, and pass it. I mean, this is a motherhood issue, Mr. Speaker.

There is no difference in setting up a Kruger in Corner Brook or another Abitibi in Grand Falls or one in Stephenville or a Come By Chance, or what have you. It is a motherhood thing! You cannot have your cake and eat it too!

If you are coming in here or anywhere else around the Province and criticizing the government on the high unemployment rate, you cannot say, at the same time, coming in here and say you cannot support something that is going to create approximately 3,000 or 4,000 jobs, including the spinoff.

The NDP figure they can have their cake and eat it to, but I think, Mr. Speaker, that the populace in

this Province and in Canada, over the next year or so, will certainly show the NDP that that is not so. They are not going to be that naive.

Now, getting back to the amendment by the hon. member for Maskaupi. It is a good one. It calls on all parties of the House and a committees of the House to support the NATO base for Goose Bay.

I mentioned last week about the socio-economics of the base for Goose Bay. It should not have to be reiterated, but you have got to keep it up. Last week I mentioned the fact that the NDP were about to reaffirm their decision or their stand on NATO. I mentioned the fact that they probably took their reasons for looking into it and forming a committee to look into it from the British system.

What happened in Britian? The Labour Party in Britian took a stand against the Thatcher Government with regard to NATO and what happened? Good bye! They have not had the chance to do this here, Mr. Speaker. Worse still, what they are going to do here - take Canada firstly - is that they are going to try to bring in a more or less modified version of their stand against NATO, and, at the same time, expect to get elected on it when most of the country are against it. The polls show that most Canadians are in favour of NATO. And why not?

Where would we be today, Mr. Speaker, without the Allies and most of the member countries that are in NATO today? Where would we be? We would not be in here sitting down with fifteen or sixteen Opposition members and the Socialists allowed to have two or three, as it is. We would be

saluting, Mr. Speaker, and wearing hard hats.

The very people and the very countries that came to our rescue in the Second World War are in NATO, and that our people went overseas with, and not only from Canada, Mr. Speaker, but from this Province. All parts of this Province joined in, some of my own relatives as well, and I would say just about every member of this House has been touched in one way or the other by it. The nerve and the gaul to come into this House and, if nothing else, just on principle, you would stop and think and say, 'Look what happened in the past.'

MR. BAIRD:

They do not know anything about it.

MR. WOODFORD:

It is going to promote nuclear war! This has nothing to do about promoting nuclear war, Mr. Speaker. It is like night and day. We are just trying to do the opposite, avert a nuclear war, and not only a nuclear war, but a conventional one as well.

Now the very fact that we have countries training in Goose Bay, they could be training in Konya, Turkey, the other country that is after it. They are training now in other parts of the world. They are training all over. The United States, for instance, has bases all over the world that they are training their fighters on.

They do not have to come to Goose Bay because they can do it in their own country, Mr. Speaker, without any flap. They do not have to put up with this nonsense in their country.

What is West Germany doing, when

got the Warsaw Pact forces just across their border? I would like to see approximately four million to six million people just the other side of Whitbourne here somewhere, and we out here, and see what kind of a stand the NDP will take then.

We got approximately 4.5 million men, some of our own men, Canadians and Newfoundlanders, stationed in West Germany today, Mr. Speaker. Why are they there? Why are they there? They are not there to stop a nuclear war. They are there to just try to, right today, if a war started today in Germany, if the Warsaw Pact forces started to come across the lines in Germany today, we got 4.5 million men there to try to stop them with conventional weapons.

MR. FENWICK:

And nuclear.

MR. WOODFORD:

And nuclear, I am not denying that. The nuclear is there for a purpose as well. It is a deterrent as well as a force.

In any case, Mr. Speaker, all statistics show and all military experts state quite clearly, and it is public knowledge, our forces would only last in a conventional war twenty-one days. Twenty-one days is what we have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WOODFORD:

We are going to give in, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker the NATO Allies, of which we are a part, we were very proud of up until about twenty years ago. The last twenty years we decreased our participation in

NATO. We are there, Mr. Speaker in name only. We have very little equipment. I stated that also last week, that the government now, and it obvious from some of the things that has been brought down in the budget in the last couple of years, that are going to be spent in NATO, our forces, Mr. Speaker, are humiliated because we have nothing to fight with. We have nothing to fight with.

