

VOL. 3

NO. 10

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
FRIDAY, MARCH 13, 1981

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. I have received a letter from a committee in the Premier's district, in which they specifically asked me to bring up in the House of Assembly their concerns about the school facilities in their district and some apparent misunderstanding between the committee and the Premier; and that they had a meeting with 500 people - asked the Premier if he would attend the meeting. I have been asked to attend the same meeting-and they have asked me to bring it up in the House and ask the Premier. And the Premier knows I am going to bring this up, I told him about it. They asked if I would ask the Premier if he would support their request and if he would indicate a time when he can attend the meeting in his district to discuss the school problem.

MR. NEARY: Too busy with oil.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am in touch with the committee that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition refers to. As a matter of fact, about four and one-half or five weeks ago, I visited the school and spent two hours at the school, and not only that school, but a number of schools in that area, the King's Point-Harry's Harbour area, and I am totally familiar with the circumstances surrounding the present move now to get a meeting. I have been in touch with the Salvation Army officer in King's Point in the last three

PREMIER PECKFORD: or four days trying to arrange a mutual time for a meeting, and we are still in the process of working out a suitable time. So I have visited the area and have supported their request over the last three or four months and have been in the school.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that there is an example in the - I saw the same situation when I was there during the leadership campaign - I am glad that there is a situation in the Premier's district, as there is in my district, of schools that are grossly inadequate and that brings up the concerns that my colleague, who has a medical appointment this morning and could not be here, but he has been asking the Minister of Education (Ms Verge). In view of these kinds of concerns, Mr. Speaker, that have been expressed, can the Premier give this House - and the parents of these children all over the Province and the school authorities, who I understand are now releasing publicly some of the concerns that they have expressed to the minister as far back as November - can the Premier assure us that money will be made available this year to bring these primary/elementary schools up to the standard requested by these educational authorities without taking any money from this expanded high school programme? Can they give a definite assurance that monies will be provided in the Budget to look after the inadequate schools in his district, in my district and, I would imagine, in most of the other districts?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the question posed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) shows a total lack of understanding of how educational capital financing is done in this Province. Each year the Government of Newfoundland provides substantial capital funds to the Denominational Educational Committees who then, in consultation with the school boards, decide on how and when and where that money is to be spent. The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador does not decide on what school is built in a given district. That is why I cannot give a guarantee to the people of King's Point or the people of Hare Bay or to the people of LaPoile or to the people of any part of this Province. We provide the capital funds and we will be providing the capital funds again this year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: That is what we are talking about.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I can guarantee the Leader of the Opposition that additional capital funds will be provided as they are every year for school construction around this Province. Then the priorities as to what schools get done in any given year are entirely up to the Denominational Educational Committees and the school boards, because we believe in the decentralization of education so that local people on school boards who understand the local conditions better than people in the Department of Education, should be the ones to decide upon the needs and the priorities in a given district or a different area of the Province. That is the way the educational system is arranged; we provide the funds and then the Denominational Educational Committees and the school boards decide what school is going to be built in what community in what year at what time.

MR. STIRLING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it seems as though the government has decided that their tactic, their technique, on anything they do not want to deal with is to say, 'Well, they just do not understand' - that is the technique - and then they will pass the buck.

MR. NEARY: It is worse than that.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, everybody understands in our denominational system of education the decisions are made by the DEC and they would gladly make those decisions, Mr. Speaker, but in this letter which I received from the Chairman of the committee in the Premier's district - and I hope that he will be protected because he has spoken out; he is the principal of a school - but he says -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - "But you know the story. The IEC's -

MR. STAGG: We are not the Liberals.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I must bring to the attention of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition Standing Order 31 (d) which states, "Oral questions must not be prefaced by the reading of letters, telegrams, newspaper extracts or preambles of any kind."

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I do respect the rules of the House, but it is very frustrating, as you can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that these people do not understand that you cannot read a letter in the House in Question Period. Let me ask the question then of the Premier, is the Premier aware that various parts of the DEC, the IEC for example, have indicated to the people in his own district that last

MR. STIRLING:

year the money provided by the government in total was not sufficient even to pay the interest on the money that they owed for school construction. Is the Premier aware that this information is coming out from the IEC, that there is no problem in deciding on separate schools or which school, but that the problem is the government has not provided anywhere near enough money to look after even the most desperate situation as is indicated in the Premier's district and in my district?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Is the Premier aware of that?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I regret that the Leader of the Opposition in his preamble to his question saw fit to question the integrity of myself and this government in how it operates and how -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - teachers are hired and fired in this Province. I think it the lowest of the low for the Leader of the Opposition to get on like that. But let me tell him if he wants to drag himself and his side of the House down below what is considered to be decent behavior in this House, he will be there alone because this side does not intend to engage in such debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition had better get his facts right if he is going to talk about what the DECs are saying and what they are not saying and what kind of money is being provided.

May I answer the direct question with another question. Is the Leader of the Opposition aware that the

PREMIER PECKFORD: integrated school committee of the DECs in consultation with the school board, the Green Bay Integrated School Board, has approved a million dollar extension for the Baie Verte Integrated High School called Beothuk Collegiate?

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, speaking of rules, I would gladly answer the question if the Premier would like to change positions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: But I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, I would have to have a ruling from the Chair - Is it permitted for the Premier to ask the Leader of the Opposition questions in Question Period? I would be glad to answer it if the Chair would rule on that.

MR. SPEAKER: I assume the hon. the Leader, then, rose on a point of order, did he?

To the point of order, no, I would rule that questions are not allowed to be asked of members of the Opposition. My interpretation of what transpired is that the hon. the Premier answered your question with a question.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am glad some of the students are in the Galleries. The question that I posed was a rhetorical question, for the Leader of the Opposition's benefit, it was a rhetorical question which meant to indicate by its nature and by the facts contained therein, that there is money available in the Green Bay Integrated School Board because they have just committed a million dollars for an expansion

PREMIER PECKFORD: to a school in that district.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order?

MR. STIRLING: Oh, no. We could keep that going all morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I gave a ruling on the point of order. I presume the Premier rose on another point of order. I am not sure if it was a point of order, but perhaps a point of explanation.

MR. WARREN: A Ministerial Statement.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I recognize the Premier as the leading expert

MR. L. STIRLING:

in rhetorical questions. Unfortunately that is how he has been trying to govern this Province, with rhetoric instead of fact.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Will the Premier now give the information to this House and the assurance to this House, to the DEC, that the DEC will get the same kind of money provided, as he has just indicated has been provided for his own district, in order to bring these inadequate facilities up to standard, and the same concerns expressed by people to his minister about the lack of money to bring the standards up to standard before they get into an expanded Grade XII programme? Will the Premier now commit himself to putting in the additional money that has been requested by the DEC?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I shall assure, as the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has done from time to time and the Minister of Health (Mr. House) from time to time, that we intend to continue the very aggressive programme of capital financing to education in this Province that has been started, that we began last year, that we will continue this year, and that all parts of this Province - not my district or the Leader of the Opposition's (Mr. Stirling) district necessarily - will be treated fairly and equally in the disbursement of capital funds. And we will do our utmost, as we have proven in the last year and a half, to do our utmost to see that all parts of this Province get an equal share of the capital dollar that is available to education.

MR. L. STIRLING: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

March 13, 1981

Tape No. 357

DW - 2

MR. L. STIRLING: Would the Premier and the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) be prepared to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. L. STIRLING: - table and encourage the DEC to give to this House of Assembly the full facts of the actual state of the facilities in education in this Province? And would the Premier agree to table the requests and the comments made by people in the various school boards across this Province expressing concerns about the inadequacy of funds being made available for these capital constructions that we referred to earlier? Will the Premier table this information?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are in the process now, as the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) said the other day, of assessing and getting reports in from school boards around the Province as it relates to capital construction programmes over the next four or five or six or ten years.

MR. HODDER: The minister told us that last year.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That information is being assessed by the government and in due course we will be announcing our programme for ongoing capital construction in this Province. And during the Budget debate, after the Budget is brought down, the various members of the Opposition and the members of the back bench on this side will have an opportunity to question and query the Minister of Education on the disbursement of capital funds for education in the primary, elementary and secondary and post-secondary areas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And it is at that point in time that that kind of information would be available. Right now that information is in the Department of Education and with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and is being used as evidence to support ongoing capital funding for education in this Province.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power). I understand there are 687 barrels of matacil which are stored in Bunker 630 on Igloo Road in Stephenville. I would like to ask the minister if there is any danger of spillage or if the matacil has been recanned this year?

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, in reality are 689 barrels of matacil stored at Stephenville. They have

MR. POWER: been rebarrelled according to prescribed regulations laid down by the federal environment people and the producers of the chemical. We will be using that chemical in the spray programme this year. It is perfectly safe and checked daily.

MR. HODDER: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms) Supplementary, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, this particular matacil was used in the spray programme in 1977 and was canned the year before that. The manufacturer's label said that these particular barrels should have been recanned last year. I would just like to refer the minister to his own statement of April 22, 1980, when he said that "if the matacil is not sold by the Fall then we will have to get involved in rebarrelling." Now last Fall was six months ago, Mr. Speaker. I will ask the minister why the discrepancy, when a year ago he said that the matacil would have to be recanned by the Fall at the latest and that was six months ago. Would the minister explain the discrepancy between his statement last year and the statement he just made?

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as I have said, we check the barrels on a daily basis, it is checked by the environment people, we have had the manufacturers come back to look at the barrels. They recommend to us, as the persons who should know, that there is no necessity of rebarrelling at this time, that it is safe. We have had the environmental people check it on a daily basis, it is under a fairly secure system in Stephenville and obviously, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to deciding whether the thing should be rebarrelled or not we can only go to the environmental experts and the manufacturers of that chemical, all persons who tell us there is no necessity for rebarrelling.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: I would just like to point out to the minister, I spoke to the environmental people in Corner Brook. They have been inspecting the bunker; they have not been inside the bunker. And also, the officials in Stephenville who hold the key, that these cans have been looked at. Mr. Speaker, I would point out as well that you cannot see inside of a can and that these have not been inspected on a daily basis. The minister is incorrect. Mr. Speaker, I will ask the minister again, what will happen, when will this be recanned? What precautions will be taken when these cans are moved, Mr. Speaker, these cans which were barrelled prior to the last spray programme, at least a year before the spray programme, and the manufacturer's label at that time said that they should have been rebarrelled last year?

