

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
WEDNESDAY, JUNE 21, 1978

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

As hon. members are aware, a parliamentary conference of Atlantic Parliamentarians is taking place in St. John's. It started yesterday and continues until tomorrow. We had a few visitors yesterday and today we have a larger group and I would particularly like to welcome them. The Speaker of the Senate, Hon. Renaude LaPointe is among the delegates, pour

(Mr. Speaker then welcomed the parliamentarians in the French Language.)

Along with Madame La President of the Senate we have Mr. Speaker Woodroffe of New Brunswick accompanied by New Brunswick Legislative members. Mr. Speaker Doucette of Nova Scotia had to return. He will be represented later today by the Deputy Speaker, Mr. Casey, L.M.A. We also have Mr. Harry Blanc, M.N.A. of the Quebec Legislature, who is the Canadian Regional Counsellor to the Commonwealth Parliamentary Association. Dr. Maurice Foster, member of parliament, Chairman of the Canadian Branch of the CPA. I would like to offer a particular welcome to Sir Robin Vanderfelt, the Secretary-General of the CPA. I am sure all hon. members as well would wish me to welcome a friend of Canadian Parliamentarians for quite some time in the person of Mr. Ian Immery, Secretary-General of Parliamentary Relations. To all the delegates and their spouses I am sure that all hon. members join me in wishing you an agreeable stay in Newfoundland and we are particularly pleased to welcome you to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George's.

MRS. MCISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 106 woodsmen in my area.

This is probably the first petition of its kind to be presented. The prayer of the petition is very short.

"We the undersigned are in support of the local contractors having weight loads on trucks increased by the Department of Transportation and Communications, Motor Vehicle Division, to coincide with the factory plate weight on the door of the vehicle."

Now, in this area we have mostly woodsmen. Speaking to the prayer of the petition, the men are ready to go back to work. In fact, Bowaters are ready to start buying wood from the contractors and have been ready now for the past two or three weeks.

The contractors are getting tickets right and left for being overweight. I have a stack of them here which I intend to table with the petition. The maximum gross weight of the vehicle is, in one particular case, 50,000 pounds - I have the other one here somewhere - one is 50,000 pounds and the other one is 48,860 pounds. In the meantime, the contractors are only permitted to register those vehicles for some reason for 44,000 pounds.

The distance that they have to haul this wood is from - some of the gentlemen in the House may be familiar with the area - Fischells to Corner Brook which is a distance, I would say, of sixty or seventy-odd miles. The most that they can haul the way things are right now, is about 5.25 or 5.50 cords. And even to haul the 5.50 cords there are times when they

Mrs. McIsaac: being ticketed for being overweight when they do not have even the cordage that they think they are allowed. So the only way that they can make this pay and it involves quite a few people, the unemployment situation in my district is desperate right now. The contractor has his truck parked in the field, or the contractors, and they are speaking about one in particular who is a very large employer for that one particular area, and he himself hires up to eighty people during the peak.

So to make it probably simple, I have got a couple of letters here that I received from the contractor which may explain a little better than I could probably get it across to the members. For instance, this one letter states that he is receiving tickets. For instance, he received a ticket for \$100 on a load which was 6.47 cords, and the same amount on another one for 6.35 cords - he has paid tickets of \$100 \$80-odd, \$37. I mean, it is just running him into the ground. Now here is the way that they feel; they feel that the government is trying to put them out of work in the area. The contractor says he is ready to go to work, and he cannot get the weight on his trucks increased from the Motor Vehicle Division from 44,000 to even 48,000 - if they could even get 48,000 pounds they would be satisfied. But they feel that they should be allowed or be permitted to register for 50,000 pounds, which is stated on the plate on the side of the door. So unless something can be done to permit the contractor to register his vehicles for 50,000 pounds and haul that amount of wood, he is going in the hole every trip; even without the tickets he is still going in the hole, which means that right now there are forty men who could be working for the past couple of weeks who cannot work because of the fact that it does not pay the contractor to haul.

Now maybe there is a reason why trucks cannot be registered in this Province for the amount that is stated on the plate on the door. If there is, well I would like to know what it is, but my time is up. I would like to go into it in further detail because I have a stack of tickets here and a couple of letters here from the contractor, but I am going to put the whole thing together and send it all to the - and Table the whole works and ask that it be referred to the department

Mrs. McIsaac: to which it relates.

MR. F. ROWE: You dropped one.

MRS. MCISAAC: I dropped one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MCISAAC: All this, plus I would like to have all this sent up to the minister. Thank you kindly.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to very briefly support the prayer of the petition presented by my colleague for St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac). The problem that the hon. member refers to is a unique one, and I think all of us who represent districts where you have a fair amount of logging and lumbering and forest activity going on has run into the problem on many occasions. Essentially what it boils down to is that we have a number of operators in the Province who have trucks, long distance haulage trucks which have plates on them saying that they are registered and able and capable of carrying up to a gross weight of 50,000 pounds, and apparently there is some regulation put out by the Public Utilities Board or some other organization, or some other branch of government which in the case of the gentleman whom the hon. member refers to will only allow them to haul 44,000 pounds, and if they go beyond that they are in contravention of the law, and are thus, once they check in at weigh stations, issued tickets.

The problem is magnified, Mr. Speaker, when one realizes that over the long haul the seventy or eighty miles that the gentleman refers to, the people in St. George's referred to, that with the amount of weight that they are allowed to haul, the maximum weight, they cannot make a profit. They cannot haul the wood to the mill in Corner Brook at a profit. So obviously the only thing left for them to do is to close down their haulage operation and thereby throw

MR. NOLAN:           eight or ten or fifteen men out of work.  
Now I know we also have a responsibility and an obligation to set standards for the highways in our Province so that the highways will not be blatantly destroyed by overweight vehicles and so on, but I think it is a problem that the Minister of Transportation ought to address himself to. It is certainly helping in this particular instance to create probably unnecessary unemployment in an area of the Province where unemployment is already grossly high. So I would commend the petition to the minister on behalf of my colleagues on this side. We certainly give it our support and we would hope that the minister would be able to do something to help those people on the West Coast of the Province who find that because of government restrictions they are being unduly economically depressed.

MR. SPEAKER:           The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:           Mr. Speaker, if nobody else wishes to speak on this petition I have another petition to present.

MR. SPEAKER:           I am not sure.

                          The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:           Mr. Speaker, I want to speak for just a moment or two to the petition, the prayer of the petition that was just presented by the member for St. George's and the reason I want to speak to it just for a moment is this, because it was only yesterday, as a matter of fact, that I had a phone call from a truck operator in my district. He was not trucking wood as the two former speakers talked about, he was trucking fish.

                          Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is related to the petition. It has to do with maximum gross weight and so on. And this gentleman who phoned me yesterday told me that when he arrived at the weight scales he discovered that his truck was 3,000 pounds overweight. Now he got a \$50 fine for that, but in addition to that he had to unload the 3,000 pounds and of course yesterday, as most people are aware, and today and the day before that, and I suppose most of the Summer, we hope, the weather is not very conducive or

MR. CALLAN: very satisfactory to have to leave 3,000 or 4,000 pounds of fish sitting on the side of a road while the gentleman goes to the fish plant, which could be forty or fifty miles away and then have to come back and get it after. Now somebody might say, well it is quite easy for a man to tell whether or not he is overloaded, his truck is, that is, his truck, whether or not his truck is overloaded because the fish is weighed as it goes in the truck.

Now I might say in response to anybody who might be saying or thinking that, Mr. Speaker, that I have been on several wharves in my district where the fish is not weighed. Why it is not I do not know. There must be a good rapport between the fishermen who are selling the fish, and the buyer who is buying it, because what they do, they just fill up this box and apparently the box when it is full is supposed to weigh or hold 150 pounds of fish. They do not weigh it. They just fill up the box and the fishermen who are filling it up think it is full and then they just dump this into a bigger box so there is no way, and it is just kind of measuring, rough guessing.

So, Mr. Speaker, it is possible for a truck to arrive at the weight scales overweight and I am wondering if this double penalty, especially in a case of fish, I am wondering if this double penalty should be in effect. Number one, he has to pay a \$50 fine and then run the risk of arriving at the fish plant with the fish too soft to be allowed to stay there and so he ends up dumping it.

I think the man had a good concern, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps if the Minister of Transportation and Communications, if he responds to the petition in any way, perhaps he can address himself to this particular aspect of the trucking business as well.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 800 voters in the Province, Sir. The petition is not from any specific part of the Province. It is signed by people from all over the Province and from places like Gander, Port au Port, St. John's, Corner Brook, Dunville, Carbonear, Holyrood, Portugal Cove, Port au Port and Kippens.

The prayer of the petition, Sir, is that, "Whereas aerial insecticide spraying has proved ineffective in controlling budworm epidemics; and whereas long term forest management provides the only solutions to budworm epidemics and a provision for sustained forest yield; and whereas aerial spraying of insecticides diverts millions of dollars annually from long term forest management; and whereas aerial spraying of insecticides poses serious hazards to human health and the environment; and whereas federal laws prohibiting the spraying of homes, farms, livestock, water supplies, and areas of human habitation are routinely violated in aerial



MR. NEARY: spraying operations, we the undersigned urge that the government immediately call a moratorium on the aerial application of poison to combat spruce budworm." It is signed by 800 people, Mr. Speaker, from all over the Province.

Now as we know, Mr. Speaker, in the province of Nova Scotia they have taken a positive approach to the spruce budworm problem and Nova Scotia decided not to spray. In New Brunswick they have been spraying now for twenty-six or twenty-seven years and they are no further ahead than when they started, the only thing they have managed to accomplish in the province of Nova Scotia is a super budworm. They have had all kinds of problems in the province of New Brunswick in connection with the spray programme; it has cost the taxpayers over there a small fortune and they are no further ahead now than when they started.

In this Province, Sir, the government decided to spray rather than take a positive approach to the problem of the spruce budworm. Instead of carrying out an intensive forest management programme, thinning, reforestation, reseeding the woods, the forests and so forth and cutting the damaged timber and opening up the linearboard mill in Stephenville and creating jobs in a Province where we have record unemployment, the government decided to spray. And as a result of the spraying programme, Sir, all kinds of problems so far, and they have only been spraying now in this Province for three or four days and already we have all kinds of problems. We have reports, Sir, from Central Newfoundland, from a doctor who is a surgeon in the Gander hospital, who told me a few minutes before I came into the House that cars are being sprayed right, left and center; men, women and children are in these cars.

MR. WHITE: Shocking!

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir. And my hon. friend from Lewisporte (Mr. White) knows that a car was sprayed yesterday morning on the Junction, coming up from my hon. friend's district.

Mr. Speaker, the minister says that all complaints should be addressed to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. We do not seem to have anybody enforcing the Provincial Pesticide Act

MR. NEARY: at the moment and the minister says that all complaints should be forwarded to his office which would take weeks to process, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman already had one complaint. The doctor in Gander called up the hon. gentleman on Sunday morning, I think it was, at six thirty and said that the spray planes were in the air even though the wind speed at the time was 9.6 miles per hour which was far above the safety regulations laid down by the hon. gentleman. Now how did the minister respond to the doctor in Gander? The hon. gentleman hung up the phone and would not discuss it any further.

MR. DINN: He does not know what he is saying.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are all kinds, Sir, of examples of where the spray planes are flying in wind velocities that are far above the safety regulations that the hon. gentleman laid down. These reports, Sir, are available to the public. They can be obtained from the Met office in Gander. On Sunday for instance, 5:30 A.M. when the planes were flying the wind speed was 9.6 miles per hour, 6:30 A.M. 7.2, 7:30-9.6, 8:30-8.4 and so on and on Saturday morning the same thing when they were flying, 6:30-14.4 miles per hour, 7:30-14.4 miles per hour and so forth and so on. This is public information.

And so, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

MR. NEARY: Well despite the fact, Sir, - I want to lay the petition on the table that there has been all kinds of protests from all over the Province the government persists in spraying despite the fact that the majority of our citizens are opposed to it. The only thing I can say in closing up, Sir, is that every day when we start the proceedings of this House we should say a prayer to Almighty God, three Our Fathers and three Hail Marys that God will protect the little innocent children who are going into the country camping at this time of the year when these spray planes are overhead, otherwise set up bomb shelters out in Central Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon.member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. SIMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague from LaPoile (Mr.Neary) from 800 people, including a number from the Minister of Health's own community of Gander, his own district of Gander. We had a lot from Gander yesterday and we have had them just about every day and from other parts of the Province. I suppose we have had eleven, twelve, thirteen thousand. The minister from St. John's Center is briefly back from Florida, Mr. Speaker, I notice again,

June 21, 1978

Tape 4710

DW - 1

MR. R. SIMMONS: mumbling away. We have had thousands now, Mr. Speaker, 11,000, 12,000 -

MR. A. MURPHY: The man in the white coat is coming for you.

MR. SIMMONS: As soon as he gets you.

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

Hon. members on both sides are required to keep their contributions to the subject matter at hand.

MR. SIMMONS: I am being harassed, Mr. Speaker, by the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. A. Murphy). Ten thousand, 11,000, 12,000 people now, Mr. Speaker, have petitioned this House to stop the spray programme until we know what we are doing. All these people, Mr. Speaker, are not necessarily against the concept of doing something to control the spruce budworm. They are all for having the spray go ahead only at such time as we know it is safe and we do not know that now. We do not know that now, I say to the Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: There are a lot of things you do not know.

MR. SIMMONS: That is right. Several things, and one of them, I say to him, I do not know is that this spray is safe and he does not know that either.

MR. H. COLLINS: Sure it is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS: He may be sure, but his doctor friend in Gander, in his own constituency, is not nearly as sure as he is and the 11,000 or 12,000 or 13,000 people who signed these petitions, I say to the minister, are not nearly as sure, as certain as he is.

MR. RIDEOUT: He disassociated himself from it totally.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, why the spray? Have we passed the crucial point for this year? The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, who, by the way, is not dodging traffic today on McDonald Drive, I can see. He is here. He is actually here in the House, Mr. Speaker, sitting full upright. He has not answered the question. Have we passed

MR. SIMMONS: the critical period for this year, I ask the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture? Is it not already too later in terms of having the spray have any affect on the budworm? The egg mass count is down 47 per cent on the West coast. Why do we need the spray? There are other questions, Mr. Speaker, if we had time. Will the spray, I say to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, destroy the natural predators? Can we ignore the warnings on the matacil containers concerning dangers to bystanders from the spray mixture? Is it true that the company who tested matacil for registration on behalf of the manufacturers is now under investigation by the United States Government? And other questions, Mr. Speaker; can we ignore the geographical and topographical features - are these so different from the ones in New Brunswick that we can ignore the experiences in New Brunswick on this particular point? And many other questions. And the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture has not yet, Mr. Speaker, stood in his place to answer any of these questions and I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that one very good reason is he himself does not know the answers, which is another good reason why the spray should not be going ahead.

