

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, MAY 7, 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. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I have three statements to make today. I can make them all at once or one at a time, it is up to the hon. members opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Read them all at once.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, for some time the Workers' Compensation Board has been experiencing an ongoing and frustrating problem with admission to hospital for claimants with back ailments, in particular those requiring neurosurgical attention.

The Health Sciences Complex is the only hospital in the Province with the capabilities of handling people requiring medical attention in the neurosurgery field. The Complex, however, has been unable to assign a sufficient number of beds to neurosurgery to take care of the number of people awaiting admission.

I am pleased to announce that in an effort to resolve this problem, Government has approved a joint proposal by the General Hospital Corporation and the Workers' Compensation Board, whereby an eight-bed unit will be assigned for the exclusive use of the Workers' Compensation Board.

The Board has 50 to 60 people continuously on the waiting list for admission to the Health Sciences Complex. In some cases the claimants are waiting for as long as six to eight months and longer. While the claimants are waiting to be admitted, the Board continues to pay full compensation benefits.

MR. DINN: A recent study of the cost factor involved indicates that benefits paid during admission waiting time are in excess of half a million dollars a year.

Approximately one year ago a pilot project was carried out whereby the Health Sciences Complex assigned six beds for the exclusive use of the Board. The waiting list was reduced to approximately twenty, which resulted in substantial savings. However, the arrangement was only temporary due to an overall shortage of beds in the Complex which could be assigned for that purpose.

With a view to resolving the problem on a long-term basis the Workers' Compensation Board approached the Health Sciences administration with a proposal that the Board would cover the capital cost of completing a 22 bed wing in the unfinished part of the hospital, in return for which the hospital would assign a minimum of eight beds for a twenty year period for the Board's exclusive use. The capital cost of completion of the 22 bed wing is approximately half a million dollars.

There were two reasons for approaching the Health Sciences for an arrangement:

1. As stated earlier, the Complex is the only hospital in the Province with capabilities of handling neurosurgery cases.
2. The Complex is considered a provincial as opposed to regional facility.

MR. J. DINN:

The Board's Medical Department

estimates that with the eight beds available on a permanent basis the number of claimants waiting admission will be reduced to approximately ten, resulting in a saving to the Board of at least \$250,000 a year. The Board will therefore recover the initial capital cost outlay over a two-year period. In subsequent years a direct saving of a similar amount will be realized.

In addition to the dollar cost of having claimants waiting for admission, there is the additional problem of rehabilitating claimants to return to the work force after long waiting periods for medical attention. The social upheavals both to individual claimants and their families resulting from long waiting periods must be a prime consideration.

It is anticipated that this new arrangement will be the solution to a very serious problem.

I will go on to the other two statements if the hon. members wish.

MR. SPEAKER:

Agreed.

MR. J. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. Gordon Woodford as Commissioner of the Workers' Compensation Board following the retirement of Mr. Richard Fagan on January 31, 1980.

Mr. Woodford was previously employed by CNR District Stores for ten years. He also spent four years as Office Supervisor with Newfoundland Brokerage and nine years with Gerald S. Doyle as an independent sales representative.

Mr. Woodford also acted as the co-ordinating Chairman of track and field events for the 1977 Canada Summer Games and is the immediate past President of the Newfoundland and Labrador Track and Field Association. He has also had a life long association with the Boy Scout Organization in Newfoundland.

Mr. Woodford is married to the former Miss Mary Coleman and is the father of ten children.

MR. J. DINN:

As minister responsible for the Workers' Compensation Board I fully support Mr. Woodford's appointment to this very responsible position and I feel confident that his background and experience should allow him to make an important contribution to the Board.

Mr. Speaker, I am also pleased to inform the House that Cabinet, after a great deal of analysis and deliberation, has now made a policy decision with respect to Workers' Compensation coverage for inshore fishermen.

Government has decided to introduce legislation during this session of the House to provide compensation coverage for inshore fishermen, on essentially the same basis as the system which has been used in British Columbia for the past five years. That is, there will be universal coverage and the assessment set by the Compensation Board will be paid by the purchasers of the fish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. J. DINN:

The Workers' Compensation Act was

MR. J. DINN:

amended in 1973 to provide compensation coverage for inshore fishermen on the same basis as that applied to other industries, i.e., where three or more people are employed.

It was envisioned at that time that the owner or master of the boat would be considered the employer under the Act and that the said owner or master would remit the required assessments to the Board as employers do in any other industry covered by compensation. Government was advised by the Board at that time that the system was workable.

The first problem encountered was that of getting a list or catalogue of boats engaged in the inshore fishing industry. Since neither the Provincial Fisheries Department, the Federal Fisheries Service or the Union had any concept of how many boats were fishing, or where, it was impossible to contact all the "employers" for the purpose of applying the Act as amended. Therefore, while the fishermen were covered under law, the Board had no means of collecting the assessments.

During the ensuing years, numerous meetings were held involving the fish companies, the unions, the Worker's Compensation Board and the Departments of Labour and Manpower and Justice. It appeared that it would be administratively impossible to apply the Act as per the 1973 amendment. Some of the options considered were:

1. to repeal the 1973 amendment and revert to the original where boats with only 10 or more crew would be eligible for coverage.
2. to deem the fish buyers to be the employer for the purpose of the Act and therefore be liable for the assessments as in other industries.
3. to have the purchaser deduct the assessment from the fisherman's earnings and remit to the Board on behalf of the fisherman.

During the Fall of 1979 the present Chairman of the Board did extensive research on the application of compensation coverage to inshore fishermen. This included a detailed analysis of the British Columbia system which had been implemented in that Province in 1975.

MR. J. DINN: A number of possible options were presented to government for consideration; one of which government has accepted as being the most appropriate, keeping in mind the basic concept of Workers' compensation and the ease of administration. It would not be possible at this time to go into all the details associated with this matter. However, because of the unique nature of the industry as compared to other industries such as manufacturing and construction, the administrative procedures will be somewhat different.

Some general points are:

(1) the buyers will be considered employers only for the purpose of paying assessments on the amount of fish purchased. The buyers will not be responsible for safety matters aboard the boat except in such cases where the boat is owned by or under charter to the buyer. (2) the captain or owner of the boat will be responsible for safety procedures and will also be responsible for reporting all accidents happening aboard the boat. (3) the buyer will remit the required assessment to the Board on a quarterly or half-yearly basis, based on the amount of fish purchased during the period. (4) coverage will be universal (single fishermen or crew) and compulsory for all fishermen holding a valid fishing license.

If the House agrees to the amendments presented, it is possible that the new system for fishermen could be implemented in late Fall or the beginning of 1981. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Terra

Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, taking the statements in the order in which the minister gave them - I also want to thank the minister for giving me the copies of the statements - the first one, Mr. Speaker, relating to the setting up, or the arrangement for admission of people with back ailments to the Health Sciences Complex in terms of providing beds, now certainly we agree with that and anything that can be done to provide more beds so that these people with these various ailments are not waiting for an indefinite period of time before they can get the proper treatment.

But, I am informed that there is also another problem associated with this and probably the major problem is that the people with these various back ailments have a problem in getting the myelogram, I think it is, or the testing, the examination to determine what exactly is the nature of their problem and what kind of treatment will be necessary for that particular ailment. And this particular solution does not seem to get at the essence of this problem because the

MR. LUSH: situation is, of course, that the Workers' Compensation Board have all of those doctors with the expertise to treat these particular problems but they are also in private practice, so there seems to be some problem for the people to get these myelograms, these tests, to determine just what the problem is and just what treatment is necessary. So it seems as though this particular arrangement has not solved that problem inasmuch as that there seems to be some problem for the persons concerned to get an appointment with the doctor in the first case. And my understanding is that there again is a waiting period for this as much as six to eight months, for people to get in to get this particular examination, this myelogram. So if the minister can direct his attention to that so that these people can get in and get these tests. Again I say it is a matter of the doctors being very, very busy and it is a matter of priorities, whether the doctors give priority to the people recommended by the Workers' Compensation or whether it is their own private patients or whether they just take them in a list anyway, in regards of how far down a person is, he gets called when the doctor gets to his particular name.

So there seems to be a real problem and it looks like this particular arrangement is not going to solve that. So I would like for the minister to direct his attention to that and see if we cannot solve this problem in some way or another to certainly cut down on the waiting time that people are now put through in terms of getting in and getting the proper tests, the proper examination to determine the nature of their problem and the treatment required. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, we commend the government on their efforts to make beds available, no question.

On the second matter, Mr. Speaker, the appointment of Mr. Gordon Woodford as a commissioner of the Workers' Compensation Board, we certainly again agree with this appointment although I do not know Mr. Woodford personally but many of my colleagues do and they have certainly indicated to me that they think it is a wise choice and believe that Mr. Woodford will certainly perform an excellent

MR. LUSH: job and we wish him well in this particular appointment.

With respect to the government's intentions of bringing in the Workers' Compensation for coverage for fishermen, naturally we agree with this. This is a position that we have been advocating and we are delighted to find that the government have finally acquiesced to the request of the fishermen, and not only that, I am delighted to know that they have gone along with my own personal recommendation to put in the system as they have done in British Columbia -

MR. FLIGHT: A good Liberal programme.

MR. LUSH: - where members on the other side thought that there was no such programme in place. So I am delighted to know that they have gone along with the method used in BC.

MR. FLIGHT: We finally (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: It is too bad -

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) programme.

MR. LUSH: It is too bad, Mr. Speaker

MR. LUSH: that we had to have British Columbia take the lead in this matter. We, being the fishing Province that we are, should have been the ones to take this particular lead. But that does not matter, who took the lead in that respect, we are delighted to know that finally fishermen will have universal coverage with respect to Workers' Compensation and we are delighted over this. As the minister indicated, it would be difficult at this point to comment on some of the details associated with it because we have to wait for the amending legislation before we can comment on that. But we would hope that the minister will not delay in bringing this amending legislation. We see no reason why that cannot be brought in immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: There is no reason for delay, Mr. Speaker. Let the minister and his colleagues put their heads together and let us get that amending legislation into this House as quickly as possible so that fishermen can get immediate coverage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! I would like to welcome to the gallery on behalf of hon. members a delegation from Grand Le Pierre, Terrenceville, English Hr. East, from the district of Fortune - Hermitage. We trust that their visit will be informative. We also welcome to the gallery a former member and former minister of this hon. House, Mr. Ed Maynard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to whom I would normally direct these kinds of questions, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) relating to Come By Chance. In reading over the exchange of correspondence and documents between Petro-Canada and the Government of Newfoundland which were tabled some weeks ago, I am

May 7, 1980

Tape No. 1337

AH-2

MR. JAMIESON: puzzled by a reference to the fact that environmental standards are to be - that is any future environmental standards as I read the document—are to be waived with relation to Come By Chance and also there is a reference to the undertaking of certain environmental studies. Now, we never did hear or see the environmental study which was undertaken last year and which was given as one of the reasons why the project was being delayed. Could the minister, if it is within his ministerial competence - I do not talk about his intellectual competence—could he indicate to me just exactly what the situation is - not on the compensation side because I have some questions on that, but with regard to the waiving of the provision, for instance, not to increase the height of the stack which is one of the things which I saw in the correspondence; secondly, that they would not, as I understand it, be subject to any new environmental regulations or anything more stringent than what exists at the present time; and thirdly, the need for further study when, to the best of my knowledge, there have been at least two and perhaps three studies undertaken already?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I would have to get out the correspondence that is filed to check the exact wording, but it is my understanding that the position put forth by the Leader of the Opposition is not completely correct. It is my understanding that the setting up of a new environmental assessment procedure was waived because that had been carried out extensively. There had been extensive environmental investigation in the context of the earlier negotiations and the potential problems had been identified albeit with respect to another potential purchaser.

With respect to air ambience standards it is my understanding that these will be observed and that the standards as they exist from time to time will be observed. There was, I understand, some arrangement or agreement worked out with Petro-Canada whereby they would have some time within which to bring in certain modifications to the plant which might be necessary, or which might not be necessary, depending upon the type of crude which Petro-Canada would be supplying to the refinery. The original arrangements with respect to the high stack and so forth were made in contemplation of the use of a high sulphur crude being imported from the Middle East and the same requirements may not be present with respect to Petro-Canada, but in any event, there was an arrangement that would permit a phasing in of the necessary environmental modifications and the indications that we had was that that would be safe in the interim. And while you would not necessarily have 100 per cent perfection at the very beginning, within a very short time the plant would be at an operational standard which would be completely acceptable.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Do I understand correctly - and I, with respect, say that I think I have read it correctly, but what appears from the minister's answer is that the environmental study that was done was done expressly in relation to First Arabian. And consequently, now that First Arabian is out of the picture, that particular environmental study is

May 7, 1980

Tape 1338

EC - 2

MR. D. JAMIESON: for all practical purposes of no value
or can be turned over to Petro-Canada and they will be obliged to meet what
was concluded in terms of the relationship to First Arabian if the same

MR. D. JAMIESON: kinds of conditions prevail with regard to the type of crude used. Is that correct?

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is not correct that the study previously carried out would be useless. The study previously carried out, although done in contemplation of negotiations with First Arabian, was carried out to determine from an objective standpoint what would be necessary in order to ensure a safe operation for the refinery, safe from an environmental point of view, and that would apply to Petro-Canada or to First Arabian.

I would like to ask the President of the Executive Council (Mr. W. Marshall) to supplement my reply there because he was involved in the final negotiations and I was not there on the final day when this thing was completed.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Perhaps if it will be helpful I would add my supplementary at this point.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: In terms of the First Arabian-- I will call it that - study, I assume it would have led to changes in the Environmental Act. The way I have read the correspondence and the various documents, they are exempt, that is Petro-Canada is exempt from any future changes in the Environmental Act. I think there may be a saving clause in there or something to that effect. Could the President of the Council demonstrate to me what the distinction is between the two?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, the original, as the hon. Leader of the Opposition knows, study was made on the basis of a proposal made by First Arabian Corporation. And their proposal envisaged the use of a crude with very high sulphur content.