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I can only reiterate what the manufacturers of the chemicals have been telling us and what the environment people are telling us, that the barrels are checked daily, that they are perfectly safe as they are now, -

MR. HODDER: That is not true.

MR. POWER: - there has been no leakage. The manufacturers, who may have put the label on, also come back and tell us there is no need for rebarrelling at this time. We are following and will be following this Summer every environmental rule that has been laid down for the use of chemicals, either in storage or in spraying, and there is nothing more that this government can do.

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

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

MR. HODDER: Just a very short question.
Would the minister tell me what the labels on the cans said
when they received them for the 1977 spray programme,
when they received them in 1976, what those labels said?
How many years were they supposed to last before recanning?

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I suppose the labels
on the cans are a recommendation of a certain procedure that
the companies would like to use. We have also had another
recommendation from them telling us that there is no necessity
for rebarrelling at this time. If the member is suggesting
that we should go to the environmental people and to the
manufacturers of the chemical, who all tell us there is no
necessity for rebarrelling that spray, and at the same time
you go out and waste government money to do it, then,
Mr. Speaker, that is not our way of doing things.

MR. HODDER: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: You have had your final.

MR. HODDER: Yes, I know.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I will just ask the
minister if he would table the original labels, the inspection
slips and let us know the frequency at which these cans have
been inspected and table any information which he has on this
particular chemical.

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

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, we have followed all
of the recommendations of the chemical producers, we have

MR. POWER: followed the recommendations of the environment people. We will not be rebarrelling the spray. As I said, we will be using it this Summer in the spray programme.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Tourism care to tell the House when moose licence applications will go out this year and the deadline for returning these applications?

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to inform the hon. member that the Minister of Tourism is not responsible for wildlife; the Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth (Mr. Dawe) is.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I would ask the hon. the Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth to answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Culture,
Recreation and Youth.

MR. R. DAWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The end of March will be the deadline for the capability testing for this present year, that is for new hunters who wish to enter the draw system. The applications then will be sent out from the department some time in April, and people will be required, as in other years, to submit their applications as soon as possible and they will be informed before the end of June whether, in fact, they have been successful.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Would the minister care to inform the House what the fee will be this year for a moose license?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Culture,
Recreation and Youth.

MR. R. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, when the applications are forwarded to the people concerned they will be informed of what the fee will be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: I am going to be a little more specific with the hon. gentleman and ask the minister if it is correct that the fee has gone from twenty dollars up to fifty dollars, that it will cost, instead of twenty dollars as last year, that it will cost fifty dollars this year for a moose license?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Recreation, Culture and Youth.

MR. R. DAVE: No, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Social Services.

Mr. Speaker, I am in communication with a student who lives with her mother on \$250 welfare a month. This student has recently been accepted into trade school and with such short notice has been unable to make application and, of course, get approval for student aid of any kind. She, I understand, has applied to your department looking for aid to buy books and anything else that might equip this student to go to trade school, and I understand she has been completely turned down, flat. Would the minister care to comment?

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

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, it is not correct that the student or the family was turned down flat. My staff do not turn people down flat, they interpret the regulations -

MR. S. NEARY: (Inaudible) to buy second-hand books or something like that

MR. T. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to answer the question so that my hon. friend can hear? My staff interprets the policy of the department; if they can help they do, if they cannot they say why, and they suggest alternate propositions which might assist the family in question and in this case the student. The social worker, in this particular instance, could not assist under existing policy.

MR. HICKEY:

There is no policy to provide free books for students in university, vocational schools or the technical college where there are student loans available. We do provide schools books to students in all the other school system at all grades and so on.

Further to that, Mr. Speaker, my staff informed the student that they would give the student a certificate acknowledging the circumstances of the family, outlining the circumstances of the family, which could be taken to the school hopefully with the intent that the books could be supplied until arrangements could be made under a student loan which would correct the situation.

That is where it stands. We have not been asked - there has not been any further contact. The lady was also told, as I understand it, if there were any further problems or if this could not be worked out to come back or to let us know.

MR. BENNETT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BENNETT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Probably the student was not turned down flat-but she was turned down. So what else, you know, if the student is turned down? What else, you know, if the student is turned down? And apparently the student is only, Mr. Speaker, looking for a loan, an interim loan, a means to get into trade school. Now, if there is no policy in place to accommodate this need, which is of a general nature across the Province, would the minister explain why there is no policy in place and will the minister be implementing a policy or does

MR. BENNETT: the minister want to keep these people on perpetual welfare?

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have mellowed with the years. I am not going to rise to that last comment. The hon. gentleman is well aware of the record of this administration with regards to keeping people on welfare.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: In fact, the hon. gentleman and people-

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: - on the other side of the House are well aware of the fact of how many people this administration takes off welfare and puts into gainful employment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: Further to that, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: - if hon. gentlemen on the other side are not aware of those programmes I would be pleased to give them detailed facts, figures for all of the years since the Liberal Government went out of office. it is a shining record, becoming better each year.

MR. NEARY: I would not boast about it if I were you.

MR. HICKEY: Now, Mr. Speaker, to the point and to the question. The hon. gentleman is aware of the fact that the social assistance programme is not the end-all and be-all to solve all problems, and each case is dealt on its own merit. Policies can never be so all-embracing as to solve all problems. We make our decisions on the basis of the merits of the case and, as I have indicated earlier, we have not refused the student absolutely. The

March 13, 1981

Tape NO. 361

EL - 3

MR. HICKEY: social worker interpreted the regulations and the policy, which is all he could have done. It came to our attention at headquarters from one of his colleagues yesterday.

MR. HICKEY:

And my director of inquiries, as I understand it, informed that gentleman that if the student was not taken care of through the system at the school in terms of the books being provided, then to let us know and we would take another look at it to see that something would be done on a temporary basis so that at least the student could attend the college. And that is where it is. Now, I do not know anything more than that. If the hon. gentleman has information, he should pass it on to me so that maybe we can get the matter sorted out - maybe pass it on to me, in fact, instead of expecting me to make a decision in this Legislature for all the Province to hear about.

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary to the minister. I remember when the Liberal Party went out and along with the outgoing of the Liberal Party went the \$200 mother's allowance -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT:

- that in the Fall of the year or on any occasion helped students -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT:

- with the purchasing of books and wearing apparel or whatever to get them into school. Would the minister consider now having that mother's allowance reinstated, especially to those people who so desperately need it?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, that question really is - I am not sure if it is even a question. There was no mother's allowance in place in my department. There was a political

MR. HICKEY: allowance -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: - which was established by the former administration, put in place on the eve of an election -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: - which was done away with and the money of which was used to help the poor and the poverty-stricken and the low-income people of this Province by this administration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HICKEY: And those dollars, Mr. Speaker, have gone back into the pockets of the poor of this Province two or three hundred times over.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): We have time for a couple of short questions.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: It is just a supplementary, Mr. Speaker. This particular case that is under discussion now, the young lady in the district of St. Mary's - The Capes, I believe has been adequately handled by my colleague, the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) and but for him, the young lady would not have gotten into the College of Trades and Technology, and I would submit to the Premier that the first one of his medals be given to my hon. colleague, the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member has a supplementary, I believe. He should put it.

MR. NEARY: I want to ask the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) about this emergency assistance -

MR. WARREN: Fifty dollars.

MR. NEARY: - the fifty dollars that the

MR. NEARY: minister can give under the regulations. Under the Social Assistance Act, the minister has it in his power to grant up to fifty dollars in case of emergency. Is the minister using this particular provision of the regulations of the act or is he just ignoring it? How often does he use it and under what circumstances does he use it?

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I use every facility and every mechanism that is vested in me as minister to help people all over this Province, and I might say to the hon. gentleman, I use it wisely and I use it fairly and justly to all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. J. Dinn).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: A question to the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower. The minister has told us that the workers of the College of Trades and Technology asked for a conciliation board and were rejected. Can the minister indicate whether there have been any other moves by either the union or the government in an attempt to resolve this labour dispute?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, that question requires a little longer answer than normal. The hon. member is indicating that the government rejected out of hand a conciliation board.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. DINN: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member should know, if he does not know I will tell him now, he should know what the procedure is with respect to conciliation boards. The union in this case requested the appointment of conciliation on the 14th of April 1980, and I am going to go through this process because the hon. member appears not to understand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. DINN: I know he is not misleading the House, he appears to not understand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. DINN:

Conciliation was appointed on the 16th of April, 1980, and they had fourteen days in which to report. Meetings were held on the 23th and 24th of April, there were thirteen non-monetary items and twelve monetary items left to be negotiated. Both parties, both Treasury Board and the College of Trades and Technology, indicated that they wanted to await the outcome of the conciliation board appointed in the General Service dispute.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

We know that.

MR. DINN:

The conciliation officer made his report on the 28th of April which is his mistake. NAPE was in a position to take a strike vote at that point in time, or seven days thereafter, but they were waiting for the conciliation board report into the General Service.

Now, I realize that time is of the essence but this, I think, is fairly important. The minister is in a position where he could have appointed another board, which would have been totally not called for in this situation. The indication was that there were twenty-five -

MR. LUSH:

Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. J. DINN:

The hon. member does not want to know the answer.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I am pretty flexible

on listening to answers, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. LUSH:

The question that I asked, Mr. Speaker, was whether or not there were any other moves by either the union or the government in addition to the union's request for a conciliation board, and the minister just going down through telling me why he rejected a conciliation board. That

March 13, 1981

Tape No. 363

SD - 3

MR. LUSH: is not the question, Mr. Speaker.

It is completely irrelevant, the question is were

MR. T. LUSH:

there any other moves by either the government or by the union to resolve this labour dispute?

MR. W. MARSHALL:

To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. President of the Council to the point of order.

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, you know, when people get up on points of order it is wise to come up with authorities. I refer you to Beauchesne, the fifth edition, page 133, Replies to Questions, "A Minister may decline to answer a question without stating the reason for his refusal, and insistence on an answer is out of order, A refusal to answer cannot be raised, an answer to a question cannot be insisted upon".

Now the reason why I am drawing this to your attention, Mr. Speaker, is that the hon. gentleman has asked a question-and that is fine. He can ask a question in accordance with the rules of this House-but he cannot determine the words which the hon. gentleman is going to use in order to respond.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final submission on the point of order by the hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot quote any authorities ,but I am not going to be muzzled either by the hon. member. There is such a thing as common sense.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that one of the prerequisites of answering a question must be that it be answered. And I asked a question, Mr. Speaker, a specific question, and the question was not answered. The minister did not even go close to answering it. And I think you can call upon all the authorities in the world about parliament and

MR. T. LUSH: you will never find who will be able to justify that minister's answer to my question.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): One final submission to the point of order from the hon. President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I just ask Your Honour ancillary to the speech made by the hon. gentleman on his comments to the point of order, whether it might also be out of order to be waving your fingers because it might be interpreted as threatening gestures.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

There is already one point of order on the floor and I cannot consider the point of order that the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) just raised about waving fingers.