Mr. Speaker, with some apologies to Shakespeare and with some sincere thanks to my ghost writer, to spray or not to spray that is the question. Whether it is nobler in the mind to suffer the slings and arrows of outrageous Maynards or to take arms against their planes of trouble and by opposing end them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. WN. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, what can I hope to say that will match a combination of Shakespeare and my hon. friend all rolled up into one? But, Sir, I do rise to support a petition signed by 800 people, once more from a wide variety of areas an

MR. W.N. ROWE: the Province bringing the total, I suppose, of the twenty or twenty-five petitions which have been presented to this House on this serious subject, bringing the total number of people up to 12,000 or 13,000, as my hon. friend from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) has said. Seldom, Sir, has there been an issue which has attracted such widespread opposition and such a great number of petitions and such a great number of signatures to those petitions.

I think that we may have surpassed - how many were on the rate, the electrical power rate increase?

MR. NEARY: 30,000.

MR. W.N. ROWE: 30,000. So before the session is over, Sir, we may in fact surpass that.

MR. SIMMONS: Sometime in August.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Sometime in August. And if the spray programme goes on next year of course we will have the same thing happening again.

MR. SIMMONS: And your bill will not be through then.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was harassed by the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy every time I tried to say a few words on the spray programme. I will try to get across today what I intended to say yesterday. Mr. Speaker who is protecting the interest of the Newfoundland people on this question of matacil, the spray of a poisonous chemical into the atmosphere, soil and water of our Province? The Minister of Health, having in a discriminatory fashion seen to it that his district, Gander district, has been removed

MR. W. ROWE: from the programme with an increase in the buffer zone of one mile, discriminating against the rest of the Province by using his political influence and clout to remove his district and the water supply of his district from the programme. We know where his interests lie. We know what protection we can get from him when he got up in the House two or three days ago and washed his hands like Pontius Pilate and disclaimed any association with the programme whatsoever.

The Minister of the Environment, we know what his interest is; we know, Sir, that he is not interested in the programme because he has said to us on several occasions he will not answer questions on it and he is not interested in answering questions on this programme.

The Minister of Forestry has shown where his interest lies by acceding, I would say, to the minutest detail to the requests of the paper companies as to what areas should be sprayed and how much should be sprayed in those particular areas.

The government's interests are being looked after by a highfalutin, high paid advertising programme trying to sell to a reluctant people a programme which cannot stand on its own two legs or stand on its own merits.

And who is protecting the interests of the Newfoundland people, Sir? We have the paper companies looked after, we have an hon. gentleman looking after his own district for political purposes and we have the government looking after their interests. Who is looking after the interests of the people of Newfoundland? And, Sir, the answer to that question, of course, is no one except the people themselves who are trying to impress through the medium of this House upon the government by petitions and in other fashions that they do not agree with

MR. W. ROWE: this programme and that we should have other methods and other alternatives to a poison spray.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to make mention of the fact that there are many inconsistencies between what the minister said was going to happen and what in fact happened. For example, I do not think there is a twenty-four hour notice being given in spray areas; at least I have heard from people complaints that they do not know when the spray is going to take place. We have heard inconsistencies between the minister and the spraying company as to the air speed and ground speed and so on, many inconsistencies, Sir. All I can say is that I hope for the sake of the minister and the government that no disaster happens with regard to this programme this year. And I also hope, Sir, that the minister does not try to take credit next year for the lowering of an egg mass count as a result of the spray programme when in fact the egg mass count has gone down without any spray programme.

So I support this petition which is against the use of a poison chemical to control the spruce budworm.

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

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise very briefly to support the prayer of the petition. One may wonder why members continually rise in this House having brought in now 13,000 or more names in the forms of a petition to again raise our voices in objection to the matacil spray. But without being learned and scientific or with medical knowledge, any layman would understand that the normal testing pattern for any chemical that is to be sprayed on trees and which may very well come in contact with human



MR. NOLAN: beings is in a laboratory and you use animals - mice, rats and so on. This is, as I understand it, the normal method along with others for testing some kind of a chemical. What do we do? We spray it from the air on human beings. Is there any government in the world that has the authority, or any minister, to use people in this way, for experimental purposes? And that is what is happening here.

The risk is too great. It is nice to be concerned about the trees and the spruce budworm - we should be - and sensible and logical programmes have already been advanced by others and more, no doubt, will come including some from members opposite, but to think that any responsible elected authority would give their express permission, and it is only with their permission that it could be done, to spray Central Newfoundland, various water bodies and so on, because various water bodies that are being used as water reservoirs in communities have to be hit with the spray, I do not care if you are three miles from Gander, it has to have an effect with the winds you have in Newfoundland. And Gander is not the only one; there are numerous bodies of water throughout Central Newfoundland that are used for providing water to homes.

MR. NOLAN: We have here a programme. - I mean, what is needed? Many voices have been raised, physicians, teachers, engineers, laymen, parents, and so on, politicians, against this spraying, all for naught it would seem. So then what is the only way that this government can be stopped? The only way - the petitions apparently have not as yet, to this point succeeded - the only way is if some child or adult becomes very, very sick, ill or dies. That is it.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) have already become sick.

MR. NOLAN: That is it. And then we will get into a harangue as to whether you can find that this is directly attributable to matacil. That will go on for some time, as it has in various industrial cases that we all know about from diseases of the lungs and so on where no one seems to be responsible until hundreds of people have died. Matacil is being used allegedly for the spruce budworm. But the facts are frightening. The information we have now is that the spruce budworm count is down substantially and in fact if you had not used matacil or anything else it would have continued to drop, according to the information that we have, which are the government's own figures.

It is a frightening prospect that the only voice that can possibly be heard in this land is that some innocent person becomes very sick or ill and then there is a massive outcry. Then you will have the Minister of Health, as he has already stated in this House, saying, "It is not my programme."

MR. H. COLLINS: Come on.

MR. NOLAN: Well, did you not say that?

MR. F. WHITE: He said that. Sure he said it.

MR. NOLAN: Would the minister care to deny it?

MR. H. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. F. WHITE: He said it was not his programme.

MR. NOLAN: Well, what did you say?

MR. F. WHITE: It was not his programme. He had nothing to do with it.

MR. NOLAN: You see, there is the attitude.

MR. F. WHITE: Nothing to do with it.

MR. NOLAN: There is the attitude. I mean what is it -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. NOLAN: I mean what is it? What is this? Merely a little political bickering back and forth. I am not talking about political chicanery, I am talking about matacil and lives. That is what I am talking about. It is not a partisan issue at all. I am telling you that the minister said in this House it is not his programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. NOLAN: No wonder he would say it. I do not blame him for saying it.

MR. NEARY: He said it was not his programme. They have all abandoned the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the prayer of this petition.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the petition signed by over 800 people from all parts of Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I guess today was the day that I got most of the calls from my district. All morning people were phoning, particularly since somebody on the Junction Road had been allegedly sprayed because the plane just went right across the highway and somebody in it. Now I am told that people are keeping their windows closed when they drive over the highway even on hot days like this. And I said yesterday -

AN HON. MEMBER: What nonsense!

MR. WHITE: What nonsense, the minister says. Mr. Speaker, I said yesterday that I kept my windows closed in my car when I was driving over the highway yesterday and I did and I will again whenever there is spray in the area.

Mr. Speaker, earlier in the presenting of this petition they were talking about the egg mass counts being down in the Province and someone in speaking to the petition said that the egg mass counts from last year to this year were down forty-seven per cent on the West Coast. Actually the egg mass counts are down forty per cent all over the Province. And in Western Newfoundland they are down sixty-three per cent, Mr. Speaker. The egg mass counts in Western Newfoundland this year were down sixty-three per cent from last year -

MR. NEARY: They will try to take the credit for it now.

MR. WHITE: - from 1976 to 1977. In 1976, 495 egg mass counts for ten square meters and this year 1977, the last survey that was done, down to 182, Mr. Speaker, far below the danger level. And in Central Newfoundland the egg mass counts went down by forty-seven per cent and even in Eastern Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, the egg mass counts were down by thirty-nine per cent. Right across this Province the egg mass counts have been down by an average of forty-seven per cent. Now in British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, in 1976 they were getting ready for a spray programme in British Columbia. And in 1976 the egg mass counts in British Columbia were 505, or nearly twice the severe defoliation level. So they decided they were going to spray. But when they did the 1977 survey they found that the egg mass counts were down to an average of 134 egg mass counts, Mr. Speaker, and they decided against spraying in British Columbia and I have no idea why this government is continuing with its programme, Mr. Speaker. It is obvious the egg mass counts are down all over the Province. The only reason for spraying would be if the egg mass counts had gone up. That is the

June 21, 1978

Tape No. 4712

NM - 4

MR. WHITE:            only logical argument that you could sell  
to the people of Newfoundland and yet they persist in  
spraying. There must be other reasons, Mr. Speaker, why  
this is going on. There must be other reasons and I would like  
for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, who is rapidly

MR. WHITE: being left on his own in this matter, left on his own by the other ministers who are saying they want to take no responsibility for this, and I would like for the minister to tell us the real reasons why they are spraying in Newfoundland this year. I support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I rise to briefly support the petition. In supporting the petition I want to point out to this House that the budworm epidemic that we are faced with in this Province today is the result of a total lack of forest management in this Province. As a matter of fact, it is due to total mismanagement of our forest resources by the Department of Forestry, the paper companies and any other agency that had anything to do with our forest up to the time we got this massive outbreak of budworm.

We had lots of chances to learn, Mr. Speaker. We had the hemlock looper, we had the wooly aphid and we sprayed. When we had that particular threat to our forest the paper companies knew the condition our forest was in. Somebody said that our forest, Mr. Speaker, was a disaster waiting to happen. Well, it happened in 1971 and had the present forestry department taken the matter seriously then, and had we four, five, six, eight or ten years ago started thinning, forced the paper companies - Mr. Speaker, one of the things that the paper companies really scare Newfoundlanders with is they say, "Look, as a result of the budworm five or six million cords of wood are dead in the forest." Well, Mr. Speaker, there are fifteen or twenty million cords dead, even if there were not one budworm in Newfoundland, dead economically because the two paper companies or the Crown Land limits - there were no access roads to the Crown Land limits that

MR. FLIGHT: would allow the loggers to go in and cut it. The paper companies were only cutting what was considered cheap wood, what was either close to the mills or close to cheap water transportation to the mills. So as far as dead timber is concerned in this Province we have been looking at fifteen or twenty million cords that have been dead since day one, since the paper companies opened because they are not going after it. As a result of that, as a result of the massive amount of overmature timber that is in this Province with no effort being made at reforestation, no effort being made at thinning and salvaging the timber when it became overmature, we have the budworm epidemic we have today and the government is forced into a panic situation and have to spray.

In 1971, 1972, 1973, the paper companies were putting on the pressure, they wanted to protect their investment. Last year's experimental spray programme was the thin end of the wedge. The minister and the government were hoping; "We will get by with what we will call an experimental spray programme and next year the crowd will be brainwashed and they will accept it." Well, he was wrong, Mr. Speaker. We are not accepting it and the minister and everybody responsible for forestry in this Province are now going to have to live with the fact that not only were we pressured into a spray programme that the paper companies feel is necessary, and may indeed be necessary for all I know.

But the paper companies also designated the areas to be sprayed. The Minister of Forestry had about as much to do in deciding what areas were to be sprayed in this Province as I had, Mr. Speaker. The paper companies designated the areas, again designating the timber resources in this Province that will be the cheapest for them to cut over the next five, ten or fifteen

MR. FLIGHT: years. Mr. Speaker,  
Mr. Speaker, in my opinion,  
Sir, it was the height of irresponsibility for a government to, number one, be forced into a position where they had to spray, get into a panic situation where they do not know what to do, then when they decided they had to spray, use a chemical that we know very little about, matacil or aminocarb. We know very little about the long-term or short-term effects. There has been no research done on the long-term or short-term effects. Then in using that chemical designate areas, spray blocks in which there are communities, or communities are located where it will be impossible for them to avoid the effects of the spray through drift or direct spraying.

Mr. Speaker, I support the petition and I would suggest to the minister that he seems to have gotten away with this year's spray programme. We are half way through it now and in another four or five days it will be finished. But I suspect in the intervening eight or ten months between now and the next spray programme the minister will have seen more than 10,000 names opposing the spray programme in this Province. I support the petition.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George's.

MRS. MCISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I stand to support the petition presented by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).



Mrs. McIsaac: I think that this is a programme that the government has gone into headfirst, and while the Minister of Health can stand in his place and say that it is not his programme, it may not be his programme but it may very well be his problem when people are dragged into hospitals. We may not see the effects of it this year. We did not know that DDT was harmful for years and years, and we used it on our vegetables, but we know now that DDT is not harmless, and we -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS. MCISAAC: - do not know that matacil is not harmless.

MR. PECKFORD: Alarmists try to say stuff like that.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are only alarmists, that is all.

MRS. MCISAAC: We have as much scientific knowledge on this side of the House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Hon. members on both sides.  
Order, please!

The hon. the member for St. George's.

MRS. MCISAAC: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I would say that we have as much scientific knowledge on this side of the House--

AN HON. MEMBER: More.

MRS. MCISAAC: - as they have on the other side of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MRS. MCISAAC: Because they have not produced any scientific data to date to prove that matacil is harmless. And here we are helplessly being sprayed while the Minister of Health looks and says, "It is not my problem," and the Minister of the Environment apparently feels that it is not his problem, and the Minister of Forestry is taking it on himself. What about the Premier? Where does the Premier stand on this spray programme?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MCISAAC: We have not heard one word from the Premier on this spray programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS. MCISAAC: And he is not about to stand in his place and make a statement on this spray programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS. MCISAAC: And here we are getting sprayed and we do not know what is happening. Ten years down the road we may very well have hundreds of people, thousands of people with some kind of an outbreak of disease.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS. MCISAAC: They have had it in New Brunswick, it has been proven, and the Premier sits in his chair day after - well, when he is here; he is not here that often, But when he is in this House he sits in his chair and he refuses to rise and make one comment on the matacil spray.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is true.

MRS. MCISAAC: And the Minister of Agriculture down there, if he knows no more about the spray programme than he knows about argiculture, well, then we are all doomed so we might as well all go and make our last confession as far as I am concerned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Away to go, 'Hazel'.

MRS. MCISAAC: There is another point that I want to make again, I made it yesterday and I want to make it again, and every time I stand to support a petition that is coming in, and they are coming in every day, and there will be more. The Minister of Health used his position to have the buffer zone changed in his district, and if he can do it why cannot we all do it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MCISAAC: Why should we be used a guinea pigs? We are not second classed citizens in the St. George's area, we are not guinea pigs, and we expect the same treatment that the Minister of Health is getting for his district, Gander. What is Gander? Here we are in St. John's on the East Coast and they have the highest rate across the Province and those figures have been given out by the Department of Agriculture: The highest egg mass count is on the East Coast, not in St. John's city

MRS. MCISAAC: not on the Premier's doorstep -

MR. NEARY: They do not want to spray Bally Haly.

