

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1977

The House met at 10:00 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER F.D. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I rise today on a sad note as we often do in this House about the passing of a very prominent Newfoundlander. I move that this hon. House record our deepest sympathy at the sad loss to Newfoundland of Peter Cashin who passed away Saturday at the age of eighty-seven years. In the passing of Peter Cashin Newfoundland has lost a great son. Mr. Cashin was a man who dearly loved Newfoundland and he was a man who was regarded with affection throughout the Province. He was a dedicated and sincere man. His outstanding abilities and valuable contribution to this Province are well recognized. Mr. Cashin was motivated by a deep sense of public duty. He was one of the breed of men who, regardless of the odds, was prepared to stand by his conviction. Born at Cape Broyle on March 8, 1890 he was the eldest son of the late Sir Michael and Lady Gertrude Maloney Cashin. He was first elected to the House of Assembly in 1923 to represent the district of Ferryland, a seat which had earlier been held by his father. He also served as a Minister of Finance during the days of Responsible Government. Peter Cashin had a distinguished war record. He joined the Newfoundland Regiment in April of 1915 and went overseas as a Corporal. He was wounded in France in 1916 and returned to England where he joined the British Machine Gun Company, eventually rising to the rank of major in the field. His valuable service is well recognized to his beloved Province. And I would like, Sir, as Premier, to express to his wife Blanche and to the other members of his family, the most sincere condolences of the House. And I know Newfoundlanders everywhere join me in this very sincere expression of sympathy to one of our best known and greatest sons.

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

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may, Sir, I would like on behalf of those of us on this side to associate ourselves with the motion which the Premier has moved. Mr. Speaker, as the Premier has said it is a sad duty, one in which this House is too often called to take part to join in paying tribute to the men who have served in this House, the men who have served this Province, so many of them now are dying. I believe with Peter Cashin's passing we now have among us only one man who served in the pre-Confederation House, Phil Lewis, the hon. P.J. Lewis who is hale and hearty. He was at the funeral yesterday paying tribute to Peter Cashin with whom, of course, he would have served as a Cabinet colleague as well as a member of the House. I believe now that the hon. P.J. Lewis is the only Newfoundlander left alive.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Brown.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, sorry. The hon. Mr. Brown.- I thank my friend from St. John's Centre(Mr. Murphy) - the hon. Mr. Brown was at the funeral Mass yesterday as was the gentleman from St. John's Centre representing the government. Sir, Peter Cashin was a man of many parts. He was a soldier, an author and a politician. But above all he was a Newfoundlander, a patriot, a man who was fiercely dedicated to this land and to her people. His whole life's work was a testimony to his beliefs. He was a son of the Southern Shore. His roots were there and no matter how far away his destiny took him he always came home. I am told that just three weeks ago he returned again to Cape Broyle on what turned out to be his last visit home.

The Premier has \_\_\_\_\_

MR. ROBERTS: said he was born the son of a powerful and a prominent family. But he was a man of the people and a man who knew the people. He worked from one end of Canada to the other. He knew the dignity of toil and he knew the lot of those who toiled for a living. He never forgot them. His whole political career was to champion their cause. When the first war came, Peter Cashin responded as did so many of his fellow Newfoundlanders. His war record was one of gallantry marked by conspicuous bravery. He served with his fellow Newfoundlanders in their own regiment, the Royal Newfoundland Regiment. Enlisting as a private, he rose to commissioned rank and at the end of the war he was a major and was forever thereafter known as the fighting major.

His political career, Sir, was legendary. His father, Sir Michael Cashin, was one of the political giants of his time. Peter Cashin became one of the political giants of all time. He first saw election in 1923 in his own native district of Ferryland. He was elected then and re-elected in 1924 and 1928. He carried on the family tradition, Sir, in the Ferryland District. His father had been elected for 30 years as the member for Ferryland. Peter Cashin made a mark in politics. He soon entered the Cabinet as a member of the Squires Administration. He was Minister of Finance, I believe. It was an unhappy partnership as it turned out, one that was doomed to dissolution. It ended when Peter Cashin accused one of his Cabinet colleagues of forging a minute of council, an event which became a landmark in the politics of the time.

But, Sir, it was during the pre-Confederation years that Peter Cashin wrote his name among the immortals of Newfoundland life and politics. Elected to the National Convention for the District of St. John's West, he quickly assumed the leadership of those who wanted Newfoundland to return to Responsible Government. I am sure that my friend from Twillingate, Sir, who just as quickly assumed the leadership of those who stood for Confederation, was deeply moved and deeply touched at the news of Peter Cashin's passing and I



MR. ROBERTS: am sure he will speak with conviction and passion as to what Peter Cashin meant.

During those years, Sir, Peter Cashin struck a great blow for free speech. He was proud of this, I am told. He struck it in a characteristically Cashin way. He was sued for libel by two of the judges of the Supreme Court for statements which he made in the National Convention, statements which were broadcast by V.O.N.F, the government-owned radio stations.

MR. NEARY: I have not reached that status yet but I am getting there.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from LaPoile, if he reaches Peter Cashin's eminence, would have done well. But Peter Cashin defended himself and he was vindicated by a St. John's jury, by a jury of 12 of his peers. He was as proud of that, I am told, as a man could be and rightly so. He was Irish by heritage, Sir, and a passionate man by conviction. He fought for his cause, the cause of Responsible Government, with all the skill and courage that he could muster. He believed passionately in the rightness of his cause, and all the eloquence and sincerity that were his to command he used in that battle.

Who will ever forget the Voice of Liberty reaching out night after night on the radio to the homes of his fellow Newfoundlanders? Peter Cashin did not win that fight, Sir. He accepted defeat graciously as the voice of the people. But he set about the task of making the new province the kind of land he wanted, the kind of Newfoundland in which he believed. He was elected in 1949, again for the District of Ferryland. He was re-elected in 1951, this time for St. John's West. He served in the House until 1953, when he was appointed director of Civil Defence.

As a member of the House of Assembly and as Leader of the Opposition Peter Cashin was without peer. All who followed him, Sir, must measure themselves

MR. ROBERTS:       against his achievements.

MR. MURPHY:       He was Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS:       We remember - Yes, I am told he served as Leader of the Opposition, yes Sir. Mr. Speaker, we remember Peter Cashin for all of these things. But I think, Sir, his supreme achievement transcended any of them. Above all, first and foremost, Peter Cashin was a Newfoundlander. His love of this country and her people enfolded his every thought and shone through his every word. It stitched throughout the fabric of his memoirs like a golden thread. He loved this country unashamedly and proudly and completely. He was a patriot in the noblest sense of that word. Yesterday, Sir, at the funeral Mass, at the end, the priest called upon the congregation to sing the Ode To Newfoundland. Surely that would have been Peter Cashin's last wish to leave this world with the prayer on his lips, "God Guard Thee Newfoundland." It was his legacy to us. Let us make it a memorial to him.

MR. SPEAKER:       Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my task this morning, Sir, is a little more pleasant one, I hope, and I presume, Mr. Speaker, that it fits the criteria that we have been following in the House in the last couple of weeks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: 'Steve' I want to speak on Peter Cashin.

MR. NEARY: Are you going to -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Oh! I am sorry. I will come back to it since the hon. gentleman wants to -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was going to speak to the motion moved by the Premier, seconded by the Leader of the Opposition. I would not be happy if this occasion were to pass without my having a word to the sincere expressions that have come from the two hon. leaders of this House today on Peter Cashin. I think that perhaps the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning) and I are the only members of the House today who served in the House - no, the Attorney-General did; no, he did not - we two are perhaps the only members of the House today who served in the legislature at the same time that Peter Cashin did. That was in the old Colonial Building down on Military Road. Peter Cashin never did sit in this particular Chamber in Confederation Building.

He was, I would say, next only to his father, Sir Michael Cashin, the strongest, the most powerful opposition man who ever sat in a Newfoundland House of Assembly beginning in 1832. He was a most eloquent man, a real orator. His style of speaking, when it was not witty, when it was not sarcastic, was deeply emotional, not logical, not always reasonable, but deeply emotional and with an amazing capacity to coin phrases, and to repeat phrases from other sources, when applied to his friends or his opponents. I always felt that Peter Cashin was at heart a strong Confederate. He had lived in Canada for many, many

MR. SMALLWOOD:

years. He had been a taxpayer in Canada. He had been a voter in Canada. He had taken an active part in elections in Canada. I do not know for what party, but for some party or other. And I believe that he had great admiration for Canada. But the great purpose of his life in those years when the question of the National Convention came up was to get rid of the Commission of Government. He regarded their very presence in Newfoundland as an insult to Newfoundland and Newfoundlanders, an insult to the idea of democratic self government. And he devoted himself with all his amazing enthusiasm and emotion to the task of getting them out of Newfoundland. Now the only alternative he saw at first to getting them out was Responsible Government. There were only two forms of government that he could see, continue under the non-elected appointed commission of government or go back to the system of Responsible Government under which the people would elect their own legislature and the government would always be responsible to that legislature which, of course, is the meaning of the term Responsible Government.

I believe that he regarded my introduction of the subject of Confederation as, not only inconvenient but perilous, dangerous to his own cause, that the keen opposition of the people to the Commission's system would be diluted by the new issue of Confederation. And it was not necessarily because he was opposed to Confederation as such, but rather the introduction of the issue at that time as constituting a danger to the cause to which he was so passionately devoted himself. I had a many a private talk with him during those days of battle. And we would meet from time to time quietly, sometimes privately, mostly privately. And I would try to persuade him that the one way to get a Responsible Government restored to Newfoundland would be as a Province of Canada. I said we would have full Responsible Government. He half felt that. And there were times I felt when he was tempted to join me in ~~the cause~~

MR. SMALLWOOD:

the cause for Confederation. And it was not without significance that he and I sat together side by side in the distinguished visitors' gallery of the House of Commons at Ottawa to hear the debate by Parliament, by the House of Commons, lead by the Right Honourable Louis St. Laurent, \_\_\_ then Prime Minister of Canada, and together saw Canada pass the law which from their point of view made us, or provided for the making of a Province out of Newfoundland. When we did become a Province of Canada, he sat in the House in opposition to the government, but he had to be. I wish I could tell the House of one occasion when he and I worked extremely closely together in the most practical fashion in an election to achieve a result that we both desired.

MR. NEARY: I think I worked in that election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Perhaps the hon. member -

MR. NEARY: 2 campaigned in that election.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. I was not going to go so far as to say that it was that particular election. But in all events, we worked closely together on more than one occasion. And I was very proud that I was able to persuade Peter Cashin to accept a high position in the public service under my leadership. And he served in that capacity for a number of years. He is gone, but he is not gone. The motto of Bishop Field College, where I went, was, "Non moritur cuius fama vivit" which means, I believe, "He is not dead whose fame liveth." And Peter Cashin's fame will live and outlive the names of just about everybody in this Chamber today because he was a battler, he was a fighter and always he was a battler for Newfoundland, not only in the fields of Flanders, Flanders Fields, but in the Colonial Building, in everything he did and everywhere he went he was a battler for Newfoundland. We have lost, Newfoundland has lost the active brain and the loyalty and the devotion and the marvellous enthusiasm and emotion of a very



MR. SMALLWOOD:

remarkable Newfoundlander indeed. But his name will live.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize the hon. gentleman, it is noted in order therefore that a suitable message of condolence be sent to the survivors of the late Major Cashin.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as I started to say a few moments ago, Sir, this motion that I would like to make, and some hon. gentlemen on the other side could second it or somebody in the Opposition, I want to move a motion, Sir, that we send a letter of congratulations to St. Patrick's School Girls Glee Club which was awarded the Leslie Bell trophy for the outstanding performance by a choral group at the Canadian Music Educators Association which concluded last Wednesday night at the Arts and Culture Centre. It was the first time, Sir, that a Newfoundland choir won the award which included a cash gift of some \$200, so I am told. The eighty-five girls from St. Patrick's Elementary School were selected the top group of eleven choirs from schools and universities all across Canada which performed at the convention's evening concert last Wednesday evening. The Glee Club was directed by Sister Brenda Lynch and is well known across Canada having performed at the C.M.E.A. Convention at Ottawa four years ago and has participated in many Kiwanis Music Festivals here in St. John's. So I would like for the House, Sir, if somebody would second the motion, to send out a letter of congratulations to the choir for winning this award and for their outstanding musical accomplishments over the last several years.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

HON. T.A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of government may I join with the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) in extending to the St. Patrick's Glee Club our very sincere congratulations on this attainment. I was one of the founding members of the Music Festival in this Province, and it has been a source of great satisfaction to see glee clubs,



May 24, 1977.

Tape 3102

RH - 3

MR. HICKMAN:

particularly St. Patrick's Glee Club, each year getting stronger and stronger and moving out beyond their provincial attainments and receiving well deserved national recognition. Their director, like

---

MR. HICKMAN:

so many of our teaching nuns, has shown a great deal of devotion in training these young Newfoundlanders. And I am sure that all members of this hon. House as well as all Newfoundlanders are indeed proud of their achievement.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues I would like to join with other hon. members in congratulating the St. Pat's Girls Glee Club on their tremendous achievement and also congratulate the parents of the children and the Sisters who helped in their training period. And we would certainly like to add our congratulations to the other members and be associated with any motion that is moved in this House and put forth to the glee club in question.

MR. SPEAKER: Now before calling Statements by Ministers I would like to welcome to the House of Assembly on behalf of hon. members the Ambassador of Norway to Canada who is visiting Newfoundland, his Excellency Knut Hedemann.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

HON. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, during the estimates of the Department of Education it was stated by me that the - and in the estimates, of course - that the grade ten electoral scholarship would be discontinued this year. However, because of the lateness of the budget and the estimates and the fact that the schools in the Province had received the standard information governing the scholarship and have made preparation for it, the department has decided that the fifty-two grade ten electoral scholarships will be again awarded this year. That can be covered in the present estimates. It is an amount of about \$5,200. The remaining scholarships for both grade ten and eleven will be reduced by half as announced during the estimates. And to come

MR. HOUSE:

along with that, Mr. Speaker, and a little separate from it, I want to announce on the recommendations of the Education Leave Committee, I am pleased to announce that the names of the two teachers who have been granted sabbatical leave in 1977-78, and the two teachers are Mr. Edwin J. Broaders of Port Saunders and Madeline Wheeler of Summerford. These teachers will be attending the university for the whole semester and while on leave, of course, will receive the two-thirds of their annual salary.

Mr. Speaker, the committee is made up of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association, the Department and the Federation of School Boards. And in making their recommendations they took into account such factors as the certification of the applicants at the present time, and of course, their recent efforts to upgrade and the existing opportunities they have had in the past. I understand that both these nominees were the unanimous choice of the committee. And I think there were about forty-one applicants. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, we welcome indeed the announcement by the minister that the administration has seen fit to reinstate the grade ten electoral scholarships for this year in view of the fact that plans had already been made to award these, Sir. We are disappointed indeed that the administration has not seen fit to continue on with the Responsible Government's Centenary Scholarships. And the only thing I could add to that, Sir, it is such a very small amount of money, something in the order of \$95,000 in total - well, you double that. We are dealing with a very small amount of money, Sir, as compared with the total estimates of the Department of Education. And the one question I would just like to raise and ask the minister is why fool around and why interfere with these electoral scholarship and the Responsible Government Centenary Scholarship when they represent such a very small amount of money, but it is so very important to a few students throughout this Province. And whilst I welcome,

May 24, 1977.

Tape 3103

RH - 3

MR. ROWE:

and my colleagues welcome the announcement that the grade ten electoral scholarship will be reinstated for this year, I would like to recommend to the minister that he once again go back to his officials and possibly Treasury Board with the possibility of

MR. ROWE: re-instating all of these scholarships the Responsible Government Centenary Scholarships and the Electoral Scholarships because they do represent a very small amount of money compared to the total estimates of the Department of Education. Sir, before I sit down I would like to, on behalf of my colleagues, as well to congratulate Ms. Saunders and Mr. Broaders for being awarded, given their sabbatical for this year and wish them all the success in their studies over the coming year.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table a report of the operation of Corner Brook Housing Corporation and the Financial Statements of the year ending Dec. 31, 1976.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: A question for the Minister of Health, Sir, back on the abortion issue. Could the minister tell us, please, whether he has as yet replied to the letter dated I believe May 6, which he received from Mr. Kevin Breen of the Family Life Council here in St. John's. Has the minister yet replied to that letter, please?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if I replied to the letter or not.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. COLLINS: Do you want to answer the question or do you want me to answer it?

MR. NOLAN: It is just as well for the galleries to answer it.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly take it under advisement. I believe that I did receive a letter from Mr. Breen and I am pretty sure that it has been answered. But without giving an emphatic yes or no I prefer to check it out.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Sepaker, if the minister is not sure whether he answered the letter or not, could he tell us what he said in his answer, assuming there was an answer? The minister does not seem to take it seriously, Sir, I do. This is a group who have a very definite stand on this particular issue. A group who have written to the minister and complained publicly now that in three weeks they have not had an answer and furthermore, Sir, a group who say in their letter, as I understand it, that they find that the minister was not being full and frank - those are my words, not the committees - not being full and frank in answering questions in the House of Assembly with respect to the therapeutic abortions carried out in this province. I believe the minister's answer to which they refer was given in respect to questions asked by the gentleman from LaPoile. The minister in answering to refresh his memory, said that he was not aware of the reasons for which abortions were authorized by the abortion committee at the St. John's General Hospital. Could the minister tell us what was in his answer, assuming he remembers whether he sent an answer or not? If it is not in his answer, what answer is he going to make to them?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I gave the Hon. Leader of the Opposition the undertaking that I would check to see if I did receive the letter and I seem to recall receiving a letter. I also seem to recall responding to the letter. But let me check it out to make sure that I have responded to it or I have not responded to it. I would not want to mislead the House. If there is any fault, Mr. Speaker, I might say, if there is anyone finds any fault with the abortion procedures in Newfoundland, it is, according to Mr. LaLonde the Federal Minister of Health, a lot of people do not have access to abortion committees. So the hon. member is going to try and play with this particular issue like he is trying to play politics with other issues, he might contact his so-called confident in Ottawa and see what his stand on it is.

MR. ROBERTS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, original questioner.



MR.ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I assume I will allow the same latitude as the minister. Could the minister tell us then whether in his views he feels more abortion committees set up in this province?

MR.SPEAKER: Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR.NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister undertake to get for the House, Sir, the number of abortions performed in age groups, of different age groups, the technique that was used in these abortions, and if any research was done to see if any damage was done to the females who had these abortions? How far the pregnancy was advanced and so forth before the abortions were made to see if any damage had to be repaired later on by specialists resulting from these abortions? Would the minister undertake to get that information for the House?

MR.SPEAKER: A further supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister undertake to lay upon the table of the House when he is searching his memory—because I know the answer to this letter — will he undertake to lay upon the table of the House any communications which he has had with any of the hospital boards in this Province in the last, let us say, the last twelve months with respect to abortions? He tells us that Mr. LaLonde allegedly feels that if there is a problem it rests with the fact that not enough hospitals are providing abortions. Can the minister tell us then whether he agrees with that, whether he disagrees? And would he tell us what, as I say, what communications he has had with the hospital boards with respect to abortions?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. COLLINS: I will take that under advisement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Any hon. member rising on a supplementary? The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. Sir, in view of the warm weather that we experienced over the weekend, this uncommonly beautiful hot Summer day, I wonder if the Premier's political temperature has risen to the height that he is now willing to announce the date of the byelections in Ferryland and St. John's West?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, this is certainly not an uncommonly beautiful day in this Province. We have good weather in this Province and it is only the pessimists in the Province who think that we have a lot of bad weather. The mood is always good. The temperature is going up. And I would think, Sir, that in due course the flowers will bloom and byelections will be held.

MR. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROWE: Would the Premier indicate, Sir, whether or not the elections will be announced before or after the Summer Games?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, with the Opposition as the Opposition it may be one of the events.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Tourism, Sir, if the minister would bring the House up to date on activities in the provincial parks over the May 24th weekend involving moronic drunken individuals and groups? Could the minister tell the House just what has happened over the weekend?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

HON. T. HICKEY: I do not have the details, Mr. Speaker. I am waiting for a report. When I have it I will make a statement on it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question to the Minister of Justice.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary question.

MR. NEARY: Would the Minister of Justice indicate to the House that because of the takeover of some of our provincial parks by moronic drunken individuals and groups, could the minister tell the House if the minister is going to set up a special force to police the parks during the Summer before their complete control is taken over by these individuals and these groups?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, there has been no indication and there has never been an indication that young Newfoundlanders are going to take over complete control of the parks. If there are any breaches of the law in any of the parks, either the federal park or the provincial parks, then these breaches of the law will be dealt with by the police. But let us not condemn every young person in Newfoundland for an incident which allegedly occurred in a particular provincial park or the federal park today. My understanding is, - not an understanding,

MR. HICKMAN:

I know that during the park season that the R.C.M.P. are particularly alert to law enforcement in these areas.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. NEARY: The minister, of course, Mr. Speaker, has twisted and turned - we are not accusing every young person, nobody made that insinuation -

MR. HICKMAN: Well then, why would you want a special -

MR. NEARY: All we are asking the minister is if measures will be taken, steps will be taken to protect the ordinary person and their family when they are out trying to enjoy the facilities of the parks and if the minister intends to have the parks policed because the R.C.M.P. have great difficulty, especially on busy weekends, because the force is tied up with men off duty and so forth, very great difficulty in enforcing and responding to complaints from the parks as they did this weekend. And they have no facilities to take the people into custody and transport them to jails and so forth. And they have to be called back off duty which takes a considerable period of time. Is the minister aware of all this and if so what is the minister going to do about it?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, last Summer we had one or two incidents in parks in Newfoundland where there were breaches of the law, one on the East Coast and one on the West Coast, two for the whole year. And in both incidents I understand charges were laid by the R.C.M.P. and dealt with very effectively by the courts. And if there are any breaches of the law in any of our parks this Summer they too will be dealt with and dealt with effectively by the R.C.M.P.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, in reference to the rowdyism, drunkenism or whatever is referred to in the parks, I am wondering if the Minister of Justice has any records that he could table in the House in connection with disturbances of the types referred to in the last two or three years in the provincial park or the federal parks for that matter? And also, is the minister aware that people were driven from the parks last year because of the rowdyism of certain individuals? And what is the minister now prepared to do to assure the people of this Province who spend good money for a simple weekend that he is willing to protect them? Never mind whether the menace is local or foreign. What is he prepared to do?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I will repeat, and if I am incorrect in what I say, the hon. Minister of Tourism will correct me, that last year there were instances for the whole season in the parks of Newfoundland that required -

MR. NEARY: Get out of here.

MR. NOLAN: Ah! Go away boy!

MR. HICKMAN: You know, the allegation that people were driven from the parks. What are we trying to do with Newfoundlanders? If there are any breaches of the law the people in the parks get the same kind of protection as Newfoundlanders everywhere and they will get them here, and they will get them here.

MR. NOLAN: God help them there if that is the kind of protection they get.

MR. HICKMAN: And that is why we escape a lot of the rowdyism that other jurisdictions in North America have to encounter.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. minister aware that apart from one cartaker maybe, possibly two during certain hours of the day, that there is no



MR. NEARY:

protection for the ordinary person in these parks none at all?

And it takes hours sometimes to get the police to respond. The Newfoundland Constabulary has no jurisdiction outside the city.

Mr. Speaker, I know for a fact that R.C.M.P. had to be called back on duty on Saturday night, had to be called back -

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman will wait for a moment. I have to call to the attention of hon. gentlemen, and not only the last hon. gentleman who asked a question, actually this, I think, tendency has been shared the past few days by a number of hon. members and that is the length of questions and the inclusion therein of argument, expressions of opinion, unnecessary material. So I draw this out to all hon. members in terms of questions and the same general rule applies in terms of answers as well. And I think the basic philosophy behind that is that if questions are too long and answers are too long, then obviously there will be much fewer questions and much fewer subjects covered.

MR. NEARY: I apologize for the length of the question, Your Honour, and I would like to just - I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible.)

MR. NEARY: No, I am not finished with the question yet. I am asking the Minister of Justice -

MR. HICKEY: You do not want the facts.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I do want the facts.

MR. HICKEY: No, you do not.

MR. NEARY: I probably have more facts than the hon. gentleman has right now. But I would like to ask -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Carry on the question, but there should be no further interference. Now the hon. member is recognized for his question.



MR. NEARY: I want to ask the hon. Minister of Justice, Sir, if there is any time lag, any delay in the law enforcement officers, in this case the R.C.M.P. who have the jurisdiction outside St. John's, if there is any delay, not through any fault of the R.C.M.P. but because it is a busy weekend, the number of people on duty and so forth, people off, is there any delay in getting the R.C.M.P. to respond to these requests to come in and check the parks when they have complaints?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I will check on the response time of the R.C.M.P. to any complaint that they received over the weekend.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay of Islands, a supplementary.

MR. WOODROW: A question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. gentleman have a supplementary to my right - no.

The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: I would like to ask the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture a question, Mr. Speaker. Much concern is felt over the water supply for the city of Corner Brook, if the proposed spraying for the spruce budworm is carried out so near the water supply. Would the minister assure the House that there is no danger from the spray? And if there is a danger, why not go further inland?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I have assured the city of Corner Brook and the other groups who have approached me in this particular regard that the experimental spray programme will be carried out in such a manner that no chemicals will be released any closer than four miles to the water supply. I might point out that the chemicals that are being used in the Corner Brook area, which is matacil, mainly has been proven by environment control people that if

MR. MAYNARD: The spray was done directly over the water supply, the water supply would not be contaminated to a standard that is not acceptable as per the Canadian standards. However, because of the strong reservations expressed by the people in Corner Brook we have said that the spraying will not be carried out within four miles of the water supply and the coordinates have been plotted out for the aircraft on that basis.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. Hon. member Winsor -Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, proof that the Opposition cooperates with the government is in the fact that I defer that question to the hon. member for Bay of Islands because I realize it is a great concern there. But to the minister, Sir, it has been established over the past weekend that the spraying will indeed be within one-quarter of a mile of the Corner Brook water supply, the head water that is feeding the Corner Brook water supply. In view of this, was the minister prepared to reconsider spraying in that area and consider the possibility that spray will eventually, whether it is chemical or bacteria, will eventually end up in the Corner Brook water supply? It is causing great concern in Corner Brook and I think the only solution would be to reconsider that particular area.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister for Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, whatever information was received over the weekend I do not know what the source of it was. But I will say now, and I will repeat it and repeat it continuously from now on that the spraying will not be carried out closer than four miles to the Corner Brook or Curling water supply. If any coordinates have been given to any one that contradicts that and the coordinates have been changed obviously the person who has been giving the coordinates does not have the up to date information.

MR.SPEAKER: Hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR.RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether he has received any report yet from the Advisory Council on Occupational Health and Safety and what is exactly is happening to the hearings of that council?

MR.SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have received two reports of the meetings they had. I have not had an actual report on the items that they are discussing under the terms of reference. They are obviously doing some research in respect to certain items that have been referred to them. Other items of course which followed in the ambit of the terms of reference have also given an indication to them that the government would await the recommendations from this committee since of the committee six members were elected from the various industries across the province. Six members were elected from the various unions across the province to represent hopefully all aspects of labour and management in the province. As well I have appointed a few iceberg people, mostly from the university who have been involved in that, under the chairmanship of Dr. Leslie Harris.

As I say, I have had no report as such although I have had reports of the meetings.

MR.SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR.RIDEOUT: I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not it is part and package of the terms of reference of this committee to travel around the province to the various industrial centres to hold hearings and so on on the subject of occupational health and safety?

MR.SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR.ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, of course the committee, now the Interim Advisory Committee, has anything they want to do to advise the minister on occupational health and safety, which

MR. ROUSSEAU: this government feels to be a very important matter. I am sure hon. members across the House feel that, yes, and I have made an undertaking obviously that we are going to await the recommendations from the committee. I know right now the committee is looking at certain aspects. For example: The right of a man to refuse to work in what he considers to be an unsafe situation, the use of full time labour safety committees and other aspects of that are being considered. But obviously of course the committee wants to research other provinces and I would think also is not incumbent on the minister or government to tell the committee how to recommend to them. I would assume that hearings would be held and I would also assume that the committee would be open at any time for any individual group as we have across this province in the hon. member's district and in my own district and in some districts in southern Newfoundland where there is a real concern now on the part of the people they would certainly be open to hearings. Certainly I hope to consult these people before moves are made in areas that I have just mentioned and many other areas that are available to them.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not any allotted time span has been given this committee to carry out their work which they have been set up?

I ask that in this light, wondering whether or not when the government is going to get around to appointing a permanent advisory committee on occupational health and safety because I think it is certainly a necessary thing to have.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: In broad terms, and you know, you hate to put this on the record, this Committee really was an attempt to get the concept of an Occupational Health and Safety Committee off the ground, and generally the terms of reference have been one year, and that is the only term for which Dr. Leslie Harris has accepted the position, to get the thing off the ground. But while they are doing that it should not be misinterpreted that they are only forming the terms of reference in which they operate. They are also at specific items, two of which I mentioned, many others involved in Occupational Health and Safety. So this Committee really, towards the end of this year, would have to look at, now a permanent advisory committee in whatever form is recommended by the Committee, as well as this interim committee, to look at various aspects of occupational health and safety. And when these recommendations are made, of course, to the minister they will be brought before government for consideration.

MR. RIDEOUT: An excellent minister to ask questions to.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: An excellent minister to ask questions to.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile, a supplementary, and then the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. minister if incorporated in the terms of reference would be the provision for the advisory group to make recommendations as to the moral, legal and financial responsibility on the part of the company, because everybody seems to want the government to pave the road in Baie Verte, for instance, when I believe the company should be participating in the paving of this road; they are the ones who are taking the profits out and who created the nuisance and the health hazard. Is there any provision for the advisory committee to make recommendations or report as to the responsibility of the people who create the health hazards? You know, if there are any financial obligation on their part to pave roads, for instance, that we are now hearing so much about in the Baie Verte area?



Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I think, is a question, you know, it is a philosophical question and a very deep question the hon. member asked.

MR. NEARY: And a very good question.

MR. ROUSSEAU: A very good question. I will not tell him that. I think the Committee has to learn to walk before it runs and there are certain basic fundamentals that must be formulated before, and perhaps later on in its deliberations it may or may not. The one thing the minister is not going to do is- the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was at one time a minister, and when you appoint an advisory committee you do not tell them what to tell you. They have broad terms of reference.

MR. NEARY: But you give them broad guidelines.

MR. ROUSSEAU: They have very broad guidelines. They have six members, as I say, elected from Labour. They have six members elected from industry. Hopefully it covers the basic industries and the basic labour movements across the Province. And I am certain that their concern will be shared. And any movement that they think should be made in any specific direction they will certainly recommend. But in the meantime I think that the committee is functioning and drawing up its own mechanics as to its operation, and looking at the, I guess, more basic points at this point in time and also the question of consolidation of all existing health and safety legislation under one division or under one department of government.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to return to the Premier on the subject of the by-elections in view of his wit and humour in indicating that it may be one of the events held at the Summer Games. Is the Premier serious that the by-elections may be held during the Summer Games? And if so,

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!



MR. ROWE: I am not finished the question, Mr. Speaker.

PREMIER MOORES: Only if the member of the Opposition is, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I am not finished the question yet.

PREMIER MOORES: Go on.

MR. ROWE: I was wondering if the Premier could indicate whether he thinks by-elections or any elections in this Province are sports activities or serious business in view of the statements that he made?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not think they are sports activities as such. I think it has been facetiously referred to as events on occasions. I think it is a very serious matter. And I am glad that the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) is so lighthearted and humorous this morning, but I am glad to see he is as serious as well, but I am wondering if he is talking on behalf of the Opposition or just parts of the Opposition, who may not be in the Opposition at the present time.

MR. ROWE: The Premier is -

MR. SPEAKER: The original questioner, I believe, has a supplementary.

MR. ROWE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: No. I am asking the hon. gentleman does he have a supplementary?

MR. ROWE: Yes, I have a supplementary answer, Mr. Speaker. I am speaking on behalf of the official Opposition.

PREMIER MOORES: (Inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman for Windsor-Buchans has a supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the Premier confirm or deny to the House that the rumour has it that the Premier cannot find a candidate

Mr. Flight: to run in St. John's West? Could the Premier confirm that, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I am sure when the time comes we will have a candidate. Any rumour to that effect that we cannot find a candidate could or could not be true. We have not really looked very hard as yet, and when we do I am sure he will be the right person, Sir. There will be people showing their inclination I understand today as to whom would be the next member of the House of Assembly will be from St. John's West and from Ferryland. But I think, Sir, when the time comes we will have a candidate, yes.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, then the hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South.

MR. SPEAKER: the hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. the Premier tell us if it will be broadcaster Bob Lewis, Bob Cole or Mr. Carl Sterrett of VOCM's Hot Line or Open Line? Which one of the three does the Premier favour?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I have no idea, Mr. Speaker, but as the Minister of Justice just said, if they are under the PC banners I am sure all of them are winners.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, a question for the Minister of Justice, Mr. Speaker. During the discussion on his estimates I asked a question referring to a study done on communications involving his department, the police and so on following the tragic fire in the Goulds. Now the minister at that time indicated that he would take a look at the situation. I know there are at least four or five copies of that study going about. I now ask the minister again, is he going to table a copy of that report on communications and when?

MR. ROBERTS: In the age of Xerox nothing is secret.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. ROBERTS: No answer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question, Sir, talking about the by-elections, my question is for the Minister of the Environment and Consumer Affairs about the mystery slime not in St. John's West but in Placentia Bay. Has the minister undertaken to find out-- or the officials of the minister's department to find out about this mystery slime that is coating the nets of the fishermen in Placentia Bay? The minister does not seem to know what I am talking about.

MR. MURPHY: You are talking about slime. I mean, you must -

MR. NEARY: Yes, well the minister understands that. If there is a man in the House more qualified to know about slime it would be the hon. gentleman but, Sir, we are talking about slime in Placentia Bay. It is clogging up the fishermen's nets in Placentia Bay. Has the minister launched an investigation into this of any kind?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Environment and Consumer Affairs.

MR. MURPHY: I do not know, Mr. Speaker. I will draw it to the minister's attention. Quite frankly if Mr. Know All would give me the particulars I would certainly get my officials to check. I would say, and I am not passing the buck, but it would be a Federal responsibility. But I will certainly check with the office immediately for the hon. member and get right back and perhaps arrange transportation over so as he could see the head man and get all the particulars right there and then.

MR. NEARY: I would be glad, Mr. Speaker, to supply the hon. gentleman with the information which the hon. gentleman requires.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. Is the hon. gentleman asking for a supplementary?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Did I understand the hon. gentleman to say that this could be a Federal matter and that the hon. gentleman has not undertaken to look into this matter? Has the hon. gentleman heard about it at all or is it something new to the hon. gentleman? It has been going on now for a week or so in Placentia Bay; the fishermen had to take their nets in because of this mysterious slime that is floating around the bay.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Environment and Consumer Affairs.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. minister does not want to plead anything, Sir, but he has not been too well since last Wednesday or so and I had more slime in myself possibly than I think in Placentia Bay so I got clear of most of it. But I will certainly check. In Placentia Bay, what area?

MR. NEARY: I do not know. I presume it is in the Southern Harbour area.

MR. MURPHY: In Placentia Bay. It is Southern Harbour. Well I will check immediately.

MR. NEARY: It is in that area somewhere.

MR. MURPHY: Okay. In that area somewhere in Placentia Bay, out that way.

MR. NEARY: Yes, down near Little Harbour East, Southern Harbour, all in that area, general area. Come by Chance, Long Harbour in that general vicinity.

MR. MURPHY: Okay, we will check on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: A question, Mr. Speaker, for the Minister of Health. I am wondering if the minister is in a position to table the suicide rates in this Province for the last year or two. In fact, would he be good enough to table the suicide rates as he understands them in this Province, say, since the year 1971 and could he then give us a breakdown on how it has increased since he and his administration came to office. Is he prepared to do that?

MR. NEARY: If we get there the next election we will -

MR. NOLAN: Come on, stand up you big old -

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder, Sir, if the hon. Minister of Industrial Development, the gentleman who represents the hon. the Premier with the golden padlock, would tell us about Atlantic Design Homes in Stephenville and also, while the minister is on his feet because we do not have much time left during the Question Period, to tell us how big a layoff they are going to have in Baie Verte, the cause of the layoff? Are they permanent layoffs or will they be recalled? Will they be the first to be recalled when the company starts rehiring?

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

MR. LUNDRIGAN: In answer to the questions, maybe I should take the rest of the morning and give a detailed answer. Mr. Speaker, Atlantic Design Homes have started early this year 1977, about two months earlier than usual. So what we have heard of Stephenville is an indication that they will have a premature close of the plant.



MR. LUNDRIGAN: As the hon. member must be aware and members of the legislature, the Atlantic Design Homes normally starts up in about June and runs through until about October, it is a very short season, a five or six month season. This year they have been negotiating with the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing to avail of one hundred housing units for construction with the anticipation of getting that work - they started work early, two months early, so what they have indicated now publicly, I understand, they will be closing early unless they can get this type of work. Now, Mr. Speaker, discussions are still ongoing with the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing and the federal CMHC people to try and get the contract in place which would allow them to carry on until the Fall of this year. There are about thirty or forty jobs involved if they get the work, there are one hundred housing units, there is \$3 million worth of work, the problem has been the design - the new design that was contemplated for the housing units that are part of my colleague's, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing department.

Now I understand that today officials from the company, Atlantic Design Homes, will be in St. John's for a meeting around one o'clock with the minister and some people and it is hoped that that particular contract can still be awarded. It is a unique type of endeavour because I believe, Mr. Speaker, the problem of not having tenders called has caused some problems, plus the design problems as well. So I am not as pessimistic as the hon. member about Atlantic Design Homes, they will go through their normal work year, hopefully, if they can have the matter put to bed regarding the special contract which is above their normal work, they will extend their season, plus there is other work, we have worked with them in trying to design component parts of - component housing parts which will find their way into the market, they have started to break into the market for - what is that thing they use in education, the hon. Minister of Education?

MR. HOUSE: The portable classroom.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The portable classroom, They have not broken in as heavily, they have had big competition from Alberta Trailer Company with respect to that particular type of unit. We feel they should move heavily into the portable classroom area and we also understand that they are negotiating internationally for some types of work that can extend their season. So Atlantic Design Homes started early, hopefully will not finish. We will have an expanded season if we can put to bed the matters relating to the minister's department.

MR. NEARY: What about the layoffs at Baie Verte?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Baie Verte, Mr. Speaker, was a different type of problem and it is a problem having to do with what you might call a structural unemployment problem, and the unions are negotiating with the company right now, which does not directly come under our jurisdiction; and if there is anything we can do in working with the company and the union to lessen the impact of new shipping methods we will certainly be quite willing to work towards this.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 8.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Mortgage Brokers Act." (Bill No. 40), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 40, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 9.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Act." (Bill No. 47), carried.

On motion, Bill No. 47, read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Motion 10.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Social Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Adoption Of Children Act, 1972." (Bill No. 61), carried.

On motion Bill No. 61, read a first time ordered read a second time, on tomorrow.

On motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

For the information

MR. CHAIRMAN:

of the committee we have one hour and five minutes remaining under this heading, page 119, heading 1901.

Shall 1901-01 carry?

The hon. member for Mount Pearl.

MR. WINDSOR: Now, Mr. Chairman, I would just like to take a couple of moments to get on to my favorite topic and a few other related topics. We have had some mention, of course, of the Henley Report on the St. John's Urban Regional Study and the concept of regional government, expanded city, and this sort of thing. I am not going to dwell too long on the aspect of regional government. I think all the municipalities in the area have had a number now of meetings. And the meetings and representations that have been made to the minister and to the department have been fairly clearly in agreement that regional government is essential to this area. The main question that remains is the form of regional government to adopt, how to structure it, should they be elected and should they be appointed and so forth. The main point I want to make here this morning is that because of the Bay Bulls regional water supply system of course it is essential that some form of regional structure be adopted to manage and operate that new system, tremendously expensive, complicated, technical system.

I think the minister has indicated that he intends to initiate some form of regional government, perhaps just the basis on which the ultimate form will be built. I compliment the minister on that. I think it is perhaps the best that could be done under the present circumstances. It is impossible, I think, to - maybe not impossible but certainly I think impractical and probably unwise to implement a complete regional government at this time. There are a number of questions and a number of decisions to be made. And I think they should be thought through carefully. And so it would appear that prior to July 1st when this regional water supply system comes on stream, we should have some form of regional control.

MR. WINDSOR:

Not only with water supply, Sir, but we have, of course, increasingly regionalized, or increasingly we are regionalizing sewerage disposal systems. The minister has in his estimates here, and I may as well refer to them because it is doubtful that we will get down through all the headings, but I think there is an item here of \$750,000 for Waterford Valley trunk sewer. That, Sir, is absolutely essential. It may appear to be an extremely expensive sewer system, and so it is really. In fact, Sir, it is somewhat over-designed at the moment for the simple reason that the corridor through the Waterford Valley is very limited. There is only room, I believe, for one more pipe to go down through there. So we could perhaps get away with a smaller system for the next ten or twenty years but it would then be almost impossible to upgrade it. So it is imperative to design a system that would handle all future development in the Waterford Valley area and anything that could be predicted to flow in through it. And again I compliment the minister on initiating this and, of course, the St. John's Regional Water and Sewer Board have been working on it. That is critical. That sewer is critical, Sir, to permit expansion and to continue development of the Donovan's Industrial Park. It includes also a Mount Pearl by-pass sewer which takes the industrial sewerage from Donovan's Industrial Park past down to Mount Pearl. At the moment it flows through the Mount Pearl system and as a result you are getting overloading of the Mount Pearl system. So I am very happy to see that coming in the minister's estimates.

Now, Sir, I do not want to deal at length on the question of boundaries in the proposed regional government. This misnomer we hear, the super city, I do not think that is true. But I would like to deal for a moment with some of the arguments that have been put forth



MR. WINDSOR: for and against it, particularly, of course, as it relates to the Mount Pearl area. The reason I am concerned about that, Sir, is that in November we do have municipal elections coming up, and the minister has indicated he will have some form of regional government, but it is unlikely that, perhaps, any new communities will be incorporated, or any actual municipal boundaries will have changed by then. My concern is for the Newtown area, where we have approaching 3,000 people, who are, at the moment, governed, so to speak, by the Metropolitan Area Board. I would like to think that by November 1st these people would have some form of municipal council so they could vote in that election. Otherwise, they may have to wait for five years, unless the minister should see fit to call some form of a by-election, so to speak, and that is, of course, within his jurisdiction, his authority. But whether or not, Sir, the decision is finally made to make Mount Pearl and Newtown, Kilbride, Donovans area all of that part of the City of St. John's, I do not think, really, it would matter if the Mount Pearl town boundary was extended to include the Newtown area. I think if Mount Pearl becomes part of St. John's, then so will Newtown, and vice versa. If Newtown becomes part of St. John's, I think it would be prudent, as well then, to make Mount Pearl a part of the City, and I would be one of the first to advocate that. However, at the moment the general consensus, certainly in the Town of Mount Pearl, is very clear, although I understand there will be a circular sent around very shortly. But the reaction that we have had has been very clear, that the people of Mount Pearl wish to remain as a separate entity. And the feedback that I am getting from the committees in Newtown, who have investigated the three alternatives that were left open to them, namely, to join with the City of St. John's, to amalgamate with the Town of Mount Pearl, or to perhaps, form a separate community on their own - there were three committees set up and each of these have investigated these possibilities - and I have met with them, and the indication I am getting from them now is that the committee members, at least, are convinced that the best alternative for the people of Newtown is to amalgamate with the Town of Mount Pearl, although I can not say that in

MR. WINDSOR: any official capacity because they have not yet brought their three committees together for a joint report to a general meeting of the residents. But that would appear to be the direction they would wish to go. Sir, I am sure all that will sort itself out, in time.

There are a number of statements being made - have been made in the past, almost daily, that concern me, Sir. I hear the term, parasitic communities. That really gets me going. I would like to quote here an article from the February 5th Evening Telegram, an editorial by Mr. Collins. He says, and I am just quoting sections, but, quote "Nearby communities which depend so heavily on St. John's facilities and services to survive" and he uses the term, "parasitic villages," and "facilities and services they now get for nothing. No wonder they can enjoy such low tax rates in their own communities. We are the milk cow and they are sucking away for free." Now, Sir, that is utter humbug. I speak, primarily, for the Town of Mount Pearl on this. I do not wish to debate these statements as they might apply to Wedgewood Park, or other communities, although I think they are in much the same position.

Sir, what are these services that we are getting for nothing - I would like to know.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. WINDSOR: Yes, that is about it. Perhaps, maybe, the other way around.

Water supply, Sir. The Town of Mount Pearl does, indeed, receive water from the City of St. John's.

The City of St. John's, in 1959 I believe it was, installed a 16 inch water main from Waterford Bridge Road, or by the Waterford Hospital/Bowring Park area, to the Town of Mount Pearl, via Topsail Road. \$600,000 was made available by the Provincial Government to the City of St. John's to do that. And in so doing, the City, of course, opened up development in all the Brookfield Estates and the Cowan Heights area - all that west end of the city, which has been, no doubt, most lucrative to them, very beneficial to them. So, that was no great gift from the City. It was

MR. WINDSOR: done by the Provincial Government. The Town of Mount Pearl, Sir, buys water from the City of St. John's. We had great controversies a year or so ago, at least, that Mount Pearl was not paying for its water. That, Sir, is a lot of nonsense as well.

The City of St. John's, Sir, as I said - I think it was 1959 the agreement was made

MR. WINDSOR: I think it was actually 1961 the agreement was signed at 17 mils or 17 cents per thousand gallons. Now, Sir, that was a ten-year agreement which was negotiable every ten years, and after the ten-year period, the Town of Mount Pearl wrote the City of St. John's and said, 'Would you like to re-negotiate our contract? It has expired.' If I recall correctly - I do not have the exact figures here - I think it was three or four times the Town wrote the City of St. John's, and I think only on one occasion they received some sort of an acknowledgment saying, 'When we have time we will get around to having a meeting with you.' So, the City then, unilaterally, decided, well, we will charge 25 cents per thousand gallons, not 17, and probably had not even read their own agreement even though it had expired through no fault of the Town of Mount Pearl. So, they started sending bills to the Town of Mount Pearl at 25 cents per thousand gallons, and the Town of Mount Pearl said, 'No, we have not agreed on 25 - perhaps it is a reasonable rate, but let us negotiate it'. This went on for several years, Sir, and finally, last year - there is a clause in the agreement which says that if an agreement cannot be reached, then it would be referred to the Auditor General - it was, and that gentleman quite rightly came back with a report saying that since it was not negotiated at the proper time, therefore it shall stay at 17 cents per thousand gallons for the next ten years.