Aside from that the authorities quoted by the hon. President of the Council, I think the Standing Orders are quite clear and in this particular case the final authority will be the Chair. The answer as far as I can determine, at least, was being given. It may not have been to the satisfaction of the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). If that is the case then certainly there is another procedure which he can follow. But in this particular matter there is no point of order.

In any event, the time for Oral Questions now has expired.

Before moving on, may I ask hon. members to join me in welcoming to the galleries today two groups of students, twenty-eight Grade IX students from Mary Queen of the World School along with their teacher, Mr. Bob Sauve, from the District of Mount Pearl and -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: - seven students from Bishop College

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): along with their teacher, Mr. Jim Butters, from the District of St. John's West. We hope they enjoy their visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Order 2, second reading of a bill entitled, "An Act To Provide For The Protection Of The Forests Of The Province From Insects And Disease". Bill No. 54. Yesterday debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for LaPoile

The hon. member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when the Premier talked about the opening of the House of Assembly this session the hon. gentleman heralded this session of the House as a historic session, the most important session, the hon. gentleman told us, in Newfoundland's history. All the sweeping and major reforms, all the great reforms that the government were going to bring in would make it the greatest session of the House of Assembly in the whole history of Newfoundland. It would make it even greater, a greater session, Mr. Speaker, than the session where the Liberal government brought in the Workers' Compensation Act, which was a great reform, a major reform. It will be a greater session, so we were led to believe, than when the House met and the Liberal Government brought in the Labour Relations Act, the Labour Relations Act that has stood the test of time, that is still being used in this Province. It will be a greater session than when the Liberal Government brought in MCP to give Newfoundlanders coverage under the Liberal Medicare programme. It would even be greater than that so we were told. It was going to be the greatest session since Confederation, the greatest session of the House since Confederation. And I could go on and on, Mr.

MR. S. NEARY:

Speaker, I do not want to use up too much of my time on trying to make that particular point.

But after Confederation, Your Honour knows that the Liberal Government had to establish government departments, and all the bills that were debated and discussed in the House to set up the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities, to set up the Newfoundland Constabulary, to establish a Civil Service

MR. NEARY:

Commission and to set up the Crown Lands Act. All these bills are all just mere trifles, were trivial, insignificant compared to what we were going to have in this great session of the House of Assembly.

Now, what do we have in this session, Mr. Speaker, what does the Tory Government do compared to a Liberal Government that brought in all these major reforms? What do they do, and the sweeping changes, the great reform that the Premier told us about before the House met? Well, we have a bill on the order paper to amend the change of name act.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not know if the hon. gentleman realizes that today we are not debating the address in reply. We are debating a specific bill which is before this House. The principle of the bill relates to the spraying of the forest, and the hon. gentleman's observations with respect to the order of business and other things extraneous to this bill, I would say, Mr. Speaker, are definitely out of order. I know the rule of relevancy is very difficult to interpret, and I realize that, but I think when you have a bill, the principle of which is firmly before us, that the hon. gentleman is obviously going into areas which are not relevant.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour knows that is not a point of order. I am merely leading up, making a point and the hon. gentleman is again trying to muzzle the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Well, to the point of order, The hon. member should not interpret my smile as being an indication that it is not a point of order, because certainly irrelevancy at any time is a legitimate point of order. I, quite frankly, was trying

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): myself to understand what relevance the hon. member was trying to make with his preamble, but I did note that he indicated he was not going to spend much time on that sort of a preamble so I allowed him continue with a degree of flexibility. But I might point out that there is a bill that we are debating and the member's comments should be relevant to the bill and I ask him to do that.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour. Well, so what kind of legislation, Mr. Speaker, what kind of great reforms, what kind of legislation did the Premier eventually introduce to the House? And I mentioned a few, then there was "An Act To Amend the Human Tissue Act" and "An Act To Amend The Embalmers And Funeral Directors Act" and, Mr. Speaker, the most dastardly, devious piece of legislation ever brought before this legislature, the one we are discussing now, Bill 54. And the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side who have participated in this debate, Mr. Speaker, have deliberately or otherwise tried to mislead the House, tried to drag in a red herring, tried to leave the impression that what we are talking about here is whether or not we should spray the forests of this Province.

And I am especially, Mr. Speaker, disappointed with the brave Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry), who taught law over at Dalhousie University and I can understand now why the hon. gentleman is no longer teaching law. The hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, especially, was one of the major spokesmen. The rest, Mr. Speaker, the rest of rubbish, the rest of the arguments that we heard from the other side I would dismiss forthright, but I cannot dismiss the statements made by the Minister of Mines and Energy, a senior minister in the Peckford administration. I cannot dismiss that.

MR. NEARY: What he said, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman sort of set the trend for the junior members who spoke on this bill on the government benches who, somehow or other, thought we were talking about whether or not we should spray the forests.

The member from St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas) was sucked in, got conned into getting up and telling the House that his great organization, the Newfoundland Medical Association sat on the fence but later approved of spraying. That is not the principle of this bill at all. Did the hon. gentleman take the time to read the bill? If the hon. gentleman did, he would know, the hon. gentleman would know that this is the same kind of bill that caused all the trouble in the country from which the hon. gentleman originates. That is what caused the trouble, this sort of thing.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, is the equivalent of the War Measures Act in the province of Quebec. It is mini war measures bill, that is what it is, Mr. Speaker. And this is one of the great reforms that we were told that this government was going to introduce in this House in this session. And the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry) should be

MR. NEARY: ashamed of himself. The hon. gentleman should know better than to make a statement in this House that the Liberal Opposition are against the 18,000 people earning a living in the forests in Corner Brook and Grand Falls. And we were against that, that is what he said. What a weak, low argument!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to belabour that point either, but just for the benefit of the hon. gentleman who told us that we are not concerned about the future welfare of 18,000 workers and their families in Grand Falls and in Corner Brook. That is what the hon. gentleman - he did not imply it, he said it, made a categorical statement. Well, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. minister that we are concerned about the 18,000 workers and their families in Grand Falls and Corner Brook. We are so concerned about them, Mr. Speaker, that we are, and have been for some time, trying to point out to this House the possible ramifications, the implications of the health of these families that the hon. gentleman spoke about. We are so concerned about them, Mr. Speaker, that not only do we want them to earn a living, yes, but we also want them to be healthy. The hon. minister should take time to read a story in the Toronto Globe and Mail a couple of days ago: "New Brunswick shows higher incidence of retarded children in study." They have been spraying matacil, spraying the forests of New Brunswick for thirty years, and they just did a study.

MR. POWER: I read it.

MR. NEARY: The hon. minister, if he had read it, would not have come into the House. He must have read it after he made his speech in this House the other day or he would not have dragged in the red herring that

MR. NEARY: he dragged into this debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: How could he say that (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: How could the hon. gentleman say it, that is right. He must have the face of a robber's horse -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - if he came in here and deliberately accused the Liberal Opposition of trying to take away the living of 18,000 workers and their families in Corner Brook and Grand Falls, when he knows in his heart that there is a danger in matacil.

MR. BARRY: Read the study and you will see there are no connection.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, "New Brunswick shows higher incidence of retarded children in study." In the Maritime study, about 200 health, education and social service agencies reported, with parental consent, the identity of the retarded children. Born July 1, 1969 and June 30, 1972 - these singled out had scored lower than 55 per cent on an I.Q. test or were untestable. And, Mr. Speaker, this situation has been related to the fact -

MR. BARRY: Tell us how it has been related. Take you time. (Inaudible) paragraph three or four.

MR. NEARY: The gentlemen whom they are quoting here, Mr. Speaker, Professor Cameron McQueen, said that it may not be possible to have the high incidence

MR. S. NEARY: of retardation in the Province of New Brunswick to the toxic chemical spraying of forests in New Brunswick.

MR. BARRY: That is exactly what I said yesterday.

MR. S. NEARY: That is right. That is the same position the Premier is taking.

MR. BARRY: That is a definite maybe.

MR. NEARY: No, not a definite maybe, but it may be and it may not be, but that is the same position the Premier is taking. The Premier of this Province who is head of the administration also takes that position when he says, "We are going to spray, my administration is going to spray, but I am personally against spray." Now that is leadership for you. That is real leadership, Mr. Speaker. 'We are going to spray but I am personally against spray.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, the government have already taken the decision to spray, but I am going to use the same strategy that the Premier used. The government have decided to spray, not the Opposition, the government have already taken that decision, but I am going to use the same strategy the Premier has used. And I did not here the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) comment on that. The Opposition were the only ones against these 18,000 people and their families earning their livelihood, not the Premier. So I am going to use the same words that the Premier used and then I would like to hear the hon. government's comment on that.

'The government have decided to spray, but I personally do not agree with spraying,' I am like the Premier.

MR. BARRY: And your Party?

MR. NEARY: No, I am following your Party, your leader.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY:

He says we are going to spray but he is personally against it, 'While the government have decided to spray, I personally am against it.'

MR. TULK:

The same thing.

MR. NEARY:

The same thing, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BARRY:

Are you saying we do not need to spray now?

MR. NEARY:

I am like the Premier; whatever his logic is, I do not know what it is, but whatever logic was in his statement, then I am taking the same position as the Premier. If he can do it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY:

- as head of the administration, he is the Premier and he goes into a Cabinet meeting and he gets the consensus of his Cabinet and then he decides - it is the Premier who decides, by the way, just to show you how hypocritical it can be. The Premier then says, okay, Mr. Minister of Mines and Forests, or whatever his title is, you can go out now and make an announcement to spray. It is the Premier who tells him that, an Order-in-Council is handed down, approved by the Premier, signed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. After telling he that the Premier says, 'I am personally against it.' Well, I am the same as the Premier, Mr. Speaker, and I know that is a great sign of weakness. I know it is very poor leadership. And would you blame people in this Province for being concerned about whether or not spraying is a good thing? Would you blame them for being concerned when the leader, the man they elected to lead this Province, the Premier of this Province says, 'We are going to spray but I am personally against it'? Would you blame people for questioning it, Mr. Speaker, would you blame people for being concerned about it? Would you blame people for questioning matakil?

MR. F. ROWE: That is the courage they have.

