

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, MARCH 12, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

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

Hon. members, I know, would want to join me in welcoming to the galleries today a delegation representing the Joint Councils representing communities in the districts of Bonavista South and Trinity North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement. The statement in fact is a telegram which I wired to Major Gerald Bowering of Deer Lake this morning, and it is in response to some allegations made by Mr. Bowering in this morning's paper. This is a telegram. 'Assuming you are not misquoted, I am very disturbed and take strong exception to your comments in today's edition of The Daily News. Since the first hint of downgrading or closing out the Deer Lake Airport, I have worked diligently and supported your council and all concerned to see that both the Airport at Deer Lake and Stephenville maintain the status quo. I have not washed my hands of the affair, nor have I ever suggested that either myself as Minister of Transportation or the Provincial Government as a whole would ever do anything but fight to the better end on your behalf.

On yesterday's date you received a telegram from our Premier offering you his full support.

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

MR. BRETT: Early last week -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have been following what the hon. gentleman has been saying there and I have to draw to the House's attention that that is not a Ministerial Statement, as Your Honour knows. All Your Honour has to do is refer to the specific section of Beauchesne and the Standing Rules of this House that indicate that Ministerial Statements involve urgent, pressing matters of public importance, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: The particular minister is taking advantage, abusing the Ministerial Statement Period to defend himself against accusations or charges that were made by Major of Deer Lake. And that is not, Mr. Speaker, a Ministerial Statement. The hon. gentleman is not making a Ministerial Statement, he is reading a telex, reading a telegram to the House. And I would submit to Your Honour the minister is completely out of order.

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order. The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. gentleman gets his authorities, because he never quotes authorities because he thinks himself is authority. But, Mr. Speaker, if you wish to refer to Beauchesne, Page 262 to Page 265, it sets forth certain aspects of Ministerial Statements and this, of course, applies to the House of Commons, but it is somewhat kindred to the House here.

MR. MARSHALL: Let me say that his definition of a Ministerial Statement as being a matter of urgent, public importance is something that he has conjured up himself, but let me also assure Your Honour that when the ministry of this government makes a statement, it is always a matter of real public importance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. the minister, Mr. Speaker, is making a statement concerning the status of the airport at Deer Lake, the continuance of which this administration is supporting, and supporting quite strongly, and if the hon. gentleman does not feel that that is a matter of urgent public importance, or for that matter if he does not think it is a matter of importance, I think he ought to reassess his position in this House as a spokesman for the Opposition sitting in the backbenches.

MR. F. ROWE: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: If the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is going to quote from Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, he might as well quote the full statement. The last sentence of paragraph 262 says, "The purpose of the ministerial statement is to convey information, not to encourage debate."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Now, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the minister is not relating to the situation at the Deer Lake airport but is trying to explain himself away in the House of Assembly as a result of a debate that he has gotten himself into with the Mayor of Deer Lake. trying to weasel his way out of his carelessness and negligence.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: I do not think this is the proper place, the House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker, to try to explain himself away to the Mayor of Deer Lake, and I would suggest that this does encourage debate and therefore the point of order is valid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order raised, we certainly have had Ministerial Statements in the same category in the past and Beauchesne also indicates - although I cannot find the reference right at my fingertips - but somewhere it indicates that when a minister makes a statement, he makes a statement on government policy or ministerial administration, and I suspect that that falls under that particular category at this time. I point out also, as well, that the members to my right have an opportunity to make comments and seek explanation and clarification for half the time following at least.

The hon. the Minister of
Transportation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I think I will go back to the first part of that paragraph again in case some hon. members have not been following what I have been saying. "I have not washed my hands of the affair, nor have I ever suggested that either myself as Minister of Transportation or the provincial government as a whole, would ever do anything but fight to the bitter end on your behalf. On yesterday's date you received a

MR. C. BRETT:

telegram from our Premier offering you his full support. Early last week I wrote the CTC demanding public hearings in both Stephenville and Deer Lake if EPA made application to discontinue services at either of these airports. I have stated publicly that we will be appearing before the CTC to strongly oppose any such application.

"The provincial government has no weapons other than logic and persuasion. Regardless of what Mr. Tobin did or did not say, the ball is in his court. Should the CTC rule in Mr. Steele's favour, there is only one body that can over rule the decision, and that body is the Federal Cabinet. As you are aware, they recently overruled the CTC decision with respect to the Halifax/Toronto route. Therefore it is not unreasonable to expect that Mr. Tobin would ask his federal colleagues to take the same sort of action again. Meanwhile, if you personally take exception to my handling of the situation and do not want my assistance, then I shall continue to work on behalf of the whole area through other persons and other channels."

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. C. BRETT:

And, Mr. Speaker, to further outline our government's policy in this respect, I also would like to read the telegram that the Premier quoted to the same gentleman yesterday. And the telegram reads, "I wish to reiterate my government's deep concern over EPA's plans to drop Deer Lake from their routes. As part of their being a regional carrier, EPA has an obligation to cross subsidize less lucrative routes with more lucrative routes, and one would wonder what other smaller airports in Eastern Canada will fall victim to such a process of rationalization.

"I agree with you in that it is the federal government, not the CTC, that has the final say in this matter. This puts tremendous onus on MP Brian

MR. C. BRETT: Tobin and the Hon. William Rompkey to see that justice is done by the federal Cabinet so that Deer Lake continues to have an operational airport served by the regional carrier." And that is signed by the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. T. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would most vehemently like to suggest that Mr. Tobin and Mr. Rompkey have done their work in this instance-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. BENNETT: - I can assure you, I would most certainly want to see the minister table the correspondence that he has had in relation to the downgrading or the elimination of either of these airports in Western Newfoundland. I ask the minister to table that correspondence so that we can take a look at it and see if there is anything that we can weed out of it. I certainly would like to take a look at it and I am sure the people of Western Newfoundland would certainly like to take a look at it. So I would still like to ask the minister to make sure that he tables that information so that we can go back

MR. BENNETT: to Eastern Provincial and to Ottawa. Now, I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that if we had a Minister of Transportation that could and would negotiate in a reasonable, sane and sensible manner with Ottawa, I feel very certain there is no way there would be any downgrading of any of these airports, either of these two airports.

Ottawa has proven its faith and good judgement by now allocating \$3 million for these two airports, \$1.7 million for Stephenville and \$1.2 million for Deer Lake. Now, \$ 1.2 million for Deer Lake does not indicate that the federal authorities want to close out Deer Lake.

So, I am very anxious to see the minister's correspondence that he has had. I am very anxious to see it, so that if he has had no correspondence, well, tell the House and if he has had correspondence let us see it. And if there has been no correspondence, then I must submit Mr. Speaker, that the minister has fallen down on his obligations as the Minister of Transportation (C. Brett) of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, unlike the previous statement, I know this is a statement or a matter that will obtain the support of both sides of the House and I refer to the distinction to this House that occurred yesterday by reason of the award to the hon. the Minister of Forestry (C. Power) of the Canadian Humane Association Award that was presented to the hon. minister yesterday at Government House. This was a Meritorious Award for Bravery which arose, as the hon. members know, because it was referred to in the House last

MR. MARSHALL: year shortly after it happened, to the hon. minister for acts of bravery in rescuing two men from a snowstorm last year while they were in the Avalon Wilderness Area. And I do not think that any hon. member in this House would like this opportunity to pass without extending this House's congratulations to the hon. minister because it is not only an honour to him but, I suggest, to all hon. members and to this House itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think that this is one of those occasions when we can all speak for our colleague, colleague of all fifty-two members, and congratulate the minister and join with the President of the Council (W. Marshall) in extending our congratulations and best wishes. It is one of those rare times when we can all be unanimous.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: You have heard the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Those in favour, aye.
Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: Contrary minded, nay.
Carried.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier. Sir, would the Premier indicate to the House why he has not communicated an answer to the Newfoundland Federation of Labour in connection with their request to meet with the hon. gentleman to discuss the strike situation in the Province?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I shall table this afternoon the correspondence to which the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) relates.

There was a letter written on February 26th., the letter was written on February 26th., by one Mr. March to my office. It was written on February 26th. I do not know the date on which it was received in my office but a letter from me, signed by me, back to Mr. March was dated March 2nd. On the same day that I responded to Mr. March's letter dated February 26th., there was a further piece of correspondence dated March 2nd. from Mr. Mayo, which was received in my office sometime after March 2nd., to which I replied on March 6th. I like to think that I answer my correspondence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: In view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we do not have the correspondence in front of us, would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House what he told Mr. Mayo in his letter? Is the hon. gentleman going to meet with the Newfoundland Federation of Labour in the interests of preserving labour peace in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I have indicated to Mr. Mayo and to Mr. March that the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and the President of Treasury Board (Dr. Collins) are available to meet with NAPE and to meet with the Newfoundland Federation of Labour on ongoing problems in the labour scene in Newfoundland.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously the government are trying to restrict discussion in this House and they are going to take away the right to get court injunctions against people who object to having their property damaged in the spray programme, and now the hon. gentleman is refusing to meet one of the most important bodies in this Province, the Newfoundland Federation of Labour.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Question.

MR. S. NEARY: And I ask the hon. gentleman would he re-consider because there is no more important body in this Province than the Newfoundland Federation of Labour. And why will the hon. gentleman not sit down with the executive and the officers of the Newfoundland Federation of Labour to discuss the strike situation, or does the hon. gentleman want trouble and strife and a long hot Summer of labour trouble in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if there were a couple of questions in that speech or not. Suffice it to say from our point of view the government is ready, willing and able to meet with the Federation of Labour, with the executive of NAPE, at any time to discuss the labour situation in this Province.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). I am wondering if the Minister of Education could inform the House how long the teachers in this Province have now been working without a contract?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

March 12, 1981

Tape No. 318

DW - 3

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the collective agreement between the Newfoundland Teachers' Association and the Federation of School Boards and Treasury Board, which was for a two year term, expired at the end of the Summer of 1980. Since that time negotiations have been ongoing

March 12, 1981

Tape No. 319

RA - 1

MS.L. VERGE: since that time negotiations have been ongoing and the matter is now before a conciliation board.

MR. F. ROWE: S supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): A supplementary.

The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: I have been given to understand, Mr. Speaker, that the teachers have been working without a contract for approximately six to seven months: Is that correct? I am wondering if the minister, Mr. Speaker, could inform the House when in fact the teachers of this Province will be in a legal position to strike.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, this whole matter is now before a conciliation board and it is not for me to comment on any such matters as those raised by the member Opposite.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, Mr. Speaker, obviously the minister does not know what is going on with respect to negotiations with the teachers. I wonder if the president of Treasury Board could inform the House when the teachers will be in fact in a legal position to strike, and if he can inform the House which issues are now outstanding with the N.T.A. or the teachers, and have the teachers received a salary offer?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, just a small

DR. COLLINS: correction to the statement that was made by the hon. member during one of his previous statements there. There is a contract in place at the present time: Teachers are not working without a contract. The previous contract is in place until the new one is negotiated. In terms of when the teachers will be in a position to strike, to a large extent that is up to the teachers. They may never decide to go on strike ever again, not this year, next year, any year. When they will be in a position to strike will be something for them to decide. They can make that decision some time after the conciliation board report has come in and that report has been considered over a period of time. They will then be in a position to decide whether they want to or not. But it would be a wrong implication to make that the teachers have any intention at this point in time to go on strike.

MR. F. ROWE: The second part of the question, Mr. Speaker?

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

MR. BENNETT: I yield.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The minister did not indicate what issues are still outstanding with the teachers and if in fact they have been presented with a salary offer and how much.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there were quite a large number of issues as there always are when the contracts are up for renegotiation. I do not remember the exact number, but I would hazard a guess that something between twenty-five and thirty-five issues were up for resolution. Quite a large number of those issues have now been worked through

March 12, 1981

Tape No. 319

RA - 3

DR. COLLINS: and a satisfactory understanding
has been achieved on both sides. There are still a few others
to be worked through before, as is traditional and is as ex-
pected, one gets down to what is usually referred to as the
monetary package. There are a few issues that still have to
be gone through before that point in time arises. And I
might say that up

DR. COLLINS:

to this point in time the negotiators on behalf of the teachers have shown extremely good relations with our negotiators. There has been a very co-operative attitude towards the points raised on both sides, and it is very encouraging to see that so many points of agreement have been reached at this stage.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Speaker, the Inter-faith family and community centre at Corner Brook, as the minister is very much aware, is in grave need of financial assistance. I need not preamble very much. I think the minister is very much aware that if they do not get funding to carry them on after the end of March, they shall probably close out, their services will no longer be available. They presently have one group home established, and it seems to be working well.

Would the minister tell the House that, indeed, funds are going to be available before the end of this month so that service can be a continuing thing for these people in Corner Brook?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot inform the House that funding is going to be available to the extent that that organization requests it. I can agree with the hon. gentleman that I am aware of the situation. I have been in touch with, and, indeed, my colleagues from the West Coast have been in touch with

MR. HICKEY: me and we have discussed this issue.

I cannot commit the government to funding for the new fiscal year when we are going through the budgetary process, and I am sure my hon. friend appreciates and understands that procedure.

In relation to the group home, whilst I, again, cannot commit monies which are not yet decided upon, however, I know of no plan to phase out any group homes. Instead, we are always attempting to increase the number, and to open up new group homes.

MR. BENNETT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, there are no plans for phasing out. As a matter of fact, there are plans for extension. I understand there is a very dire need for these services, especially in the Corner Brook area. I am led to understand, Mr. Speaker, that in a group home the cost per person is something in the order of forty-five dollars per person per day as opposed to \$200 per person per day at Exon House. Should the Corner Brook group home phase out, these people undoubtedly may have to come in this direction where it is going to cost your department \$200 per day per person.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister

MR. BENNETT: cannot find interim funding that could certainly salvage - and I say salvage because there is grave concern being expressed that indeed if funds do not become available very, very shortly that the existing group home in Corner Brook will have to phase out. So I am wondering if the minister would put more effort into making sure funds became available.