Before the government would even concur with discussing further with First Arabian, which deal as everyone knows has fallen through, they wanted to be sure with respect to the environmental hazards. So we engaged a firm, a world renowned firm, down

MR. W. MARSHALL: in the States to do this particular study and that study was done on the basis of the heavy sulphur crude that was envisaged to be used by First Arabian. In our negotiations with Petro-Canada it was pointed out by Petro-Canada that they would not be using this high sulphur crude if, in fact, the refinery comes into operation. I think we, as I think the hon. Leader of the Opposition would realize, we always have to say that because we do not want to get hopes up. But if it does come into play I believe that their original intention was that they might be able to secure a supply of crude from Venezuela. That crude would not be as heavy a crude as was envisaged from First Arabian,

MR. W. MARSHALL:

but in

any event, they had also indicated that they would dilute the sulphuric content of this particular crude by using what is called sweeter crude, which is of less sulphur content. Now, the original study was done - it was done, you know, the Government paid for it - it was done by a group of experts, and we were quite satisfied with it, on the basis of the very high sulphur content.

That having been done, and being satisfied

that in the event that the Petro-Canada plan does come into existence there will be a lower sulphur crude content used, then in that event we would have considered that the environmental study, as such, would have already been done. But, at the same time, Petro-Canada is quite aware of the fact and accepts the fact that any plan for operation of the refinery would have to meet the tests of environmental studies. And in particular it would be the government's intention, when and if, and hopefully if, there will be a plan for the operation, then at that time we will re-engage the firm who did the original study on First Arabian Corporation to ensure consistency, to make sure that the environmental hazards are to the minimum that they could possibly be, and, also, to ensure that there would be no real significant or irreparable damages to the environment.

So, hopefully that explains

to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition why that particular passage was in the letter at the time, Sir.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A final supplementary, the hon. the

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, in connection with another

clause in the agreement, I think the President of the Privy Council

(W. Marshall) is aware that there is considerable concern among the fishermen with regard to the limitations agreed to with regard to Petro-Canada. My

MR. D. JAMIESON: recollection is that it is \$1 million and I believe the period is something of the order of fifteen years which obviously is or could be very, very inadequate and also can only be, as I understand it, under the agreement, implemented through court action. Has the Government—and if the hon. minister wants to take this as notice, or perhaps some other minister knows about it, I am quite content to wait for an answer. But, is there any supplementary-like source of compensation funds over and above this amount which could be— as we have seen in the case, for example, of even the most recent one on the South Coast, I have forgotten the name of the ship, but, in any event, would in a single mishap well exceed what it appears that Petro-Canada is committed for. Is there anything available on that?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I will attempt to answer from my recollection of the agreement and there may be - we may not be talking on the same point. But it is my understanding

MR. W. MARSHALL: from the aspect of the agreement to which the hon. Leader refers, that we had provided that Petro-Canada would have to maintain a certain amount which in effect would be by way of an insurance fund for the fishermen but this would not preclude, of course, no matter what amounts have been provided there, this would not preclude the people who had sustained damage taking action against those parties who have caused the damage. There was no intention of this, this was just a little bit by way of extra that we had intended to put in the agreement and I remember that it was discussed at the time of the negotiations, It was never intended at the time that this would be the imitation of the liability. We have tried to make it a fairly handy and reasonable way to resolve any damages but, of course, we cannot provide a formula that is going to encompass every single area by way of insurance. But this can be done, as I say, by the people taking actions against the third parties who may have caused it in the first place.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: My question is directed to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett).

In February of this year the Provincial Government ended up giving a subsidy to Labrador Airways for a trial period of three months, February, March and April, for carrying passengers from St. Anthony to points South on the Labrador coast. A lot of people were a little bit upset at that time because it was in the Winter months when basically not that many people were travelling and, therefore, they saw, really, no use of it in the sense of having a clear picture of the movement of people. For example, in February, 161 people moved, in March, 195, and now the report for April is in and it was telexed to the government today; 400 people moved in April from St. Anthony to points South and vice versa.

MR. E. HISCOCK: It is now finished, the subsidy, and so much so-I do not know if the attitude of the government is so callous but basically it was cut off as of April 31st. and now we have passengers stranded in St. Anthony. Basically, the question I want to ask is does the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) have any intention of continuing this programme because of, particularly, the popular support it got? And we can see the dramatic increase from February to April, 400 people moved in April whereas in February there were only 161. One would assume that as it goes on towards the warmer months that it will still increase.

So I would like to ask the minister what plans, in the immediate future, is he going to have for the people who are stranded there? And, basically, Labrador Airways is asking that this subsidy be permanent on three trips per week and what is the government's reaction to this?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, that service was prompted by a group of students who came to see me last year, before Christmas, I think, with a very sad story that every year around Christmastime they had some difficulty in getting home, home to Labrador because they came second in line, the mail coming first.

MR. BRETT: We tried to make some arrangements to get them home for Christmas but I think, for some reason or other, it did not work out. I do not know whose fault it was, mostly the students, I think because they never came back to me anyway. But they made a request, I guess, which had been made many times before, that some kind of service would be started from Labrador to the Island portion of the Province and that the government would subsidize same.

So I set the wheels in motion and we did start the service, we subsidized the service. But we decided to do it on a trial basis for a period of two or three months, with the hope that once the service would start and sort of get moving that there would be enough traffic so that the company would generate enough profit to continue on its own and then there would not be any necessity for a subsidy. And it appears to me that that is exactly what has happened and I am really proud because the first month there were 161 passengers and now, the last month, there were 400. And the hon. member tells me that this will climb. Well, that is good. Because if it continues to climb then there will continue to be less need for the subsidy and we cannot, as a government, continue to subsidize every single travelling service in this Province, you know, it just does not make sense.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) service itself?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. BRETT: Well, we do not subsidize the hon. member if he gets in his car and drives to Clarenville or to Grand Bank somewhere. That is not subsidized. And if there is enough traffic on this run so that Mr. Patey, or whomever -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. BRETT: - can make a profit, then there is no need for taxpayers to subsidize it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. member for Port au Port -

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: - wishes to yield to the hon. member for Eagle River, a supplementary.

MR. HISCOCK: I am a little bit amazed that the Minister of Transportation ended up saying that this service was prompted by students, who I may say I ended up bringing in. And I also have to correct the minister that those students did get home - over one hundred and something people moved in during the month of December.

MR. BRETT: (Inaudible) me.

MR. HISCOCK: Well, I have to correct you by saying that they did. And I am amazed that the minister does not know a little bit more about what is going on in that part of the country.

I find that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

If the hon. member has a supplementary I would direct him to ask it now.

MR. HISCOCK: The question I basically want to ask is that -

MR. NEARY: Now, be a good boy now.

MR. HISCOCK: - we have people stuck there and whether in the future this subsidy may be needed, or may not be needed. As of now it is in a trial period and to have this subsidy for the Winter months, I mean, is ludicrous. To have it for a six month period, then maybe Labrador Airways could find out that they could carry it on. But as of now it is in a trial period and I want to know from the minister what the immediate plans are with regard to rectifying this

MR. HISCOCK: problem of getting these people out of St. Anthony and to other parts of the Coast?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Oh my, Mr. Speaker, have I got to repeat all that again?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: I do not think it is necessary, Mr. Speaker, for me to do anything. Because if, as the hon. member has indicated, in the last month there were 400 passengers on that service and that is going to increase, well, you know, it stands to reason that if the number of people who are travelling continues to rise then the service in itself will be profitable, that the person who is operating the service will make money on it, and why should the taxpayers subsidize it?

Now, as I indicated we did it on a trial basis and as far as I am concerned we proved what we set out to do, we proved that it is viable, that it is economically viable. And if it is economically viable then why should the government subsidize it? You know, if the need arises somewhere down the road to subsidize it well we will have another look at it. But right now if there are 400 people travelling a month, and that is going to climb to 500 or 600, then it is economically viable and we do not need to subsidize it. It is as simple as that. And if there are people stuck over there then let Mr. Patey put on more trips, not come after me for more money.

MR. HISCOCK: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary the hon. member for Eagle River, followed by the hon. member for Port au Port, followed by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. HISCOCK: I would like to ask, with the subsidy itself on a trial period, will the minister consider, so that we will have more facts to back it up and give Labrador Airways a chance because it may mean that the Winter months have to be subsidized whereas the Summer months have to carry over the Winter months, will the minister give consideration to extending the period for another three months?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, on those days I am ready to consider almost anything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: Would you consider resigning?

MR. BRETT: No, I would not consider that. The people of Trinity North would not appreciate it very much if I resigned. I can assure you that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: They gave me a fantastic majority of over 1600 and they would not be very pleased if I resigned.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: At the moment I would have to say that we are not prepared to consider a subsidy, at this particular time. But I indicated,

MR. BRETT: the second time I got up, if somewhere down the road the necessity arises, then sure, we will consider it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Port Au Port.

MR. HODDER: A question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). I understand that the minister has guaranteed lobster fishermen \$1.70 a pound and I understand as well that there are some range of prices across the Province. Could the minister tell me whether the \$1.70 is held across the Province and whether there are various areas of the Province where fishermen are getting a uniform price for their lobster?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the Fishing Industry Advisory Board has been monitoring the situation regarding the buyers in the Province, the prices they are paying to fishermen, and also monitoring the situation in the wholesale market area, like in Boston, and no buyer throughout the Province to date has paid less than \$1.70 per pound. In fact, most of the buyers are paying \$1.75 or \$1.85 per pound and in some areas of the Province, on the Avalon Peninsula, like, for example, in Chance Cove, Mr. Smith is paying \$2.00 per pound and also Argentia Fisheries is paying \$2.00 per pound and I think one other company, Sutton and O'Brien in Fair Haven. But throughout the rest of the Province they are paying around \$1.75 to \$1.85. The buyers on the Avalon Peninsula area, as I mentioned, they have markets in the local area and that is one reason why they can pay more to the fishermen. However, the situation in Boston last week, the beginning of the week, was \$2.50 per pound Monday and Tuesday and the middle of the week it went down to \$2.40 per pound and at the end of the week it went up to \$2.75 per pound, for lobsters in Boston. But suddenly, when an influx of supply of lobsters came in to Boston.

MR. FLIGHT: That is a speech.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: That was my second question.

MR. MORGAN: You do not want the information?

MR. HODDER: No. No. I said that was my second question.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, your second question. I will kill two birds with one stone. The situation in Boston is that it was \$2.75 per pound at the end of last week but suddenly there was 173,000 pounds, or around that figure, came in from Newfoundland to Boston and down goes the price of lobster. So the price went down to \$2.25 US dollars which still means that the buyers in Newfoundland are now getting around \$2.60 per pound, our dollar, in the Boston market which means that they can pay at least \$1.70, in fact, anywhere between \$1.75 to \$1.85 per pound.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplenentary. The hon. member for Port Au Port.

MR. HODDER: My second question to the minister was to be about - I believe' actually the Boston market went as high as \$2.75 per pound and I was aware that it was down, but what I would like to ask the minister is while he is guaranteeing that the lobster fishermen get \$1.70 per pound what is the minister doing to ensure that the fishermen are getting the maximum benefits because the exchange rate is something between fifteen and eighteen cents a pound and the Boston market is fluctuating upwards at certain times? What is the minister doing to ensure that - you know, it is enough to say that \$1.75 a pound is the minimum but what is he doing to ensure that the fishermen get the maximum when the market is high rather than the company getting a windfall profit when the profit is high?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, of course, I think, in the action we took this year we set a precedent, and maybe a dangerous precedent, in getting involved in setting prices as a government.

MR. MORGAN: and you can only go so far in that field and I know that. But I think the limitation that we set was a reasonable one whereby we told the companies we will monitor through our Advisory Board, the Fishing Industry Advisory Board what the market is like in Boston, what prices you are getting as buyers in the Province. We control your licenses that you hold and if you are not paying a reasonable price, in this case at least \$1.70 per pound, we will have no hesitation but to have the Advisory Board investigate why you are not paying by means of looking at the records, your records and your books etc. To date we have had no reason to do that, to move in on the companies. However, at the same time we told the companies that we intend to monitor on a continuing basis what is happening in places like Boston and if there is a fluctuation in price, especially upward as in this case, which means profits to the buyers, we will have also to indicate to the companies that we feel the prices should be reflected in the prices paid to the fishermen. Now, in this case, because it is only a few week after opening, less than two weeks in fact, the fluctuation is occurring from day to day in Boston. It depends on the supply of lobster, so we cannot very well go to a buyer and say one day you pay \$1.75 or \$2.00. Our main objective right now is to make sure that no buyer in the Province, as long as the market remains relatively good in Boston, and we think \$2.60 per pound, our dollar in Boston, is a fairly good market for lobster, a good price, and we see no reason whatsoever why any buyer should pay any less than \$1.70 per pound but in the meantime, we will monitor and if the prices go up in Boston we will talk to the buyers.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary. The hon. member for Port Au Port followed by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. HODDER: So if I understand the minister correctly what he is saying is if the market fluctuates up to \$4.00 or \$5.00

May 7, 1980

Tape No. 1343

AH-4

MR. HODDER: a pound and becomes something like
caviar, that basically \$1.70 a pound is all you are really going to
ask the - or intend to ask the companies to pay the fishermen. But
I would like to put another situation to the minister because this
\$1.70 a pound sort of bothers me, because I am not sure that
we should not be monitoring the market and trying to get
the companies to give a fair price to the fishermen, but what I would
like to ask the minister, what happens if -

MR. J. HODDER:

now there is a projected slump, or some people feel there may be a slump in the Boston market - what can the minister do then to insure that they get the \$1.70 a pound if indeed there is a slump, because this again works on market conditions?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are basing our information on the last two years average in the places like Boston for the wholesale price of lobster and we see no reason at this time why there should be a major slump in the market for lobster. In fact, our projection from the Advisory Board is that lobster prices will probably increase over the next two or three weeks instead of slumping. The situation there, would be, of course, that again, as I mentioned, the buyers in the Province have been told to pay at least \$1.70, it does not mean they cannot pay that - they are paying now in many areas \$1.85 and shipping in to the Boston market. Last year when the price of lobster in Boston was \$1.95 a pound they were paying \$1.50 here and I felt that last year they should have been paying more than \$1.50. But at least when they are getting \$2.25, which means \$2.60 and around that range in the Boston market, there is no reason why they cannot pay in this Province around \$1.80 or \$1.85 a pound for lobster. That is the position of the Department of Fisheries and the Fishing Industry Advisory Board and the Fishermen's Union.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, it is good to be back home again, Your Honour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

My question is for the Minister of Health, Sir. Would the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House) indicate, in view of the fact that his colleague, the minister responsible for the Environment (Mrs. H. Newhook), has indicated that acid rain has been detected in three parts of Newfoundland and the Minister of the Environment says it is not as serious as it is in Ontario or Quebec - whatever that means, you can interpret that whatever way you want because in Ontario we are told that it

MR. S. NEARY: is extremely serious - would the minister indicate what the side effects are of acid rain, if there are any?

