



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 233

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
*(Hansard)*

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

1 April 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

This morning, we in the Opposition received a request to give our consent to the televising of the Budget Speech tomorrow. I would hope that this could be done in the Legislature so that the people of this Province have a chance to see what it is government - now, mind you, I do not think it would be very good - is planning for us for the next year. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the government is in agreement with televising the Budget Debate - I believe that is correct - but I understand that the New Democratic Party represented in this Legislature, the group down in the corner, the roadrunners, have said no to the televising of the budget, denying Newfoundlanders the right to see just what it is the government of the Province is planning for us in the next year and denying Newfoundlanders the right to see what indeed the future is, and denying investors who cannot get into those galleries the right to have a detailed presentation before the Province of what is a very important event in this Legislature every year. I think, Mr. Speaker, it is clear to this Legislature, at least to the government and to ourselves, that the Parliamentary group in this House called the NDP owe an explanation to the people of this Province as to why they refuse to

give unanimous consent for such an important event.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FENWICK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FENWICK:

I called the Government House Leader about two hours ago indicating to him that we would be perfectly happy to see the Budget Speech televised tomorrow as long as he would be willing to make some initiatives to having all the proceedings of the House televised at a future date. We maintain that position and we will, Mr. Speaker, until such time as we get all the proceedings televised.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, just so it is clear and in the record, we were approached by Your Honour, as were the other parties in this Legislature, as to whether the parties would agree to televise the Budget Speech tomorrow, full stop. The NDP did not agree because they wanted strings attached to it. As we have indicated over and over again, at this present moment there would have to be an awful lot of changes made to this Legislature and it would cost hundreds of thousands of dollars to do it. I know the NDP do not worry about money, Mr. Speaker. I understand that. They

would bankrupt the place in two seconds if they could get away with it.

The official Liberal Opposition were prepared to go along with it - one loaf is better than none - if we are not going to get the whole thing televised now, which we are not right now because it would be another budgetary consideration on the day of the budget. But they were prepared to go along with it and argue on the issue of televising the House, or whatever, at another time with their own private member's resolution, in the budget debate, or whatever. They have all kinds of opportunities to do that. But to hold up the budget being presented to all Newfoundlanders, as the Opposition House Leader has said, putting strings on everything that they do, I hope the message will go out to the people of Newfoundland through the media who are here in the press gallery that this Socialist Party down here in the corner, Mr. Speaker, this people's party, is not the Socialist Party of Newfoundland but the dogmatic party of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I do not think that is a point of order. I think it was an opportunity for all sides to express an opinion, and the three sides have done so.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Could I put an additional viewpoint on the subject, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

All right, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMS:

It will have to be a new point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will raise a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

By leave!

MR. SIMMONS:

Okay, by leave!

MR. DINN:

The NDP does not want to give you leave.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I say to my friend for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn) that he and I have both learned not to expect anything from the NDP, so I will not hold my breath for favours from that crowd.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the Premier has put very well the argument which shoots holes in the NDP position, it is called, if you are looking for a little code word to save time, 'the tantrum approach to problem solution'. If you cannot have your way all of the time, you kick a tantrum.

MR. DINN:

Or you run out of the House.

MR. SIMMONS:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, which is one form of tantrum. Tantrums take many forms, but they come under the general umbrella of being tantrums by any other guise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second point, I believe, is maybe a little more instructive, a little more helpful. I hear what the

Premier is saying on the question of cost. I hear it in principle. I hear also what the press tell us, that the cost is not nearly as great as is thought by certain members on the other side of the House. That is a matter to be decided. But I have a suggestion, Mr. Speaker, which could address the problem of cost. And keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier first made his concern known about cost at a time when we thought a change was impending, and so the proposal, then, let us wait. It is only a short time. What is the rush? Now, of course, we know the thing is put on the back burner.

So, I say to the Premier, if the cost of television is exorbitantly high in the present circumstances, would he adopt, and this might go some way toward accommodating my friends - my friends, I say - in the NDP, and God knows they need friends, Mr. Speaker, would he adopt the British model, which would be much less of an expense, and as a short experiment allow audio to go to this Chamber so that television -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:  
- and radio could at least carry audio? Then, once you have that experiment, I am sure that it would be a very minimal cost, Mr. Speaker, no renovations required, to run a few wires from where you are, or from that control booth over there, to where my friends in the press are and that would solve the problem at no real additional cost. I say to the Premier, is that a way around his concern about the price?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I am entitled now, there were two from the Official Opposition. This is what happens in this House of Assembly all the time. You see, people abuse their rights in this House, Mr. Speaker, abuse them over and over again. Now, if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) wants to bring that up, fine, but let us not bring it up now and waste time on it. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to ask me a question on that in Question Period, let him do so. Let us not abuse the rules here. It was a simple question of whether, in fact, all members of this House would agree to televise the Budget tomorrow, full top. There is not agreement because of the Socialists, and that is the end of that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Now, if the Leader of the Opposition on some other point, which is the question of audio wants to do it, let him do it in the right form.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I have already ruled there is no point of order. I understood the hon. Leader of the Opposition was speaking by leave on that particular occasion.

#### Oral Questions

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. the Premier and again it concerns the executive stock option plan of the privatization of FPI. Mr. Speaker, my question to the Premier is under that plan, if it were exercised today, the thirteen executive officers would stand to make a profit of \$160,000. Does the Premier agree with such excessive cash rewards at no risk to these thirteen already very highly paid officers of FPI?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not know how much they would make. It depends on the shares, I guess, and the value of the shares at any one time. I do not know how much they can make. I do not know where the hon. member gets his figures from. It depends on when they purchase and when they sell or whatever. It is an executive stock option plan that is common to a lot of large corporations and I do not see anything wrong with the way it is going now. They do not have control of the company or anything like that. They do not control the company, nobody can have more than 15 per cent. They are managers and they are allowed to buy shares into the company that they are managing and I see nothing wrong with it whatsoever. It is a common practice in the business world and it is going to be common for Fishery Products International as it is for any

other corporation in Canada. So I see nothing wrong with it. How much they will make from one time to another will depend on when they buy and when they sell, I guess.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, I can maybe enlighten the Premier. The 53,500 were available at \$12.50 and today at 1:30 p.m. they were trading for \$15.50, a net gain of \$3 per share. So multiply \$3 by 53,500 and you can see where the profit comes in.

Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier. He talks about the purpose for that share option being to create a performance incentive. Does the Premier really think, Mr. Speaker, that executives, who are already earning average salaries in excess of \$110,000 annually, not to mention the other perks that go with it, really need an extra incentive of \$160,000 in a single day as they could have made from that stock option?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, first of all I do not follow the stock of FPI like the hon. gentleman does because I am not allowed to invest in it in any case or get involved in it. I do not know if the hon. member has, but I have not. I do not know what their price is as of 12:30 p.m. today on the stock exchange. FPI is now a private company.

FPI, under its privatization, went out to the world markets and has raised a lot of money. I think the hon. member for Twillingate, and all hon. members of this House should get down on their knees and say halleluiah, halleluiah that finally we have an offshore fishing company, for about the first time in our history if you go back long enough, that is out of the hands of subsidy from government, that is creating jobs and providing a very stable economic climate for the offshore fishery of this here Province, Mr. Speaker. I think everybody should be singing halleluiah that it is doing so well. That is what we should be doing but no, Mr. Speaker, not some Newfoundlanders. If there is any success in Newfoundland, condemn it and make sure you get somebody to come in here from outside and then we will praise them to the skies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:  
Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary to the Premier.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:  
He talks about Newfoundlanders being down on their own company. We are not against Fishery Products International or the people who make Fishery Products International work sharing in the profit, but we object to thirteen highly paid officials having a cushy deal with Fishery Products International.

My question, Mr. Speaker: In light of the fact that this stock

option, this cushy deal, was put in place to provide a performance incentive, if these thirteen executives exercise that option now, today, then what incentive is left for the future? Can the Premier square that reason with the fact that they could very well exercise their option and there would be no further incentive?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, the whole thing is just crazy and foolish. Not only are some of the executives allowed to buy shares in FPI, so are the workers. They are given them. They do not have to buy them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
They are given them, Mr. Speaker. It is not just to the executives. A lot of the workers, a lot of the fishermen and fish plant workers have been given shares in FPI and can make incentives on it. What does the member for Twillingate say about that? And what would the member for Twillingate say if they bought them \$12.50 two days ago and they went down to \$8 and they lost money? Mr. Speaker, they are taking a risk the same as everybody else as to what the shares will sell for at any one time.

Mr. Speaker, just let me say one more thing. I am an extremely proud Newfoundlander on what this government has succeeded in doing, almost single-handedly over the last three or four years, to make the offshore fishery of

Newfoundland successful. And I say hallelujah to the management of FPI, to the fishermen and fish plant workers to see this happen the way it happened and for all of us to share in the good fortune.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:  
Could I have a final supplementary, Mr. Speaker? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, can the Premier -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member has already asked a final supplementary.

MR. W. CARTER:  
Can I ask a final, very short supplementary?

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, but for that interruption I would have invited my colleagues to applaud the performance. Because the Premier can yell and scream all he wants, but yes, FPI is a private company, but it is privatized under a privatization plan approved by the Cabinet which includes the most scandalous stock option programme ever.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, let us get this straight. The Premier can yell and scream all he wants, but in

the process will he just answer one civil question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
The question is this: Is he telling the House that he agrees that it is proper for senior management - by the way, he says "all employees". That is not right, only senior management, not all employees, I tell him - is he saying that he agrees, supports the principle that a senior management official of this company can buy shares the other day at \$12, sell them today because they are up to \$15, go in tomorrow and buy them at \$16, hold on to them a week and sell them at \$20, and that can go ad nauseam for years? That is what this plan allows to happen. That is scandalous, Mr. Speaker. I am asking the Premier, is that what he says he supports? Does he support that? Does he give credence to it? Does he allow it to go forward by approving that privatization plan? That is the question, Mr. Speaker. Does he support that scandalous stock option plan?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, yes, I support that stock option plan. It is not scandalous, like no doubt the press will now report it because the Leader of the Opposition said it. That is the lowest stock option plan in any company in

Canada, and there is \$7 million worth of shares being given to the workers of FPI. I support it 1,000 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Premier for at least having the courage to express his convictions.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I always do.

MR. SIMMONS:

It is not his convictions I am concerned about, it is the lack of rightness of some of those convictions that bothers me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

The hon. member should stand up when he speaks in the House.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman from Pleasantville, he is right. My physical stature is probably not as high as his.

We now know, Mr. Speaker, what the Premier stands for. Now, will he tell the people of Newfoundland why he supports something that senior management can make a boondoggle on over the next few years, an absolute boondoggle? No risk, all gain, buy today, sell

tomorrow, buy the next day, sell the next day, and make a mint.

MR. J. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. SIMMONS:

Oh, he is back!

MR. J. CARTER:

The token, temporary Leader of the Opposition is misleading the House, not intentionally, I am sure, but there is no doubt about it in my mind that he is passing misinformation to the House. A stock option plan is a plan whereby -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Order, Mr. Speaker!

MR. J. CARTER:

- the board of directors say to certain officers of the company, you may buy shares at a certain price. Now, that does not mean to say they get in on the ground floor, they may say you could exercise an option to -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member is not making a point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was about to ask the Premier, now that we know where he stands, could he explain to the people of Newfoundland why he stands in that



position, supporting the favoured few who are going to make a mint on this, at no risk? Can he explain, Mr. Speaker, why, at the same time, only a measly 9 per cent, \$16 million worth, of the shares were made available to ordinary Newfoundlanders, and yet a certain group of management personnel, thirteen, get this highly preferential deal? Why, Mr. Speaker, was not the same kind of deal offered to ordinary Newfoundlanders, and especially Newfoundland fishermen? Why? And I ask the Premier why because he leads the Cabinet which approved that privatization plan in collaboration with the other shareholders, the federal government. So he cannot walk around this one. The Cabinet approved this. Why?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I agree. Cabinet approved it, Mr. Speaker, and we are proud of it! It is a fantastic privatization proposal. Do not let the Leader of the Opposition say, 'He cannot move away from this one.' I am proud of it. I am out front and center supporting this privatization plan. I am out supporting plants on the South Coast that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition agreed to see closed down under a previous restructuring agreement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Under the Liberal option of

offshore restructuring, Harbour Breton, Gaultois, Ramea, Grand Bank and Burin plants were to be closed down, and today they are open. I support a plan which sees the fishermen and fish plant workers given, carte blanche, shares in the company. And I also support them making available shares to their senior executives, all of whom are Newfoundlanders who have made this company a success. And if members opposite want to condemn our own people, when we can ourselves, rather than having people from away, make something work in Newfoundland, well, they can stand and do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I do not condemn Newfoundlanders for making the Newfoundland fishery work.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:  
You are making your buddies rich, Brian.

MR. FUREY:  
Answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, given that it was the self-same Premier who said in Toronto - and I can probably still get him a tape - three or four years ago on national television, quote: "Some fish plants will

have to close." That is an exact quote.

MR. TULK:  
That is right.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
I am asking, Mr. Speaker, will the same Premier who sent his Fisheries Minister to Ottawa to sign a deal that allowed Harbour Breton, Grand Bank and Burin to close, and then cut the legs out from under him because he realized after the fact that he was doing a silly thing - I agree it was a silly thing; we advised against it in the first place - will that same Premier now, Mr. Speaker, stop getting up in the House and giving his own version of reality and instead, Mr. Speaker, tell us about this shameful deal here where the Newfoundland Government -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Supplementary! Supplementary!

MR. TULK:  
He is asking a question.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. MATTHEWS:  
You got booted out of your riding.

MR. FUREY:  
Order, soccer mouth.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Will the Premier explain, Mr. Speaker, why the people of Newfoundland, through the

government, is losing \$26 million because of the premature privatization of FPI, because of the rush of this government to took after a few senior management types at the expense of the taxpayers, at the expense of ordinary Newfoundlanders, particularly at the expense of fishermen, through a sweetheart deal that practically guarantees making eighteen executive officers of the company millionaires over time? Will he explain why he persists in that asinine action?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, it is the Leader of the Opposition who cannot slither out from supporting a government that was committed to the closure of Ramea, Harbour Breton, Grand Bank and Burin. I was there, I saw it myself and we stopped it from happening. We stopped it from happening, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Your minister signed it.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Number two, Mr. Speaker, what is premature about privatizing Fishery Products International when investors from all over Europe and North America were rushing to take up the shares and an increased number of shares were sold and an increased amount of money was raised? What is premature about that? Let the investors decide whether it was good, bad or indifferent. It was good. We raised all the money, or FPI did, that they needed and wanted to raise. We have a success story on our hands in

Newfoundland, created by Newfoundlanders and, of course, other Newfoundlanders have to condemn it.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the Premier does not understand what is happening here. In this particular option plan, as I understand it, the executive option part of that plan means that certain executives can buy today at \$12.50 and if they want to wait they can sell them -

MR. MATTHEWS:

So can everybody else.