MR. NEARY: That is courage for you. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) the same way, the other day did a 180 degree turn - we have the clippings here in the newspaper to prove it - where he had gone to Cabinet with a heavy heart and a heavy mind and he said, 'No, no, in '78;', he said, 'we should not spray', he told his colleagues. And in '78 they sprayed, Mr. Speaker, and they did not need this bill that we have before us now to give them the authority to spray. They went ahead and sprayed anyway because, Mr. Speaker, let us brush aside the rhetoric and the nonsense, the government had the authority to do it anyway. They did not need to come to this House to ask for the authority to spray. And I wish that message would get through, the government had the authority, the government governs this Province. They could have taken the decision to spray without any reference to the House of Assembly, without any reference at all; they did not need to do it, they already have the authority. The minister has the authority under the Act.

AN HON. MEMBER: Otherwise they were doing it illegally.

MR. NEARY: Otherwise, as my colleague indicated, Mr. Speaker, in 1978 they must have sprayed illegally. I know that is not true, the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) knows that is not true. The way our parliamentary system of government works, the government is elected, the head of the government picks the ministers, they form an administration and they run the affairs of the Province. And in the process of running the affairs of the Province one of the decisions they made back in

MR. NEARY:

1978 was to spray. And they had every right to do it without any reference to the House of Assembly, without bringing in a special bill, without bringing in this dastardly piece of legislation we have before us now - I wish I could find it, I have it here somewhere. It is so bad it has probably fallen down in the garbage can somewhere.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we have to ask ourselves, then, is what this bill is all about. What is it all about? It has nothing to do with whether or not government should spray or not spray. That debate has already taken place, will continue in the future. In New Brunswick they have been spraying for thirty years. The debate is still going on. They have a super budworm now in New Brunswick. Anybody who read the story in the morning news would see that three decades of spray has not ended debate in New Brunswick. The constant spraying is not doing a thing to help cure our sick forests. So, Mr. Speaker, that debate will continue, it will go on, whether to spray or not to spray, will go on as long as we have the spruce budworm in Newfoundland. As long as we are using matacil and other chemicals to try to protect the forests, there will be debate on whether or not it is a good thing or a bad thing.

The government have already decided that they are going to spray this year. The Royal Commission reported that they could not see any alternative to spraying, which was a bit of a disappointment to me, personally. So the government accepted the recommendation and decided to spray. And that decision was made, Mr. Speaker, before this bill came into this House. The whole world knows that in 1978 government did not need this bill to spray. Back in the 1960s, government did not need a bill to spray when we sprayed the forests against other insects like the woolly looper.

MR. F. ROWE:

Woolly aphid.

MR. NEARY:

What is the name of it?

MR. F. ROWE:

Woolly aphid.

MR. NEARY:

Whatever it is.

MR. STAGG:

The hemlock looper.

MR. NEARY:

The hemlock looper.

Back in the 1960s government did not need a bill to spray. Back in 1978 government did not need this bill to spray. And government had already made a decision in 1981 to spray, when, lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, what appears in the House but the most mischievous, the most backward piece of legislation -

MR. F. ROWE:

That is right.

MR. NEARY:

- that we have ever seen brought before a Legislature in this land.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

The whole purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker, is to take away people's rights. And they have covered it up. They have managed in a clever way, led by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), to drag a red herring into the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS:

The press are sucked in.

MR. NEARY:

No, the press are not sucked in, the press know the difference.

MR. THOMS:

Yes they are. This has been reported.

MR. NEARY:

No, I must say I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman. The press knew that spraying had been done in this Province before, back in the 1950s and 1960s, that spraying had been done in 1978, that the government had already decided to spray in 1981, and government did not need the authority from the House, the press knows that. And if they did not know it, they know

MR. NEARY: it now, I have just told them. But I am pretty sure, Mr. Speaker, they know it - unless government back in those days were spraying illegally, unless they did something illegally. And as my colleague who served in Cabinet, the member for Twillingate (Mr. W. Rowe) knows, there was nothing illegal about spraying the forests when they were sprayed. Government had a right to take that decision and they took it, and they had the courage to stand by it. They had the guts and the intestinal fortitude to stand by it. But this government, Mr. Speaker, have made a decision to spray and they are trying to cover up for their lack of courage. They are trying to cover it up by bringing in this piece of legislation to stop people who object to spraying, people whose property may be endangered, people whose property may be damaged.

MR. THOMS: And not necessarily from spraying either.

MR. NEARY: And not necessarily from spraying, by the way. Anybody who reads this bill can see the sweeping powers that are being put in the hands of that minister -

MR. NEARY: who just got recognized for
bravery the other day.

MR. THOMS: Not only powers in the
minister's hands but powers to the private contractors.

MR. NEARY: Well, in this particular case
he is not very brave, Mr. Speaker.

What the bill is doing - and
it is just as well to face it and forget all the nonsense
that we have heard from the government benches about the
merits or demerits of spraying, such as we heard from the
member for St. John's Centre (Dr. McNicholas), who thought
that he might just capture a little headline by introducing
his few remarks in French - he thought that was the way to
do it - and then went on to tell us about the Newfoundland
Medical Association, how wishy-washy they were in the
beginning. You know, Mr. Speaker, if that is the philosophy
and the policy of the Newfoundland Medical Association,
I would say God help the people of this Province. At least
we had one brave doctor, who was also a member of that
medical association, in Gander, who fought the good fight,
Dr. Thurlow. Mr. Speaker, Dr. Thurlow, I would say, being
a medical man, and all the other people who were involved,
civil servants, ordinary workers, lawyers who were involved
in the protest against spraying in this Province, I would
say they probably had a case. They had a case. The
government was spraying too close to the Gander water supply,
too close to communities in the area. And they are still
going to do it. That is the same spray programme, if not
worse - \$4 million worth of spray will be dumped on the
people in Central and Western Newfoundland.

And we are told, Mr. Speaker,
by the brave Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) who
led the attack, that 'Oh, no, this does not stop people

MR. NEARY: from suing the government,'
suing them after the fact. This does not stop the people
from suing the government after the fact. All it does is
to stop the government or companies employed by the
government - all this bill does is stop them temporarily
for ten days, a couple of weeks or three weeks, from
dumping \$4 million worth of matacil down on their children,
ruining their property, ruining their camping grounds,
ruining their water supply. Government can do that now -
I do not know if the hon. gentleman is aware of it - once
this bill goes through. And then, Mr. Speaker, you ruin
the health of children who are not even born yet, children
that women are carrying around in their stomachs.

MR. CARTER: Rubbish!

MR. NEARY: Rubbish? The hon. gentleman
says 'rubbish' but he does not know -

DR. McNICHOLAS: Are you against the spraying?

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

DR. McNICHOLAS: Are you against the spraying?

MR. NEARY: I am the same as the Premier -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MR. NEARY: - and the Premier is the head
of the government.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, you are not.

MR. NEARY: And he says, 'We are going to
spray to save the forests,' but he is personally against it.

Mr. Speaker, you can sue after
the fact but you cannot get an injunction to stop the damage
to your property, the damage to your children, the health
of your children and the damage to the health of these
18,000 workers and their families that the hon. the Minister
of Mines and Energy spoke about. You cannot get an injunction
to stop it, but you can sue the government after. Now that
makes a lot of sense, does it not? Sue the government after.

MR. NEARY: You have a retarded child born, so you sue the government. You are poisoned by drinking the water in a water supply, your children are all sick - and I do not know if hon. members are aware of the damage that matacil does to a person's body, especially little children, but it attacks the nervous system, as my hon. friend knows, and causes convulsions, and they tell me it is about one of the worst things that a doctor could witness. Reye's Syndrome, they tell me, is devastating. And the hon. gentleman says, 'Oh, no, go ahead. Let them go ahead carte blanche, no control from the public. Let them go ahead and dump this \$4 million worth of spray, damage people's health and their property but that is alright, you can sue after.' Hiroshima all over again, Mr. Speaker! Drop the bomb, do the damage and then spend the rest of your life trying to rectify it and correct it, that is the hon. gentleman's philosophy. That is the Tory philosophy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: Agent orange, too.

MR. NEARY: Agent orange the same way.

They allowed that to be dumped. We have not been able to identify the areas yet where they dumped it. But that is the Tory philosophy.

MR. CARTER: Rubbish, rubbish!

MR. NEARY: We were told, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. Moores when he was Premier, two things he did in Newfoundland -

MR. TULK: He tried to get rid of us all.

MR. NEARY: - two things he did that will put his name into the history book; number one, Mr. Speaker, he created a climate for economic development in Newfoundland for the first time since Confederation.

MR. TULK: What?

MR. NEARY: And the second thing he did, so we were told, was to bring the democracy to Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Bring democracy to Newfoundland.

And that crowd followed that leader for seven years. Now, Mr. Speaker, after Mr. Moores brought democracy to Newfoundland- I might say the only thing that he and the present Premier have in common that they both like their little bit of comfort. They both like their comfort. That is the only thing they had in common - but after this man working so hard for seven years to bring democracy to Newfoundland, now this crowd are going to destroy his reputation and take that bit of credit away from him.

MR. NEARY: We have a government now that has become so arrogant that you cannot deal with them. We saw examples of that this morning. We see a government that is trying to restrict debate in this House. We have a government that moved the estimates off the floor of the House of Assembly - and that is the only reason the House is here is to pass estimates.

MR. CARTER: You never come to those hearings.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now we have a government that is going to take away the right of the individual or a group of individuals to seek a court injunction if they see their health is being endangered or their property is being damaged or imposed upon by this government and its storm troopers that they are going to contract to go out and drop \$4 million worth of matacil on the people of this Province, they cannot get a court injunction.

The government obviously has no faith in the courts. Because we are told, led again by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), that anybody can go down, any crackpot, he said, can go down and get an injunction on frivolous grounds, Mr. Speaker. They cannot do that.

MR. POWER: We would lose \$4.5 million!

MR. NEARY: Oh, we would lose \$4.5 million! They are putting money ahead of the health of the people of this Province, and the rights of the people of this Province. It is their basic rights, their human rights. Mr. Speaker, thank God if they -

MR. THOMS: Their sacred right.

MR. NEARY: It is their sacred right. If they use their majority, Mr. Speaker, brute force to ram this

MR. NEARY: bill through the House of Assembly, the only hope we have is the Charter of Rights under the new Constitution -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: - and they will not be able to get away with this ever again. That is why they are fighting so hard against the Charter of Rights and against the new Constitution.