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

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, our department has been holding discussions with the Department of the Environment and at this point in time we do not think that there is a very serious problem. But I do not have any specific details. I can check further with the environmental people. We do not have any details on it in the Department of Health, but I will check further with them. As far as I can gather from my department - and it is just a few days ago we were discussing it - there seems to be no serious effect here in this Province yet.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman may have misunderstood my question. I am trying to find out - because acid rain is something new to members of this House and the people of this Province, would the hon. gentleman indicate, from a health standpoint, what could happen to a person as a result of acid rain? What part of your body, if any, does it affect? Could the hon. gentleman tell us what the effects are of acid rain or if there are any?

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

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, a couple of years we were talking about the presence of certain chemicals in water, in certain fish, I believe, in some parts of Labrador. A lot of people thought that that may have been as a result of acid rain. I do not exactly know what parts of the body it does affect - I am not a medical doctor, by the way - but I will certainly get the information or try to get the information. I doubt if it is available right now, but I will take the question as notice and report to the hon. member later.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. We have about thirty seconds remaining.

MR. S. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman also find out the effects of acid rain on the environment as far as vegetables and the like are concerned, and on the people consuming vegetables and fish in this Province? Would that have any effect on the human body? Would the hon. gentleman get that? Or maybe he has the information at his fingertips now.

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

MR. W. HOUSE: No, that was when I mentioned the first one. There was some in the second question there when we - a couple of years ago there was some mercury content, I think, in the fish and they did not know if that was being caused by industrial waste or other kinds of activities and that was being looked at. So the answer to this last question is the same as the second time, but I will try to get the information.

MR. S. NEARY: You do not know right now.

MR. W. HOUSE: No, I do not know right now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for St. John's West.

MR. H. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I wish to report to the House that the Estimates Committee for the Resource departments of Government has examined the estimates for Head XI, Department of Mines and Energy, Head XII, Department of Forests, Resources and Lands, Head XIII, Department of Tourism, Recreation and Culture, Head XIV, Department of Fisheries, Head XV, Department of Industrial Development, Head XVI, Department of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development and I am pleased to report that each of these Heads has been passed without amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further reports?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Motion No. 4. The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, there is some question, I suppose, whether the motion that I have on the Order Paper is now relevant in that the Royal Commission that I was calling for on opening day has, in fact, been set up. But, I do believe that it is in order and is relevant because the wisdom of the setting up of Royal Commissions is certainly something that all hon. members might like to address themselves to and, also, to give us all an opportunity to put something on the record that the Royal Commission might consider worthwhile. So, my motion is as follows: WHEREAS the health of the forests and the people of this Province is of concern to the Government; AND WHEREAS serious questions have been raised as to the danger to human health of chemical spray programs to control the spruce budworm; AND WHEREAS sufficient research and public debate has not taken place with regard to the resolution of this critical issue; BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this Hon. House supports the establishment by the Government of a Royal Commission to analyse and make recommendations as to the course of

MR. F. STAGG: action to follow in the protection of our forest industry and the health of our people so far as it relates to measures to be taken to control the spruce budworm."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the spruce budworm dilemma is one that has been prevalent in this Province now for a number of years. Certainly it is something that has dominated a considerable portion of the 1970's, and all of the emotional and philosophical arguments that can be put forward by the general public and by the political figures have been aired time and time again. The argument might be made, Mr. Speaker, that we have heard so much about it that everyone is probably in a state of confusion. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to wade my way through my hon. friend's refuse here. He is an environmental hazard, throwing newspapers behind me and trying to trip me up but I will do my best to get through it.

In my research in this matter, I found that, while I commenced with the feeling that I had the answers, I was audacious enough to think that I did have the answers to this question, I find that the issue is by no means clear-cut. There are schools of thought there are fanatical schools of thought on this subject. Some people are so violently opposed to the spruce budworm spraying program that it is probably a consuming interest of theirs and it is something that has taken a considerable amount of their extracurricular activities.

The spruce budworm dilemma might be likened, in some respects, to the nuclear war or the nuclear energy protest movement in the United States

MR. F. STAGG: and certainly throughout the world, as well, as we have seen in, many cases, the demonstrations before nuclear establishments in the United States, of major importance in Japan. And I was watching an American television station the other day and some commentator in the States was decrying the kind of protest that was going on by the people who were protesting nuclear energy and he called it, "The what if syndrome". What if this and what if that and what if and what if until a person taking some many of these what if questions can make a disaster appear inevitable. Well, that is a comparison to what we are debating. We had the debating in this Province and certainly throughout Canada for some years now; What if we do nothing about the spruce budworm? What happens? Certainly we are all aware of the enthusiastic and vigorous campaign waged recently by the paper companies in this Province, Bowater Newfoundland Limited and Abitibi Price, the full page ads that they have used quite frequently on this subject and certainly it would appear that they have taken a responsible position as far as their advertising is concerned. They are not using scare tactics, they are using, what I would consider to be a responsible method of advertising their position, as responsible as any company can be when they have a particular position and there are others who are opposed to it.

Some weeks ago, when I spoke in the House on the Environmental Assessment Act, I was less than charitable to the Newfoundland Medical Association in their assessment of the spruce budworm problem. I indicated there that it appeared as if their research, at least in one respect, appeared to be superficial. Well, I would have to say that at that stage my own research had been rather superficial and even today I have only scratched the surface of the material that is available. And I am not, by any means, as convinced now that I was correct in making that assessment of their position because they did advocate the wisdom of a spray programme last year, they indicated that it would probably be okay, and I will quote from some documents in that regard later on.

MR. F. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, the public of this Province does not know what to think on this subject. The general public is at the mercy of the news media and the news makers and the politicians and the would be politicians as far as this is concerned. Now, there is nothing more advantageous to a person who would like to get into politics than to crusade for a river that might be about to be destroyed or to crusade against the destruction of the forest. These are the sorts of things that many of us in our past as politicians might be able to say that 'Yes, I might have gotten on the political bandwagon on that subject. And I even see a few grins from hon. members opposite. I do if I struck a responsive cord or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: I cannot help but grin at you boy.

MR. F. STAGG: The hon. member does not grin he leers, but there was an hon. member across the way who was grinning.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Listen. (inaudible)

MR. F. STAGG: What does the public think on this subject? I believe that the public is totally confused, certainly when they have to look at the two alternatives. One alternative is to spray and then we come across the sort of thing that we have in The National Geographic. It says, "Are we breeding super bug?" And there is a picture here, the February 1980 National Geographic of a tobacco budworm.

MR. D. HOLLETT: That is the one the Premier quoted from.

MR. F. STAGG: It is an excellent article. The National Geographic is one of the -

MR. D. HOLLETT: The same one the Premier quoted from.

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, but it probably is.

MR. L. STIRLING: Whatever the Premier does he does the next day.

MR. F. STAGG: The hon. members, Mr. Speaker, are seeming to say that because the Premier quotes from something that that should be it, nobody else should be allowed to quote from it. Well, I do not know, maybe the hon. members are not being that nasty.

MR. HOLLETT: I agree with you. I subscribe to that all the time. I have read it and I recommend (inaudible) to everybody in the House.

MR. STAGG: Well, certainly I will have a look at -

MR. RIDEOUT: And take it under advisement.

MR. STAGG: - take that under advisement. I do not know if I have that kind of resources, Mr. Speaker.

Anyway, here we have the tobacco budworm -

MR. HODDER: (Inaudible) politician.

MR. STAGG: - see the monster there, February 1980.

That is this year, 1980. "Ploughing through DDT, a tobacco budworm remains unaffected by the white crystals lethal to earlier generations of the pest." There it is. So are we breeding super bug? And that is the sort of thing that the public, and we as political figures, have to be aware of, that in the insect world their ability to take a poison, something that is lethal to a particular generation of insects can be the food of a generation, by our lights, probably only a year or so chronologically, a year or so distant from the time when the, let us say, DDT was a poison, it could become food for the insect and their ability to become resistant to the chemicals is certainly phenomenal. So that is one aspect of it, the super bug aspect of it.

The other aspect of it is the one that was brought home quite readily to me by a businessman, a West Coast businessman not connected with the woods industry, but generally a well-informed and a good honest opinion you would always get from him, he indicated that unless we do something about the spruce budworm there will be no paper industry in this Province in the foreseeable future. So there are the two schools of thought. And I had, this year, welcomed the news by the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. C. Power) that there be no spray and, I suppose, at that stage I was subscribing more to the super bug theory, or the super bug syndrome. Obviously, there is the other side of the coin, that is pointed

MR. STAGG: out by the Newfoundland Medical Association, and this is the report that I mocked earlier, I mocked it really without having read it, so I apologize to the writer, although the name is not there. I am not sure who wrote it. Anyway the conclusion in the Newfoundland Medical Association's report, the conclusion, "The major loss of forests, which will arise if the current budworm epidemic continues unchecked, will have major socio-economic consequences, including increased unemployment. This is a major threat to the health of the Newfoundland population. And in light of this, the postulated health hazards from the current short-term spraying programme with Aminocarb - which is another name for Matacil - in Newfoundland are deemed to be insignificant." I still dispute that kind of reasoning, Mr. Speaker, that because there is a possibility that the forest industry might be harmed or decimated that we will have unemployment, then we will have health problems, I find that to be almost nineteenth century in its approach to the problems, and it is the sort of thing that we had during the Industrial Revolution where we had child labour and all the rest of it. So I still do not believe that that is a conclusion that I can subscribe to, but nevertheless it is something that was considered worthwhile enough by the Newfoundland Medical Association to include it in their report.

We have had on the West Coast of this Province a group that has been most

MR. F. STAGG: vociferous and effective, I guess, in their opposition to the spruce budworm. This is the Eco-Watch people of Corner Brook and I am going to read one paragraph from their brief. Now their brief is a most impressive document. It is thirty-five pages long and small type, with copious appendices and is a frightening document. It certainly does not lead one to believe that spraying is without hazards.

Anyway, the second paragraph of their Introduction says, "This paper was developed in part as a response to what many feel has been a failing on the part of government, particularly the Ministry of Forestry and Agriculture to present the people and members of the House of Assembly of Newfoundland with a complete and unbiased picture of the spruce budworm problem. While Eco-Watch understands that, based on information made available to members of government by the Ministry of Forestry and Agriculture, there is considerable pressure to spray our forests, they believe that only the most myopic view can cause government to ignore the very long-term dangers of such a spray programme, not only to the forests of Newfoundland but also to such diverse areas as health, fishing, hunting, agriculture and tourism." And they go on to say that their report will elucidate on that and back up their findings. And their report on environmental effects and so on is most impressive. My gosh! I only have five minutes to go.

In my further research, I talked with some people within either the federal or provincial government on this and I was told that not everything in the Eco-Watch brief is entirely accurate, that there is a certain amount of editorializing in there and that there is a certain amount of raiding of materials so that some of it will be taken out of context. Well, I take that view in stride as well. But, Sir, I am certainly prepared to accept that not everything in the Eco-Watch brief is correct but neither am I willing to concede that everything in it is wrong. It is most difficult to be categorical in coming down on the side of one or the other.

Now, the medical report of last year by the Newfoundland Medical Association made some conclusions and recommendations

MR. F. STAGG:

and I will just briefly read from that:

'On the basis of results from medium-term one year post spray monitoring of environmental impact of spraying with matacil, there is no evidence of major disruption of terrestrial eco-systems attributable to spraying. There are, however, several points of potential concern raised in the studies. There were the lower rates of production of juvenile birds in sprayed areas relative to unsprayed.' That jumps out at you like a sore thumb. 'There were lower rates of production of juvenile birds in sprayed areas relative to unsprayed. However, this may be due indirectly to spraying through reduce levels of budworm that would otherwise be used by the birds as food,' and so on. There are a number of reasons why there could have been a lower number of birds there, but I am not entirely reassured by that. I am suspicious that the reason there were fewer birds there is that the matacil killed them. And if the matacil killed them, is that one of the steps in the food chain that is critical to the whole thing and does it eventually get itself into the human sphere and so on? You know, the canary, I believe, was taken down into the mines of England and other places - the coal mines - years ago, and if the canary died it meant there was gas in the mine and the miners had better get out. So the death of songbirds has saved many lives for us before and it could be a fact that the death of these birds may be in that category.