MRS. MCISAAC: - he is looking at me now as if I got two heads, but I have only got one. But the highest -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS. MCISAAC: - count is on the East Coast. But you do not come near the East Coast because the East Coast, they are too important to spray.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MRS. MCISAAC: You can test it on us, we are the guinea pigs.

Now I would like to hear the Premier stand in his place and tell us what he knows about matacil and whether or not it is harmful.

MR. NEARY: He was not on the river for the last couple of days when they were spraying.

MRS. MCISAAC: I am sick and tired of being treated as a second class citizen, and I expect the same treatment that the Minister for Gander got. He had his buffer zone changed, and the water in his area is still being sprayed; we are having our ponds that run into the Dribble, as I said yesterday, sprayed and we do not intend -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS. MCISAAC: We do not have much choice, we have got to put up with it because we have got a maniac Minister of Forestry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MCISAAC: Now if that is unparliamentary, I will withdraw it but I still think it. But I will withdraw it. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry must be a very, very lonely man. I am sure every morning he must get out of bed and look to the East and get down on his knees and salaam to Mohammed and hope that a plane does not fall out of the sky or a child does not get sick because he is all on his own in this programme. The Minister of Health has stated that it is not his spray programme, so why question him. The Minister of the Environment on CBC the other day said that if anything

June 21, 1978

Tape 4714

PK - 4

Mr. Strachan: happens it is the Minister of Forestry's baby, not his.  
So do not question him. So the Minister of Forestry must

MR. STRACHAN:

be all alone praying every day that nothing occurs which would cause him to have his throat slit.

Mr. Speaker, our question about matacil is a very serious one, because there is no point in the government telling us that the chemical, aminocarbonates or the family of drugs to which it belongs are harmless. There are some very harmful drugs in aminocarbonates and matacil is one of them. There is no point in saying to us that it has been proven. It has not been proven. DDT, like the member for St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac) says, was for many, many years used until it was found to be extremely harmful. We have questions nowadays with saccharine, questions about many drugs. Many chemicals that we use daily are now shown long term, over a period of years, to be extremely harmful. And our argument basically is that matacil has not been proven and until it has been proven to be absolutely 100 per cent sure and clear of any short term or long term effects then what is happening is that the people of this Province are being used as guinea pigs.

MR. NEARY:

Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN:

What we should do, I believe, is to do what we have offered from here. We are not being totally negative. We have offered solutions to the problem; we have asked whether there has been any consultation with Nova Scotia. The reply to this from the minister was, Why should they trot off to another Province to discuss with them their programme?

We believe very seriously that the forest management programme with the creation of jobs and harvesting that Nova Scotia has carried out should be discussed with them. The minister has stated that Nova Scotia is prepared to sacrifice its forests. We do not believe that, We believe that they have followed the logical and sensible

MR. STRACHAN: route, because what we are afraid of is that once you start this programme you are on a treadmill and our argument basically is the same argument that occurred in New Brunswick twenty-five years ago when they started on the programme and have now been on this treadmill for twenty-five years at a cost of \$100 million. And we would ask the minister could he tell us now whether he is only going to spray, now that he is spraying, this year and this will be the last year that he will be spraying? Or are we going to see an extension next year with larger acreage or more concentrated spraying next year and the year after and the year after? I do not accept that this is only a short term programme. It is a treadmill that you get on that in effect it has been proven in many cases that spraying in fact increases the length of time, the duration of which the budworm is effective and can spread it out over many, many years as is witnessed in New Brunswick.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, we have obviously shown by some positive suggestions that there is another route, another way out. We are concerned that this short term programme will not be a short term programme. We are concerned that the chemical used, matacil, is a chemical which can be dangerous, can be possibly proven later on to be dangerous and we will be spraying innocent people in this Province.

And lastly, of course, the minister must feel, as I stated earlier, all alone with all his colleagues abandoning him, that they have nothing to do with the programme, it is not theirs, it is totally his. I hope the minister, if something does happen, and it could very easily happen with 'planes that a 'plane can come down and there can be massive pollution using this matacil, that if there is massive pollution that the minister will

MR. STRACHAN: stand up and answer for it,  
because his job virtually is on the line.

I support the prayer of the  
petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I find that I must  
rise again today, the second day in a row, and say a few  
words in support of the prayer of this petition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will not say  
the same as I said yesterday - the hon. the member for  
Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) should be quiet and listen,  
he might learn something. The minister has already given  
us his opinion on the budworm spray but we have not heard  
of it this last month or so after the Premier had a chat  
with him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me  
as if we in this Province have become so stubborn and so  
dug in on an issue that we cannot be open minded and change  
our minds once the facts of the situation become evident  
to us. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that expert  
knowledge has told us that the spruce budworm egg count in  
this Province has substantially reduced over last year.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Now that would indicate to any sensible, reasonable person that the spruce budworm epidemic is taking care of itself by natural means. On top of that, Mr. Speaker, you have the oodles of concern expressed by people, rational, sensible people all over this Province in the form of petitions; it must be up around 12,000 or 13,000 now over the last week or so, On top of that, scientific fact proven by the foresters and the experts in the Province that the spruce budworm egg count is on the decline, on top of that you have the massive concern as expressed so vividly in those petitions from all over the Province saying and pleading and praying to the government to hold off on the programme for this year again to see if this reduction in the egg mass count is going to continue and see whether or not after this year there is any evidence to show that the epidemic, the problem will take care of itself by natural means.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that seems to me to be a most reasonable decision taken by the people of this Province. So what is the reaction of the government? The government, Mr. Speaker, has chosen to dig in their heels, The Minister of Forestry is probably the only one left now, he appears to have been deserted by at least a couple of his colleagues, but the Minister of Forestry has dug in his heels, he is not willing to listen to the scientific facts and to the pleas and the prayers of the people of this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, that seems to me to be a very sad state of affairs when government decides that to hell with what the people think, when government decides they are going to use the scientific facts only when it suits their fancy to do so. This appears obvious in this case because it cannot be argued, Mr. Speaker, that in the vast majority of cases and vast majority of areas in this Province the spruce budworm egg mass count has been on the decline, it has declined over last year. On top of that, we had very unfavourable conditions this Spring, conditions so unfavourable that the Premier at one point, Mr. Speaker, held out a ray of hope and said that if they were to continue then we might give some thought to postponing or eliminating the programme altogether for this year. So in consideration of all those facts, we have a minister and a government that, putting all those facts



MR. RIDEOUT:           aside, have dug in their heels and have said, "No way! We are not going to back down now or it will look as if we are crumbling under pressure, it will not look good publicly, We are not going to do it whether the people want it or not, They can like it or lump it they are going to get it anyway." So, Mr. Speaker, I do not care if there is a petition brought into this House every day from now until the end of the session expressing those reasonable and rational fears of the people of this Province, I think it is our obligation to support it, I have done it this past couple of days and I will do it again.

Mr. Speaker, I gladly support the prayer of the petition. I know it is fruitless, I know that the government is not going to change its mind because it appears to have become stubborn and dug in and you would not move it now with a barrel of matabail plus a case of dynamite.

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

MR. F. ROWE:           Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the petition presented by approximately 800 people from many parts of the Province against the spray programme. Sir, I find it extremely depressing myself to stand here day after day and see petitions being presented on behalf of the people of this Province, hundreds and thousands of people, Sir, who are voicing their concern over the spray programme, We keep asking questions and pointing out certain hazards with respect to the spray programme, and, Sir, what I find very depressing is this, that in very few instances do we see any members or government ministers on the opposite side stand up and speak in support or answer any of the questions that have been raised when we have supported these petitions. Sir, the government obviously is not paying any attention to the elected representatives of the people in this House of Assembly, They have seen fit instead, Sir, instead of answering questions in the House of Assembly and replying to the petitions that have been presented, they have seen fit instead to embark upon

MR. F. ROWE:

an advertising programme to try to sell the spray programme to the people of this Province. And, Sir, this is extremely serious. I would like to know, Sir, probably the Minister of Health or the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment or the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture or the Premier - the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture is not in his seat now - could indicate to this House just how much this advertising programme is costing the people of this Province; the advertising programme trying to sell the spray programme to the people of this Province. Sir if the government is so convinced and are so committed to this spray programme, why do they find it necessary to embark upon an expensive advertising programme?

MR. S. NEAKY:

Snow job.

MR. F. ROWE:

Now, Sir, I asked that one simple question. How much is that programme costing and why is it necessary if the government is so convinced and so committed to the spray programme?

MR. MURPHY:

You have been in politics (inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE:

Sir, another couple of questions I would like to ask the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment instead of jabbering away in his seat there now.

MR. A. MURPHY: You do not ask questions now. Are you presenting a petition or what?

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, the purpose of supporting the petition is to do just that, support it and ask any questions related to it. Now, Sir, the hon. Speaker knows that we have not got answers to these questions during the Question Period. Now if I may be permitted to continue, Sir, I would like to ask the Premier or any other hon. minister related to this spray programme this question: Is this a case - now I have asked this question before and I ask it again - is this a case where the government had decided some time ago to embark upon a spray programme and had in fact contracted a chemical company and gotten the hundreds of gallons of matacil -

MR. A. MURPHY: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has come up. I have to hear it.

MR. A. MURPHY: I was out of the Chamber for a while on business. Are we on the Question Period now or are we on petitions, Sir? And I would like for the hon. Speaker to explain to the hon. member, who has been in the House a few years, what the purpose of petition period is.

MR. SPEAKER: Obviously we are on petitions. With respect to asking questions, in supporting the petition I assume one may ask rhetorical questions if that is the style of oratory of an hon. member.

MR. MURPHY: And what is a rhetorical answer?

MR. F. ROWE: The rhetorical answer is sitting right there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: An hon. member may indulge in rhetorical questions but an hon. member may not indulge in rhetorical answers.

MR. FLIGHT: Shot down, 'Ank'!

MR. F. ROWE: Another attempt, Sir, to take two or three minutes of the five minutes that I have at my disposal. Sir, is this a case where the government had gotten into a contract to purchase the chemical involved, matacil?

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: There you go, Sir, To buy the chemical matacil and is this a case where the government had entered into a contract with a chemical spraying company, an aircraft company and then after we got the public protest and the evidence brought forth the government just dug in its heels because they might have been in a breach of contract situation. And I would like to ask as well, Sir, rhetorically for the benefit of the member for St. John's Centre whether or not tenders were called for the chemical involved and whether or not tenders were called for the contract with the

June 21, 1978

Tape 4717

DW - 3

MR. F. ROWE: particular company involved?

Sir, I think these are serious questions to be asked. And finally in closing, Sir, to what extent has the government, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, in conjunction with the paper companies entered into a long range plan for forest management for the sake of our forest period and also silviculture basically for the purpose of -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman time has now expired. He may finish the sentence.

MR. F. ROWE: - trying to establish a spruce budworm free forest which is quite possible as has been proven in other provinces.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that my district, or a section of my district, specifically Port Blandford is included in the spray programme, and in view of the fact that these people have let their protest against this spray programme be known through a petition here in the House of Assembly, I want to support the petition so ably presented by my friend and colleague from LaPoile on behalf of 800 residents throughout Newfoundland. A very well

Mr. Lush: worded petition, Mr. Speaker, a petition that protests the aerial insecticide spray programme on the bases that it is not a solution to the problem, and they specifically state that a long term scientific forest management programme is the only solution. Also they expressed in the petition their anxiety and their worry and their fears with respect to the chemical matacil.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to these petitions I have addressed myself to the importance of forest management. Spraying is the last resort. If the government were doing the spray programme in conjunction with or the spray programme, more exquisitely put, were an adjunct to a good forest management programme then our people could justifiably swallow it, they could justifiably take the spray programme. But, Mr. Speaker, the opposite is true. The spray programme is the primary concern of the government in this fiscal year, whereas forest management is secondary. And that defies all logic, Mr. Speaker, that defies all rationale, it is the forest management programme that must receive emphasis. It is the forest management programme, the long term scientific forest management programme that must occupy the attention of the government. That is where we must put the emphasis.

And, Mr. Speaker, by looking at the Budget in terms of dollars and cents there is certainly more money being put into forest management programmes than is put in the spray programme. But that is not the point, Mr. Speaker, when one views the items under the forest management programme one can very readily see that there is somewhere in the vicinity of \$4 million being spent on forest management. But when one views the Budget very closely, one could very quickly come to the conclusion that very little of that money is going into the alternatives to spraying, the actual forest management of reforestation, harvesting, thinning, this sort of thing, very little money is going into this aspect of forest management. A lot of the money is going in, the bulk of it is going into forest access roads which certainly is a part of forest management, which certainly will provide the opportunity to harvest the infested wood. But will we do this? There are several forest access

Mr. Lush: roads in the Province. Are we just building these forest access roads for the sake of building them? Is there any purpose to building them? Or is it the intention of the government once these forest access roads are built to start a major programme of harvesting this infested wood and the overmature wood and the balsam fir on which the spruce budworm thrives - is this what we are going to do? Past experience indicates, Mr. Speaker, that we just made forest access roads anywhere, criss-crossing the country, criss-crossing all over the place but no effort to harvest the wood concerned, the overmature trees and the infested trees. If one could be sure that this is what the government was going to do then at least one could swallow the spray programme at least with some measure of agreement, with some measure of satisfaction. But, Mr. Speaker, such does not seem to be the case.

So it seems as though the government are putting a total emphasis on spraying and little emphasis on scientific forest management which is the only long-term cure, which is the only long-term solution to controlling the spruce budworm. And I would hope that the government would immediately cease this crazy and mad course on which they are now embarking.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I also am prompted to rise and support this petition signed by 800 individuals from various communities who are effected by this spray programme. I do not believe Adeytown was mentioned among the names of the people who signed the petition.

AN HON. MEMBER: A few from Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Two from Bellevue. There is no spraying going to be done at Bellevue. Thornlea, perhaps, but not Bellevue.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned Adeytown because, I do not know if it was last night or the night before as I was listening to the forecast of spraying and so on it was announced that the spray programme would be carried out next in the area of Random Sound, Adeytown was mentioned. It is unfortunate for those people who live down there, Mr. Speaker, that the only news they get is the bad news. They are going to get spray down there but they could not get any pavement a year ago and they could not get any calcium chloride -

MR. WHITE: Nor water and sewer.

MR. CALLAN: - put on their roads this summer but they are getting sprayed. They are getting all the bad news.

Mr. BRETT: (Inaudible) pave Random Island.

MR. CALLAN: That is right. The Minister of Social Services, Mr. Speaker, convinced the former Minister of Transportation and Communications not to pave Adeytown, just go to the last house in Deep Bight. And now they are getting more pavement on Random Island in addition to the spray.