As an example again, last week we had a trawler off St. Pierre and Miquelon, off the Banks, and what happened? Sure we brought them in. What happens if the French come over? What are we going to send out, our Coast Guard with the bow and arrows to take them in? We have got to have a good force if we are going to be a true, strong, and staunch participant in NATO.

If we are going to sit around the table in Brussels, Mr. Speaker, with all our NATO countries, the United States, West Germany, Britain, the Netherlands, Italy, all our NATO countries, the people who we are depending on to defend us in case of an attack by any of the Warsaw Pact countries, or anybody else, when it comes to that, we have got to be there not only in mind but also in body and be able to offer something.

Imagine, when they reaffirmed their position on NATO last week, the gall, again, to be using blackmail. The hon. member just stated the three things that I am going to state right now. The first one says, 'Although calling for what we will call a pull-out, in a subsequent term of the NDP government party strategists have focused on the goals that Canada should accomplish while still - while still - a member of NATO.'

That word 'still'.

MR. EFFORD:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:

We cannot hear a word the hon. member is saying because of the interruptions and the talking going on on the other side, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:

Getting back to what they said in reaffirming their stand with regards to NATO. 'These include a new Canadian controlled surveillance and warning system to replace the existing NORAD arrangement with the United States.' Here we are, we are going to pull our of our NORAD arrangement on surveillance with the United States. We can turn on the radio, we can pick up the paper, we can turn on the television, and every day of the week our forces, either the Canadian CF-118s or the United States forces, have to intercept their planes over our territories. That is just an example of a small part of that. Who is going to tell us if something does happen? What other country is going to phone us and tell us if there is something wrong in our waters or something wrong in our land? How silly and naive! Stupidity is the word.

The second one, Mr. Speaker: 'The re-deployment of forces in Europe to other tasks at home and abroad.' How foolish! I just spoke about our participation in NATO. We are going to sit around the table in Brussels, sit in where all our NATO allies are, where they are making decisions not for today, not for next week, and not for next month but for years down the road, if they have to be used, and we are going to sit there, with everybody with their little thing from the NDP in front of them, saying, 'Well, boys, we have got to be careful what we say in here, because those fellows are going to pull out of NATO.' It is crazy!

We are going to make plans for the Warsaw Pact forces and we are going to sit at the table and our Canadian member in NATO is going to be there shaking like a leaf on a tree. He is going to have to be asked to leave the room when they take a vote. I mean, how can you operate and take our forces out of Europe?

MR. FENWICK:
Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Dirty NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BARRETT:
Where were you in 1939 and in the 1940s?

AN HON. MEMBER:
He was in Montreal. That is where he was.

MR. WOODFORD:

What did they say in the 1940s, Mr. Speaker, getting back to it again, when we had to send our people overseas? Did they say bring them back, some of the very people who were needed over there and made a difference in whether we stand here today as a free and democratic Province and Nation? Some of the most important battles fought in the Second World War were fought by Canadians and Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:
Do not tell me about it. And to have the gall to say today, after they have given their lives overseas, that we have to get out of NATO, we have to stop this kind of thing because it will not happen again, you are living in a dream world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:
Thirdly, Mr. Speaker, 'The purchase of helicopters, patrol aircraft, frigates, mine sweepers, diesel submarines to boost conventional forces' - conventional forces now, this is - 'and persuasion of NATO members to abandon their first-use policy on nuclear weapons.' How hypocritical!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hypocrites. Hypocrites.

MR. FENWICK:
(Inaudible) use them first.

AN HON. MEMBER:
They are going mad over there, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BAIRD:

If I could get you in front of them, I would.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. WOODFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the hon. member to come out to the Legion in Deer Lake and debate this subject with me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:

Now, all this I stated, Mr. Speaker, has to do with the word 'still'. Get this, 'While we are still a member of NATO.' Now, in getting those things while still a member of NATO, all the military experts and even the Opposition people in Ottawa, and some of their own people, have stated quite clearly and unequivocally that the same monies that are going to be spent to do the things that they ask here, while still in NATO, it will take the same amount of monies to do exactly what we want to do while we are going to be a good and sound partner of NATO, no different. The same billions of dollars and we can still be a full-fledged member of NATO, which is where we should be, Mr. Speaker. We are putting out money where our mouths are, where we never had it for twenty years; we did not have it because of freezes.

