



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 18

---

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

Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas

Wednesday

25 March 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

MR. BAIRD:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD:  
Mr. Speaker, I am sure the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward), the member for Mount Pearl (Mr. Windsor) and, indeed, all members of this hon. House of Assembly would like to join with me in congratulating the Capitals hockey club on winning the Herder Memorial Trophy. In addition to that, now that the Corner Brook Royals paved the way last year in proving that the Allen Cup can be won by Newfoundlanders, I am sure we should all join together in wishing the Capitals the best of luck in their bid for the Allen Cup.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
Mr. Speaker, I lost again. It is with great pleasure - not as much as I would like to have - that I congratulate St. John's, wish them well on their up and coming series, and hope that they can repeat for Newfoundland what Corner Brook did last year in proudly representing this Province. I would also like to take the time to congratulate the

Stephenville team which performed very well in coming back and beating Corner Brook, as a matter of fact.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:  
I now congratulate that organization and I want some money from the hon. member. We in the Opposition wish good luck to the St. John's Capitals. I wonder if they are going to get any uniforms. I am not sure if they need them or not, but I told the hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Matthews) to take it under consideration.

Thank you, very much.

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:  
Thank you, Mr Speaker.

I, too, would like to add a congratulatory note to both teams, particularly the Capitals. I also make note of the packed House that was at the Stadium and how that represents the incredibly strong interest in the Province in always following senior hockey and how that keeps alive the enthusiasm for amateur sports in this Province. I wish St. John's all the best as it goes on to the Allen Cup, and congratulate them on bringing back to St. John's the Herder Trophy, for the first time in eight years, and we look forward to winning it again next year.

MR. BARRY:

On a matter of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon the member for Mount Scio  
- Bell Island.

MR. BARRY:

So as not to permit the opportunity for raising this matter to be waived by the passage of time, some time ago I asked the Premier whether there were negotiations underway with the Province of Quebec. It is my recollection that the Premier indicated that there had been not only meetings between himself and Premier Bourrassa but also meetings of officials over the last several years. This morning, Mr. David Mercer, I believe it was, of Newfoundland Hydro, in the course of these hearings that are now underway with respect to Quebec's application to export electricity, indicated that there had not been any meetings of officials between the Province of Newfoundland and the province of Quebec and I would give notice here now that once we have had the opportunity of researching Hansard, we will be raising this matter to determine whether in fact the Premier has misled this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Why did you not just ask a question?

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

I think the point should be raised

at this time that this is clearly not a matter of privilege. The hon. member relies on the word 'officials'. I do not know if Mr. David Mercer said that he did not meet or someone in his organization did not meet. I do not know that. But if the Premier said there were officials, I think the Premier is probably the one in the best position to know if officials did meet or not rather than someone in a Crown Corporation, even though a large Crown Corporation like Hydro. The fact that Mr. Mercer does not know that officials met or did not meet is really meaningless, so I do not think there is a point of privilege here.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I hear what the gentleman from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) is saying, but surely he missed the point of my colleague for Mount Scio - Bell Island (Mr Barry) in which he was not submitting that he wanted now to launch into a case on which you could make a decision as to whether it is a prima facie case of privilege at all. He rose, as is his right in the Chamber, to give notice and you cannot take away a member's right to give notice. If the gentleman for St. John's South wants to debate the merits of the case, he will do that at such time as the gentleman for Mount Scio - Bell Island brings forth the case in the House. So it seems to me the

matter ought to have ended when the gentleman for Mount Scio - Bell Island sat down.

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the new Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons) on his new position. We had a democratic process take place in the Liberal caucus. One presumes it was a democratic process, and we have seen the result. So we wish him well for the first five or six minutes in his job. But I do have to make this point, that I think the Leader of the Opposition did make a somewhat incorrect statement there.

To my recollection, the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) rose on a point of privilege. Those were his words. He did not rise to give notice of a point of privilege, he said, "Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege," or words to that effect.

MR. SIMMS:  
Anyway it is up to the Speaker, so it is not worth belabouring.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Just to clarify the point, Hansard will show exactly what the member for Mount Scio did say. If the hon. gentleman did not hear it correctly, then he should listen more closely. Because what the member for Mount Scio actually

said was that he was giving notice of his intent to raise a point of privilege if and when the research that he had to carry out showed, indeed, that he believed the Premier had misled the House.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of privilege, I will wait until I hear some further information on that matter.

Before we get to Statements by Ministers, I have not had the opportunity of drawing the hon. member for Windsor - Buchan's (Mr. Flight) attention to words he stated here on, I think, Thursday last. The Chair, on occasion, finds it difficult to hear what members are saying if another member is speaking, because it is frequently an aside from one member to another. But I did check Hansard and I see that the hon. member did, on three occasions, say that the hon. Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) was lying. So I would ask him to withdraw the statement.

MR. FLIGHT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I resorted to that particular tactic, I think, to draw attention to what, to me, was a very important concern to my constituents. I withdraw without equivocation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

#### Statements by Ministers

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Forest

Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I have a brief but important statement. Today I want to advise the House that my department has issued export permits to two companies that will see the shipment of some 7,100 cords of pulpwood to overseas markets during the next year or so.

A permit for the export of 4,500 cords has been issued to Eastern Wood Harvesters Ltd. of Lewisporte and a permit for 2,600 cords has been issued to Terpstra Management Ltd. of Goose Bay.

Mr. Speaker, these two companies will obtain the wood from Forestry Management Unit 2, which takes in the Bonavista Peninsula. The wood will be purchased from local operators who are engaged in intergrated sawmill-pulpwood enterprises. This, incidentally, includes sawmillers, Mr. Speaker, in the Terra Nova district area, the Bonavista South district area, and the Trinity North district area.

There are a number of benefits, Mr. Speaker, to the arrangements on which the export permits are based. As I have explained to hon. members on previous occasions, our forest management policy requires that commercial sawmillers harvest all wood, not just sawlogs, in timber stands which have been allocated to them. The requirement to harvest all wood is a condition of commercial sawmilling licences. There are several reasons for this, Mr. Speaker, including efficient utilization of the resource, it also leaves the site clear, of course, for future silvicultural treatments.

What happens as a result of the clearcutting requirement is that sawmillers build up a stock of wood that is too small for sawlogs but which is suitable for pulpwood. Our policy of allowing the export of this wood therefore gives these sawmillers a market that otherwise might not exist, especially in areas far removed from our three pulp and paper mills.

The other major benefit is, of course, creation of jobs or extension of existing employment, especially in harvesting and transporting this pulpwood.

The number of jobs to be created, Mr. Speaker, as a result of these two particular export permits may, of course, vary in relation to how long the companies take to purchase and assemble the wood. However, Mr. Speaker, we estimate that about forty-five jobs will result, as well as additional employment in loading the wood aboard ships. So, whilst it might sound like housekeeping to the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), I think it is clearly significant to the economy of those areas.

I am pleased to be able to inform the House, Mr. Speaker, about these two projects, as it clearly illustrates that the government is following good forest management practices while adding to the local economy in a significant way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker, the Opposition obviously welcomes these two projects. We hope the minister is right in his higher figure, forty. We welcome the jobs that have been created. I might say to the minister, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the export of timber, there is a good argument being made that because of the enormous amount of timber stands in this Province that been attacked over the years by the budworm, and latterly the hemlock looper, but is not dead, it is still useful as pulp or as sawlogs, that maybe one of the things he should look at is the possibility of salvaging it, making sure it is not a loss to the economy. And if you can find a market to export that wood, that is the way we should go. Because even though the paper companies, themselves, are doing the best they can to salvage the infected, the moribund wood, they, in their normal requirement for logs, will never cut it and, therefore, that type of timber will never be utilized. I would suggest to the minister that he look very seriously at that as a solution to some of the dead stands or the dying stands we have in our forests.

I would suggest also in closing, Mr. Speaker, that this Opposition is very much looking forward to a new F.E.S.P. programme. We understand at this point in time the minister is not having that much luck in getting a F.E.S.P. programme which, in effect, would create a lot more jobs than he is talking about here, and the benefits of which our forest badly needs in order to enhance and to improve the stands that we have. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, I also welcome the minister's announcement. The kind of details that the minister has given about this programme suggests a fairly imaginative approach on government's part in giving assistance to sawmillers, in part, by applying the requirements that the minister has outlined, by assisting them in finding markets and encouraging export and, with those requirements, also looking toward future projects when sites are cleared. So we would hope that this announcement is an indication of an intention to integrate programmes wherever possible to assist not only in harvesting and management and providing jobs, but to plan for the long-term continuous development of the resource in areas where people are developing this programme. Thank you.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, as we approach the end of the 1986-1987 fiscal year, I would like to take this opportunity to provide hon. members of the House and the general public with a status report on our 1986-1987 Provincial Job Creation programme.

Mr. Speaker, in December of 1986 the Province withdrew from the job development portion of the Canadian Jobs Strategy programme, for both the remainder of the 1986-1987 fiscal year and the 1987-1988 fiscal year. My department did, however, continue to fully co-operate with the federal government in the delivery of other programmes under the Canadian Jobs Strategy and offered suggestions and priorities in terms of training and job creation.

Three of the programmes we participated in on a 90/10 cost-sharing basis with the federal government, specifically, the job entry, skill investment and skill shortages programmes, provided a number employment and training opportunities for Newfoundlanders.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that the decision to deliver our own Job Creation programme was made to complement federal government programmes, as is done in many other provinces.

Upon agreement to establish a Provincial Job Creation programme, a committee of Cabinet ministers was formed consisting of the hon. the Ministers of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development, Forest Resources and Lands, and Mines and Energy, with myself as Chairman, to review proposals for Job Creation. Monies targetted for job development, together with any funds remaining in the budget of the Department of Career Development and Advanced Studies, was redirected to the Provincial Job Creation programme.

Mr. Speaker, recognizing the urgent need for job creation projects right across the

Province, an "All out" effort was made to ensure that these funds, allocated for the creation of jobs, was shared between all electoral districts as equally as possible.

Toward this end, our attempts to regionally distribute these employment opportunities enabled many communities in various locations throughout the Province to participate in and benefit from our 1986-1987 Job Creation programme.

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure today to report that our Provincial Job Creation programme for 1986-1987 was a tremendous success. To date, 166 projects have been approved, placing the total dollar value of approved projects at \$2,561,000. Through these projects, 539 jobs have been created.

Mr. Speaker, this government is ever cognizant of the need to create jobs in this Province and we will continue to work diligently towards improving and enhancing Job Creation programmes.

As outlined in the Throne Speech at the opening of this session of the House of Assembly government will, over the coming months, be introducing a comprehensive Job Creation programme for 1987-1988.

On March 13th the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands announced the first of the approved projects under our 1987-1988 Job Creation programme. The \$1.3 million worth of funding approved for these forestry job creation projects will create some 200 jobs.

Mr. Speaker, the success of our 1986-87 provincial job creation

programme and the expediency with which we have introduced the first phase of our 1987-88 provincial job creation programme is indicative of the high priority this government has placed on job creation and our firm commitment to get job creation projects approved and in place as expeditiously as possible.

Thank you.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the statement contains three words that need brief comment and that, when commented upon, might reveal or expose the ruse in this whole statement.

The first one is 'withdrew': 'The province withdrew from the job development portion of the Canadian job strategy programme.' In that sentence, and in that word particularly, lies a whole story. We were onto it yesterday in the House with the Premier in Question Period; Premier Don Getty talked about it the other day when he said he might have to split the two wings of the Tory party in Alberta. It is not enough, I say to the minister and the administration he is a part of, to talk in closet terms, almost, about what is happening in terms of the relationship. The relationship is hurting our ability here in this Province to create job opportunities and it is time, Mr. Speaker, that they got off the withdrawing act and got on to trying to get together with that motley host up in Ottawa,

until they are run of the office in the next election.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the second word in this statement that bears some comment is 'cognizant'. My background is Salvation Army, and if I were in the Salvation Army they would say halleluia to that one. Halleluia! They are cognizant finally of the need to create jobs. Well, it is about time. It is just about time, after fifteen years. Now, Mr. Speaker, after they got some cognizance, now that they have achieved cognizance, let us pray and hope they do something about the new insight they just discovered.

The third word, Mr. Speaker, in this text is the biggest mockery of all, it is the word 'success'. How can anybody in that administration say the following with a straight face? 'The success of our 1986-87 provincial job creation programme, etc.' Go out and ask, I say to the Minister of Career Development and Advanced Studies (Mr. Power), who, I said publicly the other day, by the way, is a half decent fellow, he is a nice fellow, but he also has to answer, Mr. Speaker, for the lack of success of his efforts at advocating more jobs for the people of Newfoundland, money for more jobs. He has got to answer for more money for the university and so on, but I will stay on jobs. I say to him he should not throw his English language around so loosely when he talks here about the success. What an absolute mockery! What an insult to the thousands of people out there who are walking around thanks to the malaise and the incompetence and the callousness of this particular government.



SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We welcome the statement from the hon. minister if not because of its content, certainly we welcome it as an attempt to clarify the position of this government with reference to job creation. There has been some confusion and some concerns expressed as to what exactly this government has in the way of programmes for job creation. Since I have been sitting in this hon. Chamber, since the past Christmas, I have been trying to understand the implication of being invited to participate in the job creation programme which the minister has addressed here.