MR. TULK:

No, it is a little different.

- in five years time at perhaps \$20 a stock and still pay \$12.50 at that time. Now, I ask the Premier why is it that ordinary Newfoundlanders who made this company, who bailed it out during its privatization, are being forced to take all the risks while management and the executive officers take no risk at all and are given a cushy deal? I ask the Premier to explain why the difference between ordinary Newfoundlanders and the executives of that company?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, there is no cushy deal. We have a highly successful fish company here on our hands and the Opposition does not know how to deal with success.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the Premier that the executive option plan means that those people today do not have to put up one cent, not one red cent for their options. Now, what does the Premier think an ordinary, hard-pressed inshore fisherman, who has just perhaps made \$5000 this year as his full year's income and in some cases felt threatened by FPI, what does the Premier think that that fisherman today believes about his government when thirteen highly paid executives of that company, with the approval of government, can today pick up \$160,000 with a single phone call to their broker without putting up one penny?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we are giving the same shares to the ordinary employees of FPI and we are providing a stock option plan to the management of FPI. We are being fair to all of the people who are involved in FPI. We have a success story on our hands and the Opposition do not like it and that is just too bad.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier can stand

in his place all he likes.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And I am going to.

MR. TULK:

He can stand in his place and try to deny what is happening here all he likes, but the truth of the matter is that those people today can buy those stocks, sell them in five years time, and not put up a red cent, not a penny. They can sell them today for \$160,000 profit today - the stocks today are \$15.50, I am told, at one o'clock - up \$3.00 a share and not put up a penny. Now I ask the Premier, I wonder was the premature rush - and it was premature in our opinion - to privatize FPI a result of those people wanting a cushy deal and wanting to pull out a fast buck for themselves?

MR. FLIGHT:

Which they did. Which they are doing.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No, Mr. Speaker, not premature. We support it 1000 per cent, as I told the hon. member earlier. We support what we have done in the privatization of FPI. All the plants are open. Work is going ahead. Modernization is going ahead. Mr. Speaker, a brand new plant in Burin, a secondary processing that everybody talked about. We are putting our money where our mouth is and making it a secondary processing plant. We have just about all of the other plants that were not part of the core of FPI, that they wanted to divest, sold and opened. Only Charleston is left, all the rest are sold and opened. It is a

success story, Mr. Speaker. We support providing and giving free shares to the employees, the fish plant workers, and we support a stock option plan to the other Newfoundlanders who have made this company work. They can make money or they can lose money on their shares.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

More! More!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We are proud of the success that we have made out of a disastrous offshore fishery. We are proud that we were the ones who stuck out for Burin, stuck out to keep all of the plants open, Mr. Speaker. And we will go all over Newfoundland praising the glories of FPI because we made a success where there was a failure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier if he is aware - he must be since he approved it - and would he indicate to this House what the average remuneration of the fourteen senior executive officers of FPI is? What is the average remuneration? And in light of that remuneration, does he still feel that this type of stock option is needed as an incentive in addition?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I honestly do not know what the average remuneration is for those thirteen management people, Mr. Speaker. I do not have a clue. I will find out for the hon. member if he wants me to. But I reiterate, again, we support completely what we have done 1000 per cent. We are proud of FPI, and we will preach it everywhere in Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, if the Premier had read the prospectus he would see that the average salary, and some of them would be much higher than this, works out to \$107,000 plus another \$7,000 in fringe benefits. So the average salary for these fourteen executive members is over \$114,000. It looks as though some of them could go as high as \$200,000.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. BARRY:

I ask the Premier, incentive is one thing, but did the Premier approve the payment of salaries to these executives?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That is done by the Board, boy.

MR. FUREY:

Oh, come on, 'Brian'!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

That was done by the Board of the company. We do not get into that.

MR. BARRY:

Did the Premier approve, Mr. Speaker, as a major shareholder of this company, the granting of this level of salary to the executives of FPI?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, we do not get into that. Whatever the Board of FPI approved as their salary remuneration, we do not go through with a fine tooth comb on that kind of thing. We are interested in the overall business plan of FPI, and how it is going forward in the future and so on. We were convinced by that that this was an appropriate time to privatize, and we have been proven right, because there are an awful lot of people out there who wanted to buy more and more of FPI shares, and even go higher than raising \$160 million or \$170 million. It has been a highly successful situation. You cannot isolate the salaries of the management of FPI. Look at other companies of their worth and of their size in Canada and compare what the executive of FPI are getting with what the others are getting. FPI is a very, very large company. Then you have to compare apples with apples. You cannot compare the salary of the member for Mount

Scio - Bell Island (Mr. Barry) with an executive of FPI, because the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island is not even CEO of his own party now, he is not a vice-president or a president of a large corporation, he is the member for Mount Scio - Bell Island seeking to be leader again of the Liberal Party, so you quantify his salary at a certain level. So what you have to do is take FPI, see how big it is, go get another company in Canada of equal size and compare what the remuneration is for their chief executives as it is for FPI, then you will get an idea as to whether FPI are overpaying their people or not.

We are proud of FPI, Mr. Speaker, we are proud of the privatization proposals and we love success.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BARRY:  
Would the Premier indicate whether

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I think the hon. member has asked a final supplementary.

MR. BARRY:  
No, this is my second supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
I thought you asked a final one.

MR. BARRY:  
No.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, I realize it is not a cut and dried rule. I would like to ask was the Premier aware that FPI was paying anywhere from \$100,000 to \$200,000 to its executive members and did the Premier give any direction to the representatives of the provincial government who sat on the board of FPI as to whether or not they should approve that level of income for these executive members and was he aware of that at the time he approved the deal to give the additional stock option to these management employees?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, the people who make up the board of FPI do not have to be directed by me or anybody else when it comes to the remuneration that is going to be provided or approved to the management who work with them. And I would not go directing directors who were appointed by this government and get into that kind of petty kind of way of dealing at a board of directors meeting. When we appoint people to the Board of Directors we trust them, we think that they are decent, honourable people, and they will use their best judgements. We are not going to be interfering into the board operations of a company day by day like that, Mr. Speaker. We trust them, that is why we put them there. That is why we appointed them, and therefore I do not get into that kind of petty kind of thing at all, and I do not intend

to. Now it is privatized.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier as well. The executives of FPI can purchase these shares for \$12 a share and next year, if these shares go up, Mr. Speaker, by 100 per cent, they can still purchase the shares for \$12 a share.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the Premier, is this sweetheart deal, where there is no risk involved, for the employees as well?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, the hon. member knows well enough what the plan is for the fish plant workers. He knows well enough what the plan is for the management of FPI, the hon. member does and all hon. members opposite. And I am very, very disappointed that the hon. members opposite want to try to somehow construe a success that we have on our hands here as somehow terrible. It is not terrible. As I said before, we support the whole range of things that have been done to privatize FPI. It is a big success story. Newfoundlanders are proud of it and it is about time for the Liberal Party to suddenly get in tune with the rest of Newfoundland and support this great success.

MR. FUREY:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:  
I would like to ask the Premier whether he agrees with the fact that the employees have to buy their shares now? They have to buy them now whereas management can wait a year, two years, watch the stocks climb and gouge it for a fortune. If they go from \$12 to \$20 they make \$8 on a share. They do not have to buy them now. And if it goes down they do not have to buy them.

Does the Premier, Mr. Speaker, feel that this is fair to the employees in their stock option participation in this charade?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
The whole privatization of FPI is a reasonable, sensible, sound way to go for the offshore fishery and we support it in total. It is a good deal for Newfoundland, it is a fantastic deal for Newfoundland. We have been able to raise money all over the world to bring to bear upon the fishing industry so that they do not have to dip every day out the public treasury for more and more subsidies. It is a highly successful company, as has been proven by its privatization plans. The employees at the outset were given shares in the company - the employees of FPI were given shares! - and there is a stock option plan for the management as well and, therefore, everybody in FPI can benefit from this success story. The people who will benefit most are not the executive and the employees, although they have a chance to

benefit, but it is the people of Newfoundland who will see the offshore fishery continue to prosper.

MR. FUREY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

I just want to make sure of something and maybe the Premier could clarify. Did I hear him say that the employees did not have to buy their stocks options now, that they, like management, could watch the stocks and see if the rise or fall, that they too can be part and parcel of this sweetheart deal of standing on the sidelines, keeping your money in your pocket and watching the stocks?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the employees, at the outset as part of the deal, were given shares in the company, given \$7 million worth of shares, and then there was a stock option plan for the executive. Therefore, if you balance off one being given and the nature of the stock option plan both groups have done fairly well, and so they should. They are involved in making the company work, the fish plant worker is and the executive is, Mr. Speaker. So both plans, in their own way, were good deals for the employees and the fish plant workers and for the executive. Hopefully, through these two plans of giving shares to the employees and the fish plant workers and to the executive, we will have a highly

successful company. To see that the fish plant workers are motivated they are now part of a company that is successful and want to work hard to ensure that it continues to be successful, and the executives also will be motivated to ensure that the company keeps on this highly successful road. So both have benefitted, and so they should, to make this company work and to continue to be successful and compete well in the world markets.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander. There is time for just one question.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The reason FPI is a success is because of \$25 million of our money plus the sweat of the fishermen. I would like to ask the Premier how does he think the fishermen on the Northeast Coast of this Province are going to feel about the thirteen or fourteen senior executives getting \$100,000 to \$200,000 a year plus being able to rake off millions in a deal that they do not have to put any money in? A year down the road or whatever they can purchase and sell ten seconds from each other without putting any money in and rake off millions of more dollars. How is the fisherman on the Northeast Coast going to look at that, Mr. Premier?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate the member for Gander does not see



that there must be other elements involved. For years and years and years in the offshore -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
May I answer, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
I never interrupted the hon. the member for Gander when he asked the question. I never said a word. I listened to his question, Mr. Speaker, and I would expect him to have enough respect, whether he likes me or not, to listen to my answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, what the member for Gander said in his preamble to his question had nothing to do with the people of FPI, nothing at all, because it only had to do with the fishermen and only had to do with millions put in by the government. How come, then, in the last twenty-five or thirty of forty years in the offshore fishery, they have always lost money and still had a lot of money from government? How come? How come? Millions were put into the offshore fishery ever since 1930 and it has failed, and they have needed money. Fishery Products International, the Lake Group of Companies and Nickersons have all needed money, they have all needed money for the last fifty or sixty years. Now we have an offshore company that is paying us back

money, are paying us back a significant amount of what we gave them, and are going out in the marketplace and raising the rest, Mr. Speaker. How come? That is what I would like to know. How come that is happening? There is a plan in the privatization which gave shares to the fish plant workers, to the people in the union, all the fish plant workers and the other people who work for FPI, given to them, free, gratis, and the employees did not have to pay a cent for them. By the same token there is a plan for the executives and they can make money on it or they can lose money on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No, they cannot. No, they cannot.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Sure they can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No, they cannot.

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

I ask my hon. friends on my right to please give the Premier an opportunity of answering the question.

PREMIER PECKFORD:  
Mr. Speaker, there is the opportunity where shares are being given to the fish plant workers and there is an opportunity for the executives, and that was all part of the privatization plan and it is a good plan, an excellent plan.

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

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

MR. TULK:

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier - and I do not want him to mislead this House - does not understand what is happening here. Yesterday you could have bought the stock for \$12.50 and not have to pay for it, exercise your option today, sell it at \$15.50, and therefore there was no risk involved. That is the point.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member can have his opinion and I can have my opinion. Where a point of order comes in I do not know.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is no point of order.

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

Presenting Reports by  
Standing and Special Committees

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to table the Report of the Small Schools Study Project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In accordance with provisions of the Newfoundland Medical Care Insurance -

MR. BAKER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, for some time now I have been asking the minister to table this particular document and to make available to the House exactly what is happening with regard to the Small Schools Study. The minister had decided and passed me a copy of a Ministerial Statement that he was going to make on this particular study today, but for some reason, Mr. Speaker, instead of availing of that opportunity - I do not know what advice he was following - he did not present it as a Ministerial Statement, after first of all indicating to us that it was going to be a Ministerial Statement. And I suspect the reason is, Mr. Speaker, that this process that he is going through now precludes any debate on the Ministerial Statement and on his position in the Ministerial Statement.

So I feel that because the minister presented us with a Ministerial Statement for presentation -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member is not making any point of order. I just cannot understand the point of the hon. member. He is referring to a report that presumably the hon. minister is tabling. As I understand it, it is a courtesy to give an hon. member on the other side a copy if he so wishes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
He might make the Ministerial Statement another day.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
I have already ruled that there is no point of order there.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, I rose on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A new point of order?

MR. SIMMONS:  
Yes, Sir.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
It relates to the same issue but it is an entirely new point of order.

MR. SIMMS:  
Yes, I bet, about as strong as the other one.

MR. EFFORD:  
It is no good talking to your cousin.

MR. SIMMONS:

It helps to resolve these issues when you have a closed mind from the beginning, I agree.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:  
We close everything we can when he stands.

MR. TULK:  
What abuse! Are you trembling?

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, my point of order will be forthcoming as soon as I am given the courtesy to state it.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
The Minister of Education, Mr. Speaker, knows the long-standing tradition of this House, and he is attempting today to skirt that tradition, so in his absence I want to do something that he should have done. We hear statements on the progress of a few patronage appointments, and this issue of small schools is not important enough to have a Ministerial Statement on it. Is that what he is saying? He is afraid to put down the minister's statement, so on his behalf I will table it for him. I will table the statement.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS:  
Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that the minister must be instructed by the Chair not to flaunt the long-standing tradition of this House.

MR. HEARN:  
Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, two points, last Wednesday being Private Members' Day here in the House, we had one of our members who was opposed in presenting a petition because we went over time, given leave and then the leave was withdrawn because it was Private Members' Day. The other point is, we are always hearing, we do not give advance notice, we do not supply copies of the statement. I have supplied my Liberal critic and also the critic from the NDP with copies of a statement that I will make in this House at the appropriate time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In accordance with the provisions of the Newfoundland Medical Care Act, I wish to table in this House the annual report of the Newfoundland Medical Commission ending on 31 March, 1986.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Labour.

MR. BLANCHARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In accordance with the Labour

Relations Act, I wish to table the report of matters transacted by me during 1986 under the provisions of that Act. This also contains the annual report of the Labour Relations Board and certain other reports.

### Notices of Motion

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

On behalf of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Supply to consider certain resolutions for the granting of supply to Her Majesty.

I also give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means to consider the raising of supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

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

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, I wish to table answers to two questions asked by my hon. socialist friend from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick).

MR. SPEAKER:

Today is Private Members' Day.

The motion is in the name of the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) and debate was adjourned by the hon. the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt). He spoke for ten minutes.