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition. Mr. Speaker, I am on record and on tape as well as to my position regarding the spray programme. Two weeks ago I gave a press release to the media in which I said that if the spray programme is to be carried out at all, if government thinks that it should be carried out at all, then it should be carried out on a very limited, experimental basis removed from communities, towns and water supplies. It should be carried on somewhere in the interior, in the

MR. CALLAN: wilderness. Let us do some experimenting, yes, if necessary, very limited experimenting with this deadly chemical matacil. But the government is still carrying out this silly spray programme which has aroused the anger and the fear of thousands of Newfoundlanders. What the government should be doing, Mr. Speaker, instead is what the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) just mentioned and, as I said in a press release a couple of weeks ago, the government should be carrying out a forest management policy, a forest management policy which involves reforestation and getting rid, harvesting the wood that is infested, that is dead on the stump as we have heard so many times mentioned in this House, and thus, Mr. Speaker, spending millions of dollars harvesting the infested timber, the dead timber, harvesting that and in so doing trading hundreds of jobs for the people who are so badly in need of employment in this tiny Province of ours. In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, as I said, what will be done with the harvested wood? The harvested wood, Mr. Speaker, could be used to several good advantages. One of these of course as I have mentioned so many times could be used in the reopening and the refurbishing of the Stephenville Linerboard mill which, as we have heard, one of the reasons why it shut down was lack of supply of wood and it need not have happened. There is lots of timber in this Province, Mr. Speaker, lots that could be used to keep that mill open. A system of sawmills, a system of lumber banks, Mr. Speaker, across this Province where this lumber could be bought up by the large and small users of lumber rather than have sixty-five per cent of the lumber that is used in this Province today brought in from as far away as BC and that is not the back of Carbonear, that is British Columbia. Sixty-five per cent of the timber, the lumber that we use for building and other purposes in this Province is imported. And here, Mr. Speaker, we have millions of cords of lumber dead on the stump and nobody especially the government does not seem to know what the solution is. Instead of harvesting and spending most of the \$8 million that was granted in the agreement that was signed with Ottawa last week, instead of



MR. CALLAN: spending most of that for harvesting and reforestation, it is going into silly nonsense, helping the paper companies, Mr. Speaker, and, of course, the silliest thing of all, this silly silly, silly spray programme. Mr. Speaker, I support the petition and I call a quorum. I call a quorum, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I call a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum has been called. We will take the bell as rung. It will not ring.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ding a-ling a-ling.

MR. SPEAKER: We have a quorum. The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition. It is a shame that in this day and age we approach the subject of a chemical that is being sprayed to supposedly kill a pest of the forest, it is a shame that we take the premise whereby this chemical is innocent until proven guilty. I do not think that we should be thinking in terms of that chemical being innocent. It is guilty until proven innocent.

Mr. Speaker, I find it hard to believe that last year when we had the closing of the Linerboard operation and the government knew at that time that we had a very, very serious budworm problem, I find it hard to believe that since 1972 when the budworm problem was identified that this government sat back and did nothing until this date.

DR. KITHCEN: They came with the Tories.

MR. MCNEIL: The budworm, as has been suggested by my hon. colleague, came with the Tories. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, which has done the most damage to our Province, the budworm or this provincial government, the Moores P.C. Government. Both are disastrous to this Province.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible).

MR. MCNEIL: Mr. Speaker, it is such a fine day and to hear the hon. gentleman on the other side blow again -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
One hon. member at least has informed me that that hon. member has difficulty in hearing the hon. gentleman from Stephenville. I would ask hon. members to guide themselves accordingly.

MR. MCNEIL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
I would have thought last year, and it was mentioned then,

MR. McNEIL:

that the Linerboard problem because the market was bad, there was a small return in the marketplace and that the cost of wood was so high that maybe the government would have put the money into harvesting rather than spending money into buying a chemical and spraying our forests with this deadly poison.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the government will consider the whole reforestation - or the whole spraying programme and move in the direction of reforestation and harvesting. I would be able to accept a limited amount of spraying with a different chemical that was proven. But when you ask us to accept a chemical which is not proven to be safe, you are asking us, the general public, to accept it because the forest is going to be destroyed if you do not use it is a lot of baloney. The forests were in a very critical condition prior to this year, prior to last year when they had the experimental programme on the go. So, Mr. Speaker, I think that the government again is misleading the people. They are trying to make - well actually what they are trying to do is dump the chemical that they have stored right now. They are backed into a corner. They do not know what to do with the chemical and the only way to do it, to show that they are at least trying to do something in a constructive manner, is spray against all opposition.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the petition wholly and I do hope that the minister will change his decision in spraying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question no. 100 in the name of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) wherein he asks the names of the people who make up the Board of Management of the Hospital at Gander, the date on which they were appointed, the term of the appointment, the title of the position held, be it chairman, vice chairman, member or otherwise and also whether there is a per diem allowance, travel, meal and accommodation expenses and annual salary in connection with the performance of duties.

All of the existing members were appointed on April 1, 1978 for a three year period. And the Chairman is Mr. Hudson Davis. The members are Mr. G.C. Smith, Mr. Ed McCarthy, Captain Max Burry, Mr. Harry Newhook, Mr. C. Galway, Mr. Lloyd Noseworthy, Mr. W.G. Strong, Mr. Cyril Hicks.

AN HON. MEMBER: All Tories.

MR. H. COLLINS: I doubt if Captain Burry and Cyril Hicks are exactly Tories. Reverend Father W. Hearn, Mr. Eric Burry, Mr. Lawrence Guy, Reverend Munden Way, Mrs. Katey Simpson, Mr. David Power, LL.B, and Mrs. Genevieve Pickett. None of the members of course are paid and there are no out of pocket expenses.

Answer to question no. 99 is along the same line and the names of the people in this relates to Twillingate, the hospital at Twillingate. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, this gentleman cannot be considered as a big, rampant Tory. The chairman of the Board, and all of those people were appointed again April 1, the chairman of the Board is Mr. H.W.C. Gillett.

MR. NEARY: A good man.

MR. H. COLLINS: And if my memory serves me correctly he should not have been over there but he was over there. I think he was a Tory at heart, but certainly he is not well known in Newfoundland as being a big Tory. The other members of the Board are W.T. Earle, Mr. John Hamlyn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. H. COLLINS: I understand some of those names were poll captains down there somewhere. Mr. M.J. Earle, Mr. Frank Guy, Mr. M.C. Loveridge, Mr. Bud Osmond, Mrs. Ida Reid, Mr. Rex Wheeler, Mrs. Thelma Osmond, Mr. Morley Parsons, Mr. Edgar Anstey, Reverend Donald Ford and Mr. Thomas Wheeler.

The other Board is the hospital at Springdale where the chairman is Mr. Edward A. Smith. The members are Bill Abraham, Don Batstone, Arthur B. Murphy, Gordon Fudge, Ken England, Fred Morgan, Mrs. Margaret Wheeler, Charlie Green, Mrs. Valera Heath and Dr. Dennison. And as I say, Mr. Speaker, there is no per diem allowance. I believe I said on the previous one, which was in error, that there is no per diem allowance. But in the event that the boards have to travel, like come to St. John's or something like that, they are paid by the boards for out of pocket expenses. And there is no annual salary of course in connection with the performance of their duties. In fact, it is the only group of people I know in Newfoundland who provide a very real and a very valuable and a very good service to the people of this Province who receive no per diem allowances at all. I have some more -

MR. NOLAN: What do you pay a hospital board like the General and so on, the members, you know?

June 21. 1978

Tape 4721

IB-4

MR. H. COLLINS: Nothing.

MR. NOLAN: Nothing?

MR. H. COLLINS: Nothing. Which one is dead?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. H. COLLINS: Rex Wheeler where? You are wasting  
time as usual.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Justice should stop harrassing  
the Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: I will have some more on the continuing story tomorrow.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. Government House Leader could tell us whether the Premier is going to be in the House for the Question Period today. The hon. gentleman has been absent now for two or three weeks and has not appeared in the House for the Oral Question Period. Is the hon. gentleman out in the Common Room and coming in for the Question Period or has he gone back on the Serpentine or whatever river he was on salmon fishing? Not coming back for the Question Period?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier for the record has been in this House this afternoon from three o'clock until twenty after four. I do not know if he is within the hearing of my voice now or not but -

MR. CANNING: He was only in ten minutes. He did not stay in.

MR. NEARY: Five or ten minutes is all the time he spends here.

MR. CANNING: He has not been in ten minutes in the last ten days.

MR. NEARY: He should be well rested now. The Premier should be well rested after three or four days vacation.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Only one person really has the floor now and that is the hon. minister in answering a question.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Right. That is okay.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will put my question to the Minister of Justice, Sir, the Minister of Finance, the Government House Leader; perhaps he can give me the answers. In view of the fact, Sir, that the economy of Newfoundland is in a shambles at the present time and in view of the fact that we have record unemployment at a time of

MR. NEARY: the year when skilled tradesmen and young people should be working, would the minister tell us if there will be any employment in this calendar year on the Lower Churchill Falls Development?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not in the position to answer that question. Maybe the hon. the Premier will be here before the Question Period is over and the hon. member can ask him or my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, who is participating in the graduation ceremonies at the Trades and Technical College this afternoon and he too may be here before the Question Period is over and one or the other, I am sure, will be more than happy to advance to the hon. gentleman any information he has at his disposal in that particular field.

MR. NEARY: Now let me try my luck, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Let me try my luck on the Linerboard mill. We understand that there are some speculators now out in the town of Stephenville, former Tory bagmen, who may or may not have the inside dope on whether the Linerboard Mill is going to open up. What is happening with the negotiations in connection with the Linerboard mill? Has it been sold? Is there any possibility of selling it and getting it opened again? Perhaps the Minister of Transportation, T and C, would like to answer that question. But the people out there, Sir, are very concerned about the fact that land speculators, land grabbers are moving into the area. What is the story on the Linerboard mill?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: I think I answered that question yesterday, Your Honour, or certainly fairly recently. The story on the Linerboard mill is that a series of ongoing discussions and negotiations are being held with at least three companies, all of whom show varying degrees of interest in acquiring the asset. There is nothing firm or definite to report at this time. The talks have not reached a level of agreement whereby we are in a position to report to the House on the progress. We are encouraged by the fact that these firms are showing an interest and a real interest.



June 21, 1978

Tape No. 4722

JM - 3

MR. DOODY: As for the speculators who are investing in the Bay St. George economy, I find that very reassuring and very pleasant. I do not know what their occupations are or indeed anything else about them except for the reports from the hon. member. If the hon. member feels that we should discourage people from investing in that part of the Province then I could certainly try to get the word out. But of course I know that that is not the intention and I certainly would not do anything of that nature. I can only say that I find both the discussions

MR. DOODY: with the companies and the fact that people are reinvesting and showing some confidence in the future of the area, I find both of these concerns to be very encouraging.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously we are batting zero. There is going to be no work in connection with the Linerboard mill and we do not know about the Lower Churchill. What about the Come By Chance oil refinery? Is there going to be any employment there this year or are people going to be forced, in this Province, to go on welfare in the next few weeks when their stamps run out, their unemployment insurance stamps run out? What is to become of all the unemployed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. DOODY: The Come By Chance oil refinery situation is at the present time as follows: There is one company only which has shown a definite interest and has made a proposal which the holders of the first mortgage through the receiver are considering to be worthy of further investigation and further consideration. They are currently checking on the credentials and the bona fides of this particular company and have asked them to produce satisfactory evidence which would inspire the holders of the first mortgage to move along toward a satisfactory conclusion.

To date we do not have anything further than that. The British ECGD people and Kleinwort-Benson keep us informed of the various discussions that they are having with the First Arabian Corporation which is the name of the company with whom they are dealing, and, as I say, they have not moved beyond that particular point.

The second half of that question, of course, is a hypothetical one and certainly not one on which I would be prepared to speculate on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, then the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. DOODY: Who shouted the loudest that time, Your Honour?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary, Sir.

MR. DOODY: You did?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members can always come back to the subject matter,

MR. NEARY: You mean I cannot finish up my question?

MR. SPEAKER: No, I said I recognized the hon. member for a final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary? Oh, I see, Sir.

I want to put my final supplementary to the Acting Premier, Sir. It is a question, really, that should be directed to the hon. the Premier but I understand the hon. the Premier is in conference right now with a very important gentleman. I want to ask the minister, because the outlook for the future is so dismal for the unemployed in this Province, especially the skilled tradesman who should be working this time of the year, and the young people who came out of the College of Trades and the vocational school and the university who cannot find jobs, does the government have any special programmes or any plans, make-work programmes, make-work projects to create jobs, especially for our young people who are unemployed to bolster the economy or to prop up the economy at a time in our history when we have record unemployment in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not share the

MR. HICKMAN: pessimism of the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). We do have in Newfoundland more unemployed people than any of us like to see, but it is also significant that there are a lot of jobs still going unfilled.

MR. SIMMONS: Name one.

MR. HICKMAN: Name one? If the hon. gentleman has been reading the newspapers one would see, as an example, an advertisement being carried by the Department of Transportation and Communications for technicians and for graduate engineers. I am told, and the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications can correct me on this, that up - now remember we graduated from Memorial this year, I presume, about forty to fifty young Newfoundlanders in engineering - that in the Department of Transportation and Communications there were only two responses to their advertisement with a starting salary of \$18,000 a year.

MR. HICKMAN: I would have thought that was a reasonably good salary to offer a young graduate coming out of Memorial, certainly competitive. I am told -

MR. NEARY: Now tell us what special plan -

MR. HICKMAN: - I am told that there are only two applications, neither of which were from this Province, which leads one to assume that the engineers who came out this year and the technicians have found employment within Newfoundland. It is a fact too that the income in the fishing industry amongst our fishermen have never been as high as it is right now. It is a fact, and

MR. NEARY: And you are not going to do anything about -

MR. HICKMAN: - the hon. gentleman from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning) will bear me out on this, that one of the problems we have right now on the Burin Peninsula -

MR. P. CANNING: The biggest problem we got is the 270 students who graduated in the Burin district the other night without any job. That is the problem we got.

MR. HICKMAN: And the problem we have right now on the Burin Peninsula is keeping kids in high school when the fish plants are pounding on the doors offering them big salaries to quit now, and this has become a very serious problem on the Burin Peninsula.

MR. NEARY: You have no plans.

MR. HICKMAN: One of the superintendents told me -

MR. CANNING: The only (inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: - if one goes into Gander, one finds that Gander is the fastest growing town now in Atlantic Canada, with a high income indeed. And if one looks at the two paper companies, the paper towns of Grand Falls, Windsor and Corner Brook we see a great deal of prosperity there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: But let me say, Mr. Speaker, this does not gainsay that Newfoundland still has an unemployment rate that is unsatisfactory. And all we can hope for is that the programmes such as the ones outlined by my colleague, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries will meet the long term needs of this Province. Because one thing Newfoundlanders do not want

Mr. Hickman: these make work programmes that last for a week or two, or a month or three.