Sir, the Town of Mount Pearl has been paying its water bill. It has an accounts receivable - or accounts payable built up there. Most that, Sir, I would think probably all of that came from the first five years that the system was in operation. The reason for that is simple, Sir. As I mentioned earlier, the City received \$600,000 for that original water system, that main water line. That, of course, was paid, I think, over a five-year period. So, as long as the City was receiving that annual supplement from the Provincial Government, they did not even bother to send the Town of Mount Pearl a bill for five years, and finally they did - for five years supply of water, a staggering amount! And so the Town was then



MR. WINDSOR: saddled with this great amount. This is the reason why it is there. Then, there is a great debate over the accuracy of the meters; all the water going to Mount Pearl is metered by a bulk meter at the foot of Park Avenue in the Dodge City area. Sir, while employed by that Town, I questioned the accuracy of that meter, did a study on it, had some experts brought from Boston I believe - it was Boston or New York - and they did some tests on it. They indicated that the meter was reading, I think, approximately 32.8 per cent in error, and some corrections were made on it. Since then there have been other studies. There have been adjustments made, and now they find that last study I think that was done in the case that perhaps the meter is correct. Sir, I am personally, still not convinced that that meter - it may be correct now, I am not questioning that - but I have every indication to believe that it could have been a sporadic accuracy over the number of years that it was in use

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible) check by the Federal Weights and Measures?

MR. WINDSOR: No.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not, eh?

MR. WINDSOR: No, it is not. Probably it should be.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. WINDSOR: Yes. That is a good point the Minister makes. Perhaps the Federal Weights and Measures should inspect it, but it is not the sort of thing that these people normally get involved in, I think. It is a fairly complicated process. It would take professional engineers to actually do the inspection on the thing.

So, anyway, I think I have made very clear here the point that the Town of Mount Pearl is indeed paying for the water it uses, paying very nicely.

The garbage disposal, Sir. People say, 'Oh, well, everybody is using Robin Hood Bay. So, the City is operating a great regional system. Are not the surrounding communities lucky to have the City operating this for them.' The Town of Mount Pearl,



MR. WINDSOR: Sir, pays 10 per cent of the cost of operating Robin Hood Bay - 10 per cent - which was agreed on a few years ago, and the only reason we did was because of the development of the great Newtown area adjacent to Mount Pearl. Mount Pearl had its own dump, and I use the term 'dump' because it certainly was not a sanitary land fill. It left a great deal to be desired, and it certainly is to the benefit of the Town that it was closed down. But, the primary reason it was closed down at that particular time was because of the development of the Mount Pearl - Newtown

MR. WINDSOR: At that time there were great talks about having a regional solid waste disposal system. It appeared to be imminent, and so, in the interim period, the Town of Mount Pearl decided to use Robin Hood Bay, and we agreed to pay the City of St. John's 10 per cent of the operating cost. At that time, it was, I think, something in the order of \$7,000 to \$7,500 per annum, and I understand from the Town officials that it is now up to \$13,000 to \$14,000 because the City has decided to do a much better job of it now. They have been trucking in a lot of material that they were not properly doing for a number of years. Other communities are using it. So, certainly, it would appear to me - and this is something that really the Town should be negotiating with the City - the Town now, I would not think, is contributing 10 per cent of the amount of solid waste that is disposed of in that facility.

Bus service, Sir. People say, 'Well, the Town of Mount Pearl has bus service provided by the City'. Yes, indeed they do, and anybody who crosses the bridge - Dunn's Bridge on Park Avenue - on that bus, Sir, pays an extra 25 cents for the privilege of making that little loop up through Mount Pearl, and I would suggest to you that the Mount Pearl route is perhaps the only one of all the City bus routes that is paying for itself. So, I do not think we are getting any great gift from the City of St. John's in bus service. Albeit, it is much more convenient than if the Town had to operate its own, but certainly I think the people in Mount Pearl are paying their way there.

Fire protection, Sir. Certainly, we use the St. John's Fire Department service, but then the cost of that is entirely paid for by the Provincial Government. So that is no great gift from the City. And Police - the City Police do not cover the Town of Mount Pearl, Sir, - the Newfoundland Constabulary, I should say - but essentially they are the City of St. John's Police force. The RCMP do, and the Town of Mount Pearl has its own Police force. So, the people of Mount Pearl are paying essentially for three Police forces. Provincial taxes are paying for the City Police

MR. WINDSOR: force, Federal taxes are paying for the RCMP, and the Municipal taxes are paying for their own Police. The bulk of the service they receive is from their own Police force. Certainly, Sir, between the RCMP and the Mount Pearl police they give total coverage, so the Town receives no great gift from the City of St. John's.

So, I would like to know what all these great gifts are. What are they? Shopping facilities, perhaps. People say, 'Oh, well, you come out and you shop in the City of St. John's'. Yes, of course we do. Shopping facilities in the Town of Mount Pearl are limited, although there are some fine establishments there, but we do spend most of our dollars in the City of St. John's. Who gets the tax revenue from those businesses? The City of St. John's does. They say we work in the City of St. John's. That is true. I agree. We do.

AN HON. MEMBER: So what!

MR. WINDSOR: So what! That is right. So what! Sure, we drive on the City streets. An awful lot of St. John's people drive on Mount Pearl streets, and Provincial highways - there are certain subsidies that come from the Provincial Government to the City of St. John's, Sir, that we are all paying for. So, I have yet -

AN HON. MEMBER: Two per cent.

MR. WINDSOR: That is right. I went through that argument when the Minister was away, and what percentage of the Provincial dollar is coming into the Avalon area. I could get into that one again if you wish -

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. WINDSOR: - but I will not.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. WINDSOR: I fail to see where anybody could dig up this ridiculous term of 'parasitic villages'. I would like to see the hon. gentleman who wrote that explain himself. What is he talking about? I doubt that he knows. Sir, I am sure that other communities in the area feel the same way. I am sure that Wedgewood Park would

MR. WINDSOR: say the same thing. Very little benefits that they receive from the City of St. John's. Very, very little. Just to clue up, you are talking about parasitic villages, let us consider very quickly the percentage of the revenue the Municipality has received from Provincial Government. At any rate, the Town of Mount Pearl at the moment is receiving, I think it is, 23 per cent of its total revenue from Provincial contributions.

Mr. Windsor: Now we look at some other communities in the area, Paradise 56 per cent, Petty Harbour-Maddox Cove 59 per cent, Pouch Cove 53 per cent, Torbay 50 per cent, Wahana 73 per cent, Wedgewood Park 41 per cent, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Mount Pearl is what 20 - what?

MR. N. WINDSOR: 23. The lowest town in the area. It is not bad for a parasitic village. The people of Mount Pearl are, Sir, paying their own way and have for a long time. And not only this gentlemen, I may be picking on him unfairly, but I am just simply quoting from him because it was an article that was available, you know, gentlemen, many branches of the media have used the same term, Sir, and I think it certainly is a misnomer.

MR. CANNING: I wonder would the hon. member allow a question?

MR. WINDSOR: Sure.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

MR. CANNING: I would just like to ask the gentleman -

MR. N. WINDSOR: Can I answer his question before I sit down?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Thank you.

MR. CANNING: Does that gentleman to whom you are referring call Mount Pearl a parasitic city, does he live in St. John's?

MR. N. WINDSOR: Oh yes.

MR. CANNING: That is quite amusing, is it not?

MR. N. WINDSOR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Young): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Chairman, maybe at this time, since time is getting a little short, I could answer some of the questions put forth by hon. members, and possibly get on with some of the things that should be discussed in this Committee.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning) mentioned several water systems etc. that were started in his area, and wondered what could be done etc. to these areas with



Mr. Dinn:

respect to sewer systems in the coming year and so on. One of the places mentioned by the hon. member is the community of Rushoon where the Provincial Government put in a water system and they have received something like, in grants to that municipality, something like \$150,000 for the water system. And Mr. Chairman, one of those areas where we have to get concerned as members of government as to whether or not we should continue on the basis that we have continued or have completed the water system in Rushoon. In Rushoon, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. CANNING:

(Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Yes. - there was a possibility of servicing, from the system that was installed, something like sixty houses, and to this point in time only thirty houses have decided to hook up to that system. So, Mr. Chairman, although the price, the cost of installing that system was not excessive, we did spend upwards of \$150,000 to put a water system in a community and only thirty or 50 per cent of the residents in that community decided to hook up to that system.

MR. CANNING: Why?

MR. DINN: I do not know what the reason why, maybe the hon. member would be able to inform the House and indeed inform me as to why only 50 per cent hooked up, but that is the case and, Mr. Chairman, with the numbers of people that we have in Newfoundland today without a water system, indeed with no chance of getting a water system for one reason or another because of cost or whatever, it is saddening to me to see a community with a water system where the residents decide not to hookup to that system. And it is one of the reasons, Mr. Chairman, earlier this year the department decided to send out a questionnaire and ask those communities that were requesting new water systems to indicate by going around and checking with all of the residents in the area how many people would be willing to hookup to that system, if installed, or when installed. And a lot of the communities that we sent out the questionnaire to indeed got back and there is an indication in some that there is 80 per cent, and indications in others that only sixty-something per cent will hookup

MR. DINN: and so on, but we indicated to them what the minimum service fee, water rate, would be and would they hook up if indeed they got a water system. And it is surprising that we did not receive from all those towns requested, when we would hear from hon. members the request coming in for water and sewer systems in the Province and then we go back with a questionnaire as to how many are willing to hook up and we get either no indication or an indication that only sixty per cent, say, will hook up to a system, it is rather saddening to me that we look at a bill for \$1 million or \$2 million for a water and sewer system, and having installed that system and even before it is installed they are indicating they will not hook up to it.

So we cannot even recover, Mr. Speaker, the cost of operating and maintaining, and that is basically what the water rate is for or the water and sewer rate. It is a minimum cost to the person using the system or using the service, a minimum cost that will defray the costs of operating and maintaining those systems.

The other one was Parker's Cove, Mr. Speaker, and that one was one that was started in March 1972 where it started off and it is one of those things that we would like to get involved more in because we have had many, many successes where the people in the community did the majority, the major portion of the work. We started off in March of 1972 and we went on through until March 1977 and the total contribution there, Mr. Speaker, for water and sewer is \$69,557 to this point and time. No doubt that kind of thing will continue.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the Patterson Report, the hon. member for Winsor-Buchans and I do not know whether or not he was quoted accurately in the news media, in the Daily News of this morning, but it is alleged in the column in there that the hon. member has said that he would like to see the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing do a plebiscite in Grand Falls and Windsor to see if the people wish to be amalgamated or joined together right now. Well,

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, with all due respect to the hon. member, I would be willing to discuss it with him outside the House, in my office or at any time, the relative merits of going ahead with that right now or not. I would think an indication has been given to me by many people that they would not consider incorporation from the point of view of the town of Windsor. They certainly do not want to become part of Grand Falls as poor cousins, as I have indicated earlier, and from the position of the town of Grand Falls, I do not think they would entertain taking over Windsor or becoming amalgamated with Windsor with the high costs and the high capital requirement in Windsor for the repair, upgrading, paving etc. of the roads and the other services that are provided-or the people of Windsor would wish to have provided now.

MR. NEARY: What about Freshwater, Jerseyville, Placentia and Dunville?

MR. FLIGHT: Would the hon. minister yield for a moment?

MR. DINN: Certainly.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you. I was quoted correctly, Mr. Speaker, in the context that I went through the solution that the former minister, the hon. minister's predecessor, stated in this House of Assembly last year when the Patterson report was being discussed here that he indicated that what he saw over a period - now we have to assume he had to be talking over a period of six or seven months or a year and not five years down the road - he saw a situation where, number one, the Patterson report recommendations would be studied by two councils. The two councils would make their opinions and their views known. Then he saw the next step as being some effort being made by, sponsored by the Department of Municipal Affairs, to enlighten, so to speak, the people of both towns as to the disadvantages or advantages of amalgamation. Then it was his word and not mine, of course you know, when he suggested that when this was done that he would envision and believe that a plebiscite would be the next step. Now that was the minister's solution less than a year ago, Sir.

May 24, 1977

Tape 3116

JM - 3

MR. FLIGHT: Just one more minute just to add to this: I would suggest to the minister it is fine what he said, I agree with him that Windsor needs upgrading before they would \_\_\_\_\_

MR. FLIGHT:

consider coming in as an equal partner. Grand Falls, I can certainly understand Grand Falls' reluctance to amalgamation at this point. But I would suggest to the minister that if ever amalgamation is going to come about then the funds needed to upgrade Windsor, to put the state of mind in Windsor in a position where they would accept amalgamation, would have to be forthcoming through this government, through this minister, through the administration of municipal affairs. And we have not seen that type of input for this past forty-nine years. And I am suggesting to the minister that if he believes that amalgamation of those two towns are in the better interest of Newfoundland or the central area, then one way or the other he is going to have to find the funds required to upgrade the various facilities in Windsor. And that is the whole point I was trying to make.

MR. DINN: That is a very good point, Mr. Chairman. The thing about it is the previous minister outlined last year and basically that position has not changed and that step, number one, was to be input from the councils in the area. That input is not received in my department. Mr. Chairman, it has not been received. We have not received it. I have not seen it. It never came to my desk. I would like to make that quite clear to the hon. member through you, Mr. Chairman, and until that time then step one and step two and step three will follow that. But we are, Mr. Chairman, going on with the idea, and I personally am getting involved here in that I would like to definitely - see, I have been out to Windsor several times now, and Mr. Chairman, I would like to see something done with Windsor and hopefully this year if at all possible. The hon. member has been made aware of the fact that we are building fifteen subsidized rental units this year in Windsor. And that came about, Mr. Chairman, through co-operation with the hon. member. At the first indication this year was that we did not need that kind of a thing in Windsor this year. And



MR. DINN:

through discussions with the hon. member, Mr. Chairman, we have arrived at the decision whereby fifteen housing units or subsidized rental units will be indeed built in Windsor this year. We would also like to look at the possibility of getting a neighbourhood improvement programme done for Windsor. Now that takes a considerable period of time, Mr. Chairman, and it may not come about this year. What you have to do to get this kind of a programme off the ground, as the hon. member probably is aware, is that first of all you have to get the town involved. You have to get a conceptual plan. You have to get the people, the residents of Windsor, to agree as to what should be done in the town, get a conceptual plan done, have that plan submitted to the Provincial Government, and in discussions with the Federal Government get it approved and so on and the funds then put in place. And it takes a considerable period of time. In the case of the first neighbourhood improvement programme in St. John's East, it took something like fourteen months from a committee getting together and becoming organized, getting their plans all the way through to a point where approval was given by all levels of government. And in this case it was the municipal, provincial and federal governments. So it takes a considerable length of time. And I intended, Mr. Chairman, to initiate something of that order in discussions with council and possibly with the federal people through Newfoundland and Labrador Housing to get something going for Windsor in the very near future.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have already discussed the Henley Commission Report as to how far we have gone along to date. I would like to address myself now to some of the comments by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) with respect to the questionnaire that he circulated last year. And, Mr. Chairman, on most of the points talked about in the questionnaire, and some of the points that came back from these members, indicated to me, and I am sure to the previous minister, Mr. Chairman, as to what

May 24, 1977.

Tape 3117

RH - 3

MR. DINN:

things should be done in municipal affairs, in local government, etc.  
in the Province to make the system a little more operational, if you  
will, if that is the correct term,

MR. DINN: in Newfoundland. And one of the things suggested by the hon. member was suggested last October by the Federation of Municipalities at a meeting out in Gander, that we should get some kind of a programme for administrators, for the town clerks and the managers, etc., in Newfoundland. And we have gone on on that, Mr. Chairman. It has proceeded to the point where now, with the Department of Public Works, I believe, the Public Service Commission, and, in co-operation with my department, Municipal Affairs and Housing, a programme will be initiated this year, and hopefully out of that will come some more suggestions, as indeed these things are ongoing, and they never stop. They are always being revised, and new suggestions coming in hopefully will improve the lot of the administrators of the town, and the towns in Newfoundland, the clerks, the managers, and so on. So, although I believe we have been on this since last October, and the hon. member's report did not come in until a little later on in the year - we have been on this, and hopefully improvements will be made in the coming year and we can improve their lot. We had, as hon. members will note, in the Budget, some \$4,000 set aside for a conference we held last year in Gander with the municipal administrators, and hopefully, we will have the same kind of thing this year, and get some kind of a programme off the ground, as they indicated to me last year, it was their intention to pursue this matter, and it was our intention to carry out something. And it will be this year.

Mr. Chairman, if there are other questions that hon. members may wish to ask - There was a question by the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) about the \$600 New Homeownership Grant. And that was one of the things, Mr. Chairman, that we had quite a - I did personally, anyway, because I felt, the programme was a good programme. There is no question about that in my mind. I received representations from the Home Builders Association as to whether we should continue or not. It came down to the point, Mr. Chairman, where we had so many dollars allocated in Newfoundland, from the provincial coffers, if you will, for programmes this year. Now, the New Home Ownership programme would have cost the Provincial Government out-of-pocket about \$2 million in the coming year to continue that programme. Well, Mr. Chairman, we had an opportunity to avail of a Federal programme that would assist the rural communities,

MR. DINN: small communities in Newfoundland, and it was called the Rural and Remote Housing Programme - we are calling it Programme No. 2 - which is a programme whereby, and I explained this briefly before, whereby the Provincial and Federal Governments would get together and cost share in implementing a programme for people who are, say, in a low income or a needy category. And it is based on the Rent Supplement Programme that we have available to people in the urban areas, the only difference being that the people in the rural areas will pay the same rent, or on the same rent basis, the same rent scale, from, I believe, 16.7 per cent of their income, up to a maximum of 25 per cent of their income, and they would own their own home. The payout, the difference in what the person pays toward the mortgage and what the mortgage payment would normally be, will be cost shared by the Federal and Provincial Governments on a 50/50 basis. So, it is a good programme. The total cost of the programme, or the total infusion of dollars into the Province this year, is of the order of \$12 million, of which \$3 million will be provided by the Province and \$9 million by the Federal Government. Mr. Chairman, it is an excellent programme, and, although the \$600 New Homeownership Programme was a good programme, it was a programme that we put in, because people had planned last year - had been getting the federal subsidy of \$500 - we decided to put it in for a year, to try to soften the blow on those people who had planned to build a house and so on, and do it for at least one year. Well, we have gone through that year now, Mr. Chairman. We have extended the date for applications now. It was extended to April 29th - it is now extended to September, so that anybody who has met the criteria - that have had their homes 65 per cent complete - have been moved in there up to March 31st - will still be able to avail of the programme. And it will not have to do with whether they got their application in, on time, or not. We hope that will alleviate it somewhat.

So, Mr. Chairman, we had the decision, I guess, to make, as to whether we should go on with the \$600 New Homeownership Grant, or participate with the federal people on the new programme for the rural areas, which, as hon. members will note, the programme of this administration is, to try to assist the rural areas, so that we can get our

May 24, 1977

Tape No. 3118

EC - 3

MR. DINN:           economy going out there, to strengthen our economic base, and thus, hopefully, in a couple of years, to have the Province on a more sound financial basis.



MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: I take it the time is running out and I doubt very much if the minister is going to be able to deal very much with the item by item. There is just one question I would like to pose to the minister, actually two. One is the - I hope the minister will be able to find sufficient funds in his vote this year to complete the water system at Musgrave Harbour. But I have discussed this matter with him privately and I do not expect him to be able to tell me now. There is one matter which I have been getting a lot of complaints about and that is the policy of taxation, especially as it effects the old age pensioner. We have several communities and town councils around where you have two people, two elderly people, getting the old age pension and they are both taxed for services.

Now we can understand the wage earner, either male or female, being taxed for the service fee. However in a great many communities in Fogo District this is a complaint about where both old age pensioners are taxed that fee. Could the minister enlighten me, is that in the Act or can it be changed? What I am trying to imply to the minister, perhaps that should be changed and only one of the wage earners or the householder be responsible for the service tax.

MR. DINN: Just to answer that question: yes, that is true that both can be, but the only out that they have now is that they can apply to the council and request that only one of them pay and then they can get to me and I approve them 99.9 per cent of the time. That is the only way out there.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. member for Burin -Placentia.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Chairman, I asked several questions over the weekend, I got very few of them answered. The minister has told of some places where there are some water system laid and the people have not connected to the system. That is very

MR. CANNING: discouraging, I know. But at the same time I am wondering why the people at Rushoon have not connected? Is it that the waterline goes along by cliffs. People live inside of a cliff and it is practically impossible to get down with the means that the council would have at their disposal to carry out the work. I do not know, but surely I would not agree with that and I agree with the minister that if people are not going to try and pay for their services it is just too bad, because this province cannot afford to put in costly systems in places where people only hook up to it if they feel like it.

However, Mr. Chairman, the questions that I posed were, some of them, were more important than the number of people who have connected up. It was pollution. I reiterate again it is not the fault of the present minister, by no means, but two previous ministers left behind them an awful mess in the district of Burin-Placentia West.

At Lewins Cove I mentioned the sewer flowing into the playgrounds which is pretty serious. I was hoping that the minister would say that something would be done this year. Perhaps he will if I hurry up and give him a few minutes. At Marystown there is a terrible pollution situation. It is horrible. I mentioned that, I told of sewer flowing through the ground, flowing about high-water mark in one cove. Sewer pumps, lifts or the pumps that were supposed to lift the sewer over one area into

MR. CANNING:

another cove broken down since last October, and was fearing that we even could have an outbreak of disease in the Summer in that particular area. That is Rushoon, again, where \$150,000 has been spent to connect up less than one-third, I imagine, of the population. They have a sewer problem there. At Bartlett's Cove, there is a sewer problem there. We should have fought the contract, walked out and left a very poor job behind them. I am not an engineer, but I know enough to know that a sewer cannot flow up a hill.

If you drop down a sewer line in the middle of a village, the middle of a town, you need gravity flow or it does not pump. The situation there, right in the middle of the village, the sewer line dropped down by the river, goes up another incline and the sewer is still in it until the flow is such that it brings it up to the gravity point. But mostly it is still in it and mostly the odour from the manholes is just unbearable for the people during the Summer months. Again that sewer flows into a still pool, an indentation in the harbour. It comes in for about a couple of hundred feet, I think, and it is a very narrow indentation. And the sewer just goes down to the edge of that and lies there and again in any part of town you can get the odour, particularly during the Summer months and hot weather.

So, Mr. Chairman, first of all, I am hoping that the minister, if he has time, will tell me if he is going to do something about this ridiculous situation at Lewin's Cove, if there is going to be funds made available. Another question I would like to have answered - I am not expecting the answer to it - is if his department has yet arrived at the figure of the cost of the Burin installations, the water and sewer in Burin Bay Arm and of the overrun, the call of \$200,000 which I claim is the fault of the contractors and the people of Burin should never have to stand that cost. Is that going to be charged or is it already charged? Has the council accepted the responsibility for it? Because what I get from the council and what I get from the people there - I think that it is a mistake of the bad administration at the time, the lack of supervision by the department that caused the overruns

MR. CANNING:

with the five contractors and the two companies of consulting engineers. They seemed to throw everything into the thing to make it cost as much as they possibly could. And, of course, the detractors clean off the people of Burin, 3,000 people of Burin who certainly cannot afford to meet their financial responsibilities without taxation - property tax. They said they are going to have to put on property tax. They are going to have to tax the stages, tax the outhouses or what in heck you have. If the hon. member was as old as I am he would remember that was the big private Tories back in 1949 trying to prevent us from joining Canada. Everything was going to be taxed the nets, the twines, the lines, the boats, the stages. So I do not see any other thing ahead of us at the present moment like we are going without taxing the property. I think that is about it, Mr. Speaker. Maybe other speakers - there is only a few minutes left. But I would like for them to answer those questions in what time he has available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor), Sir, raised an interesting question that I would like to just pursue a little further and that is in connection with senior citizens paying municipal taxes. It is a great burden on our senior citizens, Sir, and I believe that we should be working towards the ultimate elimination of this particular tax for the senior citizens in this Province.

Now, Sir, I just sent out 2,500 ballots to householders in LaPoile district to find out - I gave them four choices - to find out what advice, what counselling they wish to give me in connection with my political future. And within a matter of a week or a couple of weeks I should have a pretty clear indication of which course of action they want me to take. But one thing I want to tell the House is this, Sir, that no matter what



MR. NEARY: the people of LaPoile district indicate they want me to do, whatever my political affiliations is in the future - whether it is with the regular Liberals, whether it is with the NDP, whether it is with the Progressive Conservatives, or whether it is as an independent Liberal - one thing that I will fight for, Sir, is the elimination of municipal taxes for senior citizens. It does not make any difference where I stand, whether I am with the Tories, with the regular Liberals, with the NDP, or standing alone, I will fight and I will demand any time and any party that I join in the future, I will demand that one of the commitments that they make is that they would work towards the elimination - work towards ultimate elimination of the municipal tax burden on our senior citizens.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

age of sixty-five with \$20,000 a year that we should be exempt from taxes. You certainly cannot mean that -

AN HON MEMBER: You collect the Old Age Pension do you not?

MR. MURPHY: Sixty-five is not the magic number, that is all I am saying; income will have to enter into the thing.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman obviously was not listening to me, I said for the majority of our senior citizens.

MR. MURPHY: The majority, well it all depends, you know.

MR. NEARY: Does that answer the hon. gentleman?

MR. MURPHY: No it does not, I would like to know -

MR. NEARY: That the tax burden, the municipal tax burden be eliminated, that we work toward phasing it out for the majority of our senior citizens. Well Mr. -

MR. MURPHY: The majority of our senior citizens in ten years time will be better off that we were at the age of forty -

MR. NEARY: Right now, Sir, our people, our senior citizens, cannot afford to pay this tax, it is a burden to them and I, as I say - I mean, I am entitled to my own philosophy, my own ideology, my own



MR NEARY: feelings and I have very strong feelings on this and no matter who I - which way I go - which way the people of LaPoile district indicate that I go, that that would be one of the commitments that I would have to get from either party, either of the three parties, that they would work toward the ultimate elimination of municipal taxes on the majority of our senior citizens.

And I believe the hon. minister is a compassionate man and the hon. gentleman has a heart and I believe the hon. gentleman would agree with that. Now, Sir, the other point that I wish to make before I take my seat is in connection with three water and sewer projects that have been underway in the Province new for several years past. One is down in the community of Placentia. \$1 million has been spent, Mr. Chairman, \$1 million so far, I believe has been spent over a period of three years in an attempt to put in a water and sewer system in the community, expand the extension, I believe -

AN HON MEMBER: A sewer system is the problem.

MR. NEARY: A sewer system - well I do not care what the problem is, they have been working on it now for three years, they have spent \$1 million, and not one home yet is connected. And, Mr. Chairman, what I do not understand, what I do not understand, Sir, although it is Dart, I believe, Dart Construction, the one that went bankrupt was also involved in the Placentia one, - of why the bond holders have not been forced to go in and finish that job. And we have the same situation down here, Sir, in Pouch Cove - whereas the Americans used to call it Pouch Cove, I call it Pouch Cove. In Pouch Cove, where we heard the hon. member, the Minister of Tourism, the hon. gentleman who represents that district tell us the other day about all the wonderful things he was doing since Pouch Cove became a part of the district of St. John's East Extern and they sent a Tory member to the House, how great it was these people had been led out of the darkness by the hon gentleman.

MR. NEARY:

Well they are down there now, Mr. Chairman, the place was torn up; I went down there two Sunday's ago and looked at it myself and met with some of the people down there. The fences had been torn down, people's property had been destroyed and Metro Engineering, Sir, Mr. A.B. Walsh and Company, the gentleman who we have heard so much about in this hon. House over the last several weeks; If hon.gentlemen do not remember it is the gentleman who is alleged to have delivered the colored television sets.

AN HON. MEMBER: The low bidder.

MR. NEARY: The low bidder? Well I do not care if he was the high bidder or the low bidder or the medium bidder; the gentleman pulled his company out, effectively pulled his company out of Pouch Cove and out of Torbay. Mr. Chairman, this happened last Fall when both projects were underway, Metro left the two town councils high and dry through lack of performance, poor organization-

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman knows it is true and the hon. gentleman's answer to the town of Pouch Cove when they came to see the hon.gentleman was to get rid of the engineering consultants, That was -

Mr. Neary.

no answer, Sir, because the engineering consultants, who are Proctor and Redfern, are nationally known, a nationally reputable company that would not kowtow or bend over backwards to give Metro Engineering extras and more benefits that they were asking for. They effectively pulled out and when they came to the minister, the minister's suggestion was, Get rid of your -

MR. DINN: Not true.

MR. NEARY: Well, it is true, Sir.

MR. DINN: It is not true.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman did tell the town council and the mayor to get rid of the engineering consultants. And if the hon. gentleman wants his memory refreshed - the hon. gentleman also told me the same thing privately.

MR. DINN: That is not true.

MR. NEARY: That is true, Sir, that the way to solve their problem was to get rid of the engineering consultants, get rid of Proctor and Redfern.

MR. DINN: On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised.

MR. DINN: First of all, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member is going to quote me, whether in private or in public, he ought to quote me either in its entirety or not take something out of context. The fact of the matter is, in Pouch Cove the consultant could not work with or the engineer, could not work with the construction firm. There are two options: Number one is to call in the bonding company; number two is to get rid of one or other of the parties. If they get rid of the engineering firm or if they get rid of the construction firm, then the bonding company is called to finish or perform where they feel that the construction firm did not perform. In the case of Torbay, it is exactly the same thing. They have a choice, and the choice is to call in the bonding company - and I did not recommend that they do that nor did I recommend that they get rid of the consultants nor did I recommend that they get rid of the construction firm. All I recommended to them was their options. They chose to call the bond. The bond, when it is

MR. DINN:

called, it is up to the bonding company whether they will come in and perform. If they feel that their client, the construction firm is in a good position, and if they did what they could in order to perform what they were supposed to perform, then the bonding company does not go in and finish the job, but they rather go to litigation or go to the courts. And I believe in one case one of these three that the hon. member has talked about is, the writs have been issued. In two of the other cases, writs are pending. And my concern, Mr. Chairman, is to get water and sewer in Pouch Cove, in Torbay and in Placentia and if that is to get rid of a consultant, to get another consultant, whether he is competent or not - and I have never called into question of the competence of any consulting concern in this Province - but if that is the way to get water and sewer in, then that would have to be one of the recommendations, and that is one of the recommendations I gave to the town council and to the hon. member. That is one way out. And there is no - I have done nothing in either of these three cases, Mr. Chairman, that would affect the town councils. It was their decision. They had the decision to make and indeed I would be or could be accused of interfering if I did anything other than to recommend to the town councils on that basis.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I feel that there is no point of order.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour. I feel there is no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The minister has clarified the situation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman, Sir, admitted that one of the recommendations made to the Town Council of Pouch Cove was to get rid of your engineering consultants. And this is perfectly true, Sir. But the town council saw no reason to get

Mr. Neary.

rid of their engineering consultants, because they were doing a magnificent job in protecting the taxpayers of this Province and protecting the householders in the town of Pouch Cove. And, therefore, Sir, Metro Engineering, Mr. A. B. Walsh, effectively pulled his company, his construction company, without even as much as giving a notice to the town council, pulled them off the project, and they did the same thing in Torbay. Now Metro Engineering and the bonding company have been served a writ by the town of Torbay for breach of contract and they are being threatened with another writ by the town of Pouch Cove. In both instances, Sir, the bondholders have been called upon to finish the work themselves. And, Mr. Chairman, to the best of my knowledge, it is the first time in thirteen years, Sir, that bondholders have been called upon to become involved in projects where a contractor is accused of non-performance. And the minister can twist and turn all he wants. The contractor has been accused of non-performance by the two



Mr. Neary.

town councils involved. They have not -

MR. DINN: There is no twisting and turning.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, they have. And the irony of this whole mess, as I said a few moments ago, Sir, is that the company involved in these two projects is the company that has come in for severe criticism, both inside and outside this House in recent weeks. We have already heard about Mr. A. B. Walsh's other firms that have been getting a million dollars worth of work from the government without calling public tenders. Well, this is the same Mr. Walsh involved in Metro Engineering. But, Mr. Chairman, what I am concerned about most of all is what steps the minister and the government have taken to protect the public treasury. The minister tells us that he does not care how the people in Pouch Cove and Torbay get water and sewerage as long as they get water and sewerage. Well, if it cost \$1 billion, the people in these communities have to pay for it, and the minister should be concerned about it. And it is the public treasury that will have to put up the money.

MR. DINN: I never said that I was not concerned. I said, I am concerned that they get water and sewer. That is the prime objective.

MR. NEARY: At any cost.

MR. DINN: No, not at any cost.

MR. NEARY: At any cost, Sir -

MR. DINN: I did not say that.

MR. NEARY: - and I say that that is scandalous. The minister -

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: I did not quote the minister as saying that.

MR. DINN: I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that I said, "At any cost."

MR. NEARY: I did not say you said it. I did not say you said it.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman.

MR. DINN: You said that I said that the water and sewer should be installed at any cost. I did not say that.

MR. NEARY: No, you did not say that.

MR. DINN: And I would ask you to ask the hon. member to withdraw.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I did not say it.

MR. DINN: Come on, man-fashion now, get up and do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Young): I feel it is a difference of opinion in what has been said. If not, I will have to adjourn and go for the tapes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, look, I will save you the trouble, Your Honour, if I offended the hon. gentleman, I withdraw it, but I did not say it in the first place, but nevertheless to save time, Sir, and to get on with my few remarks I would say that it would appear that the minister does not care how the people down there get water and sewerage, put it there at any cost, put it there at any cost and make the people pay for it and make the public treasury suffer the consequences.

Mr. Chairman, what I say is that the minister should take immediate steps to bar Metro Engineering and any other of the A. B. Walsh firms who are trying to horn in on government business, bar them from getting future contracts, because they cannot perform or demand - the ministers should call them in and demand that they prove they can perform before they get a contract. Otherwise, Sir, the minister is going to be wasting the taxpayers' money. And in these two cases, if not three, the one in Placentia, the minister should take and the government should take immediate steps to protect the public treasury, and as I say bar these firms from being awarded any government contracts in the future unless they can prove their ability to handle them, and not do as Metro Engineering did. Start up the project, try to milk a few more dollars out of the public treasury, and if you cannot do it, if you cannot get the engineering consultants to kowtow and bend over, bend down and grind them down, if you

Mr. Neary.

cannot grind them down with political interference and influence, then pull out and leave the communities high and dry, and put the matter before the courts. That, Sir, is their attitude. Put the matter before the courts and waste a lot of time over procedures that should have never happened in the first place. So, Mr. Chairman, these are the main points that I want to make at this particular time, Sir. I do hope that the minister will respond and respond quickly -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - and not just let this matter drag on before the courts, because the longer it drags on the longer the people are going to be left without water and sewerage, the cost will escalate, the people will eventually have to pay for it, and step in and demand that the bondholders - because that is why you have bondholders, Mr. Chairman. I do not know if the hon. gentleman is aware of that. That is why the bondholders are there. They should be instructed immediately to come in and finish these projects, and not get involved in long litigation proceedings and long dragged-out court cases. And in the meantime, Mr. Chairman, the property that looks like a cyclone hit it in Pouch Cove should be put back into shape, the people's fences should be put back, the gardens should be restored and all that damage that has been done by Metro Engineering. In going in you would not know but it was El Alamein. The landing on the beaches in Normandy had nothing on it when they started. They went in and they destroyed everything in there ahead of them.

Mr. Neary:

And they should be ordered back, put everything back in shape in Pouch Cove.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): Shall I report Head XIV - Municipal Affairs and Housing all headings without amendment?

On motion Head XIV - Municipal Affairs and Housing carried with amendment.

Head XII - Forestry and Agriculture

MR. CHAIRMAN (MR. YOUNG): The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. E. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I suppose it is appropriate for me to make a few opening remarks in introducing my estimates to the House of Assembly. It is going to be difficult to go through the Department of Forestry and Agriculture in the short time, the twenty minutes available, but I am hoping throughout the course of the four hours for the total estimates so I will have more time to answer questions and to make comments on various aspects of the department.

In general, Mr. Chairman, it is fair to say the government considers the Department of Forestry and Agriculture and the things that are administered by that department as very important because of the resource base that we are dealing with. I think the reflection and the amount of money that has been allocated to this department, as to other resource departments over the past few years, the increases generally indicate government's desire to develop our natural resources as a means of developing a base for the Province. And this is true whether we are talking about forestry, agriculture, minerals, fisheries, hydro or whatever other natural resources we have.

I might point out that in the three years, the last three years, the expenditure for this department has increased from \$21 million in 1975 fiscal year to an estimate of \$31 million in the upcoming fiscal year, which is an increase of nearly 50 per cent. So I think it is a very significant one.

Mr. Maynard:

Certainly the resources that are administered by the Department of Forestry and Agriculture are extremely vital to the future of the Province. They are renewable resources with the exception of land which is a base on which all resources have to be predicated whether it is minerals, forestry, agriculture, hydro even, even fisheries are dependent on the land base of the Province to some extent.

The Department of Forestry and Agriculture was created in 1972. It was a new department carved out of the unwieldy chaos that existed at that time in the Department of Mines, Agriculture and Resources. It was given a mandate to promote, to encourage the utilization of the forest resource that we have, the agricultural resource that we have in the Province and to administer the land base in the Province, something that had never been done in our history before.

In order to carry out that mandate in 1974-1975 carrying on with something that I had the pleasure to start when I first became involved in the Department of Forestry and Agriculture in 1972 was the decentralization of the department throughout the Province. Decentralization we felt was a way of - well it would do two things; first of all, it would enable us to better handle the many and complex issues that come before us in dealing with these resources, and it would also allow us to give better service to the public to streamline the administrative procedures of the various resources that we were administering. And, I think, Mr. Chairman, this is being done. I believe that the decentralization concept whereby all of our delivery services are split up into four different regions of the Province is working and is providing much better administrative procedure than had been in the past when everything, if it was done, was done from the central office in St. John's.

In the very few minutes I would like to go through the three branches of the department. I suppose there are many things in the department that could be termed somewhat controversial



Mr. Maynard:

or can bring up a lot of comment. One branch that seems to get the most comments and the most complaints is the lands branch.

MR. MAYNARD: Most people, Mr. Chairman, look on the Lands Branch as a branch of Government that merely handles Crown Lands applications; in other words, someone wants a piece of Crown Land to lease or grant, whether it is for agriculture, residence, recreation, or some other purpose. The general public, I believe, feel that the Branch is there just to handle that particular application and to process it to try to dispense with that piece of Crown Land that we have. So, it comes more in the public eye than most other sections of Departments of Government, and it receives more complaints. There are a lot of reasons for the complaints, and I have stated them and other ministers of the Department have stated them in the House many times. The first is that for some 200 years - and probably going back before that - there was never any attempt by any government in Newfoundland to manage the land base of the Province. It was always assumed the land was limitless, that there was plenty of it there for everyone, that everyone could use what they wanted, when they wanted, and how they wanted it. There was never any registration of who owned the land or how it was being used, unless some person happened to make an application and get a grant from some past king, long dead, or some government that is long gone at the present time. So, we find ourselves in the situation now, we do not know who owns the land in the Province. Most of it, we do not know how it is being used, and we have no complete registry of the ownership of land or the use of land in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. This presents us with quite a problem, because when people apply for a Crown Land grant or lease, we really cannot tell them whether or not it is Crown Land, and we cannot tell them whether or not they can have that for any use whatsoever until it goes through a long process of checking, re-checking, surveying, re-checking the surveys, etc. We are coming to grips, I think, slowly but surely, with the lack of management that has gone on in the past, but it is impossible for any Department, any Government, or any group of

MR. MAYNARD: people to come to grips and resolve the problems we have in Lands administration in this Province overnight. You cannot take 200 years of lack of management and suddenly turn it into a streamlined organization. However, by increasing the staffing - and we have doubled our staff over the past three years - by setting up regional offices, by devising new procedures, we are coming to grips with some of the problems in the processing of Crown Land applications. It is slow, but it is sure, and if we continue to devise new procedures - which I think we have to do - from time to time that we will eventually come to grips with the problem of processing these applications, and make it a little bit easier for the public, maybe not to acquire Crown Land, but at least to be able to know whether or not they can acquire it. So, we have the ongoing programs for improving the administration of the Lands, and we will continue to revise procedures, we will continue to try to cut corners, and continue to try to introduce new legislation and new regulations that will enable us to better deal with the many pitfalls we have.

The Lands Branch, Mr. Chairman, is much more complex, of course, than the mere fact of processing an application for a Crown lease. The various divisions: the mapping division - aerial mapping, ground mapping; the planning; the developing of the lands for various purposes, such as summer cabin development, residential development, or whatever; the aerial photography; control surveys; topographical mapping; all these are tied into a package which we hope will eventually enable us to have total land management in this Province. It is going to take a number of years for that to come about, but that is essentially what we are aiming for.

MR. MAYNARD: I will have more words to say on lands a little later on in the estimates.

Agriculture. Mr. Chairman, agriculture seems, in the eyes of most people, to have a fairly low priority on the totem pole as far as resource development is concerned in this Province. I suppose, looking at the number of dollars that are spent, that is probably true, although we do spend a significant number of dollars on agriculture development. The attitude of government is that agriculture has a limited potential in this Province, has a very important potential, is a very important resource. And we have to realize, Mr. Chairman, that we do have a limited agriculture base, and once we realize that, and we concentrate our efforts on developing agriculture in the areas where it can be developed, where it is possible to develop root crop farming, dairy farming, hog farming, or whatever, and spend our money in these areas, by and large, then I think we will be aiming in the right direction, as far as realizing the full potential that we have. I do not think you will ever see the time when the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador will become self-sufficient in agriculture products across the board. There are some that we can become self-sufficient in, and I believe that we will become self-sufficient in these. The egg industry is a good example. We have the potential to be self-sufficient, and, in most cases, we are. I think there are other areas where we can be, but there are some areas, Mr. Chairman, where it is just impossible for us to be able to reach self-sufficiency, or anything close to it, because we do not have the agricultural land base. However, it is our policy to develop agriculture on the limited scale that we have. We could realize to the fullest possible extent, and we have been doing that over the past few years. We have concentrated on expanding existing commercial farms. We have concentrated on making the farms more viable, so the people can realize more from the farms. We have, in Newfoundland at the present time, approximately 1000 farms. Only about 350 of these farms have any significant sales of commercial value. Other than 350, I do not know the exact number, but there is significantly less than that, that can be considered actual commercial farm enterprises, in the context of which you would find a farm enterprise

MR. MAYNARD: on the mainland.

Well, we are, instead of trying to spread ourselves too thinly, to go across the board and try to please everyone in every crop production in the Province, we have come to realize, we must concentrate on the areas and on the commodities which we can develop in the Province. We must concentrate our funds and our efforts on these. And if we do that, we will be able to build up a viable agriculture industry in some commodities and in some areas. The areas that we will be concentrating on, for a top priority agriculture development, will be announced, will be made known, over the next few weeks, and the commodities will be made known. I feel it is highly necessary that we concentrate on these, as opposed to trying to spread ourselves too thinly.

Forestry. I suppose, the one thing in forestry this year that catches everyone and is the topmost thing in everyone's mind, is the little pest called the spruce budworm. And I am sure there will be some serious questions on it. The spruce budworm is a serious problem - an extremely serious one. We are anticipating, this year, that the budworm will infest something in the vicinity of 90 per cent of the commercial timber stands in the Province. I should say, 90 per cent of the commercial timber stands on the Island, because the Labrador portion of



MR. MAYNARD: the Province is not infested as badly as the Island portion and it is not as serious because of the spruce content of the wood in Labrador. We have made a decision not to carry out a massive aerial applications of chemical insecticides this year. Whether that decision is right or wrong only time will tell. We are hoping that there will be some other method that we can use in the future to combat the spruce budworm, but we do know that the budworm has to be controlled. If we are to have any forest industry in this Province fifteen or twenty years down the road, the budworm has to be controlled by some means or another. And I would ask people in the Province to look on the control measures that are being used, and may be used in the future, in a rational manner as opposed to an emotional manner.

There is no intent by anyone to destroy the environment in this Province, there is no intent by anyone to destroy the wildlife in this Province. But again, Mr. Chairman, we must also be cognizant of the fact that if we do not have some controls we will destroy - or the budworm will destroy the forests and as a result of course the wildlife is automatically destroyed and so is the environment. It is a situation that you are damned if you do, and damned if you do not, as one person recently put it in an interview.

But we are looking towards the long-term as well in the budworm control problem, we are looking at new forest management techniques, we are studying ways and means of a better mix in our forest resource, better mix of species, and we hope that in the long-term that this will combat the infestation that we have had from the insects over the past years.

But that is long-term. In the short-term, there has to be some solution, either chemical or biological or whatever, to suppress the budworm, and there is no doubt about it if we do not suppress it we will be in very sorry straits fifteen to

MR. MAYNARD: twenty years from now. The Forest Taxation Act is one which I brought in in 1974, I had the pleasure of introducing to this House the most comprehensive piece of forestry legislation that has ever been prepared in this Province. I must say that it is working good, I will be bringing in some amendments of a technical nature to improve the effective implementation of it within the next few days, but in general the Forest Land Management and Taxation Act of 1974 has set out the policy and the direction in which government wants to go in controlling and administering the forests of this Province.

Although we have had some minor - not conflicts but disagreements with the companies over the past couple of years in implementating the act, I must say that in general both the large paper companies have been most co-operative and have shown their intent to go by the spirit of the legislation, perhaps reluctantly, but they have shown that they will go with the legislation because I believe that they realize that the good administration and control of the forests in Newfoundland is to their benefit as well as to the benefit of the general public.