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

When I adjourned the debate last Wednesday I was giving hon. members a little bit of the history of this Province hosting the military and pointing out the importance of this N.A.T.O. base to the Province, in particular, Goose Bay, Labrador. I regret that once again members from the NDP Party are leaving the House because I certainly had a message to pass on to them and I would certainly like to do it in their presence.

First of all, perhaps, I could deal with the amendment that was put through by my hon. friend for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). Basically, the amendment does not take anything away from the resolution that was put forward by the member for Naskaupi because -

MR. FUREY:

It generalizes it.

MR. BUTT:

No, we will still complement and add our support to the resolution. However, the fear that I have as one member of the Legislature is that if, in fact, we had a Select Committee, which was representing all parties in the House to go out and do a promotion on N.A.T.O. in Labrador that, in fact, we could have members, particularly from the NDP Party who would sit on this Select

Committee, but only to change their mind half way through. That could do irreparable damage to any kind of a campaign that we may put on. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, I have some serious doubts as to what some hon. gentlemen opposite may do. For that reason I think the amendment that was put forward by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is one that we can all support.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I am not deliberately taking the hon. gentleman's time, but he does not understand the motion. In the third WHEREAS, on page 3, it says when this all party committee is put in place, there would be a member from each party represented in the House, "and supportive of this development." So the hon. member does not understand what he is saying when he says that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BUTT:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. BUTT:

Yes, I realize that one of the WHEREASES says, "and being supportive". But, I mean, the fact of the matter is that the hon. gentlemen on the opposite House and to my extreme left have certainly proven to me that even

though today they may support a particular resolution, tomorrow they could certainly have a change of opinion. They could flip-flop on it. They have been doing that constantly. For that reason, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the amendment that was put forward by the member for Torngat Mountains. So I will speak no more to the point of order. I will let Your Honour rule and then I will get on with making my few remarks.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, there may be a difference of opinion between two hon. members. There is certainly no point of order.

MR. BUTT:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Now to deal with some of the things that a N.A.T.O. base in Labrador could bring to Labrador and, in particular, to the central Labrador economy that was totally, almost totally anyway, ever since its existence, getting their supply of monies and reaping a livelihood from the military. I pointed out last Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, that we are not breaking new ground here in that the military has always had a predominant role to play in Goose Bay. They have been there for forty or forty-five years.

Mr. Speaker, I want to zero in on a couple of very pertinent points before my time is up. I want to, particularly, single out what N.A.T.O. means to Labrador and, in particular, Goose Bay. It is not only the money that would be derived to the Province and to Goose Bay from the increased military activity, but it is also the tremendous potential there for new dollars in tourism because there are people from the U.K. in

Goose Bay, from the United States, from the Netherlands and so on, it is only reasonable to assume that their relatives and friends and so on would come to Goose Bay for visits and therefore spend new money in Labrador. That is a very, very important point.

Newfoundlanders and Labradorians could capitalize on that considerably. So another very important point in having a full-fledged N.A.T.O. in Goose Bay is the spin-off of a N.A.T.O. base. It would be just great. It would be tremendous for tourism in the area. I can understand the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) perhaps having some reservations about it. He is what I would refer to, as a member of the NDP, the pink party, I would say the hon. member is a passion pink. The hon. member's philosophy is further left than anyone that I know who ever came out of Moscow or Leningrad. I would suggest to you that if the hon. member ever gets control of the reins that he would nationalize every corner store in the Province, in fact, he might even get into nationalizing popcorn stands.

I honestly feel that if there is ever a true socialist or a leftist born in this Province, it is the hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Communist.

MR. BUTT:

When he can stand in this House and speak with some conviction about the good work that Greenpeace is doing in this Province, I suggest to the hon. member that he is stepping on very thin ice. He is stepping on very thin ice and the hon. member will

find that out when the bell is rung and he has to go to the people of St. John's East again.

I say to the hon. gentleman that he had better call in his friends Paul Watson and Brian Davis and tell them to have a full head of steam on the Rainbow Warrior because the Tories in St. John's East will come out and gobble up the hon. member when the bell is rung the next time around. He will not get away with it.

MR. DECKER:

Are you going to run Shannie Duff again or not?

MR. BUTT:

That very intelligent woman from St. John's may indeed take up the call the next time around, but I can assure you that the hon. member will need more than 1,500 votes to save his nomination the next time around because the Tories in St. John's East if they can walk, crawl -

MR. FUREY:

Slither.

MR. BUTT:

Yes.

- anyway, they will get to the polls to make sure that the hon. member does not occupy a seat in this House again.

Mr. Speaker, very briefly, the greatest sin is perpetrated in the House by the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Fenwick). I could see him even representing a St. John's district and having his certain views on N.A.T.O., but for a member who represents a Labrador riding, a member who represents the district of Menihek, one of the four seats in Labrador, to come out against the people of

Labrador - and that is what he has done - he has come out totally against the wishes of about 95 per cent of the people in Labrador when they have an opportunity to make a decent living and he has come out against them, he will be condemned. He has taken his direction from the NDP in Quebec but I want to say to the hon. member, and I am sure he is in the confines of the House, that he does not represent a Quebec constituency. He represents a Labrador constituency and the people in Labrador will remember the hon. member.

So as the Rainbow Warrior sits off St. John's harbour with a full head of steam to rescue the hon. the member for St. John's East, the present member, then I would suggest to you that there will be a car running at the Quebec border to take the hon. member for Menihek into Quebec.

N.A.T.O., Mr. Speaker, offers an opportunity for the people in Central Labrador, in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, an area I know very well. They have few other opportunities. I want to say to the members of the NDP that they have done a great disservice, they have done a great injustice to this Province and to Goose Bay, Labrador, by taking the position that they have.

I fully support N.A.T.O. in Labrador, Mr. Speaker. I think most members of the Legislature have pointed out precisely and exactly where their position is. I look forward to other members getting up and supporting the amended resolution.

If I could trust hon. members in the NDP, then I do not think it would be necessary to amend this

resolution. But I would be afraid that today they may say, "Yes, we will support it," to get on a Select Committee of the House and travel to European capitals, only when they get over there to have a change of heart, a change of opinion, and scuttle you.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member's time is up.

MR. BUTT:

Just thirty seconds to close.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. BUTT:

In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, I think that we can live with and support this amendment. I will be interested in hearing from members of the NDP on what their position is on this amendment. I compliment the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) for bringing in this resolution and to the other members who participated in the debate, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and the hon. the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey).

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this resolution. I must confess though that I did not have any difficulty with the original resolution as it was so ably presented by my colleague from the

Labrador.

The way the original resolution was worded, Mr. Speaker, was synonymous to a shot being fired from a rifle, it went right straight to the heart of the matter. There was no room for any indecisiveness.

The previous speaker said that he was afraid that he could not trust the NDP, he was afraid that they would do a flip flop as they have already done on N.A.T.O. Now I tend to take people at their word, Mr. Speaker, and I tend to believe that the members who are in this House under the umbrella of the NDP are just as honourable as myself, or as the hon. minister or anyone else in this House. I believe that we have to take us all as being honourable people.

Mr. Speaker, if the NDP were to consent to serve on this Committee, they were in fact saying that they supported N.A.T.O. There was no way that they could have avoided this, if they agreed to serve on the Committee, because the first "BE IT RESOLVED" takes care of any flip-flopping, Mr. Speaker. I believe, seeing the way that members of that party have acted in the last few days, it is necessary to put a flip-flop safeguard in place, a safeguard that will safeguard us from flip-flops. I think that is essential. I think it is necessary.

But I believe that the original resolution, as presented by my colleague, put that flip-flop safeguard in there. I think it would be wise for this House in the future that any legislation which we bring in, no matter what the resolution is, no matter what



the legislation is, Mr. Speaker, I think that from this day forward we should always have flip-flop safeguards, otherwise I can foresee that at some future date anything that we do in this House and that we have the support of the NDP on, I could see that they could do a flip-flop again, unless we have those flip-flop safeguards in place.

Mr. Speaker, the first "BE IT RESOLVED" has that flip-flop safeguard in there. The first resolve was "that an all-Party Select Committee of the House be struck, with the Chairperson appointed from the Government side," fair enough, "the Vice-Chairperson from the Official Opposition," fair enough, "with the Committee membership consisting of at least one other member from each party represented the House and supportive of this development."

Mr. Speaker, how a member of this House could agree to serve on this Committee and then do a flip-flop certainly would surprise me. I do not believe it could be done. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am left with the choice of calling a member dishonourable, which I would never do, or trusting him to be an honourable gentleman and to do what he says he would do.

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I am now saying that there was no need for the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to bring in the amendment. Because, what he has done is he has changed this motion from a direct shot, a rifle shot, and now he is taking the shotgun approach, as my colleague so rightly points out, from too long a range, it is scattered.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment, I

would suggest, is probably more in keeping with the NDP. They could probably support this amendment.

This amendment reminds me of the old saying, Mr. Speaker: 'When everybody owns something, nobody owns it.' I believe it is a Socialist doctrine that the ownership of companies be in the hands of the state, in other words, everybody owns it, it is more scattered. Of course, we know the success that Russia is having. They cannot even make a car hold together. They do such a lousy job they cannot even make the radio work in a Lada. When everybody owns it, nobody owns it. And that is what the member for Torngat has done with this particular motion. He has taken it out of the direct field where somebody owns it, where something has to be done, where responsibility is put directly on the shoulders of a Select Committee, and he has taken the shotgun approach, like the Russian ideal, where everybody owns it and nobody owns it.

I do not think, Mr. Speaker, the amendment was necessary. But, knowing the way this House operates, I might be forced into voting for the amendment. Because, if we do not support the amendment, I am afraid that members opposite might defeat the original motion. So, on the premise that half a loaf is better than no loaf, I might end up having to support the amendment, Mr. Speaker. But it is unfortunate that the member for Torngat had to meddle in this, obviously without having put any great amount of thought into it.

The original resolution was put forward by my colleague after he had put a lot of thought into it,

Mr. Speaker. This was not something that just came off the press or came off his desk a few minutes before the motion had to be presented. It is obvious my colleague spent a lot of time on it. My colleague is a native of Happy Valley, and when he put this resolution together it was after consultation with many people in Goose Bay. So it is not a spur of the moment resolution, it is a resolution which was put in place after a lot of thought, a lot of consideration. But I suggest to you, Sir, that the amendment was a spur of the moment thing just meant to water down the resolution and to tear the guts out of it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I stand today in support of this motion and in so doing I am supporting N.A.T.O. Now, I am not the least bit ashamed to let anyone in Newfoundland, or anyone in Greenpeace, or anyone in Moscow, or anyone in the world, know that I am a supporter of N.A.T.O.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

That, Mr. Speaker, is my belief. That is the way I operate. I tend to be up front. If I have something to say to an hon. gentleman, I believe it should be said to his face not behind his back. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if I am an enemy of someone, at least that someone knows I am an enemy. If I am a friend of someone, that someone knows I am his friend. There is no flip-flop. I stand up for what I believe. But I am disappointed, Mr. Speaker, with the way the NDP are carrying on with this resolution.

We know they disagree with N.A.T.O. Now, the two members

here are not the only two people in Canada who disagree with N.A.T.O. They are not the only people in the world who disagree with N.A.T.O. I am sure Gorbachev does not agree with N.A.T.O. I am sure Chairman Mao never agreed with N.A.T.O.

There are millions of people in the world who do not agree with N.A.T.O. That is a logical position for some people to take and they stand up and they say so. They say, we do not agree with N.A.T.O. I would say that Gorbachev said over and over that N.A.T.O. should be abolished. It was his right to stand up and say that, and I agree with his right to stand up and say it.

When our friends in the NDP stand up and say they disagree with N.A.T.O., I disagree with their position. But I never disagree with their right to stand up and say it. So if the hon. members stood in this House and voted against the resolution on N.A.T.O. I would respect their right to do so. But I cannot respect a man or a woman who has no spine. I cannot respect a man or a woman who does not have the courage to stand up for his convictions or for her convictions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Because such a person, Mr. Speaker, can never be trusted, they drive people to the extremes the hon. the Minister of Environment (Mr. Butt) had to go through a few minutes ago. The hon. the Minister of Environment is an extremely good friend of mine. We both live out in Manuels, very close to each other, and I have great respect for him.

But today he admitted that if it were not for the NDP faction in this House he could have supported the resolution without the amendment. But he has lost the respect that he once had for members of the NDP, therefore, he is afraid to trust them any more, Mr. Speaker. Now, when that happens, the whole tradition we have stood for is soon going to collapse. And there is nothing new about that either, Mr. Speaker, because a lot of traditional governments have collapsed when socialism got its way. I can refer, Mr. Speaker, to dozens of governments and form of tradition in Europe which fell under the axe when socialism got its way. So the hon. the Minister of Environment should not be surprised when we see a system of government being threatened because we cannot trust people, because we do not know where they stand.

What I am saying is this: If the members of the NDP had been prepared to get up and vote against N.A.T.O. I would have disagreed with them, but I would have respected their backbone, I would have respected them for taking their stand. I disagree with a lot of things the hon. Premier does, I disagree with 99 per cent of the things that he does, I disagree with the fact that he has driven this Province practically into bankruptcy, but, Mr. Speaker, I have to respect, grudgingly maybe, the fact that he has the guts to stand by his convictions. And I respect any person for that, whether I agree with what they are saying or not, but I cannot respect anyone who scurries out of this House and are too cowardly to stand up and vote for or against something.

Mr. Speaker, last year when N.A.T.O. was discussed in this House the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) voted in favour of the motion. Now, maybe hon. members do not know why the member voted in favour of N.A.T.O. I do. I know why the hon. the member for Menihek voted for N.A.T.O. And the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn) if he is listening - he probably is listening - knows why the hon. the member for Menihek voted for N.A.T.O. For the record, for Hansard, and for other hon. members who do not know the reason, I will explain why the member for Menihek voted for N.A.T.O. last year, Mr. Speaker.