The Newfoundland Medical Association on May 15, 1979, concluded that we could spray. Here is what they said in conclusion: 'In the case of matacil, I am unable to discover any significant variations in mortality in those areas which were sprayed, like in New Brunswick, as compared to other parts of Canada. Further, there are no reports suggesting an occupational hazard at present. Therefore, I have to conclude that there is a lack of convincing evidence that matacil represents a serious health hazard. I hope that this information will help to formulate your policy in regard to spruce budworm spraying.' Well, that seems to me to be a relatively small amount of evidence on which to base a decision. So, Mr. Speaker, since my time is rapidly expiring - I guess I am probably into leave time now.

MR. F. STAGG: How much time do I have, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): You have two more minutes.

MR. F. STAGG: Two more minutes. Well, then I will make my final statements on this matter, and that is to support the position taken by the Minister of Forests, Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) on April 14th., whereby a Royal Commission was established, the three principals of which were Dr. Cyril Poole of Memorial University's Sir Wilfred Grenfell College in Corner Brook, and his qualifications are very high. Dr. Poole is a rural Newfoundlander and so on. He was educated here and there and always educated well. There is a Dr. Carroll, who was born at Bonavista. He has a similar distinguished academic background and he joined the Public Service of Canada in June 1949, as a Forest Biologist at the Forest Entomology Laboratory, Frederickton, New Brunswick, then transferred to Corner Brook. He did a doctor of philosophy degree at New York State College of Forestry so certainly he would appear to be a man eminently well qualified to give advice in that regard. And Dr. A.T. Rowe, a former colleague of ours, a colleague of mine, we were elected to this House of Assembly together back in 1971 and he served as Minister of Health from 1972 until 1975, and has always distinguished himself as a man with his feet on the ground and a most responsible and excellent citizen of this Province.

So these three individuals have been commissioned to bring in a report. And the terms of reference of that report are-- if I might read these into the record; Mr. Speaker, and then I will be finished. The terms of reference: (a) to review the current status of the forest industry and the intensity of forest management within this Province and identify conditions necessary for the long-term viability of the industry and a sustained

MR. F. STAGG: flow of forest products and services for the economic and social well-being of the Newfoundland people; (b) to review and assess the current spruce budworm situation and its effect on the forest industry in light of currently practiced management and utilization standards and in light of a practical future level of intensive forest management; (c) to review and ascertain the impact of available forest protection techniques including chemical sprays on human health and the environment both on the short and long-term; (d) to make recommendations to government on a course of action which is compatible with scientific forestry, industrial requirements, economic and social well-being of the people and human health and environment safety requirements; (e) to ensure that a broad public input will be sought to develop an assessment of the wishes of the people of Newfoundland as to how they perceive the management and use of the forest resources and how they perceive protection of it; (f) to seek and receive briefs and submissions from various interested groups from both inside and outside the Province. This report is due by December 31st., 1980.

Now, Mr. Speaker, just as this government has moved ahead on other matters, strongly and decisively, not the least of which, lately, is the flag debate, the provision of a flag for this Province. Certainly - may I have a couple of more minutes to clue this up gentlemen?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes, go ahead. By leave.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD):

By leave.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Make your point.

MR. F. STAGG:

The point is that once this Royal Commission is received, the report is received, it is my hope that the recommendations made by it will be perceived to be and will be sufficiently valid, that a long-term course of action for the forest management will evolve.

MR. F. STAGG: Let us hope that they are able to put all of the divergent opinions together and come up with a recommendation or a series of recommendations that government can follow. And if their recommendations are as good as I think they will be, I am sure that the decisiveness which this government has evidenced on many occasions, not the least of which is the current provision of a provincial flag for this Province, will be carried over and the same type of decisive philosophy will result from the recommendations made by this Royal Commission.

So, Mr. Speaker, these conclude my remarks and I am sure that hon. members will have remarks as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear! .

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In addressing myself to this resolution I have to agree with the hon. member who just spoke that the resolution seems to be anti-climatic. It seems to be non-relevant because of things that have taken place since. But one would have to wonder what came first, the resolution or the decision? Because if the decision to set up a Royal Commission came first, then, obviously, the hon. member found himself very much at odds with the forestry policies of this administration. Of course, if the resolution came after the decision, then one can only deduct that the member is currying favour with the administration and taking this means of showing his support and beating the drum for them. neither of which, I am sure, might be totally true.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us talk about this government's

MR. G. FLIGHT:

approach to spraying, and let us really look, let us use this fifteen or twenty minutes to look at the kinds of decisions that this government have made over the past two or three years and the way that they have reacted to the problem of the budworm in this Province.

In 1977, this government had an experimental spray programme using matacil. The purpose of the spray programme as presented by government at the time was to test the application methods in very small blocks to determine the effect of matacil on the budworm. And there was supposed to have been an environmental assessment done both on the short-term and the long-term on the effect of that experimental spray programme. That assessment was not completed, or at least was not made public to the people of this Province or to this House, before the same government embarked on a massive all-encompassing, all out spray programme. Not having any idea of what the short or long-term effects of matacil were they went ahead in 1978. They had made their minds up, 'We are going to spray in this Province.' And the decision was not made that we will spray for one year, the decision was made that we will spray in this programme. And the proof of that, Mr. Speaker, is that there are 640 drums of matacil in Stephenville today that were surplus to that programme. Now, one has got to admit that the people who are making the decisions on that side, the Cabinet, are not very good managers when it comes to purchasing. If they were only going to have a one year spray programme, then certainly they had enough information available to them to buy the supplies of matacil needed, enough for that programme, and not have 640 drums of matacil, that are now creating an environmental problem in Stephenville, surplus to their needs.

They also, obviously, made the decision that in future spray programmes we would use matacil, having been told by practically every expert in the business that nobody knew the short or long-term effects of matacil, that it was not licenced for use in any country in the world, that the Americans refused to use it. But they bought enough matacil. The minister will, no doubt, get into this debate

MR. FLIGHT: and I am sure he will tell us, assuming we have a spray programme in the future, how many years supply of matacil is now sitting in Stephenville - 640 drums, or how many drums of matacil were used in the 1978 spray programme?

Now, Mr. Speaker, going into this kind of spray programme was bad enough but then came 1979, and we had the appointment of a Royal Commission. And as the resolution says, Mr. Speaker, "Whereas the health of the forest and the people of this Province is of concern to the government we will support a Royal Commission." One can only deduct, Mr. Speaker, that in 1978, the same people sitting in the front benches, the same Cabinet, with a total disregard for the health of the people of this Province or the health of the forest sprayed with matacil. Now it is the same people, it may be a different minister but it is the same Cabinet, individually, the same people, in 1978 they were prepared to spray the forest of this Province with matacil, spray the watersheds of this Province with matacil. There were cases where matacil got into communities. They were prepared to do that without the benefit of a Royal Commission, not knowing whether they were going to poison the wildlife, the fish life or the insect life of the Province, not knowing - and very importantly because the minister made a point of this, that we are not going to spray and endanger the health of the people of our Province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, having said that, the day the minister made that statement then he was saying also that his predecessor, the Cabinet six months before, was prepared to spray in this Province and not give two hoots and not be concerned about the health of our people. One goes with the other, Mr. Speaker, you cannot have one without the other. If it was necessary to have a Royal Commission in 1979, and I believe it was, it was necessary to have a Royal Commission in 1977, before the experimental spray programme took place. It was definitely necessary to have a Royal Commission in 1978, before the matacil spray programme took place. If it was necessary in 1979, then it was obviously necessary in 1978, and the Cabinet,

MR. G. FLIGHT: and they are all represented in this House today, the present Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) obviously sprayed and made a decision to spray with a callous disregard and indifference to the health of the people of this Province or to what long-term effects spraying with matacil would have.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can cut it any way you like, that is a fact of life. There was only one other intervening incident that took place. The problem with the spray program in 1979, is that an election was called. In order for a spray program to be effective, you have to spray in what is known as the incubation stage, in the first two or three weeks of June. Somewhere in there is the critical time. You must spray then. It is a known fact, Mr. Speaker, and I am going to keep saying this, because I think that one of the most political decisions ever made in this Province was that particular decision to not spray in 1979.

The Government had made their minds up. They had bought the pesticides necessary. They had bought enough for more than one spray program. And they were on their way with an all-out massive spray program with no concern for the effect that that spray program would have on the health of the people.

But an election intervened and being astute politicians, Mr. Speaker, and having more concern about their abilities to survive politically in this Province than they obviously had with the health of the people in this Province the year before, they decided there would be no spray program and they had to have a way out and the way out was the Royal Commission that we should have had in 1977.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the best that could happen in this Province today, we hear the words plebiscite and referendum so often these days - but the best that could happen in this Province today if this decision - if there were a referendum in this Province to spray or not to spray, the best the minister could hope for would be a fifty-fifty split. The very best. I suspect that the people who are dependant, like my constituents by and large,

MR. G. FLIGHT: the people who are dependent on the woods resource of this Province for a living would vote spray, they would vote spray because they would be so concerned about their way of life and the economy of their towns. People not dependent on the spray program, far removed, people on the Avalon Peninsula, would vote no and the best you would get is a fifty-fifty situation.

MR. F. WHITE: Good speech. Hear, hear!

MR. G. FLIGHT: And that government was not going to go into an election with a spray program problem hanging over heads that would cost them fifty per cent of the votes in this Province.

AN. HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. G. FLIGHT: And, Mr. Speaker, -

AN. HON. MEMBER: It sounds reasonable.

MR. G. FLIGHT: It sounds reasonable. And, Mr. Speaker, now we see the real reason for no spray program in 1979.

MR. J. HODDER: Hear, hear.

MR. G. FLIGHT: And then the minister - and to make matters worse, Mr. Speaker, the minister, after the election, after it was too late, authorized a BT experimental spray program - \$150,000. Now, the fact is, BT is supposed to be the ideal pesticide to spray with. It breaks down, there is no danger to the ecology. It breaks down in a couple of days. 'no residue, no nothing. And the BT was supposed to have been an experimental spray program.

However, the minister went ahead with that spray program - he had to soften the impact of no spray program. He had to do something to take the heat off because somebody was going to ask - and so what he said was 'we are going to have an experimental spray program with BT' and it made a lot of people in this Province happy because as the member from Stephenville (F.Staff) said the people who were afraid of a program suddenly felt relieved in the sense that there would be no spray program with

MR. G. FLIGHT: matalcil. But the minister knows now he just entered the Chamber - the minister knows that his advice at that time, by his officials, was not to waste the money. It is too late. There will not be time for a second application and you have to have a second application. And so they sprayed, they went ahead and spent \$150,000 on a useless BT experimental spray program.

As I have said in this House before, they might as well, for what effect it was going to have on the budworm or for what information we would glean from that program, they might as well have sprayed it out over the North Atlantic. The budworm was past the stage that the BT would have any effect and the minister was told that. The minister was told that. He had that. He was told it and he just ignored that information and he went ahead and sprayed with an experimental spray program, BT.

Now, we are into 1980, and not only are we going to go into - we are not going to have a spray program this year, we are going to wait for a Royal Commission, but we are going to spend \$500,000 on a BT program. Now, if my memory serves me right, the total matalcil program was to have cost a couple of million dollars in 1978, of which the paper companies were paying one third.

Mr. Speaker, this BT spray program brings up the question as to exactly what it is going to serve. Is this the experimental spray program? Are we spraying so we can

MR. FLIGHT: determine the methods of application, the best method of application to be used or are we spraying to determine the effects of BT on the spruce budworm?

And my information is, Mr.

Speaker, that the paper companies - having watched the massive pressure campaign they carried this past two or three months advocating a spray programme, they took the government on, they spent fortunes trying to indoctrinate and the minister says - they scared the living day lights out of their employees with these full page ads about if we do not have a spray programme there will be no future in the forestry. The biggest pressure campaign ever carried on by industry in this Province was carried on by the paper companies. And now I am told that the paper companies are not prepared to help pay the cost of that BT programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are not?

MR. FLIGHT: Are not. The minister can stand up now when he gets into debate and tell us whether or not - and what portion of the BT experimental spray programme the paper companies are prepared to fund? Now, we know they are going to help fund the - they would have helped fund the matacil programme, they did help fund the matacil programme in 1977. The indication was that they were prepared to cost share a matacil programme in 1980, and the indication is that they will cost share a spray programme in 1981 or 1982 and 1983, that is if we use matacil, if we use a pesticide that they see as killing the budworm and extending the life of the tree. But because the BT programme is simply an experimental programme, I understand that the paper companies, that the minister at this point in time has no assurances from the paper companies that they will help fund that programme and that is not in keeping with the kind of pressure tactics that they used last year when they came out and told us what great managers they were of our forests, and what the forests would mean to Newfoundland, and what the forests meant to their operation, and how far they are prepared to go

MR. FLIGHT: to guarantee a sustainable wood supply.

The BT program may well have just as much to do with sustaining a wood supply, it may be the answer, and if those paper companies are sincere, if their only concern is maintaining a healthy forest that can sustain a wood supply for their mills, then why would they not fund the BT program? Where is the sincerity in saying we will help fund a matacil program or a spray program using fenitrothion or matacil, but we are not interested in funding a program or helping to fund a program that uses BT? The fact is, Mr. Speaker, I have no question the minister is having talks with the paper companies. The paper companies may be considering helping fund the program but, at this point in time, the decision is made to spray, the Province is going to spend \$500,000, and it is with no commitment from the paper companies as to the amount of funding they are prepared to put into it. That to me, Mr. Speaker, points up the hypocrisy of the kind of a campaign that those paper companies waged in this past two or three months in demanding and pressuring for a total spray program. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would suspect the minister will probably speak next in this debate, I want to ask the minister, one of the issues re the budworm situation is what we do with the 15 million cords of wood that is now dead and dying on the stump in this Province, 15 million cords of wood is now dead and dying. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have gone into and the total emphasis, and the minister knows this came as a result of the Committee, the total emphasis now is on an export market. We are going to start exporting wood out of this Province. The idea will be to - the public relations job will be to try to tell the people of this Province that we are exporting budworm infested wood when the truth of the matter is we are not exporting budworm infested wood. The truth of the matter is that the paper companies in Europe do not need budworm infested wood any more than the paper companies in Newfoundland. Although there may be a slight mix, we are exporting perfectly healthy wood, wood that can be used by the three paper companies in this Province, and I want to question the wisdom, Mr. Speaker, of having the total emphasis of forestry put on an export market in this Province,

May 7, 1980

Tape No. 1352

GH-3

MR. FLIGHT: because we are, and I want the minister to address himself to it, we are exporting, by and large, healthy wood, wood that could probably be diverted off to the sawmills to try to shore up the sawmill industry in this Province.

