

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

THURSDAY, MARCH 20, 1980 .

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: The Speaker is too fast on the draw.

Mr. Speaker, I find it necessary today to comment upon the location of the Hibernia and Ben Nevis wells because of confusion presently existing in the media. The confusion appears to have arisen from references to the first Hibernia well being 196 miles from St. John's. In fact, St. John's is not the closest point of land to Hibernia, as I think we all realize, — that would be Cape Spear — and the 196 miles was a reference to statute rather than nautical miles. So there is a possibility of an error compounded. Discussions at the Law of the Sea Conference refer to possible revenue sharing outside of 200 nautical miles from the closest low water point of land. A nautical mile is longer than a statute mile; one nautical mile equals, I am told, 1.15 statute miles. All of the wells in which hydrocarbons have been found are within 200 nautical miles, and I set out the respective distances: The first Hibernia well was 164 nautical miles from the low water mark at Cape Spear; the second one, 162 nautical miles; Ben Nevis, 184; and the newest Hibernia stepout, 164 nautical miles. A map showing these locations is attached. I must stress, however, that nothing has changed with respect to our concerns over the Law of the Sea Conference's attempts to gain revenue sharing and this is why — it is astounding, really? If anybody saw the report from

MR. L. BARRY: Halifax last night, it was built up as if, 'Oh, now that it is within 200 miles, Ben Nevis and Hibernia, there is no problem'. There are large areas of our continental margin outside of 200 nautical miles and petroleum potential exists there. Structures for drilling, which may be additional oil fields, have been identified outside of 200 nautical miles. The 1958 Geneva Convention on the continental shelf recognizes that our country by international law presently holds petroleum rights out to the edge of the continental margin. Any concessions for revenue sharing with foreign nations would mean a relinquishing by Canada of some of these existing rights which within Canada are provincial rights. Our government's position is that the federal government should not, indeed cannot give away rights belonging to this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Well, Mr. Speaker, there is not very much that it is necessary to say or to add to the statement made by the minister, and I thank him for providing a copy. Apart from everything else, I guess it is at least helpful to know that in this case we are talking within the 200 nautical miles and therefore the issue referred to on the second page does not come up. I think, insofar as the second part is concerned, it is one of the matters that once again I would like to have the opportunity to get information from government spokesmen on through a select committee or in some other way.

MR. ROBERTS:

Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON:

But on the other hand, I thoroughly agree, and incidentally my position on this is very well known, that I have never, nor, do I believe, my colleagues feel that there is any justification for revenue sharing beyond 200 miles. I think we have a clear and unmistakable responsibility as a nation to look after underdeveloped countries, but I have never accepted this particular technique as being the one. And I think beyond that I do not think there is anything more that I need to say at this time.

MR. ROBERTS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Social Services. Given the fact that it appears, and indeed it is a certainty, that within a very short time there will be an increase in the guaranteed income supplement, and given the fact that periodically, through indexing, old age assistance and old age pensions are increased, my concern and the question is, is there some way in which the minister can ensure that

MR. JAMIESON: at least some small amount of these increases is retained by the residents of various homes throughout Newfoundland? I have had, and my colleagues, and perhaps members opposite have had, representation saying that in effect if a person is a resident of a home it really does not matter how much either the pension or the GIS goes up, the pittance, really, that they are left **with** for their own personal necessities and the like has not changed in a number of years, and that of course they are feeling the effects of inflation as is everybody else. And as a compassionate move, I wonder if the minister would consider whether it might be feasible through some technique to ensure that at least a portion of the increase is left with these elderly people for the ordinary small necessities which they are finding it increasingly difficult to buy?

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I take it that what the **hon. gentleman is referring to** is the personal allowance, pocket allowance.

As a rule he is right, for the most part, when the increase came it was reduced from the amount, or in other words it was not passed on to the recipient. I will have to check this out to make sure that I am absolutely accurate, **but** for the benefit of the House I believe that last year was the first year that there was a departure from that and I believe, I am not sure of the amount, I think it was somewhere in the order of \$9 to \$10, and the increase was passed on to the recipient. There was an increase in the allowance from

MR. HICKEY: forty-one, I believe, or forty-two dollars to fifty dollars and whatever the increase was it was passed on to the recipient. Insofar as what happens this year, I can only say, it being a fiscal item that is not yet addressed, I can only say that I will have to take it up with my colleagues and, when we determine the amount, make a decision at that time. I can certainly associate myself with the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition in terms of a need based on inflation and all of that, and I believe, if my memory serves me correctly, that it was, in keeping with this spirit **that last year the increase was** in fact passed on to the recipient.

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: I thank the hon. member for his answer and I would hope, for instance, that if in no other way perhaps some consultation with federal authorities on the matter might be undertaken to, in a sense, perhaps as the bill is put through or something of that sort to allocate or perhaps even to add on, because it is not an enormous amount of money, but certainly from the standpoint of an elderly person who wishes, for instance, to hire a taxi or to drive to visit relatives and friends and so on, I think the minister is aware that it is very inadequate at the present time, so would he look at it from both those points of view?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Social Services.

Mr. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I certainly will. I might take the opportunity as well to point out and to tell the Leader of the Opposition that one of the problems in the past was the problem with the federal auditors who come in and who check our books. A recipient who receives a federal allowance cannot, at the same time, receive a provincial

March 10, 1980

/Tape No. 496

AH-2

MR. HICKEY: allowance. That is the understanding.  
This is where the problem is.

MR. NEARY: ~~They are so cold-hearted they will not~~ (inaudible)  
they want to -

MR. HICKEY: Well, that might very well be. We  
have had a hassle with them on a number of occasions, my staff  
informs me. I am not aware of how we got over it last year.  
I will undertake to get the information and the details.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for  
the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). It is a follow-up to  
a question asked by the Leader of the Opposition a couple of  
weeks ago. I would like to ask the minister, in view of the  
fact that there is only a week or so before the end of the  
Province's financial year, and bearing in mind that last year  
the Budget was four or five months late, I wonder if the  
minister could tell us if a definite date has been set for  
the bringing down of the Budget?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I hope in a short  
while, a day or so, to be able to indicate a specific date.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member  
for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: I wonder if the minister could  
tell the House and hopefully relieve

MR. WHITE: some of the concern on behalf of the people of Newfoundland, whether or not the government intends to keep its promises and not to increase taxes, or at least some of them?

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. member is referring to a commitment given by the Premier that the -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Not me! Not me!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: - a commitment that I have no doubt that the Premier and his government will honour -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: - that the rate of tax in regard to personal income tax, in regard to retail sales tax and in regard to corporate tax for large corporations -

AN HON. MEMBER: Small corporations.

DR. COLLINS: Small corporations, I am sorry - for small corporations will not be increased. That was the commitment given. There seems to be some doubt about that on the opposite side, so I will go over it again. The rate of tax for retail sales tax, and for personal income tax, and for corporate tax on small corporations, that these rates will not be increased. I can give no indication that that commitment will be altered in any way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. the member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I think the minister is being very helpful in giving us this



MR. WHITE: information. I wonder if he could tell us now as a follow-up what taxes will be increased when the budget comes down?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I will be glad to send the hon. member a signed copy of the budget when it is prepared and ready for circulation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I should like to direct a question to the Minister of Consumer Affairs, Sir. Will the minister inform the House if the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment in this Province has received any complaints from senior citizens who have been refused a line of credit with various and sundry companies across this Province, like appliance companies and so forth? And if the minister has received any complaints, would the minister tell the House what is being done about these complaints?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I have not received any such complaints, at least these complaints have not reached my desk and I do get a report of the complaints coming in. So unless there has been something within the last day or so, I do not think there has been.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Could the minister tell the House if there is any law or any regulations barring

MR. NEARY: appliance retail outlets and so forth, if there is any law to bar them from discriminating against senior citizens and refusing to give senior citizens the same treatment as they give any other citizen of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Well, we do have the Trade Practices Act, Mr. Speaker, and if the complaint is made to our Director of Trade Practices, then an investigation can be made into a situation of this kind. If there has been an unconscionable action toward the consumer, then it will be pursued.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: I am not quite sure if I understood the minister's answer, but anyway, if I have room I will debate it this afternoon during the Late Show. But I would like for the hon. the minister - and I will give the hon. the minister a case, by the way, privately, right in her own district where appliance companies and the like around this Province are refusing to treat senior citizens the same as they treat ordinary citizens because they are not on a payroll - they are not on somebody's payroll, they are not employed - refuse to give them a line of credit. And I will give the hon. the minister a case right in her own district. But I would like to find out if the minister would look into it and see how widespread this is around the Province. I think this is scandalous. These people have contributed so much to their Province and are being discriminated against by these retail outlets. I think the minister should look into it.

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

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I will certainly make inquiries in my department and see if we have received any such complaints, and if it is so, then it will be looked into and I hope to be able to bring back a satisfactory reply to the hon. member.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett). I was wondering if the minister had any knowledge of a study commissioned by the former Minister of Transport, Mazankowski, on the two airports in Western Newfoundland, Deer Lake and Stephenville?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Yes, I have some knowledge of it, Mr. Speaker, but I do not know if the report is completed. If it is, I have not received a copy.

MR. J. HODDER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

for Port au Port.

A supplementary, the hon. the member

MR. J. HODDER:

It is interesting that the minister says that he has some knowledge of it, but yet does not know why the report was commissioned. It is my understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the report was commissioned by Transport Canada officials in view of phasing down one of the airports. And I can tell the minister now that the report is now completed and that some of the recommendations - although I have not seen the report, I have talked to people who have seen the report - that some of the recommendations are not necessarily to the benefit of either one of the airports. Would the minister care to comment on this?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. C. BRETT:

I have not seen the report, so, obviously, I cannot comment on it at this time. I would rather wait until I see it.

MR. J. HODDER:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER:

Would the minister undertake to find out, since it is in his ambit - however, it is now going to the federal government on the political level - would the minister undertake to make some representation to see that some of the implications in this report, which I understand are to withdraw funding from one or the other airports -

MR. W. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. W. MARSHALL:

This is the Question Period. The hon. member asked the minister whether or not he has seen the report. He has not, and the hon. member now is just making a statement of what he perceives to be in the report. You know, this is a Question Period, it is not a debating period.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

To that point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

To the point of order, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

I would say to my learned friend first of all that he ought to heed the old adage that people who live in grass huts should not stow thrones when he says this is not a debating period.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Secondly, my friend from Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) is not transgressing the bounds which Your Honour has laid down with clarity and precision on any number of occasions. He is simply trying to identify the areas in the report with which he is concerned and I do not think that is improper. The minister has been very co-operative and I would suggest to my friend from St. John's East (Mr. W. Marshall) there is no point of order. He ought to let his colleague, the minister, get on with the answer because I am sure his colleague, as always, will do what he can to try to help.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of order, I would rule that there is no point of order at this particular time. My understanding of the question is that the hon. member has asked the minister to make representation, or words to that effect, and I believe the question has been asked, if the hon. minister wishes to respond, he may.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. C. BRETT: When I see the report, obviously if there are matters of concern there then I will make my concerns known to the federal minister.

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

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to direct a question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn) and it is in relationship to a decision made by the Newfoundland and Labrador Labour Relations Board in terms of approving the application by the Seafarers International Union to represent workers on offshore supply vessels, and I might say this is a decision that we on this side of the House agree with in total. The matter of concern is the fact that there were several companies objecting to this particular ruling and in view of the fact, Sir, that these companies, by their own admission, have benefited from the provincial government

MR. T. LUSH: regulations, I am wondering if the minister would care to comment on this particular situation?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member for asking the question. Number one, just to clarify what the Labour Relations Board ruled on, they did not rule on whether the SIU can represent, or they did not rule whether they certified the SIU as a representative of employees offshore. What they did do was rule that they were capable of ruling on such an application if the application did come in. What has happened to this point in time is that the SIU applied for certification and then dropped their application, or requested the Labour Relations Board to drop their application, which the Labour Relations Board conceded to do. In the meantime, it was contended to the Labour Relations Board that they did not have authority to rule on whether the SIU or any other union could be certified by them and submissions were made by the SIU and several companies. The Labour Relations Board ruled, rightfully so, that, number one, since the Province owned, controlled and had jurisdiction over the offshore with respect to mineral exploration etc., that they had jurisdiction over ruling whether they can or can not certify unions who make applications

MR. J. DINN: for certification. So right now there is no application before the Labour Relations Board that I am aware of to have a union certified. The only ruling that has been made is that the Labour Relations Board has jurisdiction.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his answer in terms of what the Labour Relations Board ruling was but the minister did not get down to the crux of the question. And the matter of concern, as I have said before, is the matter of several companies, Newfoundland companies objecting to the ruling. And knowing the government's position, this is what I find unfortunate in this matter. So again, the question to the minister is, in view of the fact that these companies presumably are operating under the government regulations, what effect is this having with respect to government intentions that these Newfoundland companies in particular, have demonstrated that they oppose or reject the decision made by the Newfoundland Labour Board, the Newfoundland and Labrador Labour Board?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the hon. member's question, I do not know if he has seen a copy of the application or the ruling, and has the hon. member received a copy? Well, what the hon. member should do is receive a copy to see what proposals were made by the Seafarers International Union as an applicant in Zapata Marine Services Incorporated of Houston, Texas as the respondent, and what the different companies had to say in their proposals. But I am not particularly upset with any companies or any union as a result of the application. I think what we have done is brought



MR. J. DINN: something before the Labour Relations Board and we have a very clear understanding now by the Labour Relations Board and by people in Newfoundland, by companies in Newfoundland, as to who rules when an application comes in. I am happy with the ruling and I have no qualms with any of the companies for presenting a particular case on either side of the argument.