The member for Menihek was sitting there, in reasonably close proximity to where I sit, Mr. Speaker, the N.A.T.O. resolution was coming before this Chamber and the member for Menihek looked at me and said, 'Decker, do you have to vote if you are in the House?' Being a rookie I said, 'I do not know. Ask someone else'. So he asked the hon. the Minister of Mines. 'Do members have to vote in this House?' And the minister said, 'No, you do not have to vote if you do not want to vote, just abstain.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, the vote was called, where you had 'ayes' and nays', and someone asked for a division. The hon. the member for Menihek, secure in the information that he had received from the Minister of Mines, thought he could sit in his seat and abstain. However, when division was called, Mr. Speaker, when the bar was put across, the hon. the member for Menihek was informed by the Speaker that he had to vote. He immediately quit being an NDPer for that fleeting, frightening

second when he realized that people in Labrador were going to have to vote either for or against him in some future election. All common sense just left him totally and he became a total, absolute political animal; all he thought about was his political hide. There was nothing else on his mind for those few fleeting seconds only, 'Am I going to win the next election?' He put aside his principles, he put aside his belief in the NDP, which is synonymous with the belief of Mr. Gorbachev, that N.A.T.O. should be abolished, and he stood in this chamber and he voted yes, he voted in favour of the N.A.T.O. resolution which was passed through this House. It had nothing to do with principle, it had nothing to do with logic, it had nothing to do with common sense, it was nothing but a political animal trying to save his political hide. That is why he voted for it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. DECKER:

Since last year there has been a transformation take place in this House, we now have a real NDPer. The hon member for Menihek is closer to the Tories than he is to the NDP, do not worry about that. His political common sense is more like the Tories than it is like the NDPs. We now have in this House a real NDPer, and Newfoundlanders can thank their lucky stars, because the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) is going to show Newfoundlanders what kind of a party the NDP really is. We never saw the real party in the member for Menihek, we saw a man who was more comfortable in a dark, three-piece suit rubbing shoulders with the Tories than

being a Socialist, which the NDPers really are. But the member for St. John's East is going to show Newfoundlanders just what the New Democratic Party really is, and when Newfoundlanders learn what kind of a quasi bleeding heart bunch of nincompoops they are, let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that they will throw them out of office so fast that even Shannie Duff could beat them up in the Strait of Belle Isle, and the Lord knows that is almost an impossibility. The people of Newfoundland and Labrador will owe a great debt to the member for St. John's East, because he is going to show them what the NDP really is. The NDP is synonymous with anti-N.A.T.O., the NDP is synonymous with bleeding heart small 'l' Liberals, the NDP Party is synonymous, Mr. Speaker, with Greenpeace. I am so convinced of that that I have been known to mistakenly, accidentally slip in Greenpeace when I really meant NDP.

In the last election, Mr. Speaker, which I was involved in in the Strait of Belle Isle, a good friend of mine, Max Short, ran for the NDP and he is no more NDP than you or I. There is not an NDP bone in his body, but he was tricked into running for the NDP. And they were so determined to get him elected, they sent one of their organizers down there from British Columbia. And while he was there one of the workers in my camp said, 'Maybe we should phone Greenpeace headquarters in Vancouver and see if this gentleman has contributed to Greenpeace.' So, one of the workers on my campaign did this; he phoned Vancouver, gave the gentleman's name and was told the gentleman was a contributor to Greenpeace.

Now, not being as politically expedient or as politically minded as I am now, being a babe in the woods, I thought it might be dirty politics if I were to bring it to light so I said, 'Look, let us forget it.' But not having total control of all my workers, one of my workers sneaked out and phoned the headquarters of the PC candidate and within a few days the whole of the Strait of Belle Isle knew that a vote for the NDP was a vote for Greenpeace.

Mr. Speaker, that is probably one of the reasons the NDP did not pull the shores out from under me in that election in the Strait of Belle Isle. But it will never happen again, because the people in the Strait of Belle Isle know that Greenpeace equals NDP, the people in Green Bay know that Greenpeace equals NDP, the people in Nasakupi know that Greenpeace equals NDP, and the people in Menihek know that Greenpeace equals NDP. Mr. Speaker, we owe thanks for that knowledge to the hon. member for St. John's East. I am pleased that Shannie Duff was defeated and I am pleased that Rex Murphy was defeated, because in the ultimate scheme of things, events are larger than people.

In the ultimate scheme of things the ultimate aim is larger than the Rex Murphys, or the Shannie Duffs or the Chris Deckers of this world, Mr. Speaker, and in the ultimate scheme of things, not one second too late, a real NDPer was elected to this House so that Newfoundlanders from Cape Chidley down to Cape Ray, and from Cape Onion on down will know that when they vote for the NDP they are voting for Greenpeace, they are voting for bleeding hearts, quasi small "l" liberals.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, again it is a pleasure for me to speak in this hon. House about such a serious situation and a fine resolution, as amended.

It seems that every time I get up I go back a bit in history, or reminisce a little. I am certainly not an historian, so I perhaps should say to myself, "You are a reminiscer." At any rate, I have to associate myself with Newfoundlanders who, for decades, were always were looking for and needing jobs.

Mr. Speaker, that goes back a way back. It just did not start recently. It is history. I grew up in the thirties and I remember part of them. I remember my father and people from the area going pogy fishing in the States. Today we hear that adage used in relation to people who are drawing UIC, pogy. Everyone has their own definition of it, but mine is very simple; it is a situation where a person receives money to augment or supplement their salaries.

And that is why they went away for that pogy fishing, to supplement their salaries, but they went, Mr. Speaker, because of the problem existing in Newfoundland at that time, unemployment was rampant.

Mr. Speaker, we go from there to

the early forties. Again, there was a world war, as we all know, the Second World War, and again many things happened in Newfoundland. Newfoundland was unique in one respect, in that there were many bases built in Newfoundland and Labrador by the Americans. Mr. Speaker, the people here in St. John's, here in this part of Newfoundland as Pepperrell opened, were deprived somewhat because of the situation that prevailed at that particular time.

Mr. Speaker, the hourly rate for labour at that time in the infancy of Fort Pepperrell was forty cents per hour. That was certainly not a wage that was equivalent to what the Americans received in the United States, by no means, by no stretch of the imagination, but it had to be adhered to because the people on Water Street and in other places could not afford to pay the wage at that particular time, and Newfoundlanders were subjected to a very, very small wage. But the point is they went to work. They needed the money. They had to go to work to make it better in every respect for their families, because things that were inconsequential, were normal in other areas of the world, were luxuries in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, we come from there into the late 1940s or early 1950s, when bases on the Island part of the Province were sort of petering out and a great emphasis was placed on Labrador, the Goose Bay area and other areas in the North. Again, many people like myself went to Goose Bay and worked, the point being that we were given that right to work in Goose Bay. I can look in the gallery today and see a friend of mine who went to Goose Bay with me

in the early 1950s, in the Summer of 1950, to be exact. He could certainly relate to what I am saying, that many Newfoundlanders were down there. Again, it was great. They sought and got employment in Goose Bay, employment that was necessary for survival because of the scarcity of jobs on the Island part of the Province.

Do you know what struck me, what came home to me when the hon. the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) stand in this House a few days ago and talked about Daniel's Harbour? I thought to myself as I sat here, with the N.A.T.O. base in Goose Bay - not saying it would supply enough stable employment for everyone - perhaps the people in Daniel's Harbour who are hurting today could possibly find employment there. And then I thought to myself, our Socialist, or Communist, or whatever you want to call them, friends down in the corner are against this, and I could not believe it. I could not believe they would not only deprive Labradorians but would deprive Newfoundlanders who wanted to go to work. I was flabbergasted! I just could not believe it, Mr. Speaker. Yet, they always come forth as the saviour of the working man.

When I was in Goose Bay and we worked on that runway - I was often out there at night - I saw hundreds upon hundreds of planes in a twenty-four hour period. It was the advent of the jet age, as far as the American Air Force was concerned. SAC was there, Strategic Air Command, and they had thousands of planes flying over Labrador. But, Mr. Speaker, in saying that, there were thousands of people employed in Labrador, thousands of people from

Newfoundland and Labrador who were grateful for the fact that they could work, again to augment salaries they were earning otherwise. Some people even stayed in Labrador, made their homes there.

My friend across the way, from Naskaupi, he made his home there. I will have to say, to be truthful about it, I, personally, I never liked Goose Bay when I was there. But there was not much there then. Mr. Speaker, that was from 1950 to 1953, and certainly things changed after that. I do have a lot of friends who are still in the Goose Bay area.

MR. KELLAND:

You would love it there now.

MR. PARSONS:

I do not doubt, as the member says, that I might love it if I were down there now, and perhaps some day I might go back.

I just cannot understand it. I do not understand why any individual or individuals or organizations, or whatever, could stand in this House, or anywhere in Newfoundland or Labrador, and say we are against people going to work. Newfoundland needs work, Newfoundlanders need work and Labradorians need work. They have for centuries. They have needed jobs since Newfoundland's inception, because we could never supply enough jobs in our own industries.

At one time during this past year the Premier came out against the federal government. He assured people, as if they needed that assurance, that he was a Newfoundlander, that he was elected by Newfoundlanders, that he had to stick up for

Newfoundlanders no matter what would happen after the fact. He told the federal government that they were wrong, that he was elected by Newfoundlanders, that he was there as a Newfoundlander, and he certainly stuck up for the rights of Newfoundlanders as it pertained to jobs, or whatever.

In the same instance our Minister of Finance, Dr. John Collins, told the truth on transfer payments. We were not getting what we should get, not because he wanted to be anti-Ottawa, that was not the issue, the issue was that Dr. Collins as Minister of Finance, and a Newfoundlander, felt that we were getting a raw deal. And as such he told Ottawa, Look, you are giving us a raw deal. It does not matter what else happens, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt about the stand they took.

You know, I was here the other day and I watched the member for St. John's East get up and read something that was supposedly from a church organization. Mr. Speaker, I am a practicing Roman Catholic and when I go into a church I look at that priest and I say, Okay, he is reading from the gospel, or whatever, the gospel truth, and he is explaining it to me. On some other issues I take advice, as well. But on the majority of issues, apart from that, I consider myself to be an individual the same as that person, and what that gentleman brought into this House last week he brought in as an individual. The priest did not give -

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

He had no right to.

MR. PARSONS:

He had no right to.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

He had no authority.

MR. PARSONS:

He had no authority, that is right, to give a consensus as far as the people of the Roman Catholic diocese in that area were concerned. There was no right given to him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. FUREY:

Was that sanctioned by Rome?

MR. PARSONS:

These are not Medieval Days. You know, these are not the days when the priest or the minister was the authority, was the lawyer, the doctor, or the judge, or whatever, times have changed. We are in a different position altogether.

MR. DINN:

They are only speaking for themselves.

MR. PARSONS:

They are speaking for themselves. When they come outside the pulpit, then they speak for themselves unless they are asked to be a spokesman by some organization, or whatever. That was despicable!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

That gentleman knew, as well as I did, that that was not authoritative, to say the least, but he brought it in here in his sleazy way to try to convince people, and to try to bring the church into it, which again, Mr. Speaker, makes me feel that the two of them are angishores.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Angishores. Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Angishores, Mr. Speaker. And if you want some more Newfoundland terminology, they are two sleeveens.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

They will try to weasel in and out of anything. They are like snakes in a pit. It is like an hon. member said one day, you know, 'through the key hole bit'. They would get themselves out through a key hole.

MR. HODDER:

Peeping Toms.

MR. PARSONS:

I do not know about Peeping Toms. I do not know if that would be right.

MR. SIMMS:

Peeping Peters, and party poopers.

MR. PARSONS:

Another means they used to try to transform people was, we will not let the money go to the N.A.T.O. base, we will use the money elsewhere in a peaceful way.

MR. FUREY:

For Greenpeace.

MR. PARSONS:

I do not know, maybe for Greenpeace. Perhaps that was uppermost in their minds. But, Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter of distributing money. There is one option, who gets that N.A.T.O. base, Canada or Turkey? That is the question, a simple question, and you can beat around the bush all you like.



MR. SIMMS:

And colour it all they want.

MR. PARSONS:

Colour it, yes. You can paint it red, blue, white, whatever.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Orange.

MR. PARSONS:

Orange, yes, but that is the issue. The issue is that there are perhaps 2,000, and God knows with the spin-off there could be many more than that, jobs for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

MR. FUREY:

A billion dollar project.

MR. PARSONS:

A one billion dollar project. We just cannot sit idly by and let that adventure escape us. We cannot do it! It is a chance of a lifetime!

MR. FUREY:

They are probably from Turkey, those two.

MR. PARSONS:

I do not know. Perhaps they are from Turkey. But I cannot see any Newfoundlander standing up in his place and saying, 'I am a Newfoundlander and I do not want Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to go to work.'

MR. SIMMS:

The member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is not a Newfoundlander.

MR. PARSONS:

Oh! That may be the answer.

MR. SIMMS:

Mainland thinking.

MR. PARSONS:

That is right, it could be

mainland thinking, mainland philosophy, or whatever, but, Mr. Speaker, we cannot adhere to it. The rest of us cannot sit down and listen to that old guff. And that is what it is, Mr. Speaker, guff, you know, placing the money elsewhere. Glory be to God Almighty, how naive does he think we are? We are going to tell N.A.T.O. we cannot accept the base, give us the money and we will put it into welfare. Oh my, oh my, oh my!

MR. SIMMS:

Typical mainland thinking.

MR. PARSONS:

I was looking over some of the material the Leader of the New Democratic Party voted against. You know, it seems like those fellows are against everything. Mr. Speaker, I thought as I was speaking about a gentleman who is now is vice-principal of a school in Harbour Grace. A good many years ago we were together quite often and I remember him telling about how he worked really hard - he was another Newfoundlander who sought work, who came from a poor family. In fact, he came from Fogo.

MR. SIMMS:

Fogo?

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, he came from Fogo, and to get an education he went to work in the lumber woods around the Strait of Belle Isle. In 1949, when Confederation came in, people in the know said, "Okay, there is a guy down there now, he has been involved in organization bits and whatever, so we will ask him to organize that area and explain to them the situation regarding monies that are available for local roads.

Anyway, he went around the whole area, got the biggest place he could find and had people from all over the area come to this meeting. He convened the meeting about eight o'clock and, as in every area, there was a certain individual known for his oratory perceptions, who was gifted and knowledgeable and looked up to, but Uncle Joe was not there. So they went on with the meeting and about twenty minutes after it had started, Uncle Joe arrived. So my friend went to him and said, "Uncle Joe, later on we will fill you in on what has transpired in the last twenty minutes." Uncle Joe said, "There is no need to, my son, whatever it is, I am agin' it." And there they are down there; whatever it is, they are agin' it. It is a principle with them.

MR. SIMMS:

They are against apple pie.

MR. PARSONS:

They are against everything. There is nothing they are not against.

Mr. Speaker, I was also thinking today, in fact I have thought about it a lot in the last ten minutes, but I have heard that they are over at the university now-

MR. SIMMS:

Now listen to this.

MR. PARSONS:

Listen to this. They are over at the university, or someone at the university, I am not sure of the names of the people, but there are people at the university erecting signs to gain support against the N.A.T.O. base in Goose Bay.

MR. SIMMONS:

What?

MR. PARSONS:

That is right.

MR. SIMMONS:

Shameful. That is a communist move.

MR. PARSONS:

If there ever was a communistic move, that is one. Now, they are losing so badly -

MR. FUREY:

They have lost support.

MR. PARSONS:

They believe now that they can gain a bit of support over there that will evolve -

MR. FUREY:

Did they give the facts, though? Did they give the facts?

MR. PARSONS:

No, they do not give facts. There are no facts.

MR. SIMMS:

Anybody who wants to protest.

MR. PARSONS:

Anybody who wants to protest.

MR. SIMMS:

Using the university students, that is what they are doing.