MR. FENWICK:

Dangerous alliance.

MR. WOODFORD:

Dangerous alliance. Sure, dangerous alliance. The dangerous alliance is here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WOODFORD:

If the hon. member would go back through his short history, and go back to what happened in 1939 when Neville Chamberlain of Britain went over to Germany, what did he say when he came back? No, problem! 'Peace in our Time!' Forget it! What happened a few months after, Mr. Speaker? We lost millions of people in the Second World War, just three or four months after he came home. Then we are going to stand here today as members of the House of Assembly, members representing Canadians, our constituents, and leave them to the wolves just because we are supporting something that is a motherhood issue.

I have dwelled on the Canadian part of it and the protectionist part of it, Mr. Speaker. I will only say a few more things, because I only have a few minutes left. You would want a week to speak on this.

In any case, the socio-economic part of the whole deal for the Goose Bay area, I mean, it has been stated, it has been said over and over again, Mr. Speaker, and I cannot see for the life of me, for no other reason, why a party like that would just vote in favour of it. The lifeblood of Goose Bay.

One other reference, Mr. Speaker, an analogy I would like to make. The NDP have stated already what they would do if voted in in Canada as a government. They stated that they would have a gradual withdrawal from NATO. Now, what does this mean? What does this mean, again? They are voted in as a government. We pass this now, within the next year, and NATO is established in Goose Bay for their training centre.

The new runways are put in, the warning system is upgraded in Saglek and Cartwright, and all the NATO allies come over training, Mr. Speaker. They put everything in there. The Germans just announced a \$40 million hangar. The Netherlands come over. The Italians come over. They spend all kinds of money. All of a sudden, there is an NDP government elected in Ottawa, God forbid! What happens then, Mr. Speaker, when they say, oh, we are going to start a gradual withdrawal now from NATO? We have everything in Goose Bay. We have everything there, and now they are going to start a gradual withdrawal. All of a sudden, Goose Bay becomes a ghost town once again, another Buchans. The second time around for Goose Bay. Not the first, the second. After everything going there, they are going to take it out and all of a sudden we are back to square one. It is crazy and silly and stupid.

The hon. gentleman is supposed to be representing the labour union in Canada, and here is the biggest service union, the biggest union in Canada today, The Public Service Alliance of Canada, gone on record as supporting the NATO base for Goose Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:
Mr. Speaker, my time is up. I cannot get into some of the other things I wanted to say, but I want to thank the member for Naskaupi for his amendment. I am pretty well sure we are willing to go along with it. I will not say what we are going to do with the sub-amendment from the hon. member sitting down in the corner. In any case, Mr. Speaker, I will just

put the motion, and I want to thank hon. members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

We will deal with the sub-amendment first.

On motion, sub-amendment defeated.

MR. SPEAKER:
Shall the amendment carry?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
We are in the process of taking a vote on the amendment.

MR. FENWICK:
Mr. Speaker, I just want to know what the vote was on the sub-amendment. I did not hear clearly what you said.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Nay. Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:
The sub-amendment was defeated.

MR. FENWICK:
I am sorry, I cannot hear you.

MR. SPEAKER:
The sub-amendment was defeated.

MR. FENWICK:
Could we have a standing vote on that, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No. No.

MR. SPEAKER:

Division.

Call in the members.

MR. DINN:

Stop the clock, then.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed to stop the clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour of the sub-amendment, please stand.

Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Long.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Boo! Boo!

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the sub-amendment, please stand.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Dr. Twomey), the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms Verge), the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources (Mr. R. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Power), the hon. the President of Treasury Board and President of the Council (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and

Communications (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Russell), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin), the hon. the Minister Responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Housing (Mr. Peach), Mr. Parsons, Mr. Greening, Mr. Reid, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Baird, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Woodford.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Mr. Morgan, Mr. Callan, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Patterson, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Efford, the hon. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Baker, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Kelland, Mr. Furey, Mr. Lush, Mr. Decker, Mr. Gullage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The sub-amendment is defeated, forty-two to two.