MR. NEARY: There is nobody in charge. We need a leader over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated I would recognize the hon. gentleman for Baie Verte-White Bay next.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I am being harassed by my colleague. Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister whether or not he is aware that a public servant, the Administrator of the Baie Verte Hospital working in an institution operated by the taxpayers' dollars of this Province because he disputes or takes exception to certain beliefs, legitimate or not, of the union leaders in Baie Verte has refused to conduct miners' medicals at The Baie Verte Hospital?

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

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I had a call - I am not sure if I should be discussing this in the House, but the hon. member has brought it up.

MR. RIDEOUT: well, it is going to be discussed in the House!

MR. H. COLLINS: But I did have a call a couple of days ago from the leader of the Steelworkers Union in Baie Verte, wherein he alleged that there was some serious misunderstanding between the union and the chief of staff of the Baie Verte Health Centre. I subsequently talked with -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not identify him.

MR. H. COLLINS: He was the Chairman of the Union. I subsequently talked with the Vice-Chairman, I believe it was, in the absence of the Chairman or the President. And we have also been in touch with the gentleman involved in the hospital requesting a report from him which I understand is enroute by mail. As soon as that is received then I will determine what is the best, more appropriate action we should take. I would suspect that first of all we should try and get the different groups together with some people from the Department

Mr. H. Collins: of Health. I might add, Mr. Speaker, that the hospital in Baie Verte is operated by the United Church of Canada, and practically all of the members of the Board are people who have been recommended to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council by the United Church of Canada. And as I said I would prefer to say nothing further at this particular time in due of what is now transpiring. And if the hon. member would like me to, and I am sure he would,

MR. H. COLLINS: once we have gone into the matter in greater detail and see if we can get the different parties together I would be only too willing to let them have the report.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter and, while the minister may feel it is not appropriate to discuss it here, I do. The minister happened to be informed by a letter from the administrator of the hospital that he is not going to do it nor allow his staff to do it. Now I want to ask the minister this supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Since the law provides that miners must have medicals each year and since the Minister of Health has the authority, the only one who has the authority to approve doctors to carry out miners medicals, will the minister tell the House what action his department has taken or will take to ensure that Baie Verte miners have access to practitioners for the purpose of providing those medicals?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as I said I always like to think there is a way to solve problems without a confrontation between different people. I understand that one of the charges which has been laid against this particular gentleman who is a medical doctor is that he is incompetent to do medicals and of course the doctor says, "Well if I am incompetent to do medicals, why do you come to me?"

MR. RIDEOUT: No, that is not true.

MR. COLLINS: The hon. member says that is not correct. I am making that statement to the House and to the best of my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. We can make arrangements for the miners to go to Springdale, we can make arrangements for them to go to Grand Falls or wherever but I do not think that is going to solve the problem. What I do propose to do, and the machinery is now in the process, is get the various groups together and see if we cannot arrive at some understanding whereby the miners examinations can be done in Baie Verte where they should be done.



MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Energy I would like to direct this supplementary to the Minister of Justice. This is a very serious problem, Mr. Speaker, and I want to direct this supplementary to the Minister of Justice in the absence of the Minister of Mines and Energy. In view of the fact that it is illegal by statute and by regulation of this Province for miners to work unless they have a medical that is current, that is, within the year, and in view of the fact that more than 400 miners at Baie Verte are now working in contravention of the law, would the minister responsible for enforcing the law in this Province tell the House what action the government will take to ensure that those miners have an opportunity to get their medicals without any further delay so that they will not be working in contravention of the law through no fault of their own?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. COLLINS: If my colleague does not mind, just before the House opened, Mr. Speaker, my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy and I had a discussion on this. He is fully aware of the problem there and is most anxious as we all are to have the problem resolved. It is not one, as I said, where I can pick up a phone and have it resolved quickly. The approach we are taking I am sure is the right one, but, as I said, the Minister of Mines and Energy is well aware of it and we are doing everything within our power to try and reach some satisfactory conclusion to it.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Health did not allow his colleague to answer the question with regard to the enforcement of the law so I will ask the Minister of Health this final supplementary: Could the Minister of Health tell the House now, and through this House

MR. RIDEOUT: those 400 miners in Bale Verte, in view of the fact that medical knowledge has proven beyond doubt that asbestos fibers are dangerous to health, how and when they will receive their medicals for 1978 so that their health will be protected, number one, and number two, so that they will not be working in contravention of the law of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the first part of that question I have already answered twice and the second part of it is I refer to my colleague the Minister of Mines and Energy and we will be continuing discussions on this matter. As I said the other day, if the hon. member wants me to bring back a report tomorrow in the House or he wants to talk about some private problems out behind the curtains that is entirely up to him but we will discuss it wherever he wants to.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, in view of the answers I would like to put it on the Late Show tomorrow evening.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde followed by Windsor-Buchans.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a question to the hon. the Premier, Sir. I asked the hon. the Premier now over one month ago a question in connection with the dedicated public servant who has volunteered his services for \$47,500 a year, namely, the chairman of the special Action Group. I asked the Premier whether this gentleman had a ten year contract or any kind of a contract with the government and the Premier promised at that time to table the particular contract. Sir, he sloughed the question off on the Minister of Justice there a few weeks ago and I was wondering now if the Premier would indicate to the House, Sir, if indeed the Chairman of the special action committee does have a contract with the government, what the length of the contract is and whether the contract is for the special action committee

MR. F. ROWE:

only or if that particular committee ends whether there is a contractual agreement for them to continue on in some other capacity with the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the answer is the same as the other day and I apologize for not having the detail of that contract here. But certainly as a public servant servant it is public knowledge and I will only too gladly once again undertake to do it and I apologize for not having it done so far.

MR. R. ROWE: One final supplementary so I can sort of pin the Premier down.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. F. ROWE: Could the Premier indicate to the House when he will be able to table that particular contract and the job description and all the associated pension rights and life insurance benefits with it, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Presently by leave, Mr. Speaker. The fact is I will try and get it and have it on the table of the House say by Tuesday because Monday is a holiday.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans next, followed by the members for Eagle River and Conception Bay South and time permitting all the others.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question for the Premier is with regards to the Linerboard mill again. Would the Premier indicate who is negotiating on behalf of government for the sale of the Linerboard mill and are there negotiations going on at the same time? The word around the Province is, right or wrong, that the Linerboard mill may well be reopened anytime but it is imminent, the opening could take effect any day. Who is negotiating on behalf of government and is there ongoing at the same time negotiations that would make a wood supply available to sustain the operation?

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, my hon. colleague the Minister of

PREMIER MOORES: Transportation and Communications, who is also Chairman of Linerboard, will be in a position to answer specifically these questions. But I might say that the reason that the Divestiture Committee and the progress has gone so well is because of the fact that it has not been debated in this House. because I do not think that anyone in their right mind would want to buy any industry in this Province if it was up to this House to decide on the merits or the non-merits of it. We talk about, Mr. Speaker, is the wood supply going to be available on this Island? That question, I assume, is said with some sincerity; it is said with, where are we going to get it, and still at the same time out of the other side of the members' mouths they say they do not want a spray programme to save the woods so that places like Labrador Linerboard mill can be open. The fact is, Sir, that places like Quebec, Ontario and New Brunswick have used matacil for quite some time to preserve their forests. New Brunswick has an expanding forest industry and Cape Breton is now importing wood from the Mainland. This sort of approach, Sir, is the one that will allow Linerboard mill to open, it is the sort of thing that will encourage people to come in and start to operate the Linerboard mill. I was amazed today that the member for St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac), for instance, would be one of the ones who would be opposed to Labrador Linerboard mill opening because being against the spray programme is basically the same as that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. MCISAAC: I would like to inform the Premier that I am not opposed to Labrador Linerboard opening. I am opposed to the use of matacil when we do not know whether or not it is hazardous. The Premier to this date has not given us any information to enlighten us on this side of the House and I would like also a supplementary if it is possible on that same question.

PREMIER MOORES: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

PREMIER MOORES: A tit for tat so to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER MOORES: Well, Sir, a tat for tit in that case.

MRS McISAAC: And you have the tat.

PREMIER MOORES: The fact is, Sir, that matacil has been used by Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick since 1976, it has been approved by the federal food and drug authorities and certainly, Sir, these people should know exactly what the dangers of such a chemical are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think I would need to consult Bourinot, who has gone to his eternal reward, to rule on that point of order.

A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. FLIGHT: I hope I will be given the same latitude in asking my question as the Premier was given in his answer. I want to ask the Premier again because he still has not indicated, number one, who is negotiation on behalf of the Province and, number two, the whole issue of my question was the fact that I was wondering whether or not the timber within the limits of Linerboard would be used as a timber supply for the paper mill. So I am asking the Premier, Mr. Speaker, number one, who is negotiating on behalf of government and, number two, whether there are negotiations going on that would make a timber supply that could sustain that mill available and, number three,

MR. FLIGHT:

so as not to get into supplementaries, number three has been widely talked about, that Abitibi, Price (Nfld) may indeed be the closest to taking over that mill. And if that is so, will the timber to sustain that mill come off Price (Nfld.)'s present timber holdings or will timber in the immediate area of the mill, timber that is now dead or moribund in the area be made available to Linerboard Mill?

Now, Mr. Speaker, those are three very clear questions and can take clear answers.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, if I may I will try to provide the hon. gentleman with some of the answers.

AN HON. MEMBER: He does not want the answers.

MR. DOODY: Excuse me, Mr. Speaker, if the House does not want the information that is fine with me.

MR. FLIGHT: I do.

MR. DOODY: You do. The selling group who have been given the responsibility for contacting all the possible interested parties for the facility out at Stephenville both in Europe, particularly in Scandinavia, in Canada and the United States and one or two in the United Kingdom was headed up and is still headed up by a gentleman named Leonard Dullicat who is one of the senior people with the Woods, Gordon organization. He, as I said, heads up the selling group which is a sub of the Divestiture Committee. The public official to whom Mr. Dullicat and his group report is the Deputy Minister of Industrial Development, now Mr. Sandy Roche. Up until recently it was Mr. Victor Young, who was then the President of Treasury Board. Mr. Young has since moved to Hydro and Mr. Roche has taken

MR. DOODY:

the responsibility for the co-ordination of the Divestiture Committee and the co-ordination of the selling group.

Mr. Dullicat has available to him the expertise of his own firm but more significantly perhaps the expertise of all the government departments and the Crown agencies and he has used them extensively in preparing the various computer runs and documentations necessary for a comprehensive package and presentation to all these companies. The discussions have narrowed down now to at least three companies who are showing a sustained and continuing interest in acquiring that facility. They have not progressed to a point where it would be fair or reasonable to name these companies or to suggest that any commitment has been made by either the companies or by the owners of the mill, the Province.

The availability of wood supply is certainly one of the major factors in the discussion. There has been a substantial study done on the wood supply. This has been with the assistance of the forestry service of the Government of Canada made available as a part of the selling package and the continuity of the availability of wood taking into account the spruce budworm kill both in the Province of Newfoundland and on our sister provinces in Eastern Canada and certainly a factor in the hoped for revitalization of the facility at Stephenville.

The Abitibi-Price name which was mentioned has been and is one of the companies with whom the Divestiture Committee through their selling group are carrying on conversations. Above and beyond that I would not care to comment or I would not be able to comment. It would be premature. And in order to try to

MR. DOODY:

get the best possible deal from whichever one of these three companies if indeed we would make any deal I think it would be unfortunate to discuss the detail in the House at this time. Certainly I would be only too happy to do so when we have something concrete or positive to report. Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I think I should recognize the hon. gentleman for Eagle River at this time.

MR. STRACHAN: Okay, Sir. I am so excited I do not know if I can manage to get a question out. My question is for the Minister of Transportation and Communications on, I think, it is scandal No. 7, is it, the water bomber. Is that number 7?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, yes.

MR. STRACHAN: Could the minister inform us whether they advertised in trade magazines across Canada for the two aircraft, the Canso water bombers, because this would be the normal way of doing any advertisements for water bombers instead of just the two national newspapers which of course is not the place that people look.

Secondly, could he inform us whether the government located the planes, as was indicated earlier on, and if they located the planes who located the planes, and why were they not inspected and why did the government, if they did locate them, not buy them directly from the company for the \$110,000 instead of paying \$500,000 that they eventually ended up paying?



MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I will try to remember as much of that question as I can. The first part was, Was the advertisement placed in the trade publications in Canada and if not why not?

To the best of my knowledge it was not placed in the trade publications in Canada or the United States or anywhere else for that matter; it was simply placed in the newspapers locally, and mainland newspapers. When I enquired -

MR. NEARY: Two mainland papers.

MR. DOODY: That is right, one in Montreal and one in Toronto.

MR. NEARY: Toronto Globe and Mail and The Montreal Star.

MR. DOODY: The Toronto Globe and Mail and The Montreal Star. I do not know why you bother to ask me, why do not ask the member for LaPoile?

MR. STRACHAN: Why was it not placed in one of the trade publications?

MR. DOODY: We are trying to get to that but I am getting a lot of helpful information in the lead-up to the answer. I want to make sure that we have the benefit of the advice of the member for LaPoile.

Why was it not placed in one of the trade publications? I was unable to get a satisfactory, at least to me a satisfactory answer to that. I checked with the Government Purchasing Agency and asked them why this was not done. They said that they had been under considerable pressure from Treasury Board to cut back on the cost of advertising and they had given up advertising in trade publications. They quoted to me the price of

MR. DOODY: advertisements in various agricultural journals when they advertised for specialists in various swine programmes and so on. Certainly I agree that there is no comparison with that and with buying a water bomber, but this was the reasoning which apparently was activated at that time.

MR. NEARY: They were told (Inaudible)

MR. DOODY: Well, if they were told they certainly have not indicated it to me and I have no reason to disbelieve them. To me they seem to be, and I am sure that they are, quite honourable, quite reasonable, quite decent people who are doing the best possible job. I have no reason to doubt their word. If the hon. members opposite want to show me some reason why I should I will be only too happy to look into it for them. But I certainly am not going to doubt their word on my own.

On the inspection of the aircraft:  
The tender call specifications were as I tabled yesterday. The company - one company only - answered the tender call. It was Field Aviation.

MR. STRACHAN: (Inaudible)

MR. DOODY: I do not know who found the planes. I have no idea in the world. Obviously Field Aviation found two planes because they tendered on two planes. As to who else found planes, I have no idea. I do not know, maybe there is a great plane hunt going on somewhere in this world. I certainly have not been involved in it.

MR. NEARY: There was last year.

MR. DOODY: Well, if there was last year obviously it was successful because the government of Newfoundland found two planes which is exactly what they advertised for.

MR. NEARY: Oh, no.

MR. DOODY: They did. There is one of them down at Torbay now and there is another one that will be in this month.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. DOODY: Thank you, Sir.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day the debate on Motion 10. The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I welcome this opportunity to speak in the debate with respect to the Nordsee - Ocean Harvester proposal and at the outset I want to congratulate the hon. member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) for giving what I considered to be a very excellent speech on Wednesday last. The hon. member is obviously well informed and knowledgeable on the details of the proposed merger, and I am sure familiar with the benefits that would accrue to the district which he represents in this House and, indeed, to the Province itself if such a merger is consummated.