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, using the university students. I am going to place another thing on their agenda that it is of great concern to me and is of great concern to a lot more people in Newfoundland and Labrador: What is their position on abortion? Come up with that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Get up in the House and tell us what your position is on abortion.

MR. FUREY:

We know what the federal position is.

MR. PARSONS:

We know what the federal position is.

MR. FUREY:

Abortion on demand.

MR. PARSONS:

Abortion on demand. I mean, they do not have a position. Every position they have is federally inclined, federally documented, whatever. So have they the same position on abortion? Tell us all about it.

MR. SIMMS:

Yes, they do.

MR. DINN:

They think they can justify anything.

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, they can justify anything. But they are not getting away with it, Mr. Speaker, any more. The people of St. John's East and the people of Menihek are not going to put up with it anymore. They know the truth.

AN HON. MEMBER:

They do not know it yet.

MR. PARSONS:

They will know it, because every member in this House should make sure that they do know it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, let us all get out

and let us make sure that those people do know, that everyone in Newfoundland knows what those people are all about and where they come from.

MR. FUREY:

Challenge them to bring in the Catholic church's position on it.

MR. PARSONS:

That is right, they brought in the Catholic church's position. I can come back tomorrow with a position from priests, ministers and whatever but it certainly will not be in accord with the message that he brought to this House. It would be to the contrary.

Mr. Speaker, no matter what happens, no matter who is out there, no matter if it is communists, socialists, the Rhinoceros Party, whatever, there is no difference, I agree, whatever, whichever, but, Mr. Speaker, whenever those people get up in this House or anywhere else in Newfoundland or Labrador and say that they are against Newfoundlanders and Labradorians going to work, then I think it is time for everyone to stand up and be counted and say to them, look, you are not getting away with it!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

We want work and we are going to get that work! We are going to explain it to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador and hopefully, in the name of God, they will understand what this House and what the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are all about. They are a minority only supporting a Mainland concept.

MR. FUREY:

Turkey is usually their argument.

MR. PARSONS:

That is right. Mr. Speaker, this is far-fetched. Those people over there are watching this and saying to N.A.T.O. that there are people in Canada really against this project and people in Newfoundland against this project.

MR. DINN:

There are communists everywhere.

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, there are.

Mr. Speaker, in closing I want to say just a few minor things. The majority of Newfoundlanders are predominately hard-working people, and I am talking about the 95 or 98 per cent who want to get work. Sure, we have a few people who maybe do not want work but the majority of Newfoundlanders do and, Mr. Speaker, we cannot deprive those Newfoundlanders of a chance for 2,000 or perhaps 3,000 - and like I say, God knows where it will end - but we cannot deprive those people of the right to go to work, of the right to raise their families in dignity just because of the whims and the yearnings of those two hon. members, one from St. John's East and one from Menihek.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I just want to commend the hon.

member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) for his very fine presentation. It was an excellent argument for jobs in Newfoundland and I commend him for bringing to the House the knowledge that he presented by telling us that people in the Turkish government, and in the Turkish capital, are looking at Canada, and indeed Newfoundland, and seeing two politicians right here in our own chamber, I am ashamed to say, argue against this \$1 billion project, these 1,500 jobs and they taking a Canadian and indeed a Newfoundland argument and throwing it back in our faces and into the faces of N.A.T.O. to disallow these jobs for this country and this Province. I commend the hon. member for bringing that and shedding that light here before the House because that is an important point. What we do and what we say is being monitored, monitored not just in Canada but around the world because this is a big project with far-reaching ramifications so I commend the hon. member on his point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I commend the hon. member for St. John's East Extern on a fine speech, a good speech, I must say. He put the points very well.

I want to support the motion put forward by my colleague for Labrador, Mr. Kelland. It is a fine motion which, I think, deals with some of the problems in Labrador and lays out a strategy in which to deal with those problems.

I was down to the university today walking around and talking to some students, checking out some courses and stuff like that. On a bulletin board I saw a sign which said 'Protest March to Confederation Building April 8. N.A.T.O. Base, Jobs For Who?' I was kind of taken aback and I said that must mean support for the N.A.T.O. base in Goose Bay. I said that cannot be a protest march against it. I looked again - and I should have taken a copy of it but I did not -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Of what?

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
This poster that was at the university and was put up in public. They are trying to organize now a march up here April 8 to go against the N.A.T.O. base.

MR. TULK:  
Who is this?

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
A group of people down there at the university.

Now, I am trying to put - I am not that super intelligent - but I am trying to put two and two together. The only party, as far as I know, that is against the N.A.T.O. base and is politically active in their opposition to the N.A.T.O. base is the NDP so I am assuming, from what I can tell of the two hon. members of the NDP, they have something to do with

that. Either that or they are going to be speaking to this group when they come up to Confederation Building. I can only assume that they will be out on the steps - especially St. John's East - will be out there speaking to this group of individuals - and I hope it is a small number -

MR. SIMMS:  
When is it?

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
April 8 they have got it organized for. They are going to be coming up on a Wednesday.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Who is this?

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
We do not know yet. We are going to try to find out.

I said to myself there can only be one group that is politically active on this. We have a group in this House of Assembly that is politically inactive in supporting the N.A.T.O. base and have shown it by their shameful behaviour in not voting for the resolution to support the N.A.T.O. base just recently.

I saw that poster today and I was taken aback. The first thing that hit me was that we are debating a resolution in the House today which talks about supporting that N.A.T.O. and setting up a support system to help achieve that goal for all of Newfoundland and Labrador. So I see down at the university -

MR. FUREY:  
What time is it?

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
1:00 p.m. I think it is.

MR. SIMMS:

On the Confederation Building steps.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Yes. I think I am going to be out there in front and let them know a few things. I think we all should, as a matter of fact. We will probably try to send them back and give them some more information, proper information.

I was taken aback because I think it takes unified effort to achieve the goals and to achieve a military base for Goose Bay and Newfoundland and Labrador. It is going to take a united effort. It is going to take everybody. It is going to take all members of the House of Assembly. It is going to take all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

So when I see something like that, I have no problem with voicing my concern. Everyone has freedom of speech, but I would wish that they would meet with them and discuss the facts first before they decide to bring people into this. They are probably going to bring people into it who do not really know the issue and that is unfortunate because it is going to be a damper on our lobbying efforts to get what we need and what we want and what we rightfully deserve. So I wonder if the member for St. John's East is the member that was organizing it. He probably has been, as a matter of fact. We are going to try to find out. I hope that is not the case.

MR. TULK:

Is he around the House anywhere?

MR. K. AYLWARD:

He is not around but that is all you can do.

We are talking about the resolution and you have to refer to the NDP because they are always getting in the press saying this, that and everything else about this, that and everything else but they really do not give a position on anything. Again, this is another example of a party that says they would like to take over, but do not have a clue about they would like to do when they get there. The simple fact of the matter is they do not have a position on half of the things that go on around here, especially when it comes to economics and how you are going to pay for it at the end of the day. They do not mind wishing it but you have got to sit down with the reality of it too.

I want to say that the resolution put forward by the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) is a very good resolution. It is a resolution that has a lot of body to it. It is a resolution that sets up a committee that will monitor the situation and wants to improve the lobbying efforts for Labrador in its attempts to get the military base.

I have to bring in also, Mr. Speaker, the NDP position. We were trying to lobby for a sea cadet in Stephenville and he was there about a month but three or four months ago, he called up my local radio station and said he supported the sea cadet base, which is defense spending and military spending for the local area. So he was in Gander and he went to a meeting. He saw the sea cadets there. He decided then he was going to call up my local radio station and tell them he is going to support that. So I said, 'That is fine,' but I also know that that is defence or military spending. I will have to write

him a letter asking if he supports - as a matter of fact, I have a letter going today to all members asking for their support for a Sea Cadet base in Stephenville. So I am looking forward to his response because I see that, again, as another way of flip-flopping on the issue of defence spending in this Province. I call it social spending because it is money that has to be spent in training people. But that is another example.

The resolution is a good resolution. It says:

"AND WHEREAS these opposing organizations have inundated the public mind, through the media and by other means, creating a false and incorrect view of the majority opinion in the Region of Labrador" and Newfoundland - and that is so right, Mr. Speaker, because I think that most people in this Province, 90-odd per cent, the strong majority of the Province, want to see the development of Labrador and want to see employment created, and, employment created for all Newfoundlanders so that people from all over the Province would be able to go there and enjoy the benefits of that development.

I agree with looking at the concerns of other people who are living in the area. I have no problem with that. I am very pleased to see that studies have been done, that the information is out there and that you are taking into account all the different interest groups who are concerned. But you also have to sit down at the end of the day and look at where you are going. We have to very seriously look at our chances and where we are going, and we have to put a full effort

behind it.

When you are trying to put a full effort behind it and you see a group who do not know what they are doing and who are hindering the effort of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, then you really have to ask when are they going to get their positions right, or even look at the realism of what they are saying. Because you have to face the reality at the end of the day. We have to think about the future of our people, where the money is going to come from to support our society, and this is one venture that I think can take in all the concerns of many people and can build a tremendous future for this Province. So it is unfortunate, it is shameful, and other words that cannot be used, to see a group who last year were for it and this year are against it, and I do not know what they will be later. But it is unfortunate that they have put a damper on the situation.

The resolution presented so ably by my colleague, is one that takes into account the expanded use of the airport facilities. One would like to see improvements made there and an all-party Select Committee of the House struck, with a chairperson appointed from the government. It also says to have "membership consisting of at least one other member from each Party represented in the House and supportive of this development"; and I can see why. I wonder how the NDP members in this House are going to vote on this resolution, because they have been screaming for participation in the House of Assembly, screaming for rights in the House of Assembly and screaming for the party status that they have always wanted.

Well, they have the party status and they decided now that they do not want to act as a party, they want to act as individuals, depending on what the issue is. One day, one person of the two is against it, and one day, the other person is for it or against it. I have a hard time, Mr. Speaker, trying to figure out exactly what the party is all about and what each member is all about. We can all have our individual views but there is also a party position, and I think they are going to have a hard time with this resolution again, because, as my able colleague from Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) has put the resolution, he would like to see a member of that NDP on this committee. It is unfortunate that they are probably going to vote against this motion and not be participating in such a committee. I think it is a fine motion, one that should be fully supported by this House of Assembly.

I think the member for Naskaupi has put a great deal of work into it. He has worked very hard and he has been a very strong voice for Labrador. Especially on this issue, he has worked very hard. I think he should be commended for the work he has done in getting public exposure for and public sentiment to the issue, trying to get it pushed forward towards the federal government, and having the federal government do as much as they can with it.

It is unfortunate that we do not have a unified front. I am going to say we do, because the other two, all you can do is go along and hope for the best and hope that one of these days they are going to look at the situation, realize that there is a reality that you have to take into account

at the end of the day, and consider the position they take. What disturbs me most is that while I can have an individual position, you also have to look at the ramifications of that position, the effect it will have on the people. I can have a position on an issue, but if it is an issue that will affect a gigantic number of people and will affect the outcome, I would have a major problem in the way I express myself. I think there is a way of listening to the other side and trying to come up with a favourable reaction when working towards a compromise, even if they have these certain leanings, whichever they are. I do not think we will ever figure them out, Mr. Speaker, because they change so often you do not know from one day to the next what it is going to be.

The development of Labrador is what is at stake here. We have tried for many years to build the Labrador region and to make improvements to the Labrador region. This goal of achieving a base for Goose Bay and for the area would be such a gigantic boost and venture that it would put us ahead ten years in our development ideas and ways. We would have outside money coming in through the process that could give us an infrastructure in Labrador and see it fully developed to its potential.

It is a goal, and I think it is a dream for many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to see that occur. When you see a group of people who do not know if they want it to occur or not, it disturbs you, but you have to go and you have to keep the narrow path and you have to push for that goal. In this House of Assembly we have to keep



this issue alive. We have to keep lobbying the federal government to lobby on our behalf. The more meetings to be held, the more discussions to be held, the more petitions to be put forward, and the more questions to be aired, the better it will be because it will give a positive side to the situation in Labrador. It will push our case as best we can, and with the abilities that we have.

I want to say that the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) has done a tremendous job in doing that. I think his motion should be fully supported by the House. We would like to see this committee which he puts forward formed.

"AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Committee's mandate be to act as a unifying co-ordinating force for all groups and organizations supporting the expanded use of the airport facilities; to the liase at the political level and all other levels, to facilitate, expedite and promote the expanded use of the airport facilities to reach the common goal.

AND BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that the Committee be provided with support staff and assigned a budget, sufficient to carry out its mandate."

I can only have a positive reaction to such a proposal, Mr. Speaker, because the lobbying effort is becoming intense. In the short term, in the next little while, depending on that lobby effort, our results will be positive or negative. I think it is worth the investment for some members of this House to be appointed to a committee, and that a budget be drawn up to help with the lobbying effort, to oversee that lobbying effort to see that

something occurs, and to report to back to this House and tell us what is occurring because too often we hope that things are occurring and we want to see things occur, but we do not really set up the support staff and the support systems to come back and report to this House so we can know exactly what is going on.

It is a gigantic venture. It is a venture that could mean economic prosperity for this Province. It could help us reach ahead and catch up very quickly to other parts of Canada. I think it is a situation where we all have to get together and keep pushing this as best we can so that we see a positive development.

I would like to see the federal government keep active like it is doing, but be more active. I can only urge them to become more active on our behalf because the more lobbying that is done and the more talking that is done, then we will see, hopefully, a positive result. I think Labrador has always felt that it has not gotten enough of the economic gains and monies from our Province. I think this is one way that we could see a good development up in Labrador. We could see them feel more a part of the Province as they are becoming and as they have become over the last number of years, a very important part, a very integral part of this Province and of the country. I think those opinions and those attitudes could change very quickly if we can see a positive result coming from these lobbying efforts.

My colleague for Naskaupi has put together a resolution that takes into account the many concerns of the people of the area and of this

Province. I think it is one that we should wholeheartedly support as best we can.

The amended resolution, I think, takes away too much of the meat of the resolution that my colleague has presented. It is more general than anything else. We can support it but the initial resolution by my colleague is one that I think would be the more desirable one. It is the one that I fully support. It would see an accountability to this House of Assembly of the efforts that are being put forward now.

I cannot emphasize it enough the fact that we have to be unified in our support of this matter. I hope that the party, whatever they are, NDP, Greenpeace, whatever they may be, whatever day it is of the week, that they decide in the near future that they are going to act responsibly and try to put forward a policy that supports, at the very least, this initiative where they can put in their concerns when they are speaking and they put themselves on the record in support of such a venture. It is going to affect many people and their lives in the future. It can have a very positive effect on this Province.

I find it unfortunate that we do not have as of yet that unified body here in the House of Assembly. We have almost ninety-eight per cent of the members who are all in favour of this, and we have a group that portrays themselves as wanting to develop this Province, yet they have not given us one idea of how we are going to do it. A super idea that has come forward, an idea that means the future development of a part of our Province that has not had that

much development, and we see them deciding that they are not going to support us.