I was quite happy with the ruling. I was also quite happy and quite assured in my mind that this was the ruling that they would come up with. There was no other ruling they could come up with since I am firmly convinced in my mind that we own, control and have jurisdiction over the offshore. So the Labour Relations Board came out with a decision that I concur with and agree with and am happy with.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Hear, Hear!

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: I thank the minister again for his answer and of course that is where we stand on the points that he raised. But again the fact that -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear the question myself.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I thank the hon. the President of the Council. I have difficulty hearing him myself. I have asked the pages if they would be a little more quiet in passing out that statement. A supplementary, the hon. the Member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Again, Mr. Speaker, referring back to the fact that these companies are supposedly operating under the Provincial government

MR. T. LUSH: regulations and now that we have this particular position where they are opposing the ruling made by the Newfoundland and Labrador Labour Relations Board, is there any indication that these companies are rejecting or not abiding by the regulations in other areas as set out by the provincial government, particularly as it relates to local preference?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I can answer the local preference side of it with respect to labour offshore. For example, the respondent in this case was Zapata Marine Services who did the hiring for, I believe SEDCO 706 was the last rig that went out there, and we have a list of all the employees who were hired off there and they concurred 100 per cent with the regulations with respect to Newfoundlanders being hired offshore in places where they could possibly be hired, where we had people to fill the positions. They have concurred, as I say, 100 per cent with the regulations.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: For clarification, Mr. Speaker, more than a question: The minister is saying that these companies are abiding by the regulations, I am just wondering whether there is not some reference in the regulation stating Newfoundland's position with respect to jurisdiction. In other words, does it state that the government have jurisdiction up to 200 miles or over 200 miles or whatever. Is there any reference made to that in the regulations?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, with respect to the regulations, the most important part of the regulations that I concern myself with is with respect to preferential treatment to hiring Newfoundlanders offshore. And I see to it that the companies follow the regulations to the nth degree and I make sure that they do not hire somebody from outside where we have Newfoundlanders who can fill the jobs. Now whether we should state the obvious in the regulations, I am not sure whether we should or should not. The fact of the matter is that everybody, the companies, the unions, everyone whom I have spoken to or have had to have any dealings with agree with the regulations, have accepted the regulations and are following the regulations, and that is the important thing.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) wish to yield for the supplementary of the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary)?

MR. FLIGHT: Yes.

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman in his answer keeps referring to oil companies. Now what about all of these companies—and I believe there are seven or eight of them moved in here in the last week or so, including one that moved into Springdale — that are not oil companies that service the offshore rigs, companies that are coming in here from the mainland and Europe shielding behind local companies and so forth, who polices them and who sees that they hire Newfoundlanders and buy Newfoundland material? Does the minister have a watchdog in his department to keep an eye on these companies that are hiding behind Newfoundland firms and are hiring who they like

MR. NEARY: where they like?

MR. WHITE: A good question.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of anybody who is hiding behind anything. The hon. member seems to want to look under mats and behind doors, looking for people who are hiding behind or -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - peeping through keyholes. There is nobody in the department who is going around peeping into anybody's keyhole or anything like that but the fact of the matter is, unless the hon. member has something that he - some evidence that he can present to my department -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DINN: - I have an employment officer in my department, and I have very competent people in my department who keep track of everything that is going on with respect to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. DINN: - employment offshore. That I see is my job and that job is being well done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy. He will recall that he set out a policy in this House for this fiscal year that there would be - he named communities that would be coming off, that would stop receiving their hydro services by diesel generated power, that Newfoundland Hydro would extend the hydro lines from the grid into various communities this year and take those communities off of diesel. At the time when he made his statement he identified the communities that that would indeed happen to this year and he named other communities that would receive that

MR. FLIGHT: kind of activity over the next three or four years. Would the minister indicate if the towns that he indicated that would indeed receive hydro this year, if that has in fact been done to this point?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, all of the inter-ties may not have been completed but it is my understanding that the ones where we indicated work would commence, that the work has either commenced or will commence before year end. And with respect to future inter-ties, this will be a budgetary matter which will be revealed when the budget comes out.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if because it has no effect on the budget, really. The sequence of which towns are done in which year really does not make any difference, the cost analysis has been done anyway from a budgetary point of view, I wonder if the minister would indicate if a decision has been made as to what communities will come next in the programme?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I just mentioned that this is a budgetary decision. Every year government has to decide how much money can be spent on grid inter-ties, hooking up now isolated systems to the hydro grid. It is usually cost efficient, you usually save dollars by doing that, but you incur heavy capital costs, so it is always a question of to what extent can you rob Peter to pay Paul. And to the greatest extent possible we want to see these inter-ties completed as soon as possible but the numbers that we will be able to do this year will be identified in the budget.

MR. FLIGHT: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister indicate whether or not there is a priority system? You know, in the fifteen communities that are presently serviced by diesel power at greater cost paying an enormously higher cost for their electricity than the normal town that is serviced by hydro, will the minister indicate whether there is a priority, if those fifteen towns are identified by way of priority as to which ones comes off the diesel source first?

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the Minister of  
Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, attempts  
are made to try and identify just how much money would  
be saved government yearly by hooking up each system.  
I might add that there are some systems - some diesel  
will never, in our lifetime anyhow, be able to be  
hooked up to the hydro grid because they are too far  
away from the grid and the capital cost would be too  
great.

But, yes, an attempt is  
made to identify where the greatest savings could be  
made each year. And this is taken into consideration in  
making the decision as to which inter-ties to proceed  
with. Where will you get your capital pay-back fastest?  
Where will the most dollars be saved, most of the  
taxpayers' dollars be saved?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for  
the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, we will come  
back to that another time because, like my friend from  
Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), I have a number of  
communities that are - in fact, all of the communities in  
my district are on diesel. But I should like to ask a  
question of the Minister of Fisheries. I would hate to  
see a whole Question Period go by without giving the  
minister an opportunity to display his undoubted talents.  
I would like to ask him about the proposed fish plant  
in the community of St. Barbe - St. Barbes, if one wishes -  
in my district, the proposed plant to be built, as the  
minister knows, by T.J. Hardy Limited and by the Nickerson  
interests.

MR. NEARY: A good man, boy.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Hardy is

MR. ROBERTS: a good man. For a moment I thought my friend was speaking of the minister. I could not quite believe my ears.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: I am not speaking of Nickersons either.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister if he could tell us the position that he or the administration of which he is such an important part have taken with respect to this proposal?

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it was only yesterday that - no, I am sorry, the say before yesterday that I met with the Nickerson company. Of course, Nickerson being National Sea now, they control both companies, and we discussed with the company a number of their proposals they have now, and plans they have for new plants and new plant extensions in the Province, one of them being, in this case, St. Barbe.

There has been some concern expressed by Fishery Products operating at St. Anthony with the possible effects that the new plant at St. Barbe will have on their operation in St. Anthony, based on the fact that some fish will be, in the plans for St. Barbe, transported from the Labrador coast to the plant at St. Barbe; that is the plan of Nickersons. So in discussing with the company yesterday, they indicated now that they are awaiting a reply from DREE - they have applied for DREE assistance. We put forward our views on the plant to DREE as requested by the federal department. Our only concern was the effect it would have on existing operations in the area, as I meantioned, one being the plant at St. Anthony, Fishery Products.



MR. MORGAN: But we were convinced in talking with Nickersons that they are determined primarily to get their raw material supply, their fish supply from the feeder plants in the general surrounding area. So based on that information we have no objections to the proposed new plant at St. Barbe.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The time for

March 20, 1980

Tape No. 504

AH-1

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Oral Questions has expired.

MR. ROBERTS: May I ask a question by leave?

MR. SPEAKER: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: I will be brief. The minister's answer is most welcome and he has anticipated the question that I was going to ask so I will not need to ask as to what the government had done. Will the minister lay upon the table of the House copies of the communications to DREE, because I think it is important to know exactly what has been said. And I agree with the tenor of what the minister has said, that I think this plan should go ahead provided it does not threaten either St. Anthony or Port au Choix and I see no evidence it will.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not lay it on the table because, you understand, the reason being I would not lay it on the table at this time is because it is ongoing negotiations between the company concerned, in this case Nickerson's, and DREE. It is not the department and DREE, it is ongoing negotiations between the company and DREE and until these negotiations are finalized it may be incorrect to make public any information involving these negotiations.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired. I would like to welcome to the gallery a former member of this hon. House, Mr. Mel Woodward, who, I believe has just slipped out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Also another former member has been brought to my attention by the Minister of Justice,

March 20 , 1980

Tape No. 504

AR-2

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): (Mr. Ottenheimer), Mr. Wilson  
Callan.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member  
for Burgeo-LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked me a question yesterday,  
it will take a couple of days before I can -

AN HON. MEMBER: Which one?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: LaPoile - it will take a couple  
of days before I can give an answer on that. The hon. member  
for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) also asked a question which I  
can refer to and that dealt with alleged incidents during  
a hockey game in Gander last weekend. The department has made  
enquiries with respect to that, those alleged incidents last  
Saturday. Apparently it took place during pre-game warm-up  
and members of both teams were involved and apparently there  
was also a certain amount of at least rowdiness, or what is  
described in front of me here as a small fight at the end  
of the third period. The information that we have does not  
suggest that it is a situation that would warrant a prosecution  
for assault. I would say that obviously the department is  
concerned about violence in hockey and certainly would, if  
situations warranted it, if the situation required it, we  
certainly would not hesitate from prosecutions if that were  
warranted.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, there was a question  
yesterday or a series of questions from the  
member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock), followed up  
by the Leader of the Opposition, regarding a possible tuberculosis  
outbreak in the district of St. Mary's-The Capes. First of  
all, I just want to make this statement, to state flatly

MR. MOUSE: that there is no tuberculosis outbreak or epidemic in that district. I just want to point out as a preliminary to it that in the Province in any one year there are approximately one hundred cases. These cases are through a number of communities and identified, and a lot of these are cases which have been active perhaps twenty or thirty year ago and they recur from time to time. There have been four cases identified in three different communities; they are not necessarily related, they are all under control and are being properly treated. The doctor who is looking after this, of course, is the doctor in charge of tuberculosis in the Province, Dr. Knowling, and she reports quarterly to the department and only if there are serious outbreaks. The kind of a thing that I mentioned yesterday in Daniel's Harbour was the case in point where everyone would be made aware because of the, perhaps, impending epidemic. The other thing, I think,

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the reason for not making all this known is there is no necessity of alarming people because everything was under control. So I would like to have the House rest assured that it is controlled and being actively treated.

MR. S. NEARY: Great excuses for not talking about it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!  
The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. DINN: Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to just revert to Presenting Reports? This is a report of the -

MR. SPEAKER: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. J. DINN: It is a report of matters transacted during 1979 by the Minister of Labour and Manpower with respect to the Labour Relations Act, Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, Fishing Industry(Collective Bargaining)Act, Newfoundland Teachers(Collective Bargaining)Act, report of the Labour Standards Board and report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Labour Relations Board.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of 1,231 voters in my district. The prayer of the petition reads as follows: "Whereas the roads from the following communities, Seal Cove, Hermitage, Sandyville, Wreck Cove, Cocomb's Cove, Boxey, Mose Ambrose, English Harbour West, St. Jacques, Balleoram and Pool's Cove are dirt roads, and whereas the level of upgrading since their original construction has been very minimal and in most cases nil, and whereas the present condition of the roads are deplorable, the undersigned, in conjunction with the South Coast Regional Development Association, do hereby propose that government ensure that sufficient funds are allocated for extensive upgrading

MR. D. STEWART: and paving of the above roads during the next construction season."

In supporting the petition, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that I have travelled over the roads in question constantly over the past ten years when I was Co-ordinator with the South Coast Regional Development Association. These roads, Mr. Speaker, are indeed very narrow with very dangerous turns and really no top at all to grade. The communities involved are all fishing communities in my district and depend heavily upon this dirt road for their transportation. Fish is collected daily along this road, and also, Mr. Speaker, children are bused daily from seven of these communities to English Harbour West for high school, and the condition of the roads are very dangerous, especially during this time of year. Also, Mr. Speaker, loggers from Seal Cove use this road continuously. So, Mr. Speaker, I would like for this petition to be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department it concerns.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure that I would like to support this petition, knowing the area quite well, knowing a lot of people who live there and the trials and tribulations which they have gone through over the past number of years trying to commute daily to work, as outlined by the hon. member - the problems they have all year round. In particular, I would like to refer to the Wintertime. That road, or by far the majority of it, Mr. Speaker, is not even in fit condition for the type of equipment which the Department of Highways has located to snow clear, in places so narrow that the operators find it very difficult even to keep a machine on the road. It is an area that, in many cases, the cart has been put before the horse, in particular in the educational field. As has been outlined, the area is regionalized, supposedly for the betterment of the students and better facilities, but that is little good if the students, themselves, are not able to get to their facilities pretty much on a regular

MR. D. HOLLETT: basis, and certainly, during the last two months, I am sure there were thousands of school days lost.