What he calls a successful job creation programme was, I think, successful in as much as the provincial government was scrambling in a very ad hoc fashion to spend some money before the fiscal year ended to put some jobs in place. I would honestly say that I appreciated the invitation from the minister to have input into job proposals that had come from my district as, I believe, all hon. members were invited. Beyond that, at the time of providing that input I had real concerns of whether this was the way the minister would be carrying out all government programmes for job creation, by inviting members of the House, in a very ad hoc fashion, to provide input on what

were originally federal proposals.

So I would say we would look forward to the next statement from the minister outlining the intentions of this government.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. LONG:  
If I may have leave for a minute to conclude my remarks?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
No. No.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to hear the hon. the member for St. John's East comment on job creation, job development, and his interest in developing jobs. A few days ago, Mr. Speaker, you will recall, we had a very important debate in this Assembly. At the time, there was an agreement that the debate would be concluded but that we would have the vote on the debate at an appropriate time, when all parties were represented in the House, so as to give everybody an opportunity to indicate what their position would be with respect to a vote.

With respect to that decision and that deferral, I wonder if we might have consideration of the House now to consider the vote on that particular resolution, Motion 1.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
There he goes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
We, of course, on this side would give unanimous consent to the resolution, the motion being called now, and I want to say to the road runner from St. John's East that we are soon going to get him one of those little things which goes beep, beep. In case he does not know the rules of the House, the Acting Government House Leader should have perhaps pointed this out to him, that he could have at least stayed for the voice vote.

MR. SIMMONS:  
He is listening. Tell him.

MR. TULK:  
I suppose he is out there now drinking his coffee and listening. He could have at least waited for the voice count and left on Division, when that came about.

MR. BARRY:  
You are not trying to trick him, are you?

MR. TULK:  
No, we are not trying to trick him. We are just trying to see where the hon. gentleman stands, because we are not sure. Last year his leader voted for this resolution, now he is not sure what he is going to do and the hon. gentleman has scurried out of this House twice. Well, I say to

him, Mr. Speaker, that he can run but he cannot hide.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:  
Mr. Speaker, in retrospect, considering the fact that the intention of the House as I read it, at least those who are here, is that that particular vote be taken when all parties are represented. Perhaps it might be wiser to hold off and call it at another occasion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, perhaps Your Honour could clarify. It is my understanding that Your Honour earlier indicated a willingness to recognize a third party in the House. I am wondering now, if this motion continues to hang over the heads of this third party to the extent that they never show up in the House, would Your Honour be prepared to reconsider whether in fact there is a third party in the House?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I believe there is a point of order before the Chair relating to the status of the NDP representation in the House and I think it is a very cogent point. I mean, if the objective of having parties in the House is to give them particular opportunities to take part in the proceedings of the House, and if a group which are extended the privilege of having particular privileges so they can participate but then they refuse to participate, surely the privilege should be withdrawn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, if Your Honour does not feel 'withdrawn' is the right word, negate it. I mean, it was extended and it was refused so that it goes by the board. So, I would support the thought behind that motion.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I think we are on a point of order at the moment by the hon. the member for Mount Scio.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order raised by my colleague from Mount Scio - Bell Island. We have

watched the last few minutes and I believe the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Long) has had ample opportunity. However, the gentleman from Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) is not here. I understand he is on some district responsibilities in his riding, and that is fair ball. I would say to the acting House Leader, though, that we ought not to carry this on indefinitely. We should not call the vote today. But I believe they have been given ample opportunity. I think we should call the vote when they are next in the House. If they break speed limits again getting out of here, well, I say that is on their heads, not the head of the gentleman from Grand Falls (Mr. Simms).

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think the second point I want to make might more properly be raised as a separate issue but, since it relates to the one before the House now, let me say this: I have seen today, Sir, and I saw it yesterday afternoon for the first time, as many in this House have, and I have watched Chambers here and elsewhere, and I have never seen the like of what we have witnessed here today. We can laugh at it and so on, but put it in the context of what elections are all about.

People send us here and - I could not find the reference - Beauchesne is very clear that we are to attend the House. Some exceptions are allowed if we have other responsibilities. But there are, Mr. Speaker, in this Chamber 100-plus witnesses who know that the reason the member for St. John's East is not attending the Chamber now is not because he has duties elsewhere, it is because he is trying to avoid his duty here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

One quick, final point, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe we as members of this House can be party to that kind of thing. Now, let us understand what it is we are saying. It was my friend from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) who said it. Let us understand that the rules of this House provide that if a person wants to remain silent on a voice vote he can do so. But when the time comes to stand - and I believe it is a very good connotation here - and be counted member for member, then you have to be on one side of the issue or the other - you cannot be on both sides of it because of the picket fence syndrome - and then you can decide at that time, if we go on Division, to either stand in your place or leave the House.

What happened this afternoon is instructive in another respect. Not only does the gentleman want to avoid his duty, he has not got his head around the rules of the House, and that brings me to the point about the possibility of withdrawing privileges. At the risk of sounding as though I am speaking against the point of order raised by my friend from Mount Scio - Bell Island, let me just put another twist on it: Yes, privileges if abused too often ought to be withdrawn, but from what we have seen today, privileges in the hands of those two are in no danger of being taken advantage of.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am quite prepared to rule on that point of order, and I was some time ago. There is no point of order whatever in this matter. As I understand it, the debate on this motion was concluded by agreement of both sides, and it was agreed that the vote on the motion would be called at a later time.

MR. BARRY:

Just on another point of order then, Your Honour. Without belabouring the point, because I think it has been covered, the point has been made, but if I could just suggest a way out of this dilemma. I understand that once the bar has been placed across the door of the House, then members cannot leave. So I would recommend that members here authorize, at this point in time, the Sergeant-at-Arms to wait until both members of the New Democratic Party are present in the House and then to immediately snap that bar in place and that will solve the problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I think all the points have been made.

MR. TULK:

Are you going to second that motion?

MR. SIMMS:

I would third it, if I could.

All the points have been made, Mr.

Speaker, but in all seriousness, whilst there may be some thoughts in the minds of some people that what is being talked about now is a bit tongue-in-cheek, I can assure Your Honour that that is not the case. The point raised by the member for Mount Scio - Belle Island and spoken to by others is a very serious one, and I would urge Your Honour to give the matter some consideration before ruling on it.

I realize Your Honour said he has heard enough to rule, but I would really urge him to take some time to consider the matter because it is a very serious one. I just want to clarify that there was an agreement to put the vote on the motion at an appropriate time, and we did sort of seek leave to do that, but we have since - all of us, I think - reconsidered that and would prefer not to put the question on Motion 1 until some other appropriate time, in case Your Honour is not certain.

MR. SIMMONS:

Give them one more chance to redeem themselves.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Right on! Right on!.

MR. SIMMS:

Is Your Honour taking that point under advisement?

MR. SPEAKER:

If there are further observations on that matter, I will certainly consider them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Education (Mr. Hearn). Next year there will be, as there has been in past years, a large layoff of teachers in this Province. At the same time, each year many teachers are being hired from outside the Province while hundreds of our teachers are unemployed. My question to the minister is this: How can the minister justify this particular situation?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman as a former teacher should know that before any teachers from outside the Province are hired here that an agreement has to be obtained from the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. Now, knowing the Newfoundland Teachers' Association as well as I do, being a former member, branch president and a close ally these days, I can attest to the fact that they would never agree to hire teachers from outside the Province if the positions could be filled from inside. Certainly from my own point of view I would never agree to having any teachers hired from outside when jobs can be filled by our own teachers in the Province. However, there are certain requirements by boards to fill certain positions which cannot be met for a number of reasons; it may be a field such as French teachers in some case, or perhaps

guidance. There is another reason also. There are occasions when boards servicing in remote areas find it difficult to find teachers, even from the Province, who will agree to go into certain areas, and consequently have to resort to outside. But, there is a clause in the collective agreement whereby the Newfoundland Teachers' Association has to agree with the hiring, and I am sure that any jobs that do go outside the Province go there only because they cannot be filled from inside, not because of any other reason.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

The minister is saying that there are no justified hirings from outside the Province. Last year among the fifty teachers hired from outside the Province were teachers in core French, Music, Home Economics, Arts, Special Education and - get this, Mr. Speaker! - in English. Is the minister telling this House that we have not prepared enough local teachers in all these fields and there are simply no Newfoundland teachers available for these jobs? Is this not an indication of incompetence in educational planning?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Last year, Mr. Speaker, we had 8366 teachers in our school system, and we had a number of people who substitute. Many of the people who are substituting are only doing so because they cannot obtain full-time

employment, and many of them are very highly qualified teachers. Certainly in the fields that the hon. member has mentioned, I would be very surprised if among the teachers who are unemployed at the present, or do not have full employment, we do not have teachers who would fill those positions. However, as I said before, boards, number one, have to try to fill the positions with teachers from within the Province, and, if not, then they have no other alternative but to try to find teachers to fill the positions from somewhere else. I said also that as part of the collective agreement this has to be approved by the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. Surely the member is not intimating that the Newfoundland Teachers' Association would approve the hiring of outside teachers by boards if qualified teachers are available in the Province, because we would strenuously object to that also.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Gander.

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, according to documents from the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, they are informed early in the year of the hirings that have previously taken place. That is their input into it. I would like to point out to the minister that school boards in this Province are actively advertising out of the Province. There is one ad here from The Halifax Chronicle Herald this year where they are advertising not for the specialist teachers that the minister is referring to, but advertising for any teachers to come to Newfoundland and submit their resumes to the particular school board.

I will ask the minister again, when is he going to get his head around this issue and when is he going to actually try to do something to protect the teachers of this Province who are unemployed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MR. HEARN:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly thank the hon. member for his question. I must say, before I go any further, that I am really pleased that I got a question. Because, education is such an important topic in the Province, it is the first one. The unfortunate thing about it is that it seems any day I am here the member is not here to ask questions. I have missed one day in the House. So that might clarify the situation.

However, now to answer the question directly, if what the members says is factual, that there are boards hiring teachers from outside the Province when the positions could be filled by the teachers here, then there are three agencies who are affected and involved: Certainly, the board who does the hiring, since it is the job of the board to hire teachers; the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, who are supposed to keep tabs on those things due to the clause in the Collective Agreement; and certainly, if neither of those are fulfilling their duties, I will certainly make sure that we will do what we can to protect the jobs of teachers for teachers who are born, brought up and live in this Province.

MR. DECKER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. DECKER:

It seems to me there is definitely a 'come-from-away' mentality on the other side of the House. My question is to my jolly good friend, the hon. the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). The Clarenville Hospital is also advertising in the Halifax newspaper. It is advertising for nurses. Is this the same kind of policy as the Department of Education has? Could the minister explain why it is necessary to go to Halifax to advertise for nurses for Newfoundland?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, I have not seen the ad, but obviously I take your word. I have made enquiries just one hour ago to the Newfoundland Nurses' Association as to the shortage of nurses in Newfoundland. The information I got from them is, not at the present time. There are recruiting companies here, as you have read in the paper, trying to recruit nurses in special fields. I do not know how successful they have been. At the moment we have not got a figure, but apparently they have been reasonably successful. As well as that, they are recruiting young nurses to go to the Province of Ontario, the State of Florida and the State of California, and I could also mention the Province of British Columbia. We have no tags on that at the moment. But certainly I will take your information under

consideration and I will try and get back to you as quickly as humanly possible.

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of Finance in the absence of the Labour Minister.

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

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, any member of this House is entitled to ask questions, either from the government side or Opposition side. But in the case of any member of the House, who, for his own reasons, refused to take part in voting procedures and to take part in taking a stand on a debatable motion before the House, Mr. Speaker, my point of order is that that member should not be given the privilege of asking questions of the ministers. That is my point of order.

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

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

MR. LONG:  
I would submit that that is a

preposterous suggestion and it is certainly not a point of order.

MR. MORGAN:  
On a second point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member for St. John's East is speaking to that point of order.

MR. LONG:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would suggest not only is it not a point of order, but it is a preposterous suggestion, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

MR. LONG:  
That is fine. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
To that point of order, there is no point of order. The only Standing Order that we have pertaining to that is when there is a standing vote any member in his place has to vote at that particular time.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the Legislature I asked the Minister of Labour (Mr. Blanchard) just how much the buying of two patronage appointments at the Workers' Compensation Board was eventually going to cost subscribers. He



refused to answer the question. Today I notice, Mr. Speaker, he is not in his seat so I direct my question to, I suppose, the Acting Premier, or the Acting Government House Leader. The minister denied the public access to a piece of information that is rightfully theirs, so let me give the Acting Government House Leader another chance to redeem his government. Have they changed their mind, now that they have had time to reflect, and will they now release the cost of those two patronage appointments to the Workers' Compensation Board?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. House Leader opposite is using the term "patronage appointments." There were appointments to the Workers' Compensation Board. The set up at the Workers' Compensation Board has now been changed, and changed for the benefit of both the businesses and the employees in this Province. I think most people think it is a good change. In particular there are certain appeal mechanisms put in place now that will be more beneficial to workers and so on.

So there is a change in the structure down there. If the previous employees - or appointees, I should say, do not fit in nicely with that new structure, it is up to the Workers' Compensation Board itself to determine that and, having determined that that is the case, for them then to proceed with how to implement any change they want to make.