I only hope that they do some soul-searching on the issue and that they come up with a compromise where they can support this issue so we can see all fifty-two members of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland and Labrador supporting this issue, supporting the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), all Labrador members, and all members of this House and the Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PARSONS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. John's East Extern.

MR. PARSONS:

I would just like to put in the record that the hon. the member for Stephenville's (Mr. K. Aylward) comments were well taken, and certainly I go along with everything with the exception of the amendment. But, he is a young man and it is nice to see young men stick up for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

That is all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

No point of order, just a comment from the gentleman.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Rural,

Agricultural and Northern  
Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

First of all, I must say that you suit the Chair rather well up there. It is the first time I saw you in that position.

I too would like to congratulate the hon. member for Stephenville, Mr. Speaker, on a very fine speech. He did an excellent job, as he usually does in this debate. He has quite a nice name and when I get him over here on this side of the House in a few more months, he will feel much more comfortable with that name.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) leadership.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

He is going to run for leadership eventually but it will be on this side of the House twenty years from now.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to apologize. I missed the debate last week and I did not get all of the information. I tried to read over some of the Hansard reports there today but I did not get all the debate, so if I get a little bit repetitive, or I mention some things that were already mentioned in this debate, I apologize.

I am very concerned about this whole issue of the N.A.T.O. base and the low-level flying and some of the reports that are going out of this House of Assembly on the particular issue. I can well imagine through a lot of my friends in the Happy Valley-Goose

Bay area how confused some of them might be on a particular stand taken by one particular group in this House of Assembly. I guess it is not hard to realize which group I am talking about.

The NDP members of this House of Assembly are doing a complete disservice to this Province, to their own party members, who - it is no sense hiding your head in the sand - they have grown in support somewhat in the last little while. I even know of some people in my own district who have become members of the New Democratic Party. However, I can assure the Leader and the other elected member, the Rainbow Warrior crew, I believe they are referred to, that the people who would like to support their party for some reasons in my district, do not support their stand on the Goose Bay issue.

The people in my district, 80 per cent of them Tories - I hope they still are - would like to see the Province developed orderly and would like to see the resources we have developed for the benefit of Newfoundlanders which certainly we, on this side of the House, have been trying to do since I was elected in 1979. One of the great resources of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area happens to be a very good air force base which was built by the Americans in the 1940s. What better, I guess, resource can you build on or could you build on immediately in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area but the further expansion of the airport that has been in existence for some forty years now.

The people in Happy Valley - Goose Bay who, if you want to take the low-level flying issue which is all a part of this debate, are the

only ones in the whole Province who are low-level flied over, as I have heard it described, by every single air plane that leaves the base, be they CF-18s or whatever. They put up with and have to endure the major noises of that airport. I would say the people at Spruce Park in particular, a subdivision, a residential area, every airplane that takes off from the Goose Bay base flies directly over them.

I do not pretend to know every person in the area but I have, since becoming Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development visited Happy Valley - Goose Bay many, many times and I have gotten to know many of the people in the area. A lot of the community leaders, the town councils, the Chamber of Commerce, the Development Association people, all of these people, who I have met with and who are supposedly being flown over, supposedly, if there is a nuisance or a health hazard or environmental problems from low-level flying or from the development of an air force base, I have not yet heard one of them complain or object to the expansion of that Goose Bay airport.

They are, I would say, from the people I know, unanimous in their support of developing their region of the Province. They certainly can see the jobs which would be a great benefit to all of the Province, not only Happy Valley - Goose Bay, but people along the coast have traditionally - and I guess from as far away as St. Anthony and maybe the Northern Peninsula - have traditionally worked in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area some time during the year. Certainly when the Labrador

linerboard mill was in operation in that area, there were many people that I know from the Northern Peninsula part of our Province who went regularly to Happy Valley - Goose Bay to work at the linerboard mill, either to cut wood or ship it out and ship it down. That area provided employment at the time for a great number of Newfoundlanders.

We have an opportunity now, again, to increase the activity in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and to employ more Newfoundlanders, whether they be from Happy Valley - Goose Bay or whether there has to be people come in from other parts of the Province. I am sure it is only historical that the people come from Southern Labrador worked in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and the Coastal Labrador people have worked on occasion in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. It would be a great boost to the service sector of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area. Happy Valley - Goose Bay now is the hub now of servicing the Coast, both North and South. This would be a major benefit for establishing more service companies in that area and probably an item that could be overlooked, if the companies have a bigger market in that area, they can spread over their very high transportation costs for food and it would benefit all of Labrador. They could distribute that food at a cheaper cost throughout Labrador. It is not only the direct impact of the N.A.T.O. base and the direct jobs that would be created on the N.A.T.O. base but many, many other spin-off jobs would be created. I know there are concerns and I try to understand them, but one of the big cries, I guess, of the Native people in our Province, and in our country generally, is that they

want more activity directly related to their natural way of life, to what they have been used to. If you had a couple of thousand or more foreign servicemen in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, from West Germany, the United States, all parts of Canada and Holland, people who love the outdoors and who are not used to the great wilderness that we have in Newfoundland, and particularly in Labrador, Native peoples could benefit immensely by having an outfitting operation catering particularly to those out-of-Province military people who will come to Goose Bay.

Now, I would assume that if I had a son or a daughter in the military and they were stationed in some country, I think I would visit my son or daughter, wherever they would be in the world, occasionally. So in that sense it is possible that the parents of some of these military people, from West Germany, Norway, Denmark or wherever, will come to Goose Bay to visit, another direct benefit for the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area and the promotion of tourism in our whole Province. Mr. Speaker, the best advertisement for the tourist industry in Newfoundland, as we all know, is word of mouth. A lot of Americans and Canadians who come here go back and tell their friends what a friendly people we are, what resources we have here, and what a beautiful country we have, with an unpolluted environment, and that brings more tourists. This would definitely happen in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area and the general Labrador area.

We have the caribou harvest in Northern Labrador which is getting off the ground and has been very

successful to date. They could do with a greater market in the Labrador area for their product, and they could increase their harvest and they could sell a lot of their product to an expanded military base. The military people who come to Goose Bay and enjoy this delicacy which is known around the world, fresh caribou meat, would go back to their countries and again we would have an expanded market for another native industry of Labrador, selling caribou meat to other countries. We might need more inspection and permits to export, but it would be another word of mouth sale of a resource of Labrador which the Native people are developing.

So, if we had an expanded base and we had an influx of foreign visitors to the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, that could be a spinoff benefit. If we had the N.A.T.O. base expanded, there is another development which the Labrador Inuit Development Corporation is pursuing, and it is known to most of us as Voisey Bay Camp, which would be a direct benefit to Native peoples. It is supposed to be a family oriented holiday setting and they are hoping to get families to go to this camp at reasonable cost. People who come to visit, families of the young men and women who work at the N.A.T.O. base, would certainly be able to avail of this opportunity.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Is this a point of order you are making?

MR. TULK:

Yes, a point of order.

I am not trying to interrupt the hon. gentleman in his speech as he has obviously put a lot of thought into it, but I wonder if he has put down side by side all of the job numbers that he estimates might be there so that he can tell us just how many jobs the NDP are trying to prevent from coming into Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

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

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I appreciate the hon. gentleman's question. I do not have the full number of jobs. We are trying to come up with some figures on jobs that might be. It will depend on how many people come to visit family members who will be working on the base.

MR. TULK:

There is a method of doing it, though.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Yes, there is. The Department of Development and Tourism has a method of finding out what the spinoff jobs would be for an expanded industry in any given area. It would be very interesting to see why, or how, or what effect the NDP's opposition to this base will cost us in jobs in Newfoundland, not only the thousands of jobs for people who might move in there, or the Labradorians of European descent, but it will cost hundreds of jobs for Native people in Labrador.

There is one group in Labrador, the NMIA, who are vehemently

opposed to Goose Bay for certain political reasons. Some of them are not opposed but, I mean, they have their own reasons based on many complicated issues, not necessarily only low-level flying. But these people would benefit from an affirmative action programme that could be part of the deal of setting up an expanded base. That is not unreasonable. The military do this in other parts of Canada.

I had the opportunity last Fall, along with several of my colleagues, of visiting an operation which would be similar in scope to the Goose Bay operation. It was an airforce base in Cold Lake, Alberta. The activity is at different levels, but when I got there, there were certain exercises on and there was more than ordinary activity. There were many planes there. The Americans had some planes, the Germans had some, and one other country, either Denmark or Holland. But it was a time of very high activity at that base. I was there for a full day. We went out in a helicopter and looked at the practice ranges in the area. The whole airforce base and practice area, reserved land, is bounded by an Indian reserve. I do not know the name of the tribe. But the boundary of this base is right on the reserve. We met with some of the Native people there and they had complaints, as any of us would have with noise, but they were existing quite well. There was an affirmative action programme that was not availed of, as a matter of fact, to its extent, but it was there.

We visited some of the target practice areas. They do, in that area, live target practice, which is not even planned in Labrador.

And, when we flew over that area with the helicopters, talk about environmental disruption! We landed on a sandy site and there were caribou tracks all over it. The caribou were right in the middle of these target areas where every plane came in, and that would be, I guess, the noisiest spot in the Cold Lake area. So, Mr. Speaker, to see that type of operation in existence relieved some of my concerns. I mean, I am concerned about the environment of Newfoundland and I am very, very concerned about the health of Newfoundlanders, whether they be Native peoples or Labradorians, whether they be of European descent or Native peoples. But all these issues that are being brought up by the members - those two empty seats over there, they have been empty now, as far as I know, pretty well continuously since we started debating this N.A.T.O. issue in the House, and this is the second debate that we have had on it in the last little while. But the seats are empty, and they are doing themselves a disservice as well as the people of the Province whom they supposedly represent. I mean, if they would vote against something, I would not mind, or if they voted for it, I would be very happy. But by not voting and not taking part in debate, Mr. Speaker, we send out confusing signals.

Last year, I visited several of the N.A.T.O. countries, our N.A.T.O. allies, Germany, Denmark and Norway. Mr. Speaker, I was fortunate enough to be in the area on other business, and while there with my colleagues, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe), I visited a couple of the defence departments in these N.A.T.O. countries. What I found

interesting in Denmark, where we visited the Defence Committee, was that the Chairman of the Defence Committee was the leader of the Socialist Party in Denmark. He was the most supportive person we met for having this facility set up in Goose Bay. He was completely opposed to Turkey. We were trying to win influence for Goose Bay over Turkey at the time. The issues that are reported in Newfoundland as major issues, such as land claims and Native issues, are not issues in those European countries. They know from years and years of experience in low level flying that the environmental effects of low level flying are not as critical and are not health hazards, as is being suggested in our area, as much as is being reported.

Most of them would like to come to Goose Bay, to this expanded military base, because they see the opportunity of getting good, high quality training on a very excellent facility.

Mr. Speaker, before I clue up I have a notice that I only received a couple of minutes. I found it very alarming today to hear from friends of mine at the university that there are signs going up around the university suggesting that people interested should come - April 8 I believe is the date - to the steps of Confederation Building and protest the establishment of a N.A.T.O. base in Goose Bay. I found it alarming, but it was passed on to me, secondhand information I realize - and I usually do not do this, but it is from a reliable source - that the promotion of this is coming from a member of this House of Assembly.

Mr. Speaker, I find it incredible that a member of this House of Assembly would use the youth of this Province, not necessarily youth fully informed on the issue, but that someone would go to the university and use the youth, idealistic people as we all were at one time, very interested in peace as we all are in this Province. There is only one person in this House I can think of who would do it, the member for St. John's East. I have suspicions that that member is behind this attempt to confuse some of the young people of our Province. Incite is a very strong word, but unless people are fully informed it could be said that the youth in a certain group in our Province are being incited. I mean, it is shameful! It is ridiculous! It is very distasteful!

The signals that are going out from this House of Assembly are very confusing to people who are trying to listen to the facts. The facts are that most people in Labrador and most people in Newfoundland would like to see an expanded use of the Goose Bay Airport. All people in Newfoundland and Labrador are concerned about peace. I do not see a problem for anyone. All people in Newfoundland and Labrador are concerned about the environment. There is a study being done to make sure there are no ill effects on the environment. All people in Newfoundland and Labrador are concerned that there might be health issues involved with this. There are studies being done by the Canadian Health Association, which is an extremely reputable association, to alleviate these concerns.

Also, it is interesting to know that with all the complaints and all the hype we hear about this health issue, there has not been one documented case to the effect that there have been health concerns, or ill effects caused by low level flying, not one documented case.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on forever on this, but I know there are other people who want to speak. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

A short point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

The minister expressed surprise that this brace of socialists would be party to such a despicable act. I do not think that should be surprising, and I would inform the minister of what they did with my resolution when we sought unanimous support on the postal office situation around Newfoundland and Labrador, how they took that and inferred that it was their resolution by mailing it out to interest groups and not stating the full facts.

So, whoever is inciting young people at the university, whether it be this brace of socialists, and that would be a cowardly act in this member's opinion -

AN HON. MEMBER:

A typical communist act.

MR. FUREY:

A typical socialist cowardly act,



an act of cowardice. If that indeed is the case, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that at least they are presenting both sides of the argument, they are presenting both sides of the coin. I hope they are not just inciting and saying, 'Let us protest against this \$1 billion development. Let us protest against these 1,500 jobs,' unless, Mr. Speaker, they are presenting both sides of the argument. They are presenting the economic thrust and the pluses and the positive side, along with this facade of morality that they continue to hide behind.

MR. SIMMS:

A very legitimate point of order.

MR. FUREY:

Speak to it. Speak to it!

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):

I did not realize when I was coming in that there was a point of order. I would have waited for a ruling.

MR. SIMMS:

There is no point of order. The member took an opportunity to express his opinion.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, I want to say just a few words in support of this resolution that is being put by my colleague for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland). I think it is an excellent resolution in light of the antics of certain people who, for their own reasons, would scuttle the effort on the part of the people of Labrador to find

employment for their unemployed.

Like my colleague for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker), I too in supporting this resolution, I support N.A.T.O. Of course, we have seen before the antics of the bleeding hearts in our society, the do-gooders, the professional demonstrators who have infiltrated our society, the fringe element, the lunatic fringe, call them what you want, Mr. Speaker, but they are disrupting in many respects the efforts of a lot of people to improve the social and economic lives of people in Labrador.

I have been told by my colleague for Naskaupi that, indeed, in his district, I believe, he said about 95 per cent -

MR. KELLAND:

Plus.

MR. W. CARTER:

95 per cent plus of the people in that district agree with the N.A.T.O. base being established in their area.

I am told as well that a vast majority of the people in the other three districts in Labrador feel likewise. So what we have now are people, and not the two gentlemen in the Socialist Party, of course, are out front in this, they are spearheading the drives, they are leading the attack -

MR. KELLAND:

95 per cent of Menihek support it.