And, Mr. Speaker, the member who spoke before talked about the terms of reference of the

MR. FLIGHT:

committee. Now let me say , Mr. Speaker, I think I speak for everyone on this side of the House, we will support this resolution. We would have supported this resolution in 1977, and we would have supported it in 1978, and we support it now. Our question is whether it is a case of closing the barn door after the horse has gone. If this commission was required in 1979, it was required a lot more in 1978, and if the government of this Province, whose management of the forest resources in this Province is sincere, they would have had it in 1978. Do not tell me, Mr. Speaker, do not try to convince anyone in this Province that this is a result of the new minister coming into the department, that a new minister walks in - and I recognize the minister is doing a good job, he is trying his best, he is trying to relate to the forestry problems of this Province and it is going to take him awhile before he gets a handle on all aspects of forestry and I respect that, but do not tell me or do not try to tell the people of Newfoundland that a new minister walked in and said to his Cabinet and to the Premier, Gentleman, "this is the way it is going to be, no more spraying, we are going to have a Royal Commission." That will not sell. The minister will blow his credibility if he attempts to foist that kind of theory on the people of Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, what we have seen from forest management in this Province this past three years by that government is **dispicable**. It shows a total lack of sincerity about the health and the ability of our forests to survive, it shows a total lack of concern for the people working in the paper industries and the logging and the forestry related industries, it shows a total and complete lack of indifference to the feelings of the people who opposed the spruce budworm. We could have gotten rid of all this frustration this past three years. All we would have needed was a Royal Commission made up of the caliber of people that the minister has appointed. So, Mr. Speaker, this may be going over the heads of the press of this Province or the general public of this Province, but it is a fact, Mr. Speaker. It is a fact.

MR. FLIGHT: It is a fact, Mr. Speaker. There is no question, Mr. Speaker, that the insincerity of the Department of Forestry in this Province this past three years is, Mr. Speaker, beyond forgiveness. There is no question. The way they have handled that spray programme, the way they tackled the budworm situation and what we are seeing here today, a resolution supporting a Royal Commission three years **too late.**

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as the terms of reference of the Royal Commission is concerned I was happy to see that when the Commission was set up the terms of reference were expanded to talk about all aspects of forestry in this Province because it is an undeniable fact, Mr. Speaker, if the spruce budworm does not wipe out the forests of this Province, then the kind of forest management we are seeing will do it for them. It might take them a little longer. The budworm might do it a little quicker than the kind of forest management we are seeing now. We still have, Mr. Speaker - I hear the minister day after day, for the five years that I have been here, standing up and talking about the millions of dollars coming in from DREE programmes that **are going to be spent to** improve the forests. I hear him talking about the new relationship with the companies. **I hear him talking about** the land management tax. And, Mr. Speaker, the fact is that there is no difference today. Walk on a site, go in where the wood is being cut and being transported and there is no difference today than there was three or four or five years ago. The money we are spending and the rhetoric we are hearing from the ministers on what is going on in forestry does not relate to what is actually happening on the site. And so, Mr. Speaker, we are still seeing a criminal waste of that resource. The harvesting methods are a waste, the harvesting methods are not conducive to regeneration, to natural regeneration, the topsoil is being torn off, washed out into the rivers, windfalls all over the place. There is no

MR. FLIGHT: reforestation, Mr. Speaker. The transportation system, the floating system, where we use the rivers and lakes to get the wood to the mills, this is waste. The minister knows there is no difference today in the amount of wood being wasted in these forests than there was ten years ago, Mr. Speaker. So I am glad to see, Mr. Speaker, that the terms of reference of the commission were expanded to look at all aspects of logging in this country and I agree with the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) when he says that when that recommendation comes in and if they recognize, as I suspect they will, the dangers to the forests in this Province, the mismanagement practiced both by the companies and condoned by the minister and his department, the mismanagement of our forest resource condoned by every minister who sat in the minister's seat this past four or five or six years have not

MR. G. FLIGHT: changed. Nothing has changed.

And, Mr. Speaker, I hope when the Royal Commission comes in with its report that it does indeed cover the broad spectrum of forest management and it does indeed address itself to what we have to do, quite apart from battling the budworm to maintain a sustainable yield out of our forests for the next fifty or sixty or seventy years. I hope also, Mr. Speaker, that we move very quickly in implementing the recommendations of the Royal Commission. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I do not know really where to start in the education of the good member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. G. Flight).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. C. POWER: There seems to be such a gaping lack of knowledge about what is really taking place in the forests of Newfoundland.

MR. G. FLIGHT: A new minister but the same mind.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I suppose maybe first of all I will backtrack a little bit and congratulate the member for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg), who has shown such foresight in bringing in this private member's motion because it does relate so much to so many persons in Newfoundland.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I have to comment on some of the facts put forth by the member for Windsor - Buchans. Some of it is so inaccurate that it almost goes beyond belief that that member could be in this House and be in this Province for the last five years and be in politics, and not be more aware of what is actually taking place in the Province.

Again, as a politician, if you go back to the series and the scenario that is drawn out by the member, saying that in 1977, we had an experimental spray programme, in 1978, we had a full-scale spray programme, in 1979, we did not spray because we were afraid to, because there was an election in place - if that is carried on, then in 1980, you should spray.

MR. C. POWER: Every politician knows that if you are going to do something distasteful as a government, you do it the year after you are elected. You do not postpone it for three years and do it the year before an election. And that is the practical nature of politics. Now, every member on the other side of the House knows that that happens, so therefore, if the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. G. Flight) - if that logic follows true, then we should be spraying just about every tree and seedling in Newfoundland this year, continue to do so next year and, I suppose, in 1983 if we are politically expedient to the point that the member - maybe paranoia leads him to believe that we are, then maybe we will have a Royal Commission in 1983 or 1984, just before an election, so we can gain favour with the Newfoundland public.

Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we as a government, did not announce the Royal Commission for those reasons. We announced the Royal Commission - and again at least the first part of the member's logic is straightforward; in 1977, we had an experimental programme which proved to be somewhat effective in combatting the spruce budworm. In 1978, we had a large scale spray programme using a chemical insecticide. That also was effective in combatting and containing the spruce budworm for that given year. Again, there was still a large amount of dispute in the Province as to whether we should be using chemical insecticides or not. In 1979, in order to see if the spruce budworm would rejuvenate itself when spraying was not taking place, we did not spray. In 1980, we, as a new government begin to realize that spraying is not a simple nature of spraying for one year, that the spruce budworm problem does not solve itself by putting chemicals out one year. And again, there are a lot of misconceptions in the minds of many people in Newfoundland that spraying kills off all the budworms and if you spray enough of forest and if you put enough chemical on it, you are going to kill off all the budworms and therefore your problem is solved. In effect, it is not possible for that to happen. The dosages that you would have to spray for the budworm - you would have to spray so often that it would then become really a high hazard to all types of animal life including human life and that could not be done.

MR. C. POWER:

Therefore, the most you can do by spraying an ounce and a half of matacil or some other chemical on an acre of forest is to contain the spruce budworm for that given year. All you do is keep the forest alive for one more year. You do not kill the budworm, you do not solve the budworm problem. Anyone who is familiar with the problem, as the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. G. Flight) obviously is, the only long-term solution to the spruce budworm is that hopefully we will get the same type of weather conditions which are usually common in Newfoundland - and the spruce budworm has been in Newfoundland for some considerable amount of time - but for the last seven or eight years the weather conditions in the Spring have not been just right for getting rid of the spruce budworm, and the opposite has been taking place, that by getting early Springs and remaining fairly warm, the spruce budworm has been allowed to reach epidemic proportions.

Again, Mr. Speaker, it is important for us, as a government, and for members of the House of Assembly to realize that the budworm infestation is an extremely severe one, that this year they are talking about an extra half million acres being infested by spruce budworm. We have already lost sixteen million cords of wood through the spruce budworm epidemic. If you take into account that we in our sawmilling and pulp and paper industry in the Province are only using about a million cords a year, and we have lost sixteen million cords, you are talking about actually sixteen years supply of wood of a total inventory of somewhere in the area - economic wood available - of ninety million cords on the Island part of the Province.

MR. C. POWER:

So, Mr. Speaker, do not let it be, because we have announced a Royal Commission, then, assumed by many people that the budworm infestation is that one that is quite serious and one that is causing severe economic havoc with particularly these two large pulp and paper companies.

But again, Mr. Speaker, there are many things also that have to be taken into account, you know. The member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. G. Flight) mentions the fact of whether we should get involved in a referendum and in a referendum you would probably only get 50 per cent on your side because only the people who actually make a living from the forests would vote in favour of spraying. But many residents of Newfoundland have got to realize that our Province without a forest is not the Province that we now have. Not only the people who work in Corner Brook, in Grand Falls and the people who are directly related to the logging and woods operation are persons who make a living from the forests. We have many people involved in wildlife, we have many people involved in parks and recreation, we have many people who make a living either directly or indirectly from the forest and the forest is a very important part of every Newfoundlander's life. Although you may live in St. John's or live in Corner Brook, itself, and not necessarily work in a mill, the forests still play a very important part in all of our lives and it is important to keep that in mind, that it was not just the commercial aspect of the forest we were talking about when we looked at a Royal Commission as it relates to chemical insecticides and forest management, it was the many other things that are involved not just the commercial side.

In announcing the Royal Commission there is an important criteria that takes place that we, as a government want to consider in 1979 and 1980 that is different, that by being open and above-board, by being a government that is not interested in the year after an election in deceiving the public into thinking that a one year spray programme is sufficient, realizing, in fact, that you have got to have a long-term spray programme, and again realizing that most of the information that we have as a government relates to short-term

MR. C. POWER: effects, information, by the way, which could have been used by a Cabinet of 1978 to make a decision for one year which would not have been callous, would not have been uncaring of the Newfoundland public but a decision which would have been made based upon the short-term information that they had and the facts that a short-term programme would not severely handicap or affect either the wildlife in the Province or the health of our people.

Again we in Newfoundland are taking a long-term approach to government problems particularly with resource development. If we are going to spray our forests it has got to be done as long as the budworm is there at the level that it is now and it is that long-term nature and the subsequent health problems that may ensue that we as a government have got to evaluate before we get involved in a new programme as opposed to just, I suppose, being willing to go out and spray.

And another really important condition and an attitude of this government, maybe more so than any other government that we have had in Newfoundland since Confederation, is the fact that we do particularly appreciate and pay attention to the public input. In the case of the spray programmes, particularly in 1978 and 1977, where there was so much public, I suppose, controversy about a subject that lots of persons are not fully versed on factually - lots of persons have their emotional side where they have chosen to be for or against spraying for emotional reasons but how many persons actually know in the Province the level of infestation? How many persons actually know how many people work in the sawmilling part of our industries? How many people in the Province know what effect it will have on the mills in Grand Falls, Corner Brook or Stephenville, if you have a certain level of infestation?

So one of the main goals of the Royal Commission is not going to be, Mr. Speaker, just to go out and go around the Province and pass out, I suppose, their decision to the public of Newfoundland but it is to go out and receive information, advice and opinions from the Newfoundland public and on the other hand, and equally so,

MR. C. POWER: to make available to all of the residents of all of Newfoundland the information that we have as it relates to the spruce budworm problem and, of course, the pesticide and the matacil, fenitrothion, chemicals that we have and, of course, the other types for controlling the forests.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many misconceptions when it comes to the spruce budworm problem. We have so many people who are prominent Newfoundlanders and very well versed in their own professions who seem to think that simply by forest management and by reforestation you can solve the spruce budworm problem. That, in fact, is not true. In fact the opposite is true, Mr. Speaker, that if we as a government, as we are this year planting 1.5 million seedlings, next year -

MR. FLIGHT: Where, where?

MR. C. POWER: - that we have planted all over Newfoundland both on Crown land and on company holdings for the benefit of all Newfoundlanders.

MR. FLIGHT: Will you identify the company holdings?

MR. C. POWER: They will be planted, some on company holdings, some on Crown lands, but for the benefit of all Newfoundlanders just not for the benefit of the companies.

MR. FLIGHT: You are not doing it on company holdings.

MR. C. POWER: The simple fact of it all, Mr. Speaker, is that we have a very active reforestation programme. Next year we will have close to 6 million seedlings but do not let anyone deceive the public of Newfoundland into thinking that simply by reforesting you do not have to spray, should an insect

MR. C. POWER: approach those trees ten or fifteen or twenty years down the road. The opposite is, in fact, true, that if there is a certain amount of logic spraying what now would be a virgin forest, a natural forest that has grown on its own without any investments from paper companies or government, that if we then go in as a government or as companies and spend thousands of dollars in growing, farming an acre of forest and if fifteen years down the road that piece of forest is attacked by an insect, then there is much more pressure on the companies or government to spray because then you are protecting an investment, dollars that you have put in, dollars that you possibly could have put into some other part of your operation.