I do not think I have very much time left, so I would hope that through the course of the four hours that we have upcoming that I will have the opportunity to answer questions and to make more statements as far as any branch or all branches of the department are concerned. Okay, let her come.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, first leading off I would like to support one statement that the minister made, He said he felt that the forests of this Province his department is administering is an asset that is a renewable resource and an asset that we may have to hang our hats on. We have heard a lot about fisheries, but I would contend, Mr. Speaker, that

MR. FLIGHT: next to fisheries the non-renewable resources of our forestry is the thing that we will probably hang our hats down the road. And I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that right now, given the economic situation in this Province right now, that it is only the two paper mills, Price (Nfld.), Bowaters, two or three mining communities, Baie Verte, presently Buchans, and I am not thinking about the Labrador part of the Province, that is holding this Province together right now, that is the only productive - and the fisheries of course - that is the only productive sector that we have going.

And, Mr. Chairman, I sat through and listened very intently to the debates on Linerboard, the shut down of Linerboard. I did not contribute to the debate, I did not feel that I had to. There were other people who were better versed in the problems of Linerboard than I felt that I was, but it became all too apparent, Mr. Chairman, that the reason the Linerboard, the basic reason the Linerboard is in trouble today the situation is the wood supplied to that mill. Now it can be argued and it was argued that if the Province intended to import wood from Labrador then Stephenville would have been the wrong location for the mill. That be as it may, that was argued.

There was no question, Mr. Chairman, that if an on Island supply of wood was found for Linerboard then Linerboard could compete, and the major problem of that mill was the unavailability or inavailability of an on Island supply of wood. Now that, of course, flies in the face, Mr. Chairman, of the fact that we have a Mr. VanBeke shipping 50,000 cords of wood out of Labrador this year to Europe. It does not say much for the type of forest management or financial management that can see on one hand an entrepreneur shipping 50,000 cords of wood out of Labrador for resale in Europe while at the same time we have to admit to ourselves that we cannot bring wood from Labrador into Stephenville.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me to remind him that millions piled on millions of cords of pulpwood have been cut in Quebec, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and shipped to paper mills in England and on the Continent of Europe, that virtually all the paper mills of the United Kingdom have been getting their pulpwood from Newfoundland? Bowaters shipped hundreds of thousands of cords over there to the paper mills in England. They have been getting them from Sweden, from Russia and that the transport of pulpwood 2,000 or 3,000 miles from the source to the paper mill using it is nothing exceptional?

MR. NEARY: Not in recent years they have not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Which only means that they are shipping it from Labrador to Stephenville was trifling compared with the far greater distances for other mills.

MR. FLIGHT: I thank the hon. member. That is the point I was making, that I am not questioning the economic viability of shipping Labrador wood or Newfoundland wood for that matter to Europe or anywhere else in the world. What I am questioning is how is it that Labrador wood can be shipped to Europe at an economic rate that makes it viable, that makes it a profitable operation, while at the same time Labrador wood cannot be shipped to Stephenville, 'trifling' as far as the former Premier is concerned. And I would think that the Minister of Forestry, certainly the Department of Forestry, would have more input into that type of thing - how that can happen - than any other department of government, and I would hope that when the minister speaks again that he will play out his department's involvement in that aspect of the Linerboard situation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to get back to Linerboard for a minute. It was hinted in this House, and I am going to do it, and I want to make very clear that I have no axes to grind, I have a great deal of respect for the integrity and the honesty and the expertise of the people who made up the Advisory Board of Stephenville, the Labrador Linerboard Advisory Board, but I know this, Mr. Chairman, that

MR. FLIGHT: I am not aware, if any hon. gentleman in this House can show me, I am not aware of one instance since the Labrador Linerboard Mill was established that either Price (Nfld.) or Bowaters made their life any easier, that they offered any assistance whatsoever. As a matter of fact, one could make a case that Bowaters and Price did everything they could do to convince the people of Newfoundland and Labrador that it was not a viable operation. And the motives, one could use his imagination as to why. And it came as a shock and a surprise to me, Mr. Chairman, that there was no more public outcry or no more questions asked.



MR. FLIGHT: Then, when we see the Advisory Board, the two top people on the Advisory Board being the top people of Price and Bowaters, that, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, could bear scrutiny.

If there had been any indication over the years, that Price (Nfld.) had any desire to see Linerboard succeed - Price (Nfld.) knew that the basis of Labrador Linerboard's problem was the unavailability, the non-supply of on-Island wood - I did not hear them suggesting that they would trade limits, or they would turn back to the Province timber limits that could be utilized by Linerboard. And I have to accept the fact that these gentlemen were there because of their experience in the woods operation, their expertise. But I would suggest there were also people in this country with just as much expertise and with no axes to grind.

Mr. Chairman, I have heard the minister on numerous occasions mention this new Forestry Management. Sir, there is no evidence for anyone who lives in the woods operations, in the areas where the timber is being cut - where we see the management policies of the paper companies - there is no evidence that anything has changed this past 25 years Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters. and when I think of management I think of the way that the companies are harvesting our forests and what they are utilizing and what they are not utilizing, and there is no evidence, Mr. Chairman, that anything has changed this past 25 years.

The minister referred to his new Taxation Act. Well, I would submit to the minister, and he could probably tell us whether or not Bowaters is, indeed, complying, or are they not threatening to take his new taxation policies into Court? Are they not saying that they do not intend, and cannot pay the various taxes that they would be subject to, if they indeed, accept it - the minister's new taxation policies?

Mr. Chairman, I stood in this House - management is management, Mr. Chairman - utilization is utilization - and I stood in this House - and the Minister of Environment should listen here - last year, and for a couple of weeks - the press picked it up - we had questions being asked as to the way Price (Nfld.) was getting their wood to the mill. And I made an issue of - and I intend to make an issue again, now - of

MR. FLIGHT: the free floating wood in Red Indian Lake.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I should not have to give the figures in this House. The minister should have his people, should have his authorities, out to Central Newfoundland, finding out what is happening on Red Indian Lake. But let me relate these two incidents. Last Fall, one night, 14,000 cords of wood slushed out from Lloyd's River into Red Indian Lake, through a mistake - 14,000. Now, Mr. Chairman, last year, Price (Nfld.) laid off their work force three weeks earlier than they would normally have laid them off, and the excuse they gave was an oversupply of wood at the mill. I, at the time, made a press release, Mr. Chairman, because I was aware that the wood being cut in the Red Indian Lake area was not designated to be sent to Price (Nfld.)'s mill in Grand Falls, during that Fall or Winter. It was being boomed in Harbour Round, which is a large harbour in Red Indian Lake, below their operation. The wood was being boomed and stored there, not destined to arrive at that mill until the spring.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I would leave it to the imagination of the members of this House, and certainly I would suggest to the minister that if he does not already know he get the figures and tell us before this debate is over, how much wood would have been boomed in Harbour Round from the time that Price stopped running wood to the mill until the freeze-up and the operation closed down? Well, I will tell the House it was a total production of at least, one logging camp, so we are talking 30,000 or 40,000 cords of wood. And I will tell the House now, that three or four nights ago, Price (Nfld.) lost every junk of that wood. That 400,000 cords, that full production of a logging camp is now free floating on Red Indian Lake. How is that for forest management? Mr. Chairman, is it not just as important, is wood floating free on Red Indian Lake not just as valuable to this Province as wood being destroyed by budworm?

MR. MURPHY: Not forever, forever not.

MR. FLIGHT: I would say, in my humble opinion, that most of it is lost forever. Price will not agree. Price have berated me. They say, no. But I would - the problem, Mr. Chairman, is that when I make this type of statement, most members in this House and I can understand why they do not

MR. FLIGHT: relate to what is happening up there - Price will agree that wood will eventually end up in Exploits River. A lot of that wood, and it does not matter if it is only fifty cords, will never end up in Exploits River. It will end up on the bottom of Red Indian Lane; it will end up in low-lying land surrounding Red Indian Lake. Price is keeping the level down now. It will dry up. Thousands of cords of wood will never reach the mill - lost to the economy of this Province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest to the minister I am beginning to doubt, No. 1, if the legislation exists that would force Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters to stop this type of waste; I doubt if that legislation exists, and I doubt if the government has the stomach, if it does not exist, to bring in that kind of legislation. I am beginning to doubt this government's and this administration's stomach to bring in that kind of legislation. I am not sure if Price (Nfld.) would accept it.

AN HON. MEMBER: How can they manage that?

MR. FLIGHT: I know what I would do.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, if Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters are going to take the attitude that they will use our lakes and rivers to export their wood to that mill, then I am suggesting that this Province would bring in a beachcombers' law and that any wood free-floating in Red Indian Lake would become public property, and the people - anyone - could go in and pick up that wood, find a market and sell it. Price (Nfld.) would think twice before they would allow 40,000 cords of wood to go free in Red Indian Lake in one given night. Because, Mr. Chairman, this wood is gone and lost. I volunteered my services to the Minister to take one of his trusted officials into Red Indian Lake, and I will take him into areas where wood is that we will never get it - Price will never get it. Price have not tried to get it. Price indicated last year on letters back and forth to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment that they were doing their normal sacking on Red Indian Lake. Price have never sacked Red Indian Lake in this past fifteen, twenty years, and all they did last year was they hired fifteen or sixteen people, put them in there, cleaned up the beaches that are obvious to the general public, the Millertown front, the lake front in the community of Millertown. We have a Provincial Park up there; they cleaned the beach. The Buchans landing, they cleaned it up. And that is all they cleaned up. All the rest is there. Hundreds of cords of wood, thousands of cords of wood, right now hundreds of thousands of cords, because we saw 50,000 going in one bang, overnight.

AN HON MEMBER: Was it deliberate?

MR. FLIGHT: No, it was not deliberate, but that is beside the point. No, But Price (Nfld.) should be operating with more control and more care, and maybe the time has come to question whether or not they should be dumping that wood in Red Indian Lake when they should be taking it right down the road to the river.

They have a slasher set up in Red Indian Lake and they truck the wood 15 or 16 miles to the slasher, and then they store in in Harbour Round. They would have had to continue trucking



MR. FLIGHT: only another 15 miles and the wood would have been in the river, and the lake would not be used for the purpose it is being used.

Mr. Chairman, let me make one thing very clear - somebody might be small-minded enough or narrow-minded enough to accuse me of being anti-Price and to have an axe to grind against Price - but let me say, right now, Mr. Chairman, I am not anti-Price. Thank God for Price (Nfld.). Price (Nfld.) provides the economic base that most of the people I know in this Province earn a living. They are the only producing company - given the fact that we know ASARCO will curtail. I wish we had ten like Price (Nfld.). But are we in a position where because we have a Price (Nfld.) who is coming in, logging our resources, cutting our non-renewable resources, and making a dollar - if they were not making a dollar, they would not be here - does that give them a licence to operate how they like, irrespective of our feelings, and to waste the resource. We do not have that many resources, and wood is being wasted.

MR. MURPHY: There must be hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of money wasted.

MR. FLIGHT: Hundreds of thousands.

AN HON. MEMBER: That they should pay.

MR. FLIGHT: Forty dollars a cord. Figure it out.

I am standing in this House right now and saying there are a

100,000 cords of wood on Red Indian Lake. Now, \$100 a cord.

I will lay my credibility on the line. I know what I am talking about.

I know that there is at least 50,000 cords of wood gone into Red

Indian Lake this past two or three weeks plus what was there. And

that lake is 48 miles long, and coves and inlets and harbours and

landlocked bays, and they are all full. And most of them will always

be full unless Price (Nfld.) sacks that lake or unless the Government

of Newfoundland goes in and does it. I do not care who does it, but

it has to be done.

AN HON. MEMBER: What did you say?



MR. FLIGHT: . Sack. S-A-C-K.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that?

MR. RIDEOUT: That is a logger's term.

MR. FLIGHT: So, Mr. Speaker, let it be said - whatever is said, whatever is printed about the attitude I have taken with regard to this particular aspect, that I have a great deal of respect for Price (Nfld.). I have a great deal of admiration, and I have a great deal of gratitude for what Price (Nfld.) has done for this Province and what it is continuing to do. But, I do not believe - I do not believe that we have to - No. 1, I do not think it is necessary. I think Price is doing it because that is the way they have always done it. Up until now

Mr. Flight.

they have had no supervision.

MR. RIDEOUT: Where is the management policy?

MR. FLIGHT: Where is the management policy? Where is the management policy that allows a company to let that kind of wood float around? So, Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear the minister, when he rises again to address this House on his management policies, to tell us the situation with regards to what he intends to do, what he has done and what he intends to do and what Price is saying and Bowaters about the pulpwood that they are wasting?

Mr. Chairman, and again I would emphasize, if Price (Nfld.) - and now here is another thing. They own Red Indian Lake, they have the rights; no one can pick up one stick of wood, you would be in court the next day, you know. If a man goes in to pick up one stick of wood, one piece of four foot pulp, if Price so decides they can have him in court, and they will have him in court. They have done it. If somebody picks up off the shores of Red Indian Lake one stick of Price (Nfld.) pulpwood -

AN HON. MEMBER: They act as if they own the lake.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, they act like they own the lake, let us put it that way. They own the lake, they apparently own the lake.

MR. NEARY: No, only Murray's Pond and -

MR. FLIGHT: I know. I am being facetious, Mr. Chairman. I do not know if anyone realizes I am being facetious. But they control it like they own it.

I am aware of old age pensioners who have gone and picked up four or five cords of wood and pulled it five miles to burn and Price (Nfld.) sent in the RCMP and said, "Put it back where you found it." And they pulled it back where they found it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow me? Would he not find that the laws passed by this House of Assembly give the Grand Falls Company and the Corner Brook Company the right, the lawful right to use those lakes and rivers for that very purpose? Now if they have the right and they own the wood - it is private property; it is

Mr. Smallwood.

their property, and they are using a lake that they have the legal right to use - does it cease to be their property?

MR. FLIGHT: I am not suggesting, Mr. Chairman, that it is. I know the wood on the lake, Price (Nfld.) owns it. I know Price (Nfld.) has got the right to use the waterways. But what I am asking is how long will this House condone a situation where a Newfoundlander walks down to a beach and picks up a stick of wood to burn, and Price (Nfld) can say, No, you cannot have that wood. You cannot burn it. You cannot have it. But we will let it sink in Red Indian Lake. We will let it rot in the woods. We will let it bury up with sand, We will do what we like with it. You cannot burn it.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is scandalous.

MR. FLIGHT: Now it is scandalous. It is absolutely ridiculous and scandalous, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RIDEOUT: And they will not buy it back.

MR. FLIGHT: And, Mr. Chairman, what I am suggesting is that I am prepared to give Price (Nfld.) the rights to the waterways; I am prepared to let them enforce the law that nobody can touch a stick of their wood, but I am not prepared to let them have thousands of cords of wood floating around sinking while at the same time refusing a Newfoundlander the right to pick up a piece of wood. And it just as simple as that, Mr. Chairman.

MR. RIDEOUT: They should buy it back.

MR. FLIGHT: So the solution, beachcombing.

MR. RIDEOUT: Right on, beachcombing.

MR. FLIGHT: Beachcombing. There are hundreds of people, young men in Newfoundland, in Central Newfoundland today, students coming from the university who will go and take their tents, and they will go up and pitch around the shores of Red Indian Lake, and they will pick up twenty cords and thirty cords and if they get the right cove, they will get one hundred cords without moving, and let them sell it where they like. Let them

Mr. Flight.

sell it to the Linerboard mill. Let them sell it to the parks, let them sell it to anywhere. Let them sell it. And I will tell you things that will be accomplished. The revenue from that particular wood will go back one way or the other into the economy, but next year Price (Nfld.) will lose no booms of wood with 50,000 or 20,000 cords in it. I cannot see where Price (Nfld.) could even possibly object to that kind of an approach, not possibly. Because if they objected what they would be saying is that, you know, we are not prepared to use caution in the way we move that wood down that lake. We are prepared to let it float around Red Indian Lake or we are prepared to let it end up in the woods on high water levels.

MR. RIDEOUT: And they are prepared to let it sink.

MR. FLIGHT: And, Mr. Chairman, there is no way that if we had a beachcombing situation in this Province would we see the type of waste we are seeing today.

So, Mr. Chairman, that is enough. I am going to be accused, I am sure, and I am going to be accused of being anti-Price.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, first of all, Sir, I would like to, for the benefit of

MR. NEARY: the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) to tell the hon. gentleman that Bowaters have not exported any wood since January 1, 1972.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because we stopped them.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, we did not stop them. They -

MR. SMALLWOOD: You are wrong. We stopped them.

MR. NEARY: No, no, I do not think -

MR. SMALLWOOD: We did!

MR. NEARY: - so. Perhaps the hon. Minister can straighten us out, but I put a question on the order paper -

MR. MURPHY: 1972.

MR. NEARY: 1972. I asked that the Minister -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The legal rights expired and we would not renew them so it became unlawful for them to export raw wood by decision of the Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: The detailed correspondence, reports and other information in connection with discussions with Bowaters with respect to the question of exporting of wood from Newfoundland and Labrador cannot be tabled, so the Minister tells us, since much of this information was provided to the Department on a confidential basis. Furthermore, the question of Bowaters' failure to export pulpwood in previous years may become an issue for the courts. May become an issue for the courts. -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. NEARY: - and the tabling of this -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because they were obliged to export.

MR. NEARY: They were obliged to export. That is the point I am making, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: That is right. The Minister tells us in reply to a question that I asked the Minister, and the Minister gave me the answer on March 7th, the only Minister, I believe, who has a batting



MR. NEARY: average of 100 per cent answering my questions so far.

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Well, the hon. gentleman may be still smarting under the name I put on him in Western Newfoundland, but I hope the hon. gentleman does not hold it against me.

Furthermore, the question of Bowaters' failure to export pulpwood in previous years may become an issue for the courts, and the tabling of this information may be prejudicial to the Province's position. Then I asked the Minister, how much wood, and the Minister told me that Bowaters had not exported any wood since January 1, 1972. And then, I said, "Is it compulsory for Bowaters to export a certain amount of wood each year; if the answer is 'yes', how much of the wood cut has to be for export?" Answer: I table for the members' consideration and information, a copy of the Bowaters-Newfoundland Act No. 53 (1938) in which the information requested by the hon. member for LaPoile can be obtained. And, I presume that Act still applies or the Minister would not have tabled it. So, the Act was not rescinded, and the Minister confirms that it was not rescinded, and Bowaters are still under legal obligation to export so much wood per year. They have not done it since 1972, and personally, I am glad of it. I am not making a case for Bowaters.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If I am not mistaken, we ordered them to stop. We, the former Administration.

MR. NEARY: If I had my way, Sir, there would not be one stick of wood exported from this Province to keep the mills going, whether it is in the United Kingdom or on the Continent of Europe. Here we are with our own Linerboard Mill, shutting down because we cannot supply the wood here on the Island, and we cannot get Bowaters and Price to exchange timber rights. Let us settle it now when we are doing the Minister's estimates. Once and for all, are they going to co-operate, or are they not? And if they do not, then let this House decide, and anybody that gets

MR. NEARY:                   this foolish nonsense in their head about Bowaters threatening to pull out of Newfoundland with all the profits that they have taken out of this Province; let us not talk such foolish poppycock and nonsense. It is balderdash. They are not going to pull out. They may threaten. They are not going to do it, and if they did, it would not take somebody very long to move in with the concessions they have in this Province and the amount of profits that they make every year here in this Province. We have been too timid, Sir. We back away from Bowaters and Price. We let our own people out in the Bay St. George area suffer, shut down the Linerboard Mill because they will not exchange timber rights. There was a time in this Province we were talking about four paper mills. No problem with Bowaters or Price. Everybody was going to co-operate. Now, so we are told, we cannot operate two, unless the spruce budworm is brought under control. And the Minister is coming in for his share of criticism for going out and doing some spraying to try to save the forests in this Province. You have the bleeding hearts going around, jumping down the Minister's throat. Well, what is the alternative? The alternative is to 'let her go'. Let the spruce budworm carry on and destroy the forest industry. I do not have to rally to the Minister's defence. The Minister is doing the right thing, in my opinion, experimenting with the spray program.

AN HON. MEMBER:           Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:                 And let nobody -

MR. SMALLWOOD:           The experiment should be bigger though.

MR. NEARY:                 The experiment - well, the Minister obviously backed away again. Maybe it should be bigger, but let us hope that it will prove to be successful, so that we can save our forest industry. But, Sir, let us not be wishy-washy when it comes to Bowaters and Price. They have been pretty good corporate citizens, I suppose, up to now, but if it means that we have to exchange a few timber rights, that we have to take some

MR. NEARY: of their concessions, whether they give it up voluntarily, or whether the House attempts to take it away from them to keep the Linerboard mill going. So be it. What else can we do? They have been getting away - the administration threatened to bring in a tax on their undeveloped land. What happened to that? Did the administration back away from it? Is it in effect now? Are they going to be billed for the concessions that they have that are not being developed, that are not being worked? They will be. I have not heard anything about that piece of legislation, recently.

MR. WHITE: This is the first year. They have a two year -

MR. NEARY: Reprieve? Moratorium.

MR. WHITE: Two years to come up with the plan.

MR. NEARY: Two years to come up with the plan. Have they come up with their plans, or going into our second year now?

MR. WHITE: No. They are forming their plan this year.

MR. NEARY: This year, they have to produce plans to develop the timber rights that they have, or they will be taxed.

MR. MAYNARD: They have considered a plan as to what they are going to do over the next five years, and if government does not agree with the plan, then the high taxes apply. But they have paid the low tax already.

MR. NEARY: Okay, that is fine. Well, I mean, if we have to wait another six months or another nine months, then we have to wait. That is it, and there is nothing we can do under the regulations.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What they are going to do in the next five years -

MR. NEARY: Is produce a plan.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do in connection with timber, or mill, or what? Everything.

MR. MAYNARD: Timber.

MR. NEARY: Timber rights.

MR. MAYNARD: Harvesting of timber -

MR. NEARY: If they do not harvest the wood, they have to pay a tax on the acreage they are not using. And in that way, I presume, the administration is hoping to force Price and Bowaters to give back a certain amount of their rights to the government, so that it could be used for, possibly, the Linerboard mill, and that may happen eventually. But by that

MR. NEARY: time, the Linerboard mill will be closed.

MR. MURPHY: No more down in the mill.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) perhaps can enlighten me, but I can not get it in my head, somehow or other, how we were going to have four paper mills operating on the Island of Newfoundland unless Bowaters and Price co-operated. Or was all the wood going to come from Labrador?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can answer that.

MR. NEARY: Alright, Sir. I yield but I want the floor back.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course. I do not know if the hon. member was a member of this House when I first introduced the programme. If he was, he will remember that I had a large blackboard erected up in that end of the House -

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I was here.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And I had the -

MR. H. COLLINS: That was a cartology session.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. And I had a microphone at the end of a long cord and I demonstrated the plan which had been recommended to us by the royal commission headed by General Howard Kennedy, the great forester, Canada's greatest forester, of stopping the criss-crossing, Price going to the West Coast and hauling pulpwood eastward. Bowaters coming to the East Coast and hauling pulpwood westward. That the Crown land stands and the Bowaters' stands and the Price stands would all be treated as though they were one lot of wood but the distribution would go to the mill that was most economic for it to go to.

MR. NEARY: Nearest where the timber was.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That was the plan, and I believe the present administration have adopted very much that same plan, have they not?

MR. NEARY: I thank the hon. gentlemen for his explanation. It is about as clear as mud to me so far, Sir. The only thing



MR. NEARY: the hon. gentleman said was that instead of criss-crossing each other they would exchange, I presume, get together, two companies and exchange two timber rights, the nearest the mill.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. No. A Crown corporation would determine where the wood would be cut, who could have it. Every cord of wood to be cut on this Island was to be cut in accordance with directions given to the cutters, how much they could cut, where they could cut, where they could transport it, was to be determined by a Crown corporation that would be set up for that purpose. This would stop the criss-crossing, the terribly expensive criss-crossing of the Island of pulpwood.

MR. NEARY: Well then am I understanding the hon. gentleman correctly that all the timber resources in our forestry would be placed under a Crown corporation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Controlled.

MR. NEARY: Controlled. I mean, would then Bowaters and Price (Nfld) have to give up their concessions and agree to have the concessions that they now hold revert back to the Crown and put under a Crown corporation?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. No.

MR. NEARY: Well then, what is the advantage of it?

MR. SMALLWOOD: This House could create a corporation and this House could give that corporation authority



Mr. Smallwood:

to regulate the cutting of timber, regardless who has the concession, regardless of where the title lies, whether it is leasehold or freehold or what, and a super body could be set up to determine where and when and how every stick of wood will be cut in this Province. The House can do it at any time, it is within our competence constitutionally to do it without attacking the title. Anybody that has full title, let him keep it. Anyone who has a lease, let him keep it. But who and how and when and where it will be cut, let a Crown corporation determine.

MR. NEARY: I thank the hon. gentleman again, Sir, but, you know as far as I can see it, it would be like the supercity we are going to set up, we just have another level of bureaucracy. And it would not solve the problem of -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: It would not solve the problem as far as I can see of the Linerboard mill, for instance.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It would exactly do that.

MR. NEARY: It would?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Well then but Bowaters and Price would have to agree.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the House passes the law, they agree or get out.

MR. NEARY: But up to now they have not agreed.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, they have not agreed. They will not agree. Up to now they have been stubborn. They have been unpatriotic. And they have not agreed to exchange timber rights to keep the Linerboard mill going.

MR. SMALLWOOD: According to what the Premier says, they more or less have.

MR. NEARY: They have not -

MR. SMALLWOOD: He says the problem of supplying pulpwood to the Linerboard Mill is settled.

MR. FLIGHT: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Oh well then -

MR. SMALLWOOD: He announced that here in this House.

MR. NEARY: Well then, Mr. Chairman, there is something that I do not know and that is what got me baffled at the moment, no wonder I am frustrated and confused. I heard the hon. the Premier say, Yes, because I think I was the one that put the questions to the hon. the Premier, that yes the matter of the exchange of timber rights could be resolved. But there is no evidence before this House, Sir, that it has or will be resolved.

MR. SMALLWOOD: We have his word.

MR. NEARY: We have the Premier's word, and we know that the Power Corporation of Canada and Consolidated Bathrust and the people who own Price are on the Advisory Board. We know that much. And it would follow, it would only be reasonable to expect that these people who were appointed to the Advisory Board, who may have an eye on the Linerboard mill in Stephenville, may be prepared to exchange timber rights to get the wood, the low cost wood that is necessary to keep the Linerboard mill going. Well let us hope, Sir, that that is true.

Now, Mr. Chairman, before Your Honour rises the House for dinner I still have two minutes before 1:00 o'clock, I want to find out, Sir, what is happening in connection with the Reid Newfoundland Limited. I also asked the minister a question about this, and the answer that I got back was expected. I asked the minister to give us the name of an independent firm, if any, who documented all of the details and information for the government. If information departmental, table copies of all plans and mapping to date and indicate whether or not actual field work was done in connection with such documentation.

Mr. Chairman, this House, the administration of this Province decided to lash out \$4.6 million, I believe it was, so far

Mr. Neary:

to the Reid Newfoundland Company Limited, and they have done it, Sir, as far as I can see in reading the answer to my question, they have done it without any actual field work being done either by the minister's officials or by an independent consulting firm.

MR. MAYNARD: Not true.

MR. NEARY: The minister says no. Well, Sir, I want the minister to clear up that burning question that has been tormenting me for sometime. The officials in the Forestry Branch of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture and the Department of Justice were asked by Cabinet to prepare a confidential evaluation of the Reid properties, which were being offered by sale by the Reid Newfoundland Company Limited for \$36 million. The evaluation was prepared on the basis of a thorough review of the terms of tenure held by the Reid Newfoundland Company, former sales of large blocks of Reid property.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! It now being 1:00 o'clock I leave the Chair until 3:00 o'clock.

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1977

The Committee resumed at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I would like to welcome on behalf of the members of the House of Assembly sixteen students, Grade V and Grade VIII, of the Seventh Day Adventist School from Corner Brook. They are on an educational tour of St. John's and vicinity. They are accompanied by their teacher, Mr. Simmons, and their chaperone, Mrs. Blake. I welcome the group and trust you will have a very enjoyable stay in St. John's and vicinity. Hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I, too would like to join with the House in welcoming the students from Corner Brook. In case they do not know who their representatives are in the House of Assembly, I would like to point out that my hon. friend here with the sunglasses represents Humber East (Dr. Farrell), and I might say for the benefit of the students that my hon. friend is wearing the glasses because he has surgery recently. Right directly behind is the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow). The representative for Humber West (Premier Moores) is not in his seat at the moment which is in keeping with past traditions.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Now that the hon. member has made the introductions I would advise him to continue with his speech.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Sir, and for the benefit of the students I would like to point out that we are now discussing the estimates of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture.

DR. FARRELL: Would the hon. member yield for a moment?

MR. NEARY: Yes, indeed I will.

DR. FARRELL: I would like to welcome the students from Corner Brook, Mr. Chairman. For the benefit of the students I would like to mention that the speaker at this moment is the representative from the historic District of LaPoile in case they did not recognize him. Thank you, very much.

MR. NEARY: We are talking about the departmental estimates of the Department of Forestry and Agriculture, which play a very big role in the main industry in Corner Brook, which is Bowaters paper



MR. NEARY: mill, and the industry in Grand Falls. This morning before the House rose at 1:00, p.m., we were talking about the government's taking back of certain rights that were given to the Reid family following the construction of the Newfoundland Railway. My hon. friend the member for Twillingate here, the former Premier of the province, probably knows more about the history of this than I do but anyway the government decided to buy back the Reid property. They were given certain rights in return for concessions in return for building the Newfoundland Railway.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They were at us for about ten years-

MR. NEARY: They were at the former administration, so we are told, for about ten years. But anyway the new administration caved in and decided to take back the property. As far as I can learn have paid about \$4.5 million of the taxpayers' money so far out of a total, I am told, of \$35 or \$36 million that they are going to pay to this family for mineral and timber rights that belong to the people of this province, that I claim they should not have got one cent for, not a red cent! As a matter of fact the administration, instead of paying money to the Reid family, should have charged the Reid's for protecting their property for so many years, for putting out the forest fires on their property, not protecting the wildlife and forest fire protection, not looking after the property. We should have sent them a bill, instead of our lashing out \$35 or \$40 million of the taxpayers' money to that crowd of moneybags whose interest mainly was over on the other side of the Atlantic, over in England

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman yield? I was just remarking to my hon. friend here sitting momentarily on my right. I said, "He is the limit, is he not?" and he grinned. I said to him, "You are just as bad." May I ask the hon. gentleman if he is not aware of the fact

MR. SMALLWOOD: that when the Reid's built the railway across this Island-which was a tremendous engineering achievement at the time. It was long before the great science of engineering had developed to the present point-when they built that great railway for the Government of Newfoundland they were paid to do it, and they were paid cash and they were paid land. They were given payment in two ways: One was so much cash a mile, and so much land a mile and the land had to be in alternate blocks like a checkerboard. And the land we are talking about was payment made to them for building the railway for us. Is he aware of that?

MR. NEARY: Yes, Well, I mean, what is the point?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well the point is that it was their land. They had fee simple. It was theirs. They owned it. It was their land and while the hon. gentleman's argument is probably very valid that we should bill them for any service we gave their land by way of protecting them from forest fires and so on, nevertheless it was their land. They owned it just as much as the hon. gentleman owns the land that his house is built on, or at least I hope he does.

MR. NEARY: No, I do not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, if it was not freehold it was leasehold.

MR. NEARY: It is leasehold.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But this was not leasehold. This was freehold.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend always provides me with a piece of information that I am not aware of and always gives me the answer. But, Sir, my question is this, and perhaps the hon. gentleman could give me the answer to this. I asked the hon. gentleman to tell me, the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, to tell me and I may be something else for asking questions like this I do not, maybe I am like my hon. friend for asking these questions but I cannot help but ask the questions.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The limit in efficiency.

MR. NEARY: The name of independent surveyor or firm, if any, who

MR. NEARY: documented detailed information for the government. If information departmental -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Time is up. You sit down and you will get a chance again.

MR. NEARY: If the members keep interrupting me I will never get a chance to make my point at all, Sir. Table copies of all plans and mapping to date and indicate whether or not any actual field work was done in connection with this documentation. The key to the question being, has there been any field work done. And the answer has come back in vague general terms and still does not tell me whether or not there was any field mapping or field work done in connection with the surveys of the map. There was none done. In actual fact none was done.

MR. SMALLWOOD: By the government.

MR. NEARY: By the government or anybody else. The money was paid out to these people. They got -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Reids had - they had maps.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not care what the Reids had, Sir. The Reids could have maps showing that they own the whole of Newfoundland, but if the hon. gentleman was in charge in this administration would the hon. gentleman pay out \$35 million -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, I did not.

MR. NEARY: - on behalf of the taxpayers of this Province to an outfit without at least having a field survey done?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I did not pay anything.

MR. NEARY: No, and I am sure the hon. gentleman would not, knowing him like I do. And so I want to get the answer out of the hon. minister. I appreciate the information given to me by the hon. the Premier but I still do not know if actual field work was done and perhaps the minister could tell me. There are all kinds of answers in there. potential hydro power as determined by officials of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, recreational potential of the land for cottage

MR. NEARY: development determined by Canada Land Inventory, potential for mineral development and so forth and so on, but no indication at all that there was any work done in the field in connection with this money and that is what I want to find out from the hon. gentleman. If there was not I would say shame on the minister and the administration for paying out the taxpayers' money without having the case properly documented. I would not give them a cent if it were I. All the things that I mentioned here were protected by the taxpayers of this Province, by the government, by paying out the hard pressed money belonging to the taxpayers. So we should be sending them a bill instead of lashing out the money generously to the Reid Family.

And I asked the member about information in connection with Newfoundland Forest Products to keep the mill going down in Hawkes Bay and the minister says, "While several meetings have been held with Bowaters officials concerning the problems of Newfoundland Forest Products sawmill at Hawkes Bay, it should be noted that the problems being experienced by Newfoundland Forest Products cannot be resolved alone through

MR. NEARY: discussions with Bowaters. Bowaters involvement with Newfoundland Forest Products operations solely concerns their obligation to cut sawlogs and offer them for sale to Newfoundland Forest Products. During 1976 Newfoundland Forest Products refused to buy logs because of the cost." In other words what the hon. gentleman is saying again, Sir, is that Bowaters have refused to cooperate by allowing this company down in Hawke's Bay, Newfoundland Forest Products, to move in on Bowaters timber rights and cut the logs themselves. They cut the logs and then they try to sell them to Newfoundland Forest Products at a price that they cannot afford. I would like to get the minister's comments on that matter too, Sir.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to swing around for a moment to agriculture. I want to start off by saying to the House that the farmers in this province, especially the farmers on the East Coast of the province, and I presume it is the same in central and western Newfoundland, those who are involved in root crops and dairy farming feel that they have no spokesman in this Hon. House. They invited me to attend a meeting about three weeks ago, three or four Sundays ago. I spent my afternoon meeting with the principal root farmers in this area. They asked me if I would be their spokesman in this Hon. House. I am going to start off now to present their case to the House and to the minister. I know I only have about six minutes left and I probably will not get a chance to finish it, but if I happen to get cut down in mid-air or shot down before I finish after my twenty minutes is up, I will come back to it again because it is a very very important matter.

It is so important Mr. Chairman, that I feel that if some decisions are not taken by the administration in the very near future at an early a date as possible that we are going to lose what ever we have left of the farming industry in this province. It is going to go down the drain. The farmers themselves are discouraged



MR.NEARY: and pessimistic because of the lack of decision on the part of the administration and because of the lack of an adequate farm programme in this province. There is no programme, Sir. The government, the administration is just flying by the seat of its pants. The hon. minister can go out to Gander and any other community in Newfoundland and give the organization a few dollars but that, Sir, will not solve their problems. That is merely a handout and is going to do nothing to save the farming industry in this province.

Mr. Chairman, when land held by active farmers constitute the large segment of the total land in an area, the farmers claim, and I am quoting directly from notes that I made at this meeting of the farmers, that a land bank should be set up to buy land at agricultural prices with the seller holding future development rights in case of zoning or use being changed within a given number of years to higher price use, less the price paid plus accumulated interest over the period.

Where land is situated in such a manner that the active farmers hold a much smaller area of the total land, it would be much more difficult to protect him from development as the land bank may be forced to buy a lot of smaller parcels of land to give them a greater land base and the needed protection from development other than agricultural.

This refers, Mr. Chairman, to the land freeze, especially in the greater St. John's area, where the government has placed a freeze on land that has a potential use as agricultural land. Mr. Chairman, I cannot compete with them when there is another meeting going on in the House - there is somehow or other. I am like the former Premier in this regards, I cannot talk and listen at the same time. It is something I will never be able to master -

MR.CHAIRMAN: I would ask the hon. gentlemen on my left if they would keep their voices down.

MR.NEARY: I would love to hear what is going on Sir, love to hear it.

MR. NEARY: I am sure it is more interesting than what I am saying over here. But, Mr. Chairman, the farmers want to know what is going to be done about the land freeze. Is it going to continue? Is it going to be lifted? If it is going to continue then will the government buy the agricultural land and turn it over to the farmers. Will the government.

---

MR. NEARY: for instance, buy the land surrounding the small farms - will they now buy it before there is another house built, before there is another development takes place - buy the land and give it to the farmers in that particular area or keep it themselves and protect the farmer? Because, Mr. Chairman, once there is another house built on this land, I am talking about land that is near farms, or development takes place then that farm is doomed. It is doomed, Sir, because of all the problems that are created by residences and by developments taking place near farms, especially the smaller farms.

Mr. Chairman, it is urgent. It is urgent, Sir, that the farmers get the answer to this question and they have already held a number of meetings with the hon. minister and with the government and they have put this proposal fair and square before the administration and before the minister and they still do not have an answer. Development is still going on and houses are still being built near these farms and the farmers are afraid, the younger farmers, the young men in these area who cannot obtain suitable land through lack of ownership that they are going to be discouraged from continuing in the farming business or expanding.

Mr. Chairman, I still cannot get on the right frequency, Sir, while there is another meeting going on in the House. And I ask Your Honour to please insist that silence be maintained in this hon. House, that we have a little respect for the decorum of the House, Sir. We have a group of students in the gallery and I am sure that they do not want to see the members reading newspapers, running in and out, talking in the House, laughing, carrying on, eating candy, chewing gum. You are not allowed to do it in schools but you are allowed to do it in the people's House.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, I am not aware that you are allowed to eat candy and so on in the House. As a matter of fact I thought it was just exactly the reverse. They had some problems in New Brunswick

MR. NOLAN: I understand, Mr. Chairman, where they were carrying in peanuts and all the rest and the Speaker finally had to bring down a ruling and I am not aware that - I do not know if there is an official ruling here. The House Leader opposite can certainly correct me but I am not aware that members eat and drink, other than water, in the House of Assembly and if they are perhaps it is time we brought it out publicly and got it cured once and for all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order. In the Mother of Parliaments, the House of Commons at Westminster in London, it is a well-known fact that members drink brandy when the chancellor of the exchequer brings down his budget speech. He is supplied plentifully with brandy, which may or may not be mixed with water, but primarily it is a drink of brandy to keep up his strength. So if that can be done in the House of Commons at Westminster why could it not be done here? The precedent is well-established.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order. I am not aware of any rule which says that the occasional chew on a bit of taffy is against the rules. But may I say that I will vigorously oppose any attempt to introduce brandy or alcoholic beverages into this House. As the past recording scribe of Grand Division No. 9 of the Sons of Temperance it will not be tolerated in this House, I hope. Now I am subject to the wishes of hon. members who have never been as fortunate as I to be a member of that great institution.

MR. NOLAN: Back on the point of order again, Mr. Chairman, But was not the issue brought up about whether you are going to get into the hootch in the House or not? Things are bad enough here when all the members are sober let alone liquored up. I wish the member would get back off the foolishness he is on to again.

MR. HICKMAN: I did not raise it. It came from the Liberal side.

MR. NOLAN: The fact is if you are going to eat your lunch in the House we would like to have equal time. Now either you are going to carry on the House as it has in the past here-not like I saw one member recently eating a bag of cheezies or something - either we cut

MR. NOLAN: it out or we all have the same privileges. And the minister of course makes light of everything like he has about the vandalism in the parks -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! I think I can rule on that now.

MR. NOLAN: It would make you sick.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I think it was not a point of order as such. If the House demands a ruling on it I will have search the references, and present a ruling later. I think the hon. member's



MR. CHAIRMAN: time has expired and I will recognize some other hon. member.

The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, before we go on any further I would like to go through a few of the points that have been raised by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans and the hon. member for LaPoile regarding the various issues or the various sections of the Forestry and Agriculture's budget. The member for Windsor-Buchans responded at some length this morning on the problems of Labrador Linerboard Limited and at one point in time made the statement that it was a pretty well-known fact that the problem with Labrador Linerboard was the lack of wood supply. That is not so, and it has never been suggested by the government and it has never been suggested by anyone who has any connection with Labrador Linerboard that the one and only problem was the lack of a wood supply. To my knowledge, Mr. Chairman, while Labrador Linerboard was operating in Stephenville and at the present time it has never run out of wood. It has always had lots of wood. The wood may have been costly, it may have been more costly than the operation could sustain, but that was only one of the costs and one of the factors in the Labrador Linerboard operation.

For instance, one of the biggest factors, and much bigger than the wood supply was the lack of markets, the adequate markets for Linerboard, and I know this from experience because I happen to have served three years on the Board of Directors of Labrador Linerboard. There is no doubt about it there were some wood problems and there still are wood supply problems. There is without a doubt enough wood, if it is properly managed, properly maintained, properly harvested, there is enough wood on the Island portion of this Province to sustain three mills. There is not enough to sustain four. There is not enough wood in total on the Island and in Labrador added together to sustain four mills unless they are very small ones. But there is enough wood to sustain

MR. MAYNARD: three mills. There has to be some problems solved regarding the tenure, the distribution of the wood and this sort of thing. I think these are being resolved and it is not going to take all that long before the whole situation in regards where the various companies harvest their wood is going to be fairly well sorted out, and a lot of that is coming about because of the introduction of the Forest Land Management Taxation Act.

And that was another point that was brought up by the hon. member, both hon. members, that the Forest Land Management Taxation Act was not working. Well when I introduced the act in 1974, when government made its policy statement through me in the House of Assembly in 1974, we never did say that there would be any miracles overnight, that suddenly the whole face of the forest industry in this Province was going to change, that Bowaters was going to lose all of its timber holdings, Price was going to lose all of its timber holdings and the whole thing was going to be a whole new ball of wax. We never indicated that and we still do not indicate it. We introduced the Forest Management Taxation Act as the first step, but an important, very important first step, in trying to rationalize the forest industry of this Province, to try to bring some sense of direction into the management techniques that were being used, the harvesting techniques that were being used and the tenure situation. Because we knew at that time that there was a requirement for wood for other industries other than Price and Bowaters, and the small sawmill industry that we have, or relatively small compared to what the two large companies take.

At that time we had Labrador Linerboard on our plate. Hopefully, Mr. Chairman, we will have Labrador Linerboard around for a long time either as a linerboard mill or as some other kind of mill. And certainly there is enough wood if we use it and if we harvest it the right way. The Forest Land Management and Taxation Act is working and it is working very well. At the time that we brought it in we advised Price and Bowaters that they had two years

MR. MAYNARD: in which to come out with the necessary management plans - five year cutting plans and this sort of thing that was necessary under the legislation - two years in which to submit their first plans to government for approval or otherwise.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What does the minister mean by first plans?

MR. MAYNARD: First plan. Well the Forest Management Taxation Act requires that every holder of a timber license, whether it is a long term license or whether it is a fee simple or whatever, if they have control over that timber resource they have to submit on a yearly basis their plans what they are going to do with that timber for the coming number of years. In other words, they submit a five year management plan then update it every year with their actual harvesting and cutting plan.

We knew, for instance, that Bowaters and Price did not have the technical data in their files to comply with the Taxation Act, the Management Act. We knew that it would take them approximately two years in which to do the surveys, in which to go over their maps in which to do their timber cruises and this sort of thing in order to put together their technical data needed to satisfy us that we could accept or reject - we could accept at least the basic management plans. They have their two years by the way, during that two years we deemed the forest to be managed, and this is allowable under the Act for the first two year period, which means in effect that both companies were taxed at the low rate of seven cents per acre, and they have paid that tax.

Now, in 1977, both companies have submitted their management plans to us. We will go over the management plan and if they are acceptable to us we will give them a certificate that the land is managed for a period of one year. They have a five year plan but it is renewed from year to year, the actual cutting and operation plan. It is wrong to say that if they do not cut then they are highly taxed. That is wrong. If there is a demand

MR.MAYNARD: or if there is a market for the timber and the annual allowable cut provides that they should cut that timber, if there is a market and they do not market the timber then they have one other option and that is to make it available to someone else to harvest. If neither one of these options are followed then the lands that are not being managed properly are subject to a high taxation rate. There is the built-in penalty there \_\_\_\_\_ for the two large paper companies if they do not follow the management plans as we feel that we can accept them by the experts in forestry.

There was a point made at one time that Bowaters were taking us to court over the Act. At one point in time, Bowaters did seriously consider taking us to court and getting the Supreme Court to rule on the constitutionality of the Act. They have now withdrawn that. They are no longer objecting. Neither Bowaters or Price at this time -

MR.SMALLWOOD: Over the Constutionality of the Act of this House?

MR.MAYNARD: Yes.

MR.SMALLWOOD: The Constitutionality?

MR.MAYNARD: I do not know if constitutionality is the right word, but they were in essence saying that the Act was ultra vires this House of Assembly.

MR.SMALLWOOD: That is the constitutionality of it.

MR.MAYNARD. Well, I was -

MR.SMALLWOOD: If it was ultra vires of the authority of the House it was unconstitutional.

MR.MAYNARD: Not constitutional in the sense the Canadian constitution -

MR,SMALLWOOD: Oh, yes, it can only be the Canadian Constitution.

MR.MAYNARD: - as far as this House of Assembly is concerned. But in any case, Mr. Chairman, They have now withdrawn that. They are no longer objecting to the Act. They said that it applies to them, or they are willing to accept the fact as it applies to Bowaters and of

MR. MAYNARD: course Price accepted it from the outset, they never did have any objections to it. They had objections, yes, but not to the point of trying to -

MR. NEARY: They did not like it but they accepted it.