MR. STAGG: The people in LaPoile have not got to depend upon it (inaudible).

MR. BARRY: No.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker, throw all caution to the wind, the hon. gentleman is saying. Throw all caution to the wind. Let her go. Let her go. Let the government do what they like.

MR. THOMS: A Fascist piece of legislation.

MR. NEARY: It is the worst piece of legislation ever brought before this Legislature, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Butt): Order, please! The hon. member's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave! By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: By leave? Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for giving me the floor. I have tried on several occasions now to get the floor for the last couple of days, but apparently there is a certain curious blindness that affects people when I get up.

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to address myself first of all to a matter that was laboriously pursued this morning by the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) concerning the matacil that is stored in Stephenville. For the first time, to my knowledge, the exact location of the matacil in Stephenville is before the general public. The exact location, the municipal address and all of the matacil broadcast this morning for the general public -

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

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

A point of order. The hon.

member for Port au Port.

MR. STAGG: There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. HODDER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. My point of order is that the hon. member is misleading the House. He said that it was the first time that this has been before the House or the general public. It was made public in this House on April 24, 1980, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: A difference of opinion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order?

MR. STAGG: It is a difference of opinion, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Putt):

Order, please!

MR. STAGG:

And I want to address myself

to it further -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. STAGG:

- and I am not going to be

shut up by the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To that point of order, I would rule there is no point of order, but obviously a difference of opinion between two hon. members.

The hon. the member for

Stephenville.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the

President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I have to rise on a point of order arising from the point of order raised by the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman when he rose in his seat to make the point of order, said that the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) had misled the House.

I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, page 108, containing a list of prohibited, unparliamentary expressions - page 108 'to mislead' - and there are at least three or four authorities there, and there are many. Now, I know the hon. gentleman did not mean to insinuate that the hon. the member for Stephenville would mislead the House, but 'mislead' has connotations, Mr. Speaker, attached to it which are unparliamentary and I know on reflection that the hon. member would wish to perhaps withdraw it, but he certainly should be asked to withdraw it if he does not wish to.

MR. HODDER:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To the point of order, the hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, yes, the hon. the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is quite correct, you are not supposed to use 'mislead' in the House. I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker. I will say that the member was engaging in a parliamentary inexactitude.

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

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, semantic obfuscation by the hon. member will not deny, will not enable him to slither away from the fact that he has pinpointed today the exact location of the matacil in Stephenville for anyone who might curiously want to go up and find out where it is or do damage to it, or to just do the sort of things that vandals or other people who may want to do damage to the general public of this Province or to the general public of Stephenville - there are certain people who have that propensity. And the hon. member has given the exact municipal address on Igloo Road, whatever number it is Igloo Road in Stephenville, stored in one of these ammunition dumps where they used to store live bombs, by the way, and I also understand they used to store atomic bombs in the base at one stage - quite illegally, but they used to be stored there. The hon. member in his desire for a headline, in his desire to get interviewed by the press, has deliberately pinpointed the location of the matacil in Stephenville, and I think that that is a disservice to the public of this Province and certainly a disservice to the people of my district. The hon. member represents Port au Port although he lives in Stephenville. He is endangering everyone in this Province and everyone in our area by pinpointing the location of that matacil and inviting people who might have mischief on their minds to go there and get involved with it. He could have indicated, he did not have to pinpoint it, and I am upset with the hon. member.

MR. STAGG: It is one of the most base things that has happened in this House in quite some time and I disagree with it, and I will continue to disagree with it and I will let the people know what the hon. member has done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Terrible! Terrible!

MR. STAGG: Now, what is the Liberal Party's stand on this bill? Now, this is a very simple bill, Mr. Speaker. The Liberal Party has come through again, they have mastered that difficult art of speaking out of both sides of their mouths at the same time, and if there were three positions they would speak through the middle as well.

The member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) - I was not here last Friday when he clued up his debate, but I understand that the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), which is near Grand Falls - the member for Windsor - Buchans, I believe, invited civil disobedience, indicated that the people of the Province will be well put if they disobey this piece of legislation. Now, I understand that that does not sit too well with the powers that be within the Liberal Party, because the Liberal Party, Mr. Speaker, has always been a party that allied itself with big business in this Province. Big business in this Province has, to a large extent, massacred the forests during the tenure of the Liberal Party. When the Liberal Party was in power from 1949 to 1971, the forests of this Province got no protection, zero protection. The only thing that we can be thankful for is that the spruce budworm did not arrive here until 1972, because if the spruce budworm had arrived here before that Agent Orange would be nothing, we would be like Vietnam. The Liberals would have allowed spray - there would be no tomorrow.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: And I would suggest that New Brunswick would be a pale shadow to us, because they are tools of the corporate elite of this Province.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Concessions now (inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Concessions, yes, the concessions given by the Liberals and their predecessors are the kinds of things that this government is strait jacketed with and we have been strait jacketed with for the past ten years. And only through diligent and persistent and consistent leadership and policies on the part of this government are we managing to wiggle away some of these vast concessions given out by the Liberals and their contemporaries opposite who try to paint themselves as the party of the common man. Well, they are the right wingers, Mr. Speaker. I have said it before, they are the right wingers in this Province and the small 'l' Liberals are over here. This is where you can get people legislation, on this side of the House, and over on that side of the House what you will get is hypocrisy. You will get the right -

MR. STAGG:

wingers, that is all these hon. gentlemen are. They are a group of city folk who are out managing to get elected, through some subterfuge or other, managing to get elected out in the rural districts, but your day is coming, your day is coming! The Leader of the Opposition, after the next election, is going to be the member for Carbonear (R. Moores) because he has already proclaimed himself invincible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

And I would certainly be delighted if he were the Leader of the Opposition, because I am sure that we would be - well, he looks like he is going to have a fairly long life so I suspect that he will be around for at least another twenty-five years. Among his other attributes, he seems to enjoy good health.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the Liberals? What about the Liberals in this House? I am going to outline something about the philosophy of the Liberals in the twenty-five or so minutes that I have at my disposal. I am going to show, or attempt to show, how the Liberals are for things and against things at the same time, and I am going to start off with a point I made in debate the other day. It is a consistent point and the hon. members are going to have to live with it.

MR. THOMS:

Get off my back!

MR. STAGG:

Here is a picture. Here is a picture of the Flag Committee, a picture of the Flag Committee, flanked on either side by the member for Eagle River (E. Hiscock) and the member for Grand Bank (L. Thoms) proudly displaying the new flag, the new flag that was brought before this House.

MR. MOORES:

Relevance.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Yes. Order, please! I believe the hon. member is straying somewhat from this bill that we are now debating.

MR. RIDEOUT:

There is nobody talking about the (inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I am not straying - I am displaying - is the Speaker ready to give me - is this a point of order or what is it?

MR. MOORES: He does not have to, he is Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): You are straying from the bill before the House right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I am pointing out the inconsistency of the Liberal Party on a variety of pieces of legislation and that is a legitimate debating point, as far as I am concerned. If the Chair is to restrict me from making these points then it is going to be extremely difficult to continue.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. MOORES: This is one of the most outrageous acts of disregard and disrespect for the Chair that I have seen now in years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, no.

MR. MOORES: It is common knowledge in this House, Mr. Speaker, that the authority of this House lies in the Chair. Mr. Speaker has made a decision that you have been irrelevant and it is not in keeping with protocol in this House for you to question that decision. I say, Mr. Speaker, if he does not want to follow the rules you should name him forthwith.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order?

MR. THOMS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I want to continue my speech, whether there are points of order or whatever.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Well, first I will rule on the point of order. I believe it is a point well taken and I ask the hon. member to confine his remarks to the bill that we are now debating. And I would ask him to do so. Otherwise, the hon. member, I will ask him to take his seat and I will recognize another member.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I am going to - Mr. Speaker, the constraints that the Speaker of the Chair has put on me this morning are constraints that appear to be precisely designed for my speech, There has been a wide-ranging debate on this matter throughout the morning and throughout the last several days.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. NEARY: I know Your Honour does not need the protection of a member of this House but Your Honour's ruling is being questioned by the member at the moment and there is a procedure, Mr. Speaker, for questioning Your Honour's rulings and I would submit that the hon. gentleman, if he wishes to pursue the line of thought that he is on, Mr. Speaker, that he use the procedure of this House. If not, Your Honour should rule the hon. gentleman is - even go as far as to name him, Mr. Speaker, if he does not follow Your Honour's instructions.

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: You know that is a spurious point of order. Your Honour has made a ruling and the hon. the member for Stephenville (F. Stagg) has heard Your Honour's ruling and the hon. member for Stephenville is now getting up and making comments

MR. MARSHALL: with respect to the bill itself. It is obvious that there is a tactic, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. gentlemen there opposite to try to needle and harrass the hon. member but the hon. member is far more experienced in this House than the hon. members of the other side at this, and in other areas himself, and I am quite sure he is able to recognize what the hon. gentlemen are trying to do under the guise of the rules of the House.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To the point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, Page 38.

Mr. Speaker, "When he rises to preserve order or to give a ruling he must always be heard in silence. Reflections upon the character or actions of the Speaker may be punished as breaches of privilege."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: I will attempt to be relevant and to confine myself to the rules as -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, I would rule that there is no point of order and ask the hon. member for Stephenville (F. Stagg) if he would continue in debate on the bill before the House.

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, in an attempt

MR. F. STAGG: to explode the so-called debating points made by the Opposition.

MR. R. MOORES: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, this is outright harassment -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a point of order on the Government House Leader's (Mr. Marshall) comments of a few minutes ago when he rose to speak on the previous point of order, imputive motives, motives unbecoming of the Government House Leader toward the members of the Opposition when we brought to Your Honour's attention that another member of this House was, in fact, questioning his ruling.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, that you ask the Government House Leader to withdraw those unmitigated remarks.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, look, the hon. gentleman gets up and interprets remarks made as imputing motives. Now, let us first be clear on what the motives are. There is ruling in Beaufort that one is not entitled to impute base motives of people, not motives. And this has been said from time to time.