Now in doing that they do keep the government informed about it, but

nevertheless it is their prerogative. They have to undertake any expenditures that might be involved in that regard and I would say that the hon. member should direct his question more properly towards the Workers' Compensation Board. Having directed the question towards the Minister of Labour, the Minister of Labour I think answered very clearly that he felt that this was something that was within the purview of the Workers' Compensation Board and that he was not prepared to take that privilege and that prerogative away from them.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Let me tell the hon. gentleman that he can skirt this question all he likes, he can skate around it with roller skates, but the fact of the matter is that the Minister of Labour stood in this House yesterday evening and said that under the Freedom of Information Act he was not going to allow it, that there was a Minute-of-Council which said no to giving out this information. The Minister of Labour is responsible for the Worker's Compensation Board?

Now let me put it to him like this: Is it a case here that they do not want to give out what the cost was in terms of individuals, what they had to pay individuals? And let me ask will he now give the Opposition, and the people of this Province, the information in the sense of how much was paid out in a block, so that the Province knows just how much those two

patronage appointments cost subscribers to the Workers' Compensation Board, and indirectly the taxpayers of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Labour laid it out very clearly. He did not say he did not know the information. He said that, "I do not wish to jump in ahead of the Workers' Compensation Board." The government does not pay for the employees or the appointees down at the Workers' Compensation Board. That comes out of the funds that are available to the Workers' Compensation Board which they collect from the businesses of this Province. So, I mean, the information is known to us but it is not our place to go into that. If the hon. member wants to ask me what a federal judge is paid, I know what a federal judge is paid but I am not going to answer the question. It is not within the right of the person opposite to ask me, even though I know it. If he wants that sort of information he goes to the source and the source, in this case is the Workers' Compensation Board.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, did you ever hear of anything so ludicrous? Here we have a government that makes patronage appointments to that Board and yet when the time comes to pay them off they say they are not responsible. Did you ever

hear of anything so ludicrous? The Minister of Labour is responsible for the Workers' Compensation Board. He has made certain appointments to that Board and he has had to make certain payments to them. The Freedom of Information Act was put in place with the intent of providing information to the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Let me ask the Acting Premier or the Government House Leader, whatever he is, is he now attempting to take away the rights of Newfoundlanders to get certain information that was provided under the Freedom of Information Act? Is he now getting to the place where he wants to take that away from them?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, this is the most blatant misuse of Question Period I have seen in a long period of time. The information the hon. member is asking for is readily available. The Workers' Compensation Board reports to employers throughout this Province who fund the Compensation Board. It is within the right of an employee to ask information of the Compensation Board. I do not know many, but there are thousands of employers in this Province who are involved with the Compensation Board, and any one of them can get this information by writing. So for the hon. member to come in here and pretend that we are

deliberately hiding it, when it is open to thousands of people in the Province, is totally ridiculous and it is a misuse of the Question Period in other to score a small, miserable little political Brownie point.

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 Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), in light of the fact that the federal government will be recovering some \$104.4 million from the sale of FPI shares and the Province will be recovering \$48.7 million according to published reports, has the minister arrived at any agreement with the Government of Canada with respect to spending this money to restructure the debt of inshore fishermen and to assist those fishermen who do not have a debt at this point in time?

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, the Province as per an announcement - made I do not know when; a month and a half or two months ago, back in early January, I guess - is proceeding to finalize a negotiated inshore fisheries agreement with the federal government that will be funded jointly between the two levels of government. The Province has not approached the federal government for assistance in debt restructuring as per the

loan portfolio held by the Fisheries Loan Board. We are proceeding on that front ourselves and we hope to be able to make some public statement on it very shortly. But we are in the process of negotiating an inshore fisheries agreement with the Government of Canada.

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRY:  
Mr. Speaker, to the same minister. Will the minister commit himself here and now to this House to fulfil the promise he made to inshore fishermen to utilize the money from the sale of FPI for the benefit of inshore fishermen? And will he guarantee this House that either through an inshore fishery agreement or through debt restructuring that the inshore fishery of this Province will receive at least the \$153.1 million which is coming back to the Government of Canada and the Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, I will commit to the fishermen of this Province that the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland have committed to negotiate and implement in 1987 an inshore fisheries agreement. That will be done. I have committed to this Province, as has the government as

a whole, that we are working diligently on a restructuring of debt programme for fishermen in this Province. That will be done. These are the commitments we have made, Mr. Speaker, and these are the commitments that this government will keep.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Mount Scio.

MR. BARRY:

Such a commitment is meaningless if there is no dollar amount put on it, absolutely meaningless. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the minister to confirm that he, in fact, said that the money - not part of the money, not a fraction of the money, not a piddling little bit of the money, but the full amount of the money - coming from FPI would go to the inshore fishery? Did he or did he not promise that? And how much of the money that would be going to be inshore fishery is now scheduled to go to provide that stock option to management in FPI?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, this government has committed itself to the negotiation and implementation of an inshore fisheries agreement in 1987. We will be there with our money where our mouth is, Mr. Speaker. This government has committed itself to the principle

of restructuring the debt of inshore fishermen. We will be there with our money where our mouth is, Mr. Speaker. This government is cognizant of the difficulties that the inshore fishery faces in this Province, and we will leave no stone unturned to address the needs of the fishermen in that regard.

The Leader of the Opposition need not worry about our keeping our commitments to the inshore fishery.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

My supplementary is to the Minister of Finance.

On Monday, March 9, the Premier gave an assurance, in reply to a question that I put to him, that Newfoundlanders would be given priority in the purchase of FPI shares. Now in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the 9 per cent that is now being allocated to Newfoundlanders is about half of what is needed in order to fill the orders that are going into the brokerage houses, is the minister able today to give some kind of an undertaking that that amount will be increased? Will the minister, Mr. Speaker, consider, for example, making the entire 26 per cent that the Province has invested in FPI available to Newfoundlanders who want to buy stock?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries is in the House, he

is very familiar with this, he has kept his colleagues fully informed, and I would pass that question to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. gentleman gets the 9 per cent figure from, but the fact of the matter is that Newfoundlanders, either individually or through institutions, have in fact booked in excess of 20-odd per cent of the shares of Fishery Products International, something in excess, Mr. Speaker, of over \$30 million, I believe the largest private offering every taken part in by the individual Newfoundlander and Labradorian.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

The hon. the minister is correct. Newfoundlanders have booked about \$30 million of the shares but they are only going to get \$15 million.

Mr. Speaker, Newfoundlanders today who will call their favourite stock broker to buy shares are told that they can buy exactly half of what they order. I know of people who have ordered 1,000 shares and were told they had to put up with 500. There are \$30 million worth of shares requested but only \$15 million will be allocated. In light of that, Mr.

Speaker, will the minister give an undertaking that he will talk to the appropriate people to see if it is not possible to increase the amount that is being made available? Newfoundlanders built that company, it is their company, they are depending on Newfoundlanders to keep the company going, so why should they not be given an opportunity to buy at least the number of shares that they need and want?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, at the reasonable request of the hon. gentleman I certainly will undertake to ask the questions that he has posed.

MR. TULK:

You are wrong!

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) wants to ask a question there is some time left in Question Period and he can do so. The facts that I have in front of me suggest that it is the hon. gentleman who is wrong.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I had a question for the Minister of Energy (Mr. Ottenheimer) but seeing he is not here I will have to ask the acting Premier. One of the reasons given by Newfoundland

and Labrador Hydro for moving out of Bay d'Espoir is to cut expenses. If this is so, why is it necessary for Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, which claims it has developed all its potential in Newfoundland, to expand its office and administration center here in St. John's at the expense of ordinary Newfoundlanders?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, in starting the question the hon. member tries to set up the answer. My understanding is that Newfoundland Hydro is going to put in place a much more sophisticated computerized management information system than they have currently and this will increase the efficiency of the whole system. This was the beginning of the whole project. It was not begun as a restraint measure. I am sure that they are conscious of the need for financial restraint, but this was done to enhance the capability and the informational mechanisms that Hydro will have at its fingertips and therefore be able to give better service to the people of this Province.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

I wonder will the minister confirm for me is it true that Newfoundland Hydro's tender for office space fits exactly the description of a building that is called the Cabot Building, which is owned by two Tory organizers, bagmen?

Are you not going to answer the question? All right, I will ask it again and I will put it very simply again for the minister. Here we have it. We will keep it simple for him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, the question, again for the acting Premier, is this: Is it true that Newfoundland Hydro's tender for office space fits exactly the description of a building that is called the Cabot Building, which is owned by two Tory organizers and bagmen? Now, is that true?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, before answering that question, I would like the hon. member to say, without the shadow of a doubt, that the information he is giving to this House, in the form of a question, is absolutely true. I would say that this can be easily checked. If the hon. member is willing to say that the implication is absolutely and accurately true, I will have it checked with Hydro.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table in the House a copy of the incorporation papers for Cabot Development which shows the names

of two well-known Tories there. Now, will the minister admit that the people of Newfoundland and Labrador are seeing again another example of Tory pork barrelling?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, here we have an example of trying to give misinformation. I asked the hon. member was he prepared to back up his statement that the specifications that Hydro put out were designed deliberately to fit in with a building. He gets and gives some information about someone owning a building. I say again, is the hon. member willing to subject his question, in terms of were the specifications precisely designed to be directed only to the building owned by certain people, scrutinized by Hydro officials?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

It is now four o'clock. I must apologize for calling Oral Questions five minutes late, but I was rather distracted. I apologize for that. We could have another five minutes of Question Period, by leave, or it will be Private Members' Day.

MR. SIMMS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. SIMMS:

I would like to bring to the

attention of the members of the House that I was going to ask leave of the House for an hon. member to present a petition on behalf of a group of petitioners who, I gather, are here in the gallery and drove in to be here. I gather that the person presenting the petition has already spoken to the member whose motion is on the Order Paper. The petition would require ten minutes or so, five from each side, or whatever kind of agreement is reached. Members might want to take that into consideration when considering the Speaker's request for an additional few minutes.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

We have no problem with that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. GILBERT:

Well, a final supplementary. I table in the House an article from The Sunday Express which states that the BAE Group, the consultants for both parties, say the specifications are the same as Hydro asked for, and the building is owned by Cabot. So I table that.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, quite apart from the fact that that is not a supplementary question, it just

brings out exactly what I was getting at. The hon. member is quoting some sort of rumor in the paper and he comes into this House purporting to give that information as factual, facts that he has himself, which he does not have. It is a totally irresponsible attitude towards this House. If the hon. member is reflecting the "New Liberal Party Approach" to this House, I say we are in a very bad state.

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey). The minister is aware of a press statement that I issued on the weekend. I hand delivered a copy to him, which, of course, refutes everything that has been said by him and the Premier in support keeping the Come By Chance medical facility closed as a twenty-four hour clinic. Let me ask the Minister of Health, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that in February of 1986, when there was a twenty-four hour facility at Come By Chance, the outpatient visits were 619, and in February of 1987, one year later, when it was reduced to an eight hour clinic, the figures are up to 807 - almost a 200 increase in outpatient visits to that medical facility - when will the minister announce that the facility at Come By Chance will be upgraded to at least a sixteen hour clinic with additional staff - to do it otherwise would be ludicrous - in view of the Come By Chance refinery and all of the other facts that I presented to the minister either in letter form or

hand delivered?

Let me ask the minister, when will that be done. Will that be part of the budgetary process, for the minister to announce an increase in facilities there?

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

DR. TWOMEY:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On a previous occasion I answered a question. I told you that we have asked the Board of the Clarendville Hospital to investigate the numerous complaints that has been sent to us in the Department of Health and you have questioned me in the House about it. They are going to appoint an advisory board and we have offered them in addition that we will extend the hours of the clinic if the people locally so desire. I have not promised and I will not promise at this particular time that we will increase the number of staff in the hospital.

MR. CALLAN:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN:  
The minister, who is a medical doctor, or who used to be a medical doctor, must know that to increase the number of hours and not increase the staff would only drag out whatever life is left in the doctors and their staff out there, and drag them into their graves. The minister must know that, Mr. Speaker. To talk about increasing the number of hours without increasing the number of



staff is ludicrous! So why will not the minister come clean and admit that enough money was spent on the Premier's Office to keep that hospital open for five years at least? When will he increase the staff?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY:

Mr. Speaker, it has never been my intention, and I hope it never will be, to impose on any human being any slave labour type of request. And as I said previously in this House, we would stagger the staff in the Come By Chance outpatient clinic.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Communications (Mr. Russell). The minister and his colleague, the Minister of Mines (Mr. Dinn), stated publicly that they believed that the consumers of the Province were being ripped off by oil companies. I want to ask the minister if he still believes that the large oil companies are ripping off Newfoundland and Labrador consumers and if so what has he or his colleague, the Minister of Energy, done about this?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I and my colleague here still stand by our previous statement that the people of

Newfoundland and Labrador are paying more for gasoline and fuels than they should be paying. We are presently getting some statistical information together and in the process of drafting something to Cabinet for Cabinet's consideration.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

We have now gone considerably over the five minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no leave.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, maybe we could let the hon. member have one final supplementary and then we get on to the petition because it is getting late.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. FUREY:

I want to thank the Acting House Leader.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Leave has not been granted.

MR. TULK:

Who took it away?

MR. MORGAN:

Leave has not been given.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FUREY:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I understand that leave has not been granted in this particular case.

MR. FUREY:

A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

I just want to ask for clarification from the House. I thought that the Acting House Leader, the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms), stood in his place and gave me leave on behalf of the government side, Mr. Speaker. Could you clarify that, please?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

Leave has not been granted. There is no point of order.