MR. MAYNARD: They did not like it but they accepted it, exactly right. So both companies are now \_\_\_\_\_



Mr. Maynard.

working to comply with the terms and provisions of the legislation and the regulations made under that. I do not foresee any real problems with either one of the companies. I think both companies realize that good management techniques in forest management techniques is beneficial to their long-term future as well as it is to the general public of Newfoundland. I am not convinced that the wood on Red Indian Lake is an example of poor management. It may be an example of archaic methods of transporting wood. But I am not so sure that Price are all that anxious to lose 40,000 or 50,000 cords of wood - or whatever the figure is, and I do not know what it is. I guess pretty well anyone would have to make a rough estimate or a rough guess because I do not think anyone really knows how much wood is around Red Indian Lake.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the minister yield?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Could the minister tell me what proportion of the total cut - I would say that the two companies between them are cutting perhaps in the neighbourhood of 600,000 cords a year, 600,000 to 700,000 cords - what proportion of all that wood is now transported by water and otherwise by road or rail? Does the minister remember the proportions?

MR. MAYNARD: No. I do not have the figures. I know that Price, of course, does much more transporting by water than anyone else. As a matter of fact I doubt very much if Bowaters takes more than ten or fifteen per cent of their wood by water.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Ten per cent by water?

MR. MAYNARD: Bowaters are doing most of their trucking directly into Corner Brook and dropping some in the lake in Deer Lake, but very little transported by water as such, probably ten to fifteen per cent. I do not know what the percentage of Price is. Maybe it would be more like fifty per cent. They still use the water transportation.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is down the Exploits?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes.

They still use the water transportation quite extensively.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And tributaries, yes.

MR. MAYNARD: And that by the way is reflected in the cost of the wood to their mill. Water transportation is obviously much cheaper, and Price has traditionally been able to deliver wood to their mill for five to six dollars a cord less than anyone else, and cheaper than Bowaters.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Cheaper even after the loss of wood in the rivers and lakes?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes.

The amount of loss in proportion to the amount of wood that Price would transport over the river system is not all that great. You are talking very low percentages. Of course, when you talk year after year, after year, and you have an accumulation of wood, two or three per cent of 350,000 cords, which I think is their approximate yearly cut, amounts to a considerable amount. But the actual percentages of loss is not all that great, that is for their total cut. I think it is generally regarded that wood stored in water, well, it would have about a five per cent loss factor, approximately.

MR. FLIGHT: That is through sinkage?

MR. MAYNARD: That is through sinkage.

MR. FLIGHT: The least loss is in Red Indian Lake.

We are talking about the wood that is stranded on the beaches, in over the low lying land.

MR. MAYNARD: Well, that is the figure that is used by the paper companies, by both Bowaters and Price and on the mainland as being the loss factor that they build in when they are transporting by water, five per cent. Now I assume that that has to be sinkage because until it is sunk, it is not really loss. It is still there. It is available for the people to take out.

MR. MAYNARD:

So, you are not talking about that much added on to the actual cost. And compare that with the lower costs of transporting by water, where you do not have so much unloading and shuttling around of cars and trucks and this sort of thing, you can see that the water transportation mode is much more efficient, maybe not more efficient, but certainly much less costly. So I would assume that Price will continue to use the water method of transportation for some years to come. I am not saying, however, that they should leave wood around Red Indian Lake as they have left it, and I have seen it on occasions. I plan to take a much closer look at it again, because if the hon. member is right when he says that a lot of wood is being destroyed or being lost by this sort of method around Red Indian Lake, then obviously something is going to have to be done about it to correct the situation.

MR. MAYNARD: We are not anxious, and I am sure Price is not anxious to see all that money go down the drain because I would assume in rough figures it is costing Price (Nfld.) \$30 at least to put it in the water. That is before they even start transporting it. So every cord that is lost in the lake costs them \$30. Good corporation people, I do not think that they are too anxious to take too much loss of that kind.

The terms of the export wood thing which was brought up by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) - In 1973, I think, government made an order that no further wood would be exported from the Province of Newfoundland. This did not apply to Bowaters and neither could it apply to Bowaters, because Bowaters had it written in the 1938 Act, which is still in effect, that they were required to export 50,000 cords of wood a year or pay a penalty of \$2 per cord. That Act has not been changed, it is still in effect. There was, however, and is a clause in the Act the same as in most acts or agreements of that kind, a force majeure clause which Bowaters have been using since 1972 in not exporting wood from the Province. They have not exported since 1971 - 1972 -

MR. NEARY: 1971.

MR. MAYNARD: 1971.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is force majeure.

MR. NEARY: The answer the minister gave was 1972.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is the force majeure?

MR. MAYNARD: The force majeure is they export subject to economic conditions, strikes, earthquakes, other acts of God, this sort of thing - the force majeure clause.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Including economic conditions?

MR. MAYNARD: Economic conditions, yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a funny force majeure.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, but it is in there.

MR. MAYNARD: - But it is in there. It is in the 1938 Act, economic conditions. And that is the one that they have been arguing. Economic conditions and the export market were such that they

MR. MAYNARD: could not export wood. Now there are four years, 1972, 1973, 1974 and 1975 - I think I am getting it correct. If I am a year one way or the other it does not really matter. There were four years in which Bowaters did not export wood in which we say that they should have exported, and there is a continuing argument which may come up before the Courts so I will not say any more than that on it.

For the following two years, 1976 and this year 1977, they have been waived and the Lieutenant-Governor can waive the clause where they are required to export.

In 1977 we may have jumped the gun a little bit, but in any case we do not feel that there should be export wood from the Province when there is a wood user in the Province who can take that wood.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. MAYNARD: We are still of that opinion. If, on the other hand, there is no wood user here, if Linerboard does close down then we are going to have certainly a surplus of wood that can be cut around this Province, and if we have to fill in the gap for a few years with export wood then certainly that is what we will do. I do not see any harm in that because we have an annual allowable cut of so much per year. There is no reason why that annual allowable cut should not be reached without harming in any way the future of the forest industry in the Province. But there will be more on the export wood later and there will be more on the Bowaters Act of 1938 in a later date in this session of the House.

Let me see what other points were raised.

The Reid properties. Mr. Chairman, the decision was made a few years ago to purchase the Reid properties in Newfoundland. Now the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) says that we should have sent them a bill. That may very well be so and I did not particularly like, and neither did government particularly like the fact that Reid held a lot of property - the Reid interests hold a lot of property, and that the government of Newfoundland had to -



May 24, 1977

Tape No. 3142

EC - 3

MR. MAYNARD:                    did not have to, I suppose, but was more  
or less put into the position where we had to purchase the property back  
from the Reid \_\_\_\_\_

MR. MAYNARD: family or the Reid estate. The analysis of the potential of the Reid property was done by government people. There were no outside consultants, there were no outside surveyors. It was done by government people. Hydro may have hired someone from outside, I do not know. But I know that in our own shop in the Department of Forestry and Agriculture no outside people were hired. The in shop people did the analysis, people who have not only cruised the area, have helped to do the Canada land inventory on the area but have been very familiar with the whole Reid property situation over the years and I think they did a tremendous assessment. There was a lot of work went into it. It is not something that was just done overnight, at the tip of a hat. There was a lot of man-hours and man-days went into making an assessment of the Reid properties and we feel that based on the knowledge we have and the knowledge that we have now that the amount that was paid for the Reid properties, which was \$4.1 million for 525,000 acres, was not out of line.

Now as the hon. gentleman from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) pointed out, the Reid people had grants, absolute grants to the properties. There was 201,000 acres of fee simple absolute and 145,000 acres of fee simple, the difference escapes me a little bit but both of them are outright grants. The other 179,000 acres were the Terra Nova sulfite blocks which were owned by the Reid interest. So they were all outright grants. So there were two courses open to government and that was to buy or to expropriate. If we expropriated, it was our assessment that the arbitration would have awarded just as much as they did get by the negotiation method. No doubt about it they would have been awarded a considerable sum of money for the amount of property that they had.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The minister is to be congratulated on the lucidity of his remarks. He made his statements with great clarity and I think we should appreciate that fact.

When I was allowed by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to interrupt him, and I notice in this session that every hon. member is showing great courtesy to every other hon. member who wishes to interrogate or make a point while he has the floor, I made a statement about policy that we had adopted in the previous administration. There were two policies really that we adopted. One was the one I described when the hon. gentleman allowed me to interrupt him. That is to say, that disregarding the nature of the occupancy of timbered land, whether it was fee simple, whether it was leasehold, whether it was rented, quite regardless of the nature of the legal occupancy of timbered land, the government had the policy of setting up a Crown body, a Crown corporation or organization with the right given to it by this House by law to lay down the guidelines, and more than guidelines, lay down the law, lay down the rules of every stick of wood that was to be cut in the Province, regardless of who owned, regardless of who had title to it and regardless of the nature of the title.

The Crown, representing the whole population of Newfoundland and Labrador, was to have the right to say to Bowaters and to Grand Falls and to any other mills that there might be, and there was hope at that point of two other mills, one at Come By Chance, the other probably it was thought at that time in Labrador,

MR. SMALLWOOD: that every stick of wood that was to be cut was to be cut by direction and order of that Crown body to be set up. So that each mill enterprise would be asked how much wood do you need for the coming twelve months? We need 300,000 cords, or 400,000 or 200,000 cords. All right, you may cut so many thousand cords at point A, so many thousand cords at point B, so many thousand cords at point C, and so on. Now the location of the cutting for each concern would be determined primarily by two factors: First and foremost would be the distance of the wood from the mill, how far it would have to be carried; and second, a consideration such as the fact for example that Bowaters in their desire, in their need to produce a quality of newsprint paper that would stand the tremendous speed of the modern newspaper press in having to make a sheet of paper that was tough, that would stand the speed, needed to have a certain minimum proportion of black spruce, which they could not get on the West Coast because Western Newfoundland is largely fir and fir, if that is all you use to make paper, does not produce the kind of tough newsprint sheet that will stand the tremendous speed of the modern newspaper presses in the great newspaper offices of the world.

Bowaters had and have at this moment a substantial stand of pulpwood timber east of Grand Falls, indeed in the general area of Gander - Gambo. And it would be necessary for Bowaters to get a certain proportion of the black spruce from that area, unless the Grand Falls mill had title to substantial blocks of black spruce much closer to the Corner Brook mill, in which case the Crown body, the overriding body, would say to Bowaters, You will get your necessary proportion of black spruce at point A, rather than at point B. And of course there would have to be fair play. A Crown body could not lean in the direction of favouring either one or the other of those two great paper mills or the third mill which was to have been built at Come By Chance.

Now that was one idea. That is the one

MR. SMALLWOOD: we finally adopted because the other idea, which was a very great one, a superlatively great idea was this, that the Government of Canada would advance to a Province wished to do it, would advance to the Province the total amount of money as a loan that the Province would need to buy every tree that was growing in the Province. In other words, if the Government of Newfoundland wish to buy all the timber growing on the Bowater limits, all on the Price limits - it was then known as the AND Company, I think - all on the Reid limits, all on any other privately owned limits, then the Government of Canada would lend Newfoundland the money with which to buy all the timber that grew in the Province.

Now the government being the owner of the timber land and desiring desperately the continued success and the expanding success of the great mill at Corner Brook and the great mill at Grand Falls and any other mill there might be, desiring that they should all succeed, the government, as the owner of the wood, having paid the money to Bowaters, having paid it to Price, having paid to Reid's, having paid it to anyone else that own any timber land



Mr. Smallwood.

in the Province, the government would go to these people and say, How much wood do you want? We will sell you the wood. We will sell you the wood so much a cord. Now the price that would be .-

MR. NEARY: Would my hon. friend allow me -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course!

MR. NEARY: -seeing that I allowed the hon. gentleman on two or three occasions?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, of course!

MR. NEARY: Would that not be dangerous in as much as when the government then started to sell the wood and the government had to put the price on the wood, would they not then be able to blackmail the government into saying, Look, if you do not cut the cost of your wood, the price of your wood to us, we are going to shut down the mill?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, Yes indeed, that is so. But the answer to that obviously is that so long as they could make a dollar out of cutting the wood and using it to make paper for sale they would continue to do so. There was no great danger, we felt, and I feel to this moment, no great danger that the great mill at Corner Brook and the great one at Grand Falls would in fact close down. Why should they if they can make a dollar? That is why they are there. That is why they went there in the first place. That is why they have stayed there fifty, sixty years, producing paper for sale around the world.

In any case unless a government were a fool.- and the government, remember, would have ultimate control over that body that was laying down the law to the paper companies and selling pulp wood to them - unless they were fools, they would fix prices for the pulp wood that would enable the companies to operate and to operate at a profit and to expand and to grow, which is what any government would want. What government, would not the present administration, did not

Mr. Smallwood.

the previous administration, have a powerful desire that Grand Falls should expand, that Corner Brook should expand? That is the nature of a government, because expansion in those great mills would mean more jobs, more employment and more prosperity for the Province in general and more prosperity for the government's treasury.

Now there was no suggestion that the government would cut any wood, that the government would employ any loggers, that the government would transport any wood. The wood would be cut and transported by the same people who had been doing it, namely, the paper companies. What they would be given would be a right to go here, there or elsewhere as designated, go there and cut the wood, and pay at the stump so much a cord for it.

MR. NEARY: Like the distribution of beer.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Much the same principle, very much the same thing. With this exception, that the government would own the wood from the outset. Whereas in the case of beer, it is owned initially by the breweries, title to it is acquired by the government, and the breweries acting for the government distribute the beer to the retail customers, the clubs and the retail outlets.

We liked that plan under which the Government of Canada would advance the \$50 million, \$60 million, \$70 million that would have been a fair price at that time to buy all the pulp wood growing in the Province, and we would borrow it, and we would pass it over to the paper companies so each of them would suddenly find itself with a large amount of cash, ready cash, capital cash, which would enable it to do a considerable amount of expansion of their enterprise. Unfortunately, the Government of Canada withdrew their offer. The offer ceased to exist. At one point there was the offer of the Canadian Government to lend the Province the necessary funds. At the next moment, no such offer existed. So that the Newfoundland Government were then not in a position - unless they wished to go out on

Mr. Smallwood.

the open market and borrow money for the purpose.- were not in a position to buy out all owners of timber growing in the Province. We were then thrown back on the second of the two ideas, namely, that we would leave the title where it was. Whatever title Bowaters had, some of it was fee simple, some of it is not, whatever they had would continue undisturbed, similarly with the mill at Grand Falls and any other mill, similarly with Reids, similarly with Grenfell - the great International Grenfell Association were and I suppose still are the

MR. SMALLWOOD: owners of some timber land, We acquired, I think

we bought from them, or we somehow, I forget the detail, we did acquire some of the timber limits of the International Grenfell, But all titles would be left alone -

MR. NEARY: We have given them enough.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - and the government would merely take control, not title, not ownership, we would not buy the timber, we would merely control the cutting of it and the control would be so exercised as to serve the general overall interest of the Province, not just that of any individual company using the wood.

Now we had still another idea. I forget the term that is used in economics, it haunts me and yet I cannot remember the precise term. What it means is this, and there is a short way to express it -

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is the short way that I have forgotten. It means this, that the greatest possible economic value is to be put on the wood. In other words, if a tree ought to be turned into veneer - that is the greatest value that tree can have - if it cannot be turned into veneer then perhaps it can be turned into lumber. That would be the second best value it could have. And if it is not good enough, if it is not big enough, it has not got enough diameter or other qualification to have the greater economic value, then you let it go for a pulpwood. But pulpwood would be the lowest economic value that a tree could have. And so you would lay down certain rules, trees above a certain diameter, breast high, and of a certain quality, would not be permitted to be used to make pulp.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course.

MR. FLIGHT: Does this apply to wood growing on Price or Bowaters limits, that saw log timber would be reserved for saw logs?

MR. SMALLWOOD: This rule would apply to every tree growing in the Province, regardless of title, regardless of location, regardless of anything and everything, the greatest economic value would be placed on each individual tree. And if veneer was the best thing to use it for that is what it would have to be used for, if lumber was the next best thing it would have to be used for lumber, and what was left, and only what was left, would be permitted to be used for the manufacture of pulpwood.

Now that I hope is what the present administration approximately are up to.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I know that they are not setting up, at least it emerges in the debate today - the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will please bear in mind that I was not a member of this House when this present legislation was brought in here and adopted by the House. I was not here, I am not familiar with it - but what emerges here today is a simple fact, which is important as far as it goes, it may not go far enough, namely that every owner of timber limits in the Province shall cut all the wood on his property or on his concession that it is fit to cut, that it is proper to cut, that is allowing for the annual growth, for the reproduction of itself; and that if they do not do so, in other words if the Grand Falls mill, for example, could cut 300,000 cords a year on the timber limits that they have, and they cut 200,000 - I am only making up figures now to illustrate what I understand to be the principle that the minister has just laid down here - they cut 100,000 cords but they could cut 300,000 which would be an allowable limit not by law but allowable by nature, that nature would say, Yes, you could cut 300,000 cords on the stands that you have, but you



MR. SMALLWOOD: cut only 200,000 cords or 250,000 cords therefore there is 50,000 cords that you are not cutting; now if somebody else, apart from you, if another mill can use that 50,000, if a sawmill can use that 50,000, if a veneer plant can use that 50,000 you are to sell it to them, and if you do not you will be heavily taxed, the tax being for the purpose of forcing that wood on the market, up to the limit of regeneration - what is the technical term?

MR. MAYNARD: Annual allowable cut.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, annual allowable cut based on regeneration.

Now that is a good plan as far as it goes. It really does not go far enough, but perhaps the government are wise to bring that in and let it operate for a year or two or five. I do not know whether they will be here five years hence, but there will be someone here. There will be a government, we hope, in the Province, if it is not a Commission of Government which I hope it will not be.

MR. NEARY: God forbid.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, even a Commission - there will be a government of some kind in Newfoundland five or six or eight years hence.

And after this present rather modest but sound plan of the government has operated for a period of time, then perhaps the next move could be made. When the operators grow to be accustomed to governmental control over them, which is the duty of the government to exercise, then perhaps there would not be any great difficulty in going the next step. Perhaps I was precipitated, perhaps I was too ambitious and my colleagues with me in the previous administration, perhaps we were looking too far or raising our eyes a little too high. But whichever method be used, I think that everyone here - and no one more than my hon. friend from LaPoile - everyone here will agree that when God made this Island and Labrador, and he put timber there, and he put oil and natural gas and minerals and great rivers, when God did that, when he made this land that we call Newfoundland and Labrador, he did not mean it for a few corporations, for their sole and special benefits.-

MR. NEARY: He was not a Tory or a Liberal.

MR. SMALLWOOD: He was not Liberal or Tory. He might have been Liberal. I am sure that he would not have been Tory. I mean that is unthinkable. Liberal, perhaps. But I doubt that he was even Tory.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Has my time expired?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, Mr. Chairman, I expired myself on a good note.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few more remarks. Number one, I would like to thank first the minister for the information he did give us. He answered some of the questions raised, and I am going to address myself once more and very shortly and very quickly to the wood situation as it applies in the waters of this Province, Red Indian Lake, any rivers or lakes that Bowaters are using.

Now, Sir, it well may indeed be that Price (Nfld.) or the paper companies will indicate that they only lose two to three per cent of wood that is put into the water. That may well be. But I know this to be a fact, and I will tell the House once more to be a fact that they have lost in one loss, it has been estimated, 30,000 cords - it could well have gone to 50,000 cords - one night, overnight, gone, loose, free in Red Indian Lake. Last Fall 10,000 to 14,000 cords, one shot, into Red Indian Lake.

Now, Mr. Chairman, Red Indian Lake is forty-eight miles long, six miles wide. There are harbours, coves, inlets, landlocks. Now the minister would do me a favour if he would indicate to me how Price (Nfld.) - in view of the fact that they do not sack Red Indian Lake, they do not retrieve or make any effort to retrieve wood that ends up on the beaches. I will indicate to the minister that after the big loss a few days ago they were lucky. If they can get it in tens of thousands of cords, they will take it, because I hear that over 10,000 cords of that loss that I referred to ended up in one particular harbour in which they were able to get a boom around, and they got that, but I think that the minister would do the House a service if he would indicate how Price indicates to him that they retrieve the wood that is lost over the years on Red Indian Lake, given the size of the lake, given the coves, given the bays, the landlocked bays, the fact that that wood on high water levels, on high wind levels is driven in over the land, to lie on bogs and stuck in the sand,

MR. FLIGHT: how it is that they retrieve that wood and see that it is delivered to the mill? I would like to hear, Mr. Chairman, in terms of the figures being used of two to three per cent loss and I would like to hear, and if we hear that it can be proven then fine, we will accept it and I will withdraw anything I may have said, if it were to turn out not to be true; but the proof is in the pudding, Mr. Chairman. All the minister has got to do is have his officials walk around Red Indian Lake, use a small boat, go around Red Indian Lake and he will see for himself how much pulpwood, and by the Lord if there is only two or three per cent of the total cut left on that beach, Price (Nfld.) must have cut a lot of wood this past ten years on Red Indian Lake. I do not accept two or three per cent, Mr. Chairman, but whether I do or not is beside the point. I have done what I feel. I think I have done my duty. I have indicated to this House that there is wood being lost to this Province and I do not think we can afford it. I do not think we can stand it and I do not think it should be permitted to continue.

And I would suggest again to the minister the idea of would he consider looking at the beachcombing solution. Bring in either legislation or regulations that would permit people who want to pick up wood floating free in our inland waters the right to pick it up. It would serve the purpose of keeping our lakes clean, the wood would find an economic use and it would serve the purpose of making Price, and I say again I do not believe that that wood is floating in Red Indian Lake, I do not believe they lost these 20,000 cords, 10,000 cords, 30,000 cords at one shot because they wanted to, but obviously if they lost it there must be some shortcomings somewhere. It could not have been very well secured in the bay that it was being boomed in. And I suspect that if it were legal in this Province for people to pick up and find a market for -

MR. MURPHY: What happens to this wood? There must be a fair amount of pleasure craft on the lake.

MR. FLIGHT: We have had seven drownings in Red Indian Lake, Mr. Chairman, this past ten years. Nobody has come out and said that the boat ran into pulpwood. But she ran into something. There was one case where a boat with three men aboard drifted ashore, nine days later they found the three bodies with a hole in the bow. Now that could have been a dead end, it could also have been a piece of pulpwood because I tell you I was part of the flotilla that went to look for that boat and in a four Acadia. We were just weaving, weaving through the pulp. Everywhere, it is everywhere. You can walk across Red Indian Lake today on drifting pulpwood. Two to three per cent? The portion of that wood that Price do not get will have to make up the two to three per cent? I would like to see that figure verified, Mr. Chairman.

But in any case whether it is two or three per cent it should not be two or three per cent. We should have the right to pick up that wood if Price will not keep that lake clean, or the tributaries running into the lake, Not only that, Mr. Chairman, let us go back - it would be worthwhile to go back over the cuttings, the rivers and the ponds that those paper companies have been driving wood on this past twenty year and see the bleached wood, cords and cords and cords of bleached wood left. So, Mr. Chairman, what can one person say? I would suggest that in most cases Price will disagree with what I have said. They have already indicated publicly and privately to me that my argument is not germane, that they do salvage the wood. Well, Mr. Chairman, as I say there is only one way to prove it and that is to ask people responsible to go look at the situation.

So, Mr. Chairman, again I would ask the



MR. FLIGHT: minister to consider the beachcombing situation in this Province, give our people a right to go in and pick that wood up, find a market for it and sell it, and we will not have the problem that we have had this past few years. And, Mr. Speaker, one could get mad here, you know, and one could make the charge that those paper companies are acting with impunity, that they are a power unto themselves. They are doing what they like and very few people in the administration of this Province knows exactly what those paper companies are doing, or cares.

But, Mr. Chairman, there are other aspects of woods management too. What about our access road programme? Most of the access roads that are left in this Province are to contract those to the pulp and paper companies on whose limits that road is going to be build. As I understand it we have just awarded a contract to Price (Nfld.) to push thirteen miles of an access road from a point on Red Indian Lake in.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, all the roads and power lines development in this province when they have been built through wood stands, the timber is cut and piled and I would presume sold to the paper companies or delivered. Not so with the paper companies, Mr. Chairman. They push the V-8's in and they push it down, they bull it down ahead of them. That wood that comes down as a result of building access roads never sees the light of day again. It is bulled off, windfalls we call it, and left to rot. I mean, is that good woods management, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman, I reminded the Premier earlier on in this session of the statement he made last August that said, that indicated there are approximately 2500 people employed in the forestry industry of this province, and that he would hope in five years that would be doubled to 5000. He indicated that in order to have full utilization of timber resources we would have to utilize the sawdust, the tops the bark.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons I keep harping, keep harping on the wood free floating, the wood bleaching on the beaches, is that I find it very difficult to reconcile that kind of thinking - and it is good thinking - but I find it very difficult to reconcile that kind of thinking with what I see all over, with what I see Price (Nfld) and Bowaters doing in this province, very difficult. How can one say that we, if we are to get maximum returns for our forest industries, that we have to one day within five years start utilizing the bark and the sawdust. How ridiculous, when we are not even utilizing the logs, full grown timber been left to rot in the woods, thousands of cords being left to rot on the bogs and on the beaches.

Mr. Speaker, the reason I keep harping back is may be I cannot buy that kind of hypocrisy because that is what it is. Now, Mr. Speaker, with regards to access roads, I would

MR. FLIGHT: like to hear the minister's comments on this particular situation. These past years, the paper companies have very jealously guarded their rights to the access roads. They have built the roads and they have chained and locked them and guarded them. You only go in by right of the company's permission. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am suggesting to the minister that any road that this Province spends \$3 to \$4 million we are going to spend \$6 million in access roads this year - to the point that is not creating a fire hazard, to the point that it cannot be reasonably justified that the general public is kept off of those roads, then I believe they should be permitted on them. I would like to hear the minister address himself to that.

Both paper companies has very jealously kept their roads private, kept the general public out. Now, I accept this sometimes there is a reason, a high fire hazard and what have you. This always has not been the case, they always have not had to to justify it. They have been known that after they have finished their cut on the road to bull the road in, so that the road was not accessible to the general public. Well, Sir, if it was their own money then maybe I can accept their right to take those kind of actions, but if it is this province's money then, Sir, I suggest that wherever that road is, even if we have to go fifteen or twenty miles over a Price access road to get to a road that was financed by the province then we should have the right to travel over that road to get to the fifteen miles that the province financed.

Sawmilling, Mr. Chairman, I think it can be, I think an argument can be made that the sawmilling industry in Newfoundland, although it is suffering and is in hard times right now, and it seems always to have been hard times, that is the one industry that may be a salvation with regards to economic benefit employment in this province.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, the one problem, of all problems the biggest problem, that has plagued sawmilling in this province is a lack of timber. The reason the timber is not available to the sawmills is because in most cases the type of timber the sawmills need is sewed up on Price and Bowaters limits. Now, the Premier in that particular statement that I referred to, Mr. Chairman, indicated that we would have one day to make all sawlog size timber available to sawmills. But I would like to hear the minister indicate, Mr. Chairman, when we are going to see this type of regulation. The hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) indicated that they had considered this approach.

The Premier indicated less than a year ago that ~~that~~ is the way it would have to be. Well, Mr. Chairman, that is what the sawmillers of this province are waiting for. If the Premier wants to increase the number of people employed in the sawmilling industry, if the administration wants to increase the number of mills and thereby increase the number of people who can make a living in mills, they are

MR. FLIGHT: going to have to one way or another make the timber available. I believe, and I subscribe to the theory enunciated a few minutes ago by the former hon. Premier and to the statement made by the Premier last August, that that type of timber should be made available, should be culled. The type of logs required for successful sawmilling operations should be earmarked for sawmills. And whatever arrangement could be worked out with Price (Nfld.) to make that timber available to the sawmills should be worked out.

Going back again, Mr. Chairman, to the free-floating wood, I know mills in Central Newfoundland, sawmills in Central Newfoundland that are stagnated because they have not a supply. There are very few, some, but very little timber of the type that our sawmill industry needs on Crown lands. Because if there were any timber of that type on Crown lands it would not be Crown lands, Price or Bowaters would have it.

Mr. Chairman, talking about the free-floating wood again, while there are sawmills in this Province who are going out of business because they do not have a supply of wood, saw logs, the type that most of our mills have never seen are floating around our inland waters, lying in our woods rotting. So, Mr. Chairman, this is not very highbrow, the type of argument I am making here, but it is exactly what is happening. I have seen it, Mr. Chairman, it is what is happening in our woods. And some of the things I have referred to are what is causing the problems in our sawmilling industry in this Province today. Some of the things that I have mentioned are some of the injustices that are taking place under our present forest management, and, Mr. Chairman, if it is not changed then we will go on being raped.

Our forest lands to date have been raped. The minister has indicated that he has brought



MR. FLIGHT: in new management regulations. Maybe indeed it is changing, but the changes are not visible, not at this stage.

Mr. Chairman, another thing I would like to hear the minister refer to, expound a little on is the annual allowable cut. Now that is a new phrase to me. I am reminded of the annual allowable catch, like the deep-sea fishery. I understand what the annual allowable catch is, but I wonder what the annual allowable cut is? Is there a legal allowable cut set in this Province? Have the government of this Province said to Price (Nfld.) that this is your allowable cut for this year?

MR. MURPHY: It is the minimum, is it not? It is not the allowable.

MR. FLIGHT: His words were, 'Annual allowable cut'. I may be wrong, and if I am I am sure the minister will not take long to correct me, but I understood that the paper companies in this Province operated on they cut what they wanted. They had quotas at the mill and when that quota was filled they stopped cutting.

MR. MURPHY: It is my understanding that there must be so much cut per acre or whatever it is and if you do not cut it you would be charged whatever it is on it anyhow. Is this not the way it works?

MR. FLIGHT: I do not know. That is what I am asking the minister, but it is a new phrase to me, 'The annual allowable cut'. Annual allowable cut would indicate that there would be - and maybe that is worth looking at. Maybe it is worth looking at and determining from Price (Nfld.) or Bowaters, How much wood do you need at that mill this year? And if they say 100,000 cords, say, Well, that is what you will cut.

MR. MURPHY: That is right.

MR. FLIGHT: And then if they cut 100,000

MR. FLIGHT: cords that 100,000 cords will end up at the mill and 10,000 will not be left -

MR. MURPHY: And not on the beach.

MR. FLIGHT: - on the beach.

So, Mr. Chairman, when the hon. minister stands up again to speak I would like for him to address himself to some of the things I have mentioned with regard to forest management, primarily, and some of the things I have referred to in forest management. Mr. Chairman, again I stand, and I realize that some of the things that I pointed out may not be well accepted by some hon. members of this House.

MR. MURPHY: Very practical. Very practical indeed.

MR. FLIGHT: But I stand on every word I said. If I were not prepared to I would not make the accusations I have made and tried to lay out the facts I have laid out.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Either we change our approach to forest management, either we rein in the paper companies, either we sit down and discuss with them and work out a system whereby we stop the type of thing that is going on that I have been talking about, or the paper companies will go on being powers unto themselves, cutting where they want to cut, how they want to cut, when they want to cut, and delivering to the mill the portion of the wood that they want delivered to the mill.

MR. FLIGHT: And if that is the type of forest management that we are going to continue with then this Province is going to be the loser, Mr. Chairman, because our forest industry up to now has been ripped off, and ripped off very badly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, another very important part of the minister's speech when he led off the debate, when he introduced his estimates, was the Crown land administration. He spent a considerable time justifying the delays and what would seem to be the incompetence of the Crown Land Division with regards to issuing leases. And, Mr. Chairman, I accept the minister's explanations as to why it takes so long for a person to get a piece of Crown land. But I would suggest to the minister that his predecessor, the hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, last year introduced in this House some legislation, a bill, and in presenting it he indicated that bill would cut at least six months off the waiting period for a person who was trying to get a deed or a lease on a piece of Crown land.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible) about five years now.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, it has not been cut off yet, Sir. It still takes eighteen months and that legislation was passed six, seven, eight, nine months ago.

MR. MURPHY: It used to be three years, 'Graham'.

MR. FLIGHT: There is no justification in this world, Mr. Chairman, why a person in this Province should have to wait eighteen months for a lease on a piece of land. We talk about people wanting to invest in this Province. As I said earlier, a good investment today would probably look ridiculous eighteen months from now. And I know people who have been held up eighteen months waiting for Crown Lands. It is the most - I do not like to use the word incompetent because that would indicate that I feel that the people in Crown Lands are incompetent, and the individuals I deal with myself I do not detect in them any incompetence, But why does it take eighteen months? Why is that we have to go out through all these referrals, Mr. Chairman? We have five or six departments; the ministry has created red tape. A Newfoundlander goes to Crown Lands for a piece of land. And the new system we have now there are referrals to about ten, possibly

MR. FLIGHT: ten - I have seen as high as ten - a minimum of six, four to six other departments involved - referrals, and those referrals sit on civil servants' desks for months. And when you 'phone up and ask what is happening they dig them out and they find, 'Oh, yes. Well, we will get our inspector out to take a look.' To give an example, Mr. Chairman, last year the ministry indicated that there would be no more grants in this Province, that all land would now go out freehold except for a person who lived on the land twenty years and had prior claim for twenty years.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time is expired.

The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Chairman, I want to offer a few comments on this particular department because one way or the other it is going to play a direct role in the economic future, if you will, or industrial future of my district, or at least the major part of my district. But before I get into that I just want to assure this hon. committee through you, Mr. Chairman, that I have made my contribution towards the destruction of the spruce budworm in the Province. I went for a caribou hunt in December, set the tent up, and when the stove - the fire got going in the tent, the boughs that I had down on the snow on which I was lying in a sleeping bag started to come to life. I thought I was going to get moved out of the tent ten or fifteen feet with all the spruce budworms grabbing onto the sleeping bag and starting to yank her out through the door. So I disposed of two or three or four hundred spruce budworm there that evening. I just thought I would make that little remark before I get into my other points.

AN HON. MEMBER: Good job! Good job!

AN HON. MEMBER: Well done!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, there you go. But in speaking of the spruce budworm I would like to hear the hon. minister explain to the committee something which he mentioned to me in a private conversation just a few days ago, that one of the reasons why they are not experimenting with the spraying programme in Labrador this summer is because of the black spruce in that part of the Province - apparently it is more resistant, I believe, to the

MR. GOUDIE: spruce budworm than to some other types of trees that are found in other parts of the Province and in other parts of Labrador as well. I do not know all the technicalities involved there, but I would like to hear the minister explain that if he would.

On talking of forests in our part of the Province one has to think \_\_\_\_\_



MR. GOUDIE: back to the days when Labrador Linerboard was going full choke harvesting wood in the area and remember with a little bit of chagrin, I suppose, the state of the countryside up there now, I do not know how many hundred thousand cords of wood has been harvested over the years but as far as I can find out there has been no reforestation of any kind other than the natural reforestation, and because of the climate up that way I am told that natural reforestation takes place only on the South slopes of the hills because that is the part of the country that receives more sunlight than any other. So the North slopes are either not reforesting at all through the natural process or if they are it is to a very small degree.

But I am wondering if there are any plans at all to reforest in that area. And there is one other added complication as well in harvesting wood particularly in my part of the Lake Melville area of Labrador and that is that there is only three or four inches of topsoil and beneath that hundreds of feet of sand. It is on a plateau between the Goose River and the Churchill River. So as a result once the trees and topsoil are cleared away, and in many cases trees were harvested right to the edge of the river bank and I suppose it was done that way because of the quality of the wood. But I have flown over the countryside up there, last summer particularly, and it was difficult to tell the rivers from the land because of the colour. The sand is just washing away from the banks into the river and just flowing out.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Does the hon. member remember the date when he helped me aboard a plane in North West River and I took that flight? When was that?

MR. GOUDIE: That would have been in August, I believe.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What the hon. member is now saying certainly does not apply to what I saw.

MR. GOUDIE: No, the part of the country in which the hon. gentleman flew is not -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Up toward the Mealey Mountains.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, that has not been touched by wood harvesting at all. This is in a North Westerly direction, the direction I am talking about now. And I would think that it also has to have a detrimental effect on the fishery, although the fishery is a small scale operation in my part of Labrador as compared to other parts. It is concerned primarily with the harvesting of salmon, but some of the breeding grounds are in the Churchill River, the Kenemich River and the Goose River.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Kenamu.

MR. GOUDIE: The Kenamu, yes and that is one -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Kenamu and Kenemich.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, that is right, both the Kenamu and the Kennimish and these two rivers are the ones which are of concern to me right now because eventually if wood harvesting is to continue in the Lake Melville area of Labrador they are going to have to get into the South side of the river where the prime wood stands now exist and if they start cutting there and practicing their cutting the way they had done on the North side of the river they are going to have all of the sand and salt washing into the Kenamu and Kenemich Rivers and the prime salmon spawning grounds which support the salmon fishery in our end of Lake Melville are going to be destroyed. So in addition to clearing away the land and destroying the topsoil you are going to be destroying a small fishery which supports quite a number of people at this point and time if the spawning grounds are destroyed.

So I just wanted to point that out. I have all ready brought it to the attention of the Provincial Minister of Fisheries and he assured me he was going to pass on that concern to the Federal minister as well, and I understand other groups have done the same thing. But I just wanted to mention that. I was told in a conversation somewhere or other that the Province of Alberta has an excellent reforestation plan. I am not sure of all the details but apparently they indicate to wood harvesting companies that if they do

MR. GOUDIE: reforest themselves within a specific period of time, a short period of time, then the government agencies, the Department of Forestry, I would assume, would reforest the land which had been cut over and send the bill to the company itself. I think if that system is not already established in this Province then it should be.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. member will allow me, I would like to point out to him that there are two theories of that. One is that the concessionaire gets such an enormous area that he does not need to reforest, that he can cut out and by the time he gets back to the place where he cut out it is grown up again, and so you get a sort of perpetual motion in the regeneration of the forest, if he has enough area. For example, the paper mill at Grand Falls has had as many as three cuts since 1905, three cuts over the same land. They cut it out and it grew up. They cut it out again and it grew up, and they cut it out a third time and now it is on the way to grow for its fourth time. That is one way,

MR. SMALLWOOD: have so much land that you do not need to bother about reforesting, which is what any company would like to have, of course. The other is to have so little land that to keep your mill going more or less forever you, yourself as the concessionaire, are forced to do reforesting.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, these are both excellent points, Mr. Chairman. The only thing I was trying to stress I think in my remarks pertaining to reforestation is that in the Lake Melville area the soil is so erosive once the trees and other growth are removed that it is sometimes quite difficult to control - the growth of trees are not controlled - but at least encourage the growth of trees. So there would have to be some kind of control introduced in order to make up for that deficiency in the soil, I think.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes. Well, again if the hon. gentleman will allow me. In the United States the great floods that have taken place on the great rivers were brought about by the fact that they cleared, they denuded the river banks back for miles of what forest growth there was, whatever forest cover there was, with the result that in the Spring of the year when the snow is melted and the rains came it washed the land and all down into the river with the tremendous floods. And do I take it that what the hon. member is saying to us now today is that because of the thinness of the topsoil and the nature of the subsoil, which is many feet of sand, if you denude the land near a river bank then the whole of it will wash down into the river so that you are destroying the forest and the chance of regeneration and at the same time spoiling the breeding grounds of the salmon.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, that is what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, and because of the nature of the soil itself it would not take very long for that to happen. I would like to point out that that type of harvesting of the wood did not take place in all parts of Lake Melville. It was only in certain areas. Generally speaking, the harvesting practices were quite good. It was just that in a few cases, particularly in the case of the Goose River, I have seen where the river banks have just washed right away and as a result is doing damage to the country and probably to the trout



MR. GOUDIE: and salmon spawning parts of that river.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a desperately serious problem.

MR. GOUDIE: Yes.

MR. MURPHY: Is that erosion still continuing in Labrador?

MR. GOUDIE: Yes. The hon. minister just referred to erosion of the river bank itself, the Churchill River near Hamilton River Road. We have lost a couple of hundred feet of the river bank over a stretch of about a mile in the last few years and that is continuing again this year, yes. The only consolation this year is that we did not have as much ice as we normally would so the erosion was not as great.

I am not sure, perhaps the minister might explain whether the access road programme under his department - and I wish to point out that I think the hon. minister has two or three excellent staff stationed in the Happy Valley/Goose Bay area of the district in forestry and I would encourage him to encourage them, if you will, to do whatever experimenting would be necessary to determine the type of effects that the lack of reforestation would have on that part of the country up there. I am sure that Mr. Mercer and his staff would be more than happy to, once they have time to spare. Of course, we are coming into the forest fire season now so they may not have much time to spare, but should they have time to spare I am sure they would be more than happy to experiment with the soil and so on. But the access road programme, I am wondering if that applies to private operators as well as it had applied to the Labrador Linerboard operation. I am thinking specifically of Mr. Van Beke in his Labrador Forest Products operations and I understand that there are a couple of other groups of people who may very well be presenting proposals shortly to government for other harvesting operations as well, and semi-finishing operations. So I was just wondering about the access road programme and whether or not the department may be interested or considering the construction of access roads on the south side of the river - the Churchill River - in the near future or not.

I had an interesting question posed to me this weekend when I was home by two gentlemen who are involved at this point in time in harvesting wood. They own some skidders,



MR. GOUDIE: and apparently Mr. Van Beke I believe has a permit this year to export 40,000 cords of wood and that much wood will only support so many cutters over the cutting season. And these two particular gentlemen were wondering if they could obtain a permit to cut an additional 10,000 cords of wood to sell to Mr. Van Beke for export into the European markets. I could not answer them, Perhaps the minister could answer them. I explained that I thought it might involve the changing of an agreement which Mr. Van Beke already has with government and so on but I do not know what the implications of that are. As a matter of fact, I have not had time to explain it individually to the hon. minister since getting back from the weekend.

And thinking of hydro development in Labrador, we have to think also in terms of this particular department, the Department of Forestry and Agriculture, because if phase two does - or when it does come on stream, phase three of the development of the Churchill River, we are going to be involved I think in the flooding of the river valley, the Churchill River Valley, because as it was explained to me the three phases of the hydro development would mean the construction of a dam, I believe at Gull Island, that at least was the plan, and the top of that dam would be level with the bottom of the present hydro development at Churchill Falls; and at Muskrat Falls, which is further down the river again, the top of the dam there, if that is what is to be used, would be level with the bottom part of the dam at Gull Island. So you have the three steps -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. GOUDIE: Yes, and you make full use of the water. So as a result there would be very extensive flooding I think of the Churchill River Valley and I am wondering if anyone in the hon. minister's department has done any investigation into how difficult or how easy it would be to harvest wood in that river valley and

MR. GOUDIE: if indeed it can be done because the valley banks are quite steep. Perhaps the minister might address himself to that.

MR. MURPHY: Even the sheep would find it hard to navigate on the valley banks.

MR. GOUDIE: The hon. minister pointed out even the sheep - of course we do not have any sheep up there. The black bears I guess would find it difficult to navigate.

There have been a number of questions directed to me as well by different people as to the disposal of the wood, and I think it is in the vicinity of 60,000 cords, which are already cut some of which are on the docks at Goose Bay. The remaining number of cords are still in the woods in the Lake Melville area. I am wondering if any decision has been made as to the disposal of that wood, whether it would be sold to another concern or what if any plans are made in that regard. And the other concern that I have in just wrapping up my remarks, Mr. Chairman, deals with Crown Lands. I am sure the minister is quite familiar with the problems we have up there, but there are quite a number of private land grants which have been issued over the years to residents in Happy Valley particularly.

I myself am having a little bit of a problem now obtaining a grant because I believe the term is "street line surveys" have to be done and that may involve many complications in terms of boundaries which already exist on a grant at least. I think there may have to be some shifting of these boundaries somewhere along the way after these street line surveys are done. I am wondering if any work will be done this summer on the street line surveys and how close we may be to resolving the problem of Crown Lands in the Happy Valley area.

There is one other little point which I would hope the minister may elaborate on and that is that as I understand it the Federal

MR. GOUDIE: Department of Public Works in the Hamilton Heights area of Goose Bay has leased land I think to the provincial government and there is a charge of approximately \$30 per month I believe to the occupant of that land through the provincial government, and I know one particular person who is paying \$360 per year rent on his land and he is not quite sure why he has to pay it and I cannot really provide him with an answer. As I understand it-I will point out again, the federal government is charging the provincial government rent for that land and the provincial government is reclaiming that rent from the tenant, if you will. I am wondering if that still exists, it did up until about a month ago and if there are considerations being given right now to perhaps resolving that whole problem. These are the concerns I want to express and I look forward to hearing the minister address at least some of these remarks.

AN HON MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I will try and go through a few of the points that have been brought up by hon. gentlemen. We go back to a couple of points that were made this morning or a couple of things that were brought up. First of all the subject of Newfoundland Forest Products in Hawkes Bay has had a long - not a long - but certainly a troubled history since its inception a few years ago. We have not been able to resolve the problems of wood supply to the Newfoundland Forest Products mill. I think we are on the verge at this point in time of finding a solution to the supply of saw logs to Newfoundland Forest Products, working in co-operation with Bowaters. And, of course, having acquired the so-called Mooney Block from Price for an eight year period a couple of years ago, I believe that over the next few weeks that we will be able to resolve the problem and be able to give Newfoundland Forest Products an opportunity to deliver saw logs to their mill at a reasonable price, one which they can live with and which they can make a dollar from the lumber on. However, I cannot give a definite statement on that at this time, but I would hope that I would have more information for the hon. House within the next few days or few weeks.

In agriculture, the hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) says that the people have no spokesman in the House for agriculture. Well, Mr. Chairman, I have met with the farmers around this Province on a number of occasions when I was Minister of Agriculture the last time. I have met with farmers here in the St. John's area. I realize that they are, especially in the St. John's area, very concerned about the amount of available land and what is happening to it, and government is obviously concerned about it. That is the specific reason why in 1973 we instituted a land freeze, so-called, actually declaring the land agriculture under a certain act of the Legislature. That policy is now being reviewed in view of the tremendous amount of work that has been done, the tremendous amount of study and the public hearings that have been held and decisions made regarding the St. John's Urban region. I might say that the St. John's Urban region and the

Mr. Maynard.

Henley Commission report bears out the fact that basically the area which was frozen for agricultural purposes in 1973 should be retained for agricultural or rural areas within the St. John's Urban region. We are now reviewing our policy regarding 1973. I would hope that within two or three days at the most to be able to make a definitive statement on that particular issue to the House of Assembly.