Shall the amendment carry?

On motion, amendment carried.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Division.

MR. SPEAKER:

Shall the motion as amended carry?

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, there was a request for a standing vote on the amendment.

We will agree, Mr. Speaker, to dispense with the ten minute

waiting period.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is agreed to dispense with the time.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

All those in favour, please stand.

The hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge), the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources (Mr. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Power), the hon. the President of Treasury Board and President of the Council (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Collins), the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Butt), the hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Russell), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism (Barrett), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin), the hon. the Minister Responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Housing (Mr. Peach), Mr. Parsons, Mr. Greening, Mr. Reid, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Baird, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Woodford, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Callan, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Patterson, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Efford, the hon. Mr. Simmons,

Mr. Tulk, Mr. Baker, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. K. Aylward, Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Kelland, Mr. Furey, Mr. Lush, Mr. Decker, Mr. Gullage.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against the amendment, please stand.

Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Long.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment is carried, forty-two to two against.

Shall the motion as amended carry?

On motion, motion as amended, carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Division.

Division

MR. SPEAKER:

Call in the members.

All those in favor of the motion as amended, please stand.

The hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services (Dr. Hugh Twomey), the hon. the Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge), the hon. the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn), the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources (Mr. R. Aylward), the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Power), the hon. the President of Treasury Board and President of Council (Mr. Simms), the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. John Collins), the hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs (Mr. Dawe), the hon. the Minister of

Mines (Mr. Dinn), the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Young), the hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Matthews), the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Butt), the hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands (Mr. Russell), the hon. the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard), the hon. the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett), the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin), the hon. the Minister Responsible for Newfoundland and Labrador Housing (Mr. Peach), Mr. Parsons, Mr. Greening, Mr. Reid, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Baird, Mr. Hodder, Mr. Woodford, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Callan, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Patterson, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells), Mr. Efford, the hon. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Tulk, Mr. Baker, Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Gilbert, Mr. K. Alyward, Mr. Hiscock, Mr. Kelland, Mr. Furey, Mr. Lush, Mr. Decker, Mr. Gullage.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the motion as amended, please stand.

Mr. Fenwick, Mr. Long.

MR. SPEAKER:

The motion as amended is carried, forty-two votes to two.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

This is to just mention that tomorrow in the House we intend to proceed with legislation, starting with Order 3, Order 4, Order 5, Order 6, and Order 7. We are prepared down to Order 8, which is

six or seven bills. I do not know how far we will get, but we will see.

MR. SIMMONS:

Orders 3 to 8?

MR. SIMMS:

Three to eight, at least, yes. We are prepared to go on from that.

And tonight Environment and Lands, tomorrow morning Public Works, tomorrow night Forest Resources for about an hour or so, I gather, and then Fisheries from then on.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, April 21 at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to Questions
tabled

April 20, 1988

tensoad

asked Dec 1988
by Hon. Minister of Career
Development & Advanced
Studies

ORDER PAPER 1/88 - MARCH 15, 1988

ITEM #3

QUESTION

Mr. Decker (Strait of Belle Isle) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) Invoices, vouchers, receipts, etc. to cover the cost of accomodations, travel, car rentals and entertainment incurred by the Minister, Parliamentary Assistant and/or Parliamentary Secretary and other members of the Minister's staff in the Province, between the dates of November 25th and December 18th, 1987 inclusive.
- (b) List regions visited during that period and for what purpose.

ANSWER

- (a) nil
- (b) nil

Received 20 Apr. '88
by Hon. Minister of Career
Development & Advanced
Studies

ORDER PAPER 1/88 - MARCH 15, 1988

ITEM #3

QUESTION

Mr. Decker (Strait of Belle Isle) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) Invoices, vouchers, receipts, etc. to cover the cost of accomodations, travel, car rentals and entertainment incurred by the Minister, Parliamentary Assistant and/or Parliamentary Secretary and other members of the Minister's staff in the Province, between the dates of November 25th and December 18th, 1987 inclusive.
- (b) List regions visited during that period and for what purpose.