Probably more important, Mr. Speaker, for the future of that area - and it is an area in this Province that has been badly neglected - if the potential for growth is ever to be achieved, because of the geography of the area, then certainly, I think it should be a priority with the government that immediately work begin on upgrading and eventual paving of those roads.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. W. MARSHALL: Order 11, Bill No. 13.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

If I may, I was not here at

the opening and I wish to draw to the attention of hon. members that yesterday at Government House seven members of the Newfoundland Bar were invested, I think that is the correct term, as Queen's Counsel and among those seven were two hon. members of this hon. House and I am sure all members would wish me to express their congratulations to both gentlemen. They are the hon. member for Mount Scio and Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry) and the member for the Strait of Belle Isle and House Leader for the Opposition (Mr. E. Roberts). And certainly we extend congratulations to both hon. and learned gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, I know I speak for my colleagues on this side and I say we are not prepared to give leave for this statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS:

A little more seriously, I would like to thank the minister both on my own behalf and on behalf of his absent colleague who was at Government House yesterday. And I want to say that we much appreciated the commission the minister drew, particularly the words in it that referred to 'profits' and 'emoluments'. There was some considerable comment on that and all concerned were very gratified but I would thank the minister for his kind words. And as his colleague would tell him, the single us out downtown if he needs advice free.

MR. S. NEARY:

I am going to be an honorary member of the Bar first.



ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend And Consolidate The Law Respecting Boilers, Pressure Vessels And Compressed Gas," carried. (Bill No. 29)

On motion, Bill No. 29 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Amusement Rides," carried (Bill No. 31)

On motion, Bill No. 31 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Public Works And Services Act, 1973 With Respect To Government Printing," carried. (Bill No. 9)

On motion, Bill No. 9 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Industrial Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm And Adopt An Amending Agreement Entered Into Between The Government And Burgeo Fish Industries Limited And Others," carried. (Bill No. 30)

On motion, Bill No. 30 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Mineral Act, 1976," carried. (Bill No. 8)

On motion, Bill No. 8 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

March 20, 1980

Tape No. 506

SD - 3

Motion, second reading of a bill,  
"An Act To Protect The Environment Of The Province By Providing For  
Environmental Assessment". (Bill No. 13)

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Torngat

Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, first I would like to take the opportunity of congratulating the minister in bringing in a long overdue Bill for the Province. This Bill should have been brought in years ago. And what I am going to speak on in the next twenty or twenty-five minutes was to get some indication how companies have gone ahead and tore up land in this Province of ours without any environmental assessment control whatsoever.

I am going to speak this evening, Mr. Speaker, on the exploration activities of BRINEX in the Kitts-Michelin area in coastal Makkovik. Mr. Speaker, in the month of December the provincial government undertook to have a - let us see now, the best word to use is probably meetings with all the people concerned, where people from all along Labrador and other groups to express their concerns to government concerning why BRINEX should not go ahead with any development of the uranium project -

MR. S. NEARY: That is the Powell Inquiry, is it not?

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, this is the Powell Inquiry I think Mr. Clarence Powell was the Chairman, and Rev. Francis Buckle and Mr. Davis. I am sure that once the financial figure is released the cost of this report is going to cost probably in the vicinity of maybe \$50,000. So if this environment assessment review was into effect, I am pretty well sure that this process that happened in December would not necessarily be essential.

Mr. Speaker, if one had the opportunity, I am sure that many of us in the House of Assembly and many of us in the Province of Newfoundland on the Island portion do not know what has gone on in this area during the past several years, what destruction has taken place without any or very little control. Mr. Speaker, I have taken the

MR. G. WARREN: liberty of going through the last report that BRINEX submitted to government, the Environmental Impact Statement. Now I am going to go through this piece by piece and show that there has been a lot of things done and a lot of things planned without any environmental bills whatsoever. On page 17 of the report BRINEX is mentioning that a lime kiln will be built in an appropriate industrial park of Happy Valley - Goose Bay and it is going to be shipped in from the Island in the form of lime. Mr. Speaker, it goes on to say that from Goose Bay it will be trucked to Michelin on the road that is proposed to be built from Happy Valley - Goose Bay - Northwest River to Michelin. It is going to be trucked and it is going to be in the form of sulphuric acid. Now we know that this chemical is a bit dangerous and what will happen if midway between Northwest River and Michelin somewhere around one of the large rivers there that this truck encounters mechanical trouble and is left there for a period of time and the road is accessible to hunters, is accessible to tourists, is there going to be any danger if any spills occur from this vehicle that is transporting this sulphuric acid?

Mr. Speaker, first BRINEX was planning to use large ships to come up through Kaipokok Bay, right

MR. G. WARREN:

up within 150 feet of the community of Postville. Now this later was scrapped to use the port of Goose Bay and ship it by road, which is probably the lesser of two evils.

But all through this report, Mr. Speaker, Brinex is trying to give in to the people. What they are trying to do here is not to convince the government because the people were the ones who were really kicking up. They were the people in Postville and Makkovik that really stirred Brinex, that really fought like God knows what to get Brinex to come in with better regulations. It was not this government. It was the people that probably convinced the government, it was the people themselves that went time and time again to Brinex to make sure that stronger regulations were brought into force and as a consequence of this, the inquiry that we had in December, the government instituted an inquiry in December, but it was pressure from the people.

And right throughout this report, Mr. Speaker, Brinex is saying permit requirements will be necessary to start the project. And they are saying that they have not received any okay from government, but still and all, before this inquiry, before this latest book was published, they were ready to start tomorrow morning. Mr. Speaker, on the road going from Northwest River to Michelin, they have to cross the Canairiktok River, now I think my pronounciation may be a wee bit off, but the Canairiktok River is somewhere between Northwest River and Michelin. Now I am sure the hon. member from Naskaupi will correct me on my pronounciation of the river. Anyhow, this river - I would like to quote what they say here - "Salmonoid fishes migrating up river to spawn in the Summer and Fall stages before the rapids." This is a very, very vital river that the fishermen along the Coast, out in Northwest River and Rigolet

MR. G. WARREN: that the fish go up this river to spawn. Now, if there is going to be any distraction from this riverbed, if there is going to be any not strong enough regulations imposed, what will happen? Eventually, two or three years down the road, those fishermen that have to depend on fish that are going back and forth in this river to spawn will be left without a half decent way to make a reasonable living.

Mr. Speaker, there are more brooks between the Montagnais Point and the Canairiktok Bay. Now, and it says here also in this paragraph, "this area provides excellent spawning and rearing habitats for salmonoid species, especially brook trout." You know, Brinex is saying, they are saying throughout this report that, you know, we are going to have to cross these rivers and they are excellent spawning areas. So, you know, they were aware of their facing many, many dangers by having this road constructed from Northwest River and Michelin.

"(inaudible) fishing in this brook yield a very high density of brook trout fry and yearlings" and it does not say any other species. But these are in the Spring of the year, and I am sure my hon. member from Naskaupi (J. Goudie) can verify this, that in the spring of the year from April, May and June before the ice leaves the bays, many people from Goose Bay, Northwest River and Rigolet travel up around those rivers and this is where they get their supply of fresh trout for the Spring of the year. And all of a sudden, if we are not careful, this is going to be all destroyed.

Mr. Speaker, on page 24, Brinex, when they are discussing the tributaries for the Sebaskachu River and they are talking about the salmon and the trout run, and they say this poses two potential problems for road construction and bridge

March 20, 1980

Tape no. 508

EL - 3

MR. G. WARREN:                    siting consideration. And they said  
the first concern was that the construction must be planned and  
executed in such a manner as to avoid erosion. "But the second  
and the greatest concern is that of providing easy access, public  
access to a point

MR. WARREN: of migratory fish concentration below the first rapids. Now what they are saying there is that if they open up this road - there is virgin wilderness at the present time - every person who wants to go fishing, any person who wants to go into the countryside will go in there. And what will happen in two or three years time? I will tell the hon. minister what will happen; exactly what is happening today on the old Cabot Highway between Little Harbour in Placentia Bay and Southern Harbour. I will tell you what is happening: If the hon. minister would go down there today he would see that three miles of road ruined with everything from garbage buckets to salt bags to rotten squid to rotten fish. Everything that you can talk about is strewn on that piece of highway. And this is exactly what would happen if this road is kept open, everything would be thrown on there. So this is why this environmental bill needs to be imposed almost immediately.

Mr. Speaker, another concern with the opening up of the road from North West River to Michelin is that in years gone by wildlife, caribou was existing there. And although today - I think in the last report there was one caribou sighted in this area but that does not mean that in years to come the caribou is not going to revert to this game hunting ground.

Mr. Speaker, what will happen to the traplines, the simple traplines in this exact same area? There is a trap line just inside Kaipokok Bay. What will happen to guys who today are making \$6,000 or \$7,000 on their furs when people will go in there and completely disrupt the traplines? It is environmentally safe if there is no one there, but once anyone goes there naturally the environment is stirred



MR. WARREN: up and it is going to cause problems.

What I find so amazing, Mr. Speaker, about this report is that BRINEX, in almost every second paragraph, mention about the danger, they mention there is danger. And they say the greatest potential impact is from road hunters. BRINEX say this themselves. That is destroying -

MR. GOUDIE: What was the biggest danger?

MR. WARREN: I beg your pardon?

MR. GOUDIE: What was the big danger?

MR. WARREN: The biggest danger is the impact from road hunters.

BRINEX are saying this themselves, so they know. They already knew when they compiled this that it was environmentally unsafe because you are destroying the countryside.

Mr. Speaker, I was going to mention land claims but I think that will come up under a different heading altogether. BRINEX is saying that the Arctic char - now, people living in Labrador, some of us living in Newfoundland know that one of the best fish that ever came out of the water is the Arctic char. Now, the Arctic char -

MR. THOMS: Next to a salmon.

MR. WARREN: No, it is much better than salmon. I am sure that the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) will agree with me, it is much, much better than a salmon. And not until you have lived in Labrador for several years will you find out the difference.

Mr. Speaker -

MR. THOMS: Provide some samples.

MR. WARREN: Okay, the next time I come back from Labrador I will bring back some samples - I am sure my colleague from Naskaupi will agree - and we will

MR. WARREN: bring some back and  
let you all try it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: We will remember that  
too, right.

MR. ROBERTS: You bring salmon and  
he will bring char.

MR. THOMS: Either/or.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, BRINEX even  
mentioned this delicious food, Arctic char. They say  
Arctic char inhabit MacLean Lake and utilize it for  
spawning, rearing and overwintering. If any of us  
know the MacLean Lake

MR. WARREN: If any of us know the map of Labrador, we know that MacLean Bay is probably in an airplane from Postville, Makkovik right inside both communities pretty well. Now the tributaries from MacLean Lake, some of them come out through Kaipokok Bay and others come on out further down the coastline. Now, we have Arctic char go up into MacLean Lake. Now a little later on in my speech I am going to mention that BRINEX is planning to build a big dam, they are planning to build a dam in there. And this is going to stir up the travel habits of Arctic char. What will happen to the Arctic char that every year since eternity has been going up to MacLean Lake and coming down in the Spring, going up and coming down in the Spring? What is going to happen to the fishermen along that section of the coast? Arctic char today, Mr. Speaker, is roughly thirty to forty per cent of the fish caught in this area. And all of a sudden, if we are not careful, it is going to be destroyed.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the whitefish?

MR. WARREN: What about the whitefish? Probably the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) could answer that one. But whitefish has nothing to do with the char whatsoever. It is a different species altogether. And you will find it more in the Northwest Territories than you would in Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER: Whitefish -

MR. WARREN: There is a whitefish but it is not in connection with the Arctic char.

MR. NEARY: A lot better to look at than you are.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come over and have a chat.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, on page forty-two BRINEX says that effluent from the Michelin concentrator - now this was where the project starts. Before I was talking about the road going into Kitts-Michelin and now I am going on - okay, BRINEX is ready to start. They are started. Now the effluent from the Michelin concentrator will be pumped to a waste management area where solids are

MR. WARREN: settled out. The effluent is treated with lime in the mill to reduce acidity and to precipitate any metals from the effluent. Now this is what is intended, but will it do it? That same question was asked to BRINEX into Makkovik. Could they assure us, a simple question, could they assure us that no effluent was going to leak from the concentrator? They said, how can we assure you when we have not put in the process yet? I am saying, Mr. Speaker, they should not be given the opportunity to put into process if it is not environmentally safe. And this is what I hope that this bill will try to bring out to any companies that are planning to do any exploration in any part of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, on page forty-three, here they admit guilt. Here is where BRINEX admits guilty. They say, "When in operation the effluent from a treatment area will be monitored to assure compliance with standards," now that is sentence number one. Sentence number two, "possible seepage through or under the dam will be monitored." Okay, they are saying, "possible seepage through and under the dam will be monitored". That is not the answer.

MR. G. WARREN: They are saying there is going to be seepage and they are saying they are going to monitor it, but what is going to happen to it? You know, it is leaving too much too vague and it is tampering with the lives of the people, in particular in Makkovik and Postville, because those rivers flow out into their communities. Those are the people who will be mostly affected. 'This monitoring, combined with a stringent design, will ensure that failure of the structure would be an extremely remote possibility,' - an extremely remote possibility, Mr. Speaker.