MR. NEARY: As long as we got the freeze, we should try to get the land in the hands of the farmers.

MR. MAYNARD: Well, the basic problem is getting the land in the hands of the farmers. We are not quite sure whether farmers are going to take advantage of the land even if it is zoned permanently agriculture, but we would hope that they would, and certainly these are the things that we have to look at in that context, whether or not the land will actually go into farming enterprises or whether or not it will just lie fallow for a number of years and not achieve any results if we zone it agriculture. But as I say there will be a definite statement, policy statement, on that within the next two or three days as soon as Cabinet has had a decision to make its final views known on it.

MR. NEARY: If we do not get the statement, I will be asking the minister to make it, you know, over the next three - I will give the minister three days.

MR. MAYNARD: I am sure that there will be questions coming regarding that.

MR. NEARY: And then there will be a reminder. I will give him a reminder then.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, before I go on to that, the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) outlined the concept his government, the previous administration, had regarding the Crown corporation being set up to control the harvesting of wood in the Province. We have not gone the Crown corporation route. We have realized the concept behind the proposed Crown corporation that was to be set up at that time. It was our feeling that the Forest Land Management and Taxation Act would accomplish essentially the same thing without benefit of a Crown corporation,



MR. MAYNARD: and we believe that it will. It is possible down the road at some point in time that not a Crown corporation but that essentially pretty well all the forest resource of this Province will be under Crown control. In effect under the Forest Land Management and Taxation Act we are able to control the forest land in the Province and I think that is a very desirable thing for government on behalf of the people to control such a large and very important natural resource.

There has been a lot of things happened in the past two or three years; a lot has been said about the cross transport of wood, Price crossing Bowaters, trucks going the other way somewhere on the highway and this sort of thing, There has been a lot of work done by the two companies between themselves to overcome this lack of proper utilization, proper techniques in that they have exchanged a fair amount of limits, there has been a number of exchanges between Price and Bowaters over the years, over the last three or four years especially, and I believe now it is fair to say that there is very little cross transport occurring in the Province, and the holdings that are being utilized by both the companies are in close proximity to their mills and that the inefficiency of a Bowaters truck going from Bonavista to Corner Brook while a Price truck is coming from Springdale into Grand Falls is being eliminated gradually. It is coming about.

MR. SMALLWOOD: By what means?

MR. MAYNARD: By an exchange of limits between the companies, an ironing out of their limits.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Exchange of actual title or just an exchange of timber rights?

MR. MAYNARD: Exchange of timber rights in most cases, not the title. To the best of my knowledge they have not exchanged in any title.

MR. MAYNARD: Of course now, there is always going to be some cross transportation. Because of the requirements of Bowaters, for instance, to get black spruce out of Glenwood, obviously they are going to have to pass along by the Grand Falls mill and go on to Corner Brook. But that is because of the type of timber, the species they are trying to get, not because of any real inefficiency as far as their limits are concerned for the same species.

The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) has gone back to the Red Indian Lake again and I get the distinct feeling, Mr. Chairman, that even though I know there is some problem there and as I indicated earlier the problem should be corrected, and I understand that Price has made a commitment to the former minister last year some time that there would be action taken, that the actions that they were taking in the past would be speeded up to try to correct this problem. But I get the distinct feeling that the hon. member has something against the two paper companies. It seems that each time he gets up he has to lay it on hard and heavy on the two paper companies.

Well I have no doubt, Mr. Chairman, that the two large companies, Price and Bowaters, have had their faults in the last twenty, thirty, forty or fifty years, however long they have been around. I have no doubt they will have other faults in the years to come. But I am also hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that Price and Bowaters are going to stay around this Province for a long, long time. And although I am not going to bow down to either one of the companies, I am not going to compromise myself, or neither is government going to compromise itself, for the sake of either one of the companies. We are cognizant of the importance that they have in this Province and instead of an all-out confrontation with either one of them or with both of them we would much rather negotiate and try to work out our differences on a man to man basis, if you will.

MR. MAYNARD: I will certainly talk to Price about the Red Indian Lake problem, and it is a problem. I do not know, Price has not indicated to me exactly how they will retrieve the wood that has been lost in the lake. I mentioned that it was probably two to three per cent of their total cut. Maybe it is more than that. But when you realize that \_\_\_\_\_

---

Mr. Maynard.

350,000 cords a year is their normal cut, and you take two to three, or maybe five per cent, at the maximum, of that over a period of ten years, we still have a fair amount of wood.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. MAYNARD: Sure.

MR. FLIGHT: I did not say that two per cent of their cut - Price cuts wood all over this Province, not just around Red Indian Lake. What I would like to have ascertained is the percentage of their cut in the Red Indian Lake area, the percentage of their cut that they use Red Indian Lake to transport that wood, the percentage of cut around Red Indian Lake; and not the cut that is down in Glenwood somewhere where they are not using -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of all the wood that goes into the lake, how much is lost? What percentage?

MR. MAYNARD: Well, that is a question I cannot really answer, although I would be very, very surprised if any great percentage is lost. Since, as I said before, before that wood goes into the lake, it costs that company \$30, and I cannot see Price throwing away hundreds of thousands of dollars or millions of dollars. It is just not that kind of a company. I do not think they would be in business as long as they have if they were that kind of a company. However, it is a problem. We will talk with Price about it. We will try to negotiate some sort of a solution to the problem.

The point was brought up regarding bidding on access roads on the company limits. At the present time we are doing all of our access roads, or practically all of our access road construction under the DREE agreement which is a federal/provincial agreement, mainly federal as you know. It is a ninety/ten agreement. We have no way in rejecting a bid by anyone. Everyone in this Province is free or in Canada is free to bid on any of those access roads, and we are obligated by law and by the DREE agreement to accept the lowest tender. If that tender

MR. MAYNARD.

is Price or if it is Bowaters, then we have to accept it. I do not think that Price and Bowaters are all that anxious to be in the road construction business. But in some cases they felt that they should bid on the road because of the location of the road, or because they wanted to get it built faster than they thought another contractor could build it. We are not building that much access road on company lands in any case. I think the total for this year is going to be seven roads, which is approximately eight to ten miles per road. So it is not a significant thing. I might point out to the contractors who are complaining about this that in the estimates this year, we have provided something in excess of \$6 million for access roads. There is going to be ample opportunity for all small contractors in this Province -

MR. NEARY: How can they compete with companies that get their sales tax exempt, gasoline tax exempt?

MR. MAYNARD: No, they are not. When Price and Bowaters use their equipment on access road building, their equipment is under the same rules, regulations, taxation or whatever as any other contractor.

MR. NEARY: They do not have to make any payments on it. It is already paid for.

MR. MAYNARD: Well, that may be so, but then again -

MR. NEARY: It is not fair.

MR. MAYNARD: Neither one of the companies are - well, they have indicated to me, at least one company has, that they are not interested whatsoever in bidding on access roads outside of their own limits.

They are only interested in bidding on some of the access roads on their limits which, as I indicated, is going to be a very -

MR. NEARY: Why should they have to bid on their own private roads? They own these roads.

MR. MAYNARD: We cannot stop anyone in Canada from bidding on the construction of an access road.

MR. NEARY: Make terms and conditions the same for everybody.



MR. MAYNARD: It is a free country. Anybody is allowed to bid. And if they have the lowest tender, and they are capable of building the roads, then the lowest tender has to be awarded to them.

MR. NEARY: Is that so? It is discrimination of the worst kind.

MR. MAYNARD: If we went the other way, it would be discrimination.

MR. NEARY: No, it would not be.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, what is the motivation for paper companies getting involved in building roads?

MR. MAYNARD: Why would they be motivated? I have no idea. That roads that are being built on company limits are mainly salvage roads. And I would assume that the companies want to get the roads built in the shortest possible time so that they can salvage the timber. Part of the agreement for building the roads on company limits is that they will salvage wood, and this is over-mature or bug-killed wood of some kind that they have to salvage, and that is part of the agreement for us spending public monies on the company limits.

MR. NEARY: Besides, if they went off their own property, they would have to compete and licence their equipment.

MR. MAYNARD: They only have to have the same licence as everyone else has.

MR. NEARY: Unfair competition.

MR. MAYNARD: Now what other - Oh, Crown lands procedures were brought up by the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). Well, I do not know. He indicated that there was some legislation brought in last year that was going to shorten the thing to twelve months. I am not aware of any legislation that was brought in, Mr. Chairman. There may have been a ministerial statement of some kind.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Decentralization might be the reference.

MR. MAYNARD: I think there were some ministerial statements that indicated that over a period of time the processing of Crown land applications would be shortened considerably and I am confident that this will be done. One of the key factors in this is decentralization of the department. It was only last year that we started to decentralize the Crown Lands Division and we are continuing with that now. Right now all Crown lands applications are received in the region. There is the central region in Gander, there is the western region in Corner Brook, and the Labrador region in Goose Bay. And the referrals and the various departments that have to check on the land to see whether or not it is suitable for the purpose for which the application is made, are normally located in these areas and the referral system itself is going to be cut down considerably. You cannot change the procedures and you cannot change the lack of management of lands that have gone on for hundreds of years overnight. There is no one suggesting that we will, but we do think that we can cut down the time it takes to get a lease application processed a considerable amount.

AN HON. MEMBER: How much?

MR. MAYNARD: It depends. It is no good for me to say that every application is going to be approved or rejected within a period of three months because there are a lot of complexities involved.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Minimum time of one year.

MR. MAYNARD: We have applications come in, and it has been for a certain parcel of land, for instance, let us say it is on the Avalon. We have found out after the application is made and we have processed it and gone and checked it out that that parcel of land was granted to someone back

MR. MAYNARD: in 1850. In the St. John's fire of 1895 - 1896 or whatever it was, most of the Crown lands records were destroyed and we have that problem on our hands. Plus we have the problem of squatter's rights which has been always recognized in this Province.

MR. WHITE: Under normal circumstances?

MR. MAYNARD: Under normal circumstances? My estimate would be four to six months from the time that an application is made until it is finished, processed under normal conditions once the regional offices are fully set up. And I would anticipate that with the help of Treasury Board and a few extra staff that by the end of this year or sometime early next year we should have adequate staff in the regions to be able to carry on this sort of thing - once we clear up the backlog, of course.

MR. NEARY: The problem now is communications with the other departments, liason.

MR. MAYNARD: I am not going to comment on the other departments.

Anyway, Mr. Chairman, just briefly, because I have only a few more minutes: The hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) asked about the budworm in Labrador and there is no doubt about it, the budworm has infested the Labrador area. To the best of our knowledge and from the historical background right now, although the budworm will infest spruce stands and will cause a considerable amount of defoliation that the spruce is hardy enough to bounce back, if you will, from the budworm attack. That is, of course, in the case of mature spruce which is most of the Labrador wood. If it is young spruce the budworm will merely retard the growth, but it is not thought that the budworm is so disastrous to spruce as it is to fir which, of course, if it is attached four or five years in a row is pretty well useless as far as paper or any other kind of utilization is concerned.

May 24, 1977

Tape No. 3158

EC - 3

MR. CHAIRMAN:

time is expired.

MR. MAYNARD:

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. MAYNARD:

Order, please! The hon. minister's

Is that twenty minutes?

Yes, it is gone.

Sorry about that.

On motion 1201-01 through 1202-08, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1203-01

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the minister if he can give me the answer to the question I raised this morning about the Reid property. Have they received their final payment? Is the total amount to be paid out to Reid's \$4.5 million? I know they asked for \$36 million. Have they received their final payment? Is that the end of it, \$4.5 million, or are they to receive the money over and above the \$4.5 million?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: The final payment, I think, is \$1.2 million. It is in the budget here somewhere. I am not just sure where it is now but the \$4.1 million or the \$4.5 million, I am not sure which, is the final thing. They asked for \$36 million; obviously they did not get that because at that time there was so much on every bear and fifty cents on every rabbit and this sort of thing but we did not accept that claim. So the \$4.5 million or the \$4.1 million, whatever the figure was, will be the final payment this year.

On motion 1203-01 through 1203-02-05

carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: 1203-03?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1203-03-01.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I want to talk a little about the management plans. I see that in the heading here that it was referring to reforestation. I expect this is the area where it comes in, reforestation. I wondered how effective this programme is of reforestation and I agreed with the member for Naskauni (Mr. Goudie) in talking on reforestation and, Mr. Chairman, I just wondered whether the minister, for example, whether there was any reforestation taking place on the Bonavista North Loop there, that fire that spread from Bonavista North right over to Gander Bay, which robbed us of a lot of forest which was destroyed and I just



MR. LUSH: wondered what is happening in that respect, whether anybody is looking at it to see what kind of forest is coming back, whether it is coming back as good forest or whether it is coming back as shrub.

I am told that once an area is burnt out that we have got to be very careful to keep an eye on what is coming back because we could be having shrub and hardwoods and alders and there is no value at all, and I just wondered what is going on in that area, whether the minister's department has looked at this to see what kind of forest is coming back, or whether there has been any reforestation in that area at all, an area which was one time very, very rich in forest, an area that provided a lot of work to the people in Bonavista Bay and over in the Gander Bay area. I am just wondering what is happening in that respect right now in that whole peninsula.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Before the minister answers my hon. friend, Sir, I want to put a brief question to the minister because this involves management plans and surveys. I presume this is the mapping programme that is being paid for one hundred per cent by the Government of Canada.

MR. MAYNARD: That is under land.

MR. NEARY: Under land, not under forest management.

MR. MAYNARD: No.

MR. NEARY: Okay, well I will deal with it when we come to it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Before the minister gets up I am going to ask a very short question and it is very relative to what the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) mentioned, It is with regard to reforestation. I would like to hear the minister indicate, I see in 1203-03-07, forest improvements - \$325,000 and that is the only figure I can find in the estimates that would cover reforestation expenditures by the Province, and I am wondering if the minister would care to elaborate

MR. FLIGHT: on just exactly what the reforestation programmes, if any, of his department are. And while he is at it, would he give the House an up-date to the point that he can on what type of reforestation the two paper companies are carrying out this year?

MP. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MP. MAYNARD: I cannot give you the details on what the

MR. MAYNARD: two paper companies are doing this year, Mr. Chairman, On our reforestation, as the hon. members may know we have a large or a fairly large nursery set up on New Bay Road in the Bishop's Falls area which should come on stream or produce the first seedlings in approximately 1980, I think. That is going to be the basis of reforestation, replanting of areas that have been burnt over or areas that are not regenerating naturally. In most areas the regeneration is fairly natural. There are some areas such as the Bonavista North area which has been burnt over where some planting, seeding will be necessary and as soon as the nursery comes on stream and we are able to get the seedlings we will be looking at these areas. Certainly we are very cognizant of the fact that there is a problem there because of the burnt over areas. Now it is not true to say that all burnt over areas are slow to regenerate; they are a bit slower than if the area is not burnt over, but in some cases natural regeneration takes place, in other cases it has to be replanted and any areas that need replanting we will be doing over a period of years as the nursery comes on stream in full force and we are able to get the five or six million seedlings a year whatever we are anticipating out of that nursery.

MR. LUSH: Does the minister have any idea what is happening on that Bonavista North area whether it is coming back through natural reforestation or whether -

MR. MAYNARD: In some cases it is coming back through natural reforestation. There are other sections of it that will have to be replanted. It varies, I presume, with the type of soil or how heavily it was burned.

On motion, 1203-03-01 through to 1203-03-06, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 1203-03-07 carry?

The hon member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Again here under - I do not know whether this is the appropriate heading or not, but just a simple question: People in

MR. LUSH: forestry have told me that we can also experiment with other kinds of trees, the same things with crop rotation and this sort of thing, and there are other kinds of trees that can grow very well in this Province. I am just wondering whether the department has given any consideration to looking into what other kinds of trees might be grown in Newfoundland and if so what types of trees they might be?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes, we have, Mr. Chairman, There is an ongoing analysis, if you will, of getting a different species mix in the Province. One of our real problems especially regarding budworm control and this sort of thing is the fact that on the Island portion of the Province we have a tremendous amount of fir and we do not have the species that can withstand attacks by the woolly ophid and the budworm and this sort of thing. For instance, we know that spruce is a hardier type species that can withstand insect attacks more so than fir can, and that is why the nursery in the Bishop Falls area is growing pretty well all spruce as opposed to fir seedlings. There is experimentation going on with other species as well and we would like to have a good cross-mix of species as it gives one a little bit more security. It is going to take a long time to get the cross-mix of species that we need because it takes a considerable amount of time to grow trees of any kind in this Province. You are talking about periods of anywhere from forty to seventy years to grow a tree to a height or size where it is good for lumber or pulpwood and therefore it is not an overnight thing but it is certainly something that is ongoing in the whole forest management and the forest future.

On motion, 1203-03-07, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 1203-04-01 carry?

The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes. I notice

Mr. Rideout.

protection against fires, that the estimates for this year is about \$189,000 whereas it was up to \$420,000 last year. I am not all that familiar with this department, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure if this would include the cost of fighting forest fires or not. If it does, then I would ask the minister to explain on what basis this figure is arrived at, whether or not we are expecting to have less involvement in protection against forest fires this year than we had any other year, and on what basis such an assumption could reasonably be made? Also forest fire equipment is down considerably, from \$920,000 the year before down to a little less than \$500,000 this year. Now that could conceivably be because the equipment has been purchased and is in place. And the other question - I will put them all on the main heading - the other question would relate to the water bomber fleet. The capital cost is up tremendously from \$200,000 the year before to \$760,000 this year. I would like for the minister to give us some sort of breakdown on what that is all about.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Okay, I think it is necessary to take one under one heading. The total forest protection budget, taking out the insect control of the budworm which is new this year, the \$550,000, of course, you come to a little less than last year but not all that much - if you take the total in context. The protection against fires, Mr. Speaker, is impossible to estimate, and what is in the book is obviously estimates, and that one is impossible to estimate, because you do not know whether it is going to be a bad year for fires or whether you are going to have a relatively good year. The only thing you can do is make a rough estimate of what it would cost to maintain the fire-fighting capabilities under a normal year, and hope that you do not have to spend any more than that, but always with the knowledge that if the fires do occur, and if it is a bad year, then you have to pump more money



Mr. Maynard.

into it. It is just that sort of a situation where you hope you can pin it down to that much but knowing that you may have to up it. The water bomber fleet capital is \$760,000, and is related to hopefully two new bombers, I believe. There is a complete refurbishing of one Canso. We have five, as you know, now - and over the past three years we have completely refurbished the five that we have, a complete overhaul costing in the vicinity, I think, of around \$200,000 each. They are for all intents and purposes, for operational purposes, new aircraft at this point in time. So we have a fairly reliable fleet. We are hoping this year to be able to purchase two new aircrafts to add to the fleet which will bring it up to seven Canso aircrafts.

MR. WHITE: The other two are Cansos, too, are they?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes. We are looking for two new - well, not new Cansos, because there are no new Cansos any more - but two additional Cansos so that we will have seven Cansos in the fleet. We have found them very reliable. The only other alternative is the Canadair aircraft which, I think, right now costs something in the vicinity of \$2.2 million each, which is a bit too expensive for our blood.

MR. NEARY: Where are you going to find Cansos? They are all obsolete.

MR. MAYNARD: They are not obsolete as long as they can fly and put out a fire.

MR. NEARY: Where are you going to find two?

MR. MAYNARD: We have two lined up that are available.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, could the minister tell us, you know, if it is feasible and practical to get Cansos now? I mean they are obsolete. They are Second World War vintage, and I did not think they were available now anywhere in the world. Obviously - the minister knows where there are a couple kicking around, and the government is probably going to pick them up and bring their fleet up to seven.

Mr. Neary.

But should not the government now be looking at this new type of water bomber, the one the minister just mentioned here, put out by Canadair? How long more can we carry on with the Cansos? Can you get spare parts?for them now?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. MAYNARD: Well, I did not think there were any Cansos left either, Mr. Chairman, but we did find two that are in good condition. There is no problem, or very little problem of spare parts for the Cansos. As I said, the five that we already have, we have had them completely refurbished, the skin of the aircraft, the insides,

MR. MAYNARD: the standardization of the controls and this sort of thing and they are like new at this point in time, and rather than try to acquire a new fleet at costs of maybe \$15 million to \$20 million we will go with this present fleet. They are working very well and they do a good job, just as good a job as any other aircraft that we have seen. So I think it is much more sensible to go for two further additions of Cansos now than try to acquire a new fleet over the next --

MR. NEARY: Where are you going to get them? Are you going to get them in Canada or the United States or where? In Canada?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes, in Canada.

MR. NEARY: On the mainland?

MR. MAYNARD: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: 1203-04 Water Bomber Fleet (Capital).

Now I would ask the minister, the expenses vote in other departments, 1203-09 - \$2,471,100. I assume that is the operation of the Canso water fleet. Is that correct?

MR. MAYNARD: Plus the helicopter.

MR. FLIGHT: Plus the helicopter, but it is the operation of the Canso fleet and the helicopter.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to take a minute and throw out to the minister an idea that will at least be food for thought and it may seem insignificant to some members, but it does not seem so insignificant to me when one thinks about the implications that may be involved. We have heard a lot about decentralization with regard to the Ministry of Forestry this past year or so, Sir, and some reports from both ministers that decentralization seems to be working. Now then, Sir, I would suggest to the House that the water bomber fleet is presently stationed and serviced at St. John's. We could not find a place any further away in Newfoundland from the limits of the two paper companies than St. John's, either Price or Bowaters, and I would presume that our greatest fear in operating the water bomber fleet, our greatest challenge is to

MR. FLIGHT: protect our economical wood. So, Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister would care to comment, or if he would care to consider and store for future thought the possibility of relocating that water bomber fleet from St. John's to Buchans, Newfoundland. We have the airport there, Sir, he is well aware, I would imagine, of the airport. I understand it is one of the better airports in Newfoundland. It has been allowed to become dilapidated, I presume, for want of a better word in this past eight or ten years since DOT and the National Defence pulled out. From all reports, and there have been studies done on this, that airport is located in one of the prime areas in the Province as regards climatic conditions, weather, what-have-you. Flying time - any water bomber situated in Buchans would be a maximum twenty to thirty minutes flying time to the outer limits of any of the paper companies' timber stands, it has been suggested, Mr. Chairman. Now I realize there would be a fair capital expenditure to take that water bomber fleet wholly and solely and relocate it to Buchans. It would cost a fair few dollars. But the argument can be made that the water bomber fleet would be more efficient operating once the support staff was established, once the hangar facilities was established. All the support that is needed is there right now, the manpower to maintain the fleet, the machine shops. Mr. Chairman, if we are so really dedicated in finding ways to guarantee the future viability of the town of Buchans, there is something that could stand some consideration. I would believe, and I have heard responsible well-informed people indicate that it would make sense if the water bomber fleet were operating out of some airport in central Newfoundland. Well, we have the airport. The federal government, as the Minister of Transportation is aware, have made funds available for the upgrading and for the various facilities that would be required to make that an all-weather aerodrome, including asphalt. So I wonder if the minister would care to comment on whether or not he sees some feasibility in looking at the possibility of establishing the water bomber fleet in Buchans. Most of the facilities are presently

May 24, 1977

Tape No. 3162

EC - 3

MR. FLIGHT:

there. Again I would reiterate the  
importance of flying time and not ferrying time.



MR. FLIGHT: There have been cases, and I am sure that the minister will agree, where we have had forest fires in Central Newfoundland and the water bomber fleet has been in St. John's not able to get out due to weather; but, thirty, forty, fifty miles inland from St. John's, clear weather and the fleet would have been in there. And so, Mr. Chairman, I could go on, but I do not want to waste time on the minister's estimates. I thought that I would take advantage of this point in time and this point in the estimates since we are talking about the water bomber fleet to toss out that idea and ask the minister - I would not expect him to elaborate very much on it now - but ask the minister to do some thinking about the possibilities, because the possibilities are there and I believe that if we could find the capital expenditure we would require to relocate that water bomber fleet, from that point on from the time it was relocated it would be a more efficient operation. The airplanes would be where they are needed most when they are needed most and it would probably provide - it would be one thing that could provide an economic base for a fair share of that town.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Chairman, I think the hon. member is working under some kind of a misconception as to the water bomber fleet during the fire season. He seems to be thinking that each time there is a fire there is a fleet of water bombers grouped in St. John's and this is the place where they operate from during the Summer. This is not so. The water bomber fleet, while it is overhauled in St. John's at the maintenance base here and the maintenance hangar here throughout the Winter, once the fire season starts there is one water bomber placed in Goose Bay, one in Deer Lake, one in Gander and the other two are here. There is always one getting some kind of maintenance done or on a standby basis one way or the other, and these things are placed there for the duration of the fire season.

MR. MAYNARD: The only thing that happens here in St. John's is major overhauls or major repairs should they become necessary throughout the course of the season. I have to be quite frank, Mr. Chairman; I can see no justification whatsoever in moving the maintenance hangar and maintenance facilities anywhere. It is not an industry, if the hon. gentleman is thinking about an industry for Buchans. The amount of economic activity that it would create would be practically nil and the justification for spending \$2 or \$3 million or whatever it would cost to put up hangar facilities and move the crews and the maintenance people and everything into another area would just not make economic sense, period. So I cannot see anytime in the future when we will contemplate moving the water bomber fleet to another area because even if it were in Gander or in Deer Lake, once the fire season started the fleet is dispersed all over the place anyway and it has to be wherever the crews are or wherever the most fires are going to occur at any time. You know, fires occur on the Eastern part of the Province as well as they do on the Western part, so the water bomber fleet as it stands now is maintained here in St. John's throughout the Winter months, their overhaul base is here. Throughout the fire season they are spotted throughout various parts of the Province, including Labrador and that appears to be a fairly efficient way of doing it and I would anticipate that that is going to continue for some time in the future.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Excepting the water bomber that is based in Labrador, we would accept that of course it would have to be based in Labrador, the minister indicated that there is one based in Deer Lake, Gander, and St. John's, I think. I am suggesting, Sir, and I have suggested that if the center of operation were the Buchans Airport that they could all be situated, apart from the one in Labrador, in Buchans all the time, because flying out from Buchans to any center it is, as I said,

May 24, 1977

Tape 3163 (Afternoon)

AH-3

MR. FLIGHT:            within twenty to thirty miles of flying for  
any of the limits of the paper companies and I have to say , Sir,  
that I do not accept the fact that it would not create jobs nor  
that there would be no

MR. FLIGHT: industry as such. It would be very interesting to see how many people are working in St. John's as a result of supporting that operation, that hangar, the aircraft, the people supplying the airplane. I mean if you use that argument, Mr. Chariman, that is like saying that the various departments of government here do not create jobs outside of the Civil Service in St. John's. I would suggest that it is worth thinking about and I would suggest that had the operation been established outside of the city before it would been a lot easier to have recognized the benefits that would have come from that and I can understand why the minister would be reluctant at this stage to look at establishing the fleet outside of St. John's.

But I understood that the minister was the minister which the Buchans Task Force was responsible to and they were asked to come up with ideas and ways, what could be done that could create a few jobs in that area. I suggested to the minister one thing could be done and it would not affect the performance of the water fleet, indeed it may even make it more efficient, would be to look at the possibility of relocating that fleet to Buchans.

On motion 1203-04-01 through 1203-05, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1204-01.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the minister - there is a lot of new stuff in here, Sir; the government bought an aircraft last year, a new aircraft, I think, to do the aerial photography and mapping and so forth in the Province. Most of the money in this subhead is refunded to the provincial government by the Government of Canada and this is something new now that the government is getting into, Could the minister on salaries give us a run-down on what is going to be done this year in connection with aerial photography and mapping and so forth and would the minister tell us too why it was necessary to buy this aircraft from a company in Ottawa when a local firm was asked to bring the aircraft into this Province, brought

MR. NEARY: it in at tremendous expense, kept it here for several months, and then was told by the provincial government that they would have to go to tender on the aircraft. And after they went to tender, the lowest bidder was a company in Ottawa that went about \$8,000 or \$10,000 lower than the local firm and got the contract. And then, lo and behold! Mr. Chairman - the minister can laugh at this if he wants to, but the minister and the administration put this local company through tremendous personal inconvenience and expense, and the difference was only \$8,000 or \$10,000 that this company in Ottawa did not have because they were not asked to bring an aircraft in here and then they had to turn around, the company in Ottawa, and buy the aircraft from the local firm to sell it to the government, the company that was asked to bring it in here in the first place.

Why did that happen? What was the reason for this colossal blunder?

MR. MAYNARD: Talk to the Feds.

MR. NEARY: It was not the federal government, Sir, it was the provincial government that negotiated with this local company in Gander and asked them to bring the aircraft in, which they did. It was the only one available and ultimately, Mr. Chairman, when public tenders were called by the minister's department and the company in Ottawa bid, they could not supply the aircraft. The only aircraft available was the one that was brought in by this local company in Gander. The company in Ottawa could not supply the aircraft and they had to come to the local firm and ask them to sell them the aircraft so they could resell it to the government.

I would like for the minister to give us an explanation for that. And do not try to pawn off the blame on Ottawa by saying that Ottawa forced public tenders. Of course they did. What is wrong with that? I am not complaining about public tenders. But I am complaining about the way that this local firm in Gander was coddled along by the administration and they would have



MR. NEARY: been able to bid below the company that bid in Ottawa but for the additional expense they were put through by the administration and the difference ended up only \$8,000 or \$10,000 in the difference of the aircraft and they had already spent that fooling around, demonstrating the aircraft for the government, for the commodore of the fleet, Captain Pearcey and his crowd.

MR. NEARY: They had already spent that money ferrying the aircraft down here, maintaining it while it was here, insurance on it, demonstrating it for the Commodore, keeping it stored in Gander, and then were eventually forced to sell it to this crowd up in Ottawa, a company outside the Province. I would like to hear the minister's explanation on that, Sir, and I would like to hear a run-down on what is going to be done this year in the way of topographic maps and surveys and titles, and mapping generally, and aerial photography and this sort of thing. Has the minister now built up a staff down there? Is the expertise sufficient to carry out this work?

Mr. Chairman, I would like to know if the aircraft has been placed under the Commodore of the Fleet or is it under the minister's jurisdiction?

MR. MAYNARD: Keep going, I want to get some -

MR. NEARY: Does the minister want to get a smoke or get some information?

AN HON. MEMBER: Get some information.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, the only other thing I could say about this administration of Crown lands is that it is long overdue, the land mapping, surveys and so forth, long overdue. (I just swallowed it.) And now the financial assistance has been there for a long time, Sir. It has been there for the last three or four years. The Government of Canada made this money available about four or five years ago, I would say, to the Newfoundland Government to carry out its aerial photography and mapping and so forth, and this is the first year they have been able to take advantage of it. We have lost about three or four years of federal government assistance. I do not know why. I would like for the minister to tell us why it was not possible before now to take advantage of the assistance that was made available by the Government of

MR. NEARY: Canada. What was the reason for it? Why were we not able to carry out this aerial photography and this mapping before, even though the money was available, one hundred per cent paid for by the Government? This crowd cannot even spend money when the Government of Canada gives it to them for nothing.

MR. MURPHY: Was that a lump sum?

MR. NEARY: It was not - well, maybe it was a lump sum, It was an annual amount.

MR. MURPHY: No, I do not think, the hon. member may.

MR. NOLAN: He would not understand.

MR. NEARY: I do not care if it was a lump sum, or if the hon. gentleman is referring to the minister. I do not know. But, Sir, the minister -

MR. MURPHY: No, that is the Department of Fisheries.

MR. NEARY: The minister has now had his drag. Could the minister come in and give us the information.

MR. MAYNARD: Are you finished now?

MR. NEARY: I am finished, yes. I was finished before the hon. minister went out only I wanted to give him a chance to get a draw.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: I will speak now and the minister can go out and finish his draw.

Mr. Chairman, there are a couple of points I want to mention in this subhead 1204 on lands. I am not going to have anything else to say about the Crown Lands Division over there because, I suppose, that has been said by practically every member who spoke in this debate today. But I do want the minister, Mr. Chairman, to tell us what is happening with regard to the amendment that this House passed last year to the Crown Lands Act

MR. RIDEOUT: providing for people who lived on a piece of land, I believe for more than twenty years, -

MR. FLIGHT: That is the one. That is the one.

MR. RIDEOUT: - to get title to that land. It is squatters rights and it was, I believe, brought down from some high figure of fifty, or sixty, or seventy years or something to twenty years.

MR. ROUSSEAU: From sixty to twenty.

MR. RIDEOUT: Sixty to twenty. The progressive legislation from my friend from Menihek (Mr. Rousseau), good legislation.

MR. MURPHY: Good Tory legislation.

MR. RIDEOUT: But, Mr. Chairman, what happened to it? It is more than a ywar ago now that that piece of legislation was passed. I know dozens of people in my district who will qualify to receive grants to their land under that amendment but every time I call up Crown Lands, Oh, it is down to printing and they had some trouble getting it printed. I finally found out by the grapevine, I believe, that it is printed. The application forms are printed all right, but now there is some hangup with regard to the reulations, with the regulations that must be tacked on to the end of the amendment that was passed by this House.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as far as I am concerned this thing is overdue long enough. The Crown Lands, God knows, the Crown Lands Division is slow enough as it is -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. RIDEOUT: - and by the time now that they get

Mr. Rideout.

to work on this particular amendment that was passed by this House last year, by the time they start receiving applications based on that amendment that was passed by this House last year, and by the time you take into consideration all the applications that are before Crown Lands now, the people who are today sixty-five or seventy years old will never live to see their grant under that new amendment that was passed by this House last year. Because you can imagine, Sir, the flood of applications that is going to come in from all over the Province once the Crown Lands Division says that they are now ready to accept applications based on that amendment. So I think the process has certainly been slowed down too much. I do not know what all the delays were. I know what I have been told, the printing of applications, and now a hang-up with drafting regulations and so on. And I believe it is time for the minister to get on to his Crown lands people and get that amendment operational, get it intact so that the people who are going to benefit from it throughout the Province can do so. It is not much point, Mr. Chairman, of this House passing legislation, good legislation, I agree, as I have said, unless the people are going to be able to take advantage of it. And certainly lying on the Statute Books a year after it was passed is not doing much to make the process a little bit more simple and a little bit more convenient for our people. So I would like to hear the minister tell the whole story. What is going on with that piece of progressive legislation that was passed by this House last year? There has been no action on it since the day that we gave it third reading and went home for our holidays.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Chairman, I want to say a few words on this subhead. Again I want to just reinforce what some of the hon. members have been saying about the Crown lands in particular, the apparently long time it takes people to get applications approved. It



Mr. Lush.

causes all sorts of frustrations with respect to getting mortgages. I must have had a dozen this year, people hung up on mortgages because they could not get land approved. It is most frustrating. But I think enough has been said about it for the minister to get the point certainly. There are a couple of things going on in my district, Mr. Chairman, with respect to lands, that I would like to get some answers from the minister, and this is concerning summer cabins, and this not only concerns my district, I know that it does also concern part of Bonavista North. The gentleman, I am sure, from Bonavista North can talk to this. But in Gambo Pond and in Terra Nova and in several areas out there where people have had Summer cabins, this year, Sir, - they were - well, in their terminology, they call it - they were ticketed. They were given eviction notices or whatever. They were supposed to report to Crown lands and nobody knows what is going on. They do not seem to know what the government is up to in this respect, and it is causing them quite a bit of concern, and maybe the minister could tell us what is going on. What is the purpose of these notices, these tickets or whatever it is they are getting? And, Mr. Chairman, it is getting to the stage now where, you know, it is affecting the traditional style of life of Newfoundlanders. I think most Newfoundlanders realize that some of these things have to be regulated and controlled, but they are getting the distinct impression now that the kinds of regulations that are about to be or the government is trying to enforce is going to put them out of being able to build a cabin. What the government seems to be advocating now is all-season homes, something that can only be afforded by the rich and by the wealthy. And in this respect also the people contacting me have told me that it looks like these notices put on these cabins were done selectively, that is that there were cabins skipped over.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where was this?

MR. LUSH: This was in Terra Nova, Terra Nova lake.

Again, the information I get is that there were no

Mr. Lush.

people receiving notices at all in the Thorburn Lake area. There are quite a few cabins up there. These people got no notices, just a very short distance from Terra Nova. And again within Terra Nova, they tell me that the notices were issued selectively. And people are getting the distinct impression that right now they will never be able to build a Summer cabin, that this is only for the rich and for the wealthy of this Province and thus denying Newfoundlanders the opportunity to live the way that they have been accustomed to living. And again I am aware of some of the things that go on, the government trying to restrict cabins in far away places, to prevent poaching and this sort of thing. But, Mr. Chairman, some of these people are honourable

MR. LUSH: people and they would just like to be able to get away, to get up into the woods and get up into the country and take their families without any motives for poaching or what have you. I think that certainly the government needs to look at this and let the people know what it is going on. What is the purpose of these notices? What is the purpose? Are they going to be evicted? Some of these people had cabins there for years and years and years.

MR. NOLAN: Where is this, 'Tom'?

MR. LUSH: Terra Nova Lake and Gambo Pond as well.

MR. NOLAN: Right.

MR. LUSH: The people have had a traditional way of living, of going up into the forest and spending a week there, and as I have said before, some of them go up there with very honourable motives, just to get away. They cannot afford to go to Florida, they cannot afford to go overseas. About the only thing they can afford is to go up there, take their families and rough it. They cannot afford to build these mansions, these cabins with electricity. You know, they cannot afford this sort of thing. This is certainly cramping the style, to say the least, of the way Newfoundlanders used to live.

Then there is another aspect, Mr. Chairman, and this is areas being designated for Summer cottages throughout the Province. And again, I wonder how these areas are designated? Whether the people, whether the local people, whether the local residents are contacted to ask whether or not they want these Summer cottages or to ascertain how this is going to affect their style of living. Again there is a cottage development going up around Cull's Harbour that the residents there know nothing about at all excepting they called me about three or four weeks ago and asked me, What is the idea

MR. LUSH: of the surveyors going buzzing around here? When we check into it we find that a large tract of land is being taken that these people used to cut on. They used to go it to cut a little bit of fire wood, cut a few logs, and now this land, without any reference to the people, is being taken for Summer cottages and, as the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) says, for the mucky-mucks to come in there and set up those trailers and to deny those fellows of their hunting rights.

Mr. Chairman, this is an area where the people have been hemmed in and frustrated through the development of the national park. I believe sometimes, when we go about making these developments, drawing up plans for these developments, that we do not look at how this is going to affect the traditional life-style of these people. Again I want to reiterate that the people in this area, their lifestyle has been affected tremendously by the development of the Terra Nova National Park and now there is another development coming there and this is going to certainly stifle and strangle the kind of way in which these people live.

So certainly on these two aspects of the Summer cabins being - getting notices on them - what are these notices? What is the purpose? Are there eviction notices? What is going on? Are we trying to take away the little pleasures that some of the common folk of this Province enjoy? The other one is with respect to the Summer cottage areas: Just what is going on? Are we taking those areas without any reference to the people? Or have the people indeed requested, the local people, have they requested to have these Summer cottage areas designated?

It is pretty hard too, Mr. Chairman, to try to get any information on these Summer cottages. If a person wants to get a certain lot there

MR. LUSH: he cannot go in and see them, he just has to put in an application and just pray that he gets the right kind of a lot. Everything seems to be very secretive. There is no way you can find out what kind of lot you are going to get, whether it is going to be a corner one, whether it is going to be a boggy one, or whether it is going to be good firm land. It is just a very secretive operation.

These are some of the points that I would like for the minister to allude to and provide the House and the people of Newfoundland with the details which they are entitled to receive.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, I want to make a few remarks, particularly about what the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) referred to, and that is the matter of Crown Lands applications insofar as the Act which was passed last year pertains. That was the Act which gave to people who had been in occupation of land for a certain period of time the right to get a Crown grant to that land.

Now I think myself that that Act needs, perhaps, to have another look taken at it. Because what would happen? As I understand the Act, and the minister can correct me if I am wrong,



MR. MARSHALL: the persons who have occupied the land have to supply proof of their occupation of that area before the Crown Lands can give a grant. The administration of that particular right by civil servants, I think, would cast a very heavy onus on the Crown Lands branch and probably cast upon them duties which some of them are not really equipped to handle because, really, what you are going to have, you are going to be faced with an avalanche of affidavits or statutory declarations by people saying that they have occupied the land for a certain period of twenty years or forty years, or however long it is, I think it is twenty, and if that affidavit can be accepted that is all right. Fine. A Crown grant should issue. But -

MR. NOLAN: Will the hon. member permit a question?

MR. MARSHALL: Yes.

MR. NOLAN: And I only mention it - there are those as the hon. member really knows who do not hang on every word that is uttered in this House, or the rules and regulations. Perhaps it is all right to adopt the attitude that ignorance is no excuse, and so on, but I am wondering just how many hundreds, perhaps, of people who have squatters rights or whatever you call it and have occupied land over and over the years have not taken the steps that are necessary as mentioned by my hon. friend. I am just wondering what is going to happen to them if they do not take the required action. Because, you know, we have not been bombarded on the airways with the requirements and so on and I am fearful of what is going to happen.

MR. MARSHALL: I am sort of concerned as to what is going to happen as well, because there are many times people will be prepared to sign in good faith affidavits and statutory declarations that they have owned land and they have occupied it, and this land happens to be wooded. There may be a member of a family who presumes that he has owned the land, and other people in the family also have a right to the land itself. So it would appear to me that that Act, fostered and introduced with good intent, I would expect that the Department will have quite a bit of difficulty in the administration of it and perhaps we ought to have

MR. MARSHALL: another look at it because I do not think we should transfer functions to the Civil Service. I think it is unfair to them and certainly they are not qualified to do it. For them to have to sit in the position of having to make a judgment as to the quality of the ownership and possession of a person over a period of years, there are perhaps other ways and another form by which it can be done. But, obviously, something has got to be done, I think everyone will agree, with respect to the situation at Crown Lands. It is a problem and it is a problem not localizing Crown Lands itself but really because of the way land tenure in this Province has been held over the centuries. However -

MR. MURPHY: The hon. member said 'own'. Would 'occupy' be in the same context? Someone occupied the land. You know, they occupied it for twenty years rather than actually owned it. Is the ownership established afterwards, or not?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, in the person's mind, you see, if they have occupied it for over twenty years, they think they own it. Perhaps in many cases they do, but what is occupation? Is occupation building a house on a piece of land and living there? Is occupation farming land? Is occupation fencing it? Or is occupation just merely looking at it and saying that I own it? In many cases it is very, very difficult to determine the quality of the ownership asserted by individuals, and I think this is one of the prime reasons why there will be difficulty in administering that Act by the Civil Service. I do not think really that the administration of this Act - or not the administration of it; obviously the administration is a matter for the Civil Service, But the duty cast upon them to determine whether or not a Crown grant should issue on the basis of possession is something that can work practically and effectively as the Act presently exists. I think it has to be looked at again and other changes made.

Now, another point that I would like to draw to the Minister's attention, and this is the matter of the wilderness areas that are under his jurisdiction. In years gone by there have been -

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: Yes. Well, the hon. Minister of Justice happens to know that I have a very acute personal interest in this, but I

MR. MARSHALL: am not the only one. I would say there are tens of thousands of people, on the Avalon Peninsula particularly, who enjoy tremendously the wilderness area in the Avalon Peninsula which is one the most forward steps taken by any government, and I do not care which government initiated it. I will give them in that case, because I enjoy it, heaps of compliments. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, the wilderness area has in times past been threatened by the possibility of woods access roads going near the perimeter of the wilderness area itself, and I know last year that I brought in a petition with, I think, about 5,000 names of people who were very alarmed at the fact that there was an access road then planned in the immediate vicinity of the Avalon Wilderness Area. So I would just draw this to the attention of the Committee, point out that the Government listen to the concerns expressed by those people who signed the petition, and also add the hope that this wilderness area will be fostered and protected in the years to come because it has really been a real advantage and a real forward movement by the Government of this Province in maintaining and protecting this particular area. I do not think it is known by certainly all members, some members of this Committee I know, but I do not think that people really appreciate the worth of that particular area in the Province, the use of it by citizens, particularly on the Avalon Peninsula, and what it has actually done to the wildlife in the area and the entire environment of the area by keeping and maintaining that. I think that at all costs, no matter what the developers want or whatever people's desires may be, I think that for the good of all of the people in and around this area, that is the Avalon area and the St. John's area, that the wilderness area should be protected,

MR. MARSHALL: it should be fostered in perhaps that we should look into the possibility of creating in and around other primitive areas and what have you because, as I say, it is one of our greatest natural assets that we have and it should be protected.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I would like your permission or the consent of the House to revert back to 1203-05 and the point being that I was speaking on 1203-04 - water bomber fleet, and before I realized what was happening we were gone to 1203-05. Now there are a couple of questions, it will not take all that long, but there are a couple of questions on 1203-05 - insect control, budworm, that I would like to ask and I would appreciate if the minister would address himself to when he spoke. So if I have your permission -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member requests permission to revert back to 1203-05. The hon. member wants to ask a question on 1203-05, Does he have permission to revert back to 1203-05?

SOME HON MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. FLIGHT: They are very simple, Mr. Chairman, and I thank the House and the minister. The figure \$550,000 for insect control, budworm, now I would like to hear the minister break that down if he could as to just what portion of that figure has been applied to the actual experimental spraying programme. Because I know there are activities related to insect control, budworm control ongoing this past, I suppose all last year, and all of this summer coming that is related to budworm control and I would appreciate and I think the House would be interested in hearing exactly how much money we are going to spend on the experimental spraying. And having asked that question, Mr. Chairman, I am wondering if the minister could indicate, and this is a very hypothetical question and probably unfair in a sense, but I wonder if the minister could indicate that based on that cost, based on what it will cost us to do this experimental spraying programme, I am talking about the specific, what he would project that were we to go into a full large scale spraying



MR. FLIGHT: programme next year, based on the cost of the experimental spraying this year, would he be prepared to give the House a ballpark figure or a rule of thumb figure indicating what the Province could expect. What we could expect, a massive spraying programme or a spraying programme that would suffice or would be necessary in the minister's opinion as to what it would cost next year based on that particular figure?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: I only have a very few minutes left, Mr. Chairman, so I will try to answer as quickly as possible some of the questions that have been raised. Regarding the plane that was purchased, the Cessna that was purchased this year by the department, and some expression of doubt as to whether or not the procedures used were correct ones, let me say this, that the people in Gander who brought the plane in brought it in purely on spec. They were aware that the department was in the market for a plane such as this. They brought in a plane from Cessna with no encouragement or no words from our department or from the Department of Transportation and Communications of commitments that we were going to buy the plane from them or anyone else. The plane was bought under the Forestry Dree Agreement which is a ninety-ten cost shared agreement with the Federal Government. That agreement requires of course that public tenders be called. At the time public tenders were called Eastern Aviation in Gander was \$15,000 more than the Ottawa company bid and therefore we had to accept the lowest tender. There was no previous negotiations or discussions with Eastern Aviation that we would buy the plane from them or anyone else. It was purely a public tender awarded to the lowest tender. Whether or not the group in Ottawa bought the plane from Eastern Aviation or bought from Cessna in the United States is completely irrelevant at this point and time.