ANSWER

- (a) nil
- (b) nil

ORDER PAPER 1/88 - MARCH 15, 1988

Journal 20 Apr. '88
by Hon. Minister of Career
Development & Advanced
Studies

ITEM #3

QUESTION

Mr. Decker (Strait of Belle Isle) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) Invoices, vouchers, receipts, etc. to cover the cost of accommodations, travel, car rentals and entertainment incurred by the Minister, Parliamentary Assistant and/or Parliamentary Secretary and other members of the Minister's staff in the Province, between the dates of November 25th and December 18th, 1987 inclusive.
- (b) List regions visited during that period and for what purpose.

ANSWER

- (a) nil
- (b) nil

#28
Order Paper of Mar. 15/88

Handwritten text, possibly a name or date, mostly illegible.

Talled by Hon. Minister
of Fisheries 20 Apr. '88

CAPITAL GRANTS ('86 - '87 FISCAL YEAR)

DISTRICT	LOCATION	PROJECT	AMOUNT	SPONSOR
BAIE VERTE-WHITE BAY	Brent's Cove	Emergency Wharf Upgrading	\$ 2,500	Fishermen's Committee
	Baie Verte	Fishermen's Gear Shed	2,500	Fishermen's Committee
	Coachman's Cove	Wharf Canopy	2,500	Fishermen's Committee
	La Scie	Community Stage Construction	2,000	La Scie Kinsmen Club
	Fleur De Lys	Concrete Slab	5,800	Cod Trap Committee
BELLEVUE	Hodge's Cove	Wharf Washdown	500	Fishermen's Committee
	Butter Cove	Fishermen's Centre Access Improvements	2,000	Southwest Area Reg. Development Assoc.
	Old Shop	Community Stage Upgrading	1,500	Upper Trinity S. Reg. Development Assoc.
BONAVISTA SOUTH	Little Catalina	Breakwater Wharf	3,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Red Cliff	Community Stage Expansion	3,000	Fishermen's Committee
BURIN-PLACENTIA WEST	Davis Cove	Hoist on Wharf	600	Fishermen's Committee
	Port au Bras	Slipway Relocation	3,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Baine Hr.	Access Road Paving	4,000	Baine Hr. Town Council
CARBONEAR	Ochre Pit Cove	Community Stage Upgrading	3,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Western Bay	Road Upgrading	1,500	Fishermen's Committee
	Carbonear South	Cribwork Protection	1,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Lower Island Cove	Upgrading Comm. Stage Waterline	4,000	Boat Storage Committee
	Salmon Cove	River Clean-Up	500	Bayshore Salmon Enhancement Assoc.
	Job's Cove	Slipway Upgrading	3,000	Job's Cove Improvement Committee

DISTRICT	LOCATION	PROJECT	AMOUNT	SPONSOR
EAGLE RIVER	Pinsent's Arm	Wharf Extension	3,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Mary's Harbour	Storage Shed	5,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Cartwright	Landing Wharf Completion	3,000	Eagle River Development Association
FERRYLAND	Calvert	Baited Trawl Holding Unit	2,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Ferryland	Community Stage	3,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Cape Broyle	Baited Trawl Holding Facility	3,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Renews	Southside Port Development	6,000	Southside Port Development Committee
	Fermeuse	Unloading Hoist	2,000	Fermeuse Development Committee
FOGO	Tilting	Canopy Upgrading	3,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Deadman's Bay	Electrical Upgrading Stage	2,000	Cape Freels Development Association
	Lumsden South	Ramp	2,000	Cape Freels Development Association
FORTUNE-HERMITAGE	St. Bernard's	Gear Storage Shed	3,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Jacques Fontaine	Rip-Rap and Fill	3,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Hermitage	Electrical Upgrading	2,000	COHNER Regional Development Association
	Little Bay East	Fresh Water Line to Community Stage	2,000	Little Bay East Development Association
	Rencontre East	Community Stage	3,000	Rencontre East Development Committee
	Seal Cove, F.Bay	New B.T.H.U.	3,000	Development Association
GREEN BAY	Springdale	Aquaculture Project	5,000	Green Bay Economic Development Assoc.