So those persons in the Province who like to believe and like to say that simply by better management, simply by re-forestation you can solve all of the forestry problems and, therefore, you do not have to use chemical insecticides, are not really looking at the total forestry picture, they are looking at a certain aspect of forestry which has to be improved. I fully agree with the for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight)

MR. G. FLIGHT: (inaudible) commission on (inaudible)

MR. C. POWER: Well, I am just saying that I fully agree with the member when he says in his speech that he is glad that the terms of reference of the Royal Commission are expanded so that you look not just at forest protection, that you just do not look at spray programme for spruce budworm but you look at all types of insecticides, all types of insects and you also look at the total management of the forest. Because I admit, as I think most of - maybe my colleague here, the previous Minister of Forestry and most other persons in Newfoundland, that we in Newfoundland have taken for granted too long the fact that our forest is going to be there on its own, that

MR. C. POWER: it does not need man's help and encouragement to grow and be productive, that because sixty or seventy years ago when our pulp and paper operations began there was so much forest in Newfoundland, much, as someone mentioned at the committee meeting last night, as the way persons treated our fishery twenty or thirty years ago. There was so much of it there you did not have to develop it, you did not have to conserve it, you did not have to take care of it, that it would always be there. But ten or twelve years ago many fishermen and people involved in the fishery in Newfoundland began to realize that simply because you have an abundance of a resource at a certain stage in history, that if you do not care for it and manage it it will not always be there.

The same is true with the forests as the member stated in his words earlier 'That we have to get more actively involved in forest management'. Now, God forbid that anyone, Mr. Speaker, is this Province should say that over the last five years we have not significantly improved the approach of the Newfoundland Government to be indirectly involved in forest management.

MR. G. FLIGHT: It is not very obvious.

MR. C. POWER: Obvious. It was three weeks that we reclaimed from Bowater Holdings 1.5 million acres of forest land that was given to them, or rights that they had, because they were not managing, because they were not utilizing, them. They have now reverted back to the Crown, back to all of the persons of all of Newfoundland for the benefit of Newfoundlanders that we in that Land, Management and Forestation Act are making sure that if lands are leased out or licensed out to the companies that they have to make full use of them.

MR. C. POWER: Again, Mr. Speaker, when it comes down to what do we do now with the 15.9 million cords of forest that have been destroyed or that are dead and dying from the spruce budworm? If you listen to the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) you would almost be inclined to say that it is better for the Province of Newfoundland to let it rot on the stump and not export it.

MR. G. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. C. POWER: Well, all I am saying is that we are trying to develop an export market for that damaged wood. Now, I know, as the member has said, that the wood that is going out of this Province now in an export market is healthy wood. It is wood that is going out in the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, in the Lewisporte area and the Bay d' Espoir area. Well, some out in Bay d' Espoir is also damaged. But it is primarily healthy wood which we are shipping out of this Province to a pulp and paper mill in Scandinavia or some part of Europe which in turn will take pulp and put it into competition with the pulp and paper that is coming out of Corner Brook and Grand Falls.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Do you think that is a good idea?

MR. C. POWER: No, it is not a good idea but it certainly is a good idea, Mr. Speaker, that if we have sixteen million cords of wood that is dead and dying, if we can get it into a mix into the European market, if we can get rid of seven or eight million cords of rotting wood which is going to serve no other purpose in Newfoundland other than to be fertilizer for the most part for the forest, then if we can get that into the European market, if we can sell it, it has a value, but only a value in that it creates jobs in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, that it makes some of our communities that much more economically viable, that it gives a certain amount of economic stability to communities which now may find themselves in difficult times because of

May 7, 1980

Tape No. 1356

DW - 4

MR. C. POWER: a shortage of saw logs or a shortage of pulpwood in their own given area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, nobody in Newfoundland can deny the fact that that is not something that our government should pursue with the greatest of vigor as we are doing and as-I think the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Development Corporation are going to Norway this weekend and we have some people from Scandinavia coming to Newfoundland at the end of May-and as a delegation from Newfoundland will actively try and pursue in Europe some time during the month of June. If that can create employment in Newfoundland, if it can get rid of a product which is going to rot, then certainly we as a department are doing our

MR. POWER: duty for the benefit of all Newfoundlanders.

Again, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the BT spray program for this year, why are we spraying, how much are we spraying, and how much involvement are the paper companies going to have? There is absolutely no question in the minds of anybody in Newfoundland who understands anything about forestry that the paper companies, for a matter of economics, would prefer chemical sprays. They are cheaper to buy, they are easier to apply, and they can prove to be very effective. In the BT program this year we are going to be spraying, Mr. Speaker, just in excess of 40,000 acres. The total cost of that BT spray program, one part of which is experimental that we want to conclusively prove, and I also admit that last year's spray program was not conclusive, that it did not prove what it was intended to prove, and that there still are many question marks, both in the Province of Nova Scotia, where they are spraying 80,000 acres, where they are spraying 40,000 acres with BT in New Brunswick, that there still are many question marks about bacteriological control of insects. Again, Mr. Speaker, in this Province we are spraying 40,000 acres; about 20,000 will be an experiment, and \$20,000 will be primarily to protect a silviculture treated area of our forest, a part of our forest that we have planted, that we have thinned, that we have farmed in the sense of trying to make it be productive and give us a high yield, that we simply, Mr. Speaker, are going to spray that part of the forest this year and one part of that 40,000 acres is going to be an experiment.

The amount of commitment that we have: from Grand Falls, Abitibi-Price have agreed to pay their one-third of the cost of \$600,000. The company in Corner Brook has agreed to pay a proportion of the cost, although they have not finalized exactly what that cost would be. They had agreed earlier on to pay one-third of a 15,000 acre program and now that we have extended it to 40,000 acres to cover our silviculture, they are reassessing how much money they are going to put into the program. Simply, Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that for the first time in Newfoundland history, the paper

MR. POWER: companies are being forced, by government, to take a serious look, not only at reforestation, but at the protection of our forest from a government point of view and a management point of view. Mr. Speaker, it is important to note that last year the two pulp and paper companies, both in Grand Falls and in Corner Brook, had the highest production of newsprint ever.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) high profits.

MR. POWER: Yes, and extremely high profits as we discussed last night at the Committee meetings, partially due and maybe to a large degree due because of the exchange rates in the Canadian dollar and because they sell on the American market primarily.

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) back into the Province?

MR. POWER: A large amount of it is being put in. For instance, one of the things that the spruce budworm has done to Newfoundlanders, it has put a great degree of pressure on our inventory. If you are going to increase production, then I suppose it would be logical to think that you have to increase your raw material supply. That is not necessarily true, Mr. Speaker, and some of the new TMP machines in Corner Brook and some of the new renovations they are making to the Grand Falls mill actually get a much higher yield, so that if it takes a cord of wood to produce a certain amount of paper, now you can get a much higher percentage of paper from the same cord of wood by using a different process and a different machine, which really means that even though you may increase your tonnage going out of the mill you do not necessarily have to increase your cords of wood coming in. And that is an improvement, Mr. Speaker, which is going to be ongoing for the next several years with the new improvements that are being made to the two mills. We are now, as we discussed last night at Committee, getting involved with things like cable logging operations that make wood available to the mills now, which was not accessible or economic some years ago, somewhat experimental but, again, it is getting a certain amount of inventory which economically was lost to the Province which is now getting back in the economic system.

MR. POWER: Again, another very important part, especially for the members for Labrador particularly, the Great Northern Peninsula and Bonavista Peninsula, is that there is large section of the Province that now has wood that is now considered uneconomic, the Great Northern Peninsula wood, some wood on the Bonavista Peninsula. All the wood in Labrador is considered to be uneconomic to the mills in Grand Falls, Stephenville and Corner Brook. Mr. Speaker, who is to say that ten years down the road or five years down the road, with the Canadian exchange rates, that that wood will not be available to those mills, will not be economically able to be used?

MR. FLIGHT: Why is it uneconomical for Grand Falls but economical (inaudible). Why is Labrador wood uneconomical to the mill in Grand Falls or Corner Brook but economical to a mill in Europe? It is black spruce -

MR. POWER: Okay.

MR. FLIGHT: -it is the best fiber that is known for pulp -

MR. POWER: Yes.

MR. FLIGHT: - so why is it uneconomical?

MR. POWER: Primarily because, if you remember last night at our Estimates Committee when we went through the advantages that the Newfoundland pulp and paper industry has as compared with disadvantages and, in summary, the advantage that we have is that we have a certain fiber of wood in Newfoundland which happens to be better than the mass produced and larger yield of wood that they have in the Southern States, particularly, but one of the important considerations that we have - the biggest disadvantage we have in Newfoundland as a pulp and paper industry in competing in world markets is our transportation cost of our finished product. If you add to that transportation cost of your finished product and also the extremely high transportation cost for raw material, then your ability to compete in world markets is severely reduced. If you take a Scandinavian paper mill now or a French paper mill, that can bring wood from Labrador with

May 7, 1980

Tape No. 1357

GH-4

MR. POWER: a high raw material transportation cost,
but with no finished product transportation cost, they can still sell
their finished product at the other end and be just as well off.

MR. FLIGHT: That defies logic.

MR. POWER: It may defy logic, Mr. Speaker, to the member but it certainly does not defy economics to anyone who understands what is happening in the world pulp and paper industry. And that certainly is the economics of it. It is a logic which again works in world economics. It works in Grand Falls and it works in Corner Brook.

Mr. Speaker, in summary all I can say is that the Royal Commission, we have been extremely fortunate as a Province to get the three persons we have on that Royal Commission. I only hope that all members of this hon. House and all citizens of the Province take full advantage of the Royal Commission both by giving their input to the Royal Commission and by receiving as much information as the Royal Commission might have for them. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, as was indicated by my friend and colleague, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) we will be supporting this particular resolution. And, Mr. Speaker, I have always been inclined to support committees and royal commissions that have been established to look into some element of the Newfoundland society or the economy provided, of course, that after the study or after the report from the committee or whatever has been presented to government that we see action. That is what is important, Mr. Speaker. Because a royal commission or a committee was set up and established in one particular area a couple of years ago does not mean that we do not need a royal commission again or a committee to look into the various aspects of that particular area. The point of the matter is that we live in a complex society and a society that is marked by change which necessitates and requires that we do from time to time look into whatever changes may be taking place in a certain industry, what environmental changes there might be. So from time to time it certainly becomes necessary to have a general look, to have an overall look at some aspects of the economy or the environment or whatever it might be. So in principle I certainly agree with setting up this particular commission.

MR. LUSH:

Indeed we have gone on record in this particular situation of certainly condemning a spray programme. And all of us on this side of the House have spoken rather eloquently to that particular subject and have certainly voiced in a strong way our stand in that matter and a stand that was certainly against spraying the forests.

So, Mr. Speaker, we certainly support the resolution and support the establishing and the setting up of a Royal Commission. But, Mr. Speaker, I caution the government against having a royal commission established, the report of which will be stacked in somebody's office, stacked on some shelves to collect dust, which has happened in the past to so many royal commissions. As I have stated before, I certainly am a believer in setting up committees, be they of the royal commission nature or whatever, to look into some particular aspect of the economy or some particular area of the Province. But the point that is important is that there would be action taken with respect to the recommendations of that particular committee or of a particular royal commission, task force, whatever the nature of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, we are dealing with one of the major industries of this Province, an industry that has contributed immensely to our economy, an industry that has given thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians a livelihood and a good livelihood. And, Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate that over the years we have neglected the forests to the extent that we have. It is a travesty the way that we have neglected this very important industry, this major industry, this tremendous natural resource that we have, that we have neglected it to the extent that we have and it is putting us in great trouble today. And if we do not take hold of the thing, if

MR. T. LUSH

we do not put a handle on it, if we do not get down to brass tacks, then we are going to find ourselves in deep, deep trouble with respect to this very, very substantial and important resource. And, Mr. Speaker, one wonders though whether one has to establish a Royal Commission to look into the many areas of neglect. Now, I have listened with great attention, and with great concern to what the minister was saying and I was delighted to hear, for example, that the government have embarked upon a reforestation programme, a management programme. And one wonders, Mr. Speaker, why this again was not an area that we had gotten into many, many, years ago, and I do not mean to be partisan in this respect, Mr. Speaker, that previous governments have neglected the forest and this government just carried on the same way. And hopefully, it is not too late to correct the situation. We will probably be deprived for a little while and probably suffer for a little while but the point of the matter is that we have neglected our forests and if the minister in his eagerness and enthusiasm can get down to business and see that from here on in that we do have an effective forest management programme. Granted it might not cure all the ills that beset the forestry right now but, Mr. Speaker, there is no question that a proper, good forest management programme will improve the situation immensely. Whether it will eliminate the spruce budworm or other insects that infest our forest, we do not know. There is some question. The minister says that forest management is not the cure all, it might not be, however, there are people that would disagree, there are people who believe that an effective forest management programme is the best cure.

But be that as it may, Mr. Speaker, as long as we are going to embark on a forest management programme things will improve and certainly it will make the forest again, or keep it a viable industry in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the minister alluded to again all of the work from the point of view of reforestation that the government was about to embark upon. And it is sad that we have not started before. We have allowed nature just to take its course, Mr.

MR. T. LUSH: Speaker, and we have not assisted in any way at all. And we have allowed people to cut indiscriminately - not to clean up, to leave the forest in a mess, we have allowed that to happen. We have allowed it with the companies, we have allowed it with the individual and small contractors and we are still allowing it.

MR. FLIGHT: We have abetted it.

MR. T. LUSH: And it time, Mr. Speaker, that we came to our senses, it is time that we realized that if we do not take great care, if we do not set up a forest management programme, a reforestation programme that we are going to lose the forest for all time. And there is not much point, Mr. Speaker, in giving LIP service or trying to justify the actions of previous governments, that will do nothing. The point of the matter is that all of us right now, as members and as citizens of Newfoundland, we should get down to brass tacks to save that most important, that major industry to this Province and to make sure that it is around for future generations. And we are not going to do this, Mr. Speaker, by setting up Royal Commissions for the sake of setting up Royal Commissions. We are not going to do that to give government waiting time.

MR. FLIGHT: That is right.

MR. T. LUSH: Meanwhile the forests are still being mismanaged.

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear.