I was talking to Nain just yesterday and I was told that they have the highest snowfall that ever anyone in Nain could remember. You could walk partly from housetop to housetop. Now, that was a remote possibility last Summer. No one last Summer would have even thought of it, would they? They would not have said, 'We are going to have the biggest snowfall in the world,' but this year they got it. Now that is a remote possibility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: Thank you for the applause.

Mr. Speaker, BRINEX under comments concerning flooding: 'Run-off from the local water course will drain into the tailing storage area and must therefore be treated along with the mill affluent. Diversion ditches will be constructed to divert as much as possible' - you know, this is what boils my blood, here they are saying again and again, 'as much as possible'. You know, they are not saying it is going to be done, they are saying 'Diversion ditches will be constructed to divert as much as possible of the run-off around the tailing area; however, it cannot be all diverted.' Now, hear that! Now, they are pretty well telling us, 'Look, we are going to build ditches, we are going to put up dams, but we cannot divert all of it.' What is going to happen to the other little tiny bit, we will call it. You know, it does not take very much to ruin a person's life. The main danger would be that the flood water would overflow the tailing dam and that the water flowing over would erode the dam and severely damage it. Now, Mr. Speaker, what do we have now?

MR. G. WARREN: BRINEX is saying that it could be a possibility, remote as it may seem. But the overflow on the tailing dam is going to overflow the dam and it is going to damage the dam. Now, what did they mean by damage? Is it going to put a little crack in it or scar the paint off it or something? No, Mr. Speaker, when a company that is involved with millions of dollars comes out and says this, that it is going to damage the dam, down inside, they know that is much more damage than just a little crack or a little paint scratched off the dam. It is damage where probably the dam could burst right open, completely open, and what happens to everything that is piled up in the dam? Downstream it comes. The 225 people in Postville and the 350 people in Makkovik, what happens to those people? It is very, very dangerous, and, Mr. Speaker, this environment bill, this is why I say that any further development, anything further before BRINEX or any other company even thinks about addressing the uranium problem, should definitely first wait until this bill is passed, and every precaution is in this bill to make sure that none of these possibilities will occur.

Mr. Speaker, in November, 1979, the Labrador Inuit Association sent out this release. I want to take two quotes from their release. One quote is from a lady in Postville. She says, 'What are we going to do in fifteen years when the mine is closed down and the pit is left open and our land is ruined?' And the last part of the release says, 'Does the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador have the people' - this is very important, Madam Minister, when you are bringing in this bill, and I think this last part is very, very, very vitally important - it says, 'Does the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador have the people, the money and the skill to properly enforce the environmental legislation it expects to pass?'

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. G. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is very important. It is no good to bring this bill in, it is a waste of paper, a waste of time, a waste of my energy, your energy and everyone else's energy, to have it if we have not got the expertise, the people, the time and the skill to bring it into force.

Mr. Speaker, I am getting pretty close to the end and on page 46, now, here we are talking about decommissioning after the project is over; fifteen years have gone, the project is finished, or twenty years - twenty five whatever the case may be - it is all over with. Now, there are two big mountains, they got a dam put across the two mountains, probably twenty, fifty, one hundred feet high, it could be much higher, and so they are saying when the ore is exhausted permission must be obtained from the AECB, Atomic Energy Control Board, to decommission the waste management cycle. And they are saying here now, here we are looking fifteen years down the road, they are saying they do not even have a clue what they are going to do with it, we have not got a clue yet at the present time, do not have a clue. It will be necessary to review with them the best way we should go about doing this.

A large amount of research has to be initiated on this subject and improvements are likely to result from this research.

Mr. Speaker, you know, BRINEX have told the hearing in Makkovik saying that, "Look, when we are finished we will have the land back like it was before we started." Now, if you ever heard a talk about a bunch of bologna that is a bunch of bologna. How in the heck can you get the land, after destroying it for the past fifteen, twenty years, bring it back the way it was in its original state? Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, BRINEX is hiring on twenty-five or thirty men, taking blocks of concrete from a dam one hundred feet high, taking the blocks out one by one and destroying them, taking them somewhere else and

MR. G. WARREN: destroying them. What are you going to do with that big concrete wall?

Mr. Speaker, I think they do not have any clue. They said it here, "We do not know yet at the present time what we are going to do with it." They are not going to do no more with it, Mr. Speaker, than any other company that came into this Province and opened up mines and moved out. They will not do any more, Mr. Speaker, than the United States Air Force did when they left Saglek, when they left Hopedale, when they left the St. Anthony site. They will not do anything more, Mr. Speaker, that is what they are going to do - absolutely nothing when decommissioning the land.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite supportive of this Environmental Bill. I am quite pleased that the minister has seen fit to bring this in at this opportune time. However, there is one thing that comes to me and that is the Powell Report was expected, first, it was expected to be released to government at the end of December. Since then I have heard that it was going to be released sometime in January; since then I have heard that it was going to be release sometime in February, now I understand it is going to be sometime this month.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure it is not fair to put the minister in an awkward position by asking that question so I will not do so. But I am just wondering if that report will come out before this Bill is passed or will that report be made available at all? I have got a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that there is some good news in that Report, there is some good information in that Report if the Powell Report gave the feelings that were expressed. Now, that is up to the Powell Report, but if they gave the feelings that were expressed that report should say, no development, no uranium development in Labrador until - and I am of this opinion - every precaution is



MR. G. WARREN: made, everything is done to make sure that it is environmentally safe and environmentally sound to go ahead with any development in particular a development that will definitely have an affect on the lives of people living in Labrador. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, it is a great pleasure for me to stand up and support this Bill and say a few words on the Act. It is, of course, breaking new ground and I am very happy with the support that it is receiving. What it is essentially doing is showing public concern for the environment and each clause shows that and shows what a people government is going to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I listened to the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) a few days ago and the House Leader for the Opposition and, of course, they gave support too. Of course, they both said, 'Oh, it is a good act but it does not go far enough'. That is support. I think when you cannot find anything else to say, that is good support.

MR. GOUDIE: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: It is good act but it does not go far enough.

MR. GOUDIE: Good point.

MR. HOUSE: I have some problem with that 'far enough' and I am of the opinion that not going quite far enough is far superior than going too far. Being a Conservative, I think I would have to look at it that way. And if we see down the road that there are some major problems we can certainly revise upward. And we will have this government to do that. This government will be around here a long time to do that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: Well, that example there showed me that I am in better stead than I thought I was, a lot better than the people over there thought I was.

MR. STIRLING: They showed you are losing.

MR. HOUSE: No, not me. Not me. No, no. So, Mr. Speaker, the other problem, of course -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: - that was stated there was something to the effect that it gives the minister too much power. Knowing the minister, of course, this minister, and knowing the fact that this government will be here some time, the fact that - well, there is preliminary work to be done

MR. HOUSE: before any major assessment takes place. And, of course, that is normal and I think we have to give the good people we have at the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment, and the minister of course, the ability to do spade work before we go through a major cost of environmental assessment. I think we can live with that and I am sure that - I have to thank everybody who has supported it and praise the minister for bringing it in because it is showing real concern.

Mr. Speaker, I suppose most of us here in this Province still believe that Newfoundland and Labrador is one of the last bastions of non-polluted territory in the Western World. And, of course, we have become somewhat a haven for people who come in from other places. They come here, a lot of them, for that very reason. And sometimes they become very outspoken and we become very critical of them. So we have become a little bit of a haven for purists. And judging from some of the havoc wrought by some of the industry that we have, I am sort of smugly happy that we are not heavily industrialized.

Of course, when I listened to the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) the other day talking about some havoc that was played with wildlife when the Bay d'Espoir project was going ahead, that showed a wanton disregard for our wildlife, a wanton disregard for our laws. And, of course, we saw that happening too where wildlife officers, I was advised, used to go and kill off a lot of game for special banquets and so on on the advice of governments. And, of course, you can look all across the Province, and I am not only concerned with the pollution that gets into the lungs and the system, I am also concerned with the

MR. HOUSE: visual pollution, and you can go along our highways anywhere and see dugouts on the side of the road, gravel pits and so on, and, of course, now we are coming up with some kind of a remedy for that.

I could go on and give a lot of examples where we have pollution that is visual and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I am speaking as the Minister of Health today, and when I looked at the purpose of this act I felt obligated to get up and say something. Because the first one is to facilitate the wise management of our resources and the second one is to protect the environment and the quality of life of our people of the Province. And that is a real health measure. The point that I want to get across here is as Minister of Health I want to say that health is something more than the absence of sickness or the absence of illness, health is the ability to grow vigourously in a clean environment, and that is important.

This government, as much as we want industry, as much as we want industrialization, as much as we want places for people to work, the prime important thing,

MR. W. HOUSE: of course, is for people to be able to live healthy and one is exclusive of the other, I think, and we believe firmly that we can have industrialization and we have health also. So this just goes to show that, of course, we are putting our hearts and minds and people, people first, a people government putting people first; work is secondary and we hope that we can have that. And of course, as shown by the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and the statistics that we get from month to month, we are even improving our work force, the numbers, even though we are still concerned and certainly going to look after the health of the people.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think we can all take some pleasure in looking at what is happening in the Western world now. I think ten years ago if you heard tell of a person who was an environmentalist you would look askance at him. Now most everybody can class themselves as being somewhat of an environmentalist. You can look at some of the newer industries that have come on tap - well, look at the mine in Daniel's Harbour which is a recent mine where there has been very little danger and you can look at the mining operations, say, in Labrador itself. You can look at the Scully Mines or the Wabush mines, you can look at the IOC and with the IOC we had problems; I do not think there was a good environmental assessment, we are having that assessed again. A study done now. And the people there, when I was Minister of Labour and Manpower some time ago I met with them and they said, 'If we had our time back we would not have had the problems that we got now because we would have gone to a different kind of process.' And you are not having the same problems in the Scully mines in Labrador as

MR. W. HOUSE: you are having in the IOC because Scully mines have a wet process, you are not getting the quantities of dust. With the IOC that is the major problem, the dust. That was a case of where I think there was not enough assessment done and we have lived to regret it and of course the people in the area have lived to regret it more so than we have.

Mr. Speaker, it is not every day that I stand up here and speak, as a matter of fact it is not every day that I agree with the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), and I do not think it is every day that the member for Windsor - Buchans agrees with the member for Windsor - Buchans, but there are certain things that he says that I entirely agree with. And I have a lot of sympathy with him -

MR. FLIGHT: It is not every day that everyone agrees with you either (inaudible) people of Howley.

MR. W. HOUSE: That is right. I was advised by the member for Windsor - Buchans, who has some relatives in Howley -

MR. FLIGHT: Go back (inaudible)

MR. W. HOUSE: - and they are my supporters, by the way - that I would not get elected. As a matter of fact, I had the biggest majority any single candidate ever got in Howley this particular time and I want you to bear that in mind and I want the rest of the House to bear that in mind too. But I just want to point out to -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. W. HOUSE: But anyway I am trying to point out to him that I am agreeing with him on the problems that he is talking about in our waterways and in the forests, the wanton waste in the forests. And the fact that I think that Bowaters - and Bowaters certainly knows my stand on this, I was Mayor of the town of Deer Lake for six years and they have heard from me before on this and of course Abitibi Price. I believe if look back at the history of

it all they had a tacit agreement to pollute, they could pollute, and for fifty years, for instance, they have been portaging, driving - not portaging, that is the wrong word - but driving wood, mixing wood in the water and we have a build-up now of a bark in these lakes that is discolouring the water and is preventing the oxygen from getting down. It is causing visual pollution around the lakes, dead heads on the lakes. And in one case, Mr. Speaker, in Deer Lake the second year I was mayor there, I think it was somewhere around 1971, the bark was coming dry, going in on the shore and it got so dry there that we had forty fires there in one summer and this was caused by spontaneous combustion in that particular area. And I have a lot of sympathy for this and I do not think that we should ever allow anything like that to happen again because it is certainly a real problem.

The other thing, Mr. Speaker, I want to just mention here is the fact that the Humber Valley district is the site now of uranium exploration, and as far as I can gather that exploration is going ahead for another year and there are uranium findings in certain boulders in the area

MR. HOUSE: and what this exploration is trying to find is where these boulders came from and if there is any amount of uranium in the area. A lot of people have come to me from my constituency, and I have mixed feelings about it, on the one hand I would hope that there are quantities there that can be exploited, and on the other hand it has given me a little uneasy feeling. But in the meantime I have advised them that as long as I am a member and as long as this government is in that there will be a proper assessment done and everything done from a mechanical, from a technical, from an environmental viewpoint to ensure that everything is safely done. I advised them that this act coming in, which was on the Order Paper at the time, would insure that the public would have an input into determining if and when an exploitation of that mineral took place. And I advised them that the government is concerned about it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to point out that there are two or three reasons then that I want to support it, for health reasons and because it so specifically pertains to my district. There are a number of other things that we talked about and were mentioned and somebody talked about the spraying: Why did we spray two years ago and why did we not spray this year? Again it is reflective of this government and its democratic actions of letting people know the facts. I am satisfied that there is no long-term danger from Matacil spray, I am satisfied with that, but a lot of my constituents are not and the Royal Commission that we are appointing to look into that will do something similar to what an assessment would do, an environmental assessment. It will gather the people together, it will give them a forum to express their views and to learn what are the problems and then and only then will we be able to say, 'Well, this is



MR. HOUSE: it, you know the facts, and I am hopeful that it will be that there is no danger in spraying with Matacil. I do not know that yet but I am quite happy with the process we are going now and that is all in the spirit, of course, of having the public having an input and that is the reason why it was deferred, to put off for a year, to give that particular emphasis.