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman obviously did not get too clearly what I said in response to his first question. I said that it is not the policy of this government to phase out and to decrease the number of group homes, but rather our policy is to increase them. Consequently I see no danger in that group home being closed. Whether that organization operates that group home or whether the department, my department operates it, as we do many other group homes, is really academic at this point. The fact is that the hon. gentleman is partly right when he says the cost of providing for children in group home versus institutions shows a great saving and also shows an exceptionally high level of service. So that the government stands totally committed to development of group homes.

What we are involved in here is a number of other areas of concern, one being administrative costs, to other areas of various types of services which my department provides in certain instances, and we are talking about a number of things here with regard to that organization over and above the group homes.

So, in a nutshell, my response to the hon. gentleman's question is I see no danger in terms of the group home itself. Who is going to operate it,

MR. HICKEY: and I would hope it is that organization, but who will I do not know at this point.

The other issues are issues which are presently being debated. Of course, I am sure he understands I cannot give a definitive answer at this time until I know the kinds of monies I have in my budget for the next fiscal year.

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

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

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, it is a week, I think - I believe it is a week ago a telegram was sent from the executive of the group home and they have not yet received a reply. And I am wondering now that when the minister is making his final decision on this, I hope he also takes into account the jobs, not only the paid jobs but there are many, many other jobs - I understand there eight-and-a-half jobs now, paid jobs, surrounding the effort of group home development in Corner Brook, and many many other voluntary jobs that are of a very beneficial nature to the area. So, I am asking the minister if he is going to reply and would he give us some indication of the nature of his reply to the executive of that organization?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY: Now that is a rather unusual question, to say the least. The hon. gentleman has asked me to inform the legislature what I am going to say to a group maybe tomorrow morning. That certainly would not be in keeping with any kind of courtesy. And let me inform the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, that my response was conveyed to that organization through my colleague,

MR. T. HICKEY: the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), number one, so that my reply now will only confirm what the association has already been told, point number one. Number two -

MR. BENNETT: Courtesy, Mr. Speaker, courtesy.

MR. HICKEY: - it is a week, Mr. Speaker, since the telex came to me. I am sure that organization appreciates that the fact that they did not get an instant response from me such as, no, we cannot fund you, clearly indicates to them that I was trying desparately to take them out of their dilemma and to be able to indicate to them in some way what parts of their programme we might be able to tell them that could be continued and what other information I could give them, although not maybe a definite answer to all of the questions which were contained in that telex.

I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that we have been negligent in any way in responding. I think we have treated that request with speed and efficiency and, as I said, that organization knows clearly what the department's and government's position on it is up to the present time.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Does the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) wish to yield.

MR. TULK: I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that this is The Year of the Handicapped, the Disabled - and the hon. gentleman opened the year with a big ceremony down here in the lobby of Confederation Building -

MR. HISCOCK: He has forgotten about that.

MR. NEARY: - would the hon. gentleman indicate to the House if the government is going to recognize The Year

MR. NEARY: of the Handicapped, the Disabled with merely lip service or is government going to do something constructive and objective? And specifically I am concerned with the question of the transportation of disabled people. As hon. members know, the Hub is going out of the business, the City of St. John's had agreed to undertake to pay 50 per cent of the cost of transportation of the disabled to and from work and to and from university and to and from school. Will the government undertake, will the minister's department undertake to supply the other 50 per cent of the cost of transporting the handicapped here in the City of St. John's?

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for giving me the opportunity to explain the government's position on that issue.

Number one, I am very much aware, and government is certainly very conscious, of the need for the whole matter of transportation to be resolved. I explained the position of the government in regards to that issue at City Hall and very briefly confirmed that position after I was informed that the city had approved to underwrite 50 per cent of the cost. And the position as I outlined was in keeping with the wishes of the disabled people who are employed in this city and who are seeking the transportation. And their decision up to now, at least, has been, and as far as I know still is, that they do not want to be segregated as a special group with a grant from the Department of Social Services but rather wish to be treated as all other citizens are who are employed in terms of the provision of a transportation system which is paid for by the taxpayers.

Now, there are two components, Mr. Speaker; one, the disabled people who are employed and who obviously would pay their own way, and those who

MR. HICKEY: Are not employed and who are receiving some assistance from my department, which is a reasonable number of people. In terms of the second group, we certainly would provide transportation - we have in the past - and will continue to provide transportation and use whatever system the city would put in place.

Ultimately, what decision will be made as regards a cost sharing formula, I am unable to say at this point in time, again, for the simple reason that we are in the process of putting together a new Budget.

MR. NEARY: This is an emergency. How do you deal with the emergencies?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, no disabled person, to my knowledge, in this Province at the hands of -

MR. NEARY: You cannot help the disabled but you can buy flags.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman will be quiet and let me answer the question.

I repeat, no disabled person, no disabled citizen, to my knowledge as long as I have been associated with this department and the government, have ever suffered at our hands because of an emergency situation. I stand on that record and I suggest that we will continue maintaining that record.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands. It concerns the Royal Commission's problem in being able to determine whether there is an adequate wood supply for the future of the Grand Falls mill.

MR. TULK: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the Commission was unable to reconcile the differences between the department's estimates of annual allowable cuts and those of Abitibi-Price. In other words, we are perhaps cutting, if we listen to the department, more wood than we should be cutting. The question is, Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate which of those projections, those of Abitibi-Price or his department, he accepts as accurate and inform the House which one he is using?

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, in the Royal Commission's hearings around the Province, they had, obviously, the problem of interpreting facts that came from many different sources. In the case of Bowaters, Abitibi-Price and the provincial government, our own government and, of course, the Canadian Forestry Service, which does testing and surveying on behalf of the federal government, there certainly was a discrepancy between the figures that were used. We are convinced that the figures that we have used as a provincial government are conservative figures based upon what we believe to be the actual wood resource in Newfoundland and certainly, Mr. Speaker, we are convinced of the long-term viability and stability of the Grand Falls mill.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I pointed out to the minister that his own department says that we are now cutting more wood than we should be cutting, and if the minister is saying that his department is right, is he now saying that the annual allowable cut projections of Abitibi-Price over the past number of years have been wrong, which seems to have been basically accepted by his department, and

March 12, 1981

Tape 323

EC - 3

MR. TULK: that perhaps we have been cutting more wood than we should have or perhaps the Grand Falls mill is not really viable in the future?

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, there are several factors which come into play when you talk about the long-term viability of a forest industry in Newfoundland, especially as it relates to the budworm epidemic that we are having, the amount of wood that we have lost, and the amount of wood which is obviously cut each year on the annual allowable cut.

What has been happening in the case of the Grand Falls mill, the Stephenville mill, and, of course, the Corner Brook mill is the fact that there are many things taking place today which are going to guarantee a higher yield from the forest in years ahead than are now being done. The fact that \$45 million is going to be spent on silviculture is going to materially effect how much wood will be available thirty or forty years down the road.

MR. NEARY: Thanks to Ottawa.

MR. POWER: The fact that we in this Province and our department have aggressively initiated a cable logging programme that allows for us to harvest wood on steep slopes, brings into productivity an awful of wood which ten years ago simply was not available because we did not have either the wherewithal or the experience or the money to develop. Today we are having steep slope logging in many parts of Newfoundland. There is a lot of wood which is now available and which will become available over the next ten, twenty, and thirty years.

Considering the things that we are doing, our new forest management programme, silviculture money, our money for forest protection, the experimentation that we are doing with different types of species, the experimentation we are doing with new types of harvesting equipment, we are convinced, Mr. Speaker, that the

MR. POWER: long-term viability of the Grand Falls mill and the Stephenville and Corner Brook mills, and we look forward to thirty or forty or fifty years down the road of having more mills in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: A final supplementy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): A final supplementary. The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the minister that there seems to be some conflict between what he is saying and what the Commission is saying. According to the Commission, the Abitibi-Price mill in Stephenville does not yet have assigned timber limits. And the Commission also goes on to point out that the timber limits to be assigned to Abitibi-Price for Stephenville will likely be taken from Crown lands in the Province, particularly from Zone I, I believe, Management Zone I.

Could the minister indicate where specifically in Zone I those timber supplies are coming from? And could he also tell us perhaps what effect that itself will have on the Grand Falls mill in regards to the wood supply?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forests Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, in our agreement with Abitibi-Price as it relates to reopening of and the changing, of course, from a linerboard mill in Stephenville to a newsprint operation, we did make available to Abitibi-Price, we did guarantee them as a part of government's commitment, a twenty year wood supply. Government has not changed in that commitment. We have guaranteed them in

MR. POWER: negotiations and discussions only very recently the fact that they are going to have a guaranteed wood supply for twenty years. And we look forward, Mr. Speaker, in putting into place the management plans that we have to make sure that there is wood available. Now the wood that we are talking about in the rationalization of timber limits between Grand Falls and Stephenville, which are between the same company, and possibilities of rationalization between Bowaters, which has a larger block of land to deal with and only has one mill, albeit a larger mill than the Stephenville or Grand Falls mill individually, but either way the rationalizations that have taken place between Grand Falls, and they had to happen, between Grand Falls and Stephenville are continuing to happen. We are convinced, and we have talked to Abitibi-Price as recently as last week, that there is an adequate supply of wood for both the Grand Falls and Stephenville mills.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms): There is time for one final question.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker,

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

MR. HODDER: A supplementary. I picked this particular item up in a Mainland newspaper where the minister said that the Abitibi-Price mill was having trouble securing a long-term supply of wood for the Stephenville mill. And also that if it does not receive a staple supply of wood that it might be okay for the first few years, but there was some doubt about its future. I would ask the minister if this is so. If it is so, why was it that we signed an agreement with Abitibi-Price?

MR. HODDER: And does the minister realize that this particular mill that has just come on stream and is trying to compete with mills in other parts of North America, that this particular statement in the Mainland press right across Canada was very, very damaging to the Abitibi-Price mill in Stephenville?

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): The hon. Minister of Forests Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. member has not read the Abitibi-Price agreement which relates to the important industry in Stephenville. The agreement between government and Abitibi-Price guarantees Abitibi-Price a wood supply for twenty years. Anyone who knows the forest industry in Newfoundland, especially the West Coast, and the infestation of the budworm, knows that there is going to be damages and difficult to recur the losses that have taken place in the short-term—when I say short-term in the forest industry, twenty to forty years—is a difficult period for the Abitibi mill in Stephenville. Abitibi-Price knows that, and the persons who manage the forest resources know that.

Now Abitibi-Price has had difficulty this Spring, for instance, in getting enough wood stockpiled to open the mill in mid-April. But

MR. POWER: those types of things are based upon weather conditions, and upon the nature of the forest industry this Winter, which is unique this year and not going to happen every year.

Certainly, Mr. Speaker, we have guaranteed Abitibi-Price, in our agreement with them, a long-term supply of wood, for twenty years guaranteed, which we are convinced is there. We are convinced of the stability there. Abitibi-Price and us both know, as government, as managers, that there is going to be some difficulty and some short falls in a twenty to forty year period.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
The time for Oral

Questions has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I should like to table, because I was asked a question on it in Question Period, the replies to Mr. Mayo, and the telegram I sent him to substantiate my statements that I did respond to him promptly on his request.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Charlottetown, in the district of Eagle River. I take great pleasure in presenting this petition, and I regret to say that I am not too pleased, basically, by the results of this petition so far. The prayer of the petition reads: "We the residents of Charlottetown, in the district of Eagle River, hereby petition the House

MR. HISCOCK: of Assembly of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. We ask the House of Assembly to make sure that Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation becomes responsible for administering the Rural Residential Rehabilitation Assistance programme"-commonly called RRAP.

"We also implore the House of Assembly to make sure that there are local offices set up at Cartwright, Port Hope Simpson and Mary's Harbour. We have some of the worst housing conditions in Newfoundland and Labrador, and all of Canada. This area has been designated as a rural residential rehabilitation assistance programme area by the federal government since last year, and we still do not have this programme in operation. We call upon the federal and provincial governments to co-operate in this problem and properly implement this programme immediately."

Mr. Speaker, this is a extremely important petition. Because the fishing has failed on the Labrador for the past several years, residents from Red Bay to Paradise River have to maintain two houses - not only two houses, but they have to maintain their fishing boats, their ski-doos. It has been proven that they pay the highest cost for electricity in Canada, it has also been proven that they pay the highest cost for food in Canada. And here we have a programme that was designated by the federal government for this area and we still, after a year's operation, do not have this programme in operation on the coast.

It is a problem between Canada and Central Mortgaging and Housing and the Department of Municipal Affairs and Newfoundland

MR. HISCOCK:

and Labrador

Housing Corporation. We need this programme in effect and if it does not come into effect within the next couple of weeks, what is going to happen is the break-up is going to come and we will not be able to get inspectors in, we will not be able to have local people come out for this programme.

I have given

Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation the names of people who are qualified to do this job. I have also given them to Central Mortgage and Housing. If we do not have this programme in operation soon, what is going to happen is that all the residents of Charlottetown, as well as all the other residents in Lodge Bay to Paradise River, will be moving out to their Summer stations and another year - two years-will be lost in implementing this programme. It is a total disgrace to the bureaucracy, it is a total disgrace to the confrontational situation that has existed between the federal and the provincial governments and this has permeated not only by the level of politics, but it is also gone down to the level of other bureaucrats.