MR. W. CARTER:

95 per cent of Menihek, I am told, the district represented by the Leader of the Third Party in the House, also favour the N.A.T.O. agreement. But yet, Mr. Speaker, we see people that are being led by these people and others, the

lunatic fringe I call them, the vocal minority, that would threaten and jeopardize the rights of the silent majority.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the time has come, Sir, when the silent majority must take a stand because all too often all we have seen are the minority groups. We are seeing it today in Newfoundland in Greenpeace, and the people for whatever reasons, and I suspect most of them are self-motivated to gain for themselves, these people are threatening a way of life. In fact, they have all but destroyed a very important part of the Newfoundland economy, namely; the seal hunt.

I consider the actions of these people as being cowardly, I consider their actions to subversive, and I say now they are comforting the enemy. There is always a certain clique in our society, and I have seen it in other places, I have seen it in the House of Commons where a certain group, and I must say, and I am not here to put them down, but certainly the NDP appear to be always in the forefront when that lunatic fringe take hold and try to impose their wishes on the silent majority. They have an anti-American attitude. If you mention the word 'American' in the House of Commons, Mr. Speaker, you can see it daily on television, on Question Period, the moment there is any mention made of America or the President of the United States or any attempt made for Canada to try and develop a close liaison with that powerful ally, then you see the NDP rise and they will object to any such efforts. Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious that there is a certain element, and again I regret to say that our two

colleagues from the NDP have become very much a part of that element, the vocal minority. These are the people. The groups who are now leading the charge against the N.A.T.O. agreement in Labrador are causing a lot of trouble and, no doubt their voices and objections are being monitored very closely by other countries that are vying for that facility. I am sure that the people of Turkey, maybe West Germany and other European countries would dearly love to have that facility established within their boundaries. I am sure that they are monitoring the voices that are coming out of Canada objecting to that facility and are no doubt using it to their advantage.

Mr. Speaker, I had the privilege some years ago of serving on a committee whose mandate was to visit eight countries in Europe, thirteen major cities, to assess Canada's future role in N.A.T.O. It was a Committee of the House of Commons in which I had the privilege of being picked, not because I was such a great internationalist or expert on military affairs, but, I suppose, maybe it was my turn for a trip. I was selected to serve on that twenty man committee. We travelled throughout Europe and Scandinavia talking to the heads of N.A.T.O. and others that were all concerned with the defense of Europe.

I recall we went to Sweden, Copenhagen I think it was, and that country at that time was not a member of N.A.T.O. I think it was still outside of the N.A.T.O. alliance. At that time they were very much against N.A.T.O. I think they had a Socialist government at the time, I suspect, yes, in fact, that is why it was,

but to make a long story short, I recall, Mr. Speaker, when we sat around and heard some of the speeches that were being made by delegates to that meeting representing the Socialist government of Sweden the utter contempt that was felt for that country and for those people by the other member nations of N.A.T.O. that were sitting around that table. Their objective was self-defense. That was their only interest, self-defense, and they were not at all concerned with the defense of their fellow Europeans. Mr. Speaker, I certainly do not want to see Canada get jockeyed into that kind of a position.

Something has come to light here today that is sickening. Maybe it is because I have gone beyond the stage of caring too much, but get a little sick and tired, quite frankly, of listening to some of these bleeding hearts. When I hear some of the arguments being advanced by some of these so-called do-gooders, the lunatic fringe, who are against the N.A.T.O. agreement in Labrador, they are against Motherhood and I am losing patience with them. Maybe I am getting old, I do not know, but certainly I am rapidly losing my patience with them.

I saw an *The Evening Telegram* story yesterday, I think, quoting some young gentleman who is here representing some group, I believe, from some part of the Eastern Seaboard of the U.S. against the seal hunt. He was saying he could not do his job. He could not fly over the herds and be very effective in stopping this terrible slaughter, as he put it, because he did not have the money. He did not have the money to engage aircraft.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I think that young gentleman is playing a game and I am sure that most reasonable people see through it because in that little article what he was saying to the other 50,000 or 100,000 people who share his view was 'Step up the donations, we need more money if we are going to be able to carry on successfully our fight against the seal hunt.' That is the sort of thing we are seeing all the time.

My friend, the member for Kilbride (Mr. R. Aylward) and I think the young gentleman from Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) mentioned the fact that at this moment young students at our university are being psyched up by somebody - and I suspect we all know who it is - being psyched up and stirred up to march on the Confederation Building. For what? To protest N.A.T.O.'s presence in Labrador and N.A.T.O. generally. Are they suggesting we should become part of the Warsaw Pact? That is the alternative. The Warsaw Pact, which is made up of the East Bloc countries, is the alternative to N.A.T.O. Well, N.A.T.O. might not be the end all or be perfect but certainly I would much prefer to be part of that alliance that I would to be part of a Warsaw Pact alliance. That is what we are seeing today. We are seeing people who for very devious reasons, very devious and underhanded and in some cases personal reasons for personal gain, are mounting objections and charges against most of the things that most of us stand for.

We see it every day. We can turn on television almost every night and see the professional demonstrators waving placards and going around pretending as if they are the only ones. These people

would have you believe that - and I suspect that our two friends here to my - physically at least to my right - feel likewise - have a monopoly on everything that is good and right.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to cut my few remarks short. I understand that the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) wants to have a few words on this. I know the debate has to be adjourned by the mover. I wanted to end by saying that I support of these speeches on the other side and I must say that the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) made what I thought was an excellent speech. In fact, the member is coming through as being a very responsible and a very articulate member and I am quite proud to see that happen.

So, Mr. Speaker, again I support this resolution and I hope that my colleagues opposite will see it fit to do likewise.

Thank you very much, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands has about one minute, unless by leave.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I may need more than a minute. Perhaps my friends opposite might give me a couple of minutes but I do not want to take up the hon. member's time. I think he is interested in hearing what I have to say on a couple of

points.

I had not been prepared, Mr. Speaker, to speak in this debate today because I have expressed my views on other resolutions at other times in the House. However, when I heard the suggestion being made by members on both sides now, it appears, and the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) was a little bit more explicit as he had talked to some university students himself personally, and the suggestion apparently is that a member of this House, and the suggestion further was made, I heard somebody mention it in debate, that the member might very well be a member of the New Democratic Party, and even more specific than that, I hear that the name that has been floating around is the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long), has been using, that is the only word to use, using young university students over there, trying to incite is the word that I would use, trying to incite them to meet in the front of Confederation Building next week to protest the N.A.T.O. presence in Labrador and the N.A.T.O base being developed in Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I understand members on both sides of the House, at least on this side and from the Liberal Party, are investigating that allegation a little bit further. If it is found to be factual, Mr. Speaker, I believe that this House should take some kind of appropriate action. What that might be I do not know. That is very, very serious, in my opinion. We all do our political manoeuvring. We all talk to students and try to get their support and things like that, but we do not go out and incite them to march on the

Confederation Building to oppose something which the majority of Newfoundlanders by far support and indeed the vast majority in this House, with the exception of two hon. members, support.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:  
Well, it is difficult to say at this point in time but certainly I think it has communistic traits what they are doing and I have said that before.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
By leave!

MR. SIMMS:  
By leave?

MR. SPEAKER:  
By leave.

MR. SIMMS:  
Okay, Mr. Speaker, I will not be too long.

MR. FUREY:  
They need both sides of the story.

MR. SIMMS:  
Well, that is the point. The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) made a very good point in his contribution to this debate when he said, 'I wonder is this individual,' whoever it is, the member for St. John's East or whoever, 'I wonder is he, when talking to these students, telling them the positive side to this particular issue.' I am willing to bet and my suspicion is he is not. He is using the same old malarkey and baloney that they are

using to try to defend their position in this issue. It is clear that their position is indefensible. It is not defensible, Mr. Speaker.

One point that I want to make, just while I have a minute. There is some view out there that the NDP's position on this issue is one of wait and see. That is what the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is trying to put forth now, although he voted for it last year. He is now trying to say we should wait until all of the information comes in on the studies and all of the rest of it. So their position is one of wait and see, therefore, they cannot vote for or against it. Now, that is the position he is trying to put forth and that is what the public thinks.

But, Mr. Speaker, everybody in this House and everybody who observed the NDP Convention in Montreal, everybody knows that the member for Menihek supported -

MR. TULK:  
Could you stop for a minute? Does the minister realize what they are saying, inside of this House they are saying 'wait and see', and it appears that by going out and organizing they are trying to organize public support against it so they can have it both ways.

MR. SIMMS:  
Oh, yes, there is no question about that. But my point is this, -

MR. TULK:  
They are actually against it.

MR. SIMMS:  
Yes. That is another point. But my point is this they are trying to give the impression that they

are not in a position yet to declare where they stand on the issue. That is what they are trying to portray here in this Province. Yet, in Montreal at the National New Democratic Convention, everybody knows that the member for Menihek, certainly the member for Menihek, supported and voted for a resolution put forth at the National New Democratic Party Convention which states the New Democratic Party opposes the establishment of N.A.T.O. operations in Canada, and then, Mr. Speaker, very specifically says, including a tactical fighter weapons training centre in Goose Bay - Labrador.

MR. FUREY:

Did Pawley vote against that?

MR. SIMMS:

I do not know what Mr. Pawley did. But I do know that the member for Menihek voted for it.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How do you know?

MR. SIMMS:

I am told he voted for that resolution and supported that resolution. Now if he did not, then perhaps he would be man enough to come to this House and tell us that he did not. But I am told that he did.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He did not.

MR. SIMMS:

Well, if he did, how can he now stand in this House and say that well we have not made up our minds on this issue yet.

MR. TULK:

If he did, he should have voted against the resolution right here.

MR. SIMMS:

Or voted against the resolution, yes, perhaps, more importantly he should have voted against this resolution, if that is his position.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no way that the New Democratic Party in this House can stand or stand outside, because they will not stand in the House, but stand outside and say that we cannot make up our minds on this issue yet because we do not have all the facts and information. That is a pure farce. That is all it is. They are trying to be in bed with the federal New Democratic Party, and then somehow try to jump in and out of bed, as easily as they can here in this House. So I wanted to make that particular point, Mr. Speaker.

The second point I want to make, if the hon. members will allow me, just one more point. There is an editorial that has been circulated in this House, and I will table it, Mr. Speaker. I want to read from it before I table it. Now this editorial I think hits the nail on the head. It is entitled 'Political Morality'. Let me read, Mr. Speaker, it is a very short one and I will table it.

"Peter Fenwick's pathetic and feeble attempt to curry favour with the rag tag bunch of peacenicks, lefties, limousine Liberals, and Mercedes Marxists from the auto-fish union by virtually writing off Goose Bay is contemptible in the extreme and shows how little the welfare of the common man means to these Socialists when they sniff a chance to make political points in Quebec, the province where fairly or unfairly Canadian Governments are made or lost.

"Fenwick, who last year supported the establishment of a base here, now repudiates this support. Why? He claims it to be because he has obtained further information on the subject. What information, the type which the library a couple of weeks ago advertised as a book? If so, then this is indeed thin beer."

Now, here is the crucial paragraph in this editorial: "Our view is that he was given his instructions by Ed Leftbent," they call him here, "not to rock the boat or do anything which upset the Quebec wing of this fast growing red robin. After all, the chance of winning an NDP seat in Labrador is somewhere between slim and none, thus Fenwick can see no loss by pandering to St. John's fellow travellers and Quebecois allies."

"Come-from-aways like Fenwick always underestimate the innate mistrust of the average Newfoundlander and Labradorian towards our Quebec neighbours and perhaps, Mr. Fenwick, will be sadder and wiser before to many more years pass as he and the Liberal caucus" - I do want to read that part, "help re-elect Brian Peckford for the foreseeable future."

Anyway, I think, that that editor makes an excellent point, Mr. Speaker, and speaks for all of us in this House and the vast majority of Newfoundlanders outside of this House.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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 all the members from both sides, I should say the two parties who have spoken in support of the question of N.A.T.O. and the question of the secure future of Canada and the economic future of our Province.

I have addressed the actions and the attitudes of the other party, the NDP, on a number of different occasions on the question of N.A.T.O. and I thought that perhaps today they would not mount another attack against them. I am a firm believer that I should never pick on someone who is not mentally capable of defending themselves so I thought I would leave that out in this particular case.

I would like to address the actual amendment and the motion because that is what it is all about. I am going to make a plea to the members on the other side to disregard the amendment and whether that is successful or not remains to be seen.

But, before I get into that, in confirmation of what a number of member has said here in the House today on this particular question, I would now like to table the poster that we are talking about. I will table this for the record of the House. It says, 'Jobs for who?' This was taken from a notice board at Memorial University. "Demonstrate against N.A.T.O.'s plans for a military base in Labrador. Wednesday, April 8, Confederation Building, 12 noon to 2 p.m."

Now, I know the government side did not put that up there and I know the official Liberal Opposition did not put it up there, but it came from the Confederation Building as told to me by a number of students last evening at a function, so there is only one other party, the NDP.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Shame! Shame!

MR. KELLAND:  
To talk to the amendment itself, Mr. Speaker, as is proper, I would think, I would like to tell the members of the House that in my opinion the amendment, though perhaps well intentioned, does, in my opinion, remove the teeth from the intent of my original motion. I put a lot of thought into that motion. I put a lot of work into it, I suppose, from the point of view of doing research in my own district with respect to N.A.T.O. and some of the arguments in favour of the amendment as put forth, for example, by the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Butt) where he says he was concerned, and I understand exactly what he is saying and where he is coming from, concerned about the flip-flop attitude of the NDP members of the House.

But, if you look at the wording very carefully, Mr. Minister and other members, it says that you can only hold membership on this committee of the House if you are supportive of the development. So if they vote in support of N.A.T.O. in Goose Bay with a view to getting on the committee and then change their attitude, they immediately negate their membership, so there will not be a problem in that sense. Now, I put that forth for you to consider against your own argument as to

why we should have the amendment there.

What I have found during the couple of years I have been in the House is that when private members do put motions forward, generally speaking the wording, if it is coming from an Opposition member, is a little harsh towards the government. You know, whereas the minister failed to do this, or whereas the Premier failed to do that.

I can tell you and assure you, if you read it very carefully, there are no partisan considerations whatsoever in that motion. Read it very carefully. I know you all have, but consider it again. There is absolutely no partisanship involved here simply because I live the belief that the government side of the House strongly supports the N.A.T.O. establishment in Goose Bay, as does the official Opposition, the Liberal Party. The doubt lies down here.

So, I did that in a purely non-partisan manner. There are no words that would embarrass any member of this House, either on the government side or the Opposition side. I also thought that the wording which called for a Select Committee of the House along with support staff and an adequate budget to carry out the mandate "at the discretion of the House" would give the government all the flexibility it needs so that the costs, which might be incurred, would not be exorbitant or beyond any reasonable level. So that was worded that way for that purpose. I think I foresaw the possible objections to the wording so that is why I modified it to meet what I could see as all of the considerations and all the



questions that may be raised by government members.