DR. COLLINS:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, my understanding was that there would be an opportunity given to present a petition and I believe it was agreed by both sides of the House. So unless there is some change in that I think if Your Honour recognizes the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) for that purpose, he would present the

petition.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Of course, unlike the government side which just gave leave to the member for St. Barbe to ask a supplementary and then somebody over there, after the Acting Government House Leader stood in his place and gave leave, withdrew leave, we are not afraid of having the truth out, we are not afraid of hearing questions. And so, of course, we give the amount of leave that was requested, and I think we have a reply from this side for the presentation of this petition. Unlike the hon. gentlemen we over here speak with one voice, and in this case that happens to be mine.

MR. BAIRD:

Yes, one voice and fourteen knives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I am not going to anticipate what the hon. member's petition is. I would like to rule on the question that arose yesterday, the petition by the hon. the member for Mount Scio. I have looked through the list, and I looked very carefully because of the large number of people who signed the petition. But reading through it, I will not read it in full, 'We, the undersigned....' 'Under no circumstances should such crimes be treated so lightly by the Department of Justice.' Another 'We demand that in future the

people who we have entrusted to administer our laws fairly remember that it is the innocent who have a right to justice'. And the other, 'If you agree, sign here and we will take this petition to the Department of Justice'. In no case at all is there any indication that this was a petition to this hon. House so I must rule that that petition is out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I might add that on the bottom of this petition it says, 'We want this petition to be presented to the House of Assembly.' I want to make it clear that this petition should be in order. The prayer of the petition is as follows: By the way, it is signed by 220-plus people from the electoral district of Bellevue.

MR. MORGAN:

Oh, oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I was pleased this morning to arrange a meeting with a committee from Bellevue, Thornlea and area to meet with the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe). During the past five or six days, as we have heard through the media, there has been some concern expressed about road conditions in that area.

MR. SIMMONS:

This is shameful.

MR. WARREN:

No, Mr. Speaker, it is not shameful. I want to read the prayer of the petition. By the way, Mr. Speaker, I must say to the hon. gentleman opposite that I spoke with the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), who has the motion on the Order Paper, and asked if he would allow me ten minutes and the hon. member has agreed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would not do this unless I asked the hon. member. The hon. member has consented to me presenting this petition. I told the hon. member that there were some people in the district who gave me this petition, and I think it is only fair that a member of this House be allowed to present the petition.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, this is despicable. We were told on, this side of the Legislature, that the hon. gentleman had a petition to present on behalf of his district, and that there were some people in the gallery from his district. We were also told that he had consulted with the member for Naskaupi. The hon. gentleman did not consult with the member concerned, the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), and that is shameful and despicable on the part of the hon. gentleman. But these are the kinds of tricks that that hon. gentleman tries to pull in this Legislature and on that basis, Mr. Speaker, he can today be assured that we will not give him leave to do anything else, and we do not

give him leave today. Leave is withdrawn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN:  
I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, just to show how disorganized the Liberal Opposition is, that the hon. member for Bellevue was invited to the meeting this morning but did not attend.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Shame! Shame!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
Leave is withdrawn.

MR. SPEAKER:  
This petition should not ordinarily be presented at this time. It was presented by leave of the House and that leave has now been withdrawn, so the petition cannot be read.

MR. MORGAN:  
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:  
On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! I will recognize the hon. the member for Bellevue first.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I have to say from the outset that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is either lying to the House or deliberately misleading the House when he says that I was invited to a meeting this morning. I had no such invitation.

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

MR. CALLAN:  
I knew that the meeting was being held.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. member will withdraw that comment, 'deliberately misleading the House'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
And lying. And lying.

MR. BARRY:  
Not, lying, playing with the truth.

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. gentleman got his information. I knew nothing about the meeting this morning. I was not invited to it. But I will withdraw that comment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

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

MR. KELLAND:  
I do not like it when my integrity in the House is questioned in any

form and I will make a comment in my point of order to explain what transpired between the hon. member for Torngat Mountains and myself. Because we normally start debate on private member's motions at four o'clock, he asked if I had any objection, because I was the mover of this particular resolution, to him presenting a petition because there were some people from his home town in the gallery who would like to see him present the petition. We did not discuss the subject matter, where the home town was, or anything like that. I agreed on that basis. I certainly do not withdraw leave as an individual member of the House in any way, shape or form, and I want to maintain my integrity, no matter what, in this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. In this House we usually lean over backwards in terms of petitions. Quite often, when there is a bit of doubt, we give the benefit of the doubt to the petitioners. I think the hon. member for Torngat Mountains has gone the correct route. He had this petition, he felt it should be presented, and the petitioners expected it to be presented. He asked the agreement of the member opposite, and he then asked for leave in the House. I do not see anything wrong with the way he has done it.

Now, I make this point, also: If

we give leave for a certain matter and then just because we do not like it we withdraw that leave, it is going to make life very difficult here. If leave is given for a certain period of time and someone wants it extended and you do not agree to that, that is a different matter, you have allowed the leave you have given to run the full length of its course. But here leave was given to present a petition, the petition was started, certain members did not like it, so they decided to withdraw leave. Now, it is up to Your Honour to judge whether that is true or not, but if we take that attitude in this House we are not going to be able to trust one another, and I think, despite our natural confrontational positions in this House, we have to have an element of trust or this House cannot operate. I would say that the hon. member acted perfectly correctly and I, for one, think it is a shame that he is not allowed to present the petition.

MR. SIMMONS:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. Government House Leader.

MR. SIMMONS:

Thank you, Sir. I want that in writing.

MR. SPEAKER:

I take it back.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I agree with the principles stated by the gentleman for St. John's South (Dr. Collins), that once leave is given it ought not in the normal circumstances be withdrawn. I agree with him, but I would

suggest to him he might want to consider an important caveat. It goes without saying that if leave is granted on the basis of having received false or incomplete information, then that is another matter altogether.

MR. TOBIN:

That is not true.

MR. SIMMONS:

Well, I say to the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr Tobin) it is true, because I was party to this in that my colleague for Naskaupi came by and said to me - he did not mention home town as such that I remember - that the gentleman for Torngat wanted to present a petition. I said, 'Are you happy with it? He said, Yes, I have no problem.' So I said, 'Okay, well, that is no problem at all.' What was not said, and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, carefully not said, and it goes to the very heart of what the gentleman for St. John's South so well said, that we have to have a matter of trust in this House, is that the gentleman for Torngat quite deliberately did not flag the fact the petition was from Bellevue. I have at least one other gentleman on this side of the House, the gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) who has a petition.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is not in the House now.

MR. SIMMONS:

No, but he was here at petition time, and he did not ask leave to present it today because we know the rules of the House. The gentleman for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) has a petition but we are going to wait until tomorrow; the gentleman for the Strait of Bell Isle (Mr. Decker) has a petition

and we are going to wait until tomorrow. But we got a special request from a colleague, we dealt with it on its merit, and we now find it did not have the merits on which we based our decision. So it is not that we are changing the rules in the middle of the game. We say to him and all others that if you want us to have trust in you, play by the rules. I say to him that the people in the gallery, and we are glad to have them, their being from Bellevue, he was playing some kind of a game with the gentleman for Bellevue. I put to you finally, Mr. Speaker, it is worth noting that he carefully did not consult the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

That is right.

MR. SIMMONS:

He did not consult him because this is all a game, Mr. Speaker. And I say the next time we take twenty minutes of private members' time in this House to accommodate the gentleman for Torngat Mountain we will want it in writing, with three signatures in addition to his X.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SIMMS:

The accusation has been made, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains was to present a petition from his district. That is what was suggested when I stood. That is what the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) said, but, Mr. Speaker, that is not true.

MR. TULK:

It is what was understood.

MR. SIMMS:

Oh! Now, that is a little different. 'That was understood.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

That is where trust comes in, Len.

MR. TULK:

That is where trust comes in, my man.

MR. SIMMS:

Just a second now. One point at a time.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I have heard enough to rule on this point of order, but I will hear the hon. minister briefly.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to certainly be permitted to speak as long as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Simmons), at least on the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will hear the hon. minister very briefly.

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. Speaker, point number one is that there was not incomplete information given or wrong information given, as the member for Fogo says, certainly not wrong. That is point number one. Point number two: All of this is a bunch of folly anyway, Mr. Speaker, because surely the important thing here is that these people from the district of Bellevue, or wherever, came and approached the member for Torngat

Mountains and asked him to present a petition in this House of Assembly, and surely, Mr. Speaker, those people have the right and authority to do that and to make that request, and the member should have the right to be able to present the petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

This point of order arose because the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) got up on a point which was not a point of order - it was really a point of explaining his position - and I think the Chair was at fault to allow the debate to develop into a rather heated discussion on each side which was completely unnecessary. There is no point of order.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I think it is a very serious point of privilege and I want to make it in a serious way. When the day arrives in this House of Assembly that we as members, elected in our respective districts, cannot stand in the House to represent people in other areas who ask us to speak for them in the House, then we are losing our privileges. This is a very serious matter. The fact is this matter has been in the public eye for the last number of days, this very serious problem in the Bellevue district, a problem with roads and the transportation of school children to schools, this problem which government has been asked to deal with, and the House

of Assembly has been asked to deal with by the people concerned through a petition.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, I want to make my point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I understand the point of privilege that the hon. member is making, but he is now going on making a speech on that particular thing. As far as the Chair is concerned, there is no prima facie case of breach of privilege. Any hon. member can get up in this House and speak about a petition from any part of Newfoundland and Labrador, and I do not think there has ever been any restriction on a member doing so.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, I rise again on a personal point of privilege, Sir. When the day comes in this House that I cannot be given a chance to express a point of privilege, then you are taking away my privileges. Give me a chance to express my point, Sir, please! I rise now, Sir, on a personal point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Name him.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I have already ruled that there is no prima facie case.

MR. MORGAN:  
Will you hear me out, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER:

I have already ruled on the matter.

MR. MORGAN:  
Well, I will rise again, Sir, and I will keep rising until 6:00 p.m. this evening. I will rise on a personal point of privilege. Mr. Speaker, I want to express a personal point privilege.

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

MR. MORGAN:  
And that is, Mr. Speaker, that this man's privilege as a member of this House has been broken this afternoon. I recall rising, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I have already ruled on that matter. If the hon. member persists, I will have to name him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:  
A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A point of privilege, the hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker, if anybody's privileges have been breached in this Legislature this afternoon they are mine. Mr. Speaker, what is going on in this Legislature and is going on outside the Legislature is an insidious, foolish game that is being carried on by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) in cahoots, Mr. Speaker, with the Minister of



Transportation (Mr. Dawe). I had no knowledge, except what I heard on the airwaves, that there was a meeting this morning and that there was a petition to be presented in this Legislature.

MR. MORGAN:  
That is not a point of order.

MR. TULK:  
It is a point of order. Will you settle down.

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker, my privileges have been breached. Because as the member for Bellevue, if it were not for the interference of the member for Torngat who is carrying on an insidious game not only in Bellevue regarding roads but all over the district -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I have listened to the hon. member for Bellevue and he is not making a case for a breach of privilege. We all know, from Beauchesne, that privilege is a very serious matter, and I would ask all hon. members to take it seriously.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, I rise again, and I do it in a very sincere way, to ask for clarification from the Chair. Does it mean, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:  
On a point of privilege. Does it mean I cannot stand in this House to raise a point of privilege without being threatened to be named by the Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:  
That is ridiculous.

MR. MORGAN:  
It is not. It is a very serious matter.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

I do not know why the hon. member is continuing to interrupt, which is basically what he is doing now. He knows very well that he cannot direct questions to the Chair.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, I will rise and express my point of privilege.

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

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, based on your earlier ruling to the effect that I would be named if I was persistent in putting forward my point of privilege, I am threatened with being expelled from the House for trying to put forward a point of personal privilege. That is what I want you to make a ruling on.

MR. TULK:  
This is ridiculous.

MR. MORGAN:  
It is fact.

MR. TULK:  
To that point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. member for Fogo, to that point of privilege.

MR. TULK:  
I cannot let this pass. The hon. gentleman has done this on a

number of occasions. The Speaker made a ruling and the member for Bonavista South refused to accept the ruling. The Speaker was not threatening the member for Bonavista South. The member for Bonavista South would like to believe that everybody in the world is threatening him. Now, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to you that after you have had a look at Hansard, Sir, that the member for Bonavista South should be asked to withdraw his statements and, failing to do that, the Speaker should name him. The hon. gentleman, on a number of occasions, has tried to take this Legislature on his back. He is at it again, and it is time for him to be put in his place and the proper discipline administered to him, like you would do with any petty, childish school kid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

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

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

DR. COLLINS:  
Mr. Speaker, I think that is one of the good things about our House, that we can, every once in a while, have something flare up and people have the opportunity then to say some things, probably in the heat of the moment and that sort of thing. But I think the hon. the member for Bonavista South was merely under a bit of misapprehension about Your Honour's ruling. He was taking the interpretation, which I am sure on reflection he will not now take, that Your Honour was interfering with his right to rise on points of privilege whereas

Your Honour was making the point that he already ruled on it so that it was not in order to continue with the matter. He was just trying to bring that out.

I think this all arose from the point of the petition. I think that, as hon. members all agree, the presenting of petitions is very dear to our hearts. So I think we should either allow the petition to go ahead or, if we decide not to, fair enough, that is a decision to be made by the whole House. If not, we should get on with the next order on the order Paper, otherwise, we will be tending to interfere with the privileges of another member who, within his rights, has got a matter that should be debated. Today is the day for that debate, and time is quickly running out.