Mr. Speaker, I, as

the member for this district feel that the people in my district are being used in the manipulation of critical points and as I have said, I feel very, very strongly about this. I support this petition one hundred per cent and I ask that this government do all they can to implement this programme immediately. Here we have a programme where you can get \$3,500 back as a grant, a grant that the people of the area do not have to pay. Mr. Speaker, this government, through the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing have commissioned a study on these coastal communities

MR. E. HISCOCK:

and this study has pointed out that the worst housing in Newfoundland and Labrador is in this area. The Premier referred to it himself as the Twilight Zone.

So, Mr. Speaker, not to keep this House any longer, I ask the House to support this petition and that we get this programme underway immediately, and if we do not get it underway immediately we are going to lose another year.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to respond for a few moments to some of the comments made by the hon. member. First of all, he is directing his petition and his remarks to the wrong government. Again, this is a federal government programme in which the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation are a delivery agent of the federal programme. As were the anti-poverty organization, Mr. Speaker, on the Northern Peninsula who recently were taken - the programme was recently taken away from them by the federal government. Central Mortgage and Housing are now setting up their own agencies to deliver this programme. The hon. gentleman mentioned that that area of the whole Province is designated as a Rural RRAP area, indeed it is. The problem is the federal government has never made enough funding available to actually put into effect, to implement the programme in this area.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) half a million dollars were sent back to Ottawa

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Cosgrove, the federal minister responsible for CMHC, in an address to the HUDAC conference in Montreal, which I attended about a month ago, made very much in his remarks about the federal government policy of increasing funding for rehabilitation programmes, rehabilitation of housing, upgrading of older housing and so forth. That was what was the main thrust of his argument.

MR. J. HODDER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is debating. He can address -

AN HON. MEMBER: Support.

MR. J. HODDER: He can support the petition but he is not allowed under the rules to debate.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, all the hon. minister is doing is commenting on the petition. The petition related to the establishment of offices in Labrador, to the responsibility of the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation with respect to the delivery of Rural RRAP. And the minister is getting up and certainly he is supporting the petition for the delivery of Rural RRAP to the communities in Labrador, but he is also pointing out certain items and making comments on statements made by the hon. member when he introduced his petition.

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of order, it gives an opportunity to comment on something that has been a bit of concern to me lately in any event. On numerous occasions in the past, members have been reminded of the Standing Orders which require that they confine themselves in presenting petitions to the statement of the parties petitioning, the number of signatures and the material allegations of the petition. Standing Order 97 reinforces Standing Order 92 in stating, "There shall be no debate." Notwithstanding Standing Orders, a custom has arisen, I think it is fair to say, in our House of Assembly where members do make extended comments on the petition. This might be regarded as a matter

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): of courtesy extended by hon. members to one another.

I would simply remind members that this practice is not sanctioned by any particular rule, that the five minute limit is a maximum, not a minimum, and that when members tend to stray from the statement of the petitioners' grievances into the area of debate, in other words, begin to abuse the courtesy afforded to them by other hon. members, then the Chair will intervene at that time.

The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. M. WINDSOR: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

By way of clarification, I certainly do support the need for this programme being expanded to include not only Southern Labrador but all of Labrador and, indeed, the whole of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, as was designated. All we need is the sufficient amount of funding, and this is what I am trying to point out, that the funding has not been made available by the federal government. And in spite of the fact that Mr. Cosgrove stood up in Montreal and the main thrust of his address to the housing conference at that point in time was that the federal government were going to put emphasis on providing funding for rehabilitation of housing, a few days later we received notification that something like 40 per cent of the allocation that we had requested for this year has been reduced by the federal government and we are, indeed, getting less funding.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition presented by my colleague, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) on behalf of the residents of Charlottetown, Paradise River, I believe and the Lodge Bay area.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I never thought I would live long enough in this hon. House to hear a group of people petition for a programme that was already implemented by the Government of Canada through which the provincial government act as agents of the Government of Canada, the funding made available and the agents who undertook to implement the programme not carrying out the responsibility,

MR. NEARY: because that is what has happened in this case, Mr. Speaker. The provincial governments right across Canada are the agents in this particular case. They undertook, Mr. Speaker, to implement the programme on behalf of the Government of Canada. And as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, last year \$2.5 million was returned in 1979, \$2.5 million returned under RRAP - I do not know how much last year, 1980 - \$2.5 million unused.

MR. WINDSOR: Not true, not true!

MR. NEARY: And the people down in Eagle River -

MR. WINDSOR: How much was returned from other provinces unused?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not interrupt the hon. gentleman when he was supporting - I am not sure if he was supporting the petition or not. But I support the petition, Mr. Speaker. I do not think we need an anti-poverty organization to come in and run the programme.

We have the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - and I believe that they should immediately tackle this job of implementing the programme in the district of Eagle River. I think it is shameful that the federal government has made the funding available and the provincial government are not taking advantage of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Further petitions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Fire Prevention Act," carried. (Bill No. 5).

On motion, Bill No. 5, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, second reading of a bill,
"An Act To Provide For The Protection Of The Forests Of
The Province From Insects And Disease," (Bill No. 54).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I believe debate was adjourned
the last time by the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I had just
about finished my comments. If I could just briefly
summarize: Government accepts that nobody likes the idea
of having a chemical spray, whatever the testimony of the
so-called experts as to the fact that it will not adversely
affect humans. I believe that in all cases people just do
not know in this type of situation what the long-term
effects are going to be. So it is a very serious matter
to contemplate the use of chemical spray in our forests.
But when we have the best evidence possible after years of
public debate, after input from everybody, including hon.
members opposite, and we see that the conclusion is that
the forest industry is going to be wiped out in this
Province, that there are going to be thousands of jobs
lost to our loggers, to the workers in our pulp and paper
industry, the hardship that that entails, the unemployment,
the conclusions of the medical committee indicating that
medically the long-term effects are likely to be worse
because of the unemployment and the poor nutrition and so
forth that follows from lack of income than would result
from the chemical spray, the hard choice is that it is a
question: Do we spray or do we let the forest industry
go under? The forest industry has been wiped out in
Cape Breton. It is not just a theoretical matter we are
talking about here. If you look at Cape Breton, if you
speak to the Government of Nova Scotia, you will see that
the forest industry has been destroyed in Cape Breton.

MR. BARRY: Now, do we want to see the same thing happen on the Island portion of our Province? No. We have no choice; hard choice though it may be, we have to spray.

Now, once that decision has been made, despite the opposition of the Opposition, despite members opposite saying, 'No, we do not believe in spraying,' once government has made the decision -

AN HON. MEMBER: We did not say that.

MR. BARRY: It is documented in Hansard, Mr. Speaker. We now have members opposite not having the courage to accept the fact that spraying is necessary. They are trying to frustrate a spray programme indirectly. How are they doing that, Mr. Speaker? They are doing that by trying to encourage protest groups - and there are a lot of people who will have sincere convictions, reasons to oppose spraying -

MR. L. BARRY:

but the Opposition are trying to encourage - the Opposition and the protest groups are trying to make sure that we, as a government, do not take action to see that the spraying decision can be implemented. The decision has been made; it is necessary to spray as much as we do not like it. And there is an indication that without the amendment that is before us, without the legislation that is before us - it does not take away the right of individuals to go to the courts, to seek the protection of the courts; it merely takes away or makes clear that there is no right to an injunction. Now, there is no right to an injunction against government in any event. So all that is clarified here is that if there are contractors retained by government to become involved in the spray programme, that an injunction cannot be obtained to stop the spray programme.

MR. STIRLING:

Or any other action that the minister may want.

MR. BARRY:

An action for damages exists, and there is no taking away of an action for damages. But, Mr. Speaker, what is being established here, and it probably already exists as we see in the notes of this bill, it probably already exists, that the law at present says that there is no injunctive relief, an injunction cannot be obtained against government, a injunction probably cannot be obtained against agents of government; but just to make it absolutely clear this legislation is being passed to take away the right to injunction without proof of damage. As the minister has said, there will be an amendment proposed at the committee stage, modification, where in the event that there is clear proof of damage, then there may be an injunction obtainable. But for somebody to go in and state that the mere fact of a spray falling on a piece of ground that that person owns, without any proof that there is going to be any damage, while an injunction could possibly be obtainable and could delay matters for three weeks or so,

MR. BARRY: and that would totally frustrate a spray programme. An injunction just being obtained for a matter of weeks could totally frustrate and stop the spray programme. Because the spray must be applied, it must be applied within this very short period of time when the larvae are in the stage where they can be hit by the chemical spray. And three weeks later, three weeks earlier, the spray may be totally ineffective.

And, Mr. Speaker, the Opposition does not have the courage to come out and say that they are still against spray. And what they are trying to do is, indirectly, by the backdoor, oppose the decision to protect the forest industry of this Province, oppose the decision to protect the jobs of loggers, oppose the decision to protect the jobs of the people in Corner Brook and the people in Grand Falls, and the people in Stephenville.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Butt): Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: The minister now knows what he is saying is not true, that the position of this Party is to protect those jobs. And he has gotten away from the bill. The bill has nothing to do with this, The bill has to do with giving the minister the authority to do whatever he wants to do, including spray- that is what the bill is all about and that is what the debate should be all about - giving the minister the authority to do whatever he wants to do, and that the government feels that an individual should not be given the right to go to court to try to prevent damage.

The minister is knowingly misrepresenting the view of this Party on this side of the House and he knows that.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Butt): To the point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: That is no point of order, Mr. Speaker. As has been pointed out before by Your Honour and other occupants of the Chair, persons rising on spurious points of order from time to time can really in effect cause disorder in the House.

The hon. gentleman, in effect, the nature of his complaint is that he disagrees with what the hon. minister has said. Now the format of the House is that anyone who disagrees with something that is said by a member has the opportunity in the debate to reply, and that is the time he replies. And when the hon. gentleman rises on a point of order like this, he is transgressing on the time allotted to the hon. member himself and

MR. MARSHALL:

is consequently, when getting up on a point of order like that, himself very much out of order and contrary to the rules and the way in which this House is supposed to operate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To that point of order, I would have to rule there is no point of order but obviously just a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I must thank the Leader of the Opposition, though, for again confirming 'Barry's theorem, 'Barry's' theorem, as you might recall, Mr. Speaker, being that the closer you get to the truth, the closer you get to the point, the closer you get to revealing the fallacy and the destructiveness of policies put forth by members opposite, then the more likely you are to have them rise on points of order. Mr. Speaker, again we have seen that established, that when we get to the point of our concern about the Opposition policy, when we get to point out to the people of this Province that the Opposition are against protecting the forest industry of this Province-

MR. L. STIRLING: Point of order.

MR. L. BARRY: -are against protecting the jobs-

MR. L. STIRLING: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order please!

MR. L. BARRY: -of the people of Grand Falls, Corner Brook and Stephenville.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, people on the other side of the House who feel that they can use the protection of the Chair and the rules of this House to misstate positions and they get reported in that order, and therefore, Mr. Speaker, for as long as anyone on the other side of the House gets up to misstate the position of this party, we will have to use the rules of this House namely points of order to clarify the position on this side of the House. And we will continue to do that, Mr. Speaker. The minister is saying what he knows is not true and he is trying to misstate and cause a deliberate attempt Mr. Speaker, to cause us to sit and allow him to continue to state the party position which he knows is not correct. He knows that on this side of the House we have equal and maybe ten times the concern as people on that side of the House and that is why we are opposing this bill, Mr. Speaker, because it takes away a right, an individual right, and that is what he should be debating, this bill.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have to rise again on the same point of order and I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, page 103, Paragraph 317 that I will read for the edification of the hon. leader.

"If a member desires to ask a question during debate, he must first obtain the consent of the member who is speaking. If the latter ignores the request, the former cannot insist, even if

MR. MARSHALL: he thinks he is being misrepresented. He cannot make a denial during the speech, but he must wait until the member has resumed his seat and then he may ask leave to make a statement, or he must wait until his turn comes to address the House." Now the rule, Mr. Speaker, is plain and if an individual in this House gets up when somebody else is speaking at every sentence and feels, because he disagrees with one or two words in the sentence that he can interrupt, Your Honour, you are going to have nothing but chaos in the House itself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Now, the hon. gentleman has plenty of opportunities to put his position before the House, but he has not the opportunity to do it when a member is speaking. He is clearly contrary to the rules and I must ask Your Honour to draw him to order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! I think I have heard enough debate to rule on this point of order. Once again there is obviously no point of order, but the hon. the Leader of the Opposition took the opportunity to clarify remarks attributed to him or the party which he represents. However, I would also like to point out, as was clearly pointed out by the hon. the President of the Council, that the Chair cannot tolerate any hon. member to rise on its spurious points of order. The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy has about two minutes to conclude his remarks.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I suppose a little historical aside should be noted here. When

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Hitler and Mr. Mussolini were making their bids for power, the main strategy was to get out and to disrupt the political meetings of their opponents and to prevent free debate .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. BARRY: And if somebody disagreed with them, to get up and to interrupt and to forceably interrupt and to prevent that speaker from continuing on with the points that were being made. And, Mr. Speaker, we have had - again I must thank the Leader of the Opposition - we have had a clear statement of intent from the Leader of the Opposition that his tactic and the tactic of the Liberal Party of this Province will be a Fascist tactic. The Fascist tactic of interrupting -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY: -a speaker whenever they happen -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. L. BARRY: -to disagree with the speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) rose on a point of order, I believe.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I think whatever standard you are using for that side also applies to this side -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: - and I would suggest that Fascist is not a parliamentary expression and I would ask the Minister, whom I recognize as an expert on Hitler, Fascism, and all that sort of thing - I recognize his expertise - but I ask him to withdraw that remark.