Aerial photography was mentioned and the amount that is here for aerial photography is the conclusion, if you will, of the present agreement that we have with the Federal Government which is



MR. MAYNARD: 100 per cent Federal funds. And on the surveying and mapping agreement, the agreement has been extended for a period of one year with no extra funds so that we may be able to spend the amount of funds that was originally allocated. This came about as a result of a fairly slow start in getting the programme off the ground and therefore we have a one year extension to finish up the expenditure of the funds that were allocated. Hopefully we will have a new agreement next year or at least we are trying to get a new one.

Under section 134(b), the section relating to squatter's rights and the \_\_\_\_\_

MR. MAYNARD: granting of land to people who have been occupying the land for twenty years or more, I cross my fingers and say that I hope the application forms are now in the regional offices, or at least they should be. There has been some problems with regulations and drafting appropriate forms within the ambit of the Act, the amendment to the Act which is 134 (b). The hon. member for St. John's East has said there probably will be some problems with administration, and there possibly will. We are not confident that all the procedures have been looked at, all the various problems that may arise have been looked at. What we intend to do, Mr. Chairman, is to go with the Act as it is for a period of a year or so, see how it is working and by that time, after we get some experience under our belt as to how it is working, hopefully we will be able to do any revisions that are necessary to the Act and to make a more streamlined effort as far as the granting of land under the so-called squatters rights amendment is concerned.

What other questions were asked? The hon member for Terra Nova asked about the cabins in the Terra Nova area. The same situation applies all over Newfoundland. I would assume that if people receive tickets, it means that they are illegally occupying Crown Land. I see no reason why cabins should be skipped over other than the fact that some people may very well have a lease on their land and others do not. Obviously the person that has the lease is not in illegal occupation of Crown Land. The person who has built and does not have the lease is occupying illegally. Although we have not been able to get to all the people who occupy Crown Land illegally over the past years, who are occupying it now, we do fully intend to take more firm control as to the occupation of Crown Land whether it is for summer cabins, residences or whatever.

Unfortunately, people still look at or try to look at the fact that Newfoundland has a limitless amount of land and anybody can go anywhere.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please. It now being six o'clock I leave the Chair until 8:00 p.m.

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

*8 - 11 P.M.*

~~3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.~~

TUESDAY, MAY 24, 1977

The Committee resumed at 8:00 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Hon. minister. May I inform the hon. minister he has seven minutes left.

MR. MAYNARD: Seven minutes. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am not going to have time to go through very much in seven minutes but I will try to answer a few questions if I can find the ones that were asked. I think when we left -

MR. NEARY: Will the hon. minister please speak up? We cannot hear a word.

MR. MAYNARD: If the noise would tone down I might -

MR. NEARY: It is partly the minister's fault. He is not speaking up.

MR. MAYNARD: Okay, I will try to be a little bit more precise and louder, Mr. Chairman. I think when we left off we were still on the lands heading. We were going through the section 134 (b), which is an amendment to the Crown Lands Act to allow so-called squatters, people who have had possession of Crown Land for twenty years or more to be able to apply for and obtain a lease providing they can show the necessary documentation they have occupied the land for at least a period of twenty years. Previously the common law, the English Common Law that was being used in this Province was for a period of sixty years. However, that presented some difficulties if we were to give clear title to the land because very few people could get affidavits from other people in their community to show that they have, they or their families, have occupied land for a period of sixty years.

There have also been instances where the courts have recognized possession of Crown land after a period of twenty years, and this is the reason why we came up with the number twenty instead of using the number sixty. I would like to point out, though, that anyone who did not occupy Crown land previous to 1957, their claims will not be honoured. In effect, there will no longer be any squatters rights claims in this Province.

Mr. Maynard:

We do feel that there will be an influx of applications under this section. We will try to deal with them in the best possible manner and any administrative problems that we encounter over the next year or so will give us an insight into what, if any, amendments either in the legislation or in the procedures that we need to carry out in order to facilitate the processing of applications made under the squatters rights legislation.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) asked at one point to revert to 1203-05 which is Insect control, budworm. I do not have the actual figures at this point in time, Mr. Chairman, as to the detailed breakdown of what the spraying programme, the limited spraying programme itself will cost. However, to give an idea of what a full-scale programme will cost, I understand in the Province of New Brunswick now, after some experience in doing this, that the actual spraying programme, chemical spray programme, costs in the vicinity of \$2 per acre. Assuming that we were to spray at some point in time six million acres at a minimum, which would be approximately all of our fir tree forest cover at least, we would be talking in the vicinity of \$12 million, probably \$12 to \$15 million and that is per year. So it is a fairly expensive operation and it is one of the reasons why government has been looking for an alternative way to combat the spruce budworm as opposed to chemical insecticides which have to be sprayed every year. That has been proven in New Brunswick. We are hoping that we can come up with something that is going to have a permanent detrimental effect on the budworm so that the cost



MR. MAYNARD: will be a one-shot thing as opposed to being a repetitive thing year after year. I think there are only a couple of minutes left, and I do not know if this is the appropriate point in time, Mr. Chairman, you can correct me if I am wrong, but there is one subhead that I have to move an amendment to and maybe it would be appropriate to move it at this time. That subhead is 1205-09 - Grant - Newfoundland Farm Products is shown there \$75,000. I would like to move an amendment to add \$1,200,000 on to that subhead which would bring it to a total of \$1,275,000. That is 1205-09 and that \$1,200,000 is allocated for the expansion of Newfoundland Farm Products, Pleasantville plant.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! That is 1205-06-09.

MR. MAYNARD: 06-09, I am sorry. Yes, Mr. Chairman. That would enable us to expand the hog portion of the plant in Pleasantville. The engineers have done a study and they say that it can be done and it would be fairly efficient. So we have added that amount, or we are attempting to add that amount to the estimates in order for us to carry out that particular programme. I will be giving more details on that in a statement. I am sorry I did not have time throughout the estimates to get to that portion to give you the details on it, but I will try to give the House the details within a few days.

The new figures then for 1205-06-09 would be \$1,275,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It has been moved that \$1,200,000 be added to vote for 1205-06-09.

On motion, amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The time for this head has now elapsed.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, before you go on the additions must be corrected as you go on down through to bring them in conformity, the totals sent the department.

On motion, Head X11 - Forestry and Agriculture, all items, with amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading 13 - Tourism.

The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few remarks to

MR. HICKEY: introduce my estimates. There are a great number of things, Mr. Chairman, that one could go into some detail on. Certainly three hours would only scratch the surface in discussing this department.

The tourism industry is one which has not received the attention that it rightfully deserved, and the situation in the Province today is a very clear indication of that. This department, as hon. members are aware, is approximately four years old and up until the time that this administration saw fit to place some emphasis on the tourist industry, for the most part government played a very minor role in the development of an industry which could, and which is presently, and which will continue even more so in the future to produce jobs, badly needed jobs for many of our people. It has been argued many times, Mr. Chairman, that this Province is not an industrial area or it is not a Province which can be industrialized by way of development. And I do not know how many times we have to be reminded of that fact. I am astounded sometimes to hear my hon. friends opposite from time to time talk of industrial development and say that those things which we have should be developed by way of producing jobs. They seem to

MR. HICKEY: forget, Mr. Chairman, that for a great number of years we who sat on the opposite side of the House kept saying that. If anyone wishes to criticize this administration for not getting into heavy industry, then let them, Mr. Chairman. I for one, and my colleagues with me, are quite prepared at any time to enter into debate and to justify the position taken by this government and previous administrations back to 1972, for the position it has taken on developing this Province.

The oil refinery and the linerboard mills, the ERCO plants and all the rest, although providing badly needed jobs, we have come to know, Mr. Chairman, that for the most part they were mistakes. Newfoundland and Labrador is not a Pittsburgh and never will be, and it is high time that everyone interested in the affairs and the future of this Province realized it. That is not to say, Mr. Chairman, that certain things have to be done. That is not to say that when you have an industry such as the oil refinery or the linerboard mill or ERCO, or any of the others, that one has to turn a blind eye to it, or that one has to just forget it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What does this have to do with Tourism?

MR. MURPHY: Never mind, 'Tom', You are doing very nicely. Carry on!

MR. HICKEY: My hon. friend might not like what he is hearing, but that is too bad. It is all very closely related, Mr. Chairman, to Tourism; it gets us down to making the statement which I make very often and which my colleagues agree with, and which this government agrees with, that we must do the things that we are able to do, that we must develop the things we have and not look for pie in the sky or try to make this Province an industrial area which, as I said earlier, it is not and never will be.

To say that the oil and gas off our shores should not be developed; no one is saying that. Or



MR. HICKEY: to say that the great hydro potential should not be developed, no one is saying that either, but, Mr. Chairman, I will make a statement that might surprise my hon. friends opposite; that when the oil and gas is discovered and put on stream there is an end to that, and the forestry, when it is used up we have to wait until it grows again, and that is not ten years, I will make the statement that by and large this Province has two basic industries and will have two major industries fifteen or twenty years from now, one is the fisheries and the other is tourism. It is too bad, Mr. Chairman, that we have had to wait so long since Confederation to see some kind of development in the tourist industry.

MR. NEARY: You are right on the first one but wrong on the second.

MR. HICKEY: My hon. friend says I am right on the first and wrong on the second. Well, we will see.

MR. NEARY: I will show the hon. gentleman where he is wrong.

MR. HICKEY: Will my hon. friend agree that we are in bad need of jobs? Will he agree that we should not go out and develop this Province at huge expenditures, making huge expenditures for industrial jobs? If he agrees to that then obviously it is very simply where we should be heading, and where we are heading, where this administration is heading, it is in recognizing the things that we have in this Province which can be developed, which should be developed and which are labour intensive.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Does my hon. friend realize that every time a hotel or motel is built there are jobs created? Full-time jobs, seasonal jobs, not to mention the construction and the jobs

MR. HICKEY: that are produced there. And for the most part, Mr. Chairman, Government has little or no input by way of financial support to those facilities. Really, all we have to do is try to get out there and develop the industry and create the climate which we are attempting to do now whereby more motels and hotels are built, whereby more people are attracted to the Province. It is not to say the tourism industry should be developed at any cost. I would be the last one to suggest that. I believe, Mr. Chairman, very sincerely that the industry must be developed along well-planned lines, always providing for the benefits to accrue to our own people first, and I say that this is the track that this Administration is on. It will be developed in a way that is not going to destroy the good and healthy environment that we have, be developed in a way which is not going to be done in a manner which our people are not aware of, not well acquainted with and not understanding, so that when the development comes, or any great kind of development comes in the industry, if our people do not understand what it is all about, if there is not an education program to go along with the development program explaining the value of the industry, what the new dollars mean that come into the Province through the development of the industry, if that is not done, Mr. Chairman, then we are heading in the wrong direction because our people will turn against such developments. There will be a backlash like there has been in so many regions in various parts of the world, simply because our people were not told and we did not explain in a reasonable and detailed kind of way, the real benefits that can come from proper development of this industry.

Hon. members may wonder in hearing me say something like this or make this kind of statement, they may well wonder what has been happening in the past couple of years. Mr. Chairman,

MR. NEARY: Tell us what has been going on for the last five years.

MR. HICKEY: Three years - two years - two and a half years. I would like to proceed to do just that, Mr. Chairman.



MR. HICKEY: For the first couple of years - It took us a couple of years to identify exactly where we wanted to go and the things we should be going out to develop. My hon. friend is well aware of the task force -

MR. NEARY: Planning and priorities.

MR. HICKEY: Not necessarily planning and priorities. Planning and priorities was just one part of the major thrust to identify just where we were, what we should do and how we should do it.

My Department, Mr. Chairman, has not been idle in this time. We have developed now what we call a strategy for the development of the industry, - this book here - which will tell us very quickly and very simply what the potential is.

MR. NEARY: Who put it together?

MR. HICKEY: Our own people with the help of a consultant from Nova Scotia for a very short period of time and for a very small amount of money.

A gentleman - I forget his name. It might be here - Development Planning Associates Limited - prepared by the Newfoundland and Labrador Department of Tourism by the Tourism Work Group and the Development Planning Associates Limited. Those are the people from Nova Scotia. Those are people, Mr. Chairman, and this one particular gentleman is a former Deputy Minister of Tourism and one who has been very successful in putting together programmes for financing through the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, a gentleman who is well acquainted with the tourist industry in the Atlantic region and one who has done extensive work apart from being Deputy Minister within the Atlantic region. And in this strategy for development, Mr. Chairman,

MR. HICKEY: it is clearly stated what we should do in the next five years and how we should go about doing it. And of course one of the first issues, one of the first areas of concern, and it certainly did not come as any surprise to us because we had identified it ourselves for the longest time, and that is the acute shortage of accommodations in the Province.

MR. SIMMONS: Was that the study done by -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) shortage of moose.

MR. HICKEY: Acute shortage of moose.

Well, Mr. Chairman, I prefer to give a higher priority at the moment to accommodating people and then we will get to the moose.

MR. SIMMONS: Just like you accommodate people.

Was that study done by the Toronto group.

MR. HICKEY: No. No. No. No. It is done by a gentleman who heads up a firm from Nova Scotia.

MR. NEARY: Can we not accommodate the number of tourists coming in here now?

MR. HICKEY: No.

MR. NEARY: We cannot accommodate them?

MR. HICKEY: Not in the peak seasons. The other thing, Mr. Chairman, we cannot go out and promote the Province like we want to at this point in time, because of the accommodation situation. We are not hard selling the Province by any stretch of the imagination.

MR. NEARY: No, your deputy told us that the other day. I have it right here. Look.

MR. HICKEY: Yes. He is absolutely right when he said that.

MR. NEARY: The Province does not have facilities to handle a large influx of visitors.

MR. HICKEY: That is right. That gets me to a matter that my hon. friend mentioned the other day about advertising for the Summer Games and his question arose out of an editorial done by the

MR. HICKEY: Telegram. You know, Mr. Chairman, it is hard to win in this business because you are damned if you do and you are damned if you do not. If I went out as Minister of Tourism and put on a great splash, advertising the Canada Summer Games, and the people flocked in here and they had nowhere to go, the Telegram editor, who is so good at those editorials, would go up and down my back just like nothing else.

MR. NEARY: Is that why the Summer Games was not included in the advertising programme?

MR. HICKEY: The Summer Games, it was deliberate. I must confess, and I am sorry, I told the hon. gentleman the other day I was not sure, I thought I had been involved in that decision, but I did not want to say something and not be absolutely sure about it; but I was involved in the decision - it was based on discussion with my staff - and it was my own decision and I take full blame, if that is what the Telegram wants to call it, full responsibility for not including an ad in the advertisements that we pay for in various parts of the marketplace.

MR. NEARY: So it was not an oversight, it was deliberate.

MR. HICKEY: It was deliberate. It was the only and the best way to go.

MR. SIMMONS: Go on! Go on!

MR. NEARY: Now you will get another editorial.

MR. HICKEY: That is all right. Let them come, Mr. Chairman. I am not going to hide away from the facts. The facts are as I stated them, and I will defend that, Mr. Chairman, simply by saying that before we took that decision the Canada Summer Games people had acquainted us with what they planned to do. They had planned an advertising campaign themselves, and hon. gentlemen opposite must remember that this was not a month or two months ago, this was early last Fall, September month, maybe, or certainly if not September early October, early last Fall when we were discussing

MR. HICKEY: the advertising programme for the coming year. And the decision was taken based on what we saw from the Canada Summer Games Committee and knowing that they would be mounting a campaign themselves, plus the fact, Mr. Chairman, the criticism by the Telegram dealt with advertisements that we placed in various magazines and those advertisements, Mr. Chairman, I am sure hon. members have seen them from time to time, deal with projecting a given image of the whole Province. There is no way that those ads will zero in on any given event.

MR. HICKEY: One of the criticisms of that editorial was drawing a comparison between - because of the fact that I did not, or my department did not advertise the Summer Games in our advertising, while I was taking the Canadian Government Office of Tourism to task some weeks ago for excluding mention of the Canada Summer Games in their weekend flyer.

Now, Mr. Chairman,

MR. NEARY: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, certainly.

MR. NEARY: Is the minister aware that his colleague, although the minister himself admits that he did not do any advertising on the Summer Games, but is the minister aware that his colleague, the Minister of Education, placed an ad in a magazine on the mainland titled "A Message from the Minister of Education" and invited Maritimers to visit St. John's for the Summer Games? Is this not a contradiction of what the minister is saying?

MR. HICKEY: No, Mr. Chairman, No, certainly not contradictory. You know, the fact that one branch of government or one department of government places an ad or supports any given event does not mean that every minister must follow suite. I mean, after all if we are all going to do it where are we going to put the people? All I am saying is that taking into account government's participation in organizing the Canada Summer Games, taking into account that we were going to assist in every way possible the Canada Summer Games committee, being aware of the fact that the Canada Summer Games committee were themselves going to mount an advertising campaign, my staff and I felt that that was sufficient, that that was enough and it is bad enough for -

MR. NEARY: You should have told the Minister of Education.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, no. Not necessarily. It is one thing for the Minister of Education, Mr Chairman, to promote the Summer Games in



MR HICKEY: any given part of the marketplace that we draw tourists from. If the Minister of Education places an ad that is one thing, or if another department places an ad that is one thing; but it is an entirely different story when an ad is placed by the Minister of Tourism or the Department of Tourism who has direct responsibility for tourists and visitors to this Province. For us to go out and play up and pay for ads supporting and promoting the Canada Summer Games only to find that 100 or 500 people coming here for that event could not find accommodations, who would be the first one to be criticized? Who would be the first one they would want to talk to? They came because of looking at their ads, the Department of Tourism's ad or the Minister of Tourism's ad. Why, Mr. Chairman, that would be ludicrous, it would be so stupid for us to involve ourselves in that way. And we took the position - which, as I said, I defend; I defend to this moment - we took the position that sufficient advertising would be done, was in the process of being done and was planned to be done by other areas for the Canada Summer Games knowing full well that we would co-operate and assist in any and every way possible except going out and promoting it as a special event in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Another question to the minister, if the minister does not mind.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please! The hon minister's time has elapsed.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, the minister will have his opportunities, I am sure. Although I must say what the minister is having to say is rather -

MR. SIMMONS: You do not mind? The member for St. John's Centre does not mind?

MR. MURPHY: I wonder who the hon. member is listening to?

MR. SIMMONS: Oh listening to the hon. member -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible) some expert -

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, I have been here listening, listening, you know, taking a leaf out of the member's book from St. John's Center.

MR. MURPHY: Nice. Welcome back.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Sir. I have been here but the minister and I do not have any direct line of vision.

MR. MURPHY: That is the back of that chair. I am so short I cannot see -

MR. SIMMONS: No, I did not say that. The minister said that. Mr. Chairman, it is - sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) - direct line of sight.

MR. SIMMONS: Direct line of vision, I say, direct line of vision. Mr. Chairman, I listened with interest to what the minister had to say. Some of it, Mr. Chairman, - as soon as we get some order around here! - some of it was fairly astounding, I will come to that in a moment, but first of all, just by way of introduction, I am not sure what he was saying to us on industrial development. I am not sure whether I agree with him or not because I did not get the general drift of what the minister was saying. But I do not believe, even in the interest of making a point about Tourism or about the Fisheries or whatever, I do not believe

Mr. Simmons.

we should get on this kick about Newfoundland cannot handle industrial development. I am sick and tired of hearing that argument and at some point, in the proper place, I would like to respond to it more fully. I believe that there are explanations for Come By Chance, and there are explanations for Stephenville, and some of them have been given in this House. But the explanations do not include the one that somehow we are a bunch of weak-kneed sisters, are a group of people that cannot hack it when it comes to real jobs and that kind of thing. That has nothing to do with the issue at all, and I cannot think of a better place in North America for an oil refinery than Come By Chance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: It is on the way between the source of the raw material and the market place in New England -

MR. MURPHY: : Pick out the truth.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes. I say given the other circumstances, but just to say that because it is Newfoundland, therefore it is unsuitable a place for that kind of thing, then I do not buy it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: No, I preambled by saying I was not sure what the minister was saying. But I can support him when he talks about a place in the sun for tourism, but I cannot do it if part of his argument is that we must forget oil refineries and forget linerboard and that kind of thing.

MR. HICKEY: I did not mean that.

MR. SIMMONS: All right. I am glad that he did not mean that, because I hear a lot of people who mean that. I hear a lot of people who are espousing the new gospel that we got to be perpetual hewers of wood and drawers of water. I do not buy that. I do not buy it at all. We have got to find what we are best at, but it is not all necessarily in the fishery, as important a future as the future has.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me say that I share the minister's view when he links the fishery and tourism together in terms of their respective futures, their potential futures. I am not at all convinced

Mr. Simmons.

yet that we are really going anywhere with either the fishery or with tourism. If I were to deal with both tonight, I would have to say that the fishery appears to be going a little bit farther than tourism does. The fishery has had a couple of nice things happen in its favour recently, including the declaration of its 200 mile limit and the events surrounding that. And we now have a fisheries minister who at least indicates by his great flurry of activity that he wants to do some things. And in that respect the fishery shows some promise. Now all we need from this government is a policy on the fishery. If this government will once and for all indicate to us where it is going on the fishery - we know that four years ago it was going to spend \$40 million on trawlers, and that is now \$35 million on longliners. And I predict next year it will be \$30 million on punts or dories or something, but outside of that there is no distinct pattern as to where this government is going on the fishery.

And, Mr. Chairman, there is not any distinct forward-looking pattern in terms of tourism. There is a pattern which is emerging when it comes to tourism. Unfortunately, it is not a very positive pattern, not a very positive one at all. Indeed, the pattern in tourism - and let us reflect on the numbers of times that tourism hits the press, the numbers of times when the people of this Province are even aware of our tourist potential or subjects relating to tourism. They are hardly ever made aware of our tourist potential. But once in awhile you hear from the Minister of Tourism. He is either talking about moose licences or increases in park fees. And just reflect, I invite members of this House to reflect on what they have heard on this general subject in the past year or so. That is not to say that the Minister of Tourism must be on the radio every other day singing the praises of his particular trade. But I believe there is a need, a need that has not been filled at all, the need to attract people, the people of this Province, towards the possibilities of the tourist industry. And we have never yet, as a group of Newfoundlanders, we have never yet recognized the potential which is in tourism. It took us a long while to recognize

Mr. Simmons.

the potential which is in the fishery. It took a long time. Indeed, I found it quite interesting during the private members' debate that we were hearing some new things said about the fishery. They were not new ideas. They were said - they were thought and known for generations in this Province, but they were never admitted to. And as the Minister of Fisheries has said publicly, the fishery was the thing to shy away from, was the thing to threaten on your son if he did not do well. We changed the attitude in this Province about the fishery. We have not changed the attitude about tourism. There



MR. SIMMONS: just is no attitude really about tourism. It is something that in the public mind exists about six weeks a year when all the trailers and cars with foreign or mainland licence plates stream through your community, and then you forget about it until next year. Now that is not tourism. That is not even the beginning of tourism. But until we as a group of people, and we must look for some leadership here from the government, until we as a group of people recognize that the tourist industry, tourism, is one of our most promising resources - I link them as one of the two most promising resources that are completely underdeveloped, the fishery and tourism. Mr. Chairman, since we are on the subject of tourism tonight I will try to confine my remarks to it, because I feel very strongly that what we have to do first is orient our thinking as a people towards the potential which tourism has. And tourism has many prongs, many aspects to it. We tend to think of it as having a short season and we concentrate all our guns, all our ammunition, all our emphasis on that particular short season. That, of course, is the wrong way to go about it just in terms of logistics, because the short season we concentrate on is the very time of the year when we do not particularly need any more people - not that we do not need them, but we cannot handle them physically - we cannot handle them on the Gulf, we cannot handle them in terms of accommodations here within the Province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, our would-be spokesman on tourism is temporarily absent from the House - he was the member for Ferryland (Mr. O'Brien) - and we have no spokesman. We did not bother to do any shadow Cabinet shuffle for the simple reason that our brother will soon be back with us and we will just allow him to continue his excellent job at shadowing the Department of Tourism.

MR. PECKFORD: It will knock down your whole idea of there having to be some priority given to tourism.

MR. SIMMONS: But in the meantime - no, it does not really! It does not really at all! The member for Green Bay is in his usual form. He comments on the first half of the statement before he hears the rest of it. He is always premature in most of his judgements and therefore equally wrong.

MR. PECKFORD: That is why I challenged you three or four years ago at Green Bay prematurely.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Chairman, the member has never, unless he has done it right now, ever challenged me to go back to Green Bay. The only relationship he and I had in that respect, Mr. Chairman, was that when he wanted to seek the nomination, I was in a position to give him leave of absence without even consulting the board. I got rapped over the knuckles by the board for doing it without consulting the board, but I did it anyway. Now that is right. But I did it anyway. I did it gladly because I wanted -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - to see him in politics and I am very glad he is in.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I am going to ask the hon. member to restrict his remarks to the sub-head under discussion.

MR. SIMMONS: Now, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. PECKFORD: - Come back, come back home.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Seriously, Mr. Chairman, discussing the sojourn of the member for Green Bay in politics is strictly a discussion of a tourist, strictly a discussion of tourism -

MR. PECKFORD: Come back home.

MR. SIMMONS: - a tourist in politics, Mr. Chairman. Come back home! I will be back home! The Premier has already asked me to go in Humber West. I can only go so many places. I would love to run against the member for Green Bay - I would love it!

MR. PECKFORD: I wish you would. I will resign tomorrow.

MR. SIMMONS: You will resign tomorrow? Okay, that is a deal. Will you explain it to the Premier -

MR. PECKFORD: Yes, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - why I cannot go to Humber West?

MR. PECKFORD: No problem.

MR. SIMMONS: All right - another deal.

Now let me tell him the other half of that

MR. SIMMONS: statement, Mr. Chairman.

MR. PECKFORD: We can have two by-elections now, you know.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: We are going to have three anyway, we already know that, so perhaps we will need four.

DR. FARRELL: Would the hon. member permit a question?  
Or a point, sorry!

MR. SIMMONS: Oh, of course.

DR. FARRELL: During our remarks last week tourism was rated very important. I agree with the member from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) in his remarks, and to me it is most important what he is saying. Also it is most important what my good friend from Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) is saying. Most particularly on tourism I would like to hear the member from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir because tourism to me in this Province is vital. I have stated that I was born in another country, and that I am an adopted (thank God!) Newfoundlander. One of the biggest assets Newfoundland could have is tourism, which we do not yet have developed in this Province. I repeated it last week and I am glad he is talking on this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS: I thank the member for Humber East -

DR. FARRELL: No, no, I am Humber West.

MR. SIMMONS: I distinctly said Humber West earlier, not Humber East. I would not dare to run against the member from Humber East (Dr. Farrell). I would not dare!

Mr. Chairman, finally to the member from Green Bay of course,

MR. SIMMONS: Our having no particular spokesman on Tourism does not at all say that we are not very concerned about Tourism. Indeed we have seventeen or eighteen - what we have to settle, Mr. Chairman, over here, we all have so many things to say on this subject, it is who should go first and talk about the subject. And a number of my colleagues have some ideas, some suggestions, some questions to put on the subject. And I hope the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) in particular will be listening to what we have to say.

Mr. Chairman, I am not at all as involved in Tourism as I would like to be, I am not at all as knowledgeable about it as I would like to be. I have had in private life some association with the campground business over the years and my observation there, and I am going to say it particularly so that the minister can respond to it, my observation there is that the government, or in particular the Department of Tourism, is on a deliberate attempt - I say this with all I can muster in terms of conviction; the department, and I do not believe it is a political decision, I do not believe the government has ever decided because it is not an item of that much magnitude, I am not accusing politicians - but somewhere the Department of Tourism, it seems to me, is on a deliberate attempt to drive every private campground operator out of business.

Now, Mr. Chairman, just over this weekend, to use a small example, I happened to drop in on some friends who operate the reception booth at one of the provincial parks in Central Newfoundland, a couple of friends there from the Bishop's Falls - Botwood area. And I was astounded, I went inside, it was raining so I went inside and I sat down and I saw



MR. SIMMONS: all the brochures and I said, "You do not have," calling one of the operators by name, well, Bill Maxwell, the private man on the West Coast, "You do not have Bill's brochure, I see. You do not have the one from the South Brook Park, the KOA, you could not have the one from Kona Beach because there is none out," but I was commenting on these two. He said, "Oh no. we are not allowed to carry the private ones." I said, "Well, that is wrong," I said, "because I know that they have been delivered from a particular facility before.

MR. HICKEY: What are you talking about?

MR. SIMMONS: Hold on now! Hold on! I am telling you as I have it. And the individual said to me as late as Saturday afternoon, "Oh, it is so," he said, "I know the brochures have been here from various establishments but as soon as our supervisor arrives he insists they be taken down." And I said, "Did that happen just once? I want to get this straight." "Oh no," he said, "we just do not have them there anymore, but it has happened several times."

MR. HICKEY: I would like to know the name of the park.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, I will let the minister know the park concerned and the names of the two individuals I talked to. Okay? But that is only just an example. I come to larger examples that are brought to the minister's attention and to his deputy's attention many times. This nonsense where in every other Province you go - and we are thinking of the tourists now from out of the Province - in every other Province you go if you are looking for information on camping you will get a brochure called Campgrounds in Ontario, or Camping in Maine, something of that nature, every Province and jurisdiction in North America, as far as I know, except one, this one here.

Here you get an item called Provincial Parks, and you get another item called Where To Stay, which is basically hotels and motels, and over on page fifty-two are the private



MR. SIMMONS: operators. And I have said that to the minister and to his department for four years that that ought to be changed, and it has never been changed.

There are other forms of discrimination, where the provincial parks are allowed to say, 'Provincial park one mile,' but not the private ones. That kind of thing. All kinds of little things that in general result in the following: The man who started the campground, the Blue Haven Campground near Terra Nova National Park, had to give it up because he could not make a go of it. The man who has started the one - a gentleman from Springdale - who started the one down just off in the Birchy area, he is still struggling along but he tells me he cannot make a go of it. Bill Maxwell tells me that the only reason he can make a go of it is because he has also year-round accommodation facilities, the cabins and so on and so forth. The people at KOA tell me it is a losing business, if it was not for having gotten the property for a reasonable price -

AN HON. MEMBER: For nothing.

MR. SIMMONS: - for a song, I was going to say -

MR. NEARY: For which Newfoundland and Labrador Corporation put up the money.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right. If it was not for that kind of thing they could not make it. And I am not beating my gums on a personal thing here because I happen to be associated with the one that is going to make it for another reason altogether, unless there is an even more deliberate attempt to run us out of business. But barring that we will make it for other reasons that I will tell the minister. But I can just speak for this one because I am aware and I have talked to all the other operators. The man in Trinity has only got a half dozen anyway. The man out here, Kelland's, is in an area where he can capitalize on his nearness to a large urban market and people coming in who go to university in the Summer and that kind of thing. But generally there is a need in this Province for about twenty-five to thirty fully serviced

Mr. Simmons.

campgrounds, for example -

MR. HICKEY: More than that.

MR. SIMMONS: - or more than that.

And the fact is that the three or the four full-fledged ones that we have cannot survive and are changing hands every year.

DR. FARRELL: Why?

MR. SIMMONS: And somebody should ask the question, as the member for Humber East (Dr. Farrell) has just asked, "Why?" And the way is, the dollars are not in it, and you are not going to attract people into that kind of business if, one, there is no encouragement from the government, and worse still if there is the impression - and I gave the impression just now, and I hope the minister - I know he will say I am wrong, and I hope he honestly believes I am wrong - the impression that there is a deliberate attempt to run those guys out of business. I hope that is wrong. But I say to him that even if it is dead wrong, the impression is there, the little things. I went to the department as much as six years ago and rhymed off a list of items that could be done, that would not cost the government one cent, not one red cent; six or seven items of encouragement that would mean, for example, in the member for Green Bay's district alone - I discussed it with him two or three years ago, and I only use the one that I am familiar with as an example - in that particular one, there could be employment from the 15th. May to the 15th. September, a four month period, there could be twenty-five to twenty-seven people employed there. At the moment, or during the Summer there will be about twenty for a month and then there will be six or seven and down to three or four. There are jobs involved in this tourist industry if somebody in Tourism would begin to take it seriously.

DR. FARRELL: May I?

MR. SIMMONS: Sure.

DR. FARRELL: Is it true, and I hope it is true, that two companies which are on the West Coast, like Bill Maxwell's - you mentioned the name, so I repeat it - and KOA, cannot advertise through the tourist bureaus, or did I gather the wrong impression?

MR. SIMMONS: No, I did not say tourist bureaus.

DR. FARRELL: No, I am sorry -

MR. SIMMONS: I understand these operators have no difficulty having their literature distributed through tourist information centres.

DR. FARRELL: Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: I am told by two employees of the Provincial Park Service that they are under instruction not to hold on to or not to distribute, not to have on display, brochures from private establishments.

DR. FARRELL: That is unbelievable.

MR. SIMMONS: And I was told that as recently -

DR. FARRELL: I will find out from the minister when -

MR. SIMMONS: - I was told that as recently as Saturday afternoon, but that is only -

DR. FARRELL: I am sorry -

MR. SIMMONS: No, no!

DR. FARRELL: I am sorry for interrupting.

MR. SIMMONS: I am glad the minister has responded, because it indicates how frustrating a job has been for the KOA guys and for the Bill Maxwells and for the others who were in that particular business. And I could, except it is perhaps not the time to do it, but I could say it to the minister again privately, there are a half dozen things, just as simple a thing as allowing those fellows to put up a sign saying, Park One Mile, that simple. Because the trailer operator who is towing a big rig behind him just cannot slam on his breaks when he sees KOA or Bill Maxwell's place. He has got to have some notice. And in the absence of that what he does is that he comes into the Province at Port aux Basques, he picks up two brochures, one saving Provincial Parks and the other saving, where to stay. He looks at Where to Stay and he sees it is hotels so he throws it down. He takes Provincial Parks and after he stops at Cheeseman or the first one coming East he gets used to the little brown shield - the park name is identified; a little brown shield with Cheeseman Provincial Park - and he says, "Ah, ha!

Mr. Simmons.

All I got to look for is a brown shield," and he drives from Port aux Basques to St. John's looking for brown shields. One of the operators has even told me that someone said to him, "Well, why did you not have your brown shield up?" The out-of provinces tourists are identifying with that and that only. And as a result the fellows invest a fair amount of money in this particular aspect of the tourist trade, but just for want of some co-operation in terms of putting all the camping information in one booklet, in terms of being allowed to put up a few signs, in terms of the distribution of brochures, which I mentioned just now, just in terms of that alone, he is getting a raw deal and for no particular reason, no particular reason at all. Now there is a possibility within that aspect of the business to make it more comfortable for the tourist who does not particularly want to -rough -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Just to finish my sentence, if I may.

- who does not particularly want to rough it, you know, with outhouses and that kind of thing. There is the capability with no government money at all to have it made more comfortable for the tourists, with just a few concessions, a few areas of co-operation by government.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I do not



MR. NEARY: know really, Sir, where to begin with the hon. gentleman so I will begin where the hon. gentleman began.

MR. HICKEY: You can begin by sitting down and letting me finish what I started.

MR. NEARY: No, the hon. gentleman will have - we have three hours on the hon. gentleman's estimates and I could take the whole three hours myself. But, Mr. Chairman, let us get back where the hon. gentleman began his few introductory remarks talking about the problems that we have with the tourist industry in this Province.

DR. FARRELL: The hon. gentleman did alright.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, Sir, did all wrong in my opinion.

DR. FARRELL: What?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman told us right from the beginning that this Province was not involved in a hard-sell campaign in Tourism and I believe the hon. gentleman. But what would you call \$400,000? Would you call it a soft-sell, a medium sell?

AN HON MEMBER: Peanuts.

MR. NEARY: It is peanuts. Well, Sir, it is \$400,000 and if we are not involved in a hard-sell campaign then what is it? Is it a soft sell? It is \$400,000 of the taxpayers money and then the minister tells us, has the nerve to tell us that the minister deliberately avoided basing this year's advertising around the Summer Games. And while the minister is telling us that, his government have given the Summer Games, the Canada Summer Games organization grants so that they can go out and advertise the Canada Summer Games. So are they doing right or wrong by encouraging people to come into this Province?

MR. HICKEY: Obviously they are going to promote it.

MR. NEARY: They are going to promote it and try and get people to come to Newfoundland. Are they doing right or wrong?

MR. HICKEY: They are going right, I suppose.



MR. NEARY: They are going right. And yet the hon. minister says no, if he did it he would be doing wrong.

MR. HICKEY: I mean, how much are we going to do?

MR. NEARY: And the Minister of Education -

MR. HICKEY: Do you want everyone to do it? Do you want to block the place off and have them out on the grass?

MR. FLIGHT: Provide a better programme one way or another.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the minister has to make up his mind.

MR. HICKEY: I have made it up long ago.

MR. NEARY: Will there be enough people just drift in on their own?

MR. HICKEY: I told you.

MR. NEARY: No. The minister did not tell us anything, Sir. The minister if anything has contradicted himself.

MR. HICKEY: I said it is different for them to do it -

MR. NEARY: Oh it is different for them to do it. What about the Minister of Education publicizing his - putting his little ad, his little message -

MR. HICKEY: The Minister of Education is not responsible for accomodation.

MR. NEARY: Putting his little message in the Atlantic Advocate which circulates throughout the Atlantic Provinces. The ad was titled "A message from the Minister of Education" and invited Maritimers to visit St. John's for the Summer Games. Listen to this, Mr. Chairman, will the Minister of Tourism just listen to this, you talk about an insult to the intelligence of the people of this Province! Mr. Chairman, if I could get the minister's attention I would like to -

SOME HON MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: We can deal with Kona Beach later on, Sir, but I just want to deal now, Sir, with Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: We are not talking about Kona Beach, we are talking about the industry.

MR. NEARY: "The ad was placed by the department " - meaning the Department of Education - to let the people in the Maritimes know there is a Department of Education in Newfoundland," said the minister." Just imagine! Mr. Chairman, let me read that again. In case hon. gentleman, including my hon. colleague, the "Come-from-Away minister". "The ad was placed by the Department of Education to let people in the Maritimes know there is a Department of Education in Newfoundland," said the minister Wallace House."

MR. HICKEY: Alright! Take it up with the Minister of Education.

MR. NEARY: Well, my hon. friend should be concerned about that kind of publicity that Newfoundland is getting outside of this Province, my hon. friend.

MR. ROWE: It would be okay if you said it was the Minister of Education.

MR. HODDER: What would the Minister of Education do?

MR. NEARY: "And he noted that aside from the occasional ads in the Newfoundland Quarterly his department is not involved in promotional efforts. The Department of Fisheries does very little in the way of promotional advertising although it does participate in a multi-national effort to promote fish consumption." Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to draw a couple of other things to the hon. gentleman's attention about their advertising campaign and this article, Sir, is a very, very interesting article which appeared in the Evening Telegram of May 21st. "National and even international magazines seem well stocked with promotional advertising sponsored by the provincial government lately, most of it coming from the Department of Tourism." "Well stocked" they said, and the minister tells us there is no hard-sell campaign, only a soft-sell, only \$400,000. "The department is the biggest advertiser in government and has an estimated budget of a half million dollars for professional purposes alone."

May 24, 1977

Tape 3181 (Night)

AH-4

MR. NEARY:

Deputy Minister Frank Manuel explained that despite the high expenditure the department is not trying to hard-sell tourism because the Province does not have the facilities to handle a large influx of visitors.

MR. NEARY: The greatest emphasis is placed in the print media, and \$350,000 was spent last year in a magazine advertising campaign handled by McConnell Advertising of Toronto. The ads were placed in over a dozen magazines ranging from The New Yorker to Readers' Digest which circulate throughout the market area of Ontario and Eastern Seaboard. The department has also taken out a series of full page colour ads in Maclean's Magazine, distributed across Canada. Because of the great expense of successfully advertising in the American market, Newfoundland participates in a marketing co-op with the other Atlantic Provinces, Air Canada and Eastern Provincial Airways, he said. 'The programme promoted the Atlantic region and in the three years of its operation has succeeded in making the term Atlantic Canada well known,' said Mr. Manuel. The department also makes heavy use of brochures and over one million pieces of tourist literature were mailed out last year. The brochures are handled by NACOM Limited, a firm owned by George McLean."

MR. HICKEY: He does not -

MR. NEARY: "A firm owned by George McLean." Sir, this is what the article says and the minister can have his opportunity to get up and deny it.

MR. HICKEY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: That is an incorrect statement. My deputy minister ~~never made it.~~ It is a misquote, and if the hon. gentleman does not get too uptight on that because a lot of the things he reads are not true from time to time.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, that is not a point of order. The hon. gentleman will have to admit that I can read, and that is more than I can say for the hon. gentleman.

MR. HICKEY: A point of information.



MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, here is what it -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The point of order was raised here.

MR. HICKEY: I ask the hon. gentleman to -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Unfortunately I did not hear the point of order. Probably it is a difference of opinion between the two hon. members. I will ask the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to continue.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the article goes on in The Evening Telegram, "The department also makes heavy use of brochures and over one million pieces of tourist literature were mailed out last year. The brochures are handled by NACOM Limited, a firm owned by George McLean who handled the 1972 PC election campaign," A terrific coincidence, Sir! What a coincidence!

MR. HICKEY: And some unusual to have The Telegram say that!

MR. NEARY: "Also," said Mr. Manuel, "this is Mr. Manuel now, the Deputy Minister, "Also," said Mr. Manuel, 'a new promotional film on Newfoundland, part of the Hospitality Home Programme is currently being produced by the Canadian Office of Tourist Affairs.' He explained that his department will not be involved in the advertising for the 1977 Summer Games to be held in St. John's. However, a national promotional campaign is being carried out by the St. John's Summer Games Committee, The Department of Industrial Development also engages in promotional advertising.

"We do not advertise in national magazines, mostly in business publications to project some sort of Newfoundland presence in the minds of people who make investment decisions," explained the Deputy Minister, Alexander Roche."

Now, Sir, I am not going to get into an argument with the minister whether or not \$400,000 represents a hard-sell or a soft-sell. In my opinion, Sir, it is a substantial outlay by this Province to encourage tourists to come to



MR. NEARY: Newfoundland. And yet the minister tells us, on the other hand, that we do not have the accommodations or the facilities in this Province to look after the number of tourists that we should have coming into Newfoundland and Labrador.

Well, that may be, Sir. I am not going to argue about that. But I am going to say this to the minister, that Newfoundland does have a major problem when it comes to the tourist industry and the major problem we have is not one that was touched on by the minister. The big problem we have, Sir, compared to the other provinces of Canada is that ninety mile stretch of water between Port aux Basques and North Sydney. That is the problem, Sir. It is a big problem and people come up in droves up to Nova Scotia and up to North Sydney and they turn around and they go back because the cost of coming across the Gulf is beyond their budget, and that is the gap that we are going to have to bridge, Sir, over the next five to ten years.

Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult indeed to develop a tourist industry in this Province just based on an industry that can only operate two or three months out of a year.

MR. HICKEY: Where is the road leading to Ireland?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, it is difficult, and I doubt very much, Sir, if it will happen that you can encourage the tourist industry, the

Mr. Neary.

motels, the hotels, the restaurants, that we need in this Province to be built just to operate two and three months out of a year.

MR. HICKEY: What highway do you take to England?

MR. NEARY: You take the Norma and Gladys, Sir. If you want to go -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - to Ireland or England or you want to go around the world, if you want a free all expense paid trip around the world, take the Norma and Gladys, and if you do not take the Norma and Gladys become an official in the minister's department, and you are guaranteed to get to Ireland and to get to Europe first-class on a jumbo jet to welcome the Norma and Gladys when she arrives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: No reference, Sir, to the Norma and Gladys, Sir, at all, when the hon. gentleman made his few introductory remarks.

MR. HICKEY: I did not even get a chance.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, today I congratulated the Minister of Mines and Energy. I had asked the minister three questions. The minister gave me 100 per cent co-operation. I got three answers. I asked the Minister of Tourism, back in March, three questions. The minister did not give me one answer. The minister is batting zero at this moment. And one of the questions involved the Norma and Gladys. I will read out the question, Sir, and the minister should give us the information - while we are on the minister's estimates. List the total cost of the voyage of the Norma and Gladys, and the amount of federal funding.

MR. HICKEY: Go easy now, because I want to get the question.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. Mr. Chairman, I can give the minister a copy of this. The minister already has it. The amount of federal funding and the amount of provincial funding; the cost of purchasing the Norma and Gladys originally and the cost of overhaul, refits and modifications to the vessel, Newfoundland dockyards, out of Province dockyards? List of ships stores, Newfoundland ports, foreign ports and provide us with a breakdown: Cost of transportation relieving crew. Cost of transportation of minister and officials of the department during the voyage. List ports visited by minister and officials: Names of officials

Mr. Neary.

authorized to travel. Cost of hotel accommodations in each port visited, entertainment, receptions, etc. in each port of call. Cost of advertising visit in each port of call. Cost of agent in each port of call. Cost of mementoes, etc. in each port of call. Cost of official receptions in each port of call and list each port separately. Cost of welcoming home extravaganza. Cost of printing and local public relations. Name of individual and firm and were public tenders called and if not why not. Cost of berthing the ship for the Winter months. Number of caretakers presently aboard or employed to look after this boat. Cost of insurance, if any, and name of company insuring the ship. Names of ministers and officials attending official banquets in ports of call. Cost of transportation to and from these events. Did anybody other than ministers and officials of the government attend these functions from this Province? If so, at whose expense did they attend? List names of public from Newfoundland who attended these receptions. Was it necessary at any time for the Canadian Foreign Embassies or External Affairs departments in any of these places visited to intervene on behalf of the ship or its crew? If so, provide a complete report of such incidents and disciplinary action taken, if any. Were there any costs involved by the provincial or federal government in dealing with these matters? List ports of call in Canada, United States, West Indies, Europe and Great Britain, pilotage and berthing fees in each port of call. Fuel costs in each port of call. Tugboat services and costs, if any. Fines paid on behalf of the crew or the ship, if any? Reason for fines? Total number of crew members since ship purchased. Total wages paid to crew members since ship purchased while the ship was in Newfoundland and the payroll costs outside of Newfoundland. All very interesting questions, Sir. Not a single reference, not an answer yet from the Minister of Tourism.