DISTRICT	LOCATION	PROJECT	AMOUNT	SPONSOR
HARBOUR GRACE	Bryant's Cove	Multi-Purpose Rec. Centre	700	Fishermen's Committee
	Harbour Grace	Upgrading of Waterline	3,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Bryant's Cove	Elect. for Multi-Purpose Building	2,000	Fishermen's Committee
HARBOUR MAIN	Bacon Cove	Community Stage	500	Fishermen's Committee
HUMBER VALLEY	Beaches	Wharf	5,000	White Bay S. Development Association
LA POILE	Petites	Community Stage Upgrading	60,000	South West Coast Development Assoc.
LEWISPORTE	Little Burnt Bay	Unloading Hoists	1,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Brown's Arm	Unloading Hoists	1,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Brown's Arm	Wharf Project	3,000	Brown's Arm Development Committee
MOUNT SCIO-BELL ISLAND	Bell Island	Slipway Upgrading	3,000	Bell Island Development Association
	Lower Lance Cove	Slipway Project	3,000	L.L.C. Improvement Committee
PLACENTIA	Fairhaven	Wharf Project	1,000	Local Rural Development Committee
	Placentia	Boat Shed Upgrading	5,000	Placentia Area Development Assoc.
PORT AU PORT	Three Rock Cove	Retaining Cribwork Project	3,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Sheaves Cove	Protective Block	250	Fishermen's Committee
	Picadilly	Extension to Fish Plant	19,500	Port au Port Econ. Devel. Assoc.
PORT DE GRAVE	Brigus	Wharf Re-construction	1,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Port de Grave	Electrical Wiring - Gear Shed	2,000	Fishermen's Committee

DISTRICT	LOCATION	PROJECT	AMOUNT	SPONSOR
ST. BARBE	Norris Point	Gear Storage Shed	2,900	Fishermen's Committee
	Reef's Harbour	Multi-Purpose Building	3,000	Reef's Harbour Development Committee
ST. GEORGE'S	Codroy	New Water Supply	19,000	Fishermen's Committee
ST. JOHN'S	St. John's	Rennies River and Virginia River Enhancement and Restoration	5,000	Rennies River Comm. of SAEN
ST. JOHN'S EAST EXTERN	Pouch Cove	Community Stage	14,257	Fishermen's Committee
	Pouch Cove	Community Stage	8,500	Fishermen's Committee
	Pouch Cove	Community Stage	4,300	Fishermen's Committee
	Torbay	Reconstruction of Bridge on Access Road to Fish Plant	5,000	Torbay Council
ST. MARY'S-THE CAPES	Portugal Cove South	Upgrading Breakwater Wharf	3,000	Southern Avalon Development Assoc.
	O'Donnells	Landing Wharf	3,000	St. Mary's Bay N. Reg. Devel.Assoc.
	Admiral's Beach	Breakwater Extension	3,000	Admiral's Beach Local Rural Dev.Comm.
	Mall Bay	Community Stage Improvements	3,000	St. Mary's Bay Center Devel. Assoc.
	North Harbour	Breakwater Completion	3,000	St. Mary's Bay N. Reg. Devel.Assoc.
	Rocky River	Fishway Construction	5,000	S.A.E.N.
	Admiral's Beach	Water Supply to Fish Plant	3,000	Admiral's Beach Town Council

DISTRICT	LOCATION	PROJECT	AMOUNT	SPONSOR
STRAIT OF BELLE ISLE	Main Brook	Upgrading Community Stage	2,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Flowers Cove	Washdown System	2,000	Fishermen's Committee
	West St. Modeste	Scallop Shed Extension	2,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Great Brehat	Washdown Pump	1,000	Fishermen's Committee
	L'Anse Aux Meadows	Wharf Extension	3,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Goose Cove	Wharf Extension	3,000	White Bay North Devel. Assoc.
	Quirpon	Wharf Canopy	2,000	Quirpon Development Committee
	Ship Cove	Wharf Extension & Improvements	3,000	Ship Cove Development Committee
	Great Brehat	Landing Wharf	3,000	White Bay North Devel. Assoc.
	Hay Cove	Landing Wharf Reconstruction	3,000	Hay Cove Development Committee
TERRA NOVA	Cannings Cvoe	Upgrade Fishermen's Centre	2,000	Fishermen's Committee
TORNGAT MOUNTAINS	Postville	Wharf Upgrading & Extension	2,000	Postville Community Council
TRINITY-BAY DE VERDE	Heart's Delight	Waterline to Wharf	1,500	Fishermen's Committee
	Islington	Upgrade Waterline	2,000	Upper Trinity S. Reg. Dev. Assoc.
	Sibley's Cove	Waterline to Wharf	3,000	Fishermen's Local Improve. Comm.
TRINITY NORTH	English Harbour	Fish Splitting & Storage Shed	200	Fishermen's Committee
	English Harbour	Washdown Pump	350	Fishermen's Committee