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: If we might get something clear here, there is nothing unparliamentary, there is nothing contrary to the rules of this House to use an accepted political label to describe a political philosophy or doctrine.

Now, members opposite can get up, when their turns for debate arise, and deny that they are Fascists, deny that they believe in interrupting people who are participating in the democratic process. But, Mr. Speaker, if you were to check your Oxford Dictionary, or if you were to check your American dictionaries, you would find that Fascism -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - you would find that Fascist and Fascism is a legitimate description for a particular political philosophy.

MR. NEARY: It is not.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, it is not being used in the pejorative sense; it is being used in a factual sense to describe a particular political philosophy which was exemplified by the Leader of the Opposition's interruption.

MR. HODDER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. That member -

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please'

MR. HODDER: - can stand up -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: - as much as he wants -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: - and say what he wants.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: But if Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. HODDER: - would pay attention to his Beauchesne -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Sit down 'Jim'.

MR. HODDER: Do I not have the right, Mr. Speaker, to respond to that point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: Of course the hon. member has the right, as soon as the Chair recognizes him. The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if that hon. minister can get up and make the type of speech that he just made in the face of when he is totally, absolutely wrong - if Mr. Speaker would look at his Beauchesne, page 109, he would see that when the minister spoke of Fascism, his argument that a recognized political party, you could call it that, it says here, Mr. Speaker, in Beauchesne that Nazi is not a -

MR. BARRY:

Nazi

is an attitude.

MR. HODDER:

- that Nazi was a

political party, Mr. Speaker, that Mussolini or Canadian Mussolini cannot be used in referring to other members. I submit, Mr. Speaker, as well that when we are called a group of Fascists here, that that as well would come into line with Mussolini or - that is page 109, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

To that point of order:

I will reserve ruling on it. I will check Hansard and find out what the hon. minister - how he attributed those remarks as Fascist or what have you.

MR. NEARY:

Your time is up now.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. minister's

time has expired.

The hon. the member for

Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F.B. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, I thought

all the violent turbulence had settled down last week when the Minister of Mines and Energy was speaking, but he decided to keep it up again to day and I must say I was rather disappointed in the Minister of Mines and Energy.

Mr. Speaker, the

Minister of Mines and Energy had no foundation in fact or fiction to suggest that any member of the Opposition is against the spray programme, not one single fact to support his contention that any member of the Opposition is against the forests of this Province, or the protection of the forests, as he stated. That is utterly false. He even stretched it as far as to suggest that we were against the welfare of the people of Corner Brook, Grand

MR. F.B. ROWE: Falls and Stephenville,
which is stretching the truth, I would suggest, Mr.
Speaker.

And he talked about the
courage- or the lack of courage of the Opposition or
Liberal Party. Well, let us talk about courage, Mr.
Speaker, let us indeed talk about courage. He said that
we did not have the courage to support the spray
programme in this Province. Mr. Speaker, that is false
to start off with. We are talking about Bill 54, and we
will get back to that later. Because it has nothing to
do with spraying in this Province, Bill 54. But let us
get back to courage, Mr. Speaker, let us get back to
courage and let us see who had courage.

Hon. members may

remember well that

MR. F. ROWE: in 1978, Mr. Speaker, the government decided to spray this Province fairly heavily with matacil, against the wishes of many groups in this Province. They had that courage, Mr. Speaker, what tremendous courage in 1978 they had, to go ahead and spray this Province with matacil. Then in 1979, -let us look at the courage of this administration, Mr. Speaker, in 1979, Mr. Speaker, when this administration knew that they were going to have an election that Summer, June of '79, what did the administration decide in 1979? They gutsed out completely, Mr. Speaker. They lost their great courage and they decided, not for any scientific reasons, not for any philisophical reasons, not because of any Royal Commissions or reports they were presented with, not by any scientific studies or new facts or data, but in 1979 this courageous administration, Mr. Speaker, decided to drop their spray programme for one single reason - because they were afraid, Mr. Speaker, that the public reaction would be too great in this Province and that they would have the ill effects of that brought to the full force during an election campaign.

So, so much for great courage, Mr. Speaker. In 1981, now that they are back in power, Mr. Speaker, we once again see this great courage coming to the forefront. No election this year, Mr. Speaker, not even a possibility, by the looks of it, of the Bellevue by-election, but certainly no general election this year, Mr. Speaker, and once again we see the courage of this great administration coming to the forefront. They, once again, as the election is over, have the great courage, Mr. Speaker, to re-institute the spray programme in this Province, Based upon what, Mr. Speaker? How come this year - Why not last year? Why not '79? Why '78? Because, Mr. Speaker, I submit to Your Honour that if there is anybody on any side of this House who lacks courage, it is the administration opposite.

MR. F. ROWE: If they had any conviction in '78 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: - they should have had it in '79,
Mr. Speaker, But oh, no! A simple little election cancelled out
their great courage and their great philosophy and their great
principles.

MR. H. BARRETT: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. member for St. John's -
whatever he represents will have the honour of speaking.

MR. WARREN: DAC. DAC. He represents DAC.

MR. H. BARRETT: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: If the hon. member wants to speak he
will get his half hour to speak. And I would like the hon. mem-
ber for St. John's to voice his opinions on the forced protection
of the St. John's area.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. the
Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry) wants to get up in this
House and accuse the Liberal Opposition of lacking in courage,
he better look a little bit inward at the actions of himself,
his own cabinet, his own administration and every single member
sitting opposite. If there is anybody lacking courage, Mr.
Speaker, it was the spineless administration opposite who did
not have the courage of their convictions to continue on with
their spray programme in '78 during an election campaign.

MR. F. STAGG: (Inaudible).
The hon. member for Stephenville

MR. F. ROWE:
(F. Stagg) can look in Beausheue all he likes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker,

March 12, 1981

Tape No. 331

EL - 3

MR. STAGG:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

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

MR. STAGG:

Mr. Speaker, in Beauchesne, page 110, 'spineless' is unparliamentary.

MR. ROWE:

I withdraw, Mr. Speaker, with a great apology.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has withdrawn.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, I withdraw, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, this bill-to spray or not to spray is not the question. It is as simple as that. We did not need this bill to spray in '77, we did not need this bill to spray in '78, we did not need this bill or the lack of it to stop the spray in '79. We did not need the bill if we decided to spray in '78 - '80,

MR. F. ROWE: I am sorry - and we certainly do not need this bill to spray in 1981. Mr. Speaker, this government sprays whenever it feels like it. The record speaks for itself.

MR. TULK: One year in five.

MR. F. ROWE: So this bill has nothing to do as to whether or not the government has the right or has any intention to spray. They have sprayed without this bill. They have cancelled the spray with or without this bill. And now they are coming in on the basis of a Royal Commission report, which is a well-done report, I might add, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Look, if the hon. member is concerned about my health, Mr. Speaker, I will admit to him that I am tightening my belt because I had oral surgery four weeks ago, five weeks ago, and I spent four weeks on a liquid diet, soup and juices only, and I happened to lose a bit of weight, and I am now tightening my belt, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Butt): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish the hon. member -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: - would have suffered the same fate for the last four weeks of not being able to speak, and that would happen to him the next four weeks.

MR. HANCOCK: It would have killed him.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member looks better but he does not sound any better.

MR. F. ROWE: No. I would not expect that I would to the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). He does not look any better.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this administration had the great courage now to reintroduce the spray programme based on the principles and the recommendations contained in this Royal Commission on Forest Protection and Management report, written by three notable citizens of this Province, and it is an excellent report, Mr. Speaker. But the only thing this report does, Mr. Speaker, is that it puts in writing and for publication, facts and figures that this administration were aware of in 1978 and 1979. All of this information was known to the administration and to the Cabinet and to government members and members on this side in 1978 and 1979. It was known to them. So I ask the basic question; why did they cancel the spray programme in 1979 and wait until 1981 to reintroduce the programme?

I think the facts speak for themselves, Mr. Speaker, They did not have the courage to spray in 1979 because of the provincial election, and they have the great courage now, using this Royal Commission report as the excuse, and if necessary, Mr. Speaker, if the public resentment is great enough and strong enough, I would submit that they would use this Royal Commission report as the scapegoat for the introduction - and if anything went wrong with it - for the introduction of the spray programme.

As excellent as this is, Mr. Speaker, this report, it was set up solely to lift the government out of trouble, give them a crutch, and an excuse, and a reason for reintroducing the spray programme. It is as simple as

MR. F. ROWE: that. And it was totally unnecessary, Mr. Speaker. Totally unnecessary. Although it is a good report, it was not necessary for this administration to introduce the spray programme.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at spraying, which has nothing to do with this bill except coincidentally, because, I repeat, Mr. Speaker, this government sprays whenever it likes, sprays what and when it likes, as history has shown. But let us look at the situation with respect to spraying. Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to the coin here; there is the environment, and by the environment we are talking about human beings, vegetation, animals in the forest, lakes and streams, the bogs, the air, what have you. There is the protection of the environment to be considered. And having been a science teacher in schools, and having taught science at the University, I am well aware of the problems associated with any insecticide that is sprayed in this Province. We simply do not know the long-term effects of chemicals on the forests, on the animals, on the shrubbery,

MR. F. ROWE: on the streams, in the air, in the what you might call sub-animals, we simply do not know the long-term effects. So there is every right, Mr. Speaker, for certain groups in the Province to be deeply concerned and upset about the spray programme, because we simply do not know what the environmental effects of a spray programme may be in the long or short run. But what we do know, Mr. Speaker - and this is where it is easy for people to make a decision and where it is easy for me to make a decision and for my colleagues to make a decision - we know one fact certain, that if the forests are not sprayed they will be destroyed by the spruce budworm. The forests will be destroyed in this Province, hundreds of jobs will be lost, forest fires will start, mills will close down, all the spinoff jobs will cease to exist and we would have an economic disaster in this Province if we did not spray. That is fact certain, Mr. Speaker. We know that. It is simple, it is true. So it is easy for all hon. members in this House, every one of which on this side so far have come to the conclusion that a spray programme is necessary. And let it not be said that we are against spraying for the protection of the forests of this Province. We reluctantly agree with the spray programme.

MR. STAGG: I guess the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) will resign.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the difference between a P.C. and a Liberal. We have the capability of changing our minds with changing data and changing evidence, and changing with the times.

But to repeat, Mr. Speaker, we know one fact, that if we do not spray the forests of this Province, they are doomed to destruction by the spruce budworm - thousands of jobs out the window, hundreds of

MR. F. ROWE: thousands of dollars lost, mills closing down, spinoff jobs gone down the tube. The choice is easy, Mr. Speaker, we have to spray. But there is an unknown factor, Mr. Speaker. What are the short-term and long-term effects of matacil and/or any other chemical on the forests, indeed, the shrubbery, indeed, the air, the water, the land, the people, the animals, the insects? What are the long-term effects? We do not know, Mr. Speaker. So are we to get back to this bill now, which is why we are against this bill, one of the reasons why we are against the bill, which has nothing to do with spraying directly - the government can spray when it feels like it. It sprayed in 1977 and 1978 when it did not have this bill.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member is spraying all over the place now.

MR. F. ROWE: I wish the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) were under the spray.

MR. NEARY: No, no, we do not wish any harm.

MR. F. ROWE: My spray, he is talking about.

MR. NEARY: Your spray - oh.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, this is why we have to argue against this bill, because the unknown factor is what are the long-term effects or the short-term effects upon the total environment. It is unknown. And this bill says that any group that might have some knowledge of chemistry and the environment and biology and who see that something is going wrong with respect to the spray programme - which is not necessarily government, it could be a private contractor who is now classified as a Crown agency, can be out there spraying helter-skelter - it comes to the attention of environmentalists and chemists

March 12, 1981

Tape 333

EC - 3

MR. F. ROWE: and biologists and doctors and
dentists and other people interested in the environment
that something is going to be drastically wrong and they

MR. F. ROWE: do not have the right to an injunction. Is that correct, Mr. Speaker? Now I understand, Mr. Speaker, the necessity, I understand that there is a short time in which you can spray the forest of this Province, there is a limited time as the spray has to be introduced in order to catch that thing, that spruce budworm.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two weeks.

MR. F. ROWE: Two weeks, the hon. member informs me. But, Mr. Speaker, the unknown factor, the great danger of total obliteration of our shrubbery, or of our woodlands, or of our forests, or of our waters and lakes and rivers and the animals in them, is still a possibility. And this bill says that if this comes to attention, or if a certain group comes to the conclusion that that is so, they do not have a right to an injunction. But they can go to court, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) says. Sure they can go to court, Mr. Speaker, just like the hon. member is trying to go to court about the offshore oil and gas, about the transmission of power. We will talk about how long it takes things to get settled in court, Mr. Speaker. They have not even got it to court yet, let alone get a settlement on it. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that there are environmentalists, biologists, medical people and what have you who may - I am not saying will - who may, could conceivably discover that this could be a great tragedy because the effects of spraying are unknown in the short and long run.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, so we leave it in the hands of a bunch of private contractors under the watchful eye of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power). Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not taking any personal shots at the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, I hope that he is going to make the right decisions, but this bill takes the major decisions respecting such

MR. F. ROWE: programmes out of the broad responsibility of a Cabinet and places it in the little hands of a minister. Now do not tell me, Mr. Speaker, that individuals are not capable of making a gravest error when it comes to the ecology of this Province. I submit that this bill is giving the minister too much power, Mr. Speaker, it is taking out of the hands of the Cabinet. One could quite easily argue for placing these kinds of decisions in the hands of the members of the House of Assembly, because I go back to my original point; we are dealing with an unknown factor and that is the actual effects in the long run and possibly the short run of chemical spraying.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROWE: It is a very serious situation, Mr. Speaker, extremely serious. I am not going to get into the civil liberties bit.