I would suggest to Your Honour that it could be asked one last time whether the petition may be presented and then we will get it over quickly. If not, we will get on to the next order on the Order Paper.

MR. SIMMONS:  
Briefly to that, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SIMMONS:  
The leave, Mr. Speaker, was withdrawn because of both incomplete and false information. The false aspect has to do with informing the House that my colleague from Bellevue had an invitation to a meeting. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is hearsay evidence because, obviously, if my colleague from Bellevue had it, he, from Torngat, did not have it.

Another rule of this House says that you must take, in terms of first hand information, the speaker at his word. We have the word of the member for Bellevue that he did not receive the invitation, so you have to take that at its value, that he did not receive it. Therefore, both statements cannot be true and the one that we have to rule out is the hearsay one in which the gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) says he thought he had an invitation.

So he has given us false information, number one; he has given us incomplete information because he did not indicate it was about his district. And so, Mr. Speaker, we have withdrawn the leave. We have other people who want to present petitions. Their right is no less complete than the gentleman's from Torngat and so for that reason we have to treat all of us the same. We had granted leave earlier on the understanding it was a special condition today, but we now know, Mr. Speaker, that the real reason he has risen is not to do his duty in this House on behalf of the people of Torngat, but to try and see if he can feather his nest the next time around. Well, that is another issue. We will deal with him at election time. In the meantime, Mr. Speaker, no. Under those despicable circumstances, we would not give leave. We would not dignify the cowardice.

MR. TULK:

That is right. Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I will hear one final submission.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Speaker for his ruling and tomorrow will be another day. I will have the opportunity tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, to present a petition that was ably given to me -

MR. MORGAN:

It came all the way from Bellevue today. They are in the gallery. Shame!

MR. WARREN:

- by people who drove four hours over rough roads in this Province. I have no sympathy, Mr. Speaker. And furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed, my point of order -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

My point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that I have fifty-two copies here of a letter from the people of Bellevue and Thornlea that every member of the House should have. I would like to ask the Page to deliver one to every member of the House and that is on behalf of the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Doyle) who also met with the delegation today. Tomorrow I will present my petition.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

This is Private Members' Day and I now call on the hon. the member

for Naskaupi.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

If I can say so initially, Mr. Speaker, I regret the most recent occurrences here. I accepted the request for leave and I do not want to dwell on it too much, and I granted it on the limited information I had and I still maintain that I wish to maintain my integrity in this House. I will not go back on my word on anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

However, today we want to talk about something that is very critical, not just to Naskaupi district, but to the region of Labrador and indeed our entire Province and the country of Canada, the nation.

It has been said many times in recent days in the House, Mr. Speaker, that indeed most members, and I say all the government members and all the Liberal members in this House do support the question of the N.A.T.O. tactical training centre in Goose Bay. Bilateral agreements between Canada and various N.A.T.O. Alliance countries, our partners in N.A.T.O.; but the problem that has presented itself now in the House, and outside the House, is the fact that the approval once given by the third party in the House now seems to be in some serious doubt. We have talked about that in the past few days and all parties in the House have had an opportunity to address the question.

What is totally disturbing to me, more than the exchange of a few minutes ago, is that the one member of the New Democratic Party who is presently able to attend sessions of the House will not face up to his responsibilities as an elected member of this Assembly. I find that totally disgusting.

Yesterday evening, I might mention, I had the occasion just at six o'clock to be in the Liberal Common Room along with a very good friend from Coast of Labrador, who is in the gallery today. We were there having a cup of coffee to take advantage of a chat while he was on a visit to the capital city. We heard in the background this thunderous noise coming from the Chamber and, suddenly, saw the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) literally run into the Liberal Common Room and hide behind the Common Room door with his ear cocked to hear what was happening out in the Chamber. I, along with my good friend from Labrador, at that time had to question what the guy was up to. I just could not believe that.

I will say one thing, before I get to the actual point of what I want to talk about in my resolution, if you have a position, if anyone in this House - I am glad to see the member back in - has a position, and it may be an unpopular position with the electorate, by God I think any member should have the guts to get up and say he is against something, instead of running out of this House like a bloody coward!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

I know you will forgive me for that outburst, Mr. Speaker, but it is something that is dear to my heart. I believe a member's integrity and his word and his ability to stand on his hind legs and state his position, no matter how popular or unpopular it is, is a right given to us by the electorate of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

To get to the resolution itself, I have been given some indication that there may be an amendment proposed, but, for the most part, I would like to tell the members present that I put a lot of thought into the wording of this resolution to allow for any eventuality. I worded it in such a manner that every party in this House would have to take a position in order to be represented and participate, and to put some teeth into the whole question by way of a Select Committee of the House where you have a designated body as opposed to, let us say, a more loosely put together effort.

To look at the 'WHEREASES' and I want to make special reference to the fourth 'WHEREAS', if I may read: "AND WHEREAS these organizations" - those which are pro-military - "often appear to the public to be at cross purposes, notwithstanding the fact that their respective mandates give them a common goal." I think that bears some explanation because I do not want to give the impression that these organizations are, in fact, at cross purposes, but sometimes the public perception is that they may be working at cross purposes, even though they have a common goal.

I will make reference to the Mokami Project Group. It is a good group working very hard towards the promotion of N.A.T.O. in our Province. But, because of some differences, philosophical or otherwise, with the group and a former employee, the project officer, where he terminated his employment and so on, that may have appeared to the general public or their perception may have been that, 'Look, there is some kind of an infight going on.' We do not want that to be the public perception.

What I proposed was that a Select Committee of the House act as a unifying and co-ordinating force so that the Chairmanship would come from the government side of the House, the Vice-Chairmanship, I believe, in all fairness, would come from the official Opposition, and that the membership of that particular Committee would be made up of at least one member from each of the parties in the House who are supportive of the project.

If they are not supportive of the project, they are darn well going to have to say so before they get a position on any committee which may be formed as a result of this. That was the point that I was trying to make there. I think my wording allowed for the flexibility to give the government the option of appointing as many members as they wished, which is traditionally so, in order to maintain a majority on the particular committee.

When we speak about the groups who are on the pro side of the question, there are quite a few actually. The Mokami Project Group, which we all know was put in place last year and given

funding of some \$140,000 in order to carry out their mandate. But besides that, we have, I suppose, the host town of the base, the town council of Happy Valley - Goose Bay, speaking on behalf of the largest community in the Upper Lake Melville area, who have given their wholehearted support. The Labrador North Chamber of Commerce which represents the business community in the Upper Lake Melville area have given their support. And the Mokami Regional Development Association also have given their support, as separate entities and separate organizations who are the three partners involved in the Mokami Project Group.

MR. DINN:

The Public Service Alliance of Canada also support the idea.

MR. KELLAND:

Yes, there are quite a few more, as the minister mentions.

There are a number of other town councils in Labrador, community councils and town councils, who have also taken a position of support. I do not know if thirty-one or thirty-two, whatever the figure is, have actually done that, but there are a number who have, and notably the Town Councils of Labrador City and Wabush, which makes up the entire population of Menihek district. That should be of critical importance to the member who is now there because of the labour problems.

Of those two councils, only one member, who coincidentally, perhaps, certainly not accidentally, was a candidate for the NDP Party in a previous election -

MR. WARREN:

What is his name?

MR. KELLAND:

Well, his name is Mr. Ern Condon. Now, he voted against every other member of those two councils in saying he was not in support.

As the minister mentioned and we have mentioned before in the House, a number of labour groups are in strong support, and notably so, again, the Public Service Alliance of Canada. You will all recall when we all pinned our buttons on here the other day, and the two members representing the NDP Party refused to do so. I think that was another day they ran out of the House in fear of the question which may have been asked.

So the Public Service Alliance of Canada, as one of the manifestations of their support, have circulated these buttons and provided us with extra copies that we could wear in the House as we wished. They are in support and several other labour groups have given public support to the idea of a N.A.T.O. tactical training centre in Goose Bay and, of course, of the continuation of the bilateral agreement is between Canada and some of our partners.

So when all of this is happening, and I think the point on the WHEREASES and BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED is pretty plain. We must have, in my opinion, a committee formed from this House representing all parties who are supportive of the idea of promoting a greater military use of Goose Airport and a N.A.T.O. centre there. I think the explanation is within this, and I know that the other members, the member for Torngat Mountains and others on this side who will

address the resolution and will make their particular feelings known.

But in all of the media reports and all the Hansard transcripts that we can go through over the past two days which talked about the N.A.T.O. question, as we did back in June of last year, when there was unanimous support, which now seems to be in doubt, as I said, I happen to have run across an article in today's paper and, if I may read the headline, Mr. Speaker, it says, "Mokami group issues challenge to Fenwick."

Now, the Mokami in this case is the Mokami Project Group. It is interesting that every time Mr. Fenwick makes some comments about alternate suggestions for how you can maintain the economy in Goose Bay, the Mokami Project Group are quick to respond and gives some actual facts, as opposed to what Mr. Fenwick tries to put out.

He talks about AWAC planes. Let us not have F-18s, which I suggested the other day, the NDP must think are used to harvest bakeapples because they fly so low. Let us not have F-18s, but instead let us have AWAC planes. I wonder if the members know what AWAC is.

It is a surveillance plane but it is certainly used for more than peace time surveillance, if you know what I mean. It is a defensive surveillance aircraft as well as anything else, just as a F-18 is. An F-18 is a defensive weapon. How can you have an AWAC, which is a military operated aircraft doing surveillance and protecting your Northern boundary, when you do not want to have a F-18, while it does not do surveillance, it certainly is

there to intercept any aggressor. So, as we said, they have tried to play the game on both sides. It gets to the point that the Mokami Project Group frequently as to come out and take a confrontational position with the NDP, not with the Progressive Conservative Party, the government party, and not with the Liberal Party.

We have made our positions quite clear. There is no question about the fact that we support the development project and getting jobs, not only getting 1,500 new jobs, but maintaining 600 we already have. There is no doubt about our position.

Last June the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) voted in favour of the N.A.T.O. proposal and then after, outside the House, he said he was railroaded into it. I would like to see the Liberal, Tory or NDP that could railroad me into voting against my principles. I can tell you that right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

There is not a party in this Province that can do that. If I want to speak against something, I will speak against it; if I want to speak in favour, I will speak in favour, and I will vote according to my conscience and to the mandate given me by the people of Naskaupi district. Therefore, I really feel that something is vastly lacking down to our right here when a man can get in and vote and try to wiggle out of the House and get up in the press gallery or wherever he had to go, but still was forced back in here, voted in favour and then got out

and said he was railroaded into it. In a very, high-pitched frustrated shriek, he said to me, 'I was tricked.'

MR. DECKER:

Yes, tricked, tricked. What does he think this is?

MR. KELLAND:

Unparliamentary language almost dripped from my tongue there, Mr. Speaker, but I am restraining myself.

As I have said, we have taken a position, as has the government side. We have had a party down here that last year voted in favour but now, when they got up in Montreal for their annual federal convention, the hon. member from Menihek bowed to the Broadbent line. He said, 'Look, my friend Peter, you better get down there and straighten up your act. We are not in favour of N.A.T.O. and you are not allowed to be either.' That is exactly what he told them, let us face us. He said, 'We are not in favour of N.A.T.O. and you are not allowed to be. We will not let you.' So, now what happens? Because fast Eddie in Montreal gave them their orders, they are down here now and they run out of the House every time the question is raised on whether or not they support N.A.T.O.

I think I coined the phrase the other day that they have certainly bombed out in this and they will never again fly in Labrador as long as the labour force is what they are depending on to put them back into their seats.

To get back to the article in the paper, the Mokami Project Group, if I may paraphrase without reading directly, except for one

quote, Mr. Speaker, in responding to Mr. Fenwick's comments said that he was trying to explain the unexplainable and make silly suggestions. Listen to this direct quote hon. members. Mr. Speaker, here is what the group said, "To keep uttering economic fantasies from afar about this area's economic future is an insult to the people of this region", and that is the region of Labrador. "Economic fantasies" are the whole basis on which the NDP is formed, as far as I am concerned, 'economic fantasies' and other flights of fantasy.

Mr. Speaker, it is important to me and important to every member here, every party here and the people of Labrador, Naskaupi district and Labrador generally. Despite references made by the two members down here, I think you can talk to an awful lot of Labradorians, by choice or by birth, who may have questions about N.A.T.O., may have questions about the effects on their traditional wildlife and harvesting of their wildlife, but no way do those questions be given an implication that these people are necessarily against N.A.T.O. In fact, I think you will find the exact opposite.

We can go back forty-some-odd years, Mr. Speaker, when there was no Goose Bay Airport. The whole reason that all of us live in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and that general area is the fact that that airport was put there in the early 1940's and people came from many areas, the coast and from other parts of the Island part of the Province, to work there and get work. Ever since the 1940's, to varying degrees and levels of employment, that base and that airport has provided the basis of



the Central Labrador economy, which spreads out and spins off into the Coastal areas as well because, by virtue of our airport and by virtue of our location and transportation facilities, we are the service center for much of Coastal Labrador.

So what hon. members, who support this project in Naskaupi district, are doing is they are supporting our livelihood. They are giving support to the 600 federal employees already working there. And every time there are 600 federal employees, look at the spinoff effect in the services around town. In fact, the provincial level of employment, which is pretty reasonable up our way, at a pretty high level, they would not be there either if the federal people were not there to maintain the airport we already have. So we are talking about a fair chunk of the labour force in Happy Valley - Goose Bay and Northwest River and that general area, Mud Lake as well, that are dependent upon the airport.