Mr. Speaker, there are other things, we mentioned that we have no oil and gas finds out here and no way to control the spills. Well, before any of that starts coming ashore—and we have people coming from all over the world to our Fisheries College here learning about marine life and about marine life and we are putting on courses, as you heard the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) talk about the other day, we are putting on courses that are going to help come to grips with the problems of oil spills and so on. And of course it will be some time down the road before that is going to be a danger. But I can assure you that this government is going to be very concerned about that and going to try to ensure that there is going to be the minimum danger.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to go on much longer. I just want to point out that I am supporting the bill. I think it is good legislation. It is long overdue, there is no question about that. It is democratic in that you do not go out and impose your will on the people, that the people have an input and get educated. So with the good minister that we have, the good department, this good legislation and of course with newer technology that we are industrializing in an age where the technology is improving and changing, and with people who are concerned and a discerning public and with a good people government we can

MR. W. HOUSE: be assured that we are going to have a good healthy environment and we can be assured that this act is going to help maintain the healthy environment that we have and that we want to continue on in the future. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME. HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (R. Baird): The hon. the member for Bonavista-North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I had not intended to speak in this debate, Mr. Speaker, because many of the points have been covered by my colleague. However, I hear that there is another speaker on the other side who wished to have something to say so that we will carry on and participate in the debate.

Mr. Speaker, a lot has been said about the need for this kind of bill and this government has a little bit of Dorothy Wyatt in it, has a little bit of attempting to say to the public and make all the appearances to the public of great concern, and having gotten that message across that in public the government shows some concern, they then go on in the same old manner. For example, the offshore oil drilling that is going ahead right now: If we believe what we are hearing it really is being drilled right now.

We had a visit recently to this Province of Justice Berger who was the chairman of a similar kind of thing as we are talking about in this act. And Justice Berger - now I attended his meeting - Justice Berger did a very serious study of a pipeline. Presumably we are going to have a pipeline offshore if you are going to believe everything that the Premier says about this oil that is coming to shore in Newfoundland, that this is a Newfoundland resource, that it is the same resource as the trees and

MR. L. STIRLING: it is coming to Newfoundland in a pipeline. Justice Berger took three years, three years from the time that that commission was appointed until they had finished their studies. He brought out some very interesting points. One of the points that he brought out was that you need to spend a great deal of money to make sure that people really have a fair chance to appear before a hearing or a board or a commission because millions of dollars will be spent by the developing company or companies to present their views. Millions of dollars! He estimated something like \$50 million had been spent by the companies presenting their views.

By the way, the pipeline was eventually turned down. So he said that you need to provide adequate funding. There is no mention, there is no mention in this of the kinds of funds that are going to be provided for people to do a reasonable and independent study amongst any of the projects that are being undertaken. We have asked for a very simple kind of opportunity for both sides of this House to participate in the discussion of the problems related to the environment in the offshore. The government has not, and nobody has mentioned, nobody from the government side, in discussing this bill, nobody has mentioned how they are going to apply the problems of the fishery. And we are talking about this offshore development as

MR. L. STIRLING: if it were going to happen tomorrow. We hear statements that oil can be brought ashore within the next couple of years. We hear other statements that we are talking about ten years down the road. We hear statements that this is going to come to shore in Newfoundland. Well, if you need three years to do an environmental study on a pipeline on land, how many years do we need to do a study of a pipeline to come from Hibernia into St. John's or into the Avalon Peninsula or into any other part of Newfoundland? - if that is what we are talking about.

AN HON. MEMBER: He will not live long enough to see the benefit to Stephenville.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the inconsistency that I find in this government that once they get out to the public and make a noise to the public about how concerned we are - and as the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House) said a few minutes ago, convince people that this is a 'people' government and admitted that he does not see anything wrong with spraying; I wonder would he agree - I notice that he has left, but maybe he can come back in and say whether he agrees or not - that with the previous Minister of Forestry an agreement had been made and the forestry officials felt - the recommendation of the forestry officials was that they were going to spray this year. Everything was all set to spray this year. I wonder if the 'out' in this environmental impact bill, I wonder if the truth of the difference between the government's public attitude and what they really intend is covered in Page 18, in which they say, 'An undertaking that is in progress before this act comes into force is exempt from this act.' What does the government mean by that? If there is something in progress:- What does progress mean? The Upper Salmon - one of the points that my colleague brought up last year - was that rushed through before this bill so you would not have to deal with the environmental impact study?

MR. F. STAGG: Definitely not.

MR. L. STIRLING: A question that was never satisfactorily answered in this House.

My colleague who spoke just a few minutes ago spoke about the BRINEX concerns, all the problems related to that.

MR. L. STIRLING: Well, I would predict, Mr. Speaker, that we will not be going ahead with that project because of the action taken in British Columbia. But what would have happened, Mr. Speaker, if this government had that in progress under this bill? What other projects are in progress? And what did they define as 'in progress'? Does it mean 'if the plans have been made'?

MR. G. FLIGHT: A lot of these industries are in progress.

MR. L. STIRLING: And the mining?  
What do they mean by 'in progress'?  
Do they mean that anything that is now on the drawing boards is in progress?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. L. STIRLING: What does it mean if they are talking of the development in the offshore, is that in progress?

MR. F. STAGG: That is happening now.

MR. L. STIRLING: The member for Stephenville just said, 'That is happening now.' Now, is that 'in progress'? Are the government getting ready in this wild-eyed panic approach that they have used in the last months to say, 'Now, look, Newfoundland, you have a choice - we can send out a ship and pump that pure oil right out of the hole that we have out there. Now that is "in progress", and we do not have to have any kind of impact study on that and we had better get that going now for a couple of years because we can make enough money on that, Newfoundlanders.' Is that 'in progress'?

MR. F. STAGG: Read the regulations.

MR. L. STIRLING: Nobody on the other side has mentioned the definition of what is 'in progress'.

What about, Mr. Speaker, some of our salmon rivers that are now being polluted by mines, by paper mills? Is that 'in progress'? And if somebody wants to put in a new \$20 million mill or a new \$20 million plant, is that 'in progress'? Is that one of the reasons why it is not going to be looked at? And what is the

MR. L. STIRLING:

consistency with a government that says on one hand, 'The public must be informed and the public must be involved,' and they have some kind of a God Almighty fear that they should not let the members on this side of the House participate in a Select Committee? And they said, 'Oh, no, cannot look into that! We have made up our minds,' - about one little piece of it. Have you made up your minds about what is going to be the effect on the fishery? Have you made up your minds about how the oil is coming in? Is it coming in by pipeline? What is the affect going to be on the fishery? Have you made up your minds about that? Why should not we, both sides of this House, start right now? Because the offshore is too important a thing to be postponed until some time in the

MR. STIRLING:

future because Mr. Burger has already said it takes three years just to study the effects of a pipeline on land. I do not see the consistency of this government which is afraid to set up a select committee to look at all aspects of it. Up until a few hours ago, the government had not cleared up in their own minds about where that oil was located, whether it was inside or outside the 200-mile limit. Mr. Speaker, this is a government that I do not know if you know or you care what you are doing to the people in this Province right now the kind of an approach that this government is taking about letting out a little bit of information? Do we have oil or do we not have oil? There is speculation going on all over the Province. We have a housing situation right here in this area, in this urban region area. We have no new land being developed for housing right now. The prices have gone sky high. The people on fixed incomes are frightened to death because they are not going to be able to get jobs on the offshore, and we are just sitting back and letting it happen. A concern about people! People every day are seeing the prices jacked up in anticipation of the oil. All that is happening right now is all local speculators, mainland speculators, every kind of a speculator, trying to take advantage of what may happen, and we have a government who, up to this time, have given no straight answers. They have not allowed - this government on that side and the Opposition on this side - they have not allowed us to come together to look at the basics. They have been screaming on the basis of, "The main question is ownership". This party has been on record on the ownership of this offshore for ten years, and they are now discovering it. They are now discovering the ownership is a question. There is no difference in us on the question of ownership, no difference.

Now, let us get on to the other questions.

How are we going to handle the very problems? Hibernia is no longer a guess. Hibernia is no longer an estimate in somebody's mind. We now can look at the alternative routes. You should now have an appointment

MR. STIRLING: made, a public hearing set up. We are saying that if you have not got that done, at least get a select committee set up in this House. Let a select committee - what is the Public Accounts Committee if it is not a select committee? Everybody agrees the Public Accounts Committee has done a good job in the past. Whether they will do a good job in the future will really depend on whether the government allows them to operate and to act, and this is a select committee, the same concept of looking into all aspects. It is a question that is very fundamental, brought up by my colleagues on this side who said the act does not go far enough and the Minister of Health (Mr. House) said he is a Conservative and he is quite happy with it and then he ran out of the House so he would not have to answer some of the comments.

MR. STAGG: So he would not have to listen to you.

MR. STIRLING: That is probably a very good idea. What is in the act? I have been told, "Read the act". The minister -

MR. STAGG: Not that act.

MR. STIRLING: - the minister - what are we debating? I am debating this act. The minister in this act -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) you already (inaudible), shut up, boy.

MR. STIRLING: The minister under this act, and I would refer the member to Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) to some of the comments that he made this morning in which he said that we are now about to participate in an exercise - that he thought the people who held the highest office would end up with criminal charges. Those are his words, not mine. If you cannot trust the person who holds the highest office -

MR. STAGG: Point of order, point of order, point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Point of order.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible) The hon. member (inaudible) quote me, he does not quote me. I talked this morning about the possibility of criminal charges being laid, I did not say criminal charges were going to be laid, and the hon. member, if he is going to



MR. STAGG: quote me, quote me accurately, but I doubt whether the hon. member wishes to do that.

AN HON. MEMBER: But what about the point of order?

MR. STAGG: I got my licks in there anyway, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) With regards to the point of order, it is just a matter of a difference of opinion. I would ask the hon. member to carry on with his speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: It would be much better if you were.

MR. NEARY: Why do you not learn the rules of the House?

MR. SPEAKER: I would also like to remind the member, too, of relevance.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What I am saying is very relevant.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Listen to the anti-labour minister, anti-union minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. POWER: Is there any way of keeping that chap quiet over there, Mr. Speaker?

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is very .

MR. STIRLING: relevant and I am glad that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), as he said, got his licks in.

MR. NEARY: That is what they say (inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: The member for Stephenville has said 'be relevant'. Okay, I am being relevant. Page 17, 'Exemptions'.

MR. NEARY: Spokesman for the telephone company.

MR. BENNETT: How relevant can you get?

MR. STIRLING: Now, Mr. Speaker, I think if you refer to Hansard, and refer to the Committee's report this morning, you will see what the member for Stephenville was saying and will decide who was right in the quotation. Because I agree he does not know from one minute to the next what he said.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. STIRLING: Exemptions -

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Sir, this hon. gentleman over there is supposed to be talking about the environment bill and he obviously lacks the ability to speak on it so he thinks that he can get a few cheap shots here about what happened this morning or what did not happen this morning. Obviously the rule of relevancy applies here. He is being quite contemptuous to the Chair.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): The hon. the member for Lewisporte to the point of order.

MR. WHITE: There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) is forced to answer the member for Stephenville and to not be relevant because the member for Stephenville continues

MR. WHITE: to interject into the  
debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WHITE: He should be the one to  
be shut up and not the member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Baird): On the point of order.  
There is no point of order and I will again remind the  
hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) about  
relevance.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr.  
Speaker. To be relevant, page 17, Mr. Speaker, my  
source, page 17, 'Exemptions'. "Where the minister is  
of the opinion that it is in the public interest, having  
regard to the purpose of this act and weighing the same  
against the injury, damage or interference that might  
be caused" -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. STIRLING: The minister. - "by the  
application of this act to any undertaking, the minister,  
with the approval of the Lieutenant-Governor in Council,  
may by order exempt an undertaking or proponent of an  
undertaking from the application of this act". And that  
is the relevance, Mr. Speaker. We have had many records  
in the past of ministers not following the act. We have  
had recent history, recent examples where a minister did  
not follow the Public Tendering Act. And in this case,  
what we are saying here, is that we do not think this  
should be trusted, regardless of who the minister is,  
regardless of which party is in power, that this act is  
a useless piece of paper if you have a minister who can  
be pressured to say, in my opinion - let me quickly say  
that I have the highest respect for the present minister  
and I do not think the present minister is one of those  
people that I am talking about.

MR. NEARY: May be weak. May be weak but (inaudible).

MR. STIRLING: But let us say that there are other people who might be put in that position.