MR. STAGG: You do not agree with that philosophy anyway.

MR. ROWE: No, it is not that, I cannot get worked up about it, Some of my hon. colleagues on both sides can get terribly worked up about it. I believe in civil liberties, but there is more to it than the right of a person to kick up a racket, that is the way hon. members are looking at it over there. They have managed to manoeuvre it and shape it to think that civil liberties are represented by a bunch of characters out there with long hair, unshaven and kicking up a stink.

AN HON. MEMBER: They only think that.

MR. ROWE: That is not civil lib-

MR. STAGG: Libertorians.

MR. ROWE: I cannot get that one out because of my jaw, Mr. Speaker - because of civil liberties -

MR. NEARY: They only think they have

(inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: - that is not it. We are talking about a group of people who are knowledgeable of the environment, the chemistry on that environment, who are very disturbed about the possibility of something happening being rejected, their rights being taken away to stop it before a tragedy happens. That is what we are talking about. And for the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) to suggest that this can be taken care of by the courts, that is like, Mr. Speaker, well, they are going to court after the damage is done. It is as simple as that.

MR. STIRLING: That does not apply only to the spray programme. It applies to anything that the minister wants.

MR. F. ROWE: That is right, Well, of course,

It applies to anything that the minister wants to do relating to the protection of the forests of the Province from insects and disease.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) they want to start a forest fire.

MR. ROWE: That is kind of a stretched out or extreme example to prove the point. There is simply too much power being placed in the hands of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (C. Power). It is as simple as that, Mr. Speaker. And taking away the rights of people in the know to seek a writ of injunction against the activities of a group of private contractors being put under a Crown agency for their protection is completely unacceptable.

MR. THOMS: They are protecting all their buddies who pay into the Tory coffers.

MR. ROWE: Which leads me to the basic question, Mr. Speaker: Nobody on the opposite side has addressed themselves extensively to the monitoring programme that will be implemented when this spray programme is activated. Now, if we are to stop certain people from seeking the right of injunction to basically protect the environment of this Province and the animals, and the rivers and streams and lakes and air and land and shrubbery and what have you, if they are to be stopped, if they have to give up their right to protect a tragedy from happening environmentally, what has the government done to set up a monitoring programme that will protect the environment against the possible wild behavior of a bunch of private contractors hiding under the protection of a Crown agency? What monitoring?

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, one of the principle recommendations by the Royal Commission on

MR. ROWE: Forest Protection and Management recommends a monitoring programme. I am looking for it. I cannot find it. One of the recommendations does recommend a monitoring programme. For example, Recommendation 13, 'A contingency plan' - this is recommended, 'A contingency plan to prevent or to contain with any mishaps to personnel or aircraft on the ground or in the air be required before a permit is issued. The contingency plan should be tested in a simulated exercise to encourage that personnel ensure that personned are familiar with it.'

This recommendation, Mr. Speaker, on second look at it, is a contingency plan to protect or contend with any mishap to personned or aircraft. What about the environment itself, Mr. Speaker? What about the people under these flying aircraft? What about the animals and the fish in the rivers and on the land under the spray programme? What monitoring is going to be done? We have not heard from members opposite, Mr. Speaker, we have not heard any description of what Recommendation 11 calls for.

MR. HISCOCK: Right on.

MR. ROWE: Environmental monitoring, Recommendation number 11, Mr. Speaker. "Environmental monitoring of forest spraying operations be continued and that the environmental monitoring committee established in '77 be reactivated to plan and direct a comprehensive environmental programme. Consideration should be given to the feasibility of initiating an air sampling project in and around spray buffer zones as part of investigations on insecticide drift. If environmental activities are conducted over a reasonable period of time, and if no important environmental concerns are identified, the programme should be reduced in scale."

MR. ROWE: Not one word, Mr. Speaker, from members opposite have I, at least, heard of the nature and the degree of the monitoring programme that is to be instituted as a result of the reactivation of the spray programme.

Now, we want to hear a little more detail, Mr. Speaker, because we have a new situation now. Mr. Speaker, we have a situation where a bunch of private contractors - and I have nothing against contractors, Mr. Speaker. All contractors, all business people are out to make an honest profit.

MR. F. ROWE: There are unforeseens in a spray programme. It is not unlikely that some contractors may lose their shirts or may see themselves losing their shirts during the spray programme. And I would submit that then being protected by the shield of a Crown agency is not a healthy one, Mr. Speaker. It could conceivably encourage, once these private contractors may see the possibility of losing some money or losing their shirts, of doing something during the spray programme, cutting back on certain little safety protections, cutting back on other standards that have been applied, that will do damage to the environment. And our so-called civil libertarians, the protectors of the environment, where do they stand? They do not have any rights, Mr. Speaker; they do not even have the right to an injunction but they would only have the right to go to the court after the damage is done. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that hon. members opposite should give serious consideration to that.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in closing I will reiterate that it is not this crowd over here who lacks courage, as stated by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). We are supporting a spray programme. We are against the dictatorial powers of this particular bill. It is hon. members opposite who lacked the courage, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, in 1979, when they scrapped the spray programme because they did not have the guts to conduct one during an election campaign. It is as simple as that.

MR. F. STAGG: Right.

MR. F. ROWE: The hon. member for Stephenville
(Mr. Stagg) agrees.

MR. TULK: And in 1980 when they did not want to take the shine off things.

MR. F. ROWE: And in 1980 they did not want too be blatant and bold and slap it right back in in the first month of their election, that Summer, so they waited a year hoping that things would smoothen over and that by this time they would have a nice white report -

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. F. ROWE: - a royal commission coming out Mr. Speaker, that would give the government the rationale for the go ahead. Gump, Mr. Speaker! This was unnecessary. It is a good report, it was not necessary. The government has shown that it sprays whenever it feels like it, it does not need this legislation. This legislation is only being brought in to give the minister certain powers that I rightfully feel he should not be given, any minister. It should be in the hands of at least the Cabinet, and I think it is pretty sad when certain people who are knowledgeable of the environment and the chemistry of the environment and the biology of the environment do not have the right of injunction when it comes to protecting the environment against hazards, the very deep hazards, because there are unknown factors in a spray programme.

So, Mr. Speaker, I for one, as a bit of an environmentalist and a biologist myself, knowing the hazards of it, the unknown factors, the unknown possibilities, I have to say, since I know what the effects of not spraying will be - that is, a complete disaster - and knowing that the effects of spraying could be a disaster, I have to vote for spraying as have all of my colleagues stated thus far as they have spoken.

But let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that we will not find ourselves in a position or situation during this coming Summer where we will see evidence that shows that spraying is as disastrous as, say, not spraying.

MR. F. ROWE: That is as simple as that. At this point in time I have to fall on the side of spraying. It is as simple as that -

MR. DINN: Are you coming over with us?

MR. F. ROWE: - but that has nothing to do with this bill.

MR. DINN: You are going to support the bill?

MR. F. ROWE: The bill has nothing to do with spraying. The hon. minister was not even in the House when I was talking about it. Mr. Speaker, did the hon. Minister of Forestry in his day, this was before he went to compensation, did he need this bill to spray the forests? The answer is 'N-o', No, he did not need this bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, for that reason I am against the principle of this bill -

MR. C. POWER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Here he goes now. We just got a new organism come into the House, Mr. Speaker, who did not hear what I had to say -

AN HON. MEMBER: Humanoid.

MR. F. ROWE: Humanoid organism. The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), I think I got him straightened out, but now I have to start all over again with the leave of the House to try to straighten out the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, for the sake of the Province and the people and the animals in it, if I can carry it that far, I do wish the minister luck in his spray programme, but I cannot see the need for him to bring in this particular bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the member for St. John's Centre.

DR. McNICHOLAS: Monsieur le President et mes chers amis distingue, En vue de notre cour de Francais, je decide de vous address en Francais. Aujordhui je parle de la tourdeuse.

I thought, Mr. Speaker, I would take this opportunity of introducing my remarks in French as an indication of my gratitude to the Speaker for the opportunity he is giving us on both sides to improve our French in the evening.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. McNICHOLAS: I am sure that la tourdeuse could not care less whether I speak in French or English, but we have had la tourdeuse around since the Ice Age and there is a competition between la tourdeuse and the forests that, from what I have read about the spruce budworm, is an ongoing thing that every fifty to seventy years the trees mature. They are attacked by la tourdeuse

DR. McNICHOLAS: and they are completely wiped out and will start again as seedlings. And surely, the whole purpose of this spraying programme is to break that cycle. As we know, there is roughly a fifth of the forests here in Newfoundland that are already dead or dying from the spruce budworm and I do not believe any responsible person would or could accept this condition getting worse.

Now, some members of the Opposition have said that the government did not have the courage to carry on this programme in 1979. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that the present government showed great courage in 1979. As you know well, there was a lot of agitation by environmentalists, and my own medical profession in 1978 appointed a special committee to look into the medical aspects and the hazards of a spray programme. But, Mr. Speaker, what did they come in with? I can tell you what they came in with. Their recommendations just sat on the fence. Their first recommendation was: "The Newfoundland Medical Association states that it is not opposed to the current short-term forest spray programme with aminocarb." Now, their second recommendation, they have certainly sat on the fence even more so. They said, "Any decision to conduct a forest aerial spray programme in the Province must be made by the provincial government, with whom, in the final analysis, the responsibility must remain."

Now, Mr. Speaker, in view of that report and reports of environmentalists, this government responded very soberly and correctly and they appointed a Royal Commission, and that is why we did not have a spray programme in 1979. We were waiting for their report, and their report was that we should spray.

Now, addressing this particular legislation, I think it has been said by members on both

March 12, 1981

Tape 337

EC - 3

DR. McNICHOLAS: sides that there is a critical phase in the spraying, that is about a ten-day period. If you do not spray during that period you might as well forget about it. And the reason for this legislation is in case some,

DR. MCNICHOLAS: you might call them crackpots or they might have the best intentions in the world, but if they get an injunction during that ten day period it means that we can forget about the programme for another year and there will be so much more of our forest destroyed.

We are talking about \$3 million or \$4 million . I think the present government and the minister are going to deal with this in a responsible way. Anybody who feels that they have suffered, the courts are still there for them to seek damages. And I am sure that the government will supervise the spray programme in a responsible way to safeguard our water supply, our health, and any other health hazard that might arise.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

By reading this legislation, the point that I am rather concerned with in this legislation is having to bring in this injunction is my main concern with the legislation, having to bring in an injunction to stop a group of people or a town council or any group who feels that it is in their constitutional civil libertarian rights. This government in its wisdom, or lack of wisdom I would suggest, have decided to bring in this piece of legislation that provides against having an injunction. I find it repugnant, I find it most alarming against a democratic process that we are used to in this country of Canada and the British Commonwealth.

I cannot understand why we did not have this in 1977, I cannot understand why we did not have it in 1978. The former speaker who stood up mentioned that back

MR. HISCOCK: in 1978 we had the study of the medical profession to recommend what should be done, and we were told they sat on the fence. Well, the government sprayed, they did not sit on the fence, they sprayed that year even though the medical profession was sitting on the fence.

MR. TULK: The doctors did not support long-term spraying.

MR. HISCOCK: But what did they do? And as the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) pointed out, the medical profession did give the agreement that it would be short-term, they would support spraying. But in 1979, did the government sit on the fence? Did they listen to the recommendation of the Medical Association? No, they did not. Just because they came back from a fresh election, and as it was pointed out in this, because of the environmentalists - I find what really is a little bit interesting now that we have this government that is so, so, so concerned, and so compassionate with regard to the individual rights of the citizens of this Province, that they turn around and say that they are going to spray, and not only are they going to spray but they are going to continue to spray on the long-term irregardless of the consequences.

I ask this House, Mr. Speaker, and we have the Premier who states that he is a great man of history -

MR. STAGG: The best man in Newfoundland.

MR. HISCOCK: - and maybe the best man in

Newfoundland. But how many years ago was it that the miners went down into the mines in St. Lawrence and the only safety or health precaution they had was their own lives. They had no government regulations.

MR. PATTERSON: That was the Liberal Government.

MR. HISCOCK: Does it matter what government it was? The main emphasis there was that we needed jobs, jobs at all cost, Mr. Speaker, jobs at the detriment of the health of the citizens of this Province. We cannot afford not to have jobs because we have high unemployment. We cannot afford to have disease, whether it comes fluorspar in St. Lawrence or the dust levels in Labrador City, or the asbestos in the drinking water down in Baie Verte, Mr. Speaker.

We find that we are in a Province, and in a civilization, Mr. Speaker, that, because we need to pay for our cost of living, because we need to live, we are now doing away and digging ourselves slowly, slowly into the grave because we need jobs that

MR. HISCOCK: we are a have-not Province or a Province that finds itself in a situation where we cannot have the luxury of closing the mine in Baie Verte because of the problems with environmentalists and pollution and that we cannot afford to turn around and close the mine or put pressure on the Iron Ore Company of Canada to upgrade it because, no, the Iron Ore Company of Canada will turn around and say, 'Well, we will close and we will go to Brazil,' which as larger mines, or Australia.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation now which is Catch 22, a situation where if we do not spray we are going to be out of jobs. If we do spray, we are told that these environmentalists, these misguided people, these crackpots - and one of the largest councils in the area, Gander, is made up of crackpots and environmentalists. And anybody who would want to get an injunction -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who said they were crackpots?

MR. HISCOCK: But, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: - to turn around and have a civilization where we are digging ourselves slowly into the grave does not say very much for the new 'Step Forward into the '80s.' It does not say very, very much about the quality of life. Not only about the quality of life, Mr. Speaker, but the arrogance. We heard this government say time and time again, 'the arrogance of the Prime Minister'. How arrogant can you get? - a government which turns around and will not even let its citizenry have their rightful right of due process of the law. Is it that they have no faith in the courts, that the courts cannot, themselves, decide who is misguided, who is serious when they bring this in and ask for an injunction?