So, having said that, we have to look at the fact that we must maintain at least the current level, which means a number of bilateral agreements between West Germany, for example, and Canada. Royal Netherlands Air Force will also will be there this Summer. The British have been there for quite a number of years. The detractors and the people who are against N.A.T.O. say, 'Well, there are no direct jobs. They do not give that many direct jobs.' What the hell difference is it if they are direct or indirect as long as the jobs are there!

Let me tell you the jobs that are there. For every time you refuel an aircraft, every time someone

has to go for a meal, every time anyone has to go to the washroom facilities, for that matter, anytime anyone has to find a place to sleep, who are part of the military establishment, there are people who have to provide the services to them. I know the NDP are going to say, 'But those are all menial tasks.' I suggest to the member for St. John's East, why do you not go up and get one of them? You would do a lot better job than you are doing in the House of Assembly today by running out at every opportunity.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Yes, it is all right for someone to say they are against N.A.T.O., those big airplanes coming up into Goose Bay and protecting our country. Let me ask this question, Mr. Speaker: I wonder what would happen, what would the member's attitude be, the member for St. John's East, if a few N.A.T.O. ships pulled into the port of St. John's? They would require some services and they may need longshoremen or stevedoring or food to go aboard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. KELLAND:

Is the member for St. John's East saying that he would not want his own constituents to get a job trying to put provisions on the ships and offload and unload?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. KELLAND:

Is that what the member is saying? Are you saying yes?

MR. LONG:

No nuclear weapons, that is what I am saying.

MR. KELLAND:

You will never be accused of being a nuclear weapon, I can tell you that.

I will tell you something, that man, if he stood up and said, 'No, boy, I cannot have my constituents down working aboard a N.A.T.O. ship,' -

MR. SIMMS:

That is what he is saying.

MR. KELLAND:

No nuclear weapons! Does the hon. member believe that I would like to see my family and my friends and my constituents destroyed in a nuclear holocaust?

MR. LONG:

I would believe anything from you.

MR. KELLAND:

The hon. member said he believes anything of me. I am very pleased to hear that. No doubt he will tell me that outside the House some day.

There is not a member in this House, Mr. Speaker, that wants to see any sort of a nuclear holocaust. But we do -

MR. LONG:

Put it on the record.

MR. KELLAND:

I just said it. That is on the record. We do not want to see a nuclear holocaust.

MR. LONG:

I am glad to hear it.

MR. KELLAND:

But we do believe in our

districts, our people, our Province, and our country. We believe in Canada being able to defend itself and its sovereignty. One way to do that is to maintain our position in NORAD and N.A.T.O. which you would like to see us get out of.

I can understand the other guy, the guy from Menihek. He is an Upper Canadian. We all know that. But presumably the member for St. John's East is a Newfoundlander. Is he telling us that he would not want Canada, his Province, to be able to defend itself in the case of aggression? What would he do if an aggressor came towards Canada, whether the Northern route or whatever?

MR. DECKER:

He would welcome his comrades with open arms.

MR. KELLAND:

What would the member do? Would he run and hide in the Liberal Common Room or would he be a Canadian, be a man and get up and fight for his country like the rest of us?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

I am sorry if I appear to be picking on the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) but the reason why I do it is because his attitude towards N.A.T.O. and our economic future is picking on the Naskaupi district and the people I represent, so fair play is fair play.

Mr. Speaker, we can say what we like. I was reading through Hansard. I must again complement the Premier in his delivery because we share a common view and

a common goal there. The other day when the debate on the previous resolution was talked about, I had the pleasure of leading off for the Liberals on that and received congratulations from members on both sides of the House that we were getting our message out. I was pleased that other members from the government party and from the opposition party were able to stand and speak. Again, I can say I was dismayed and disgusted and almost ashamed of the fact that two members of this House, elected here to represent their people and, at the very least, express their own views and take a position on their own views, would chose to leave the House, literally scuttle and run. Nevertheless, I found that a little disturbing.

When people rose on points of privilege and things of that nature in the House today, I thought about my privileges as a member and how fortunate I feel, and all of you must feel, to be able to be in here because people wanted you in here. You represent people and ideas, you represent their economic future, their social welfare and every other thing you could mention that government and legislature are responsible for. It is a privilege and an honour to be in here and be elected. But, are we shirking that privilege and that honour? Are we shirking our duties that come to us because of those things? No, we are not.

MR. TULK:

If you scuttle out of the House you are.

MR. KELLAND:

That is the point. We may often disagree. We may disagree within

caucus. You may disagree within caucus on points but, generally speaking, on a position that is of some benefit to the people we represent, we can take a common stand as we have done on this and several other issues. But, when you have the honour of being elected to the House of Assembly to represent people and you abuse it by having a position and making comments to the media and rationalizing what you are doing but not the guts - that hurts me - not the guts to stand up in this House and vote, whether you vote fifty-one to one or whatever it happens to be. Look, I stand up if it were 10,000 to one and I was the one and I had a stated position as these members seem to have. I would have the guts to stay in here, as I know the other hon. member would, and make my position know by form of a vote and not just a voice vote either, but stand to be counted.

So, when people feel that their privileges of this House are being abused, I think we could almost raise on a point of privilege with respect to the members representing the NDP here. Sometimes when we get on subjects so dear to my heart and the heart of a lot of other people, I feel my privileges are being abused and that I have to be a party, I have to sit in a House with a person that has not got the guts to get up and vote on what his position is, whether it be for or against any given question.

Just briefly back on the motion to make the final comments, if I may. If I go a little over, just a minute or so leave may be needed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. KELLAND:

I just want to say that in my "BE IT RESOLVED" sections, if I can quickly explain again, it states "that an all-Party Select Committee of the House be struck, with the Chairperson appointed from the Government side, the Vice-Chairman from the Official Opposition, with the Committee membership consisting of at least one other member," I think those are my key words and I thought that out quite well, "from each party represented in the House and supportive of this development."

The point again is that we would be sure that we would have representation on a committee that could be a unifying and co-ordinating force for all the other people out there on the same side as we are and who are making their own efforts. If we could bring them together with the authority and the prestige of a House of Assembly Select Committee, I think we could work wonders.

That is why I took some time in making sure the wording was satisfactory. Often, of course, private member's resolutions, as everybody is aware, will make some derogatory type reference to other parties or whatever. In this case, it is so vital to us and with the assumption that all three parties were in favour, based on last year's resolution, it was worded in this manner.

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

the expanded use of the airport facilities to reach the common goal;

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

I think what I should explain here is that the final terms, "at the discretion of the House" means that it would consider any monetary or funding restrictions or constraints which we might be under. As I said, I put some thought to this. It was not hastily slapped together just so I could get a poke at government. Here I want the support of government and I am expecting to support the government.

Thank you, very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Having had the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, of reading the resolution that was so ably presented by my friend from Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) I must say, Mr. Speaker, it is good to be in a political atmosphere when you have four members representing the largest portion of our Province and knowing that generally, most of the time, you get two or three at least with the same aims and ambitions, and that is to do the

best they can for the people they represent.

I must give full marks to my colleague, the member for Naskaupi. Since the hon. member has been in the House of Assembly, the same as I have been myself, that I have to give him credit where credit is due, that he has spoken up for his constituents and for others in Labrador. With that in mind, I have to compliment the hon. member for bringing in such a forceful resolution, such a vital resolution and a resolution that is so important to all of the people of Labrador in particular.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask your indulgence before I go any further. Yesterday, about five minutes to six, when a question was called, we saw the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) skiver through the door over there. It is a good thing that the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) was not standing in the doorway because I am sure, Mr. Speaker, there would have been the biggest crash you ever saw. He took off without letting the people know what he is in favour of.

Mr. Speaker, before I go any further I want you to clarify for me, because I do not want to get up here for the next twenty minutes and use my time and your time in speaking in favour of N.A.T.O. in Goose Bay, if the hon. gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Long) is allowed to speak this evening. I do not think he should be allowed to speak any more! That man should not be allowed to speak in this House! Yesterday he took off out through the House without standing up for a vote. Today, on three occasions he took off out of the House.

That man was elected by some 2,000 believe I believe, or 1,200 people.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Fifteen hundred people.

MR. WARREN:

Fifteen hundred people. He came into this House and every time an issue comes up, instead of him standing up and showing what he is made of, he shows rubber and fat and jelly. That is what he is made of, three ingredients, rubber, fat and jelly. He runs out of here without airing his views.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you as a Speaker allow that hon. gentleman to speak, I will be very disappointed, number one. Furthermore, I will be disappointed if he has the gall to speak. He should be off on Cape Race or Baccalieu Island surrounded by turrs. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is where he should be, away from everybody else. Because he does not represent one person in this Province!

I am utterly disgusted that the hon. gentleman would have the gall to be in this House this evening. I would say to you, Sir, -

MR. TULK:

I will tell you what we should do. We should get a petition and go around St. John's East and ask for his resignation.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my hon. colleague from Fogo (Mr. Tulk), I am sure the hon. gentleman knows that if there were a petition from St. John's East, there would be at least 4,000 names on it to get rid of him for the action that he has taken over the last two or three days.

MR. TULK:  
5,500.

MR. WARREN:  
5,500. Mr. Speaker, to know that that gentleman can still come back and forth through the door. You know the best thing that happened in this House in the nine years that I have been here - here he goes again. He cannot take it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:  
- Mr. Speaker, was to see the hon. gentleman today could not get the opportunity to ask a question, because if he did I am sure, Mr. Speaker, I would have to get up on a point of order.

Mr. Speaker, to get back to the resolution. All this resolution is asking for is for this government to support N.A.T.O. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the hon. gentleman's resolution. I do not think it is too far off base with what the hon. gentleman is saying. I have spoken to the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) before the resolution and I given him a copy of my proposed amendment.

Mr. Speaker, without reading out all the WHEREASES, I would like for you, Sir, if you need to take a five minute recess to evaluate whether it is in order or not, I would like to read the THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED. I believe the THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED can tie into what the hon. gentleman is saying. With that I would explain to the hon. gentleman and to the members opposite that I believe that we can achieve the same thing that the hon. member is asking for by getting a united force together, including the members

opposite and the members here.

You know, Mr. Speaker, I am not a bad guy after all. In fact, I would even say to my hon. colleague for St. John's East (Mr. Long), look, join together with us! We will give the hon. gentleman a chance to wake up and realize that the Second World War is finished with. The Second World War finished in 1945.

Mr. Speaker, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that all members of this House - I did not say fifty-one members, or fifty members, I said all, a-1-1, that even includes the little guy over there with the diapers on, Mr. Speaker - all members of this House to act as a unified and co-ordinating force for all groups and organizations supporting the expanded use of the airport facilities to liase at the political level and all other levels to facilitate, expedite, and promote the expanded use of the airport facilities to reach its common goals.

What I am saying is for all members here to get together and everything that we can do through the media, through the papers, through our voices, through our friends, through every way and means so that all of us promote jobs in our Provinces in every way we can.

Mr. Speaker, before I go any further, I want your clarification to know whether it is in order or not before I go on for my next twenty minutes.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
Yes, the amendment is in order.

MR. WARREN:  
I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I want to issue a challenge, Mr. Speaker, that was in the paper today. The headline read: "Mokami group challenges Fenwick." I will say, Mr. Speaker, Garfield Warren challenges Gene Long!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I challenge the hon. gentleman for St. John's East to come to my district any time and express the views that he has expressed here over the last three or four days. The hon. gentleman can debate with me anytime, anywhere at his convenience. Mr. Speaker, even if it is in the Mealy Mountains, anywhere at all. I tell the hon. gentleman that he is making a grave error.

MR. SIMMS:

Challenge him to go to Goose Bay to debate with you.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I say to my hon. colleague, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms), that I challenge the hon. gentleman, at any convenient time, to set up a forum in Goose Bay. We will have an independent Chairman.

MR. SIMMS:

I will moderate.

MR. WARREN:

Either the hon. member or the hon. member for Fogo, either one of them, or the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), to have a forum there and we will invite -

MR. SIMMS:

Maybe the Speaker could Chair it.

MR. WARREN:

Maybe the Speaker could, sure. He

can invite all his little friends in Goose Bay. How many are there? Two, Father Roache and who else?

MR. KELLAND:

I will do it if Saint Peter comes along.

MR. WARREN:

Okay. You can invite your friends all you want to come to a public forum and debate the issue where this item of most importance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

You have never been in Labrador. You do not know what Labrador is all about. The hon. gentleman is getting up here and trying to stop jobs in Labrador.

MR. SIMMS:

Never been to Labrador?

MR. WARREN:

No. He does not know how to get there.

MR. SIMMS:

It cannot be so.

MR. WARREN:

And you smile, you laugh at it. You are despicable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Ha, ha!

MR. TULK:

Now 'Garf,' take that back.

MR. SIMMS:

That may be unparliamentary.

MR. WARREN:

I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker. Sometimes I might go overboard.

MR. KELLAND:

You might go overboard on the Rainbow Warrior.

MR. WARREN:

My hon. colleague said I went overboard on the Rainbow Warrior. No, not me, but somebody associated with the NDP. Mr. Speaker, if I have said anything unparliamentary, I withdraw it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

But I want to tell the hon. member, and I will tell forty-eight other members in this House - I want to make it loud and clear -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Forty-eight?