The big thing about why the motion was put forth in the first place is that because there are so many groups, let us say, under various Chairpersons, and even though they have a common goal in trying to see or promote the establishment of the N.A.T.O. base in Goose Bay, there is sometimes in the public perception something that says that they do not all appear to be working in exactly the same direction or hauling on the rope the same way at the same time. Now, as I say, this is a matter of public perception. I would like to believe that all of the groups are working in favour of N.A.T.O. really have a common goal in mind, and that is also clearly stated in there, but sometimes the public says, 'But that group over there, that is not exactly what the first group said or the second group said.' So I thought, and my colleagues agreed, we would add yet another very important voice to the pro side of developing N.A.T.O. in Goose Bay if we could lend the weight and the authority and the prestige of the House by appointing a Select Committee of the House. Again, it with no partisan intent whatsoever and I am sure all members will agree with that.

I think I have probably expounded on that particular question and again I enter the plea to the members opposite to consider disregarding or withdrawing the amendment because the original motion itself adds the strength, the weight and authority and the prestige of the House and amendment really only says exactly what we are doing right now. It is my motion exactly, except for the fact that it takes the teeth

out of the original motion and it says if I may read just briefly:

"THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that all members act as a unifying and co-ordinating force" - the rest of the words are mine anyway - "all members act as a unifying and co-ordinating force."

We are doing that now with the exception of the two members on our extreme right, Flip and Flop, the NDP. So this amendment does not really say anything much more than what we actually do now because we all, I suppose, as individual members of the House, are out actively promoting the establishment of a N.A.T.O. Tactical Training Center in Goose Bay. So it is hardly necessary.

If this amendment is passed we can say we have a motion that is very weak because it does not add anything to what we are already doing. The intent of a Select House Committee is to add something and add another voice and a strong voice and a prestigious voice to the question of whether or not we should have N.A.T.O. I ask members opposite to consider those points.

Some interesting points were brought out. The Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward), my very good friend from Kilbride, made an interesting point when he talks about practice bomb ranges. For example, my understanding is that there is no intent for live ammunition bomb ranges that I know anything about or that I have heard about. It is a well known and well established fact that anywhere where there is that type of an area designated as a practice area in a wilderness that wildlife by some unusually, innate

instinct are aware of the fact that humans do not generally frequent those areas.

I think it has been shown, and there are perhaps studies not only in Canada but in the United States and other countries, that wildlife will actually increase and be attracted to areas that are conserved for some reason. By instinct they are aware they are not going to be hunted in there and you will see the multiplication and the attraction of more wildlife to those particular areas. So the argument that they are going to be dropping, I believe they refer to them as dummy bombs on areas like that, and this is very, very dangerous, is just so much hog wash, Mr. Speaker, and members of the House, because that is not true.

I had the occasion approximately five years ago now to visit Kentucky at the time when they were considering an aluminum smelter for the Goose Bay area because of the availability of power and so on. We went down to Kentucky to look at the Anaconda operation down there and we were given quite a tour of the place, not just by the Anaconda people, but by wildlife officials and everybody else. They had a zone around the Anaconda plant. I forget the total acres now, but several thousands of acres of land were in a sort of a belt around the Anaconda operation in Henderson, Kentucky, and in there I was told by wildlife officials, biologists that there were more white tailed deer concentrated in that particular area because it was a conservation area, than any other place of perhaps two or three times its size anywhere else in the state. So that is an

indication then in support of what the hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development said in what I just mentioned.

The stories that are being put out by those people who oppose the establishment of the facility, under close examination, do not stand up. We have seen things and we have heard things mentioned in the House where a certain book was available, produced by the Leader of the NDP, which was nothing more than a few photocopied pages making use of a public library in this Province to get out its propaganda, which is a terrible thing.

We have seen things such as the poster that I just tabled a little while ago that was put up on the notice board at Memorial University to attempt to mislead our students, and my information is that that is an illegal poster. All posters on campus must say who places them there. I could not see anything on there saying that, so that is an illegal poster. Not that that should surprise any of us.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

It is now six o'clock.

Will we stop the clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Stop the clock.

MR. KELLAND:  
Just a few seconds. I again plead with the members opposite because of my non-partisan intent with this. I believe if we make the amendment it will not have the same strength and the same teeth as the original motion had,

consider that. I would not like to see you vote against an amendment by one of your colleagues but certainly withdraw the amendment and proceed as follows.

The end result of everything we have said about N.A.T.O. and the end result of everything we have said about this particular motion will change an area of land which has been in use for better than forty years for one specific purpose generally, once known as Uncle Bob's berry patch, and see that evolve into one of the greatest N.A.T.O. establishments in this world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The amendment is in the name of the hon. member for Torngat Mountains. All those in favour of the amendment please say "aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against "nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Nay.

MR. SPEAKER:

I declare the amendment carried.

All those in favour of the main motion as amended, "aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those against the main motion as amended, "nay".

I declare the motion carried as amended.

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

**Index**

**Answers to Questions**

**tabled**

**April 1, 1987**

*Tabled by Hon. . .  
of the Council, 1987.*

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM  
MR. FENWICK, M.H.A. MENIHEK, ASKED ON MARCH 9, 1987

Mr. Fenwick asked the Minister of Energy to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

1. Q. What are the current salaries for the following positions in Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro from April 01, 1984, to the present day and including any increases due in the calendar year 1987.

- (a) Chairman and Chief Executive Officer
- (b) Vice-President of Operations
- (c) Vice-President of Finance.

A. The salaries of senior management at Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro are established by the Board of Directors of Hydro pursuant to Section 13 of the Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Act. It is the policy of the Corporation not to disclose individual salaries. Salary information is provided on a confidential basis to the Public Utilities Board at the time of each rate hearing. This is common utility practice. For 1987, the overall increase in executive salaries, inclusive of reclassifications, averaged about 8.5%.

2. Q. The salary scales for non-unionized employees of Newfoundland Hydro effective April 01, 1984 to the present day and including any increases due in the calendar year 1987.

- A. Attached are tables providing this information. Non-unionized employee salaries were based on the 1984 scales for 1984, 1985 and 1986 because of the two year wage freeze. To determine the appropriate pay scales for 1987, the 1984 scales were updated for 1985 and 1986 but not implemented. For 1987, non-unionized employees who were sufficiently below their job rate received an overall increase of 8.5%, comprised of a step progression of 3.5% and a scale adjustment of 5.0%. If they were below the bottom of the appropriate pay scale, they were brought up to it plus given a 4% increase. If they were at or above the job rate for their positions, they received an increase of 6% or less.
3. Q. Increases should also reflect any reorganization that has occurred or any reclassifications.
- A. Re-organizations and reclassifications are an on-going process both for unionized and non-unionized employees throughout the whole Hydro organization. These are undertaken whenever necessary and the affected employees are slotted into the appropriate step on their new pay scale or pay rate as the case may be. Over the past two years or so approximately fifty (50) non-unionized employees out of a total of about four hundred (400) were reclassified because of re-organizations, changing job specifications and the like. Over a similar timeframe, approximately seventy (70) unionized employees out of a total of about five hundred (500) were reclassified for like reasons.

4. Q. What guidelines, if any, of the Provincial Government apply to wage increases for unionized and non-unionized employees at Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro.

A. Newfoundland Hydro was requested to comply with the general guidelines of Government over the past number of years and has done so for both unionized and non-unionized employees. In the two year wage freeze period, Hydro was included in the Order-in-Council and applied the 0-0 provision on essentially the same basis as Government for unionized and non-unionized employees.

March 31, 1987

Attachments

*Tabled by Hon. President  
of the Council, 1 Apr. '87*

RESPONSE TO WRITTEN QUESTIONS FROM  
MR. FENWICK (M.H.A. FOR DISTRICT OF MENIHEK)  
ASKED ON MARCH 9TH, 1987

Mr. Fenwick asked the Minister of Energy to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Q. The names of all individuals who bid on a proposal for space called by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro closing on February 23, 1987.

A. Bids were received from (i) Cabot Place Limited, (ii) Comet Investments, (iii) Gateacre Limited, (iv) Harvey and Company Limited, and (v) St. John's Development Corporation Limited.

Q. The names of successful bidders, if any.

A. None of the bidders were successful.

Q. What price was bid on each of them.

A. This information is considered to be confidential by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro as some bidders have indicated that public disclosure of their (unsuccessful) response to the proposal call may jeopardize their ongoing negotiations with other parties.



- Q. An explanation of why the tender period was so short.
- A. Hydro sought to acquire existing office space or space in a facility currently under construction. Bidders, therefore, already knew their cost for such space and only required time to decide whether their space matched Hydro's needs and the price at which they would offer it to Hydro. As bidders were not required to estimate construction costs, etc. a period of three weeks was considered adequate for the submission of proposals. No bidders requested a time extension.
- Q. Why no bidders could bid on properties that are not currently under construction, in other words, why no new proposals.
- A. Hydro made clear in its public advertisement that it wished "to permit a realistic assessment of the opportunities to acquire the space needed through long-term lease or purchase of facilities currently available in the St. John's area and to compare these with the alternative of constructing its own building of custom design". In short, the proposal call was aimed at identifying market opportunities related to existing space; it was not a tender for the construction of a new building.
- Q. Why the lease was for 20 years, rather than the current practice of other organizations such as the Federal Government of a 5 year lease with a 5 year option.

A. One of the facilities which Hydro proposed to house in any space it might have acquired was its Provincial Energy Management System. These facilities must be housed in specially prepared space with perimeter shielding to filter inadvertent radio signals and antenna for satellite communication, etc. The cost of tenant improvements related to preparing such space cannot practically be amortized over a short period of time, such as 5 years and 20 years was deemed more appropriate.

Q. Who were the Panel's evaluators.

A. The proposals received were evaluated with regard to technical aspects by Hydro's Managers of Purchasing, Administration, Properties and Contracts with assistance from an external architectural adviser from the B.A.E. Group. The overall evaluation covering financial, technical and other related aspects was undertaken by senior management without outside advice.

DWM/kdc  
March 30, 1987

GENERAL SALARY SCALES IN EFFECT IN 1987

=====

| <u>RADE</u> | <u>MINIMUM</u> | <u>JOB RATE</u> | <u>GRADE</u> | <u>MINIMUM</u> | <u>JOB RATE</u> |
|-------------|----------------|-----------------|--------------|----------------|-----------------|
| F01         | \$13,800       | \$17,300        | OE01         | \$22,300       | \$27,900        |
| F02         | 14,600         | 18,300          | OE02         | 24,100         | 30,100          |
| F03         | 15,500         | 19,400          | OE03         | 26,000         | 32,500          |
| F04         | 16,500         | 20,600          | OE04         | 28,200         | 35,200          |
| F05         | 17,400         | 21,800          | OE05         | 30,400         | 38,000          |
| F06         | 18,500         | 23,100          | OE06         | 32,200         | 40,100          |
| F07         | 19,600         | 24,500          | OE07         | 32,800         | 41,000          |
| F08         | 20,800         | 26,000          | OE08         | 35,400         | 44,200          |
| F09         | 22,300         | 27,900          | OE09         | 38,200         | 47,800          |
| F10         | 24,100         | 30,100          | OE10         | 41,400         | 51,700          |
| F11         | 26,000         | 32,500          | OE11         | 44,600         | 55,700          |
| F12         | 28,200         | 35,200          | OE12         | 48,200         | 60,200          |
| F13         | 30,400         | 38,000          |              |                |                 |
| F14         | 32,800         | 41,000          |              |                |                 |
| F15         | 35,400         | 44,200          | EN01         | 27,500         | 30,400          |
| F16         | 38,200         | 47,800          | EN02         | 31,600         | 33,200          |
| F17         | 41,400         | 51,700          | EN03         | 35,400         | 44,200          |
| F18         | 44,600         | 55,700          | EN04         | 41,400         | 51,700          |
| I01         | 35,400         | 44,200          | DP01         | 21,400         | 23,900          |
| I02         | 38,200         | 47,800          | DP02         | 25,100         | 26,300          |
| I03         | 41,400         | 51,700          | DP03         | 27,500         | 28,800          |
| I04         | 44,600         | 55,700          | DP04         | 30,400         | 38,000          |
| I05         | 48,200         | 60,200          | DP05         | 32,800         | 41,000          |
| I06         | 52,000         | 65,000          |              |                |                 |
| I07         | 56,200         | 70,200          |              |                |                 |

GENERAL SALARY SCALES IN EFFECT - APRIL 1, 1984, 1985 and 1986

| <u>JOB GRADE</u> | <u>MINIMUM</u> | <u>JOB RATE</u> |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| GS001            | \$13,395       | \$14,943        |
| GS002            | 14,134         | 16,068          |
| GS003            | 15,015         | 17,297          |
| GS004            | 16,142         | 18,527          |
| GS005            | 16,933         | 19,654          |
| GS006            | 18,219         | 21,168          |
| GS007            | 19,428         | 22,754          |
| GS008            | 20,940         | 24,584          |
| GS009            | 22,526         | 26,500          |
| GS010            | 24,083         | 28,583          |
| GS011            | 25,999         | 31,001          |
| GS012            | 28,082         | 33,417          |
| GS012A           | 33,733         | 35,324          |
| GS013            | 30,000         | 36,084          |
| GS014            | 32,501         | 38,916          |
| GS015            | 35,084         | 42,085          |
| GS016            | 37,500         | 45,501          |
| GS017            | 40,499         | 49,085          |
| GS018            | 43,750         | 53,001          |
| GS019            | 47,000         | 57,249          |
| GS020            | 50,670         | 61,834          |

CONTACT SUPERVISOR SCALES - IN EFFECT

APRIL 1, 1984, 1985, 1986

| <u>JOB GRADE</u> | <u>MINIMUM</u> | <u>JOB RATE</u> |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| CS001            | -              | \$23,690.       |
| CS002            | -              | 24,049.         |
| CS003            | -              | 26,980.         |
| CS004            | -              | 30,425.         |

ENGINEERING SCALES - IN EFFECT

APRIL 1, 1984, 1985, 1986

|       | <u>HIRING</u>   | <u>6 MONTH</u>  | <u>12 MONTH</u> | <u>18 MONTH</u> |
|-------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| EN001 | \$25,200.       | \$25,950.       | \$26,900.       | \$27,900.       |
|       | <u>24 MONTH</u> | <u>36 MONTH</u> |                 |                 |
| EN002 | \$29,000.       | \$30,450.       |                 |                 |
|       |                 | <u>MINIMUM</u>  | <u>JOB RATE</u> |                 |
| EN003 |                 | \$32,012.       | \$38,916.       |                 |
| EN004 |                 | 36,555.         | 45,501.         |                 |