MR. HISCOCK: Do the courts automatically give an injunction to anybody who comes forward and asks for an injunction? I would say no, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HANCOCK: That is what the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) would have you believe.

MR. HISCOCK: The President of the Council would like to believe that this Province is Tory. He would like for us to believe a lot of other things. But I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I do not follow the views of the President of the Council. He would also like to feel that the only persons who can speak for anybody in this Province now are the members on the government side. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation does not come back to haunt this administration just like the legislation that was brought in to open up the mines down in St. Lawrence came back to haunt the Liberal administration.

Also, now, we have problems with dust problems in Labrador City and down in Baie Verte. So, Mr. Speaker, surely, the Premier is always saying we must learn from our past. Well, we as Newfoundlanders are no longer going to follow the ways of the past, short-term gains. We are no longer after short-term gains.

Mr. Speaker, as was pointed out earlier with regard to the Year of the Disabled -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: If the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) wants to speak, then I will let him speak after I am finished. I would ask for the guidance and protection of the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I am rather concerned about this spraying but I also feel that as elected members we have to do certain things in this House from time to time that are not politically expedient, and that may include this spraying. We all know how important forest related jobs are to the economy. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this government, with regard to the environmentalists they called them a bunch of crackpots, did not have to go with this report, that if the government turned around and sprayed in 1977 and 1978, then they can spray again in 1979, 1980 and 1981, whatever. Mr. Speaker, I ask, why do we need this Fascist legislation? And I say Fascist legislation because anybody who denies the right of the population to their duly elected people, and not allow the people of this Province to express their constitutional rights. We hear the Premier talking about the constitutional rights and about the overlapping. We saw grand stand on the Labrador boundary which is not even in question in Labrador.

We have seen him with regard to the problems with denominational education as a constitutional right. But he does not turn around and say that he is taking away

MR. HISCOCK: the constitutional rights to go before the courts and ask for an injunction. Asking for an injunction, Mr. Speaker, is quite different from getting one. And I have faith in our courts and in our judges. Even though some of them may be political appointments from time to time, I still have more faith in them because once they are appointed I feel that they put themselves above politics.

But, Mr. Speaker, I find, as I said, this legislation extremely repugnant and I think that if the government had any wisdom they would take it down.

Another question I asked is why is it that they saddled the present Minister of Forestry (C. Power) with it? Is it because, now, only the Premier thinks he is the best in the Province? Is it that he wants to go on and have a legacy of thirty, forty, fifty years and that the best thing he can do now is destroy any opposition around him? Is it that he looks upon the Minister of Forestry as an up and coming young minister behind him, and he has to snuff him in the bud before he gets a chance, Mr. Speaker, the same way that he ended up trying to nip the Minister of Energy (L. Barry) with regard to taking the credit for the ERCO bill when the Minister of Mines and Energy had worked so hard on it. We see here, Mr. Speaker, a one man government, we see here a government that has been surrounded by elderly Cabinet Ministers of the former administration. And when we have a young and upcoming member of this House, and a credit to the House. what do we see? We see them bringing in, as I said, Facist legislation which is quite contrary to the intellect of the minister and I ask why is it that it was not brought in before? Why was it not brought in before?

MR. HISCOCK: And so, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this legislation, I am particularly concerned about it. And as the member from Trinity - Bay de Verde (F. Rowe) pointed out, this will be carried out by private operators and if the private operators, for various reasons, decide not that they are going to lose their shirts but, take it to the other extreme, they want to make a quick buck, they can turn around and just drop it. I have known of cases in New Brunswick where they had a reforestation project and they did it on a contractual basis. They had the students, or various people employed, go out with a full box of young seedlings and get credit for planting them when all they do is dump them, and then go out with another one - in New Brunswick. In Newfoundland, I think we have something like seventy per cent, eighty per cent production of our seedlings, where in New Brunswick it is far below that.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we have these private enterprise people, who because of greed, want to turn around and make a quick buck, we can find them in a situation where they probably can dump too much of the spray in one area and then come back for another load, and come back for another load.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

If the hon. member would permit me to interrupt him while he is catching his breath, I can announce now, although it is not quite five o'clock, that I have received notice of three motions for debate at five thirty, when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House.

First, notice is given by the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (F. Rowe) arising out of a question asked the Minister of Education (L. Verge), and the subject matter is introduction of Grade XII, a revised high school programme.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The second notice given by the hon. the member for Eagle River (E. Hiscock) arising out of a question asked the hon. the Minister of Education (L. Verge), and the subject matter is Grade XII.

And the third notice given by the hon. member for Grand Bank (L. Thoms) arising out of a question asked the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) and the subject matter is the bait holding unit at St. Lawrence.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, and as I said, if we have a company which wants to make a quick buck, they can turn around and take all the spray and dump it and then go on back for more, thereby, probably, getting paid on a contractual basis for the number of loads of spray or the quantity of spray. We do not see in this piece of legislation-and again I say that the press is totally irresponsible in this matter - we see now in our Province, and as I said, this was the concern that I pointed out, we

MR. E. HISCOCK: have a committee set up, a Select Committee of this House, to go around and look at the renewable resources and to then set up a fund.

MR. STAGG: Non-renewable resources.

MR. HISCOCK: - non-renewable resources - to set up a fund and look at this problem. And now we are bringing in legislation and we are going to get into spraying and we do not even know the effects that this is going to have. Here is the media giving that type of committee, and will give that committee all types of publicity and the reason, Mr. Speaker, we have it, is to give the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. Rideout) area all the publicity. We find ourselves in a situation because the industry here in this Province and the people depend so much on these jobs for a living that we find that the press and the mass population of the Island are probably saying, 'look, we do not want to hear about not spraying, we do not want to hear about spraying, go ahead and do it, we have to save the forests'.

So what we are doing, Mr. Speaker, we are throwing out the baby with the bath water. We may find ourselves in six, seven or ten years and I hope that the ministers of this government and the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) can say in fifteen years time, 'we were right by having this legislation. And the spray, Mr. Speaker, now will be matacil. But New Brunswick has proven that after you spray with one type, insects become immune to it and then you have to spray harder and harder chemicals. So, Mr. Speaker, we do not know what we will be doing in ten or fifteen years time. And I think that the press is being irresponsible from the point of view that the majority of the people are fed up about whether to spray or not to spray, with the Royal Commission and the Medical Commission on it and the loss of jobs. But surely, Mr. Speaker, we should have from this government a commitment as to how this programme is going to be monitored. How are we

MR. HISCOCK: going to monitor these companies?
How are we going to be checking on them?

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of danger in this legislation, too much danger and the Opposition, having the courage to turn around and point out this, is also taking on the government from the point of view of exactly the way the government works. Just because we turn around and talk about this piece of legislation and ask that this injunction clause be taken away, what are all the government members doing when they get up? Are they addressing this injunction clause, this legislation that is taking away their rights? Are they addressing the part of the legislation that is not good enough with regard to the implementing of the programme, the spray programme and the precautions? No, they are not. Mr. Speaker, they are addressing that the Liberals are against spraying. That is all they are saying. That is their concern for the population, the population of this Province here, the Liberals are against spraying. That is all they feel that they can - and, do you know what? The press itself, because it is really almost a dead issue now, the press itself it completely ignoring the cry or the plea from the Opposition by basically saying, "Look, do away with this part of the legislation. Bring in stronger regulations so that we know, and the people of this Province know, that it is going to be monitored well and allow the courts to take their rightful situation in this country.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am extremely concerned about this legislation. I am concerned about the arrogance of this government, that they are not concerned with setting up a select committee on the cost of living in this Province. They are not concerned about setting up a study into the high cost of oil and related products on the Coast of Labrador. They are not concerned with having an enquiry

MR. HISCOCK: and say, "The people of Newfoundland and Labrador, you have elected us and we will stand by the decision, and we will spray. And if that means that we will lose members or lose the government then, in our judgement, we will do it." With regard to the Royal Commission on Fisheries, why is it that they had a Royal Commission on Fisheries after it was recommended several years ago that they have one? Why is it they had one? It was only, Mr. Speaker, because of the strike. It was only the strike of last year, and this government was so embarrassed by their stand in this strike that they figured that the only way that they could turn around and get out of this problem was to go and hide behind a royal commission. So, Mr. Speaker, when this Opposition points out the need for a commission, or a need for a Select Committee, because we recommend them in the House, the Opposition, we do not get them. But if we cross the House and go on the government side, our Select Committee is recognized, not only recognized in that way but, also -

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: That was a small price to pay for it.

MR. HISCOCK: - what do you expect from the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter)? That is it exactly, what do you expect? You not only have a Fascist piece of legislation but there are people probably on that government side who would probably like to have all Fascist tendencies, not only going around with their little flags and their little medals, but the next thing we will be saluting. So I am saying, Mr. Speaker, if you allow the extreme element of the Conservative party of the government to take its role, then I tell you, Mr. Speaker, we would be clicking our heels quite fast, quite fast.

MR. HISCOCK: I would say, Mr. Speaker, if this is a government and if this is a House of Assembly of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, that we respect their wishes, and if we bring in a resolution asking for a Select Committee, it should be looked at from the point of view of relevancy to this Province and the enhancement of a better quality of life for our people, not what political stripe or political side it comes from, Mr. Speaker. Surely, surely, Mr. Speaker, in stepping into the eighties we did not ever think that we would have a government led by people so narrow-minded as to think that because it is recommended by the Opposition side, they have to defeat it. Mr. Speaker, surely not. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we have a government that is wise, that is led by some of the best intellectual men in this Province and that they are big enough to turn around and see what criticisms are due and respect Her Majesty's Opposition in doing its job and doing its rightful job. Surely, Mr. Speaker, we have not got a government that is narrow-minded in that way. Surely we do not have a government that allows Conservative Associations to make political press releases in districts. Surely we do not have that, Mr. Speaker. Surely we do not have a government that turns around and only looks at Select Committees that are recommended by the government and surely, Mr. Speaker, we do not have a government that stands behind royal commissions when it comes to sensitive issues. Mr. Speaker, I ask you, do we have that type of government? Surely not. This is not the type of government, at least, that is perceived in this Province. But, Mr. Speaker, I would say this is a

MR. HISCOCK: dangerous piece of legislation. and I would go so far as to say that this legislation will far outlive this administration. And I will say that Mr. Peckford or the Premier, if I may call him the Premier, will be in history, not only for probably bringing in a provincial flag and a few other things, but will probably go down in history with regard to the spray program and the effects that this is going to have upon the people of this Province. I hope, Mr. Speaker, in twenty-five years time, long after all the members here on both sides are probably gone, long after many other people will come into this House, that this piece of legislation will not be looked upon as one of the most negative, negative pieces of legislation that has ever been brought into this House of Assembly since its creation. Surely, Mr. Speaker, not. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, why? Because the government is so arrogant. The government is so arrogant, not only to not respect the courts but to go along and to turn around and have their extreme - what you see in here, you see the extreme of your party. And, also, I point out to the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), the Premier is being addressed now

MR. HISCOCK:

as the best man in Newfoundland and Labrador and maybe Canada, and some people would suggest he should run for the national party.

Mr. Speaker, I do not question that but surely our own Liberal Party, as great Mr. Smallwood was, in the later years it was the Liberals who became disenchanted and gave criticism. At least we gave criticism, Mr. Speaker. Do not be so arrogant and cocky and naïve as to allow an extreme element of your own party to take it and take it to such an extreme that it is going to be devastating to the long-term effects on this Province. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, that that is what is happening, that we are seeing the radical element, the right wing of the Conservative Party taking on this. And, as I say, Mr. Speaker, I consider this clause Fascist.

And the member may very well laugh but I would say in twenty-five years time, if the member is still around and still got part of his wits with him.

MR. NEARY: He will not be in five years time.

MR. HOLLETT: What has he got now, half?

MR. ROWE: He is only a halfwit now.

MR. STIRLING: He would be a halfwit then, but now he is a nitwit. It is better to be a halfwit.

MR. HISCOCK: So I would ask, Mr. Speaker, in twenty-five years time if we will be able to look at each other and say, 'Member from Stephenville (F. Stagg), remember in the House in 1981, the piece of legislation, is it true now that you supported that piece of legislation?

So, all I would ask this House, Mr. Speaker, is to address the day to day concerns, not be a government that a political party is running, but be a government of

MR. HISCOCK: statesman, put yourselves above that. You have power, you have power by overwhelming majority, do not come down to the low level of political life by running it as a political party.

Mr. Speaker, we ask for more than that. The people in this Province elected this government on that mandate. They elected this government, this Premier with the view that we were going to be stepping forward, with the view that there was a newness, a newness, a new style of politics and, Mr. Speaker, we are seeing not only right wing, radical, radical legislation of the worst type, Mr. Speaker, we are finding -and I would say, Mr. Speaker- and I do not criticize the media because I feel that the media have to do their jobs from time to time

MR. THOMS: The problem is they do not do it.

But, Mr. Speaker, this piece of legislation is unheard of in this Province and is unheard of because our jobs are becoming, now, more important, and the quality and the way of life. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, when we arrive at a civilization where we have to turn around and poison ourselves and eat dust and drink water, asbestos water and all these things in order for us to survive, then, Mr. Speaker, I do not really think that we are really being taken into the '80's by a very progressive, a very progressive step or a piece of legislation.