MR. STAGG: Name him.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

If I might interrupt the hon. member, if he would permit me. Although it is not quite five o'clock, I will take advantage of your interlude there to point out to hon. members that I have received notice of three matters for debate at five-thirty when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House. Notice given by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) arising out of a question asked the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) and the subject matter is native land rights in Labrador. The second matter for debate, notice given by the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) arising out of a question asked the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the subject matter violence in hockey. The third matter for debate, notice given by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) arising out of a question asked the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment, and the subject matter refusal of retail outlets in this Province to give senior citizens a line of credit as they do with other people.

I thank the hon. member for allowing me to interrupt and ask him to continue.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Can somebody tell me how much time I have left?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has until five minutes past five, I believe, Is that correct?

MR. STIRLING: Five past five.

MR. NEARY:

By leave.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I want to

get back to a point -

MR. NEARY:

By leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

Order, please!

If the matter is to be raised it will have to be raised at five past five when the member's time does expire then we will see if there is leave.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North may continue.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I am glad

that the Minister of Health (Mr. House) brought up another point and that was the question of the spray programme. And he uses the setting up of that royal commission as an example of this government's competence or efficiency, a prime example - of this government - that he is looking for bouquets for the spray programme. Well, just let us have a look at it, Mr. Speaker, because

MR. STIRLING:

I can give the minister an example of why I think that that is a good example of how this government operates. This government at times takes credit for going back to 1972. The Premier takes credit for his involvement in the offshore oil. I was involved with a group, and the former Minister of Lands and Forests was involved with a group, attempting to reopen the Gambo mill. And when we got into it, when we got deeply involved in reopening the question was, "What about the wood supply?" And we finally had to get a meeting of all the forestry officials and the answer came back on the wood supply that 80 per cent to 90 per cent - not 5 per cent, 10 per cent or 15 per cent - 80 per cent to 90 per cent of that wood supply in the Gambo area assigned to this mill, 80 per cent to 90 per cent of it was now dead or dying from the spruce budworm and that is an exact example of the kind of concern that I have, Mr. Speaker, about this environmental -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh! Shameful!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, that is an exact example of what I am talking about. What I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, is that this government has a responsibility for the management of our forests and you cannot wait for eight or ten years after it is destroyed, as they have now done, to say, "Look, I think we will set up a Royal Commission on the spruce budworm". After the problem has eaten the forest they are now going to set up a royal commission and I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, that that is the same attitude they are going to take with the environmental study, that by the time our fisheries have been killed by spills from a pipeline that is trying to come in from Hibernia they will say, "Oh, I think we had better have an environmental impact study - after the fishery is dead." And that is what we will do.

MR. STIRLING:

What we need to do, Mr. Speaker, is to take the action far enough in advance so they can do something with the problem. The time for a Royal Commission on the spruce budworm which should have been a Royal Commission on forestry management as my colleague here has said, a Royal Commission on forestry management should have been done when this government came in in 1972.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. STIRLING: Or at least in 1975.

MR. PECKFORD: How about 1971?

MR. STIRLING: 1971, sure a good time. A good time.

MR. NEARY: They do not want to hear anything about the Moores Administration-

MR. STIRLING: Well, Mr. Speaker, you cannot have it both ways.

MR. NEARY: - only the Smallwood, not the Moores.

Well, they are going to hear more about the Moores Administration before this is all over.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

It is very difficult to hear the hon. member make his comments.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) when he can get up and lie.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I have no objection to the interruptions. I carry on.

MR. SPEAKER: In that case the hon. member may carry on.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, that is why we have to have some consistency. We talk about the future of Newfoundland and we talk about the kind of life we want in Newfoundland, we talk about the concern for getting people involved and yet we then have a government that makes

MR. STIRLING:

the public utterances and then they produce a piece of paper which has all the trappings of being a good bill and then they give the minister, as is now starting to come out, various ministers since 1972 have not shown that they have acted in the public interest.

MR. NEARY: That is right, in good faith.

MR. STIRLING: And I do not care which government was in power, Mr. Speaker, that authority should rest in this Legislature.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. STIRLING: And I am concerned, as I was concerned and spoke up about the Municipalities Act, when you can bring in regional government by having a minister refer to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. And we are in danger in this House of Assembly of seeing all the authority of the House of Assembly taken onto the ministry, taken onto the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and taken away from the people; and it is the people who put us here and we have every right as members of this House to speak up. And, Mr. Speaker, I want to thank you for giving me the extra - oh, I do not. I still have another few minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. STIRLING: No, I still have another three or four minutes. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. STIRLING: No, I still have three minutes. I do not need the leave for three minutes, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of related problems that this government should be doing something about right now. They should be looking into the concerns of the people in this area who have to live on a fixed income and are wondering what is going to happen to them



March 20, 1980

Tape No. 520

IB-4

MR. STIRLING:

in this wild speculation of the offshore.

MR. NEARY:

Right on!

MR. STIRLING:

There is a news report coming over

MR. L. STIRLING:

from London today, just today, in which they are now saying, "Maybe the offshore in the North Sea was the worst thing that ever happened to us because people got false expectations, prices went out of range, inflation has gone sky-high and that they are not going to face up to reality." There are a lot of the realities of this whole question of the development, Mr. Speaker, this whole question of the impact on the fishery, the impact on the environment, all of these questions that should now be dealt with. We asked for a select committee to say, 'How do you propose to deal with all these problems? How are you going to deal with the senior citizens? How are you going to deal with the person who is on welfare, long term assistance? What are you going to do with the tremendous housing shortage we already have in this city?' And in the next four or five years you are going to have a problem all over the Province. But we are not dealing with those problems, we are making public, nice, little statements that motherhood kind of things you cannot disagree with.

MR. NEARY:

Playing political trickery.

MR. L. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, when people can get up and take credit for bringing in a piece of paper, then they should put some teeth in it. They should not allow the minister to say that the minister may say that it is not required, or that if something is in progress it is not required. It is not specific enough and we have not had any of the answers on this side of the House. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear;

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt)

The hon. Minister of Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development.

MR. J. GOUDIE:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to have a few very short words on this environmental assessment bill. I think it is such an excellent piece of legislation that it does not require any more than a very few short words to support the legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. J. GOUDIE:

The purpose of this bill is outlined on page 6, and any bill with that kind of purpose in mind, I think, is to

MR. J. GOUDIE: be lauded, and I will give one specific reason why. The hon. member (Mr. Stirling) who just took his seat, Mr. Speaker, and was talking about royal commissions being implemented after the forest is gone and after the oil is gone, the fishery is gone and everything else, I think should bear in mind there was directly and only because of this legislation, this proposed piece of legislation here, that the public hearings were held into the proposed uranium development to be carried out by BRINEX up in the Kitts-Michelin area, only because of this. If it had not been for this proposed legislation that process would not have been in place and the project, if it had gone ahead, would have gone ahead in the fashion that it would have gone ahead - what? - ten or fifteen years ago. Would that be an accurate statement to make?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. MARSHALL: The first time it ever happened.

MR. J. GOUDIE: First time. And BRINEX agreed to this particular process, they did not have any choice but to agree with this process because of the pending legislation that we are debating here in the honourable House today, Mr. Speaker. Far be it from me to try and defend BRINEX and their proposed operations into the potential uranium developments in Labrador. That is not my job.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. J. GOUDIE: I did not say it. I just said far be it from me to defend them. The hon. member for LaPoile is deliberately misconstruing again, the way he always does, Mr. Speaker, deliberately misconstruing what hon. members of the House say. That is what the member for LaPoile is trying to do.

MR. FLIGHT: The bill is here.

MR. J. GOUDIE: I am talking about the hon. member for LaPoile's comments.

MR. NEARY: Let us hear what you are going to say.

MR. J. GOUDIE: The member for Windsor - Buchans -

MR. FLIGHT: Come on. Let him do it, boy!

MR. J. GOUDIE: Well, that is all right. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is carrying on in his traditional fashion. I will try and get a couple of more comments in before he -

MR. NEARY: Tell the truth.

MR. J. GOUDIE: The truth of what?

MR. NEARY: Everything in this House. In connection with dishonesty and corruption on top of that.

MR. J. GOUDIE: We are discussing a truth here I think, that this is good legislation. So there it is, Carry on. I am not going to try, as I was saying a couple of minutes ago, and defend BRINEX in what they are proposing to do. The hon. member for Torngat (Mr. Warren) went through one of the six or seven environmental assessment reports which were presented by BRINEX to government, to the public in their environmental hearings and so on. But having gone through that he pointed out a number of concerns, I think, in relation to the trucking of sulphuric acid, I believe is what he was referring to in his comments, from the Goose Bay area to Kitts-Michelin if that is to go ahead, and there is no guarantee right now, in relation to this environmental bill, that it will go ahead. I understand that BRINEX has some problems and I think they have stated it in the papers, they have some problems with unstable markets and that kind of thing so it does not necessarily mean that this thing is going to go ahead. The idea of the public hearings, as I understand them, which are referred to on Page 14 of this bill, Section 29 and right on down through, is to give the proponent the opportunity to defend their proposed project to the public. And that is what BRINEX was required to do in this particular process. They went to the communities of Happy Valley - Goose Bay, Northwest River, both sides of the river - Postville, Makkovik, and put forth their case and there was a fairly interesting, I think, discussion and reaction to their proposal. I think though that one comment I have to make, it does not directly relate to this particular bill but to the proposed operation that BRINEX want to go ahead with if they can get everything in place and satisfy this.

MR. GOUDIE:

Environmental Bill process is that if it does go ahead my district stands to benefit more, I suppose, in terms of direct impact of that operation and spinoff than any other community in Labrador -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) a favour.

MR. GOUDIE: No, I am not saying that, not saying that in the least.

MR. THOMS: Do not be like a monkey, you are either for or against it.

MR. GOUDIE: I am for the proposed operation of Brinex if they meet all the requirements laid down by law. That is all I am saying. I have stated that publicly before and all I am pointing out now -

MR. NEARY: What are the requirements?

MR. GOUDIE: The requirements of what?

MR. NEARY: Did you not say that there are requirements?

MR. GOUDIE: Well, here, has the hon. member read the bill?

MR. NEARY: No (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The Powell Royal Commission.

MR. GOUDIE: Pardon me?

MR. NEARY: The Powell Royal Commission is the one that is looking into the uranium plant.

MR. GOUDIE: That commission is a direct result of this particular piece of legislation.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not. It has nothing to do with it, absolutely nothing to do with it.

MR. GOUDIE: If it had not been for this proposed legislation, Mr. Speaker, then the public hearings would not

MR. GOUDIE:

have gone ahead.

MR. NEARY:

There is no way you can link the two.

It has nothing to do with it, no relationship at all.

MR. GOUDIE:

Well, perhaps other speakers might

be able to convince the hon. member more than I can.

MR. NEARY:

This is a royal commission of enquiry.

MR. MORGAN:

Be quiet! Let the man speak.

MR. GOUDIE:

Into what?

MR. NEARY:

To look into the environmental problems

in connection with the development of uranium.

MR. GOUDIE:

I am talking about the public

hearings, not the Royal Commission. That is what I am

talking about. Now I do not know what I was going to say

in the first place after that exchange. But in any event,

my district stands to benefit is what I was saying.

MR. WARREN:

Have to sacrifice (inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE:

There goes the hon. member

deliberately misconstruing my words again, completely,

deliberately misconstruing. That is what he is trying

to do. He is following the lead of the hon. member for

LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY:

Well, make yourself clear.

MR. GOUDIE:

If the hon. member will stay silent

for just a moment, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE:

- I am going to try to make a point.

That is all I am trying to do, make a point.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. GOUDIE:

If that uranium development goes ahead,

'if' and it is questionable right now.

MR. STIRLING:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order. The hon. member

for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: I think that the last speaker just made a remark which was unparliamentary about my colleague from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) and I ask him to withdraw it.

MR. GOUDIE: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To the point of order, the hon. minister.

MR. GOUDIE: I think that the hon. member is referring to the words 'deliberately misconstruing'. When I spoke I said, 'deliberately misconstruing my words' not 'deliberately misleading the House of Assembly'.

MR. STIRLING: To the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Still to the point of order?

MR. STIRLING: Still to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: That is right. Regardless of what the motive, you cannot make that kind of comment. I would suggest that reference will show that that is not an acceptable comment.

MR. MARSHALL: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that is the parliamentary rules and forms according to Stirling or whether it goes to Beausheerne but, Mr. Speaker, the word in Beausheerne if the hon. gentleman would like to - I know this will send him to the books for the next couple of hours - but the word 'mislead' is out of order, 'deliberately misleading', 'deliberately misled'. But to say somebody is 'deliberately misconstruing' is not in there. It is a different thing altogether. To mislead is to have an intention to do something, it is to have a premeditation. Somebody can misconstrue something and misconstrue something accidentally. So, you know, we go by Beausheerne, as I say, not by the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please! Order, please!  
Order, please! Order, please! I would ask the hon. gentleman  
to come to order when I call order.

To the point of order, there is no  
point of order and I would ask the hon. minister to continue.

MR. GOUDIE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the minister.