MR. T. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, the government certainly now should be in a position, they have been around long enough to know just what a mess the forest is in and I hope that we do not have to wait, as I said before, for years and years before we take action on any of the recommendations and indeed take no action at all and find ourselves four or five years down the road setting up, establishing another Royal Commission without having taken action on the one that is now in place.

So, Mr. Speaker, the important thing about a Royal Commission is taking action on the recommendations. And for sure. they are going to be making recommendations, recommendations based on the subject matter that we have been alluding to today and elucidating upon. These

MR. LUSH:

certainly are the areas in which they will be making recommendations, there can be no other. Mr. Speaker, I think of the large areas in this Province, the large areas of land that were previously forested that are now being replaced by hardwoods, birch, trees that are of no good to this Province, when, if we had taken action, we would today be experiencing or seeing a regrowth of economically viable forests.

In Bonavista North, that forest fire, Mr. Speaker - and I want the minister to listen to this - that forest fire in 1962, that destroyed all of the forest in Bonavista North right over to Gander Bay, all around that loop, beautiful forest, the people there, Mr. Speaker, were making a great living, all the people there. I expect that the people in that area knew nothing of welfare, social assistance, before that fire. All of the people were hard working loggers and the forest was just destroyed. I would venture to say there has not been a seedling planted in that area, Mr. Speaker -

MR. FLIGHT: Or anywhere else in Newfoundland.

MR. LUSH: - not a seedling in that area of the fire of 1962. That would have given us now eighteen years, if we had started at that time, eighteen years. But I would say there is not a seedling planted there, not one and I expect there has been nothing done there to look at the area. Now the area, what is not barren and dismal has been replaced by hardwoods, woods for which we have no economic use at this particular point in time.

Also, I would expect, Mr. Speaker, much more seriously the fire that burned out a large section of the area between Gambo and Glovertown last Summer, what has been done about that? Is there any reforestation planned for that area?

MR. POWER: We are going to harvest some of it now.

MR. LUSH: Going to harvest some of it now. Well, I hope we do get it all out of there as quickly as we can and reseed it, Mr. Speaker. Then we will know what kind of a forest management programme the government will have. Then we will know how serious they are looking at this whole idea of forest management because we do not need, we do not

MR. LUSH:

have to wait for the recommendations from the Royal Commission to know that action should be taken in both those areas immediately. We do not need the report of the Royal Commission on that. We do not need the recommendations. We do not need to wait that long. We know, Mr. Speaker, that the forests are ruined there. So what we need to do is to harvest what we can there and to start a seeding programme immediately.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering what kind of monitoring and what kind of controls are presently in existence with respect to our forests. I am wondering how often the people from the Department of Forestry are out looking in the forest where people are cutting to see how they are doing it, to see that they are doing it properly, to see that they are not leaving the forest in a mess, to see that we are assisting the regrowth. Are we doing this with the companies? The minister mentioned that there were going to be seedlings placed on company lands and on Crown lands and I would hope that the companies will pay their share for this, will pay some of the cost. Indeed, they should pay all of the cost of the seedlings that go on company lands. These are the people who reap the benefits and these are the people who should be paying the costs.

MR. FLIGHT: They should be reseeded, have their own reseeded programme by legislation.

MR. LUSH: Exactly. I hope the minister is going to look at that to see that those companies are forced to carry on a seeding programme, a reseeded programme, reforestation.

MR. POWER: One of the problems we have in our natural reforestation is going to be (inaudible) an extra heavy abundance of trees on any given acreage and really the best way to get a good yield from the forest is to do pre-commercial thinning as we talked about last night at the Committee. Now that is a very expensive proposition but it has a good productive yield.

MR. LUSH: Well, whatever needs to be done the companies

MR. LUSH:

in this Province should be required to pay a share of the cost and I am not at all adverse to asking them to pay all the cost. These are the people who have reaped the benefits from the forests of this Province from the 20th century and these are the people who should be required to meet whatever requirements, to meet whatever regulations are necessary to bring the forest

MR. LUSH:

back to a viable, economic industry and to keep it that way. So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the minister would certainly pay attention to these matters and see that they are done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter I would like to address myself to, because it all comes under this rather comprehensive topic, if you will, all inclusive topic. I would like to talk about the loggers of Newfoundland, a group of people that have been tremendously neglected over the past few years, probably neglected -

MR. FLIGHT: The sawloggers, the sawmillers.

MR. LUSH: Well, I am talking about loggers generally and I will get to which loggers I am referring to in a moment. But, Mr. Speaker, the loggers in this Province have been neglected and neglected in a shameful manner. I am talking particularly about the individual loggers, if you will, loggers not working for contractors but loggers out there in the urban areas of Newfoundland slugging away day after day cutting logs and taking them to sawmill operators trying to sell them, and there is nobody looking after them, Mr. Speaker, nobody looking after them. They are getting shamefully, shamefully neglected, and these types of loggers that I am referring to, they cannot qualify for UIC. Now, why can we not do the same thing for our loggers as we have done for our fishermen? We have got in this Province a large number of loggers who cannot qualify for UIC. Discriminated against, Mr. Speaker, and I am wondering who is standing up for those loggers -

MR. FLIGHT: Nobody.

MR. LUSH: - those loggers with family operations, small operators, who cannot qualify for UIC. I do not think they get any concessions with respect to gas. We have fishermen who get marked gas, get a reduction in their gas. Our loggers do not get that. So, Mr. Speaker, I have quoted two areas where the loggers of this Province have been tremendously discriminated against and shamefully neglected, people who have contributed enormously to the economy of

MR. LUSH: this Province and been shamefully neglected in this manner. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope somebody on the government side would take up a bat for those loggers, because they are in the position to do it, they are in the position to do it, that somebody would look into this whole matter as it relates to UIC and to see if there is not some way we can bring our loggers under that scheme. I know of a shameful situation in my district, Mr. Speaker, two small operators who got UIC and received it for a couple of years and, of course, when they -

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, the rule of relevance would appear to be -

MR. F. ROWE: Is that a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: - being breached here. Yes, a point of order, yes, that is the point on which I rise. UIC for loggers - granted I came in at the tail end of the hon. member's run-on sentence, but I believe that it is clearly out of order and irrelevant. The matter we are discussing is the Royal Commission, the spruce budworm and forests.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the loggers certainly are a group of people who work in the forestry and I would suggest that to do a study of the forestry in this Province, as it relates to the health of the people, and to not consider the loggers is something beyond comprehension. So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that I have been quite in order.

MR. STAGG: I will withdraw the point of order, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member was talking about the health of the loggers here, yes, certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) There is no point of order.

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: That is what I am talking about, Mr. Speaker, the health of our loggers, because if they are not being taken care of adequately by this Province, how can they be healthy people? And, Mr. Speaker, at this moment, as I have said, the loggers are discriminated against tremendously and I am talking

MR. LUSH: about the small type operator. I am talking about the small type operator, and I would certainly hope that the member from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) envisaged the loggers as being a part of the forestry and that they are not going to be left out, that we are going to look into the welfare of these loggers. We are going to look into that situation and see that our loggers are afforded the benefits that are given to other workers in this Province, the same benefits that fishermen receive and miners and other people. As I have indicated, Mr. Speaker, they are tremendously discriminated against. UIC that, I suppose, is extended to almost every worker,

MR. LUSH:

every worker in the Province, every worker in Canada and these people are discriminated against, they cannot receive it. And before the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) interrupted I wanted to just mention an example in my district, two operators, a father and son, thought that they legally qualified for U.I.C. and a couple of years after, when they did their studies there, when they started back a year or so ago looking into any irregularities in the U.I.C., found out that between the two of them that they owed just about \$12,000 and the government came after them for it. What next, Mr. Speaker? Two small sawmill operators, how would they ever be able to pay back \$12,000? It would ruin them. Callous attitude! And I do not care which government is in power, Mr. Speaker, it is a callous thing to do. And I would, as I have said, that this commission would look into that aspect and certainly see that the loggers of Newfoundland and Labrador are afforded the same opportunities and the same rights extended to other workers in this Province and that they get the same benefits. I see no reason why, Mr. Speaker, that they should not be getting marked gas or getting a price on their gas. They are all using power saws. What is the difference in using a power saw to cut down logs and using a speed boat or a motor boat or whatever to catch lobsters? What is the difference? Mr. Speaker, why should those workers not be getting a deal on their gas? Why should they not be getting marked gas or getting special prices? There is no hon. member, I do not believe, would disagree with that. There seems to be no difference. But the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) obviously he is not familiar with that situation. But, Mr. Speaker, I think he has conceded that he will allow that to be a part of the commission, that will be a task.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me clue up by saying that we support this particular commission and let me say we are glad that the hon. member did it because had it come from this side of the House they would not have supported it. We have got, I see, down the line another Private Member's Resolution, an area or an objective that we have been trying to achieve during all this session and it looks like it is going to be the next Private Member's Resolution. It is a good one.

MR. LUSH:

It is one that we have been trying to get the government to- it is a point that we have been trying to get them to agree to. But it looks like it might be the next topic for Private Member's Day. And it will be interesting to see, since they disagreed with us on it, they disagreed with us all year. So, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) put this resolution on the Order Paper. Of course, the resolution is after the fact but he put the resolution there and we are glad he did because had it come from this side of the House it would have been rejected, outright rejection. But, Mr. Speaker, we want to demonstrate to the government, as we have demonstrated so often in the past, that anything the government will do for the benefit of Newfoundlanders, anything the government will do that is advantageous to the people of this Province we will support them and will continue to support them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. HODDER:

The problem is that they do so little.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. Minister of Health.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I just want to thank the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) for supporting the resolution. And I can assure him if anybody from the Opposition made a resolution to support the government we would accept it, we certainly would accept it.

MR. ROBERTS:

But it does not work both ways.

MR. HOUSE:

Well, it necessarily cannot work both ways because sometimes the Opposition will put resolutions that are in opposition to government and you cannot support that. This is certainly not in opposition because if I recall -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) politics there.

MR. HOUSE:

- I will make allusions to that a little later. I just want to say that I am going to speak on this basically from a health point of view but I want to, as I say, respond to some of

MR. HOUSE:

the things that were said by the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). They talk about planting reseeding, forest management. I think the minister outlined what the government has done. And since 1975, since I have been here, there has been a lot of work done in forest management and reseeding and it is taking place now. The reseeding

MR. W. HOUSE: is taking place, maybe a little late but it is a kind of a thing that you cannot do overnight you have to plan for it and you have to work within the land claims that interested parties have and it is not a thing you can do one year, say we are going to do it and have it all in place in one year. I know and everybody here recognizes that the major companies in the forest industry got most excessible wood first, there is no question about and now, of course, we have a lot of wood that is in excessible, that is just a normal procedure in business and there was no checking to insure that that did not happen. It is like if you go in certain places in mining and companies start high grading they are going to do it if you do not keep it in check. So this government has gone and put a forest management programme in place and is working on it actively now. I worked in the woods a number of years ago and I guess I worked in the woods at the time of the crossover from the time you got in with the bucksaw and did not tear up the forest, you just got in there and walked with a pair of logans and that was the heaviest thing was going over the forest floor. And, of course, two years after we get the tractors and the large hoisters, and at that time you know, everybody, the woodsmen particularly, did indicate that this was going to create some problems. But I have gone in blights, where the same blight has been used for 20 years, and there is good growth in that place now. So, I think it has been the advent of the machinery in the forest that has caused a lot of the problems. So, the programmes are in place. Now, the Royal Commission- of course, the member suggested that he hoped when it makes its finding that it will be acted on and I think I can assure him that that will certainly be the case. Now, the main point of the resolution is to support the government action in deferring for a period of time, possibly a year, at least until the commission gets time to do its work, any further spraying action or spraying with matacil and waiting for the outcome of the commission. It is not saying that the information we had before

MR. W. HOUSE: was all wrong, Basically, I think the minister just stated three things. He wanted to look at the long-term nature of the spray programmes, to look at the health considerations and to have an emphasis on the public input, and that aspect public input is very important. It is alright, of course, for me to be fairly satisfied with what is happening, but the public out there now like to be satisfied, they like to know what is going on. That is one of the basic parts of our Environmental Assessment Act, the act is put there basically for the public to go to hearings and get all the answers for themselves. And that is the purpose of this commission, to go around the Province to look at the long-term nature of the spray programme. Because I think what we had before, and I will refer to the Newfoundland Medical Association Report, were mostly concerns about the short-term and that there were no serious short-term effects. Now, Mr. Speaker, we in 1978 particularly, had the spray programme and we got a lot of opposition from across the House. I did not expect them to vote against this resolution. They could not in all conscience because we stood over here and we did a programme, a short-term - we were assured that there were no short-term effects and we got total disapproval. We were accused of poisoning little children, old people, young men and maidens. People were saying over there. "Look at them out there squirting their poison" and this sort of thing. So I did not expect that anybody over there would be voting against this resolution, they

MR. W. HOUSE:

could not really in all conscience. So, I just want to point out now and say that the basic reason for this is to let the public know what most of us know now. Let them know the answers. Let them have the answers. In 1977 the Committee on the Spruce Budworm in Newfoundland, the local committee, did not recommend the use of aminocarb, matacil, because they said there was insufficient information. In 1978, a year later, after additional information was available they concluded that it was suitable for short-term use and I think we have got to make sure that we understand that - it is available for short-term use. That was the year that we did spray. That was the year that we were castigated by the Opposition and a lot of people across the Province for spraying even though that committee on the spruce budworm in the Province said it was all right in the short-term. The other point, of course, that kept cropping up was the relationship between that kind of a spray, the aminocarb or the matacil, and the Reye's Syndrome, a disease that we have heard something about last year and I just saw in the paper today in the United States last year there were 459 cases. But the research people, the medical people have told us there are no ideological causes for matacil to be connected with Reye's Syndrome. So we were given the go ahead by the Medical Association, by the Department of Health in saying that they did not think there was any appreciable short-term problems with the spray programme. Now, I will support the Newfoundland Medical Association Report. I am going to support it because it is not only the Newfoundland Medical Association Report but there has been input from the Department of Health, officials of my own department. Now, the report, while recommending we go ahead with the spray programme this year, was very precise in what it said. It said, "Any postulated health hazards from the current spraying programme are deemed insignificant."