So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to this piece of legislation I ask, Mr. Speaker, that the government have the statesmanship to realize, to put confidence in the courts. And, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just one more closing remark; I would say this to the government itself and to probably the private members and the

MR. HISCOCK: ministers, do not allow your government, do not allow your Premier or your ministers to become so carried away by their sense of self-importance and power as to override the day to day operation of the running of this Province. Do not become so naive as to live in your own ivory tower and think that everything you do is holier and greater than thou and that no criticism can come from anywhere, that you are all right and all powerful because I say, Mr. Speaker, if this piece of legislation goes through and the press does not pick up on the points that we want to point out; that there should be greater control of monitoring, and we do not need this legislation

MR. HISCOCK: and injunctions. If this goes on through then you are going to see the most radical element of your Conservative Party bringing in worse legislation than this.

MR. NEARY: Right on! Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Why is it, Mr. Speaker, that we are being cut down to two days debate on the Throne Speech? It is because the government feels that we might get on to a certain issue and we might get into a little bit of a political steam and we might go forward and point out some of the faults of this government. But no, it is designed from the point of view, Mr. Speaker, of proving that this government can ride roughshod on the rights of this Opposition.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope and I suggest to the members and to the ministers of this government that you be critical of your government, that you be critical of your administration and of your Premier, and do not allow your government to be misled and misguided by the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall). Somebody stand up to him. It is about time that some of you people stand up to the President of the Council. This is a one-man show.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: It is not the Premier, it is the voice behind the Premier, there is a little whispering into his ear.

MR. NEARY: An original Tory he is.

MR. HISCOCK: An original Tory is not the word. He probably is the original Tory of the Province.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Baird): The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I feel that the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) will need about half an hour or so, there are only about fifteen minutes left, and I am sure he would like to speak on the bill.

MR. HODDER: He will never speak tomorrow.

MR. WOODROW: - tomorrow morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Now, first of all, Mr. Speaker, I have to ask for the protection of the Chair before I speak.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Bill 54, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - and I am going to do it for some of the following remarks I am going to make. First of all I will congratulate the former speaker. Excellent. God bless him for his great ability to speak and the like. But I do wonder now whether he is a staunch supporter of the Liberals or not. I think he is leaning a lot towards us over here, and probably one of these days he will be one of the ones who will be over with us.

MR. STIRLING: Think again.

MR. WOODROW: Now I would like to say that the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) referred back to the election of 1979, and he made an assumption, he indicated that the government of the day were too naive

MR. WOODROW: or too afraid to go on with the spray. But what happened, Mr. Speaker, the government, and especially the Cabinet, which are the government, they were not sure. So they set up a royal commission and as a result of the royal commission, they have now decided to spray.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say in refuting - I am sorry the hon. House Leader - I do not want him to leave because I have something to say.

MR. HISCOCK: Again pointing out the cost (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: Keep him in his seat.

MR. WOODROW: I think we can argue in three words, in three different ways. First of all, we can argue by the written word, on the authority of others, and on tradition. We can believe or not, we can believe the written word, we can believe on the authority of others, or we can believe in tradition.

Now, I want to dwell on number two, the authority of others. We have here, Mr. Speaker, in this hon. House, on this side of the House, we have five - is it four or five? We have the hon. member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry), a man of great integrity -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - in fact, I am sure honest, and a man who has a lot of love for this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: We also have the member for St. John's East, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), who is - in fact, even the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) always refers to him as the learned member, and, therefore, he is recognized by the Opposition as being one of the most learned members of this House, and I will put it on the record and say perhaps

MR. WOODROW: the most learned and the most calm person in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: We also have, Mr. Speaker, the member for Waterford - Kenmount (Mr. Ottenheimer) who also is respected throughout this Province. We have the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) - I think he is gone at the moment - and he certainly is making his name known as well. And last, but not the least, our hon. friend, not sitting in her place at the moment, the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) is really letting herself be known as well.

Now, what I am saying - I refer to this, Mr. Speaker, because I want to say that I feel this government wants to win this country again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: If they did not want to win it, perhaps they would go along with some foolish policies and the like. They are trying to do what they think is best for this Province. Can you imagine the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) sitting down and doing something that would hurt, say, the people of Corner Brook or the people of Gander or the people of Grand Falls? My God, you would have to be out of your mind to think that he or any of the other hon. members that I mentioned would do anything like that!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: What about the people in Gander?

MR. WOODROW: I mentioned the people in Gander as well. They certainly would not want to hurt the people of Gander.

Now, Mr. Speaker, maybe the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) would feel differently if his district depended upon the forests of this Province.

MR. WOODROW: The people of Bay of Islands, Mr. Speaker, in large part, maybe 65 per cent of their livelihood is gained from the mill in Corner Brook either directly or indirectly, and even now, in fact, a lot of the people from Corner Brook and around the Bay of Islands area are going on to Stephenville to work as well. And, of course, this, Mr. Speaker, applies to Grand Falls and Windsor.

Looking back, since I have been here in this House, at least for the past - what? - five or six years, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) always opposed the spray.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: And at the present time, this is not being disputed, it is a cover-up. It is a way to say no we are not going to support it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MR. WOODROW: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the trees of this Province are destroyed by the spruce budworm or even by fire, what in the name of goodness is going to happen to the city of Corner Brook, Grand Falls, and what will happen to Stephenville in the future? They will become extinct. In fact, they will not be in existence any longer.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) is not here, but he, as well as other members, would recall that we travelled last year and we travelled the year before - he was not a member then - but we travelled with several members of the Opposition including the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), the member for Windsor - Buchans and others. We travelled the forests of the West Coast between Corner Brook and Stephenville, you could say East, West, North and South. We travelled by bus, we went on foot. I know I got my feet wet many a time. I should have taken some long

MR. WOODROW: rubber boots or something, but foolish-like, I did not. However, that is beside the point. We also travelled by helicopter. And, Mr. Speaker, what did we see? We saw, Mr. Speaker, a dead and dying forest. I think my hon. friend from St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) said, at least one-fifth of the forests now is dead or dying. And this is going to continue unless some action is taken to offset the spruce budworm.

Now, as far as the bill is concerned, what is going to happen? First

MR. WOODROW:

of all, Mr. Speaker, probably it is only tripe to say what I am going to say now but every member has said so, there is only a certain time of the year, two or three days, or something like two or three weeks, there is only a certain time of the year when we can spray. So if somebody comes in and says, 'Well, okay, fine, we are going to oppose it', that means that our forests are going to be left maybe for another year without spray. So, therefore, I think, apart from the fact that we must spray, I think, Mr. Speaker, we must also support this bill as well.

Now, we have heard -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Another plug.

MR. WOODROW:

What are we going to do? What are we going to do? Just let it go ahead? I realize there are problems and the like but how far can you go? Are we going to ask God? Are we going up to ask God should we do it or should be not? Eventually we have to take some stand on it. We have heard the member for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) speak about the damages in the Province of Nova Scotia. I know about it as well. And as I said earlier, there are only certain days on which we can spray. We have at least \$4.5 million involved in the spray programme. What would happen to the hon. Speaker's district if they did not -

AN HON. MEMBER:

It would be gone.

MR. WOODROW:

It would be gone, absolutely gone. In fact the trees would be all destroyed. God knows there been enough destroyed already over there with forest fires and the like. So I would join with my colleagues over here in saying that the Opposition are looking for a way out, and this is a way out. It is a way to get a bit of publicity but it is a way out. Why not come up and say, 'We are against the spray'.

MR. AYLWARD:

That is what they want to say.

That is what they mean.

MR. WOODROW: Well, it follows as night follows day if this bill did not go through the House, Mr. Speaker, there is a possibility the spray would have to be delayed another year. However, Mr. Speaker, as I said, my district, the people of my district, are depending upon my voice here in the House of Assembly. They do not want their livelihood destroyed. So I stand here now, in fact, Mr. Speaker, to support this bill. The member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) and the member for Humber East (Ms. Verge), their districts are involved as well and they too have given their support, they have given it earlier. I know the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird) already has given a public announcement over the airwaves on it.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support the bill and I do hope and perhaps we all should pray - I would ask the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), I would ask him, for example, especially - let us hope and pray that the spraying that we do to the forests, the only thing we will hurt will be the budworm. I hope we will not hurt anything else. I hope we will not hurt any creature, not even a rabbit, for example. So I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the spray will go on and that the good Lord will guide us, Mr. Speaker, when the time comes due in June or July and that what is being done by this government now will go down in history as one of the greatest pieces of legislation that was ever passed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we only have about a minute left, I think, so could I move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to call it 5:30 then?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. It being 5:30 a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House.

The first matter for debate raised by the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) is the introduction of Grade XII or revised high school programs. The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I would advise the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) to listen to what I have to say very carefully because it is a very serious recommendation I am going to make to her, and that is that she postpone the revised high school program or the implementation of the revised high school program until we get further evidence that it will work in the schools.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is very simple. Before a captain sets sail, he has a destination, he has a ship, obviously a captain, a crew and the funds to run that ship. In the case of the revised high school program, Mr. Speaker, there is no objective, no aim, no destination stated whatsoever in this outline in this blue book. Mr. Speaker, the DECs do not have the money now to build new classrooms and to build the new schools that are needed for 1981. They simply do not have the money which is in excess of \$200 million. They did not have the money last year, Mr. Speaker, to operate the schools properly, and I would submit they will not have the operating money next year. More of their money is going to non-instructional aspects and non-educational aspects of education in this Province, and the minister

MR. F. ROWE: knows whereof I speak. Mr. Speaker, the simple matter is that this revised high school program, as outlined in this blue book, does not broaden the high school program sufficiently, except on paper. Many of the new courses, Mr. Speaker, have not been adequately prepared, the teachers are not adequately prepared to present them, the facilities do not exist in the schools to present them next year or the following year or in the third year. The new high school program cannot be broadened to the extent as suggested in this booklet because we simply do not have the facilities to teach some of these new courses. Neither, Mr. Speaker, does this new program have the vertical extension - that was the horizontal extension - that is suggested, and that is an extension of the academic aspect or component of this program. There is only one course, Mr. Speaker, that I am aware of that is actually, truly enriched and that is the English course, none of the sciences, Maths, except for the matriculation Maths, but none of them - Chemistry and Physics, for example, are still two years in a three-year program and that is what it is now. Now, Mr. Speaker, the simple fact of the matter is that we are introducing a program, the revised high school program, in our schools for which students have not been prepared; parents are unaware of the nature of it because there has not been sufficient education for the parents -

MR. THOMS: Teachers need training.

MR. F. ROWE: - teachers have not had any great amount of in-service training.

MR. HISCOCK: One-day workshops.

MR. F. ROWE: Since Christmas they have had a one-day workshop, Mr. Speaker, some of them, in order to introduce the nature of the program to them and try to sell the program to them. There is no traditional university

MR. F. ROWE: training, Mr. Speaker, for these teachers -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: - no traditional training for the teachers as we have in the university now for high school teachers. And, Mr. Speaker, I repeat we cannot afford to keep the schools operating and renovated and the capital expenditures in them that are required for this year, last year and the coming year. So how can we possibly bring in a revised high school program? Well, Mr. Speaker, we are, in principle, in favour of a revised high school program. There is no doubt about that, but the proper planning has not taken place. It is premature to introduce this into the schools I maintain, Mr. Speaker, and it is going to be more destructive to the educational process in our school system than any other single factor.

MR. F. ROWE: It is going to be simply that, Mr. Speaker, and I further suggest that in the years to come, if this high school programme is introduced the way it is going to be introduced, it will be looked upon as a premeditated crime against the educational system, against the students in our Province -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ROWE: - because it is simply not going to work. It is premature.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Education (L. Verge) has to come up with the proper answers with respect to the allocation of teachers, with respect to the capital funds that are going to be made available to school boards and the DEC's with respect to the operating grants that are going to be made available to the DEC's and the school boards. The minister has to give us better answers with respect to the training of the teachers, the readiness of the students, whether or not this new revised high school programme is going to truly channel students into the university, into the College of Trades and Technology, into the vocational schools and into society itself.

Mr. Speaker, there is no evidence whatsoever that the programme that is envisaged by the speaker is such that it will meet the needs of the students in this Province to go into all walks of society. It does not have an extension of the academics and it does not have a broadening of the curriculum. At least it has not been proven and it has not convinced the teachers nor the school board nor the parents nor the students nor the educators in this Province that it will do so except by word of the minister who says it has been accepted quite excitably by the teachers in this Province. That is simply not so. More questions are being raised every day and I would suggest that the minister give serious consideration

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: to postponing the implementation of the revised high school programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the remarks of the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (F. Rowe) indicate that he does not understand the context of the reorganized high school programme -

AN HON. MEMBER: He knows more about it that you do.

MS. VERGE: - which have been worked out by large numbers of educators from all parts of our Province over the last two years -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - and his comments do a disservice to those educators, to the high school teachers, the high school administrators, the school board members, the members of the DECS, the faculty of education at the university and the Department of Education who have worked long and hard at putting together the package. The programme was finalized in the Fall. It has been very well received by educators throughout the Province. I just came from a symposium on education in Corner Brook where the concept of the re-organized high school programme was praised by members of the NTA as well as many others as being a model which could be copied for the lower grades.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: In putting together the programme, the planners went back to basics and started with the aims of public education in our Province. They mapped out in detail

MS. VERGE: what high school students are supposed to get for a minimum well-rounded high school education and starting with that base, filled in a programme of studies. The programme, having been worked out over the last two or three years, has been presented to the school board and high school administrators as well as teachers for the past four or five months. Workshops, in-service training sessions, seminars, have been held in high schools throughout the Province. The department itself co-ordinated provincial and regional seminars in November and December. Since then, individual school boards, there are thirty-five of them throughout the Province, have been doing their work at the high school level, working with their own teachers. They have been carrying out information campaigns for the parents. And I am satisfied that the students, whom all of this is going to serve, are quite well informed about what is coming, what is in store for them.