MR. GOUDIE: Just a couple of remarks, Mr.  
Speaker. I do not think I will continue any further in  
this particular debate. There is a delegation within the  
confines of the House of Assembly now who want to discuss  
some very important matters as they relate to Labrador,  
to the fishery, and I think my time would be better spent  
talking with them and in conjunction with my colleague,  
the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). So I will  
just wind up now by saying that I completely support this  
bill, that I think it is a good bill, that I think the  
intent of the bill is one of the more progressive pieces  
of legislation that you will see in this hon. House this  
year and I think that the minister and the government should  
be commented for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port au Port.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I would say that  
this bill is a progressive piece of legislation and one that  
should have been brought before this House, I suppose, a long  
time ago when you look at some of the problems which exist  
around the Province because of the lack of a piece of legislation  
like this. Now, Mr. Speaker, I use this opportunity to  
speak on this bill to bring out a couple of concerns which  
I feel are very important



MR. J. HODDER: and one is that I do hope that the bill will rectify and that the hon. gentlemen on the other side will look into. Mr. Speaker, the first point I would like to make is about the caribou in Western Newfoundland and I would like to talk about two particular herds. One is the caribou herd which migrates along the South coast of this Province and which has now been, I suppose, bisected by the Burgeo Road. Now, I do not know if any environmental study was done before the Burgeo Road went there and I am sure that the Burgeo Road is a road which is a godsend to the people of Burgeo and has brought them into the mainstream of Newfoundland life. But I suppose for every progressive thing that happens we have an opposite, and sometimes things happen that are not so progressive. The problem is that that road does bisect the South coast and it is on the migratory route of that caribou herd. And as soon as the road was opened last year, reports, particularly in Western Newfoundland, had it that the caribou were being slaughtered along that road. There is no difficulty whatsoever to drive down the road and see caribou. As a matter of fact, the C.B.C crew went down there after there was a little bit of an outcry on the West coast last year and they actually filmed, and it is very difficult to film caribou, but they filmed caribou crossing the Burgeo Road. Now, Mr. Speaker, the reason I bring this up is because I believe that that particular road must be posted with signs and very, very carefully protected by wardens in this Province and by the Forestry Department. Because, you know, it has to be singled out, the people of the area, I believe they must be educated to the fact that the caribou herds are moving across that road and I think it must be-

MR. G. FLIGHT:

The Upper Salmon.

MR. J. HODDER:

- by education, whether it be done in the schools or through a public form or through the media. But, Mr. Speaker, you know, that is one of the ways in which we lose one of our natural resources. I would say, as well that the forestry officials who protect that road at the present time that the job is being done inadequately, I am not blaming this administration because the thing just opened up

MR. J. HODDER:

last year but the problem is there and with proper education and with the proper media approach and with proper guardians on that road and perhaps signs posted warning people that this is an area where caribou move back and forth, that we perhaps would eliminate some of the slaughter that has already taken place and there is no need to make any bones about it at all, there is a slaughter taking place along that road. The other thing I wanted to talk about was herd of caribou in my own district. And that was a herd that was put there some years ago, there were a hundred caribou put there. The last report I had, and I have not had one recently, but there are only thirty-four caribou left. The official excuse was that lynx were harming the herd. However, I do know that a lot of poaching has gone on in that particular area and that people gain access to the area in the winter-time because of the snowmobiles and the herd is fast declining. And, you know we do have patrols there, you see a helicopter come in there about once a month and sort of circle around the peninsula and go on again, but basically there is no car. Now I will tell you there is an interesting story concerned here and I did write the former Minister of Tourism a couple of years ago, or one of the former Minister's of Tourism, and asked him if it would be possible - the present Minister of Fisheries, I believe - and asked him would it be possible to have local residents, because local residents in the area want to protect that herd and have volunteered their services. However, for some reason or other the thing did not come about and the minister did not move on it. But I feel that, you know, that that is one way in particular where you have an isolated herd of caribou. There was a herd at the same time put on Brunette Island, I believe it was, which increased and is now, I believe that the figures are very good for that particular herd but this one is in danger of extinction. The vast majority of people who live in the area want to keep the herd and we always have a few, the fringe of society, who are willing to go out and slaughter and I think that it has to have proper protection.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, this legislation is welcome by me as well. I noticed when the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), who is not in his seat, spoke the other day he talked about a particular type of pollution which came from Sea Mining, which is in my district and which is now a defunct industry. But where he was driving when he mentioned that - while he was driving along - he was driving through an area known as Aguathuna. That is an area where DOSCO came in, mined the whole area, one of the most beautiful areas of the Port au Port Peninsula, with great tourism potential and everything else, this particular company came in when there was no legislation of this type and they tore the place apart. And anybody who has gone through that particular area in Aguathuna has seen what a great gaping hole there is in the landscape, with no attempt whatsoever made to try to beautify the area or to put it back into any semblance of order at all. It is a great shame and I do not think this sort of thing should be allowed to happen.

My final point, Mr.

Speaker, is that for years now we have been allowing the Department of Transportation and Communications and the construction companies to dig great gravel pits all over the Province. These gravel pits, and one I have had a particular problem with myself, which has never been resolved, it was ongoing for the first two or three years that I represented the district, was one that had been put there by a construction company when the roads were being rebuilt. The construction company left it just as it was with a great pool of water in the back where one of the children of one of my constituents nearly drowned. I went to the Department of Transportation and Communications, and to a number of departments, to ask if the company that

MR. HODDER: caused this problem, if they would be responsible for going back and filling in that particular area and the answer I got back was that the contract was over, the company was gone and that there was no way that they could the company liable for leaving that particular gravel pit as it was.

Now, I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is something that should never be allowed to happen again and that any company that comes in to do any type of road work in this Province should be liable for anything that they leave behind them. That is all I wanted to say, Mr. Speaker. But I do feel that the bill is a good one and I do hope that it will solve many of the problems that we have seen take place in the past.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say a few words.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I just want to saw a few words on this act, Mr. Speaker. It is too bad you cannot have two pieces of legislation to almost debate at the same time because bills 13 and 12, the other one, "An Act To Provide For Natural Areas In The Province To Be Set Aside For The Benefit, Education And Enjoyment Of Present And Future Generations In The Province" should really go with this one.

As most hon. members of this House are aware, I have, for some time over the last fifteen or eighteen months, been saying publicly on many, many occasions the desirability of having legislation in effect governing the environment of this Province, governing the assessment and scrutiny of projects.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, this act is a fairly - not only does it involve environmental assessment, but something that I think a lot of members perhaps have missed, it covers a broad, broad area of activities to be looked at. It is one thing to look at an oil refinery proposal and have it under environmental assessment, it is one think to look at a manufacturing plant of some sort, industrial in its nature, and have an environmental assessment done. It is another thing, and I think the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) just put his finger on it, to have it done for other projects which hitherto for, in a lot of people's perception years ago, would never in the wildest dreams come under environmental assessment, including roads, including other kinds of activities which are not classified clearly as industrial activity and which, up to a few years ago, were not considered to have any great impact upon the environment. But as we all see now, and in driving down over the Burgeo Road, and knowing the movement of any caribou herd, there is no question that on the one hand the Burgeo Road is a godsend to the people of Burgeo and Ramea and that area, but by the same token there is that negative part of it dealing with the caribou herds. And if I may just add to that, if you go on straight through with that road so you have that Southwest Brook Road connection, and the so-called second Trans-Canada that has been talked about off and on, you are going to almost decimate, perhaps, that particular herd. So that in future, all developments almost of any type, are going to be under close scrutiny by the Department of the Environment - all developments.

And in the preparation fo this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I do not mind saying that there are quite a few people in the various

March 20, 1980, Tape 524, Page 4 -- apb

PREMIER PECKFORD: departments of government  
who have their reservations about this legislation  
because it is going to, perhaps, inhibit

PREMIER PECKFORD:

developments that government, itself, wants to undertake like those, like other developments that we are going to be getting involved in over the next few years, that a lot of people, not only the private sector, but everybody. Because the Newfoundland and Labrador development in its broadest sense will never be the same again because of this piece of legislation. That is number one point. Because it is very broad in its scope.

MR. L. STIRLING:

Just to be -

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have five minutes and that is why

I am -

MR. L. STIRLING:

- specific on that, in that

particular case is it not simply a question then for the minister to decide that any of those things can be excluded?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am coming to that.

MR. L. STIRLING:

Okay.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is number one -

very wide sweeping. Number two is that one can criticize, as some members of the Opposition have done, the powers that are vested in the minister. And my answer to that - and we agonized over this for a long period of time before we went with it this way - as we want to try this out, because it does put, and rightly so, a lot of onus upon the government to act, and I think that is good. Now if any Minister of Environment or Cabinet is going to be foolish enough to not respond in a pretty intelligent way and give good reasons why a certain environmental assessment does not go ahead, they are going to pay the price for it one way or another. And seeing this is new and is a fairly new piece of legislation on the books, covering so many areas, we opted for this kind of ministerial discretion, and let us see how it goes, let us see how it works. And there might be then an argument, as theoretically there is right now as it relates to certain particular projects which must be mandatory for environmental assessment, and another group for which there might be discretionary power - okay? - but in the first instance, because it is new, the onus is on us now, and I accept that onus and I accept that responsibility, and I am sure the Minister of the

PREMIER PECKFORD: Environment (Mrs. H. Newhook) does, that we have to show and demonstrate when projects are going to be excluded or included - and just as much included for an environmental assessment procedure. For example, there was no question in our minds and that is why we went ahead with the BRINEX/Kitts-Michelin hearings. that even before - because we never got a chance to do this act last Fall - that we would go ahead with the public hearings as if this act were in effect. Because if you are not going to have uranium development included under such an act, what is the point of doing it? You are just playing games and you are not really making any changes.

So number one, it is very broad in its scope right now, very, very broad, and what it does is it allows the lobby groups in the Province, especially on the wildlife side and the normal ecological environmental - the purists - it allows the purists an opportunity that they never had before to garner up support publicly and to garner up legitimate arguments to put before the people of Newfoundland and before the Minister of the Environment and government as to why almost anything has to have a full-scale environmental assessment before it can proceed any further. And that is why I say it is extremely broad, because there is no question that the purists in the environmental field and the wildlife field are now far better armed than they ever were before. Because just about all of us who are trying to balance off going ahead will agree with uranium and will agree with this thing and, you know, there will be almost total unanimity on a whole bunch of projects. But there is going to be another group where there are going to be battles fought, a lot of vicious battles fought over the next few years as it relates to this act.

I think it is a good piece of legislation and I am very supportive of it, obviously, because I was personally involved in articulating that kind of legislation coming forward some time ago. But I just point out that one, it is broad - very, very broad; two, let us try it on now for size and see how it works. The government is under the gun, the Minister of the Environment is under the gun, but let nobody be mistaken that if anything we have done here today besides being progressive and doing something worthwhile, which is long overdue as most members say,



PREMIER PECKFORD:

I just caution hon. members that if anybody has benefited besides all society generally, it is the purists who will be able to make some pretty good cases for not only those things that we all would agree on should go towards an environmental assessment, but long pieces of road, small pieces of road, small projects, sawmills of certain sizes - sawmill operations - a whole host of pulpwood contractors and the way they operate the forest if a new one is starting up - there are a whole host of things that can be brought under the

PREMIER PECKFORD: the ambit of this, for which legitimate, in their point of view, reasons can be given for an environmental assessment. It is broad, it is good legislation and we are proud to introduce it but at the same time I just say to hon. members, 'Let us experiment to see whether we can come up with two or three categories where mandatory hearings must be held and where others are still optional. That is what we are going to have to work out for the next year or so as we see this piece of legislation going into effect. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

It being 5:30 a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. A matter for debate raised by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren). The subject matter is native land rights in Labrador.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, on March 18th. I asked a question to the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) concerning future staking in Labrador and whether the land claims issue will be considered. The answer that he gave the hon. House, I myself am not quite pleased with it. He did say that the government is developing its policy with respect to native claims, but a decision was made some time ago that development in the Province could not cease while this problem had not been dealt with. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering how much longer are the Labrador Inuit Association, the Montagnais Naskaupi Inuit Association going to have to submit land claim papers to the government, how much longer is the government going to just ignore the requests, ignore this basic request

MR. G. WARREN: of sitting down with those people and discussing the land claims issue and come out once and for all and say, 'Look, there is no issue or there is an issue'? I think it is very simple to discuss an issue of land claims and with that you are satisfying the people. You know, the majority of the people in Labrador are not against development. I would like to really stress this to the minister, that the people are not against development, but it is the kind of development and it is the way that development is taking place.

Mr. Speaker, BRINEX said in their last impact assessment study that the matter of land claims must be resolved by the people and their elected representatives, that is, the members of the House of Assembly and, in particular, the four members from Labrador. But if the government, if the Cabinet is not going to consider any land claims issue how in the heck can the members representing those districts cope with the land claims issue?

Secondly, Mr. Speaker, in today's Daily News, the top heading, 'Labrador Party Stirring Again'. Mr. Speaker, the person who started this up, the Rev. Francis Pye, and I would like to say now that I am not lying in bed with Francis Pye -

AN HON. MEMBER: Frank Pye.