MR. W. HOUSE:

Now, they will not say, as the minister said here, that it is 100 per cent safe. And I do not think they can say that. And for us to go out and say that to the general public, the general public will come back and say, I have not got to prove that it is safe, you are the one who has to prove that it is safe, you the government or you the Medical Association. The whole idea is to get a group of people out there to have hearings and let them come and receive the answers. Another point that they stated there in their brief was that it is recognized that in the future significant unanticipated human toxic effects of the spray programme may be identified. Now, for a general public not to be able to question that and ask what do you mean by maybe? I am satisfied that it is not a problem but the general public may want to get firsthand answers from the experts. And then they go on further to say, "This risk appears to this committee to be an acceptable alternative if it is a choice between major unemployment problems from excessive forest destruction." So, I am satisfied that what they are saying is quite accurate. I am satisfied that in the short-term it is safe,

MR. W. HOUSE: but I believe that in the spirit of our Environmental Assessment Act, the one that we just put out now, that we should have hearings and let the people ask their questions, have their input and that is all this is doing. I think I would be remiss in my duties if I did not say here that government has stated that they have all kinds of faith in the Eastern Budworm Council, the Newfoundland Medical Association, The Budworm Review Committee of Memorial University, and the staff of the Federal and Provincial Departments of Forestry. But one thing we have got to bear in mind, what they have said is, "in the short-term". And one of the things that we want to know is what about the long-term, what does it mean? And what meaning does it have for us? I think if we look at the experience in New Brunswick we know that New Brunswick, I think, has eight paper mills now in operation and they have stated that if they had not been spraying for the last twenty-five years they would have had about two. In other words, the spraying has kept the mills going. but it has not killed the budworm, it has not depleted the stock of budworms. That has been a long-term thing but they were using a different one than matacil. They were using a different insecticide than matacil. Now, they are, at this point in time, I believe, a little concerned after twenty-five years and they are spraying certain areas around communities and watersheds with BT spray. I think, while I am saying I am supporting the brief of the Newfoundland Medical Association, I am also supporting the resolution and basically, I think, when most of us look at it we think that once the public get the information first hand they will be able to accept it also. There was -

one time measuring things, making sure and being used to the woods a fellow said, "Well, in all these kind of things I always measure twice and saw once." And I think I would like to be reasonably assured that this is going to be safe for the public. Now, I am in the district of Humber Valley and a large portion of my constituents are woodsmen.

I have not received any reaction saying that we should spray

MR. W. HOUSE: this year and not wait for the outcome of the Commission report, I think most of them are saying that the damage this year will not affect them seriously because, of course, it is in a bad state over there now. But what they are saying, they are depending on it for a livelihood but they want to ensure that it is safe. And I think the only reaction I had from my district at all was just before we made the announcement that we were not going to spray, and it was from a group who said that they did not think that we should spray until we had further information and, of course, this is what this is going to do, give further information. I just want to read one page here, page three, and it says, "The ecological distortion which may arise from a long-term programme of annual aminocarb spraying is unknown." Now, I would want to question that if I were a public and say, "What do you mean by that? Do you mean that, of course, there may be some mutations eventually down the road or do you mean that it will not hurt this year but a build up of it over a period of time could have a devastating effect?" So, they are saying it is unknown in the long-term. They said that may be other organisms in the forest environment which are susceptible to the insecticide may over a period of years suffer progressive changes in -

MR. HOUSE:

may over a period of years suffer progressive changes in population trends, thereby leading to important secondary changes in their associated (inaudible) organisms, which could then significantly affect the forest habitat for occupation by man or could directly affect the health of the population. If the spray program has a harmful effect on human health, it is probable that it will be through this sort of indirect ecological change. There are a lot of people who are going to want to say, "Now, does that mean that we should just go along with it from year to year or does it mean that we want somebody to give us some kind of an answer that this will not happen?" The interpretation is important for the general public. Any long-term program of spraying will require extensive complex environmental monitoring if important undesirable trends are to be detected at an early age. This need is recognized by the Pesticide Advisory Board. So, despite the fact that they put in these little precautions they are saying, "We do not think it is going to be harmful. We cannot be 100 per cent sure." One of the other things that no medical group will say, whether you go on an operating table for an appendicitis operation or a tonsillectomy or what have you, they will not guarantee you 100 per cent that you will come out of it. They cannot do that because, you know, there are certain things that may happen. They are giving a reasonable assurance here, and I am fairly happy with what they are saying, and I would be fairly happy myself with the spray program but I am happier to have this year to collate the material, to bring it together and to go to the public in hearings and let them see for themselves, hear for themselves, what the problems are and what the effects are and let them question the experts.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to get up today to talk about this particular point in terms of the health and in supporting the resolution and also, though, in pointing out that the Medical Association's brief was a good one, I stand by it. I would hope, and I do not want to presuppose what the Commission

MR. HOUSE: will find, but I would hope that, of course, we will be able to have the report in early and be able to get on with the responsibility on us, and that is trying to ensure that the forestry industry will survive and provide the employment that we want and that can survive with - I do not want to say that I hope they will find that spraying is not harmful. I think they will but I do not want to put it in their mouths, and I would think from what I have read here, when the public see this, they are going to be satisfied with it also. So, needless to say, I am supporting the resolution.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt)

The hon. member from St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker, I am most certainly in support of a resolution such as this, and in doing so I would like to make a few comments. I, like the hon. Minister of Health (Mr. House), come from an area that has depended very heavily on the forest industry down through the years and, indeed, I think both of us probably, as you might say, cut our teeth in an industry related to the forests in the district of St. Barbe; we grew up next door to each other like. So, it is an inborn concern, I would think, for both of us, and I am very happy to have heard the minister's remarks, being the Minister of Health, and I am as much concerned, Mr. Speaker, for the health of the people, with what might happen as a result of spin-off from spray, as I am concerned for the detriment of the forests of the land. I sometimes wonder and I do, Mr. Speaker, question the wisdom of spray in my, probably, lack of knowledge of the whole situation, especially with the insecticides that are being used.

MR. T. BENNETT: I wonder if, Mr. Speaker, we have not destroyed our best defense against the insects? When we spray and kill the wildlife of the Province, the birds and the little animals, fish, salmon, trout, it seems to me that they all fall a victim to the killer spray. Not only does it effect the spruce budworm but it seems to me it has affected, in the past, such things as the birds and the fish and I would also be scared for the health of people who are exposed in the areas that are sprayed. I live in an area myself where, I guess, it is the most vegetated area in the Humber Valley. I have been living on the River Bank for 7 years, of the Humber, and I have seen more birds - I have seen the increase of birds - waterfowl and snowbirds - I have seen them increase over the last few years substantially. I have fed the little ones, Mr. Speaker, in the Wintertime and encouraged them to hang around but I have also noticed that the trees are in better shape than they have ever been, the trees that were dying, presumably from the spruce budworm, in some areas have come back to life again. I have examples right on my doorstep overlooking the river. A few years ago my children were fishing in another area that had been sprayed and they caught trout that were polluted, full of shrews and if this is an indication of what - this area had just been sprayed, and if this is an indication of what spray can do, that it would kill a shrew, then I fear for what other wildlife it might also kill. I understand shrews were brought in to help combat - Mr. Speaker, it was quite a few years ago that I witnessed and I saw the first effort on the part of government and companies to combat, I think it was the woolly aphed, or some other insect that was playing havoc on the forests.

MR. E. ROBERTS: The woolly aphed.

MR. T. BENNETT: I am not sure what insect, it is quite a few years ago, but I remember seeing little cages about the size of a scratch pad like I have in my hand, and these were tacked on to the trees all through the forest over on the Northern Peninsula. We never did see a killed tree in that area until after these little white millars crawled out, they hatched, they crawled out and took to flight

MR. T. BENNETT: and the little white millars washed up on the seashore, up on the shores of the ponds and the lakes around us and after that, it was after that we began to see the destruction. Well, I suppose, in the wisdom of those who probably know, like the companies the paper companies and the government of the day, they must have been justified, they must have been right in their assuming that the introduction of that little insect would kill the one that was already killing the trees. But as I look back over it, myself, having lived through that era, that period, I question if it was a very smart move and I question if it was a very smart move to have brought on the shrew to combat the insects that killed the trees. And now, Mr. Speaker, I question the wisdom, I question the wisdom Mr. Speaker, of the spray. As a matter of fact, I am afraid of it myself, I am afraid and that is why I am glad to have seen the Minister of Health as one of the main speakers. In a few years the Minister of Health will be asked for reports, undoubtedly, and they will come from the medical department of this Province, reports unto the adverse positive or negative effects of spray. Not very many years ago, Mr. Speaker, DDT was condemned for use in the Province and I am glad to see a Royal Commission set up to study what now

MR. BENNETT:

may very well be used to the detriment, or in a positive or a negative manner to protect our forests. Forest management, I feel, should most certainly be emphasized. And we are being told by those who presumably know that we have 15 million or 16 million cords of wood rotting on the stems. We also have the highest unemployment rate across Canada. We have men who are screaming to go to work for \$3.50 an hour. They are unemployed men and cannot get jobs and are willing to work at \$3.50 an hour. We have just heard, I think from the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power), that 1 million cords of wood fill the needs of the Province and that is the extent of the timber that we harvest. Now, I wonder why we are going to let the 15 million rot on the stems while we have so many unemployed men in the Province? I wonder why the lack of co-ordination between the various departments in government be it Social Services, Lands and Forests, Labour, why the lack of co-ordination, why we cannot utilize the labour force that we have standing around and, indeed, go out, have our forests managed. We are led to believe that the forest management have a programme in place now that is better than it has ever been in the Province. Well, let us hope they have. I suspect it could be improved upon and I think if the Minister for Lands and Forests (Mr. Power) were to pick the brains of the people around the Province and the people on this side of the House as well as the people involved in government directly I think that he would find a lot of useful information that could be put to work.

I would most certainly like to see the Minister of Lands and Forests relax regulations on licensing so our men could go in in an organized manner and harvest the dead trees. We have thousands and thousands of dollars worth of equipment lying idle on the Northern Peninsula I know, and I suspect in the rest of the Province, other parts of the Province, but most certainly on the Northern Peninsula. We have hundreds or thousands of dollars worth of equipment and some of it -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Who cut (inaudible)?

MR. BENNETT:

The wood is not cut out. The wood is not yet harvested. It is just blowing over and rotting and it is just a few years ago it was killed. And I think I asked last year's Minister of Lands and Forests questions on the burnt area and he suggested, well, it might be two years before we can organize ourself to get in there. But the timber only lasts, so I understand, a maximum of five years. And at that time I went and asked people in my district who were aspiring to get licenses to cut timber, and they said they would certainly harvest the timber immediately, as soon as the fire was out they would go harvest. They do not need to wait for a fire to go out, they can go harvest bud killed, spruce budworm killed timber and indeed support their families without having to turn to the welfare officer which they have to do at this time, a lot of people do. I have had calls today. There is not a day that I do not have calls from my district from people who want to go to work and they are able-bodied men.

Parks Canada, Gros Morne National Park, are employing something in the order of forty or fifty men. I was talking to the personnel management over there in the Canada Manpower and I am being told that they have about six applicants for every job in that area. Why cannot we put that work force in place, all that labour so it can harvest some of the dead trees? I understand we are only importing fifty per cent of our usable timber, the timber that we need to construct homes. Apparently we only import half of what our needs are. So I think there should be a lot of emphasis placed on harvesting with a view to employing.

MR. T. BENNETT:

and most certainly management, so that some years down the road we can utilize the trees to employ people and indeed keep the mills in operation. Some years back, I think the Northern Peninsula, where I am more accustomed to speak about, has proven down through the years that the revenues from the forests have been of major significance. It is also fifteen years since we have had a fish plant in Port au Choix. And before that time major emphasis was placed on forests of that area. And during the depression years that area was the most lucrative, most independent area of the Province, and it came from the forests, from the land. People did not have to go with hat in hand to any department of government looking for a permit to cut timber and I most certainly think that there should be more relaxation on the licencing now in the Province. I do hope the minister would think very seriously of relaxing the regulations, even if licences were only granted to men for one year at a time, renewable every year. I understand Rural Development has a lot of investment already out in tractors and things, rusting out, where people are not able to get sufficient wood stocks to keep them going. I would certainly like to see some of this looked into. We need the employment, the Province needs the forests protected, nurtured, the management, Government cannot sit back here and say we are going to manage the forests, the management of forests, Mr. Speaker, is out there, way out there in the country that we very seldom see from the House of Assembly. But we must have our field workers and we must have our work force in place. I am not very happy to see the countryside gouged and exploited, tractors scooping the topsoil. When we used the old methods, at that time the conventional methods of harvesting timber, there was very little need of reforestation because we did not scrape away the soil and we did not chop down every last tree but right now when the trees are not chopped they are bulled over, they are walked over. I feel we were as well-off twenty-five years ago, Mr. Speaker,

MR. T. BENNETT: with our forest-management, even though we did not know we were managing the forests. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that my time is running out. There are not many more remarks. I could talk on a considerable length about this but I would like to suggest again that I am anxious to support this resolution, as I think most hon. gentlemen are, and I am anxious to see what the Royal Commission will bring in. And I would like to adjourn debate at this time. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. THOMS: Point of order please.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: It is my understanding of the rules of this House that no member can pass between the person who is speaking and the Speaker's Chair while the member is speaking and I believe that this rule was just broken.

MR. SPEAKER: I will reserve my ruling. I will reserve ruling on that point of order.

Is it agreed to call it 6 o'clock...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. It being 6 o'clock this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at 3:00 P.M.