And I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the cost of that foolish extravaganza, that foolish nonsense, was up close to \$2 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A million and a half dollars I have been told. Between a million and a half and two million.

Mr. Neary.

Mr. Chairman, how better it would be for this Province, Sir, if that \$1 million or \$1.5 million or \$2 million, whatever it was, how better that could have been used if it were used to subsidize vehicles coming across the Gulf from North Sydney to Newfoundland, to encourage people to come into this Province.

MR. HICKEY: For one year .



MR. NEARY: Not for one year! I think it should be on a continuous basis. This year the minister is going to spend another \$300,000 trying to justify what the \$1.5 million or \$2 million was spent on last year on their foolish nonsense, when we had so many hungry children in this Province. The minister did not make a reference to it and I hope now, Sir, that I have listed the questions that the minister will provide us with the answer and if he does not I will come back to it again. And then, Sir, we want to know about these complimentary moose licences and caribou licences last year that were doled out right, left and centre by the Minister of Tourism, And one given to the Premier and they forgot to send him his tags. And the hon. the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Development and one or two other renegades in the administration, down in my district, down in LaPoile district, in LaPoile Bay, shooting moose and partridge right, left and centre and sending them back by Lundrigan's aircraft, a gentleman they would not touch with a barge pole when they were in Opposition and we were the government, and now they are buddy-buddy!

AN HON. MEMBER: Why do you not sit down and -

MR. NEARY: Sent back a load of moose and a load of caribou and a load of partridge and had it confiscated by the RCMP out at Paddys Pond. And then when the SOS was sent out they said "Oh no, the Premier does not need tags! He is like the President of the United States, Nixon, he is above the law." And I say the Premier of this Province is not above the law.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: And the Premier of this Province got caught with his moose without the tags on it the same as every other citizen of this Province and he should have been hauled into court the same as every other citizen.

MR. HICKEY: I cannot allow that statement to go. That is untrue. The hon. gentleman should withdraw it forthwith. The Premier of this Province did not break the law. He was not



MR. HICKEY: required to place tags on any carcass of moose, no more than anyone else, such as the Lieutenant-Governor is required to do or a VIP coming into this Province that is issued not a complimentary licence, there is no such animal, an authorization by me under the act which I am given the power to do. So withdraw it. Take it back.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw nothing. The Premier of this Province is not above the law. The Premier should have tagged his moose and if the Premier did not tag him, Sir, he should have shown a good example for the hunters of this Province, the gentlemen who have been picked up right, left and centre and dragged into court.

MR. HICKEY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Capt. Winsor): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman has cast - he has cast reflection on the character and the honesty of my colleague, the hon. the Premier. Does he realize what he has said, that the hon. the Premier has broken the law, willfully broken the law? I insist that he withdraw that. Your Honour, you should insist that he withdraw that. That is unfounded. There is no substantiation and when I take my place and explain this I will prove him wrong. Now why does he not take it back?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order, Sir. What I said was, Sir, that the Premier of this Province should have been charged the same as every other citizen.

MR. HICKEY: No way! No way!

MR. NEARY: And then the court would decide.

MR. HICKEY: No. No.

MR. NEARY: The court would decide whether the hon. gentleman was guilty or not guilty.

MR. HICKEY: No. There was no breach of any law.

MR. NEARY: He is not above the law, Sir.

MR. HICKEY: There was no breach of any law.

MR. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman. My colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) did not say that the Premier had broken the law.

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes he did.

MR. ROWE: He did not.

AN HON. MEMBER: He did so.

MR. ROWE: I am addressing myself to the Chair, Mr. Chairman. What my colleague said was this, is that the law should be the same for the Premier as any other citizen of this Province. That is exactly what he said. And that is the point that he is making. He did not say anything about the Premier breaking the law of the Province.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Capt. Winsor): First I must determine whether the hon. minister rose to a point of order or -

MR. HICKEY: Yes, I did.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Capt. Winsor): I see. Well I would take it the hon. member for LaPoile in making the statement either made it to present an argument or he must be sure of his facts, and I think it is a little wrong for one member to attack another member.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I hope the hon. gentleman now will learn to keep quiet.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is flying in the face of Your Honour's ruling.

MR. NEARY: Can I be heard in silence, Mr. Chairman?

MR. HICKEY: He is flying in the face of Your Honour's ruling.

MR. NEARY: Sit down and do not be making a fool of yourself.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Chairman, it is quite obvious there is an effort being made -

MR. NEARY: There is no point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Capt. Winsor); Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Can I carry on now, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN (CAPT. WINSOR): Yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I hope that this situation will be rectified, that there be no repeat performance this year of a law for the rich and a law for the poor

MR. NEARY: in this Province, and that anybody that goes moose hunting or caribou hunting-it does not make any difference; from the highest to the lowest-will have to tag their animal.

MR. HICKEY: Since when did you get your tongue? You sat there for about fifteen years with the former Premier.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon member's time has expired.

MR. NEARY: Unfortunately, Sir, I will have to come back to it again in another short while.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I have heard some garbage in my time. That should be piped into Robin Hood Bay. Are there two of us -

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister. I am sorry.

MR. HICKEY: Sorry, 'John'. your time is coming, You can go next.

MR. NOLAN: Your time is coming!

MR. HICKEY: Okay, alright. Have it whatever way you want to.

Mr. Chairman, you know, for the hon. member for LaPoile to get on with such nonsense when he knows full well that what - he does not believe what he is saying himself. He is trying to convince the House that the Premier of the Province broke the law. He is trying to say now, and he suggests to me to make sure that there is not a repeat performance next year. Make sure of what?

Mr. Chairman, the truth of the matter is that he covered complimentary licences. There were no complimentary licenses issued. The complimentary licences as such that were issued were issued by draw and by draw only. They were issued to people whose names were put in a hat for sending the results of their hunt, so many per region, so many regions in the Province, and some 114 - I believe 114 - and the names of these people, Mr Chairman, were tabled in this House. When I tabled those names more than a year ago I informed the House that it was too late to change the system that during the current year the same thing had taken place and that the Auditor General would again next year report the same situation. At the same time,



MR. HICKEY: Your Honour, I assured the House that that would be the last time that that would be done because the Auditor General found a number of things wrong with that system of reward.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise on a point of order, Sir. A few moments ago, Mr. Chairman, my colleague from Trinity South was looking for the citation in Reaumesne, Sir, in the rule of debate. The gentleman said a few minutes ago that I did not believe the statements that I had made myself. Well, the answer to that is that, Sir, I do believe the statements I have made myself. But it is unparliamentary, Sir, and Your Honour can find the reference on page 131, it is unparliamentary for the hon. gentleman to make such a statement. One of the things that is considered to be unparliamentary in this hon. House, Sir, is to make a statement about another hon. gentleman that he does not believe a statement he himself has made. And so I ask the hon. gentleman, Sir, to withdraw that statement and apologize to the hon. House.

MR. HICKEY: I apologize, Your Honour, profusely -

AN HON MEMBER: Wait now, just -

MR. HICKEY: I retract and I wish to apologize to the hon. gentleman -

MR. NEARY: And withdraw.

MR. HICKEY: What I said I take back, and I say that he is guilty of a terminological inexactitude.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member sat as a member of the cabinet with the former Premier for quite a number of years, while this same system that he now finds so unacceptable -

MR. NEARY: They used -

MR. HICKEY: Where was the hon. gentleman's tongue then?

MR. NEARY: They did not get caught without their tags in those days.



MR. HICKEY: Where was all his hot air then? Where was his enthusiasm then? Where was his backbone then? I suggest that it was unshackled. He did not have guts enough to stand up and say, "Premier, that is wrong." There should not be a law for the rich and a law for the poor. There should be one law"

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, a point of order!

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been raised.

MR. NEARY: If the hon. gentleman would just stop ranting and raving for a minute, Sir, the hon gentleman knows that you cannot say that another hon. gentleman 'does not have the guts.' That was ruled unparliamentary a number of -

MR. HICKEY: I never said that.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman does not know what he is saying. That was ruled unparliamentary, Sir, several days ago. All it does is lower the debate in this hon. House, as the gentleman has so often done in the past. And before the hon. gentleman loses his cool altogether, Sir, and makes a complete fool of himself, a jackass of himself, I ask Your Honour to rule him out of order and ask the gentleman to withdraw and apologize to the house again.

MR. HICKEY: I apologize.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please! To the point of order.

MR. NOLAN: To the point of order, Mr. Chairman. It was ruled quite specifically within the last ten days in this House that you were not permitted to make reference to who has guts and who has no guts and so on. I mean,

MR. NOLAN: this is not a fish plant, but -

MR. HICKEY: Sure sounds like it; smells like it too from time to time.

MR. NOLAN: Yes, I know, but the environment will improve the moment the hon. member leaves. But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, it has been ruled out of order previously.

MR. HICKEY: What are you using, 'John' - 'Three Flowers'?

MR. NOLAN: The environment will improve when the hon. member leaves.

MR. HICKEY: Is that parliamentary?

MR. NOLAN: Why? What is not parliamentary?

MR. HICKEY: What you just said.

MR. NOLAN: What did I say?

MR. HICKEY: 'The environment will improve when the hon. member leaves.' What are we - playing on words?

MR. NOLAN: Anyway, the minister is shouting and bawling. I mean, the gentleman is supposed to rise and address the Chair - even he knows that. So, Mr. Chairman, the usage of the word referred to is not acceptable. It has been ruled out of order before. Now can we not just get it cleaned away once and for all?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, again I apologize most profusely. The hon. gentleman has all the guts in the world. He had no intestinal fortitude at the time to get up to the Premier of the day and say, 'Premier, you are wrong. You are condoning a law for the rich and a law for the poor.' And what about all those little guys that he is now wailing and moaning and groaning about every day? The great defender of the little man's rights!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman -

MR. HICKEY: Ah, you cannot take it!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Sit down and listen.

MR. NEARY: There is a point of order before the Chair, Your Honour, and if the hon. gentleman is ignorant of the rules of the House I am sure your Honour knows the rules and would like to make a ruling at this point in time.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, my good God! I am not sure I can hack it.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

It is the Chair's opinion that perhaps

both hon. gentlemen were using a little unparliamentary terms. I would ask the hon. minister - to use the term 'no guts' is unparliamentary - if he would withdraw and carry on please.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Chairman, Your Honour must not have heard me. I withdrew without qualifications the fact that I said the hon. gentleman had no guts. I withdrew it. The fact that I later referred to him as not having had the intestinal fortitude to stand up at that time and fight against the Premier of the day for allowing this great injustice which is still spreading the land, because somebody dare issue under the Wildlife Act, not a complimentary licence, Your Honour - a simple letter of authority to the Premier of this Province, to the Lieutenant-Governor of this Province and other V.I.P.s that visit this Province, authorization to go out and take a caribou or a moose. Imagine!

MR. NEARY:

Do you count the Premier as a visitor?

MR. HICKEY:

Imagine! I do not count - I do not have to count him as a visitor.

MR. NEARY:

Well, he is a stranger to the public, we know that, but we did not think he was a visitor to the Province.

MR. HICKEY:

Let the hon. gentleman now have the intestinal fortitude when the time comes to tell the Premier that when he is sitting in his seat.

MR. NEARY:

He is outside listening.

MR. HICKEY:

Let us not talk about an hon. member when he is not here.

MR. FLIGHT:

Would the hon. minister accept a question - one short question? Why, if everything was as the minister says, that in the first day after the episode two different high-ranking officials in his department had conflicting stories as to how the thing was legalized?

MR. NEARY:

They did not have a chance to get together to get their stories straight.

MR. HICKEY:

There was no such thing as conflicting stories. There was only one statement made by my officials. Again my

MR. HICKEY: hon. friend is falling into the trap of what he read. It is like what the gentleman was quoting here this evening in The Evening Telegram - the article. The gentleman who called my deputy minister called my deputy minister for a purpose, to talk about general things and then sneak in a question about George McLean.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: If the gentleman - it is like I told my deputy like I told one reporter - if he wanted to ask me questions about George McLean come to the point. Do not beat around the bush, do not be cowardly about it and try to sneak one in in the middle of a dozen other questions. What nonsense!

So my hon. friend from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) is believing maybe what he read. That is not always what was said, because the people who write the articles in the newspaper are not infallible either. They are human beings and they are subject to errors.

MR. NEARY: Are they out to get the hon. gentleman or what?

MR. HICKEY: What?

MR. NEARY: Are they out to get the hon. minister?

MR. HICKEY: I do not think they are out to get me.



Mr. Hickey.

I do not have any difficulty in getting along with them. I speak my mind to them and they to me. We get along fine. I do not consider that I have any enemies in the press. They have a job to do. They report things as they see it, and they report things as they hear it insofar as they are concerned. And the fact that they make a mistake, you know, surely I should not stand up here and say, Well, it is right. They are not going to fall out with me because I say that it was wrong. The gentleman did not say that. My deputy minister is sitting in the common room right now, and he brought this to my attention. He said that he made no such utterance.-

MR. NEARY: What about - ?

MR. HICKEY: - about the Geroge McLean and the brochures bit. Because it is not happening, Mr. Chairman. George McLean or Nacom has nothing to do with the disbursement of brochures on behalf of this Province, nothing whatsoever. They do not produce them, nothing. He has an office in Toronto wherein there are some stored maybe. He might pass them out as such. He does not produce those brochures.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman talks about \$400,000 in promoting the Province, and he calls that a lot of money, and it is a lot of money, Mr. Chairman, for advertising. I know that it is peanuts in the advertising world when you take into account the cost of advertising and how much it costs one to advertise in Maclean's Magazine or Time Magazine or People's Magazine or Saturday Night or any of those magazines. But my hon. friend over here who is so short-sighted, because he sat with a government that was so short-sighted. And my hon. friend from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) -

MR. NEARY: Do not live in the past.

MR. HICKEY: - knows all about this, too.

MR. NEARY: You are living in the past.

MR. HICKEY: So short-sighted, Mr. Chairman, that they did nothing with the tourist industry so they would not begin to know the cost of advertising or promoting this Province. My hon. friend for



MR. HICKEY.

LaPoile (Mr. Neary) thinks that \$400,000 is a great sum - eh? Well, has he any idea what they spend in Nova Scotia for advertising or New Brunswick?

MR. NEARY: Do they have the hard sell or the soft sell?

MR. HICKEY: In Nova Scotia \$400,000 is not a drop in the bucket in their advertising budget. It is only a drop in the bucket compared to what Nova Scotia spends.

MR. NEARY: Is that a hard sell ?

MR. HICKEY: Yet my hon. friend talks about, you know, \$400,000 being a lot of money.

MR. NEARY: Is that a hard sell or a soft sell they have in Nova Scotia?

MR. HICKEY: It is in between, because they have plenty of accommodations. They have enough of accommodations, at least, to be able to go out and promote much more vigorously than we can in this Province.

The hon. gentleman went on. He wanted to start talking about the Norma and Gladys.

MR. NEARY: Here we are. Now give us the information.

MR. HICKEY: And he says that I conveniently skipped over it.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, if there is anything I can be accused of, it is not skipping over the Norma and Gladys for, number one, I am not so naive as to think that I can skip over those two ladies.

MR. RIDEOUT: Did you go to England to meet her?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: The Norma and Gladys - I am not even going to attempt to convince my hon. friend from LaPoile about the Norma and Gladys.

MR. NEARY: Give us the cost.

MR. HICKEY: Just sit and listen now. We have had enough from your side for awhile. I would not even attempt to, for there is none so blind, Mr. Chairman, as those who will not see.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Now if the hon. gentleman wants to see something from the Norma and Gladys, let him look at CBC tomorrow night at 7:30 P.M., and let him look at a film, not done by this Province or any agent of this Province, but let him see a film done by the Government of Canada, the Department of External Affairs, the National Film Board, a half hour film on the Norma and Gladys and the Law of the Sea.

MR. NEARY: Is that paid commercial?

MR. HICKEY: No, it is not a paid commercial. They are delighted to get it, and it will be featured on CJON and it has been featured all around the world, at various missions around the world, at no cost to this Province except for the few dollars that we spent in the beginning.

MR. NEARY: Wonderful, wonderful!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKEY: if nothing else came from the Norma and Gladys but the Law of the Sea and the message that she carried and the final agreement by Ottawa and the establishment of, or implementation of the 200 mile limit, ever single cent -

MR. NEARY: The Norma and Gladys had as much to do with that as the Man in the Moon. How naive does the hon. gentleman think we are.

MR. HICKEY: I am not naive at all, Mr. Chairman. This is one time that the hon. gentleman is going to have to eat those words, because I tabled, Mr. Chairman, a copy - now do not fall under the desk over there, my hon. friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: Do not worry, I will not.

MR. HICKEY: The hon. member has become an expert over the past year on the Norma and Gladys, feeding out little tidbits now and then -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HICKEY: - of things that were going on.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HICKEY: Of course, having to apologize every now and then too to the crew or some member of the crew.

MR. NEARY: I will deal with that in due course.

MR. HICKEY: You do not have to deal with anything. The proof of the pudding, they say, is in the eating. So now I will say to my hon. friend, when he gets this let him eat this, because here is a report from the Department of External Affairs on every single port of call that vessel visited. Let me read a couple for my hon. friend. He has been reading a section of The Telegram there tonight for about ten minutes. Let me read the first couple.

The Norma and Gladys cruise took place from August 16, 1975 to August 28, 1976.

MR. NEARY: Is the hon. minister going to table that document?

MR. HICKEY: The voyage of this ninety-three foot Grand Banks fishing schooner -

MR. NEARY: Onaa point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. HICKEY: Could I be heard, Mr. Chairman?

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Capt. Winsor): Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Could I be heard?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, Sir, is reading from a document, from a report there.

MR. HICKEY: Big deal. Did you hear what I said? I said I was going to table it.

MR. NEARY: Well the hon. gentleman tore off a sheet. Will the hon. gentleman put that sheet -

MR. HICKEY: That is very simply a letter which sent it to me.

MR. NEARY: Okay, Sir.

MR. HICKEY: Do you want that too?

MR. NEARY: Well we want it all. We want all the documents.

I presume the minister is going to table it, is he?

MR. HICKEY: No, Your Honour, I am going to put it on the floor if tabling it is not enough. I said before I started to read it, I am well acquainted with the rules of the House. My hon. friend forgets that.

This ninety-three foot Grand Banks fishing schooner, built in Trinity Bay, Newfoundland -

MR. NEARY: The Stockholm report is a good one.

MR. HICKEY: - in 1945. Oh, you want the Stockholm report! One second. I will do the hon. gentleman a favour and I will skip everything and I will go right to the Stockholm report for which he had so much to say, for which he had to apologize to the crew, and now maybe he will apologize again in this House.

MR. NEARY: I want the report -

MR. HICKEY: Stockholm, June 17th.

MR. NEARY: I want the report -

MR. HICKEY: Now listen!

MR. NEARY: I want the report of the captain -

MR. HICKEY: Listen!

MR. NEARY: I want the report the minister withheld from the captain.

MR. HICKEY: Your Honour, would you ask the hon. gentleman to listen -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: - so that he may learn something.

June 17th. to 20th. The visit coincided with the royal wedding, an event with which the Norma and Gladys had to compete. Nevertheless immediately after the wedding large crowds came aboard to visit the hold and a smaller but steady flow of visitors continued the next day. Prior press coverage and good publicity during the event added to the interest generated.

Has the hon. gentleman got any more questions about the Stockholm -

MR. NEARY: Is that the only report from Stockholm?

MR. HICKEY: That is the report from Stockholm. There was another report - yes?

MR. NEARY: A question for the hon. gentleman. Would the minister care to table the report from Stockholm that the minister refused to show the Captain of the Norma and Gladys until I brought it to his attention and sent him to the minister to read the report. Is the minister prepared to table that?

MR. HICKEY: And I refused to do what?

MR. NEARY: Refused to show the captain the report until I brought it to his attention and then the minister showed the captain the report. Is the minister prepared to table that report in the House?

MR. HICKEY: The hon. gentleman again is guilty of assuming things, Mr. Chairman.



MR. NEARY: No, the captain came back and told me.

MR. HICKEY: I do not care who told the hon. gentleman what. He should listen to what I am going to tell him. I am the minister and I have got that report. I refused to show that report to no one.

MR. NEARY: The captain thought.

MR. HICKEY: That report was an erroneous report made by a gentleman who was prejudiced, a gentleman who worked at the mission in Stockholm, yes. And if the hon. gentleman wants to talk about that report, Mr. Chairman, let us talk about it. That report was riddled with prejudice by a gentleman who did not get his own way, who was not up in the front line all of the time, who could not run this show all of the time because there was a Newfoundlander there demanding this, that and the other thing, demanding proper protocol, demanding this, demanding - endeavouring to see that the event went on properly, not to be kicked around. Is the hon. gentleman against that? Is he against his fellow Newfoundlander who insists on his rights?

MR. NEARY: That is not the way I heard it.

MR. HICKEY: I do not care what way the hon. gentleman hears it. Metninks he hears too much and most of it is not true, and the unfortunate part of it is that he believes it all. Now, Mr. Chairman, the reason that report never surfaced was for the simple reason that I was 'stunned when I got it. I got on the phone immediately, called External Affairs, had an investigation done and within two weeks, Mr. Chairman, there was a report done -

MR. NEARY: There was no change in the minister's condition since.

MR. HICKEY: Just listen now. Within two weeks, two or three weeks, there was a report came in from an External Affairs official, a colleague of that gentleman, contradicting every last syllable of that report, every last syllable. Now if the hon. gentleman thinks that I am hiding that report, let him get permission from the External Affairs Department and I will table it in this House. That is a confidential document, I do not have the right to table it, but get the permission and I will table it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon minister's time has expired. Hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It is obvious, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to get a change at the heads in this department.

The minister has -

MR. HICKEY: That is your own fault.

MR. FLIGHT: To this point the minister has been up for twenty minutes waxing eloquent. So, Mr. Chairman, I am going to make the few points that I want to make with regards to what I am interested in.

Mr. Chairman, the minister has already indicated that he believes the future of Newfoundland lies in the fisheries and the tourist development potential, recreation development potential. Basically I agree, Mr. Chairman,

Now having admitted that I would challenge the minister to administer the Department of Recreation in a way that will

MR. FLIGHT: guarantee tourist potential will be there five or ten years down the road. Mr. Chairman, some great statesman said that - I think it was Churchill or somebody-said "I did not become Prime Minister of England to oversee the demise of the British Empire." It appears to me, Mr. Chairman, that this minister became minister to oversee the demise and the destruction of the tourist potential industry in this Province.

I would hope that the people of the minister's department could tell us how many people coming from Mainland Canada needed accommodations, needed tourist homes or the type of accommodations we see on the Trans-Canada Highway this past two years. Name the tourist to me that comes in and pays \$33 per night unless he is on an expense account. The people that need something in this Province, Mr. Chairman, are the people who come in and stay in our provincial parks, and I suggest to the minister that the condition that our provincial parks are in by mid July is not fit to put domestics in let alone - My hon. friend from -

AN HON MEMBER: Do not use the word 'domestic.' Do not fall for that.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to say what I said because I know it to be true. I spend my time in the provincial parks. I cannot afford to get an airplane and fly in the woods when I want to go in. And I said, Mr. Chairman, that come July, come the middle of July, some of our provincial parks, the ones that get the greatest use, it is questionable whether the Department of Health should allow them to continue to stay open. The toilet facilities are such in those parks that no human being should be permitted to use them. I say that, Mr. Chairman, I have seen people leave our parks, people with children -

MR. HICKEY: We have the best provincial parks in Canada.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, I am suggesting to the minister, I am going to suggest to the minister

MR. FLIGHT: We have in lots of cases the dirtiest provincial parks in all of Canada too. And, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that the people coming down from Mainland Canada or the United States are not coming to stay in the Mount Peyton or the Albatross or the motels across this Province. They are coming to enjoy our provincial parks. And, Mr. Chairman, I would remind the minister of a statement he made last summer when he wanted to justify increasing the rates in our provincial parks by \$1.00 when he suggested that he hoped this would deter the Mainland tourist from using our parks. So that is a great statement from a minister in trying to sell or trying to bring in tourists in this Province.

Mr. Chairman, the hon member for Burgeo-Burin -

AN HON MEMBER: Burgeo- Bay d'Espoir.

MR. FLIGHT: Bay d'Espoir. My friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) suggested, Mr. Chairman, that

MR. FLIGHT: the Department of Tourism is not allowing the privately owned operators to advertise properly and what have you. And I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, I have seen this happen. I have seen mainland tourists arrive in a provincial park in Central Newfoundland, check in and check around the park, and left that park and drove sixty miles to make it to a private park where there were facilities where they could wash their hands, where they could get decent lavatory, toiletry facilities.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we can scoff all we like. The fact is, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to being in tourists we do not need any more accommodations - we need decent parks, we need larger parks. We do not need motel/hotel type of accommodations. That is not what they are coming for, and the ministry might as well acknowledge that fact.

Now, Mr. Chairman, another area that I am concerned about is the wildlife in this Province. That is the one! that is the one!

CAPTAIN WINSOR: That is your cup of tea.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Chairman, it is time for the Minister of Tourism to bring into his department people who know something about the moose population of this Province. There are not 48,000 moose in this Province. There is nothing near 48,000 moose in this Province. And if we keep going in the direction we are going, Mr. Chairman, there will not be a moose left in this Province ten years down the road.

MR. DINN: How many have we got?

MR. FLIGHT: How many? The Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing would not know how many we have because he has probably never been outside of Pleasantville into the woods to see.

Mr. Chairman, I would suggest before the minister gets involved in tourism he would familiarize himself with the Department of Municipal Affairs.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: I have been in more countries than you have.



MR. FLIGHT: In countries - yes, you were in the Air Force. I forgot. I am sorry. You were, yes.

Mr. Chairman, I am talking about the moose population of this Province. I am talking about what we are doing to guarantee that there will be a big game population in this Province five, ten, fifteen years down the road. And, Mr. Chairman, this year the minister saw fit to increase the allowable kill in this Province by 1,400 licences. Now one would have to assume, if you increase the moose licences issued by 1,400 then the allowable kill would be increased by 1,400. Mr. Chairman, every day in this Province the pressure on our big game population becomes greater and greater. Power line extensions, access roads - we are destroying the natural habitat of our moose. If the pressure is being put on they cannot survive. And if the minister had any concern about guaranteeing a population down the road, he would close the season. It would not be a very politically popular action but it would be endorsed by the people who are concerned that we do guarantee ourselves a moose population or a big game population down the road. Close it and let the moose come back, because if we do not there will be no moose left in this Province. Mr. Chairman, I have talked to people who have made their livelihood all their lives travelling this country. They have seen moose. They have seen hundreds in given areas. Today there is not one there. And anyone who knows anything about the woods and moose - Mr. Chairman, I hear that there is trouble in the Department of Tourism. I hear that some of the biologists are quitting. I hear there is one group suggesting that we should increase the kill and others are suggesting that we are doing wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: Which ones are going to quit?

MR. FLIGHT: The ones who do not like the way the department is being run. The minister knows what I am talking about. Maybe he will address himself to it when he comes in. But the fact is, there is concern in the Department of Tourism that there is not complete agreement as to the way we are handling the wildlife resource of this Province. And the minister makes a big joke. It will be no joke one of

MR. FLIGHT: these days. Look here, we will have to do what the Premier and the Minister of Industrial Relations did five or six years down the road. We will have to fly in if we want to see a moose and the problem is not very many people in this Province are going to be able to afford to do that. You will have to go into the wilderness areas. And when is this government going to smarten up and the minister take the bull by the horns and do what has to be done? When is that going to happen? Are we going to go on the way we have gone?

Mr. Chairman, another thing that has happened to our big game: The minister indicated there are only 400 non-resident licences being issued in this Province, including moose and caribou. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am going to suggest, and I believe most of the members in the House will agree, that people in Newfoundland who hunt caribou want caribou for the meat and not for the rack. But I suspect that twenty years ago

Mr. Flight.

when our game laws were drawn up, it was based on the non-resident kill for sportsmen coming into the Province. Because, Mr. Chairman, biologists or no biologists, the fact is that a caribou, a bull - and there are areas in Newfoundland where you can only shoot bull caribous, bulls. A caribou killed in September and October, a bull, is not fit to eat. There are caribou being killed by the hundreds in this country and left, shot and left in the woods, because it cannot be brought out. Now my hon. friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) will probably verify that. He is very familiar with that type of thing. What is the point? Why not open the caribou season - and this has been suggested to the minister before; it has been suggested by people who know what they are talking about - why not open the caribou season when the meat is fit to eat and close it when it is not? Newfoundland people are not looking for racks. There are no racks left anyway.

CAPT. WINSOR: What is the best time of the year?

MR. MURPHY: Racks?

MR. FLIGHT Racks.

MR. MURPHY: The antlers.

MR. FLIGHT: The antlers.

But, Mr. Chairman, this subject has been brought up before. It is not as important as offshore oil. It is not as important as the Lower Churchill developments and this type of thing. But it is very, very important to a lot of people, Mr. Chairman, and it is time for the Department of Tourism, it is time for the minister to determine whether or not he is getting the right advice from this advisors. And there are people in this Province who will stand up, people who have had expertise in the field and say, He is not getting expert advice, and that if we keep going the way we are going, we will decimate the moose population of this Province. They have got nowhere left to go. One time if you shot at a moose in Central Newfoundland, he could run five, ten days and never see a road, and now if he runs two miles, he has got to criss-cross a road, and there is another hunter waiting to shoot him. There have been reports in Central Newfoundland of moose herding on rivers, because the cover has been all

Mr. Flight.

cut, roads going into the natural habitat. How long can it last, Mr. Chairman? And I am concerned, and I would wish that the minister would be concerned. This Island is getting smaller, and that resource is very, very important, Mr. Chairman. For anyone who is thinking about developing the tourist potential of this Province, the wildlife population, as we know it, is very, very important. I have said in this House before that it would probably be more beneficial to this Province to have a moose standing on the side of the Trans-Canada to be photographed by a tourist than to have one shot by a non-resident hunter who will not leave a cent in the Province anyway. But the tourist who comes in to photograph the moose herd, there is a possibility he will - that will make his trip - go back and tell his friends.

And, Mr. Chairman, with regard to advertising again, I do not know if \$400,000 is a lot of money. But I would suggest to the minister that the best form of advertising that this Province can get is the word being carried back by the tourists who have come here and gone back. And I would suggest to the minister that some of the conditions they are running into in this Province is not the type of message that they are going to carry back and advise their friends to come again. And I am thinking about the overcrowding of the provincial parks, I am thinking about the vandalism, I am thinking about the rowdyism, I am thinking about that type of condition. I am thinking about, again, the conditions, the public health situation as exists in our provincial parks. And the tourists are not coming. And I know lots of people, local people, who refuse to go into some of those parks. And, Mr. Chairman, the thing is that they are not all alike. But the problem is that the most popular parks are the ones that are most overcrowded, you know. There are parks in Newfoundland that are never utilized. But the bigger parks that most people want to camp into and spend there ten days vacation in are the ones that are overcrowded, and they cannot stand the traffic, and halfway through the Summer it is very questionable if it is hygienic to visit those parks and if you are going to stay there for ten days and if you are going to take advantage



Mr. Flight.

of it. I know Newfoundland families who refuse. They park in pits, sand pits and grassy meadows rather than expose their children to what they are exposed to after those parks have been opened for a month and a half.

AN HON. MEMBER: The parks used to be a great pastime.

MR. FLIGHT: Well, let us face the facts. If you want to bring in tourists from the mainland, if you want them to live in our parks, make the parks decent for them to live in.

MR. DINN: The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) wants to eliminate that.

MR. FLIGHT: What? Pardon me? Speak up, Mr. Minister.

MR. RIDEOUT: Or encourage the private developer.

MR. FLIGHT: Or encourage the private developer.

MR. DINN: I said, he wants to eliminate that, and I am against that.

MR. STRACHAN: Eliminate what?

MR. DINN: Parking in pits. What have our young people got to do?

MR. FLIGHT: Sure, I want to eliminate parking in pits, but I want to provide the kind of facilities that would make it possible for Newfoundlanders to take their trailers and go out and not have to park in pits.

Mr. Chairman, I agree with the point the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) made, too. I do not know when it was, but I think it was last year that CNR doubled their rates on the ferry for mainland tourists. I know that families have come in, some better off than others, and left their friends on the other side of the Gulf, because they figured the rate across was not worth it. Now I know it was CN who did it. But I have heard the



MR. FLIGHT: minister talking about intestinal fortitude and courage. Where was he? Not one squeak! I did not hear a squeak coming from the Minister of Tourism when the C.N. doubled the rates on the ferries and made sure, guaranteed beyond the shadow of a doubt, that lots and lots of tourists just would not make the trip. It is not worth it. For what it costs to cross that Gulf today to bring your trailer across, it is just not worth it and we are losing thousands of dollars as a result. Lay the blame on the C.N., if you like, but we should have at least been entitled to some objectives from the Minister of Tourism - and not a word, not a squeak!

Mr. Chairman, with regards to the Premier shooting moose, whether legal or not legal, the fact is the impression in this Province is that it was not legal. He can say what he likes to the member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) but hunters out in this Province, the bona fide hunters who want to feel that they are as important as anyone else, who do not want to be forced to be poachers, they believe what they read, they believe what they hear on the radio. They can see when one official of the department is coming out with a different story from the other official and then overnight there is a justification made and everything is all right. I did not hear the minister coming out and rebuking any of his department officials on that particular issue. I accept the minister's explanation, but he has a job to do. He has 500,000 Newfoundlanders to convince because, I guarantee you, outside of this House there are not too many who believe that the law was strictly adhered to under those circumstances and that there is not one law for the mighty and one for the meek.

Mr. Chairman, now before I sit down, with regards to the big game. I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, that the issuing of big game licences last year became a shemozzle. Within hours after they started to do the draw it became a shemozzle. People who would never have been entitled to a licence under any priority system got them. People who were entitled did not get them. It became a shemozzle,

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Chairman, and the minister has indicated that he is going to straighten that out because he is going to bring in the computer. And I would suggest, if the minister wants to hold the respect of the people of Newfoundland and the people who have applied for licences, the same mix-up had better not occur this year. That priority system had better work right this year, because it did not last year. Most of the people out in the Province do not trust the ability of the department to issue those licences on a fair, equitable basis. And the minister has got this year to prove it. Because if the issuing of big game licences turns into such a shemuzzle as it was last year we will have a lot more poachers in this Province than we have right now.

And, Mr. Chairman, another point I want to bring up with the minister is the actions of some of his wildlife officers, his enforcement officers - game wardens.

Mr. Chairman, I am aware of an area in Newfoundland where there was not a conviction made on poaching, not one, and poaching was going on, moose were being killed - poaching of the worst kind, and not one conviction. But I am aware of at least two hundred cases where innocent people were victimized, where innocent people were forced because they had left their licence in their trailer - had lost their car and lost their rifles and lost two days of their vacation and it cost them \$25, but not one conviction on poaching, not one. So, Mr. Chairman, when the minister gets up again I would like to hear him explain why it is that we have a situation where day after day, time after time, innocent, law-abiding, upright, community-minded citizens are being persecuted, abused by his wildlife officials with the support of the R.C.M.P., and no convictions at all. I would ask the minister to explain why it is. We are coming right now into the worst poaching time of the year - June and July. There will be more moose and caribou shot illegally in June and July in this Province than will be shot the other ten months of the year, and brought out and eaten. You cannot find a game warden in this Province today, and what we did have, they have been stuffed into the parks selling licences. They have created a real

May 24, 1977

Tape No. 3192

EC - 3

MR. FLIGHT:

bonanza for the people who want to shoot  
moose. They know where the game wardens are - they are

MR. FLIGHT: selling and issuing licences in all the provincial parks. Mr. Chairman, in the Fall of the year the R.C.M.P. spends more time - there are communities in this Province that have a detachment of two members of the R.C.M.P., and from the time the season opens until it closes those communities have no police protection at all. I am wondering if the Minister of Tourism can tell us if that is by accident, or if it is by desire on the part of the R.C.M.P., or if the minister actually requests that the R.C.M.P. start patrolling the bush and ignore the police protection required by the communities concerned? Because they are miles and miles and miles away from the communities they were brought in to provide police protection for. Thank you.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the few remarks that I have to make are going to be very brief. I listened with interest to the minister earlier when he opened up the ministerial head with his tear-jerking and heart rending speech about the dilemma that he was placed in with respect to whether he should use hard or softsell with respect to advertising the Canada Summer Games. He did use the expression, Sir, he was placed in the position of being damned if he does and be damned if he does not. Well, Sir, he has placed himself now in the position where be damned if he does not and be damned if somebody else does. Because what in effect the minister has admitted to the Committee, Sir, is that although the Minister of Tourism himself and the department are not spending anything in excess of \$400,000, the fact of the matter is that other agencies of government, or other departments of government are, in fact, advertising. So it does not much matter, in fact, who advertises because the money is being spent and the people will be coming to this Province whether the



MR. ROWE: facilities exist or not.

So I am afraid, Sir, that the minister's argument was just plain lacking in logic with respect to the fact that he does not have to hard sell, advertise, to attract people to this Province, particularly over this Summer, for fear of bringing tourists in without adequate facilities. But on the other hand, other ministers and other agencies of government do advertise. You are going to have the attraction of these tourists into the Province and they will encounter the problems that the minister was fearful of.

So I would suggest that the minister himself either do the advertising for tourism in this Province or he does not do advertng for tourism in this Province, and that no other jurisdiction, no other department of government should put their foot in the door with respect to advertising for tourism in this Province. Let the Department of Tourism take care of tourism and let the Minister of Education take care of education and leave it at that. That is just one point I wanted to make, Sir.

The other thing that saddened me at the beginning of the minister's remarks was the fact that he indicated or gave the impression, probably not deliberately, but the minister did leave the impression that this Province was not capable of industrializing to any significant degree. Now, Sir, I know that there are certain disadvantages of heavy industrialization in any part of the world, including this Province. This Province is not unique. But I submit, Mr. Chairman, to this Committee that you can have compatibility between industrial development, rural development and tourism development and any other kind - fisheries development - and any other kind of development that you would want to name. You can have compatibility. In fact, I would submit, Sir, that proper industrialization



MR. ROWE: in this Province would not only not harm the environment and the people, or the wild-life of this Province, but indeed could be an attraction for tourists. I would submit, Sir, that a well run refinery in this Province, the hydro development on the Upper Churchill, and hopefully on the Lower Churchill, and the paper mills, and the various mining companies and industries, that we could have, in fact, any industrial development that is properly run in this Province, could in themselves be tourist attractions.

You can talk with any geologist in government or at the university or any people interested in geology, geomorphology, or gemstones and this sort of a thing, and you will find that you could make a mining area very attractive to tourists;

Mr. Rowe:

tours, safe tours of mines, of paper mills, of hydro electrical development, of anything that can be classed as industrial development. So it kind of saddens me, Mr. Chairman, for the minister to indicate that only tourism and fisheries were the future for this Province. It was the impression and probably a mistaken one, and I would suspect, Mr. Chairman, that if the minister had his time back he would probably rephrase that particular statement, rephrase it so that some hon. members and the general public might not get the wrong impression, because I state quite categorically that industrial development, rural development, resource development can be very compatible with the tourism industry and in fact could enhance it. I am sickened to have people come to this Province just to see the quaint little fishing villages, as quaint and as beautiful as they are. But we have more to offer than that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROWE: Did I hear some utterance or grunts or groans or something?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROWE: What I am saying - now here goes the Minister of Justice who has not yet risen to his feet in the debate, muttering to himself -

MR. HICKMAN: I want to make sure that I understood what the hon. gentleman was saying.

MR. ROWE: Well, if the hon. gentleman would listen instead of having a yarn with his buddies over there, Mr. Chairman, he might not only hear but understand what I am saying.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible) what you are saying.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, the problem is that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROWE: - no amount of articulation would make the hon. Minister of Justice comprehend what has been said from this side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: The hon. minister is over there with his feet propped up -

MR. ROWE: Now, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. HICKMAN: Do I understand that the hon. gentleman is saying that the -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, to a point of order, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: If anybody in this House, Your Honour, should know the rules of the House it should be the Government House Leader, the Minister of Justice, the Acting Premier,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - the hon. member for Grand Bank, who knows, Sir, that you are not allowed to speak while seated in this House. If you want to address the Chair you have to stand in your place in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: And take your hat off.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Chairman, I ask you to enforce the -

MR. BRETT: He has permission from the House to do that.

MR. NEARY: - rules as far as the hon. gentleman is concerned.

MR. ROWE: He asks permission from the Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, on that point of order, I thought I had the unanimous consent of the House to my actions, but if I did not may I ask now while I am on my feet?

MR. ROWE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I will be quite happy to yield for a question if that is what the minister wants to do -

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: - instead of uttering, moaning and groaning.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To dispose of the point of order, in Committee I feel that we are more informal than in the House, so that questions have been asked from the member's place whilst he is sitting, and unless they are unduly long I would not rule that out of order.

MR. HICKMAN: I asked the question and I am waiting for an answer.

MR. ROWE: I did not hear that. What was the question?

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman would articulate for the benefit of the Committee his views as to whether or not in his opinion the quaint, picturesque villages of Newfoundland and Labrador are more attraction to the tourist than, say for I understand him to say, you know, that the inside of a paper machine was a tourist

Mr. Hickman:

attraction, and I was lost when he compared that paper machine with some of the picturesque villages we have in Newfoundland. Is that the official position of the Opposition?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, it is obvious that the hon. House Leader is a lawyer, and is using legal tricks to try to get one to say what he does not wish to mean to say.

Now I will answer the hon. House Leader on the government side by saying this, that there is nothing more beautiful in this Province than the natural topography and the way of life that we have to offer to the tourists from all over the world. But I was making the simple little point, Mr. Chairman, that industrial development and tourism development are not necessarily incompatible -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: - that many people in this world have varying interests; some people have geological interests and would love to come to this Province because apparently, and I was a student of geology at one stage, the Newfoundland and Labrador area has some of the most unique geology to offer any geologist in the world outside of possibly places like Iceland which are rather unique in themselves, But the fact of the matter is that we do have mines, we do have industrial development, we could have industrial development that could be compatible with our environment, and compatible with our tourism industry and compatible with our way of life. It is as

MR. ROWE: as simple as that; There is nothing profound about that statement. there is nothing difficult to understand about it. It is not a matter of saying that a paper machine is more attractive than a beautiful fishing community. There is just no comparison unless you happen to like paper machines. It seems as if the hon. House Leader does. But anyway, Mr. Chairman, these are two points that I wish to make. There is just one last point I would like to draw to the Minister of Tourism's attention and this is this, that it has come to my attention that a number of groups have come to this Province on exchange visits, some students in particular - and this only came to my attention, I do not know how widespread it is, it came to my attention as a result of a relative of mine who had taken a couple of students from Quebec into their homes on an exchange visit. One of the difficulties they had was on the weekend getting these students into public buildings, the museum, which unfortunately I think is under renovation now so there is a logical reason for that. But the fact of the matter is they could not get into, I believe, the museum of the Confederation Building and the House of Assembly, the chambers of the House of Assembly on the weekend and some other - and in fact the theatre at the Arts and Culture Centre. This person happened to know the man who was on duty there and he did allow them into the theatre of our beautiful Arts and Culture Centre. And the only thing I would like to ask the minister is this, just how accessible are our public buildings and our points of interest, not only in St. John's but obviously other points throughout the Province where you have institutions run by the government, in fact; and is this just a seasonal thing? If it is a seasonal thing, can it not be expanded because we are having these exchanges of students and what have you, not just during the Summer periods, obviously we are having them during the Winter, Fall and Spring and I would like the minister just to indicate what the situation is because it has been brought to my attention that on a number of occasions students have come from the Mainland and have been disappointed over the fact that they



MR. ROWE: have not been able to visit such places as the museum, certain areas of the Arts and Cultural Centre, the museum at the top of this Confederation Building and the House of Assembly.

So, Sir, these are the three points, namely that the minister - you cannot have it both ways you know, if you are going to hard sell there should be hard or soft sell by the Minister of Tourism when it comes to tourism matters. It is no good sloughing it off on another department or agency of government. You are still going to spend the same amount of dollars, you are still going to have the same problem if we do not have the tourist accommodations, so the minister cannot excuse himself out of that one, and I have just mentioned the possible compatibility of industrial, rural, resource and tourism development and also I brought to the minister's attention, Mr. Chairman, the situation regarding the opening of public places over the holidays for such things as student exchange visits.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to attempt to answer some of the questions and respond to some of the remarks made by the last two or three speakers. I will deal with the last speaker, the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) first. I think his impression of what I said in the beginning is obviously wrong and he says maybe I would have rephrased it. Quite possibly so, I do not know. Let me, Mr. Chairman, state for the record that when the future of this Province to a great degree lies in the full-scale development of tourism and the fishery, I simply was saying this, that we should put money into those areas. We are starting to do so and we realize that there is a bright future in those areas. I certainly did not wish to convey the impression that there is no room for or no place for mining, or gas and oil, offshore resources, development of that area or any of those areas such as paper mills or what have you, I simply was alluding to the fact, and it is a fact, Mr. Chairman, that many efforts since Confederation to industrialize this Province have failed bitterly and all I was saying was that by all means if there

MR. HICKEY: is an industry which can be viable and provide jobs, not at an exorbitant cost per job to the taxpayer of this Province, then by all means let us have it. But let us not go on this kick of industrializing Newfoundland and Labrador when we are not an area to be industrialized, when we are not a Pittsburgh. That is all I was saying, and in saying it, I suppose, I was drawing hon. member's attention to the fact that next to nothing has been done for the tourism industry for most of the last twenty-five years, and the only bright spot in the industry has been since this administration took over. The creating of a department, the placing emphasis on it, and the task force and the study which has gone on to produce the book which I showed hon. members tonight, which is a strategy for development, which we are negotiating now with the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, which if approved will see \$18.5 million pumped into the tourist industry in this Province -

MR. MORGAN: Long overdue.