MR. G. WARREN: Frank Pye, whoever the case may be. I think he may be gone off midstream somewhere but he did say here, and I am trying not to quote from the paper, that fast decisions are being continually being made without any prior consultation to the people and they feel they are being threatened. And then he says - I am

MR. G. WARREN: going to quote from the paper for now, Mr. Speaker - he said, 'At a recent Labrador conference' - that was last week down in Northwest River - 'government seemed to be concerned only with the control aspect of the development and the residents concerned about land claims were almost ignored'. Mr. Speaker, I believe it is high time that our government and I as a part of the members of the House of Assembly should get together and address this very essential, very delicate and very important issue that is on the minds of the people in Labrador and that is the issue of land claims.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I really find it difficult to debate this particular topic because I do not understand the reason why the hon. member was dissatisfied with my earlier answer. And I have to agree with the position that he has placed that the question of land claims should be settled as quickly as possible.

MR. BARRY: We did indicate, I have indicated and it has been indicated earlier by government that we are aware of the need for dealing with the issue. It is a very complex matter, however, Mr. Speaker. I am sure all hon. members realize. I would be happy to see a debate in this hon. House on the native land claims issue. I think it would be a more useful debate once we have the background of some tentative policy formulated and a submission to put to the House and, hopefully, this will be before too much longer. I had the opportunity personally, Mr. Speaker, of getting involved in some depth in the native lands claims as a legal advisor to the Naskaupi-Montagnais. I went into the basis of their claim. I have read the very fine, I believe, report prepared for the Innu submission on land claims called Our Footsteps Are Everywhere, a very appropriate title, a very well researched document. I personally am quite sympathetic to the need of government recognizing the traditional rights which our native peoples have had in this Province. They have had the rights of fishing, trapping, hunting, the use of timber and so forth, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that this government, in the same enlightened fashion that it has dealt with other issues of great importance, I believe quite successfully, Mr. Speaker, I believe that there will be a sympathetic approach to the land claims question. But, Mr. Speaker, it would be very dangerous and it would not be a responsible position for this government to take to make a less than thoroughly researched response on the land claims issue. Since this new administration has formed the government, we have had that as a priority. A lot of work has been done and, Mr. Speaker, I am sure that as fast as possible we will be bringing in a submission on the native land claims question. I have to sympathize with my hon. friend opposite and his interest in the issue. I know that he, I suppose, represents, along with my colleague, the Minister responsible for Northern affairs (Mr. Goudie), the bulk if not - what? - it must be 90 per cent, virtually all of the indigenous native people. The Micmac people on the Island put forth that they, in fact, also

MR. BARRY: were indigenous to the Island before the coming of the white man. That is an issue that still has to be, in my opinion, more fully researched, but they have submitted evidence that indicated that they were here before my grandparents. They have not satisfied me yet, but I am willing to keep an open mind on it. I can understand how the hon. member opposite and my colleague, the Minister of Northern Affairs (Mr. Goudie) will be interested in seeing this issue resolved, and I know that my colleague has been fighting to have government move promptly on this and will continue to do so.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

The second matter for debate raised by the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) is hockey violence or violence in hockey. The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I do not know if I should speak on this with my friend from Humber West (Mr. Baird) to my right and my colleague from St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) at my back. I am not so sure I should do it.

MR. NEARY: I would rather have the member for St. Mary's-The Capes behind me.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why - I am glad to see the minister back in the House - one of the reasons why I wanted this on was because I think there was a misunderstanding as to what I was getting to yesterday during Question Period. I brought up the incident in Gander last Saturday night, which must have proved very embarrassing to the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook), I brought that up as an incident,

MR. THOMS: and it is fine for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) to have that particular incident investigated and to come up with the answer he gave this afternoon, that it did not warrant prosecution for assault. That may very well be, but my questioning and I would like to make it clear now, was that there is evidence in this Province today that this sort of thing is creeping into our national sport in this Province throughout the minor league systems. One of the reasons and one of the causes is what they read and they see in the stadium in St. John's, Gander, Corner Brook. One of the reasons is children are very impressionable. Now, there are other reasons maybe just as important. Coaches can be a reason and parents can be a reason. Mr. Speaker, government does have a responsibility here. This government pays over to both the minor hockey system and the senior hockey system in this Province thousands of dollars every year, thousands of dollars every year. Now, what I am asking for is a preventive measure. I do not want to see hockey in this Province develop to the violent stage that it did in Ontario. I just do not want it. Mr. Speaker, we know what happened there. Now, what I am asking for and what I would like to see in this Province is an inquiry and I think it would be worth the dollars. I think it would be worth the money. I would like for - I mean, I can stand up in the House of Assembly and I can express publicly my concerns about hockey, but there are parents all across this Province who are concerned, very concerned with this matter, and I think government has a responsibility and I would like to see an inquiry now to prevent a situation that has occurred in other provinces. I think it would be well worth the money for us to do that. Mr. Speaker, it does happen in minor hockey. I can give you example after example. I had a child who played in Memorial Stadium this year. I got the story from the coach, but he came home with a red welt right down across his back where another eleven or twelve year-old child - not an adult like my friend from St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock), but an eleven or twelve year-old child -

MR. NEARY: It was not my young fella.

MR. THOMAS: - okay? - who came down across his back with a hockey stick - okay? Now, what happens? I saw another case, I saw another case in a stadium right here in St. John's where a ten year-old - he may have been a nine year-old but he was in the nine-ten year-old category - and I saw this with my own eyes where exactly the same thing happened. A child of ten years or nine - okay? - without provocation hit another child across the head. Now, fortunately, they were wearing helmets but, Mr. Speaker, do you know what that child got in the way of a penalty? He got five minutes in the penalty box. He got five minutes in the penalty box, and that was it and it was over. Now, I do not blame the child. I do not blame the child and I do not blame the children playing hockey in this Province, but there is a definite need for improved coaching. There is a need for an improved attitude on behalf of the parents. I will



MR. THOMS:

be at a hockey game one o'clock on Sunday afternoon in this town and it would not surprise me to see violence in that stadium one little bit.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. THOMS: What I would like, if I may just say, what I would like to see is an enquiry and see if we cannot improve the situation, Mr. Speaker, and I would like the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) to give some consideration to this. It would be worth the money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I think the hon. gentleman opposite is probably on a quite safe wicket in saying that he is against violence and indeed I do not think he would have too much objection from anybody with respect to that. An enquiry, you know, it may well be. I do not think the hon. gentleman now is talking about a Royal Commission although -

MR. THOMS: No.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: No-because the hon. gentleman wants to keep that one for the administration of justice. But this would be some kind of a different enquiry. I would not argue against that. I am inclined to think as the situation now is, you know, the enquiry might-well, to say the Department of Justice, that sort of presumes that it is in an area of law enforcement and assault. And obviously if that were to be the situation then certainly there would be a responsibility there. I am inclined to think that to a very large extent it is a question of values which are either inculcated in teams where the competitive spirit becomes an end in itself and perhaps the winning at all costs becomes the principle and certainly it would, I think, be most

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

improper if educators and coaches and people in the recreation and athletic community in general were in any way to encourage that attitude. Violence encouraged or permitted would be a very dangerous course of action.

AN HON. MEMBER: Or condoned.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Or condoned. And certainly it would, I think, go against the principles for which these organized sports, and we are thinking essentially here of non-professionals, of people in minor leagues and bantam leagues and people from ten up to their teens and no doubt older as well. There is also the danger, obviously, that if violence is permitted or condoned in one activity it can spread over into other kinds of walks of life if it is viewed especially by young people as permissive, permitted, permissible, in certain activities.

So I would certainly say that it is incumbent upon, if you wish, the recreation athletic community, schools, coaches, all those involved to be very aware of that. If there is not such awareness or if even with that awareness violence of a nature which becomes assault and not merely a bit of rowdiness or sportsmanship but becomes assault, it is only really as the hon. gentleman is aware in that specific area that the Department of Justice as such can act. And I suppose all I can really do - I do not really think there is any disagreement between the hon. gentleman and myself - is, number one, to point out the dangers of permitting or condoning not alone encouraging violence in school and other amateur sport, the dangers of it, the responsibility on schools, coaches and athletic community and, I suppose, society in general, the responsibility on them to discourage violence in hockey and other contact sports and to say that if these responsibilities are not recognized and adhered to and if what amounts to assault is committed in the name of sport, then naturally the logical and proper course of action would be prosecution for assault. One would

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

hope it would not come to that but if it did then obviously that would have to be the course of action.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

The final matter for debate raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is the refusal of retail outlets in this Province to give senior citizens a line of credit as they do with other people.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that the answer given to my question during the Oral Question Period today by the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) was awfully disappointing indeed, to say the least, because one of the cases, one of the complaints that I have is

MR. S. NEARY: from the hon. minister's own district of Gander where a gentleman recently wanted to purchase a television. A senior citizen from Fogo district who wanted to purchase a television went to an appliance dealer in Gander and the television, I believe, was \$590 and the senior citizen said, "Well, that is fine. I will give you \$300 down and I will pay the balance in monthly instalments." And the appliance dealer said, "Okay, that is fine" and started to make out the contract and in the process of making out the contract when they came to the question, ' your employer' the senior citizen said, "Well, I am not employed, I am a senior citizen." And the appliance dealer immediately said, "Well, I am sorry but we cannot give you credit, go down to the finance company and get it." Now that has happened in two appliance outlets in Gander that I know of, and I am amazed that the minister is not aware of this situation. I do not know how widespread it is in Newfoundland, but I can tell you that the banks discriminate against senior citizens. The banks will not give - a lot of the banks, I do not know if all of them have this policy - senior citizens loans. In some cases that I know the sons and daughters of senior citizens have been forced to go to the bank and borrow money for their father or their mother to go buy a car. Now it can be argued that the senior citizen's life span is not going to be as great as that of a younger person. Well, Mr. Speaker, they can insure the loan. There is no excuse for it. It is outright discrimination against senior citizens, people who have contributed so much to the welfare of this Province, and I believe the minister owes it to our senior citizens to investigate this matter and find out what can be done about it. I do not know if the retail outlets and the banks can be forced to treat senior citizens the same as other citizens of this Province but it is certainly worthwhile looking into. These people have made their contribution to society and they are not trying to scrounge. In a good many cases they want to keep a few dollars in reserve, they could very easily probably in the case of the man from Fogo district he did end up paying

MR. S. NEARY: the \$590 in cash. He could have afforded to pay it in the first place but he wanted to keep a few dollars in reserve, but he was forced through circumstances to pay the full amount and he was not allowed to pay the same as everyone else in monthly instalments. That is not good enough, Sir, that is no way to treat our senior citizens, and in my opinion, it is discrimination. And I am amazed that the minister in the Department of Consumer Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) is not aware of it, that they have not had complaints. Mr. Speaker, this is not the only example where the department seems to be unaware of what is going on in the field of consumer affairs in this Province, and I think it is time that the department smartened up a bit, and so, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to raise this today because it is a subject that is very dear to my heart, and I am sure that other members of this House have had similar complaints. As I say it is discrimination against our senior citizens, against people who have worked so hard and made their contribution to our Newfoundland society and I believe that in their twilight years or in their retirement years they deserve better treatment than that, Mr. Speaker, and I do hope that as a result of my raising this today that the minister will not wait I already gave the minister the complaint in Gander, I gave the minister the name of the firm, there is another firm that I could give the minister the name of. I did not give her the name of the senior citizen but I have authorization from the senior citizen to give his name to the minister if she wants it. But I do not believe the minister should sit back and wait, the minister should take the initiative in this case and go out and protect our senior citizens and see that they get the same treatment, They are not asking for any more or any less, they are asking for equal treatment with other citizens of this Province, and I believe the minister should take the initiative and see that they are properly protected and if we do not have a law in this Province well then let us make a law that will give the senior citizens the protection they deserve.

March 20, 1980

Tape 530

MB - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. Minister of Consumer

Affairs and Environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

Mr. Speaker, since the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) raised his question this morning I checked with my Director of Consumer Affairs and she has confirmed that we have not received one single complaint with regard to senior citizens not being able to obtain credit. I am very sorry and I am very concerned, the same as the hon. member, that our senior citizens have to suffer the embarrassment of being subjected to treatment of this kind but there is no legislation under my department which stipulates that a retailer or a dealer must grant

MRS. NEWHOOK: a customer, or he must  
sell to a customer goods on credit terms.

I do know that certain  
firms have various policies of granting credit and I  
would think that they would wish to be assured that  
when they do give out goods on credit that the  
consumer has the ability to make the installments.

There is another point  
too, that senior citizens sometimes become sick or  
they are unable to, possibly, pay their installments.

MR. NEARY: (inaudible) speak up  
a bit.

MRS. NEWHOOK: I am sorry. In one way  
it might be a little bit of an injustice to that  
senior citizen if he or she were to buy something on  
credit and not be able to pay and the goods would have  
to be forfeited or taken back and that senior citizen  
then would have lost what he had already paid toward it.

I know that perhaps we  
can take this complaint or other complaints like it and  
we can check with the Human Rights legislation and we  
will be very, very happy to do this if the hon. member  
will give me the names. We have to have the details and  
the time it occurred and so on.

MR. NEARY: I gave you the name  
of the company and that.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Very good. Yes, I know the  
name of the company. Now, if that particular company is  
advertising certain credit terms, and, of course, a  
senior citizen goes in and he is discriminated against  
and he cannot receive those terms, well certainly, then,  
that would be a case of false advertising and in that  
case it could come under our Trade Practices Act.

March 20, 1980, Tape 531, Page 2 -- apb

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

On motion, the House

at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday,  
March 21, 1980, at 10:00 a.m.