DISTRICT	LOCATION	PROJECT	AMOUNT	SPONSOR
TWILLINGATE	Summerford	Gear Shed Extension	2,000	Fishermen's Committee
	Purcell's Harbour	Slipway Completion	2,000	T.N.W.I.C.I. Devel. Assoc.
	Wild Cove	Wharf Completion	1,500	T.N.W.I.C.I. Devel. Assoc.
	Wild Cove	Gear Shed	3,000	T.N.W.I.C.I. Devel. Assoc.
	Twillingate	Completion of Boat Launchway	2,000	Twillingate Town Council

CONTENTS

Wednesday, 20 April, 1988.

Congratulations to champion Bantam hockey team:

Mr. Rideout.....	989
Mr. Efford.....	989
Mr. Long.....	990

Statements by Ministers

Newfoundland Enviroponics Update:

Mr. Power.....	990
Mr. Kelland.....	991

Point of Order, Unparliamentary Language.....992

Mr. Fenwick.....992

Lease Agreement with Torngat Fish Producers:

Mr. Rideout.....	992
Mr. W. Carter.....	995
Mr. Fenwick.....	996

Oral Questions

St. Pierre Controversy:

French company preparing a bid on nuclear submarines for Canada. Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Rideout.....997

French company awarded contract on floating production systems for the offshore. Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Barrett.....998

Contends contract awarded without tender and the work could have been done by Scandinavian firms linked to local firms. Mr. W. Carter, Mr. Barrett.....998

Health:

Increased costs for private and semi-private hospital rooms. Mr. Efford, Dr. Collins.....999

Necessity of the increases in light of low incomes provincially. Mr. Efford, Dr. Collins.....1000

Justification of increase. Mr. Efford, Dr. Collins.....1001

Non-payment of Electricity Charges:

Legislative amendments to prevent electricity suppliers from withdrawing services for non-payment during winter. Mr. Long, Ms Verge.....1001
Consider public statements of the consumer representative as representation for change. Mr. Long, Ms Verge.....1002
Commitment to legislative changes. Mr. Long, Ms Verge.....1002

Newfoundland Hardwoods:

Government action to protect jobs. Mr. Gullage, Mr. Barrett.....1003
Suggests government retain an equity position when plant sold. Mr. Gullage, Mr. Barrett.....1003
Why wait until plant is practically bankrupt to sell. Mr. Gullage, Mr. Barrett.....1004

Salmon Rivers Protection:

Outcome of meeting with Mr. Siddon. Mr. Tulk, Mr. Rideout.....1005
Suggests duties of river guardians considered as make-work project. Mr. Tulk, Mr. Rideout.....1006
Mr. Siddon ignoring minister. Mr. Tulk, Mr. Rideout.....1007

**Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given**

Travel Costs Incurred, Mr. Matthews.....1008
Fisheries Grants, Mr. Rideout.....1008

Point of Privilege:

Mr. Rideout.....1009
Mr. Wells.....1011
Mr. Morgan.....1014
Mr. Efford.....1016
Mr. Speaker, reserves ruling.....1017

Point of Privilege:

Mr. Wells.....1017
Mr. Simms.....1018
Mr. Speaker, rules no prima facie case.....1018

Private Members' Day

Mr. R. Aylward, continues debate.....	1018
Mr. K. Aylward.....	1021
Mr. Rideout.....	1027
Mr. Long.....	1032
Mr. Woodford, concludes debate.....	1038

Divisions:

Sub-amendment, defeated 42 to 2.....	1044
Amendment, carried 42 to 2.....	1045
Resolution, carried 42 to 2.....	1046

Adjournment.....	1047
------------------	------