I am sorry that the Leader of the Opposition is not here because I did make notes on some of the comments made by the hon. leader in his speech. It is not my intention to deal with the various items mentioned by him specifically but maybe in the course of my remarks I will make a few comments concerning statements made.

I was rather disappointed, Mr. Speaker, to hear the hon. Leader of the Opposition in his opening remarks refer to my hon. colleague from Harbour Grace as having made, and I am quoting him now, "A disgraceful speech." I do not think the hon. member really meant that, I think he was probably trying to get a rise from the hon. member for Harbour Grace. But to say

Mr. W. Carter: that his speech was disgraceful, I think is very, very unfair because, in fact, he made what I thought was a very informative and a very well researched and well thought out speech.

Mr. Speaker, the proposed Ocean Harvesters-Nordsee merger is probably one of the most misunderstood proposals that has ever been made by two private companies in this Province. And I want to stress the point that both companies are private companies, privately owned, no government involvement whatever insofar as the corporate structure of these companies concerned. And certainly the actions that are contemplated by them, the merger that is now being sought or at least the approval for which is being sought, I consider a perfectly legitimate exercise on the part of two private companies that in their wisdom have agreed to pool their resources, and again, in their opinion, will be in the best interest of the company, the community, the district in the Province.

So what they are doing is certainly an acceptable proposition insofar as their rights as two private companies are concerned. Both companies have agreed to, like I said, pool their resources and to enable the present company that of Ocean Harvesters to better utilize the regenerated fish stocks that are now in the waters within our 200 mile limit.

The Province's role, Mr. Speaker, in this matter was to give the proposal our support. I might add, our qualified support and again that is the right of government and I submit, Mr. Speaker, in the light of circumstances, and our aspirations and hopes and ambitions for the future of the—at least the future development of the fishing industry, we did in fact have a duty to support that proposition.

The hon. members of the House, Mr. Speaker, will undoubtedly recall back in the early Winter of 1976, in fact, just after this present government assumed office after the July election of 1975, a delegation from the government, Cabinet ministers, highly placed officials within the various lying departments visited certain European countries with a view to establishing certain necessary relationships with prominent

Mr. W. Carter: companies, companies that are involved in the fishing industries located in the countries concerned. The purpose of that visit even though it was probably a year prior to the official declaration of Canada's 200 mile limit -the purpose of that visit was to make certain contacts, certain necessary contacts that might stand us in good stead once the 200 mile limit was declared and Canada had control over the management and conservation and harvesting of the resource within our 200 mile limit.

In the course of these meetings, Mr. Speaker, in Europe we met and had quite lengthy discussions with the Nordsee Company, the principals of that Company, at which time they expressed an interest in what was happening over here. And I might add a willingness on their part, an anxiety on their part to become part of the future fishery development of our Province, certainly insofar as their resources would permit.

This was the initial meeting held in Germany by members of Cabinets and officials, not at that time, mind you, discussing any merger with Ocean Harvesters, nothing of that nature, but an exploratory meeting to first of all determine the level of interest that was being, at least, evident in these countries, and to what extent would this Province be able to develop any kind of a meaningful relationship

MR. W. CARTER: if and when the 200 mile limit was declared. It did not take us, Mr. Speaker, too long during these meetings, discussions to determine that a lot of interest was in evidence in the companies concerns and that they were willing to enter into some kind of an arrangement with our Province and this country with respect to fishery development. At that time we talked about joint ventures and that of course was a new term back in those days, two or three years ago, joint ventures. We talked about the possibility of chartering foreign ships realizing as we did that that with an extended jurisdiction, with the availability of the fish resource on that 200 mile Continental Shelf bearing in mind too that at that time back in the early winter of 1976 Canada was giving away free gratis to foreign countries approximately seventy per cent of the total allowable catch within our 200 mile limit. Mr. Speaker, you did not have to be a genius or an expert in fisheries to appreciate the problems that would be encountered by Canada and by Newfoundland once the 200 mile limit was declared and once we had preferential access to all of that fish. We knew that the allowable catches would probably be reduced but we knew as well that even with those reductions in the total allowable catch that we would still fall far short of having sufficient catching capability to enable us to harvest to the fullest extent possible the resources within our 200 mile limit.

As I said, at that time Canada found it necessary to allow seventy per cent of the resource within the 200 mile limit to be allocated to foreign countries. Our aim then, our objective then was as it is now. Our policy really has not changed. We recognize the need to increase our catching effort and thereby provide increased raw material, increased sources of raw material to our much underutilized fish plants. We recognized at that time that it would be impossible for Canada, for Newfoundland the private sector to embark on a boat building programme and to have ships built overnight that would increase our catching efforts and thereby enable us to

MR. W. CARTER: maximize the benefits that would flow to this country and to this province because of the proposed extended jurisdiction.

At no time, Mr. Speaker, did we look upon joint ventures or chartering arrangements as the end all, as a long-term solution to the problem. We looked upon joint ventures, chartering arrangements as being short and at best midterm solutions to the problem. Our ultimate objective as it was then and remains now is to provide, at least to enter into a ship building programme that would enable us to provide sufficient harvesting capability, ships designed specifically for our fishery and hopefully built in our Province owned by Newfoundlanders, manned by Newfoundlanders harvesting the resource landing it in Newfoundland for the benefit of Newfoundlanders. That was our objective then and that is our objective now. As hon. members will recall in those days or at least at that time we were instrumental really in arranging a joint venture with the Nordsee Company or at least the West German Trawlerman's Association which is a conglomerate of the various fish harvesting companies in Germany. We were instrumental in arranging for a 6,000 ton joint venture wherein the German Trawlerman's Association were given permission by the Government of Canada at our request and with our support to harvest 6,000 tons of cod fish in the

MR. W. CARTER:

so-called Northern Waters in ICNAF areas, 2J and 3KL. For the benefit of members, that area would take in from Northern Labrador, from Main, say, in Labrador South to off the Southern tip of the Avalon Peninsula. That is referred to in ICNAF circles as being areas 2J and 3KL, or commonly referred to in this Province as being the Northern Waters, Northern areas. Within that area the West Germans were given rights by the Canadian governments supported by this Province to harvest 6,000 tons of cod fish to be landed in Harbour Grace for distribution to plants in Marystown and the Ocean Harvester's plants for final processing. That fish was frozen on board, transported to Harbour Grace some of which was transported to Marystown, thawed out by the use of special thawing equipment and processed in these two plants and then shipped back to Germany in a processed state.

Now that was not the ideal arrangement. We recognized it had certain flaws, and certainly the Newfoundland Government would not entertain any long term plans in that regard. We recognized it as a short term pilot operation to enable us to find out first hand if it was economically possible to, economically and technically possible to catch that fish and to freeze it, transport it to a plant in Newfoundland to thaw it and then to have it processed and again sent back to West Germany for marketing. It was a viable operation. The two plants concerned, the owners will tell you that they did in fact make a profit. They did not make a fortune I knew but they did not lose money on the proposition. They did show a profit and I am led to believe that the West German company as well made a profit, again not a large profit but certainly one that



MR. W. CARTER:

made the venture worthwhile.

That was the first joint venture entered into. That of course as I suppose was to be expected did draw considerable criticism from certain quarters in the Province, mainly I suggest because of ignorance of what it was all about and the benefits that would accrue to the Province from that kind of an operation. We have heard the principal owner of Ocean Harvesters, Mr. Moores, Alec Moores, state publicly that because of that joint venture, that much-maligned joint venture, I might add, they did enjoy pretty well full employment in this plant in Marystown or at least in Harbour Grace this time last year processing that fish when in fact this year without that source of raw material the plant is operating very much under its full operating capability.

So, Mr. Speaker, irregardless of what people think of that first joint venture it was economically satisfactory for the people concerned and it did in fact give us a chance to study first hand the implications of that kind of an arrangement, the pros and cons of entering into any further joint ventures and for that reason alone I submit that the 6,000 ton joint venture was more than justified.

The second phase, I suppose you would call it, of our thinking at that time was to enter into it, at least to identify countries in Europe where ships were available under charter. To that end we established an office in London and had it manned by a highly qualified young naval architect who was on the staff of my department, the Department of Fisheries, who went to London and moved around and identified countries

June 21, 1978

Tape 4731

IB-3

MR. W. CARTER:

where ships could be chartered. His survey was very interesting in that it was ascertained by him that indeed a number of ships were available. Maybe not the type ships that we would build to prosecute the fishery but certainly with some minor modifications

MR. W. CARTER: and a little give and take here and there insofar as the actual technology and that sort of thing is concerned, a lot of these ships could be converted or at least could be pressed into service in the Newfoundland fisheries and again in so doing increase our own catching effort.

That proposal, Mr. Speaker, did not receive the kind of response from Ottawa that we had expected and consequently we have to abandon the idea of arranging charters to enable us to be better able to avail of the fish stocks that were available to us now that the 200 mile limit was declared, was proclaimed.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Is the minister saying that Ottawa turned down (inaudible) of this Province in chartering (inaudible).

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, maybe I can elaborate there. I do not want to be unfair to Ottawa. Far be it from me to say anything that would reflect on our good friends in Ottawa unfairly, but the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that in the early part of 1976 we did, in fact, with a lot of time and effort on the part of senior public servants with the provincial government and with the assistance of others in the private sector, we did put together a proposal that was later, at least on May 11, last year, 1977, submitted to Ottawa prior to the meeting at which time they established the allowable catch and the quotas. This proposal was made to Ottawa with the request that when they were determining the Canadian fishing effort, the total allowable catch, that they would plug in, as it were, to their Canadian fishing effort our request for an additional 12,000 to 15,000 metric tons of codfish from areas 2J and 3KL.

In our proposal, which I have since made public, we identified areas where ships could be acquired on terms that were acceptable, that would make

MR. W. CARTER: the operation, at least we think, economically viable to prosecute the fishery and to harvest at least another 15,000 metric tons of codfish for landing and processing in our Province in 1977.

That 15,000 tons of codfish would have come off the so-called surplus that was subsequently declared by the meetings that were held in Halifax and would have meant that 15,000 tons of fish less would have been given to foreigners and 15,000 less that would have ended up on the filleting tables of fish plants in Europe to the benefit of people in those countries.

Our request, Mr. Speaker, to sum up and to put it in simple terms, our request for an additional 12,000 to 15,000 metric tons of codfish would have kept a sizeable fish plant, a fair sized fish plant operating almost on a year-round basis - 12,000 tons, 24 million pounds that, of course, is equal to the through-put that is planned for the new modern, sophisticated Burgeo fish plant. So 24 million pounds of fish would have kept a fish plant the size of the new Burgeo plant operating, in terms of man-years, almost on a full-time basis.

So 15,000 tons might not sound like much when you are talking about a total allowable catch of 167,000 tons, but certainly in terms of our production in this Province it would have provided a lot of jobs, a lot of jobs both directly in the plants and the spin-off effect that is always felt insofar as fish processing is concerned.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Would the minister permit another question?

MR. CARTER: Yes, of course.

MR. F.B. ROWE: I do not know if the minister will

MR. F.B. ROWE: remember or not, but if he will -  
I will not be partisan, obviously -

MR. W. CARTER: That is all right.

MR. F.B. ROWE: - but I am interested in getting  
some information. I will be quite willing to give leave  
if it is okay with my colleagues to let him go on past his  
time if he will allow me to ask certain questions.

MR. STRACHAN: There is only the member there so  
that is agreed.

MR. F.B. ROWE: The minister did say, Mr. Speaker,  
that he did set up a group in England in order to look  
around Europe with the possibility of chartering vessels,  
I understand, for use by this Province, presumably, so  
that we could catch this fish. Now, what I am trying - and  
the minister indicated that he did not receive the kind of  
response back from Ottawa

Mr. F. Rowe:

that they had hoped for, in relation to presumably chartering trawlers, or vessels, or ships from Europe.

Now what I am really asking the minister is this; did this Province request, and do they have - oh, yes, they do, they do have to get permission from Ottawa for licencing purposes - did this Province in fact request of Ottawa to have a certain number of trawlers leased by this Province? And did in fact Ottawa sort of turned thumbs down on it?

MR. STRACHAN: Could I just add a little supplement to that?

MR. W. CARTER: Yes.

MR. STRACHAN: Then I will not interrupt you again.

Also could the minister explain whether you considered the charter of the vessels, and instead of a joint venture system in which there is ownership gained by a foreign company, whether it was ever worked out to have a marketing relationship, for instance, to charter other vessel, and a marketing relationship as is normal with many companies and so on, rather than have this ownership or equity position held by Nordsee?

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

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, yes, we advised Ottawa in May of 1977, in the Spring of 1977, and I want to make it clear now that under the new 200 mile regime meetings are held in May or early June at which time the Canada scientists and biologists, other people from the member nations of ICNAF get together, and Canada will then make known its intention with respect to the following year. For example, meetings were held in Bonn, West Germany, in the early part of June at which time Canada put forward our position with respect to the 1979 total allowable catch, our position with respect to the Canadian catching efforts, and, of course, our position with respect to the disposition of surpluses, the surplus, of course, being the difference between the Canadian effort and the total allowable catch. In 1977 that difference amounted to, I believe, around 67,000 metric tons of codfish. The total allowable catch then was 167,000 or 160,000, I am not quite sure. We, I believe, set aside for ourselves 100,000 tons, which left a surplus,

Mr. W. Carter: a so-called surplus of sixty-odd thousand tons. Our request to Ottawa in the Spring of 1977 was to give us the go ahead. We explained to Ottawa that we had in fact identified countries where ships were available on terms that in our view were acceptable. Would they let us go out now and start negotiating with those countries and companies?

For example, I myself went to Portugal and had meetings with the Trawlermen's Association in Portugal and the ship owners, or whatever they call themselves, and we at that time identified ships that were available on excellent terms, but again we could not enter into any firm agreement, far be it from us to commit the government and the people of Newfoundland, or the private sector to any kind of a chartering arrangement that would involve substantial sums of money without first of all knowing and being absolutely certain that Ottawa would give its approval to such an arrangement. So that is what we did, we took things in their right order. We first of all went and identified ships that were available. Secondly, we asked Ottawa to give us the go ahead to negotiate a chartering arrangements with those countries for certain ships. We said that on the basis of the information that we have, the contacts that we have made, and the ships that we have identified as being available, we believe that 1977 or 1978 that we can harvest an additional 12,000 to 15,000 metric tons of fish. That proposal, Mr. Speaker, was rejected.

MR. F. ROWE: Based on the request for increases.