But the second thing I can tell Your Honour, and the hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores), the machinery of attempting to get under somebody's skin, as it were, for use and want of a better word, is a recognized tactic of debate. But when I was getting up, Mr. Speaker, all I was doing in this House was passing an opinion as to what the hon. gentlemen opposite were trying to do. Now, the hon. gentleman should read the rules and not get up and just quote them. He can look in Beaufort and he can see and this silliness that he and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) from

MR. W. MARSHALL: time to time get up about, you know, you are not allowed to impute motives. It is clearly stated here you are not allowed to impute base motives. Obviously, nobody in this House gets up, or anybody gets up to speak about anything but he has a motive, he has a motive, first of all, to speak in the first instance. But it is not the motive, it is the characteristic of the motive.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

I will reserve ruling on that point of order. I will have to check Hansard.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. F. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, the members of the Opposition are for the spray programme but they are against the spray programme as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. STAGG: In my interpretation of the rules that should be relevant within the bounds of relevancy. The hon. members, they are for the spray programme but they are against it as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. STAGG: The hon. members are the type of people who curry favour, who have curried favour with the paper companies over the years. They are the type of people who go on paid excursions at holiday resorts within the Province, courtesy of the paper companies. I do not know if any of us have ever been on any of these holidays. I have never holidayed at the Serpentine myself. We have never been the patsies of the paper companies. And we only arrive at this conclusion that we must spray because -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. STAGG: We only arrive at this decision after the most expert of advice, the most excruciating of debate. And after looking at one's conscience as deeply as one can and after asking for advice from the most expert people, and going around the Province and speaking to anyone and everyone who had an opinion on the subject, reluctantly the Royal Commission decided that they would have to spray.

Now, what are the recommendations of the Royal Commission? Well, they are found basically on pages ninety-four and ninety-five of the Report of the Royal Commission on Forest Protection and Management. And I am going to read briefly from certain portions of it; 'A decision to control forest losses to spruce budworm by use of chemical insecticides is a matter of balancing risks and benefits. Uncontrolled forest insect outbreaks can mean disaster for forest industry, loss of employment opportunities and earnings for employees and collapse of communities supported by the resource. It is recognized that chemical insecticides are toxic and their use may involve risk of environmental damage. The environmental risk has been greatly reduced in recent years by scientific advances in developing safer insecticides and technological improvements in their application by aircraft delivery systems.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned in retrospect about the last spray programme in this Province. And I was appalled and alarmed when I found that the empty containers for the matacil were being used as barriers in the parking lot at the Stephenville Mall in Stephenville. It is an area used by thousands of people weekly, punitively, tens of thousands of people every week. And these empty matacil containers were used as barriers. So obviously, there

MR. F. STAGG: was a certain amount of uncontrolled security with regard to the disposition of these empty containers. Now, I was quite pleased -

MR. STAGG: - when the Premier indicated at the press conference that that sort of thing was not only going to be frowned upon but there was to be an absolute prohibition on it. And the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) has indicated that the live matacil, so to speak, that is being stored somewhere in Stephenville and the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) attempted to, and, I suppose, successfully pinpointed the location of it, much to my chagrin.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member gave a municipal address on Igloo Road for the matacil. Now, if that is not pinpointing it then I do not know what it. What is it?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: And I said, much to my chagrin.

MR. S. NEARY: There is a point of order, sit down boy.

MR. HODDER: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. The same point of order as before, Mr. Speaker. That was made public knowledge in this House one year ago.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. member cannot rise on spurious points of order. That point of order was dealt with, I think, previously and a member cannot be interrupted when he is speaking.

(Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

There is no point of order.

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to repeat that.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: I am going to repeat it, Mr. Speaker. It may have been made public a year ago but it certainly was not something that was flogged as it was here this morning by the hon. member looking for a headline, looking to get interviewed with some of the local media or the provincial media, hopefully, national media. That is the whole object of his question, to pinpoint it, precise location of it, a municipal address for the matacil that is stored at Stephenville. And all these igloos look alike, Mr. Speaker. So if you want to know where it is, somebody has to tell you because I do not know. I never made it my business to find out and drive by and say, there is the matacil.

MR. THOMS: Get to the principle of the bill.

MR. STAGG: I am concerned, I do not know if it will happen, I certainly hope it does not happen, but if there is any vandalism or if there is anyone on a nuisance frolic that makes their presence felt or breaks into that matacil, the hon. member is going to have to take some responsibility for it and I suggest he will take more responsibility than he wants to. There was no need for it, there was no need to identify where that matacil is, everyone knows it is in Stephenville and I am quite concerned about it.

MR. THOMS: What has the member been doing about it for the last year?

MR. STAGG: The member has confidence in the minister. It needs to be recanned.

MR. NEARY: According to (inaudible) you have.

MR. STAGG: Yes, the member has confidence in the minister and his officials and the experts that are employed to look after it. If anything happens the minister will share his responsibility and I will share mine as well. I do not flinch from responsibility, I do not sling away. Slinging away from responsibility is the Liberal method. That is the federal Liberal method. That is what the hon. members

MR. STAGG: opposite are doing when they are talking about the fisheries licencing programme.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) Devine and McConnell.

MR. STAGG: That is the Liberal method, to sling away from it as best you can.

Now, back to the Royal Commission on Forestry, Mr. Speaker. It says, 'There is no evidence of persistent environmental damage to fish, fish organisms, birds or mammals from the insecticide' - how do you pronounce that? -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Fenitrothion.

MR. STAGG: - whatever it is - aminocarb or acephate.

MR. S. NEARY: His time is up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: 'There has been no evidence of loss of species, diversity, minor pest interruption, pest resistance or degradation of soil process as a result of the use of insecticides over forest areas. There is also no indication that the processes of predation and parasitism of pest populations are damaged by spraying. Most pesticides are transient! And some hon. members opposite are transient as well, so they have something in common with these pesticides. They are applied locally and are not sufficiently stable to be transported in an active form very far from their site of application.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not a cursory report. This is a report done by Dr. Gus Rowe, former Minister of Health in this House, a man who distinguished himself in the House of Assembly, who was distinguished himself in practice and I believe is now associated with Memorial University at the Medical School, a fine honourable gentleman; Dr. Cyril Poole in Corner Brook is another fine Newfoundlander.

AN HON. MEMBER: Dr. Carroll.

MR. STAGG: Dr. Carroll - I do not know Dr. Carroll but I presume that he is as equally dedicated and

March 13, 1981

Tape No. 374

SD - 4

MR. STAGG:

as worthy a Newfoundlander.

Now, they have brought in a
report, I would suggest that they did not arrive at a decision
without

MR. STAGG: long hard thought, as well, and their decision was that we should have spray. Alright, now, if you are going to have spray, it is necessary that you spray during a relatively short period of time. You have to get the budworm or the larvae at a particular time, and there is probably a two-week period in which you can get it. Now, apparently, there is a loophole in the law whereby environmental groups or an individual or anyone -

AN HON. MEMBER: Crackpots.

MR. STAGG: Crackpots, the hon. member says.

I do not classify the environmentalists as crackpots.

I have some letters here -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible) The Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) did.

MR. STAGG: Well, maybe - the Minister of Mines and Energy can speak for himself on that. I doubt whether he said it though.

I have a fair amount of correspondence from individuals in my area who are violently opposing the spray and they oppose it on philosophical grounds and they oppose it in the same way as the people who opposed atomic explosions, atomic tests, back in the 1950s and 1960s - they have the same philosophical opposition to it as these people did. I certainly respect them for it and I believe that these people must continue their efforts to dissuade government from becoming tools of the paper companies or anyone else who wants them to take action that might be out of the ordinary and that might upset the balance of nature. I respect them and I encourage them to continue to write me. Each one who writes me, I write them back and I tell them what my position is. And basically my position is as I am putting forth here this morning.

But you do reach a point, if you are a government, where you must govern. And if you govern,

MR. STAGG: you must make sure that your efforts to govern are not thwarted by things unforeseen. Now, apparently it is possible for a group or an individual to go before the courts of the Province and get an injunction to stop the spray programme. Well, I would submit that if I were advising any of these groups, How do you stop the spray programme? - well, as soon as it is about to start you get an injunction and then you go through the process of having an injunction lifted and by that time the time for spray is over and, well, you have licked the spray programme for that year. By the time the injunction is lifted it is no good to spray. So you have to guard against that sort of thing. This is not a civil liberties bill, Mr. Speaker, this is merely a piece of legislation that enables government to do its stated intention, which is to spray the forests with matacil this year in an effort to control the spruce budworm outbreaks that are ravaging the Province, that have approximately 10 per cent of our forest land either dead or dying, and it has caused considerable alarm to anyone who has had a look at it.

Now, I fancy myself an environmentalist and I guess all of us in our idealism would prefer that we did not have to get involved with these chemical methods of controlling nature, and I was quite delighted in 1979 when the government said it was not going to spray. And I was delighted again last year when it said it was not going to spray - I said so in this House.

Now, the Royal Commission has satisfied me that on the balance of risks that are evident or known, that we should try a spray programme this year, and I guess if we commit ourselves to it this year, we are committed to it for several years, but what else must we do? Well, obviously, this government is not depending on the spray programme by itself to control the spruce budworm.

MR. STAGG: We must have silviculture, we must have rational harvesting methods, we must get into cable logging of the steeper slopes in this Province. I must say that cable television brought me a very interesting -

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

On a point of order, the hon.

the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there is a quorum in the House at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Clerk count the House, please?

We have a quorum,

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, this is the kind of harassment, of course, that the Opposition considers to be cute and clever, you know, to indicate that there is not a quorum. The hon. members have, I think, seventeen members and falling on the other side. At the time the quorum was called there were only three members in the House. They obviously do not want to hear the truth.

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

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, this foolishness from this individual is just too much.

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon. the member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, for the second or third time this morning, members of the government side have been imputing motives on the part of the Opposition in raising -

MR. THOMS: Base motives.

MR. MOORES: - base motives in following the procedure of this House in raising legitimate points of order. It is not the responsibility of the Opposition in this hon. House to maintain a quorum, it is that of the government, and if the government sees

MR. R. MOORES: not fit to maintain a quorum, then it is the responsibility of any responsible member to rise on a point of order and ask that a quorum be maintained. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): With respect to the point of order I rule there is no point of order.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. F. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is obviously the position of the members opposite, they do not think they have to sit in the House. The hon. member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores) hardly ever sits in the House -

MR. NEARY: A point of order.

MR. F. STAGG: - but this week he has been here three days in a row. It is a world's record for him.

MR. S. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if Your Honour could ask the Clerk to indicate if the hon. gentleman's time has expired?

MR. W. MARSHALL: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order,-

MR. W. MARSHALL: I will rise on a point of order after that is dispensed with.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, with respect to the point of order the Chair and the Clerk's at the table are quite able to look after the timing of members and I assure you we watch it very closely. I believe the hon. member now has about one minute remaining.

The hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. F. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have one minute remaining of the - the substance of my speech was thwarted, successfully thwarted to a large extent by the interjections and guerrilla warfare and sniping and whatever, of hon. members opposite. But there is another day, Another day will come. And, I suppose, to some extent I may deserve a little bit of razzing from the Opposition since I occasionally indulge in it myself, only on occasion of course.

Mr. Speaker, I support this piece of legislation. It is the sort of thing that is consistent with governing a Province. The government would, indeed, look foolish if, after having made its position clear and indicated to the public at large that they were going to have a spray programme this year only to wake up some fine morning in June to find out that an injunction had been filed successfully with one of the courts in the Province and the spray programme was off. So it is not a piece of civil liberties legislation, it is merely a piece of housekeeping legislation to make sure that the government's stated intention and the position that the government should take as outlined in the Royal Commission, that it, in fact, is carried out and I will support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to say a few words concerning Bill 54. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I would like to start off at the beginning by reading what the bill says, "An Act To Provide For The Protection Of The Forests Of The Province From Insects And Disease".

MR. G. WARREN: I think that it is the most camouflaged bill that ever came into this House.

Mr. Speaker, do you know how this bill should read, 'An Act To Provide For The Protection Of The Minister'. That is what this bill is asking. If we want to look right at this bill, this bill is asking for the protection of the minister. Because we are going to have the spray programme, the minister has already announced that we are going to have the spray programme and now all we are asking in this bill is an act to provide for the protection of the minister and his officials.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that the media will finally realize that this bill does not have anything at all to do with the spray programme. The spray programme - this government has decided to go ahead with the spray programme. All this bill is saying is that the minister can do what he darn well wants to do.

MR. TULK: And his independent (inaudible).

MR. G. WARREN: And his independent- and he can just do what he wants to do and no one can stop him.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to me, as a citizen of this Province, I believe that that is infringing on my rights. It is infringing on the rights of every other Newfoundlander and Labradorian.

Mr. Speaker, I would say if this bill passes through this hon. House, I would give this government another three days and they will be bringing in another bill for another minister, a bill probably to read something like this, 'An Act To Provide For The Protection Of The Labour Force'. The Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) can hire and fire and do what he well pleases. These kinds of bills will come into the House, Mr. Speaker, if we give one minister protection from human society, it will happen

MR. WARREN: to other ministers of the Crown. And this is one thing that I as one member of this House will not stand for.

MR. J. DINN: (Inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I will not get into debate with the Progressive Conservatives of this Province, but however, Mr. Speaker, I did notice one thing and this came from the remarks of the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) and he said that 1972 was the start of the spruce budworm. However, Mr. Speaker, I think 1972 was a disastrous year for Newfoundlanders. In fact, Newfoundland, in 1972, had two plagues inflicted up on it, the spruce budworm and the PC Party.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on!

MR. WARREN: There were two plagues in one year, the PC Party and the spruce budworm. Well, Mr. Speaker, how in the heck can Newfoundlanders withstand such a barrage of infestation.

Mr. Speaker, a bill "An Act To Provide For The Protection Of The Forests Of The Province From Insects And Disease." Mr. Speaker, we are talking about human rights. We are talking about the rights of the individual. In this bill 7.1 'Without limiting the generality of section 7, the minister may take such measures as he deems necessary to protect the forests of the province from insects and disease.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe this section.

Now, in taking such measures under subsection (1), 'The minister may use his own officers or may employ or authorize independent contractors to take such measures as the minister directs.'

MR. WARREN: Then the bill clues up by saying, 'For the purpose of the avoidance of doubt, it is hereby declared that an interim or permanent injunction may not be granted by a court against the minister, the Crown and so on.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is where it infringes upon my rights or the right of any other person in this Province. Do you mean to say this House is going to bring a bill in that is telling the courts of the Province what to do and what not to do?

Mr. Speaker, one of those days we might have a drunken driver who could clean out probably five or six human beings, and all of a sudden the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) could come in with a bill and say, 'look, we will not have the courts to prosecute or to bring in a verdict, charge against this driver! This means the same thing, you are infringing on the rights of the individual. And no way can any House of Assembly in any province or any provincial government have those rights. These rights should not be granted, Mr. Speaker.

So if this spray programme goes ahead for the ten or twelve days as is predicted, and for some reason -

MR. STAGG: What about (inaudible)?

MR. WARREN: I suggest to the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), if he wants to say anything, go back to his own seat or go outside altogether.

MR. TULK: Outside is the best place.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot see how the PC Party and the Liberal Party, who are in this House today, will allow the minister or give the minister that authority. Mr. Speaker, it is asking too much. We have courts in this

MR. WARREN: Province and the courts should be the ones to decide.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying earlier, let us, for example, go back to June or July, or the last part of May, whenever the spraying is going to take place, and say, for example, the spraying is going to take place in the Gambo-Glenwood area. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering if the Department of Lands and Forests is going to do enough surveillance to see that there are not going to be any people in the woods in this area. What about the wildlife? Is there protection for the wildlife? This spray is going to fall down and kill the spruce budworm.

MR. J. CARTER: The wildlife (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: But however, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) to shut up too. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard in silence by the way.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): Order, please! The hon. member request to be heard in silence, and he has that right.

The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would say that we cannot allow this bill to pass through this hon. House. Now, before I go any further I wish to say it is my honest conviction

MR. G. WARREN:

that I personally am against the spray programme. I am completely against any spray programme because, Mr. Speaker, the health of the people is much more important to me, as a human being in this Province, than whether the trees are going to be eaten by the spruce budworm. We can protect these trees, Mr. Speaker, other than damaging the lives of the people, there are other ways to protect the trees.

Mr. Speaker, twenty-nine years in New Brunswick and the spruce budworm is still there.

MR. MARSHALL: So are the Tories.

MR. WARREN: So are the Tories there, twenty-nine years?

MR. NEARY: No, they are not.

MR. WARREN: I would ask the hon. President of the Privy Council (Mr. Marshall) to check his facts. In fact, the Tories are there for about another two months and then they are gone -

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. WARREN: - but, Mr. Speaker, the spruce budworm will remain.

Now, Mr. Speaker, here is what the paper said about the spruce budworm in New Brunswick. 'The evidence is overwhelming that chemical spraying simply increases the budworm problem, over-spraying simply increases the budworm problem.' And is this not a good suggestion by Gene Foster who said, 'It is time for government and industry to admit their mistakes and stop spending good money after bad.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that is a good lesson for this government to learn. The constant spraying is not doing a thing to help cure our sick forests, it is just an environmentally dangerous, ineffective dose of medicine applied every year to treat the symptoms of our

MR. WARREN: forest problems and not the cause. Mr. Speaker, it is the same thing as a person who has a real severe headache and that person is contented with having aspirins day after day after day. The aspirins will only help to alleviate the pain but it will not cure the headache. And that is the same thing about this spray programme, it will only help to alleviate it but it will not cure it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. POWER: Are you against the spray programme?

MR. WARREN: Yes, I am completely against the spray programme, yes. And I am surprised that the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power) is for the spray programme. In fact, I would venture to say deep down in his intestinal -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) same as the Premier.

MR. WARREN: - I would say the same as the Premier, personally, is against it. And I am completely against the spray programme because it is going to hurt and it is going to affect the medical lives of the people of this Province. And that is why I am against it, because nothing has been proved, the minister has not proven anything, that the spray is not going to affect our medical lives.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, yes, that report does not give any indication that it is medically safe.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, if you can show me any evidence - after twenty-nine years in New Brunswick it is still not medically safe, so then, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: I thoroughly understand, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) spray, but we are personally against it.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if, for example, when those ten or twelve days that this government plans to spray - if this bill is passed - and we have, probably, the same kind of weather that we had a couple of weeks ago where everything was fogged in, completely fogged in, no aircraft were flying, nothing was flying? There are just only ten or twelve days in a year that we can spray, what happens if we get that kind of weather? The minister has his big ego, his big bill passed through and he cannot do a thing about it and all the money -

MR. NEARY: Do you know what they will do then? They will say that God is a Liberal.

MR. WARREN: They will call the man who calls the shots a Liberal.

So, Mr. Speaker, what I am saying is I am praying, I will pray day and night, that we will have the worse weather on record in Newfoundland for those particular days that this government is planning to spray. Because it is giving the minister the complete authority, supreme, it almost gives the minister the same privileges as God has, and I am sure, Mr. Speaker, he is not in that boat.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said earlier, I was surprised to here the member for Bay of Islands

MR. WARREN:

(Mr. Woodrow) saying it is \$4.5 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, one of the holiest persons in this House is the hon. the member for Bay of Islands.

MR. TULK:

That is right.

MR. WARREN:

And, Mr. Speaker, to see that hon. gentleman get up and say there is going to be \$4.5 million lost; Mr. Speaker, he is not thinking about the holy lives of this Province that may be lost. There are many lives that could be lost, many lives that could be endangered, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WOODROW:

Well, you are not going to please everybody. Somebody is going to be the victim.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the member is saying someone has to be the victim. They will hit them wherever they are, or if your time is come you have to go regardless, that is what the member is saying.

Mr. Speaker, I advise the hon. House that I will definitely be voting against this bill. In fact, maybe different from some members, I am going against this bill because I am against the spray. I am completely against the spray, number one, and secondly, it is giving the minister supreme power. And, Mr. Speaker, I do not want one of the physically smallest ministers in this government to have the power of stopping the courts from acting. And now, Mr. Speaker, this is what this bill is doing. And I hope that the media will finally try to get it across to the people of the Province that the spray programme is going to go ahead - the minister already announced that. But this bill that we are debating today has practically - the only thing it has to do with the spray programme is to give the minister the power to stop the courts from acting. Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not a disgrace to human society, a disgrace that the people in this Province may have the

MR. WARREN: rest of their lives affected!

MR. NEARY: They are removing the safety valves.

MR. WARREN: So anything safe at all is removed. Anything safe in any bill is removed.

And I would venture to say just imagine now, next week, the Minister of Education (Ms Verge) is going to come in with a bill, and the bill is going to read something like: "An Act To Provide For The Protection Of The Department Of Education To Implement Grade XII" regardless of whether it is damaging or not, sort of thing. You know, these kinds of bills are going to be brought in, and it is going to give the minister the full authority, 'yes' or 'no'. Why bring it into the House of Assembly? Why bring it into the House of Assembly?

MR. NEARY: They are going to do away with the House of Assembly.