MR. WARREN:

Forty-eight, including the Speaker. I should say forty-seven including myself. I want to make this loud and clear that I will challenge anybody to come up and take me on on issues of Labrador anytime.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Anytime, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WARREN:

I said forty-eight. The member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland), the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), and the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), they are the three members for Labrador. I consider that those three members know as much about Labrador as I do. I have confidence in the three members for Labrador.

MR. FUREY:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

It is nice to get recognized, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MITCHELL:

This the member that agrees with the hon. member and his speech. 'Good stuff,' he said.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I would ask the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Mitchell) to put his foot back in his mouth so I can speak.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

There is a point of order on the floor, if the member would not mind.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

I would ask the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) if he would like to rise to that challenge put forward by the hon. member for Torngat, Torngat being Innu for God of storm and wind.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do not think the hon. member for Torngat has presented anything worth challenging. He stands up with a smile on his face, telling jokes



and laughing when we are dealing with a very serious matter. When the hon. member gets serious maybe I will take him seriously.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

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

The hon. the member for Torngat.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I thank my hon. colleague from St. Barbe. Mr. Speaker, it is very, very interesting that the hon. gentleman would not come to Labrador to challenge me. Would the hon. gentleman kindly set up a forum in St. John's East to challenge me down there?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
Would the hon. gentleman do that?

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

MR. LONG:  
I would be glad to do that. I would be glad to set a time and place to debate with the member for Torngat Mountains, in my own district.

MR. WARREN:  
In fact, Mr. Speaker, I want to say to the hon. gentleman, I am ready, willing and able.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
Are you ready to go to Labrador? Yes or No? Open your mouth when you are supposed to.

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

MR. WARREN:  
Open your mouth now.

MR. LONG:  
I am ready to go to Labrador, the problem is finding a convenient time to do that when we are short in caucus. My leader is in Labrador at this time. I was unable to get through to him because the phones were down today. I do not want to be out of this House for too long, but I will be glad to go for some weekend and take the hon. member up on his challenge, if indeed it is a serious challenge and if it is not all fun and games, as we have been seeing here for the last couple of days.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, let me advise the hon. gentleman that I will arrange a time, I will arrange a place, and I will arrange anything that the gentleman wants. But the gentleman is going to have to know, and I will tell the hon. gentleman, that in order to get to Labrador this time of the year you have to go to an airport and get on a plane. That is the only way you can get there. So I will tell the hon. gentleman that he is welcome, and I will set up the meeting.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot say what will happen to the gentleman, honestly I cannot say. But once the gentleman arrives in Labrador

and meets the people who are depending on work, who are up there trying to make a living for their families by the sweat of their brows, and they learn that this gentleman can get up and try to stop people up there from making a living, then I would suggest to that hon. gentleman, you had better be careful. You had better be careful, Sir, and watch your words. I will leave that with the gentleman.

I think it is ridiculous, it is unreal.

MR. LONG:  
How about Davis Inlet?

MR. WARREN:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, there you go! The hon. gentleman wants to go to Davis Inlet. Now, I ask him to go to Labrador, there are thirty-eight communities, and he picks out Davis Inlet. Now I suppose I should say, chicken. Let us go to Davis Inlet. Okay! Let us go to Davis Inlet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:  
I am ready when you are. When will you be ready?

MR. SIMMS:  
You arrange it and let him know.

MR. WARREN:  
Okay. I am ready to go my friend. There is not one community in Labrador that I would not go to.

MR. SIMMS:  
You picked the wrong man 'Gene'.

MR. WARREN:  
You are picking the wrong man, Sir, to talk about Labrador.

The hon. gentleman might say I am foolish -

MR. LONG:  
That is all you have been here for two days, foolish, every time you stand up.

MR. WARREN:  
I should say to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Oh, oh!

MR. LONG:  
You should all be ashamed of yourselves, the way you are dealing with this issue.

MR. WARREN:  
I should say to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker -

MR. LONG:  
When are you going to talk about the concerns in your district?

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I should say to the hon. gentleman -

MR. LONG:  
Talk about the concerns now.

MR. WARREN:  
Mr. Speaker, I should say this loud and clear to the gentleman: There is only one concern in my district, only one concern in the district of Naskaupi, only one concern in the district of Menihek, and only one concern in the district of Eagle River, there is only one concern, Sir, and that is to make sure that tomorrow morning they can have food to go on the table to feed their children, their families. That is the concern of Labradorians. I tell the hon. gentlemen that I do not want the hon. gentlemen to jump on my back.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me tell the hon. gentleman that I lived in Davis Inlet for two years. I should also tell the hon. gentleman that maybe 80 per cent of the Indian, the Inuit people in Davis Inlet know me by my first name, and will know from this day forward the kind of jelly and the kind of fat the hon. gentleman is made of. Here he is against the Indians in Davis Inlet having enough food to feed their family. Mr. Speaker, if I can do it, and looking back at what was done yesterday I think I can, I am not too bad at organization - I must say, Mr. Speaker, I believe I can arrange and organize anything.

I know I have to close, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate your time, Sir.

But in closing, I want to tell you that if this hon. gentleman gets up, I am going to make it known now - he will have twenty minutes, as every other member will - I am going to listen to him, Sir, and I will interrupt the gentleman on any false pretence, on any one thing he does wrong, because, as far as I am concerned, he does not know what is happening here and to me he is a disgrace.

I am in support of the amendment. It is a good amendment. I want to compliment my colleague from Naskaupi on his resolution, and I want to compliment members of the Liberal Opposition. We have to join our forces, all fifty-two of us, and try to support Happy Valley - Goose Bay, Torngat Mountains, Menihek, Eagle River and Newfoundland, too. So let us all join together and make sure we go out of this House as a most united force.

Thank you very much.

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:  
Mr. Speaker, that certainly is a hard act to follow. That particular speech by the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) was absolutely superb, factually correct and must have been absolutely tormenting for the hon. member from St. John's East (Mr. Long).

We all know that Torngat Mountains, Mr. Speaker, is Inuit for the God or Goddess of storm and wind, and he certainly raised storm and wind over there today, but he wrapped it in a factual presentation to allow all of us to see clearly just where the people of Labrador are coming from.

Mr. Speaker, I want to take a minute, first of all, to point out that what we are seeing here, interestingly enough, is almost an intentional muddying of the facts, a muddying of the waters. Because what we witnessed the other day from the other half of the NDP Caucus, the leader, we saw him come in here and table all kinds of letters as though certain religious institutions were completely and wholly behind the simplistic argument that he laid before this Chamber.

The fact of the matter is, that he had gone before the age of enlightenment, he had gone back before the Eighteenth Century where we saw the division of powers, where we saw the separation of state and church.

But what did he decide to do here as we are thirteen years from the Twenty-First Century? What did he decide to do? He decided to muddy the waters, to mess up the pool, to distort the facts, and to not present reality. He chose to separate an economic issue, and it is an economic issue, it is an issue that affects the lives, the livelihoods, the families and the children not just of Labrador but of all of Newfoundland and Labrador. Mr. Speaker, he chose to distort the issue, to muddy the waters. What is so amazing about this NDP crowd, this crowd of Socialists, Mr. Speaker, is that they are so self-righteous. They can jump up on their pedestal and pontificate, and they are always right because they have the luxury, Mr. Speaker, of leaning way out on the limb, way out on the limb, because they know, Mr. Speaker, they will never govern. That is why federally and provincially, and in every country in the free world, you will see these people indulge, indeed, gorge into an orgy of the luxury of getting on with things that will never be because they will never govern. That is the reality.

Mr. Speaker, what we see from the NDP, from this caucus, this group that suffer from political schizophrenia, this brace of snakes in the grass - we now know that this brace of snakes are poisonous, Mr. Speaker, so let all of us other fifty members, including the Speaker, in this Chamber keep our heads up, because there is going to be venom squirting every chance they can, because they have the luxury of leaning way out on the left to squirt their venom and their bile and their nonsense all over the place.

Mr. Speaker, they stand here in this Chamber, and indeed in all Chambers in the free world, this crowd of Socialists, and they stand behind the moral facade - they put up a false wall - and say, 'If you do not do it this way, it is morally incorrect.' That is why I say, Mr. Speaker, we have to read into the record and be very clear on this issue. This is not a moral issue. This is a fundamental and economic issue that is very, very pertinent to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. We are talking about 1,500 new jobs in a Province that is crippled and on her knees and needs every bloody job we can get.

MR. LONG:

We need (inaudible).

MR. MATTHEWS:

What? What did he say?

MR. FUREY:

Never mind what he said. The hon. the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth wondered what he said. It does not matter what he said. He is going to flip over and flop over in two minutes anyway, so it does not matter what he said. He will change his mind in a minute. We saw him scurry out of this Chamber today. It was almost an embarrassment to every member, especially senior members. I bet you no senior member has ever seen that done before, that charade. Have you ever seen that done before?

MR. SIMMONS:

Never.

MR. FUREY:

I mean, it was just unbelievable how Flop ran out to phone Flip to see what he should do. I mean, flip and flop, that is the only real way of dealing with this kind

of moral cowardice, where we see them putting up a wall of morality to distract from the real issue of jobs. Just unbelievable!

Mr. Speaker, I heard in this Chamber the other day the Leader of the NDP, N-D-P, No Defence Policy, talk about changing his mind on certain issues. He said that when the original resolution was tabled here in this Chamber he did not have all the facts. He said that at that time he did not have enough time to make a good decision. I saw him, you saw him, we all saw him, stand in Division and support that resolution that he is now backing away from.

Mr. Speaker, are we to determine and understand henceforth that whatever the Leader of the New Democratic Party, the No Defence Policy Party, says now we cannot believe him because he did not have all the facts, he may flip and flop on it? Let me offer you an example: Are we to believe his assertions publicly, in this Chamber, and on the media that he is against the minimum price for milk, or does he have all the facts? You see, that is what we have to start asking ourselves about this kind of political schizophrenia which we see in living flesh and blood action personified by Menihek and St. John's East, that brace of cowards, if 'coward' is permissible.

Mr. Speaker, are we to say that their position will change? This vehement, almost violent assertion that the Real Estate Board fees, and the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mr. Russell) will remember this, how adamant the Leader of the NDP's attack was on the Real Estate Bill, allowing fees to be set up to educate

realtors, are we to assume that he did not have all the facts? Are we to assume that he will change his mind?

Are we to assume that there will be a flip flop on real estate fees and on the minimum price of milk? How could we possibly assume that he would do such a major public flip flop on the N.A.T.O. base for Goose Bay? Absolutely incredible, Mr. Speaker. Ludicrous! Scandalous! Outrageous! No wonder he scurried out of the House with his tail between his legs, Flop, that is.

MR. BAKER:

The runaway party.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely interesting to note, as well, how the NDP, the No Defence Policy Party, can be all over the map on all issues, from all sides of the political spectrum, from all parts of the country. Let me give you two examples: We see this crowd go to Montreal and we see them unanimously endorse a resolution to keep jobs out of Newfoundland and Labrador. Who voted for that do you suppose? Did Howard Pawley vote for that, the Premier of Manitoba? I think, he did. Yet, it was Pawley who went in haste to an emergency meeting with Prime Minister Mulroney and said, 'Listen here, Brian, you gave those jobs to Quebec when Manitoba - Bristol Air - fought for those jobs. What were those jobs? Mr. Speaker, those jobs were constructing and building brand new CF-18 fighter bombers to be used in Goose Bay, in Labrador. So Pawley said it was all right for Manitoba, but it is not all right for Newfoundland and Labrador. We say a pox on both their Houses, both the NDP House

in Newfoundland and the NDP House in Manitoba. But, Mr. Speaker, I would not mind if it stopped there, this utter landscape filled with contradictions from this No Defence Policy Party, the NDP.

Now, what else did they do? This same group of hypocrites, and that is the kindest choice of words that we can use in this Assembly, what else did they do? The NDP federally, James Fulton, the member for Skeena and Skelly from British Columbia, all these federal New Democratic Party members, what did they do in Montreal? They supported, Mr. Speaker, the resolution to keep 1,500 jobs out of Newfoundland and Labrador. But they did that through the right side of their face, and through the left side of their face they went and lobbied the federal Conservative Government for a Polar icebreaker, a nuclear ship, to be built in their home riding in British Columbia. What is sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander, and this member better start understanding that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, what we see is a collection of convoluted contradictions, twisted contradictions from twisted left wingers who will have the luxury to say whatever they want to say because they will never govern. We want those 600 jobs to be protected, Mr. Speaker, indeed, we want those 600 jobs in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. We want to build on that foundation. We want to say and be able to say happily in this Assembly in a year's time, no, Mr. Speaker, there are not 600 people working in Happy Valley -

Goose Bay, there are 2,100 people working in Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK:

The population was 15,000, now it is down below 10,000.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, we know that this party has the luxury of saying what it wants because it will never govern, and that brings me to another interesting topic that has been in the news in the last little while, and I am talking about the seal hunt which was part and parcel of our history. I heard the hon. the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) talk eloquently, indeed brilliantly, about his forefathers and how they went to the Front, and the hon. member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons), in a very interesting note, talked about himself as a young boy going to the hunt, as well. You know, all of this would sound wonderful if there were consistency from the Socialists, consistency from the left wingers, but there is not. They can talk how wonderful the hunt is, but is there a member in this House who does not know that they support, either directly or indirectly, Greenpeace? It is just amazing, Mr. Speaker. Every member in this House is for peace, all of our children are for peace, but we are not for Greenpeace. We are not for that kind of peace which comes in and steals our jobs, that cripples our families, that tears away a part of our life, disrupts our history, crucifies our past, does not allow us to participate in the present, which is our birthright. How dare they come in here from Mainland

Canada, from the United States and from France and Europe, how dare they come over here and tell us, with the accepted acknowledgement of the socialists, that we cannot participate in our birthright. Has any Newfoundlander gone over there and told Brigitte Bardot she cannot wear a fur coat? I do not know of any Newfoundlander who has done that.