MR. W. CARTER: There is no, as I recall, there is no real reason given. In fact the request was ignored for months, and it was only after I wired two or three times, finally almost demanding an answer to our proposal, did we get some kind of a lame excuse as to why it could not be done. And by that time I understand the Canadian effort had been established, the allowable catch had

MR. W. CARTER:

been established and it was after the fact. I think it would have been impossible then anyhow for approval to have been given. But we did make known our position and submit our request in ample time to enable the Government of Canada to have plugged in that request with their final figures insofar as the Canadian fishing effort was concerned. But that is in the past. There is no point, Mr. Speaker, in moaning or groaning over what happened in the past.

Our joint venture arrangements, reasonably successfully, certainly it did not have any adverse effect on the cod stocks contrary to certain charges and allegations that were being made by people in the industry and others, I believe the Opposition as well and the union. We were talking about 6,000 tons of codfish from the Northern areas, 6,000 tons out of a total allowable catch, Mr. Speaker, at that time of 160,000 tons, 60,000 tons of which were given away to foreigners, and this government dared suggest that we be given the right under this joint venture arrangement to harvest a mere 6,000 metric tons for processing in our Province by our people. We were brazen enough, Mr. Speaker, to ask for permission to do that, to land 6,000 additional tons on a joint venture, I repeat, out of a total allowable catch of 167,000 metric tons bearing in mind that sixty-odd thousand tons were being given away to foreigners free gratis for which Canada and Newfoundland did not derive one cent, no visible benefit whatever in economic returns to this Province.

The 6,000 tons of fish that we managed to get from that 167,000 tons did in fact provide, I believe, around 300 or 400 short term jobs,



MR. W. CARTER:

three or four months employment and other benefits as far as I am concerned did accrue to the Province in that we did like I said learn a lot from that joint venture.

The second phase of our operation would have been to have arranged charters, chartering of ships that would be capable of prosecuting the fishery, partially manned by Newfoundlanders at the outset. Hopefully in the longer term maybe entirely manned by Newfoundlanders, crewed by Newfoundlanders. To increase the Newfoundland Canadian fishing effort and thereby lessen the need for a surplus that would have to be allocated to some foreign country or countries, to have that fish landed in this Province, processed in this Province, and hopefully in the final analysis enable us to avail of other markets that were available for that fish in Europe or from the countries from which the ships originated. That was the second phase of our plan.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, it was not approved. It did not get the approval that we sought.

MR. STRACHAN: Why?

MR. W. CARTER: I have no idea.

MR. STRACHAN: What is the objection (inaudible) and they seem to have a policy that will not allow you to charter or market a contract back to them. What is the reason?

MR. W. CARTER: I am quite prepared -

MR. STRACHAN: (Inaudible)

MR. W. CARTER: I would be quite prepared, Mr. Speaker - I do not have the correspondence here but I am quite prepared and I give an undertaking as a matter of fact. I would be very happy to table the correspondence that we have and I will do it if I can maybe later this week. I am not trying

MR. W. CARTER: to deceive the House or to try to get around anything. I am merely stating that our request for approval to do that sort of thing was first of all ignored. Our submission was made on the 11th of May of 1977; the meetings were held on May 30th at which time the Canadian fishing effort was established and the allowable catch and my first reaction to that request after I had wired and asked for a reaction came I believe sometime in August, a very scantily worded telegram to the effect that - Yes, I can almost quote the telegram verbatim after I had pressed Ottawa for an answer and again I have correspondence to prove what I am saying. The answer from Ottawa was that our proposal to charter ships and to get an additional 15,000 metric tons of cod fish from within the 200 mile limit could not be considered in isolation of the broad Atlantic concept that was now being put together for fishery development and I can quote almost verbatim the text of the telegram. It said that any plans that emanate from Newfoundland and for fishery development in Newfoundland must be tailored and that is the word they used, 'tailored' within the broad Atlantic fishery development concept and we are not prepared to accept any proposals from Newfoundland in isolation, again, of this broad Atlantic concept. I am quite prepared to table that telegram.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Well that is reasonable.

MR. W. CARTER: No, it is not reasonable, Mr. Speaker. It is totally and absolutely unreasonable because I contend, and I have said this before that I am convinced that in Newfoundland we have a special case. I do not think Newfoundlanders and Newfoundland can be content to be lumped into a broad Atlantic Provinces fishery development programme. I happen to believe that and I am convinced of this that Newfoundlanders, we have certain special historic rights, rights that we gained hundreds of years ago such as we mentioned the other day about the shrimp off the Coast of Labrador. I contend, and my hon. friend, a person whom I respect very much admits and agrees with us, that we do have certain special rights.

MR. STRACHAN: A legal right.

MR. W. CARTER: I do not know about a legal right but certainly we

MR. W. CARTER: have a moral right, an historic special right to these fish.

MR. STRACHAN: It would not be there if we did not join Canada.

MR. W. CARTER: I do not think Newfoundlanders should be content to be lumped into a broad Atlantic Provinces context or concept insofar as fishery development is concerned because for one thing we have a greater degree of dependency on the fishery than any other Province. I am not sure, in fact I am sure that maybe what is good for Nova Scotia is good for Newfoundland. Conversely I am not sure that what is good for Newfoundland would be good for Nova Scotia or the other Atlantic Provinces. So I believe that all things being equal that we have a right to be treated maybe differently from the other Atlantic Provinces and not to be thrown in in this great melting pot that is now emerging Atlantic Canada, and I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that if we allow that to happen, that Newfoundlanders will be the losers, because when Ottawa looks at the Atlantic Provinces being a unit, a region within Canada, they automatically look upon Halifax as being the capital of that region. And I think that is being demonstrated almost every day when we see federal government offices in some cases leaving this Province, being resettled, being re-established in Halifax, which again in the eyes and in the minds of the upper Canadian bureaucrat is the capital of Atlantic Canada. I have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of standing by and allowing Newfoundland to become a satellite of Nova Scotia or St. John's to become a satellite of Halifax. I do not think we should have to. But their argument against our proposal that the Newfoundland position could not be considered in isolation because it would in fact be running counter to their obvious plan to develop Atlantic Canadian fisheries in one context and in one region.

MR. F. ROWE: Why did the minister make a joint proposal to Nova Scotia through Ottawa if he does not feel like being lumped in?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, there comes a time when maybe discretion is the better part of valour and we realize then, we begrudgingly or reluctantly realize that maybe if that is the game that Ottawa is going to play, then maybe we should in fact, as much as it is against our principles and what we stand for, it might well be that it would be in the best interests of our Province and our fishermen to maybe get together with Nova Scotia, in certain areas of common concern and common interest. Of course what could be more common, Mr. Speaker, to the two provinces, what could be more common to Atlantic Canada, especially the provinces that are dependent on fishery, what could be more common than the need to replace our catching effort, our offshore vessels, that was the common denominator. All the Provinces of Atlantic Canada were facing the same problem where fish stocks were being regenerated, where the existing fleets were aging and had to be replaced. So we thought that would be a common ground where we could have a meeting of minds that we could have with our counterparts in the other Atlantic Provinces and maybe in so doing we would convince Ottawa of our desire to co-operate and

MR. W. CARTER:

maybe dispel any suspicions that they might have that maybe we are a little bit too ambitious and maybe too anxious to grab too big a piece of the pie for ourselves, For that I make no apologies, but obviously Ottawa was not prepared to accept that kind of an approach. We all know what happened to our fleet replacement proposal to Ottawa; it is being treated like a joke, it is being treated as a big Newfoundland, Nova Scotian, Atlantic Canadian joke, Mr. Speaker, and that is unfortunate and I question the motives of the people who have seen fit to demean or to downgrade that proposal because I am sure that if they have any feeling at all for the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada they must recognize the need for an early start on a construction programme to replace our aging offshore fishing fleet. If we do not, Mr. Speaker, within five to eight to ten years our fish stocks will be increased, in fact scientists have projected that within eight years, eight short years by 1985 the fish stocks in the ICNAF areas that I have mentioned, the so-called Northern areas will go from 135,000 tons to 300,000 tons, more than doubled in eight years. But, Mr. Speaker, the unfortunate thing about it is that unless we do something now and unless the attitude - or at least if the attitude that now prevails in Ottawa is allowed to continue well then in 1985 we are not going to have sufficient harvesting capability to catch that fish, in fact we will have to defer to foreigners I submit for substantial quantities, substantial quotas. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I submit that we will not be catching half that fish in 1985 unless we do something now to beef up, to increase our catching effort, to replace the existing fleet and where necessary to expand on the existing fleet.

MR. STRACHAN:

I wonder if the minister could tell us, getting back to that telegram, the reply that he has there, I am interested in his analysis of it; whether he believes that the reply is a political reply, that is, a reply coming from the highest kind of level or whether the reply is from the mandarins who in some questions I have regul questions about their attitude. I am wondering whether he knows is a difference? Can he indicate to us what his analysis of coming back is? Exactly who did it come back from or wher

MR. STRACHAN: it came back from and what is their attitude?

MR. W. CARTER: I cannot verify the author of the telegram but I can certainly verify the person whose name it was over and that is minister, the minister, Le Blanc himself. He was the author who must assume responsibility for the contents of the telegram because it was sent over his signature. I would be quite happy to table that telegram. If I can get a chance to get back to my office tomorrow morning I will do it tomorrow. Was it a political ploy? I have no idea, Mr. Speaker, but I am not unaware of the political realities of life, I am not unaware of the fact that in Newfoundland we have very little political clout in Ottawa, I am not unaware of the fact that we do only have seven seats as opposed to - what? twenty-two seats in the city of Toronto?

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. W. CARTER: Well I have been around long enough to -

MR. STRACHAN: No, I was asking quite seriously. I was not looking at it in a political sense,

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, we would be naive indeed if we were to ignore the political realities of life and how it affects Eastern Canada.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, are you talking about the minister or the low civil servant?

MR. W. CARTER: I am talking, Mr. Speaker, about an action taken by the government of Canada, as to what their motives were in taking that action I am not able to say. I have my own suspicions and my suspicions are that Ottawa is unwilling, in fact that is the reason I submit why the Nordsee Ocean Harvester proposal is still resting on the desk of some minister or some official in Ottawa, that Ottawa is unwilling to do anything for Newfoundland notwithstanding the justification or special rights, I submit that Ottawa is not prepared to do anything for this Province that is it not prepared to do for any other Atlantic province. And I submit that

MR. W. CARTER: that is the name of the game.

That is the way it is functioning.

MR. F. ROWE: I think that is called something like Confederation.

MR. W. CARTER: That, Mr. Speaker, in my view, makes a mockery of Confederation.

MR. F. ROWE: No, it does not (inaudible)

MR. W. CARTER: It makes an absolute and utter mockery of Confederation, because what it means is that Newfoundlanders - and I take some little pride as we all should on this side of the House by virtue of the fact that we took the bull by the horns, and even by their own admission, by the admission of the minister in Nova Scotia and certain highly placed officials in the federal Department of Fisheries, that this government were about a year and a half or two years ahead of Nova Scotia and the other Atlantic Provinces and in fact, maybe even five years ahead of Ottawa in our thinking with respect to the development of the fisheries and being able to maximize the benefit that would obviously flow from the declaration of a 200 mile limit and a regenerated fish resource.

MR. F. ROWE: Would the minister -

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note -

MR. F. ROWE: (Inaudible)

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, in a moment now. I suppose imitation is the greatest form of flattery, but it is interesting to note that most of the proposals that we put forward two and a half years ago that were turned down by Ottawa, were being scoffed at and laughed at by Ottawa, a lot of these proposals are now being implemented by Ottawa and are being tooted as being their ideas, but who cares? For example, it is no secret that we intend to establish a Crown corporation through which we will hopefully

MR. W. CARTER: charter vessels which will again hopefully be licenced by Ottawa that will enable us to increase our catching effort and thereby provide more raw material for the under-utilized fish plants in our Province. That was an idea that we put forward to Ottawa about two years ago.

I met with the minister at his home on Third Street in Ottawa on May 24, 1977 at which time I told him of our plans to establish a Crown corporation to charter vessels

AN HON. MEMBER: At his home?

MR. W. CARTER: - yes, it was a holiday in Ottawa - for the purpose of landing in a central landing port, which is now the subject of a study by the Canadian Kellogg Company to be distributed to our under-utilized fish plants. And to say that the minister was cool to that suggestion would be putting it, I think, rather mildly, because it did not cut any ice at all with him, but I was very interested to learn no later than a few months ago that the federal government have pretty well decided now to embark on the exact same concept, in fact, the minister announced some time ago that they would be maybe chartering vessels through the auspices of a Crown agency that would catch fish within our 200 mile limit in the Northern areas for landing in places like Fortune, Grand Bank, Gaultois, Burgeo - plants on the South Coast - an exact replica of the proposal that we put forward to Ottawa almost two years ago.

MR. F. ROWE: Would the minister -

MR. W. CARTER: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: I would just point out that the hon. gentleman's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave, Sir, by leave.

MR. F. ROWE: The minister has been fair in



MR. F. ROWE:                    answering questions and it is a very important topic, Mr. Speaker, and we are quite prepared to allow the minister to go to 6:00 P.M. if he wishes on this particular subject, but in doing so we would like to have a little mild exchange in terms of trying to have some questions answered.

                                  The minister, Sir, indicated that, you know, Ottawa has something against Newfoundland and then he watered that down a bit and said that Ottawa are not willing to give any more to Newfoundland than they would to any other Atlantic Province. Well, you know, that is a strange thing. We are in a system of Confederation and we would not expect any more or any less than any other Atlantic Province unless, in fact, we had a special right -

MR. W. CARTER:                    Which we do.

MR. F. ROWE:                    - which we do now. Okay, which we do, the minister says. What I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, from the minister is what efforts the minister and his associates have made to indicate to Ottawa through very serious consultation and negotiation in person what our special rights are and try to gain some of those special rights or regain some of those special rights if indeed we do have special rights. You know, I tend to agree with the minister that we do in fact have special rights when we united with Canada. We brought the Continental Shelf in with us, not just the land mass above water, and we may indeed have special rights. What I would like to know from the minister is what efforts he and his associates have made to get across to Ottawa, a federal government, a federal institution, the fact that we do have special rights and not just

Mr. F. Rowe: await a reply from a telegram and then become very upset several months down the road.

And the second question, Mr. Speaker, is this, is that the minister has indicated that the federal government would not approve of the chartering of vessels and trawlers etc. And the minister said, he really did not get an answer why. And I would suggest to the minister that probably the reason why that the requests were being made at the very time we were trying to conserve the stocks in the Northern cod stock, and now we are on the upswing and we are starting to increase our domestic efforts.

MR. W. CARTER: I appreciate the hon. member's generosity in allowing me to continue and I respect his right to ask questions, and I shall endeavour to answer. But first of all I gave the reason why in that, and I shall Table the telegram. But our proposal charter ships, to harvest an additional 15,000 metric tons of codfish in the Northern waters was not acceptable to Ottawa because it did not fit within the broad concept for the development of the Atlantic Coast fishery. And that no plan from Newfoundland would be treated in isolations. And again I keep repeating I shall make that telegram available to the House.