MR. HICKEY: - which will zero in to the whole matter of accommodations, which will identify and verify what the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) pointed out very clearly, the accommodations problem, the need for developing private parks and camp grounds in the Province. I want to get back to that because the hon. member made a number of points and to a great degree he is perfectly correct.

The issue my hon. friend for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Rowe) raised about the visitors not being able to get in to certain public places, public buildings, that has been a problem. We are wrestling with it at the moment and we hope to be able to have those places open on weekends. Because I agree with my hon. friend, that many times that is when a great number of visitors would want to get in. Of course, the rush season

Mr. Hickey:

or the prime season of the tourist season as such, like July and August, usually sees a great number of people in the city wanting to get into those places, and of course they do not just try to get in there five days a week unfortunately because they are in the city for a week or however many days; it could be that they are just in for a weekend. And so it is a problem and we are attempting to come to grips with it.

My hon. friend mentioned, again in commenting on my initial statement, mining and the paper industry and all of that. It too is attractive. Of course it is. It is an area where tourists would like to go on tours and so on. So I am not saying in any way that those things are not compatible to the development and the full development of the tourist industry. I do not mean that at all. I simply mean that we cannot hang our hat as we have in the past on the theory that the former Premier used to espouse and used to articulate, develop or perish. And his whole development centered around industrialization of this Province. And all I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that we have got to get down to the real problems and the real roots and the real potential of this Province. By all means let us develop our resources. Let us develop the greatest resource we got, our human resource through education. Surely nobody can quarrel or nobody can doubt this Province is doing that. And let us develop the mining industry, and the forest industry and all the rest. And let us do it in a way which is not going to be a noose around the taxpayers neck and still end up failures, still end up having to be shut down, closed up or what have you, while we turn a blind eye on two industries which obviously have great potential, namely the fishery and tourism. That is all I will say.

Mr. Chairman, my hon. friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) talked about camp grounds and so on. I want to say to him that to a great degree he is right in what he says, that - of course the statement he made that we are discouraging or trying to put out

MR. Hickey:

of business or it would appear that we are trying to put out of business private people in developing camp grounds, of course that certainly is not the situation. I know from some of the things that he talks about it might appear that way, but I assure him that is not the case. And the strategy for development places great emphasis on development of private camp grounds, \_\_\_\_\_

Mr. Hickey.

development of recreational areas, of facilities to attract the tourist. We are taking two regions of the Province, Mr. Chairman, the Great Northern Peninsula, and the Bonavista - Burin Peninsula and for starters, for a five year period, we hope to develop those areas in a way which is meaningful and which will show the private sector that there is money to be made in the tourist industry by development of private campgrounds. To assure my hon. friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) that this administration far from discouraging the private sector to get involved are indeed inviting and encouraging the private sector to get involved by going to DREE and attempting to negotiate an agreement which will see a major thrust into encouraging the private sector to get in to the private campground business. Why are we doing that, Mr. Chairman, one might ask? Very simply this: We realise that hotels and motels cannot be viable in many parts of this Province. The answer is in private campgrounds. Why is it that we are withstanding the pressure by a demanding public, both at home and our export tourism, to put hot showers, to put first-class facilities in our provincial parks? I will tell my hon. friends why.

MR. FLIGHT: Will the minister please tell which parks in Newfoundland have hot showers and that type of facilities?

MR. HICKEY: I am saying that we are withstanding the pressure to do it. We are refusing to do it. And one of the reasons we are refusing to do it is because we want the private sector to do it. And if we do it, Mr. Chairman, we will not be able to charge the rate - I suggest that no government will charge the rate - that must be charged to break even much less make a profit.

MR. FLIGHT: The money would come in in other ways.

MR. HICKEY: Let me finish now.

The private sector, private industry, can and will charge and will get plenty of business, although it is a short season, and it can be a viable operation. It is no good for anyone to say, Mr. Chairman, that that will not work. It has worked in other provinces. It is working in Nova Scotia. Let me give my hon. friend some figures as to just where we are, and this will demonstrate maybe more than



Mr. Hickey.

anything else what my hon. friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir is talking about, and on this I agree with him totally. We in this Province have approximately fifteen per cent of campgrounds, parks and campgrounds, camp sites, which are operated by the private sector - twelve to fifteen per cent. What is the situation in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island? In Nova Scotia approximately seventy-five per cent, private industry. In New Brunswick, sixty-eight per cent, private industry.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where?

MR. HICKEY: In New Brunswick.

In Prince Edward Island, about seventy-six or seventy-eight per cent, private industry. That, Mr. Chairman, is the position we want to be in. Now my hon. friend from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) is a gentleman whom I find it very difficult to get upset with, because I honestly think that he is, you know, a sincere individual, Mr. Chairman. I think that he honestly means what he said. When he talks about our parks and how bad they are, he should get together with his leader, because only a few days ago his leader said that the best money, the best investment this Province made was in provincial parks.

MR. SIMMONS: Would the hon. minister yield for a minute?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, sure.

MR. SIMMONS: I think the House would be interested in knowing that the Liberals have won Prince Edward Island. Mr. Caouette's son is leading in the Témiscamingue seat and the Liberals are leading in the other four.

MR. WHITE: That is five out of six.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is Liberal territory anyway.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. HICKEY: Yes, I will permit an observation and a question.

MR. FLIGHT:       Okay.  Assuming that the Province were to spend the money that the minister indicates, to provide the capital, to provide our provincial parks, you know, with the type of facilities required, you know, good washroom facilities, . . .

MR. FLIGHT: hot showers, good toilet facilities.  
Okay, so it would cost the Province a lot of money and they would have to charge, as he indicates, a lot more to people using the parks, and I am thinking basically of the tourist. But would it be necessary to charge the tourist? Would not the extra revenue - more tourists coming - Because they are not coming now. They cannot get into the parks and when they do come they do not like what they find in our parks and I cannot blame them. Would they not, knowing that they had good facilities in the parks, come in droves, so to speak, and spend their money in the small stores, restaurants - you know, does it not work that way as well?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman - to a certain degree, but I cannot accept what my hon. friend says that the provincial parks in Newfoundland are such a bad place to go.

MR. FLIGHT: Go live in them in August.

MR. HICKEY: No, I do not have to go live in them, Mr. Chairman, because as minister, I see a whole host of letters coming from all parts, almost all parts of the world, certainly a fantastic number of letters come to us, all of appreciation, all of complimentary - a kind of complementary letter which says our provincial parks are second to none across Canada -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: - and down in the United States - little or no complaints. Last year, Mr. Chairman, I do not think there was a letter came in with a complaint of all the letters we got. Now, surely, if the situation is as serious as my hon. friend feels it is - certainly, I mean, those people who are very quick to write us when they find accommodations in hotels not up to par would certainly not play up our parks as being such a great place to visit if indeed they were not.

Another thing that might interest my hon. friend is that this Province could not begin to meet the demand for camp ground that there is at the present time. We are turning away thousands of people. Our money, Mr. Chairman, must go into expansion of parks not improvement of facilities. Our parks have been kept the kind of parks they are, such as limited facilities, nature trails, this kind of thing, as

MR. HICKEY: sort of wilderness parks, very close to nature.

MR. NEARY: Golf courses.

MR. HICKEY: They have been kept that way. That is the Terra Nova National Park my hon. friend is talking about - no golf courses in provincial parks.

MR. NEARY: - statement we made came out.

MR. HICKEY: This Province, Mr. Chairman, is doing this deliberately to allow the private sector to get into the area where the money is and where it can be profitable to operate those things. Because there is no way that we can find the money with a budget like we have and with all the demands and the revenue that we have to spend, there is no way that we could scratch the surface of meeting the demands in terms of dollars for park development. So our effort must best be applied to expanding existing parks where the need is, where the greatest number of people are turned away, where there is overcrowding to some degree during the peak season. My staff keep a running record of those things. We know the parks that we should expand and this is the programme that we are embarking upon - that we have been. Whenever we can we will develop yet another park.

MR. NEARY: How much would it cost to do it?

Say like for Butterpot Park.

MR. HICKEY: Oh, my goodness! Off the top of my head -

AN. HON. MEMBER: Remember what you spent on the one in Bay d'Espoir?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, \$600,000/\$700,000 minimum.

MR. NEARY: If you had kept the Norma & Gladys home you could have put in about two parks.

MR. HICKEY: I knew I was walking into that one, Mr. Chairman. I have been around with the hon. gentleman so long that nothing comes as a shock. If I were as short-sighted, Mr. Chairman, as my hon. friend from LaPoile that is just what I would have done, because he cannot see any further than his nose.

MR. NEARY: Do not get nasty now.

MR. HICKEY: I am not getting nasty. I am just telling the hon. gentleman the truth. The truth is bitter.

MR. NEARY:

Do not lose your cool now.

MR. HICKEY:

as a cucumber.

I am not losing my cool. I am as cool

MR. NEARY:

For the last twenty minutes you have been  
doing all right and now you are going to blow it.

MR. HICKEY:

I am as cool as can be.

MR. NEARY:

Do not blow it.

MR. HICKEY:

Now let us not waste any more time of  
the committee. So why does not the hon. gentleman let me continue?

MR. NEARY:

Well, sure. Carry on.

MR. HICKEY:

We were making great progress while the  
hon. gentleman - Go out and have a cup of coffee, on me!



Mr. Hickey:

Mr. Chairman, you know, so that -

MR. NEARY: Is that the strongest you got? I would not buy it for the boys on the corner.

MR. HICKEY: I should say to my hon. friend for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) with regards to the park booklet -

MR. SIMMONS: They have some extra words on the front.

MR. HICKEY: - they are mentioned but I will acknowledge without any hesitation that we are not doing the things that we should be doing in a major way to promote private camp grounds and private parks, and this is the area that this book will take us, this development will take us as soon as we sign that, and I am very hopeful that it will be signed within a matter.

MR. NEARY: Is that the minister's bible now?

MR. HICKEY: It is a strategy for tourism development.

MR. NEARY: Is that the minister's bible?

AN HON. MEMBER: Who prepared that?

MR. HICKEY: It was prepared by my staff and by a consultant from Nova Scotia.

MR. SIMMONS: You had a consulting firm from Toronto a couple of years ago around interviewing, Where they involved in that one?

MR. HICKEY: No, not that I know of - but I am not familiar with that consultant.

MR. SIMMONS: Well he is engaged - he got - well let me put it another way. A couple of years ago the department advertised saying they were going to do a study inviting tenders or inviting bids or something, Is this the result of it?

MR. HICKEY: Maybe what my hon. friend is talking about is the domestic travel survey -

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

MR. HICKEY: - which is now going on, which is being conducted DeLeuw Cather consultants, That is ongoing, that is to -

MR. NEARY: That is federal, is it?

Mr. Hickey: - establish the local industry, the domestic tourist industry right within the Province, It will tell us where our own people travel, and where they do not and the obvious reasons as to why. Because in any province, in any jurisdiction, Mr. Chairman, a great chunk of the tourist industry -

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

MR. HICKEY: - certainly in provinces like Newfoundland and Nova Scotia and those places, a great chunk of the tourist dollar is local, and this is what an awful lot of people do not realize is that when a person leaves Corner Brook and comes to St. John's or vice versa or any other point in the Province going from point A to B, those dollars are being spread around, those dollars help to keep the camp grounds operating or makes them profitable, those dollars helps to keep the motels and hotels operating, and they are just as important, almost as important as the new dollars coming in. So we are hoping and looking at development in that area so we will know exactly what to do, and where to put the accommodations such as the small motels, where to develop the tourist homes, hospitality homes and so on.

MR. NEARY: Can we get a copy of the bible?

MR. HICKEY: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: Can we get a copy of the bible?

MR. HICKEY: When it is released. When the agreement is signed, certainly I do not -

MR. NEARY: Who does the agreement have to be signed with?

MR. HICKEY: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: Who does it have to be signed with?

MR. HICKEY: With DREE. The negotiations are going on with DREE at the moment.

MR. NEARY: How much money are we talking about?

MR. HICKEY: Eighteen and a half million.

MR. SIMMONS: How will it be spent? Can you tell us how that money will be spent?

MR. HICKEY: My hon. friend reminds me of - and this is probably what my hon. friend from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) is talking about, Stephens and Kellogg did a private camp ground study.

MR. SIMMONS: Yes.

MR. HICKEY: And obviously some of that went into this strategy for development.

MR. NEARY: But I thought you got it done for nothing, you said, the report was done by your own officials.

MR. HICKEY: I did not say that, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: You see how my hon. friend exaggerates things and takes things out of context.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not exaggerating. I am only quoting the hon. member.

MR. HICKEY: I did not say that. I said that it cost us very little in terms of the value of the report -

MR. NEARY: How much did it cost?

MR. HICKEY: - that for the most part my staff and our own people provincially had a great deal of input -

MR. NEARY: How much?

MR. HICKEY: - and it was from the data which was collected locally -

MR. NEARY: How much did it cost?

MR. HICKEY: - we took a consultant - I do not know. I will find out and get it for you.

MR. NEARY: Well okay, get it before the Committee of Supply finishes.

MR. HICKEY: We got a consultant to correlate all the information that was available locally and put together this document which when anybody reads this they will be darn proud. It is a good job.

MR. SIMMONS: Can the minister indicate how the \$18 million is going to be used?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: Yes, in a nutshell, I cannot go into detail obviously. That is not an easy book to remember. I informed the Committee that two

Mr. Hickey:

regions of the Province are being designated now, because it is for five years, and then we will go from that five years on to another hopefully. One is the Great Northern Peninsula area and the other is the Bonavista-Burin Peninsula area. And those two regions will see assistance to develop private camp grounds, small cabin projects, and hopefully, Mr. Chairman, the main thrust being to convince the private sector that there is money to be made in this industry and that when that is shown and proven,

Mr. Hickey.

Then we will either lease or sell those establishments to the private sector -

MR. NEARY: You are going to have to extend the tourist season.

MR. HICKEY: - and entrepreneurs to operate themselves.

MR. NEARY: You are going to have to extend the tourist season.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The hon. minister's time is up. ~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, I have sat back for the last two or three hours and observed the minister proceeding with his estimates, and I can only conclude from that that it is rather fortunate for the minister that he did not have to go through this exercise - what? - It is the first time in three years or four years, I do believe - it is rather fortunate for the minister, Mr. Chairman, that he did not have to go through this exercise for the past three or four years. The minister, from my observations tonight, Mr. Chairman, has been rather touchy. Some issues have been raised, and the minister has gone into fits of convulsions in trying to explain and justify the acts of his department or the lack thereof, and we still have not got the cost of the Norma and Gladys. We still have not got the answers to the dozen and one questions raised by my friend from LaPoile.

MR. FLIGHT: And wildlife.

MR. RIDEOUT: And we still have not got the answers to the questions regarding the wildlife population in the Province raised by my colleague -

MR. HICKEY: Do not ask as many questions -

MR. RIDEOUT: See, Mr. Chairman, see what I mentioned about the minister flying into fits of convulsions. That is exactly the way that he responded to the questions raised by this side of the House. But, Mr. Chairman, I will say this, that the minister could be the greatest



Mr. Rideout.

asset to tourist development in this Province that we have ever seen.

MR. NEARY: Have him stop the nonsense.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, we could do that. But the other alternative would be to bring a television camera into the House while the minister is trying to present his estimates and take a few pictures and show them across the country and people would come down here at least to see the Newfie joke personified in living colour, because that is about what we saw tonight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STRACHAN: A new Rowdy Man.

MR. RIDEOUT: A new Rowdy Man, yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - a couple of coloured television sets.

MR. RIDEOUT: But I enjoyed the minister's presentations, Mr. Chairman. They were rather lively although he was rather sore and touchy at points. Now, Mr. Chairman, I have to say from the outset that I have to agree with a number of the points raised by my friend from LaPoile, especially when it comes to talking about those special moose licences. Now I am not going to say complimentary, because the minister says that that is not the right word to use, and the minister, all knowing and all powerful as he is, if he says it is not the right word to use, well then, of course, I will not use it. But I want to mention, Mr. Chairman, that ninety per cent of the people who apply, and probably ninety-five per cent of the people who apply for moose licences, big game licences in this Province, agree with what my friend from LaPoile said here in this Committee tonight; there should be no chalk of one and cheese of the other when it comes to handing out big game licences in this Province. Now I am not suggesting, I am not even thinking, Mr. Chairman, that the Premier of this Province, if he wants to go hunting for a few days, should not be given a moose licence or should not be given some sort of authorization. I would not even be as small as to suggest that. I am not suggesting that the Ambassador from Russia, if he came in, should not be given the privilege of hunting big game in this Province. But

Mr. Rideout.

I will suggest, Mr. Chairman, that not the Premier of Newfoundland or not the Prime Minister of Canada or not the Premier of Russia should be allowed to go in the woods in this Province and bring out game without putting tags on it. That is the whole crux of the matter. How can you justify that, Mr. Chairman, to a poor old hunter from Westport, for example, in my district who goes into Deer Lake to pick up his licence because of the fiasco the minister's department had last year in getting the big game licences out? I suppose you could even call it incompetence. But because of the fiasco they had in getting the licences out the poor old fellow had to go into Deer Lake to pick up one of those special permits. So he figured it was okay to take his gun with him, and he got nailed, because he had his gun aboard with no licence, no permit. Yet the Premier or a minister or somebody else can go around this Province, bring out game -

MR. MORGAN: No, no, the Premier, but not a minister.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, the Premier of Newfoundland -

MR. MORGAN: Qualify your statement.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Chairman, the lip from Bonavista is over-lipping again, and I am not too concerned about him.

MR. MORGAN: Get your facts straight.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, we will deal with that minister on Thursday when we get to his estimates.

MR. MORGAN: Get your facts straight.

MR. ROWE: The mobile mouth.

MR. RIDEOUT: The mobile mouth.

Mr. Chairman, is there anything in Beausheerne to silence 'Jaws' from Bonavista South? Is there anything there we can use?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STRACHAN: Beausheerne itself.

MR. RIDEOUT: Beausheerne itself, yes. Throw it because he will catch it.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, I was about to say that -

MR. MORGAN: Selikoff and his report will catch you.

MR. RIDEOUT: Selikoff's report will catch the minister, where I will not say.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was about to say that I am not against those people coming into this Province and hunting. I am not against giving them special privileges to do so. But why should we let them go in the woods and take their meat and bring it out without a tag on it? If somebody in my district -

MR. MORGAN: Who is 'they'?

MR. RIDEOUT: Anybody who gets one of those special licences, be it the Premier of Newfoundland or the Premier of Russia or the President of the United States or anybody. That is what I said. Now if the minister would open his ears and listen he might hear and he would not have to be interrupting.

MR. MORGAN: He is only the man who rules the Province. Do not give him any privileges.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is right, he is the man who rules the Province. What about the little guy down in Baie Verte - White Bay who pays taxes? Does he not deserve consideration?

MR. ROWE: Too bad he cannot leave while he is ruling.

MR. RIDEOUT: Too bad he has to leave it to some people like the Minister of Transportation.

MR. NEARY: - becoming the servants of the people instead of their own, self service.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Chairman, I was about to say that I do not think those people should be allowed to bring moose or meat out of the woods without putting tags on it. If somebody down in my district went in hunting and even forgot their tags and they were caught by a game warden in this Province they would be nailed.

MR. SIMMONS: No doubt.

MR. RIDEOUT: They would be nailed right to the wall. They would be taken to the cleaners, no matter if the licence was

MR. RIDEOUT: in their possession, in their pocket, whether it was in their pick-up, if they did not have tags on that meat they would be nailed. Why should anybody else, is the question I would like to ask the minister, why should anybody else be any different, whether it is the Premier of Newfoundland or the Premier of Alberta or the Premier of any province. Let them come in - oh! the minister can go on, 'the poor fellow!' Go down in his own district and justify it! Why should they be any different?

MR. MORGAN: The naivety of it.

MR. RIDEOUT: The naivety of it! the naivety of the minister.

MR. MORGAN: Naivety.

MR. RIDEOUT: Be careful now you do not put a hair out of place over there.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) naivety.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member will not get an invitation to the opening of his club, Sheephead.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well I am not really concerned if there is any - I will not get into that.

MR. SIMONS: The Premier will not take the minister, that is the problem.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a legitimate question to ask the minister. That is a question that has been raised by hundreds of people that I talked to around this Province. They are not against giving the special licence or whatever name the minister wants to put on it. I have not heard too many people argue against that. But I have heard a lot of people upset over the fact that they can go in and catch this meat, shoot the meat and bring it out without tags and I believe that that is a legitimate complaint and I think that if the minister insists on having the authority or retaining the authority to pass out those special licences then he should ensure that whoever he gives them to, whoever he passes them out to, has a set of tags.



MR. CANNING: Hear! Hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not think that is too much to ask and I think the people of this Province have a right to demand it because if I get caught without my tags then I am nailed to the wall and so is the next person in this Province.

MR. CANNING: Hear! Hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: So I do not see why anybody else, whether he is a VIP or an NIP should be any different.

MR. MORGAN: You have not a clue let alone the tags.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, but see, Mr. Chairman, the difference between me and the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) is that you cannot lose something that you have not got, and he has not got the clue to lose in the beginning.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the minister talked about industrial development also pertaining to, or not being adaptable with tourism development in this Province and I cannot take that down. I believe that there is room in this Province for both development of the tourist industry and also industrial development be it heavy industry or development of our rural resources or whatever. So the statement by the minister, or the impression at least left with the Committee by the minister is not one that I can fathom at this particular time.

The minister also made some reference to the DREE agreement that is being presently negotiated between his department and the federal government at Ottawa. And the information that I have been able to come by, Mr. Chairman, suggests that this DREE agreement could very well do more for the future development of the potential tourist industry of this Province than anything else that we have seen in the past dozen or so years. And I am disappointed in a way that the minister



MR. RIDEOUT: did not spend more time in the three or four times that he has spoken to the Committee already tonight elaborating on the DREE agreement that is presently being negotiating between Newfoundland and Ottawa.

MR. MORGAN: Is that by negotiations?

MR. RIDEOUT: I do not want him to - Look, Mr. Chairman, anybody who has their head screwed on at all can go and look at the agreement signed by New Brunswick and the federal government for development of tourist industry in that particular Province. I know what is in the particular package and I would go so far as to suggest that probably another dozen members in this House know what is in it. It was a good package, a good agreement signed between those two governments.

Now I heard the minister refer to a couple of points that are in it and if it is breaking negotiations then the minister has already done it. He talked about the Great Northern Peninsula and also the Bonavista and Burin Peninsula and that is very fine, Mr. Chairman, but I would also like to know whether any attempt has been made in this particular DREE agreement to negotiate for some incentive to enable businessmen in this Province, investors in this Province to put up the type of accommodations that the minister was saying tonight that this Province lacks. What attempts have been made in that area? Is that going to be in the agreement? Are we looking for it? These are questions that the minister could very

MR. RIDEOUT: well address himself to and take at least fifteen or twenty minutes of the committee's time so we can know, at least we can have a chance to find out, what is coming for the development of the tourist industry in this Province.

And, Mr. Chairman, before I sit down I want to refer to one other point, and that is the wildlife officers who work for the minister's department.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Chairman, the minister will be lucky to have a wildlife officer working for him if he does not take the bull by the horns and do something about the dastardly way that his officials have been treated by government in their attempts to negotiate some reasonable sort of pay conditions and working conditions. For example, I know that the minister's department has informed the game wardens in this Province that they have been informed by Treasury Board to tell those people - those people, Mr. Chairman, who work for very little salary, and when I say very little I mean very little in terms of the hours that they punch in; they punch in eighteen to twenty hours a day, some of them, travelling throughout this countryside attempting to do something about poaching that my colleague referred to, attempting to enforce the wildlife regulations that have been laid down in this Province - and they have been told by an official of Treasury Board when they went to negotiate their salary that if they did not like the offer they could quit.

MR. MORGAN: No, that is not true.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, Mr. Chairman, that may not be true, but it was told to me. I know that it was told to me and I have told it to the minister. The minister is aware of it. I am not saying anything behind the minister's back.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. RIDEOUT: I am talking about the game wardens who are employed by the minister's department, and I am suggesting that if something is not done with Treasury Board to negotiate a reasonable contract for those people then the minister is not going to have any

MR. RIDEOUT: game wardens and he is going to have to go out and look for brand new ones all over again and he will not have the type of people that he has situated in various parts of this Province now who know the country, who know the territory, who know the people in it and are willing to punch in fourteen, fifteen and some - times sixteen and seventeen hours a day to enforce the wildlife regulations in this Province; and who are willing, Mr. Chairman, to go to Court and to prove their case and to be abused in many, many cases by their fellow citizens in the small communities in various parts of this Province. I have had some of those people talk to me because some of them are in the Central Newfoundland area and some of them know me. And they have been told by Treasury Board that 'if you do not like what we have offered you then quit.' And that message was passed along, I was told, Mr. Chairman, from Treasury Board to the deputy minister to their supervisor who passed it on to them. Now if anybody wants any more concrete proof - if the Minister of Transportation wants any more concrete proof than that there is ample room for it to be checked from Treasury Board to the Deputy Minister of Tourism to their supervisor to the people who are doing the negotiations. Now, Mr. Chairman, those people, from the information that I have, it has been ten years since their salary classification has been looked at, ten years, Mr. Chairman. What other group in this Province has been subjected to that kind of - I suppose discrimination is not too strong a word - ten years since their job classifications have been looked at. I asked them when they were talking to me what was the maximum salary that was paid those people - something around \$9,000 a year, or a little over \$9,000 a year I believe is what they are being paid. That is not the supervisors now, but the people in the field. And they are working fourteen and fifteen hours a day for that kind of money. They have been ten years without having their salary classification changed. They have made effort after effort to sit down with Treasury Board and try to have that negotiated and they say they are fed up. And would you blame them, Mr. Chairman, when they get the word back that, 'Look, we have offered you something, it is far from what you want, really far from what you want, but if you do not like

MR. RIDEOUT: it you can quit.' Now, Mr. Chairman, are those people that expendable that we can tell them they can quit? I would suggest to this committee, Mr. Chairman, that in many cases those people are carrying out the same type of work as is being carried out by the R.C.M.P. in many parts of this Province. In fact, if you had to depend on the R.C.M.P. to reduce poaching and to bring about convictions under the Wildlife

MR. RIDEOUT: Act in this Province without the help of those game wardens, we would have very few. And I do not believe they have been treated properly and I think it is time for their minister, not Treasury Board, their minister, that is who they are looking to -

MR. FLIGHT: To go to bat for them.

MR. RIDEOUT: - to go to bat for them, and after ten years of lying in the wilderness for their minister to go to bat and make sure that there is some form of reclassification for those people, that at least there is a decent wage for those people. How in Heavens name do you expect them to perform the job. The amazing thing, Mr. Chairman, is that they performed it so well as they have and when we talk about poaching that was raised so well by my friend and colleague from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), is it any wonder if any of those game wardens even bother to go into the woods with the way they are being treated and the way they are being bandied around and being made footballs of and told if you do not like it well you can lump it or you can quit.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is -

MR. NEARY: What a way to treat your employees.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, I asked questions of the minister in the House the other day. I know the minister is not negotiating for them. I know that. They negotiate with Treasury Board. and I would hope that the minister is just as upset over this as I am but the minister is their minister and he should go to bat for them. He should go and give Treasury Board or his colleague on Treasury Board a few little roots and say, I want you to deal with my people a lot better than that. They deserve a lot better than that and the wildlife of this Province depends on those people enforcing the wildlife regulations. And, Mr. Chairman, they are waiting to hear from their minister. They made efforts to meet with them and I think the minister has agreed or probably



MR. RIDEOUT: by this time has met with them, I do not know, but I would hope, and they have been attempting, Mr. Chairman, for the information of the Committee, to negotiate since September 1976.

MR. FLIGHT: What?

MR. RIDEOUT: Almost a year ago, They have been attempting to negotiate with Treasury Board for different classifications for higher salary and so on since September 1976.

MR. FLIGHT: September '76?

MR. RIDEOUT: And is it any wonder therefore, Mr. Chairman, that they are fed up? Is it any wonder they are disillusioned and I think it is time for their minister to go to bat for them and do something for them.

MR. FLIGHT: That was a year and a half ago, September '76? Lord!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, under the minister's department comes the division of wildlife and before I get into some of the points that I would like to raise about the Wildlife Act, I have been very easy on my friend this year compared to last year.

MR. RIDEOUT: It is time to get hard on him now.

MR. STRACHAN: I should state that I think that a division of wildlife being located within the Department of Tourism is a mistake. Wildlife is a natural resource to this Province. People do not go in and look for black bear or seal or geese or something to take pictures of them. They go in to get them for meat in general. And as such then the division of wildlife is misplaced in being placed in the Department of Tourism because the Department of Tourism is expounded to try to encourage other people to go in and get these animals.

But getting into the act itself, I think it is about time the minister sat down once and for all, and we have stated this a number of time, and threw out that totally insane, ridiculous, foolish Wildlife Act as it stands just now. The laws as

MR. STRACHAN: they stand just now have no applicability whatsoever to the people of this Province and to the people, especially in the North but in other areas as well who are hunting, especially hunting for the meat as a resource.

We know for instance that looking through the act that almost everybody on the Labrador Coast could be at any time taken to court. We realize that the magistrates have a difficult job because they have to enforce the law, the law as it stands, and they realize the foolishness of the law and yet they have to enforce the law because that is how the book reads. I think it is about time, last year we went after this, but it is about time the whole Wildlife Act within the Division of Wildlife was revised and changed. I will give you some examples of this and I have given this numbers of times before, the seasons are all wrong, totally wrong for this Province. The seasons might suit one area but they certainly do not suit another area. As I indicated last year, and I do not know if it is changed this year, but if you are killing black bear for meat then to kill black bear in July is too late because the best time to kill black bear is early Spring when they are eating the berries from the year before and you kill them before they get on the beaches, because once they get on the beaches they become too musky and too strong and you kill them again in the Fall. So the whole Wildlife Act which states that you kill during the Summer is wrong because the meat is bad and also the hide is of no value whatsoever if you wish to use it for anything.

The goose season and the Migratory Bird Act is totally ridiculous. We are seeing more and more people hauled up in front of the magistrates and the magistrate has little choice

Mr. Strachan:

but to enforce the Act and find people, ordinary people who are not committing any criminal act, people who are going out in the Spring of the year and hunting ducks right along the Labrador Coast and up in the Northern Peninsula as well, and I think it is foolish that we cannot have a season in the Spring of the year when we can kill geese and ducks, and at most times you can only kill geese in the Spring of the year with a rifle, you cannot kill them with a shot gun; so with the result that you do not kill many geese with a rifle, and at the same time geese are necessary as well as ducks for the meat. We take eggs in the Spring - and we still do it; I still do it - we take eggs in the Spring because we realize that if you take the first eggs from ducks or sea gulls they will lay again. And we always spread out and take eggs, only from one nest of one area, and each person has his own area in which they spread out and take the eggs. And if you had not had fresh eggs for three months or four months or five months then naturally if there are eggs around you will go and take them as long as you realize that it is the first eggs you are taking, We still do it, and I still do it, and will continue to do it, regardless of whether it is breaking the law or not because the whole system of the Wildlife Act in this Province, especially for Northern areas, is totally ridiculous and totally foolishly enforced.

I remember one time being in, in which we had spent six days in snow houses chasing caribou, and on the seventh day we managed to get our caribou and a helicopter came down with the wildlife officers who then informed us that it was a Sunday and we should not be killing on a Sunday, Now he was coming out from the comfort, and this was four years ago, the comfort of a helicopter when we had been living in snow houses held back from caribou because of storms, and then to be informed by him that our six and seven days hunt with another 250 miles to go back home by ski-doo that we should not be killing them that day because it was Sunday. And if he wished to he could have taken all we had, our rifles and our snow machines when we got back to the village. This kind of enforcement is foolish.

Mr. Strachan:

The minister, for instance, in the Wild Life Act, some people have been charged with this naturally as soon as you leave a community, and as soon as you leave the community you load your rifle, and you put your shells into your magazine, you never carry one in the breach until you see something that you want to shoot at. But if you are going to wait in the cold with mitts and gloves in the cold, and wait to see something, a wolf or a fox or a caribou, whatever it is, and then start putting your shells into your magazine you are going to get nothing, absolutely nothing. So we travel with shells in a magazine. That is an offense, an offense under the Wild Life Act. If you carry your rifle and you see a seal for instance what we call the sheena, the outside ice, and if you see a seal and lean over your snowmobile to rest your rifle which is a normal way of picking off seals you are committing an offence because you are on a snow machine, on a motorized vehicle, with a loaded rifle, and so therefore you are then charged with another offence, and there are whole heaps of offences that we can be charged with, and so people in the North are finding that as the regulations are being enforced, and naturally wild-life officers are employed to enforce these regulations and as these regulations have been enforced in the letter of law, they find it now they are being criminals and being hauled up and charged in court and losing their rifles and losing - so far no one has lost a snow machine that I know of, but can lose a snow machine and can get fined up to \$500. Similarly we have had situations where people have killed polar bear and have run into trouble when killing a polar bear which has marauded around their camp in the Summer. And if you can turn around and tell me that you are not going to shoot a polar bear - because you are living in a tent with your family, and the polar bear is around the cape and travelling around the necks and around your tent - that you are going to leave that polar bear and hope that he just goes away, you know, it is foolishness! You will go and shoot the animal. So what people are doing is shooting the animal, eating the meat and then burning the hide, and that is happening because we got our foolish law which states



Mr. Strachan:

that they can be fined, goods confiscated, lose all of their equipment and everyone is afraid.

MR. SIMMONS: It is forcing people to be deceitful.

MR. STRACHAN: That is right, it is forcing people be be deceitful. It is forcing them to be criminals. It is forcing them to feel that they must hide everything. We are getting to the stage now we are devising all kinds of tricks of the trade, outboard gas cans with false bottoms to put your ducks into, and the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) can tell you a couple last week too. We are devising all kinds of tricks of the trade to overcome or get around the Wildlife Act.

Now I stated the RCMP as far as we are concerned have been very generous to us. The RCMP in Nain for instance during the Spring of the year when we are hunting geese never appear on the wharf at night. When we come back we can leave the snow machines on the ice and jump over with our bag of game and so on, and I have even handed my bag of game to a Mountie, who passed it up on the wharf for me. And he just stays away because he knows if we have no fresh meat, and the only meat



Mr. Strachan.

you are getting is the meat you can get out to get at with a rifle. So the whole Wildlife Act as it applies is creating a tremendous amount of upset, and people are now starting to feel criminal, they are starting to hide, and the whole Wildlife Act should be changed. And I have appealed a number of times to the minister, and I am stating this for not only native peoples - it is immaterial to me - the whole coast right down the South coast are hunting ducks, migratory birds in the Spring of the year and they are taking them. They are taking them right now. They have been taking them for awhile and will continue to take them.

MR. HICKEY: Would the hon. member permit a question or an observation? In view of the fact that we have but nine minutes left after eleven, would he permit me for five minutes to closing time to respond to what he is saying. I think I can give him some information. Or would the Committee agree to continue on and go that nine minutes and finish the estimates and have it over with? Either one, I am agreeable. We will finish in nine minutes after eleven if we agree to go.

MR. HICKMAN: All we have to do is stop the clock.

MR. STRACHAN: I am talking just as much here for two people, see. I am talking for the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) who breaks the law as often as I do -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: - and for the Minister of Transportation who eats our geese.

MR. MORGAN: Do not tell stories now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NOLAN: What is the decision? Do we continue?

MR. STRACHAN: In fact last year the member for Naskaupi was driving the boat, and I was eating supper out of season.

Mr . Strachan.

But the point that I am trying to get at is that I think the whole Wildlife Act needs revising and completely looked at, the whole change. Some of the laws are just totally ridiculous and foolish. They cannot be enforced. There is just no way of enforcing them. If you are going to continue to enforce them, you are going to upset an awful lot of people. People are relying on these kind of things, on meat like this as a resource. We are not talking about people going in there just to get a rack. Nobody is interested in a rack or a head or antlers and so on. They are not the slightest bit interested. They are interested in the meat, and they will hunt it at the time of the year when the meat is best. As far as I am concerned I prefer to kill geese in the Spring than I do in the Fall, because in the Fall of the year the geese are no good. They are tough as far as I am concerned. During the Spring of the year, they are far better, and they are fatter. And we will continue to do it as people are doing it all the time. So all it requires is -

MR. GOUDIE: They are better in the Spring because they are grain fed.

MR. STRACHAN: That is right, and they are fatter.

MR. GOUDIE: That is right.

MR. STRACHAN: We have talked about this a number of times, and I see more and more cases - and I am not getting into the North West River case, because I think that the recent North West River case is a totally different case, and I believe myself that there was very bad advice given to the Indian people there to do that. I think to try to prove your aboriginal title, your aboriginal right, your claim to land through a Wildlife Act to me is a very foolish way to do it. I think that you got to do that in an entirely different way, and to try and prove it that way is wrong. But all the same they have some points in the Wildlife Act that forces them to do certain things. But forgetting that, I do not want to get into that issue. I am just talking generally on the Wildlife Act.

Mr. Strachan.

I also feel - just one last point here away from that - that there is a total stupidity and gross misunderstanding or ignorance of places like the Labrador coast where we can have a Department of Tourism and we can have a Labrador Services Division, for instance, three years ago, who can spend \$250,000 building an exotic fish camp on the Voiseys Bay and Franks Brook, Voiseys Bay, which the member for Naskaupi knows very well, at a site picked out by someone who happened to run against me in the last election, at a site picked out where there is no fish, no game. You have got to travel up river over sandbars. You cannot get down at low tide. You cannot move. There is no wildlife, nothing. Two hundred and fifty thousand dollars worth of fish camp built by the government. It is typical of government getting into a business they should not never be in, this business of building fish camps or building camps of this nature to try to run them.

MR. HICKMAN: That is a good, strong Tory philosophy. Government should never get into business.

MR. STRACHAN: Oh, you could head them. You nationalized everything, Linerboard and so on, you know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Crime does not pay.

MR. STRACHAN: That is right, but let the government do it.

But that is fact. You can see a beautiful fishing camp sitting on a side brook of Frank's River there, a beautiful fishing camp owned by the government, and you cannot use it. There are fish passing through it for three weeks of the year, and they pass right by, on they go. It is only Arctic Char anyway.

AN HON. MEMBER: Frank's River?

MR. STRACHAN: Frank's Brook. But this is typical of the kind of thing and I think that government should get out of that kind of business - should never be in it - and if there is going to be something of this sort of nature, and I hope it never occurs again, that was one of twelve camps they were going to build - if it ever occurs again there should be some co-ordination because they have one department of Labrador Services Division building a fishing camp on a river which has got no fish in an area in which there is no wildlife, up the river which you cannot get up at low tide, and you get stuck on sandbars, it just does not make sense. It is typical, and in fact, a number of native people were objecting to the camp and when they found out where the location was and a quarter of a million dollars were going, they stopped objecting because they said, 'We might as well leave it and let them build it. They never came and asked us where to put it, and where they are putting it there is nothing there anyway.' So they watched the government sit and spend a quarter of a million dollars on a camp which they did not want.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Unbelievable.

MR. STRACHAN:

And if this is the kind of encouragement, if this is the kind of programme we are going to get into -

MR. SIMMONS:

This was the former Liberal government.

MR. STRACHAN:

No.

MR. FLIGHT:

It is the present administration?

MR. STRACHAN:

No, it is the present administration.

MR. HICKEY:

We built that?

MR. STRACHAN:

Yes.

MR. FLIGHT:

Under the present minister?

MR. MORGAN:

We built that? Where?

MR. STRACHAN:

Yes - four years ago - Voiseys Bay.

MR. MORGAN:

No. Not at all.

MR. STRACHAN: No. The choice was made through Labrador Services Division, but it belongs to the other department.

MR. MORGAN: They paid for it anyway.

MR. STRACHAN: Pardon?

MR. MORGAN: They have paid for it.

MR. STRACHAN: Oh, it is immaterial where it was paid for.

MR. MORGAN: They paid for it.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, because the federal/provincial committee -

AN HON MEMBER: It was crazy to build it there.

MR. WOODROW: By Joseph R. -

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. STRACHAN: No, it was built previous to the last election - a couple of years before - four years ago.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Beautiful camp.

MR. STRACHAN: - An excellent manager - wasting his talents, but an excellent manager.

AN HON. MEMBER: No wildlife -

MR. STRACHAN: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Built by Labrador Services Division.

MR. STRACHAN: The site chosen by a P.C., you know, by a P.C. candidate.

But anyway, I will let the minister respond to my earlier remarks on the Wildlife Act, because I think that unless something happens soon we are going to be tearing into him again because more and more of us are going to be hauled up - sometime or other I am going to get caught; sometime or other the member over there is going to get caught, should have been caught last week with black ducks in his possession -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!



MR. STRACHAN: - And the whole act and the way it relates to Labrador and the Northern Peninsula is totally wrong and I think it has to be changed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! If the hon. minister will permit me just a moment. Is it unanimously agreed that we consider the clock stopped just short of eleven o'clock until such time as the time allotted for this head runs out? Is it unanimously agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Nine minutes.

Hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and let me thank hon. members as well to finish this and have it over with.

First of all, let me say that my department, at least, is not involved in the camp that my hon. friend refers to, and as I understand, that would be Labrador Services under a federal/provincial agreement.

The matters raised by my hon. friend from Eagle River, I certainly appreciate some of his concerns, and some of them we have discussed before.

The matter of the black bear: It is my understanding, and I have checked with my staff just a few moments ago again, as I have checked with them in the past, and I am advised that the season is that which the people demand or want. For example, we have increased the bag limit because of representation. We are flexible on that season if the people up there want it. But the best information that I can find indicates that the people up there want the season that we have.

MR. STRACHAN: Is the season open now?

MR. HICKEY: I could not be sure - I am not quite sure.

MR. STRACHAN: The people want the season open now. People have left to go-

MR. HICKEY: In any event, I can assure my hon. friend that the matter is now raised again. I have advised my staff to look into it again and to determine just what the situation is. If indeed

MR. HICKEY:                   there is a need for a change, I am quite prepared to entertain that and do something about it.

                                  The matter of the Wildlife Act, Mr. Chairman, is one which is under review at the moment and I can concur with my hon. friend that there are sections of it that need to be changed. The thing that I would want to stress, and I think any minister responsible for

Mr. Hickey:

enforcing the Wild Life Act of this Province would have to stress this, that there can only be one Wild Life law for all of the Province. There cannot be two. We cannot obey the laws that we like and break the ones we do not like. And so with that principle I am certainly agreeable to change it in the Wild Life Act, not only in Labrador but in the Island, There is a need for it, and they are under review and there are going to be changes.

The critical issue I think that we have to face in Labrador is one which we talked about before and that is the special considerations which are given. And again I repeat that while it may appear to be cumbersome, and it may appear to even discriminate, But it is termed that by people who do not understand the basis for these special considerations; the special considerations are for the Northern section where there is not an availability of fresh meat as there is in the Goose Bay area where there is better transportation and certainly better supplies.

I think it is sufficient for me to say that any changes in that system that we have at the moment tend to create more problems than solve. And I think really the answer, as my hon. friend has indicated here, I think, the answer is looking at the Wild Life Act totally as it applies to the whole Province all in one -

MR. STRACHAN: I did not mention native people or separate anybody out.

MR. HICKEY: Right.

MR. STRACHAN: I am talking about it as it is.

MR. FLIGHT: Right.

MR. HICKEY: To do that I think is reasonable and I think that is the route we should be going. In any event I can assure my friend that it is under review, and I do not know how many changes, and I do not know how many will be approved, but I can assure him that attention is being given it.

Mr. Hickey:

Mr. Chairman, I did not get the chance to mention one other programme which is very important to the tourist industry in this Province, and one which we are working tediously on at the moment and that is what we call the ARC proposed ARC agreement that we are negotiating with the federal government through Parks Canada. And I cannot give any details any more than I have in the other one, except to say that we hope for a twenty-five year agreement with the federal government in the development of a historic corridor which will see a pretty fair amount of development take place over that period in five year agreements. Certainly a concept which is sound, and one which certainly lends itself to this Province, because this Province is shrouded in history, and has, as I indicated earlier tonight, many areas with great potential for recreation of one kind and another. It is with this kind of development, Mr. Chairman, that the tourist industry will finally come into its own. It is with this kind of development which will allow and which will entice people to move in and provide needed accommodations, and it is with this kind of development plus the strategy for development that I talked about earlier which will allow the Province to more vigorously go out and promote this Province as a vacation spot only if we develop along the lines that we have talked about, and only if we develop as I said earlier realizing first and foremost that the good environment, the clean environment that we have got we should preserve, we should not allow any development including the tourist industry to be developed at the expense of that environment.

MR. FLIGHT: ... The Wild Life Act.

MR. HICKEY: My friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is high on wildlife and he has every right to be because that is an intricate part of the package that we promote.

So, Mr. Chairman, I want my friend from Windsor-Buchans to know that we in this department realize the valuable asset that the wildlife of this Province is to the tourist industry and to our own people, and our own people first, as long as we realize that whatever

Mr. Hickey:

we do in the tourist industry should always take into account first and foremost the needs of our own people. And I think no development should be allowed in the absence of that kind of policy, and it is that kind of policy that we support.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!



On motion 1301-01, carried.

On motion all items under heading 13, carried.

On motion Head 13 without amendment, carried.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee rise, report considerable progress and ask leave to sit again. All those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", carried.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed estimates of expenditure under the following headings. Forestry and Agriculture XII, with amendments, Municipal Affairs and Housing, XIX and Tourism, XIII, both without amendments and have made further progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion that the Committee reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have passed headings of expenditure XIX without amendment, headings of expenditure XII with amendment, heading of expenditure XIII without amendment and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining orders of the day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 o'clock, and that this House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved that this House now adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday at 3:00 P.M., those in favour "Aye", contrary, "Nay", carried. This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M.