The programme is a re-organization of the senior high schools -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - to include three grades, Grades X, XI and Grade XII, spanning those three years. It will be phased in beginning with Grade X this September.

The first students to participate are -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - are the ones now in Grade IX who will then progress to become the first Grade XII graduates in June of 1984. It is obvious to anyone who takes the trouble to read through the

MS. VERGE: written programmes, that there will have to be a broadening of each student's education. It is necessary for high school graduation to attain a minimum of thirty-six credits, a maximum and usual number of forty-two credits. Of these twenty-one have to be derived from the core programme which is worked out to cover the basic ingredients of a minimum high school education. And the core is divided into various components which assure coverage of the basic areas of education.

Until now in our Province, we have been attempting to cram into a shorter time frame than the rest of North America, the high school programme. As a result students have had a very narrow, restricted programme, the traditional English, Math and three or four others. They have been short-changed in not getting many other subjects. A large number of our high school students do not get history or social studies. They do not get French or Music. If they want to do both, they can only do one -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MS. VERGE: - because it just cannot be fitted into their timetables. Adequate resources are being planned and will be made available by government. The budgetary process is underway. It takes time. The Budget will be brought down in due course.

Teacher allocations for the first year of the programme with Grade X have been announced. There has been provision for 107 extra teachers, more than would have been in our schools had the changes not been made. And I am satisfied that the programme will be successfully implemented and will bring long-term benefits to our young people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The second matter for debate raised by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) is Grade XII.

The hon. member for Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My great, granduncle, Dr. Arthur Barnes, was one of the people who brought in the Education Act and added schools outside of St. John's and also was one of the people who helped organize the University. He would absolutely turn over in his grave, exhilarate dozens of times by hearing what the minister is after saying. This concept of Grade XII for urban areas is quite good and is probably long overdue. But with regard to urban students in urban areas - and I am not one for putting the townies against the baymen, ^{or} that philosophy - but I am saying that this course, the way it is now being done is really going to be crippling to students in our rural areas. Many of them now, because of lack of interest and also having difficulty attaining Grade XI by way of adding extra teachers, by way of having gymnasiums, by way of having libraries, by having science labs, they have the bare minimum now but at least they can get Grade XI.

The former President of the University was a student from a one classroom school. Dr. Warren of the Royal Commission of Education was from a one room school and many, many others. We are now seeing that Grade XII in urban areas and now having to be put in rural areas is being put out beyond the range of the average person in those places.

The minister is going to say we have a bursary programme. I hope when she gets up she is going to answer the question, how many students will you need in order

MR. HISCOCK: to have a Grade XII programme?
Answer that to the rural teachers and the rural school boards and the DECs around the Province. How many do you need? Do you need fifteen? Do you need ten? Do you need twenty? Twenty five? How many will it be in order to have a minimum? Are the people in Port Hope Simpson, Charlottetown, Mary's Harbour, Cartwright, West St. Modeste and Forteau going to have to turn around and send their students into some other area? Is the government going to be opening up the residential school in North West River again for coastal students like they did before?

The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) said that facilities down in Southern Labrador are sub-standard. They are sub-standard now, Mr. Speaker, with regard to Grade XI. Can the minister inform us what programmes she has involved now that are going to exhilarate and bring these sub-standard schools up to the current level that we enjoy in other parts of the Province? Mr. Speaker, this department is

MR. HISCOCK: perpetrating intellectual rape on our young students in rural areas, and I would say many of them are going to bear the scars of not arriving at their full potential, because this programme is being brought in very ill-conceived, very ill-planned, and now the government feels it has a mandate to follow. And therefore because again of the arrogance of this government and the lack of foresight -

MR. S. NEARY: She said so herself.

MR. HISCOCK: The main core of this programme was with regard to culture in Newfoundland. The programme is not even ready for September, the main reason why we were going to bring it in. This programme is not ready and this government and department had the nerve to get up and say, 'We are not ready.' The concept is a good one but we need to build up the standards, we need to get more teachers and more equipment in the labs and the libraries. Mr. Speaker, this concept is quite good, in urban areas it is excellent, but with regard to rural areas there are a lot of questions that have to be answered and I would say, Mr. Speaker, if these are not answered and not addressed, it is not going to be the minister's sons or daughters who are going to suffer. And I am not coming between townies and baymen because, as I said, we are all part of this Province and if we are going to become anything we have to build together. But, Mr. Speaker, there is a lot that has to be answered for with regard to Grade XII and I would say, Mr. Speaker, that this programme should be delayed unless it is going to get the full support of the financial dollars and the commitment that the N.T.A., that the DECs and the school boards and the parents and the students of this Province demand and require. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, we are not going to get it and we are going to find out three or four years down the line that several hundred

MR. HISCOCK: students got their livelihood and their potential thrown down the drain.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the members opposite seem unable to take a clear-cut position on this issue of the reorganized high school programme. I am unable to discern whether, in fact, they support Grade XII for our Province or not.

If the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) had taken the trouble to inform himself of the programme as mapped out, which, as I said before, took over two years-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MS VERGE: - to compile, with input from people in his district as well as in other parts of the Province, he would understand that the programme was designed with the small schools specifically in mind.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Hear, hear!

MS VERGE: Because Newfoundland and Labrador is a Province of small schools. It is not only the hon. the member for Eagle River's district which has small schools, the average school size in this Province is only about 220 students and the average is rapidly dropping. And it was with the small school in the rural area in mind that this whole programme was conceived and put together. It is the small schools which stand to benefit most because of the credit system, which, over the three years of the programme, allows the small school to stagger its course offerings, so that with a relatively small staff catering to a relatively small high school student enrolment,

MS VERGE: more courses will be made available to those students over the three years of senior high school than would have been the case otherwise. To illustrate with the sciences; in a case where now students leaving Grade XI have only the chance to do biology, which is the case in some of our very small schools in the Province, it will now be possible to give those students at least two choices, biology and, say, chemistry, with biology being given in years one and two and chemistry being given in years two and three.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MS VERGE: Now, the plans for this programme include the construction of facilities, most of which will be programme support facilities such as multi-purpose rooms, libraries, laboratories, which will benefit Grade XII when that comes onstream three years from now. And I would like to stress that there will be no Grade XII next year. Contrary to impressions given to the media, Grade XII will not be offered in our Province until three years time. What starts next year in September, 1981, is Grade X of the revised high school programme. The labs, the libraries, the multi-purpose rooms will benefit Grade XII, but, of course, they will also benefit the existing Grade XI, Grade X and the lower grades.

This whole programme is going to have significant benefits for the students in the member's district and some of his teachers from the Straits Coast were recently on C.B.C. television praising the programme and saying that they think it will be good

MS. VERGE:

for their students in Forteau and other communities in the hon. member's district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The final matter for debate raised by the hon. member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) is the bait holding unit at St. Lawrence. The hon. member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Merci Monsieur le President. Just a little practice, Mr. Speaker, in anticipation of tonight's class with the hon. member for Humber West (Mr. Baird).

Mr. Speaker, I just want to record that I -

MR. HISCOCK: He is working down in his district. Sorry about that, Sir.

MR. THOMS: May I have the protection of the Chair from my own members, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. THOMS: And that is the last time for this session, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to record that I did receive a call from somebody in the minister's department asking if I would postpone this debate for this afternoon until the minister got a chance to get back from the front. However, on checking with Your Honour I was told that a matter on the Late Show could not be postponed, and there are a few things I want to say about the St. Lawrence situation. Mr. Speaker, it is also a typical example, I believe, of the way that this administration are treating Liberal districts and that is that they are ignoring them. And this particular minister, Mr. Speaker, from this particular minister,

MR. THOMS: you know, I am not getting the kind of co-operation that I am getting from some ministers on the other side of the House. I can say something nice about the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) for a change, I do get his full co-operation when it comes to matters I have to deal with within my scope as a member of the House of Assembly. The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) I have had no problems with. I have not had too much to do with the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) since the mine has closed down in St. Lawrence but, by and large, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Brett), for example, or the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) and so on, I usually get good co-operation from these ministers. But the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) gets his back up, makes commitments and, Mr. Speaker, he does not keep them, he does not keep them. At the Burin Peninsula Fish Conference, which was held in Salt Pond, Burin, the Minister of Fisheries made a commitment, made a commitment, Mr. Speaker, to the fishermen's committee of St. Lawrence, and that commitment was that he would provide the funds to insulate the bait holding depot, which is a provincially owned depot at St. Lawrence. At the present time the fishermen have no place to store their bait, no place. When the fishing season opens they are going to have to go some other place and buy, buy their bait. They have a bait depot right there but it needs insulation. So the Minister of Fisheries committed the funds right there in the vocational school, Salt Pond, Burin. That was a year ago, Mr. Speaker, and I have been in touch with the Deputy Minister of Fisheries who claims that he has no jurisdiction in the matter, that this is a

MR. THOMS: political matter. He did not know if the minister made the commitment or not, he did not know but it was a political matter and would have to be taken up and worked out through politicians. Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister would not answer the question the other day. He would not answer my question. He said he would answer to the fishermen's committee of St. Lawrence, and who did he name? This shows you what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) knows about the fisheries in the district of Grand Bank. Who did he name? Leo Slaney. Leo Slaney is the town manager in St. Lawrence and, as far as I know, has never fished. The other member of the fishermen's committee he named was Vic Edwards, but the closest thing that Vic Edwards is to a fisherman is the fact that he is a member of the PC district organization down there. Well, this is the fishermen's committee that he is going to talk to. They are not members of the fishermen's committee at all. Pearce Stacey, Mr. Speaker, is the chairman of the fishermen's committee. And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries also made a commitment to me some five or six months ago that he would

MR. THOMS: go to the district of Grand Bank and meet with the fishermen of that district before this Present session of the House of Assembly opened. That is a commitment that he has not kept. And I cannot get a date from him. He will not give it to me. And he is welching on his commitment is what he is doing.

MR. TULK: He is gone to the front. He is supposed to be in Musgrave tomorrow.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, maybe the minister when he gets back next week, will take the opportunity in the debate in this House to tell the House why he has not kept those commitments. And I hope he does.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is all very well to make statements about a minister and to make statements about what a minister has said, but I think the hon. gentleman should consult the record to see exactly what the minister said. The hon. minister indicated that he had discussed this matter with the fisheries committee down in St. Lawrence some time ago. He had said that the matter was now a matter of discussion between himself and officials in the Department of Fisheries, and it was in the process of consideration for the programme of the department. Obviously matters like this have to await the determination of the Budget programmes for next year. And the minister has indicated that he has it under active consideration.

The hon. gentleman tries to indicate that the minister did not know who the fishermen's committee was. This is part of the breath of his remarks. He said that Mr. Slaney, the Town Manager, and Mr. Vic Edwards, - well, Mr. Slaney is the Town Manager - all right? - and Mr. Vic Edwards apart from following the right faith, political

MR. MARSHALL: faith, as the hon. gentleman has said, he also happens to be the Mayor, I believe, of the town council. And if the hon. gentleman will consult the record the hon. gentleman will know that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) not only said that he would be consulting the fisheries committee but he was also going to consult the Town Council.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And that is how the names of these gentlemen came up.

The Minister of Fisheries is most thorough about discussing the matters with the people concerned. He also said, Mr. Speaker, so let there be no doubt about it, that the minister intends to travel to Burin as soon as it is possible for him to do so to consult with the fisheries committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And also to consult with the Council. And I have no doubt he will. At the present time the Minister of Fisheries is travelling right now, he is on his way to the seal hunt to visit with the sealers for a few days -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: - and to indicate the interest of this Province in the sealing industry and the activities of the sealers themselves. The hon. Minister of Fisheries is the most travelled minister in this government. Last Summer he spent a large part of the time in Labrador, up in Mary's Harbour and up and down Labrador. He has been to pretty well every community on the Northeast coast. He has been to the

MR. MARSHALL: South coast. He has visited more communities than any Minister of Fisheries in the history of this Province has ever visited. And I am quite sure that the hon. -

AN HON. MEMBER: Walter Carter (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Carter was quite good as well. But the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is equalling his record. And I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Fisheries will be down, he has this matter under consideration, he will be down to the peninsula as soon as ever possible. He will discuss it with those people who are interested in it, and he will be putting the position, he will be working very hard for it.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted as I say that the hon. member has brought it up. It is rather refreshing to see the hon. member direct a question in this House towards the fishery which is of such importance in his district, and also to see the hon. member actually asking questions about his district instead of, you know, other matters such as Ku Klux Klan and what have you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: As to the hon. member's statement about the Liberal districts, that this Province does not look at the needs of Liberal districts, are many instances I can show, but down on the peninsula itself -

MR. THOMS: Member of this (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: - down on the Burin Peninsula itself
I think the most startling evidence of the attention

MR. MARSHALL: of this government is the thirty-plus millions of dollars that this government has pumped into the shipyard down at Marystown, which we very gladly do, and we shall see to the security of the people of Marystown, and we shall see to the continuance of the shipyard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Would that the hon. members opposite had breath enough and felt as well toward the rest of Newfoundland, and St. John's in particular, to give the same support to the synchrolift in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: So, Mr. Speaker, as far as the remarks - I think I have dealt with all the remarks made by the hon. member. The hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), as I say, is out visiting with fishermen at the present time. I have no doubt the hon. the Minister of Fisheries will be down around the Burin Peninsula, in the not too distant future, and he can probably show the hon. member around his district at the same time, when he is down there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The motion is that this House do now adjourn. Those in favour 'aye', contrary 'nay', carried.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 13, 1981, at 10:00 a.m.