The second part of his question is that maybe the request was poorly timed in that it was at the time when the fish stocks were on the upswing, and we were waiting for the stocks to be rebuilt. That, of course, is wrong because even though we were denied access to that additional fish to which we demonstrated our right and our ability to harvest, Ottawa was at the same time issuing 600 licences to foreign countries to harvest 64 per cent, Mr. Speaker, in 1977, 64 per cent of all of the fish caught within our 200 mile limit, 64 per cent of the total allowable catch was being given away at that time, after we made our request to foreign countries for which Canada, Newfoundland did not get one at least no visible economic returns whatever. I do not know what returns we got in terms of wheat sales, barley, flour, rye, rape seed, or farm equipment. I am sure there

Mr. W. Carter: must have been some gains to Central and Western Canada in return for those quotas, but certainly there are no visible benefits accruing to this Province from that giveaway.

The Ocean Harvester, Mr. Speaker, Nordsee thing I should touch on that for a moment. Our support of that proposal of course is well known. You do not apologize to anyone for supporting it. And I am not naive enough to think, Mr. Speaker, that the Nordsee Ocean Harvester proposal is the end all, the ultimate answer to our problems in this Province. I submit to you that had Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, agreed to our proposal to the phasing in, if you like, of our plan to develop our fishery, that the Ocean Harvester Nordsee merger might not have been necessary because the main thrust of the arguments, in fact, the overriding benefit as we see it that will accrue to this Province from the Nordsee Ocean Harvester merger is in allowing us to increase our catching effort, allowing us to increase our source of raw material. Now that could quite conceivably have been achieved by the chartering of ships as we requested initially. But in light of the fact that our request was refused, well then the Nordsee thing came along. It did in fact satisfy us that to a large extent it would increase our catching effort and our source of raw material to what was normally, to what was heretofore, in fact still is, a vast underutilized fish plant. That was the sole basis for this government's giving its support to the proposed merger of Nordsee Ocean Harvesters. We offer our support Mr. Speaker, bearing in mind, of course, that

MR. W. CARTER: the final decision rests with Ottawa from the Foreign Investment Review Agency and the Federal Minister of Fisheries the former, of course, having to do with foreign investment and the latter having to do with the issuance of licences to operate the ships.

That proposal, Mr. Speaker, I said this initially, does have certain, in fact, a great number of pluses and advantages to this Province. This business about foreign takeover, Mr. Speaker, is utter and absolute nonsense. When you realize, and the Leader of the Opposition the other day said that he is not against foreign investment - I have notes from his speech here - he has no complaint about foreign investment - these are his words - "But I am against foreign ownership."

MR. F.B. ROWE: And control.

MR. W. CARTER: "and foreign control." He asked a question; "Would the Nordsee people be interested in involving itself in the fishing industry in Newfoundland if they knew that they were not going to get any licences to operate their ships?" Of course, that is hardly a sensible question because what would be the point? What would be the point, Mr. Speaker, in Nordsee involving itself to that extent in a Newfoundland company in an operation that at best was operating at what, three or four or five months of the year? I submit to you there are no advantages whatever either for Ocean Harvesters or for the German company concerned.

MR. F.B. ROWE: One they will have fish and they have the markets, so -

MR. W. CARTER: Because, and I will be quite frank, if it is only a matter of expanding the plant the \$2 million or \$3 million required to improve the operation of that company, that plant in Harbour Grace, I am sure that that money could be found without selling or allowing a

MR. W. CARTER: foreign company to gain a certain amount of control of the company. But that is not the point, Mr. Speaker. You can modernize the plant in Harbour Grace all you like. You can spend \$50 million to modernize the Ocean Harvester plant but if you do not have the fish to go through that plant to keep it operating it is all for nothing.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. W. CARTER: You have a beautiful big plant, modern, sophisticated, capable of getting the maximum yield from fish going through it, but you have no fish. Certainly, if you are going to depend on the inshore fishery at this point in time to keep that plant operating, even near full-time, it is virtually impossible.

So the big advantage, Mr. Speaker, and again in the absence of Ottawa's approval for us to charter ships to increase our catching effort by charters, in the absence of approval on the part of pretty well all concerned, union, opposition, certain other segments of our society to enter into any other joint venture such as that entered into in the Spring of 1977, what other choice do we have?

MR. STRACHAN: If Ottawa gives you the right to charter now, will you drop the joint venture system?

MR. W. CARTER: That is not for me to say, Mr. Speaker, but I will repeat what I said a moment ago, that our main objectives in this Province, the main objective of this government, our primary concern, Mr. Speaker, is not whether or not Nordsee and Ocean Harvester manage to merge, our main objective is to find ways and means of harvesting as much of that fish as we can to be landed in our underutilized plants for the benefit of our people. That is our primary concern. We submit, I submit, and I know that my colleagues share my view, that the Ocean

MR. W. CARTER: Harvester - Nordsee merger is one means by which that objective can be achieved. Maybe not the ideal way, maybe not the ideal way, but certainly, Mr. Speaker, it is an acceptable way as far as we are concerned.

By entering into that kind of an arrangement, Ocean Harvesters (Nfld.) would have at its disposal five modern, sophisticated ships. The Opposition Leader last Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, made reference to the age of the ships and he said the ships are worn out, obsolete, rusted out ships that have nowhere else to go and that if the Germans cannot press them into service in Newfoundland they are going to remain tied up in Bremerhaven rusting out.

Well, that is not true because these ships, first of all, are not obsolete. I submit that even now, even at their present age of what, eight to ten years old, which is really still less than the average.

MR. W. CARTER:

age of the Newfoundland trawlers. I would submit to you now that these ships, and I have been on board of them, the Premier has, are light years ahead, Mr. Speaker, of many ships operating out of our ports, light years ahead in terms of technology, sophistication, many, many years ahead. I doubt very much if any ships that we would start to build now would be capable of doing what these ships can do even though they were built eight or ten years ago.

MR. STRACHAN: Satellite navigation.

MR. W. CARTER: Let us not kid ourselves, these ships are good, excellent. Maybe not the type of ships that we will be building. I do not think Newfoundlanders need worry about building factory ships, \$25 million a shot, \$25 million on our factory ships. We are a factory. We have a stationery factory sitting right in the middle of the most prolific fishing grounds in the world, I suppose.

MR. STRACHAN: We should be building -

MR. W. CARTER: It would be ludicrous for us to build that kind of ship.

MR. J. WINSOR: We could have done with a couple this morning though.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, of course we could. Another spin off benefit that would be derived from this kind of a merger would be the glut which we are now starting to experience and I anticipate tomorrow I will be getting questions from my friend opposite asking me what I am doing about the glut.

MR. F. ROWE: No, you would blame it on Ottawa.

MR. W. CARTER: No I will not. Maybe if I did I would have good reason to and again I can produce evidence to that effect. But just imagine, Mr. Speaker, what we could do in this Province right now at this point in time if we had factory ships and freezer ships capable of taking fish that would normally be dumped or left in the traps of the fishermen.

MR. STRACHAN: That is not the answer. We have no cold storage space or freezing capacity on this Island.

MR. F. ROWE: Where are the eighteen cold storage plants going to be?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, we cannot do that overnight. We have the Province spending \$1 million this year in Argentina. We now have a proposal put together but we are going to be looking to Uncle Ottawa for some help to implement, for the provision of freezing and cold storage facilities around the coastline, around the coast. But we cannot do that tomorrow morning. We cannot do that to accommodate the glut this year. I suggest we probably will not have it in place by next year.

MR. F. ROWE: If the minister will permit again. I thank him for, Sir, his generosity and the minister mentioned the glut problem - in Twillingate during an event a few months ago the Premier, Sir, promised eighteen cold storage plants on the Northeast Coast. I wonder if the minister could indicate what the status of that is since he has been talking about -

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have seen the Premier at times being very modest and I was at a meeting when he made that commitment and I think that was a very modest boast on his part because I can see the time when we will need probably twice that many.

MR. F. ROWE: I am not talking about the need, I am talking about -

MR. W. CARTER: And the fact is, and again the Premier made that statement, we have said it since we have been in this House, that plans are already prepared, as a matter of fact a proposal is now ready to be submitted, hopefully we will be getting some assistance from DREE to undertake -

MR. F. ROWE: No. No. But there was an announcement made in Twillingate during the election, seventeen cold storage plants for the Northeast Coast.

MR. W. CARTER: Of course, and the announcement and the promise made will be kept.



MR. F. ROWE: When, I wonder.

MR. J. HODDER: He also said that that Twillingate plant was going to be doubled.

MR. F. ROWE: I beg your pardon?

MR. J. HODDER: He also said that the Twillingate plant was going to be doubled.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes. Right.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I only have about a minute to spare but let me try to dispel some of the fears that have been expressed by certain people with respect to foreign ownership and foreign takeover. That is not possible. That is not possible today. If the Germans wanted to take it over they could not. And the reason being of course that there is not an industry in Canada more regulated or rigidly structured than the fishery industry. For example to operate that plant they would have to apply to the Province for a licence and meet certain criteria that has been established by the Province. We have a right to revoke that licence if they violate the terms and conditions under which it was given. Before they can send a ship out to sea, before they can untie it and send it out to catch one codfish they have to apply to Ottawa for a licence. The minister in Ottawa on a yearly basis

Mr. W. Carter: would have to issue that licence. The minister in Ottawa would tell that ship owner or the company how much fish he can catch, where he can catch it, what species he can catch and so on. All will have to be within the Canadian catching effort that has been established by the minister in Ottawa. We are not asking, Ocean Harvesters are not asking that the allowable catch be established. We recognize the need for tight controls over the resource, allowing it to replenish. We are not asking that the TAC be increased by 15,000 or 20,000 tons. Ocean Harvesters are not asking that the TAC for 1978 be increased. All they are asking is that they be given, a Newfoundland company incorporated under the laws of Newfoundland, that they be given a right to harvest the resource that is their's by right. It is their's by right. That 135,000 metric tons of codfish that is designated to be caught within our 200 mile in 1978, you know, we should not forget the fact that that is our fish by rights. And that the terms and conditions under which the 200 mile limit was declared gives us as a coastal State the right to that fish.

Secondly, and the most important, at least the second most important right given us by the Law of the Sea is that any surpluses given foreign countries can carry with it certain economically motivated conditions. So to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that if that merger does in fact take place that it means a takeover of the Harbour Grace plant is sheer nonsense, utter and absolute nonsense. Because under the existing laws and regulations that are operative, both federally and provincially, It would be impossible for any company to - I notice the Speaker is telling me my time is up - but it would be impossible, Mr. Speaker, for any company, whether it is a Newfoundland company, a German company, a Nova Scotian company or any other company -

MR. DOODY: Your time is up, just adjourn.

MR. W. CARTER: - to have that kind of a takeover.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. minister cannot move the adjournment of the debate his time is up, so I do so, Sir. I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde has moved the adjournment of the debate.

It being 6:00 o'clock the House adjourns until tomorrow,  
Thursday at 2:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JUNE 21, 1978

June 21/78

QUESTION #94

Mr. Noary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

1. What are the names of those persons who, as of a current date, are members of the Board of Management of the Hospital at Springdale showing in each case:
  - (a) the date on which he was appointed;
  - (b) the term of his appointment;
  - (c) the title of the position held, being it Chairman, Vice-Chairman, member or otherwise?
  
2. What is the value of amounts payable to members of the Board in respect of:
  - (a) per diem allowance;
  - (b) travel, meal and accommodation expenses;
  - (c) annual salary in connection with the performance of his duties in this respect?

ANSWER

Period of appointment - three years

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</u>
Mr. Edward A. Smith	Chairman	April 1, 1977
Mr. Bill Abraham	Member	" " "
Mr. Don Batstone	"	" " "
Mr. Arthur B. Murphy	"	" " "
Mr. Gordon Fudge	"	" " "
Mr. Ken England	"	" " "
Mr. Fred Morgan	"	" " "
Mrs. Margaret Wheeler	"	" " "
Mr. Charlie Green	"	" " "
Mrs. Valera Heath	"	March 7, 1978
Dr. A. Dennison	"	" " "

2. (a) Nil
- (b) Out of pocket travel expenses
- (c) Nil

June 2, 1978

Jan 21/78

QUESTION 99

Mr. Henry (130516) - To ask The Honourable the Minister of Health to be upon the table of the Hon. the Member information:

1. What are the names of those persons who, as of a current date, are members of the Board of Management of the Hospital at Twillingate showing in each case:
  - (a) the date on which he was appointed;
  - (b) the term of his appointment;
  - (c) the title of the position held, being if Chairman, Vice-Chairman, member or otherwise?
  
2. What is the value of amounts payable to members of the Board in respect of:
  - (a) per diem allowance;
  - (b) travel, meal and accommodation expenses;
  - (c) annual salary in connection with the performance of his duties in this respect?

ANSWER

Period of appointment Three years

<u>NAME</u>	<u>POSITION</u>	<u>DATE OF APPOINTMENT</u>
Mr. H.W.C. Giffell	Chairman	April 1, 1976
Mr. W.L. Earle	Member	" " "
Mr. John Hamlyn	"	" " "
Mr. M.J. Earle	"	" " "
Mr. Frank Guy	"	" " "
Mr. M.C. Loveridge	"	" " "
Mr. Bud Osmond	"	" " "
Mrs. Ida Reid	"	November 7, 1976
Mr. Rex Wheeler	"	April 1, 1976
Mrs. Thelma Osmond	"	November 7, 1973
Mr. Morley Parsons	"	April 1, 1976
Mr. Edgar Anstey	"	" " "
Rev. Donald Ford	"	June 7, 1977
Mr. Thomas Wheeler	"	March 7, 1978

- 2. (a) Nil
- (b) Out of pocket travel expenses
- (c) Nil



June 21/78

QUESTION # 100

Mr. Henry (Lal) Lal — To ask The Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

1. What are the names of those persons who, as of a current date, are members of the Board of Management of the hospital at Gander showing in each case:
  - (a) the date on which he was appointed;
  - (b) the term of his appointment;
  - (c) the title of the position held, being it Chairman, Vice-Chairman, member or otherwise?
  
2. What is the value of amounts payable to members of the Board in respect of:
  - (a) per diem allowance;
  - (b) travel, meal and accommodation expenses;
  - (c) annual salary in connection with the performance of his duties in this respect?

ANSWER

1. (a) All were appointed on April 1, 1978.
- (b) Three year period.

(c) Chairman

Mr. Hudson Day

Deacons

Mr. G.C. Smith

Mr. F. McCarthy

Captain M. Burry

Mrs. Harry Newhook

Mr. C. Galway

Mr. Lloyd Newworthy

Mr. W.J.G. Strong

Mr. Cyril Hicks

Reverend Father W. Hearn

Mr. Eric Burry

Mr. Lawrence Guy

Reverend Munden Way

Mrs. Katie Simpson

Mr. David Power, LL.B.

Mrs. Genevieve Pickett

2. (a) Nil

(b) Out-of-pocket expense

(c) Nil

June 2, 1978