MR. MATTHEWS:

They told her a few other things, but it was not about her fur coat.

MR. FUREY:

It is very interesting to see these socialists. I witnessed it, experienced it, watched a Greenpeacer from Vancouver come a campaign gainst my colleague from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Decker). I mean, it is just amazing.

MR. LONG:

Yeah, yeah! Why do you not sit down out of it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. FUREY:

I think we hit a nerve with Flop.

MR. MATTHEWS:

Mary Poppins.

MR. FUREY:

Hopefully, he will get up and say something different.

MR. TULK:

What did you say to him?

MR. FUREY:

I said that Greenpeace, under the auspices of the NDP, the socialists, came to the Strait of Belle Isle from Vancouver, a professional organizer, a man who paid into Greenpeace, and ran the

campaign for the NDP the last time. Now, I mean, if that is not hypocrisy, absolute, utter - would it not want to make you vomit, the hypocrisy of it all? Mr. Speaker, it is just absolutely incredulous. 'Incredulity' is the word, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. LONG:

The member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) is repeating what was said here last week. My leader stood up at that time and gave the House information that a radio station reporter, in Corner Brook, called to check on that question and found that it was an absolute lie. Now here we have the member standing up and again repeating mistruths as an act of desperation to try and discredit the NDP with its growing momentum in this Province, and he is lacking credibility once again.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order. The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

The hon. gentleman just made a statement which he should be asked to withdraw. A mistruth by any other name is exactly that.

MR. FUREY:

He said it was a lie.

MR. TULK:

He said that it was a lie, and the hon. gentleman should be asked to withdraw.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would ask the hon. member for St. John's East to please withdraw the word 'mistruth'.

MR. LONG:

I withdraw the word. I will rise on a point of order every time members mislead the House in that way on that question, but I withdraw my remarks.

MR. FUREY:

Get up and withdraw unequivocally.

MR. SPEAKER:

I would just ask the member to withdraw the word 'mistruth', and that is fine.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I understand the socialists want to pull out of N.A.T.O., the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. They actually want to make themselves and make Canada part of the non-aligned countries of the world. Now what does that mean? That means we do not want to participate in the free world's umbrella called N.A.T.O., which Canada can sit under for a price, and we all have to pay the price in this world of reality of defense. They are saying, on the one hand, they will not participate in N.A.T.O., and they are implying that they might participate in the Soviet satellite bloc system in Eastern Europe. So how can you be non-aligned? It is absolutely foolish to say that Canada can be

non-aligned. We will be very interested in hearing his remarks on that particular topic, as well.

Let me tell you an interesting little anecdote, Mr. Speaker, about what happened to me personally, as brought to me attention by my colleague from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) recently. This will tell you, this will outline and, in fact, define very clearly the hypocrisy of this crowd. I brought a resolution to this House, Mr. Speaker, a number of weeks ago which asked this House through myself as the sitting member for St. Barbe, and through the hon. the member for Waterford - Kenmount, the hon. House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer) - he and I together worked out the framework of this resolution - to protect and indeed enhance and indeed upgrade post offices around Newfoundland and Labrador. We all voted for that, did we not? The entire House unanimously sent that resolution to Ottawa - we changed the wording a little bit to make sure that the Government of Newfoundland was seen to be already fighting for this, etc. - and what did they do? They knew that there was a committee coming to hold meetings in Foxtrap on the dignity of post offices and they took my resolution, tabled in this House and unanimously accepted, and sent it out to the people who would be attending that post office meeting. No commentary such as 'This was the Liberal member for St. Barbe supported by the PC member from Waterford-Kenmount.' None of that! The inference was, 'Look what' either (a) 'our NDP member for St. Barbe did', or (b) 'look what we voted for and forced unanimous consent to in the House.' I mean, that is pure



sleaze, Mr. Speaker. There is no other word for it. There is no other word for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Absolute hypocrisy! I challenge the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) to stand up and say that that resolution was brought to this House but the Liberal member for St. Barbe, supported by the hon. Conservative House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer). I challenge him to tell us, was that said? Was that done? Milk prices might change, real estate fees might change, you flip-flopped on this one, and now we see the kind of hypocrisy hiding behind a moral facade when the real question here about Labrador is economics, jobs and a future for our children.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot expect, as I said in my opening remarks, to get protection under the N.A.T.O. umbrella unless you financially participate, and we see this crowd down there trying to duck out of that responsibility. And it is a responsibility to everybody who breathes in the free world. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot be popsicles on this one, and we know where the sticks are in the popsicles.

Mr. Speaker, the Mokami Group is made up of the Town Council of Happy Valley - Goose Bay, the Labrador North Chamber of Commerce, and the Mokami Regional Development Association, and in a recent issue of The Evening Telegram - was it? - what did we see? We saw the spokesman for the Mokami Group, Clarice Rudkowski, say that Mr. Fenwick's comments on the NDP's future plans for Goose Bay Air Base amounted to trying to

explain the unexplainable. Now that is something else. No wonder we have branded them with Flip and Flop. No wonder they engage in this political schizophrenia. They go on to say that 'The group now wants Mr. Fenwick to debate the issue and other concerns in a public forum in Goose Bay. To keep uttering economic fantasies from afar about this area's economic future is an insult to the people of the region.'

I commend the hon. member for Torngat Mountains for issuing the challenge to Flop, better known as the member for St. John's East (Mr. Long), and his colleague Flip, better known as the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). I commend him on that admirable and courageous challenge and I ask the member for St. John's East not only to rise to the challenge of a debate on his home turf, here in St. John's East, but do the honourable thing, rise to the challenge to have the debate continued, part two if you will, in Goose Bay, Labrador, in participation with the member for Torngat Mountains. That is the fair way.

MR. DECKER:

That is a good challenge.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. FUREY:

By leave? Just for a minute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Sure!

MR. FUREY:

Just a comment, Mr. Speaker, on the amendment. The hon. member for Torngat Mountains asked us to look at the amendment, to consider it, and it is interesting to note that what it does is it takes the specificity, or the specifics out of the original resolution and boils it down to a general nature.

MR. SIMMS:

It moves that a select committee -

MR. FUREY:

Yes, well, what we are saying is we would like to see an all-party select committee with a chairman, a vice-chairman, a staff and a budget to delve deeper into this, and that amendment strips away that specific and boils it down to general. But you can speak to that after. I would appreciate hearing your remarks on that.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, can we believe anything ever again from the lips of Flip and Flop? I do not think so. Can we believe that they sincerely and genuinely are against a minimum price for milk when they flip-flopped on N.A.T.O.? Can we believe that their comments were given in honesty, were given with integrity, were given with the greatest of thought on the real estate fees? I do not think so, Mr. Speaker, because they flipped and flopped all over the political landscape and I say this to them, that this kind of engaging in political schizophrenia for their own political futures will not wash with the people of Newfoundland. They screwed us by taking Greenpeace by the hand. They are now putting the boots to us by ignoring 1,500 jobs in Goose

Bay, Labrador, Mr. Speaker, which will affect all of Newfoundland, and I say they have a lot, an awful lot to answer for to the public at large in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. BUTT:

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to begin a few remarks on this resolution put forward by the hon. member for Naskaupi and commend the previous speakers for their input into the debate on this.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Long) is gone. He has left the House, and for that reason, I am going to take a slightly different approach to address the resolution and hopefully, add some of what I hope will be interesting and worthwhile information. I will take a slightly different approach now because he has gone but I can stand here today and speak with some conviction about Labrador, and in particular Goose Bay, Labrador, because it was my home for some fifteen years.

My youngsters are all Labradorians. Two were born in Goose Bay at the Paddon Memorial Hospital and one was born in Labrador City. So I can speak with some conviction on Goose Bay. As a matter of fact, I was one of few members in the House directly and personally affected by the phase down of military

operations in Goose Bay. I can speak with some conviction on military activity in this Province and in particular Labrador.

I think it is interesting for hon. members to know a little about this Province's position on hosting the military. I think it is worthwhile to inject that here, Mr. Speaker, when we address the N.A.T.O. facility in Goose Bay.

In 1940, a long time before my time, there was a view out there in the international world that Newfoundland had something to offer in that it was a strategic location to build and establish bases. I think it was in 1943 that construction began in Goose Bay by the Canadian Armed Forces and then the Americans came after.

At the peak of military activity in this Province we hosted 17,000 officers and men in the military here. I do not think I will have to convince hon. members of the value in jobs and money that the military have contributed to this Province when it was at its peak in Argentia and Fort Pepperrell. That is interesting. I think the hon. member for St. John's East actually represents part of what was Fort Pepperrell, Pleasantville. That is correct, I believe. Mr. Dinn would know. There was Argentia, Stephenville and Fort Pepperrell. They used Botwood and Gander for awhile and, of course, Goose Bay was a key place.

To address the N.A.T.O. issue at Goose Bay, Mr. Speaker, I think it is important that hon. members should be aware that we just did not go into Goose Bay in a hodgepodge way and say we are going to establish a N.A.T.O. base

there. Goose Bay was a base for a long, long time. It was not like breaking new ground but, nevertheless, to address the legitimate concerns of local people, in particular the Native people, there were a number of steps taken. It is interesting to review them.

An Environmental Preview Report was obtained, the first one. The Canadian Health Association was there, made up, I might add, Mr. Speaker, of a blue ribbon panel of medical experts in this country with impeccable credentials who were not on the side of the Minister of Environment from Newfoundland or taking sides with anyone. They were fair and they were very reputable people.

On top of that, Mr. Speaker, there were also about \$1,500,000 dedicated to the study of the caribou. It is interesting to note, as the hon. member for Naskaupi said the other day, during this low flying in Labrador, the population of the caribou grew from about 100,000 to 600,000 or 700,000 or 800,000. It is hard to get a handle on them. They are growing so fast. So, low flying had the affect, I suppose, of an aphrodisiac on caribou because they multiplied rapidly under low flying conditions.

Finally, and very importantly - we cannot overlook this fact - the federal minister, under his legislation, established a federal Environmental Assessment Review Panel made up of people from the local area. Every resident of Labrador had an opportunity to be selected, appointed, and nominated to serve on that panel of seven people. It was not isolated to people on the Island portion of the Province. As a matter of

fact, the focus was on appointing people to that panel from the area affected, namely Labrador and the North Shore of Quebec. That panel is doing invaluable work and addressing many concerns that have been raised. So, despite what the NDP said the other day, that this is going ahead without any concern for local people, that is absolutely incorrect, that is wrong, totally, 100 per cent wrong.

Mr. Speaker, you have to know Labrador and Goose Bay, in particular, when you talk about military activity there. Goose Bay, in its heyday, in the 1960's, was one of the most affluent places in this Province. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that the social problems that are there today, because of unemployment and a lack of employment opportunities, are ten times worse than when we had a very active military community there in Labrador. Goose Bay has few other opportunities.

Goose Bay is Goose Bay because there was a base built there, then everyone else came in. The only people who visited Goose Bay area, prior to the base being built there, were trappers. I think members from Labrador, in particular, can attest to that. The only people who visited the Goose Bay area before the base went there were trappers from Labrador. So, Goose Bay is Goose Bay, a Goose Airport, because of the base.

There is another very important thing to mention here too, Mr. Speaker. Most of the infrastructure that is required for a N.A.T.O. base is already existing in Labrador. You could not put a N.A.T.O. base here in St. John's right now because the

infrastructure is not here, but you can do it in Goose Bay. You can utilize existing facilities, beautiful runways, and some of the best weather in the world for flying. Not only that, the terrain of Labrador is very much like the terrain in the East Bloc countries. So, when those military flyers go out and do their war games and practices, whatever they are doing, then they do it in an environment that is very, very much like it would be in the real thing, if they were to make an attack on East Bloc countries. Labrador is very much like that.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing wrong with the military either. I can say that as an ex-military man.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

I had some personal experience in the military myself. Not a great distinguished service or anything like that. I do not have a lot of ribbons, but it was not my fault that there was not a war on at the time. I was in the service during peace time.

I make this point, Mr. Speaker - and it is very, very difficult, I must say, to concentrate when all the world is breaking out around you - to say that in Goose Bay today, the commander of Goose Air Base, Colonel John David - I am sure he will not mind me mentioning his name - he is a great ambassador for Canada. He is a great ambassador for the military.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BUTT:

He should not be a colonel, he should be a general or a chief of staff, I would say. He has done yeoman service for his country and for this Province, in particular, and for the people of Goose Bay.

MR. WARREN:

He should get promoted.

MR. FLIGHT:

Sit down 'John.'

MR. BUTT:

No, no, I have many things to say in my next ten minutes. But, Mr. Speaker, for the sake of members, I will get back at this again next Wednesday. I will adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Shall we call it 6:00 o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until 3:00 p.m. tomorrow.