MR. WARREN: You people have thirty-three members. And let us face it, every bill that you people bring in will be passed because you have thirty-three members. But that is only going to last for a little while, Mr. Speaker. I would say the thirty-three members will be reduced drastically when the next election is called, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: When the next election is called, Mr. Speaker, there will not be thirty-three members - yes, there will be thirty-three members over there, but they will have a different colour blood, they will not have blue blood, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: They will have red.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: There will be thirty-three members over there. And I can see now the members who are going to

MR. WARREN: go down the drain when the next election is called.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: You are safe, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Okay, I was about to call the hon. member to relevance, but I will let him proceed if he is going to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. House that I think it is disgusting, it is humiliating, it is disgraceful, it is uncalled for and it is even unconstitutional to have a government of this day bring a bill into this House that will disrupt the rights of the individual in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I cannot see -
you know, Mr. Speaker, I feel ashamed sometimes, I feel really ashamed, Mr. Speaker, that

MR. WARREN: the Minister of Forest Resources and
Lands -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: When the time is called at one o'clock,
when we adjourn at one o'clock, the minister can leave this
Chamber and go out and let the public of this Province see
the minister and the minister holding his head high, but
the minister -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. member is struggling and
so is the Chair, and I would ask hon. members if they have to have
conversations, would they, maybe, have them outside the
Chamber.

The hon. member for Torngat
Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am ashamed
to be a member of this hon. House, and to know that once
we adjourn for the day that the hon. Minister of Forest
Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) can go outside of the
Chamber and hold his head high because he is proud that
a bill such as this is coming in to give him the sole authority
to advise the courts what to do and what not to do.
Mr. Speaker, is that not shameful?

MR. THOMS: Do not show any shame (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Is that not shameful, Mr. Speaker,
that a minister of the Crown can go out and let the public
see the minister going around with his head cocked in
the air, so high and mighty while saying to the courts, you can do
what you want to do? Now, Mr. Speaker, that is against
democracy, it is shameful, it is ridiculous, it is disgusting,
it is humiliating and everything else, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: It brings out the character of the government.

MR. WARREN: When the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) spoke he spoke about the lives of the people. And a couple of times he was interrupted, especially by the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) and the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). We are all concerned. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned to about the work force -

AN HON. MEMBER: And the great galoot from St. John's North.

MR. WARREN: - in this Province. I am sure the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) is concerned. He does not care about the people on strike at the College of Trades and Workers' Compensation -

MR. NEARY: Only when it is convenient for him (inaudible) protecting the jobs of the workers.

MR. WARREN: I am concerned -

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Simms): Order, please! The hon. member has asked for the right to be heard in silence.

MR. WARREN: I am concerned, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: He cannot use that argument.

MR. WARREN: - that we will not have 18,000 people working in our forests if our forests are destroyed by the budworm. I am concerned about that.

But this government is so high and mighty that they can create jobs overnight. That is the idea that the Minister of Labour and Manpower is giving to the people, that they are creating jobs overnight.

MR. TULK: He has 18,000, thanks to the federal government.

MR. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, my concern is as I said time and time again, is the lives of the people, the health and welfare of the people of this Province. Now, Mr.

MR. WARREN: Speaker, a person can get up and say to me, well, the 18,000 jobs are in trouble. Yes, Mr. Speaker, but not only are the 18,000 jobs in trouble if the spruce budworm spray programme does not go ahead, there are 500,000 people in the Province whose health is in trouble. So, Mr. Speaker, I suggest strongly to this government that number one, they would vote against this bill.

MR. NEARY: They have not got the courage.

MR. TULK: To withdraw it.

MR. WARREN: If I were the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands I would say, boy, look we are the government of this Province, we are concerned about the people. This is what the Premier should do:

MR. HOLLETT: He would not (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: He should call the minister in and say, Hey, Charlie, boy, I think we should be more concerned about the people in this Province than we are about making you a little Emperor.

MR. NEARY: We are the only province in Canada to have this kind of legislation.

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is what the Premier should do. In fact, the Cabinet should meet again before the House opens again on Monday, and the Cabinet should decide we are going to drop this bill from the Order Paper. This is what the Cabinet should decide, Mr. Speaker. I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) in New Brunswick (inaudible).

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

MR. WARREN: - if the CBC programme Here and Now would ask the question as they did with Grade XII

MR. WARREN: and as they did with the flag, all those kinds of question - positive answers came back to the government. I think with the flag it was twelve to about three hundred or something like that. About Grade XII education, there were still those against what the government was doing. So if CBC programme would ask a simple question, Do you think the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands should have the authority to stop the courts from granting any injunctions against the spray programme?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the CBC programme next week would ask that simple question to the people of this Province, if a minister of the Crown could have the authority to stop the courts from acting, I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, this government would not have ten callers.

MR. WARREN: The only ten or twelve or twenty callers they would get would be the Cabinet Ministers themselves and probably members from the House of Assembly, on that side. Those are the only people who would call in. There is not one other person, there is not one other person in this Province who would consider calling in to say, yes, the minister should have the power.

MR. NEARY: They got them organizing groups for calling the hot line.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, and writing notes in the papers.

MR. TULK: And writing notes in the papers.

MR. WARREN: Right, and writing letters in the papers.

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

MR. WARREN: Letters to the editor too, yes, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to go back. Mr. Speaker, I might be out of order but I have to go back for a second to the Throne Speech where it was mentioned it was an honest and efficient government system. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is what you call an honest and efficient government. It is honest, all right! It is honest for the Minister of Lands and Forests (C. Power), it is going to give him the power but it is not honest for the rest of the people of this Province.

MR. TULK: Right on.

MR. WARREN: Because you do not care. This government does not care about the people.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this bill is as, the member for St. John's North (J. Carter) said about the comments that the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) was making -

MR. WARREN: he said what the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was saying was rubbish - I believe this bill is rubbish.

This is where the rubbish is. Mr. Speaker, this is where the rubbish is, in this bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, no way - it is completely rubbish. Like the hon. member for LaPoile says, it is undemocratic and is completely out of line with other parliaments across this country.

Mr. Speaker, you go from province to province and you will not see a bill pass through -

MR. NEARY: The only province in Canada that has this kind of legislation.

MR. WARREN: You will not see a bill pass through Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: New Brunswick does not have it and they have been spraying for years.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, -

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman has asked to be heard in silence and, you know, we have heard him in silence, but we cannot hear him because he is being interrupted by his colleague continually, the hon. member for LaPoile.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I rule that is a valid point of order and I would ask that the hon. member for Torngat Mountains continue, and be heard in silence.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) only two minutes ago opened up a book and said did you read it? Did you read it. Mr. Speaker, I read it but Mr. Speaker, nowhere in this book, nowhere in this book - this government has decided to spray-nowhere in this

MR. WARREN: book did this Royal Commission ask for a bill to be brought into this House such as this.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. WARREN: That book did not mention such a stupid bill being brought into this House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to abide by the Royal Commission on Forest protection and management, surely goodness we should not give the minister the supreme power to bring this bill into the House. So, Mr. Speaker, we cannot have our cake and eat it too. Here we are, here is this government going ahead with the spray programme but the minister is saying, hold on now, I cannot go ahead with that spray programme unless I got the power. It is what you would call Power's power, Mr. Speaker

MR. TULK: Super-spray.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I suggest that if the minister is so intent on following the regulations and the recommendations in the report of the Royal Commission, Mr. Speaker, he will also have to get out of his ivory tower, come down from his ivory tower and remember he is just another citizen of this Province. He is only another citizen of this Province and no way should he have the power to bring this bill before the legislature.

MR. TULK: He wants to be called super-spray.

MR. WARREN: Yes, we can call him super-spray or we can call him whatever we want to call him but, Mr. Speaker, as long as I am a member in this House I will not tolerate seeing this bill being passed. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Humber West.

MR. BAIRD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You will note I did not put on my garments this morning because I am speaking as the member from Humber West and cannot be accused of anything else. I would like for Mr. Neary to stay. He might learn something else.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) LaPoile.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. BAIRD: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Bill 54.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD: To spray or not to spray, that seems to be the question. I would suggest that all members of the House, most members of the House anyway, are very reluctant that we have to spray and evidently the member from St. Barbe South (T. Bennett) and the member for Torngat Mountains (G. Warren) are not even reluctant to spray, they are on record as no spray. I would like for those members to go to the Humber area, a lot of the central area and find out about the number of jobs and what the spray programme - whether it is necessary or whether it is not.

Nobody likes to spray. Even in our bathrooms we have to spray sometimes but we are reluctant to do it, though sometimes we feel that it is necessary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BAIRD: It should be noted, as we have stated already this morning, that New Brunswick has been spraying for twenty-eight, twenty-nine years. There is no medical evidence of damage to the health of humans. Again there is no medical evidence of damage to the health of human beings. If a lot of the members in the area had the opportunity to visit the forests as I have had, instead of their own little ivory towers, get in and see the damage that is done in the areas, I do not think we would be too quick

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

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

MR. BAIRD: -to criticize government for spraying. It might open their eyes.

To go back to bill 54; apart from the spraying, government has already in their wisdom, and I will not say otherwise, I say in their wisdom, they have decided to spray is necessary. Having heard the report of the Royal Commission, looked at it for one year and taken the abuse-you spray or you do not spray is a no win situation - they took the responsibility, spray we must. I am very glad that spray we have to.

Go back to bill 54, why is it necessary? We are taking away the rights of this one, and we are taking away the rights of that one. I would suggest to some people we need to take away their rights. When you go back and you hear the Greenpeace and Patrick Watson and all these groups, what they should do and what they are not doing, I think it is unfortunate, particularly for Newfoundland, that the law does protect them. Because if I had my way I would like to be spraying some of these individuals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD: So rather than hold up the bill go back to the \$4.5 million that was talked about this morning. I do not think it is the cost, \$4.5 million is a lot of money for any government, particularly our government, with other things to do, but it goes to show the importance that this government places on the affects of the spray programme, the 18,000 jobs that are necessary in our forest and the future of this Province. It certainly was not taken lightly. And it is a good thing

MR. BAIRD: that some of the members opposite have not got to make that decision or I would be very, very fearful for this Province in five or ten years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BAIRD: Again going back, the reason for the bill is that you have some individuals, some crackpots, sadist, also some honest people that do not like spraying. Nobody likes to spray, I do not either. I do not even use a hair sprav.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BAIRD: But, however, it is very necessary. We know that we have a cycle of two or three weeks. If the larvae is not sprayed at the prime time - a court injunction is three or four days and as soon as you get rid of that, another court injunction and you get rid of that. In a period of three weeks the season is over and we have another year gone. I do not think anybody wants that, even some of the individuals who are trying to make a little bit of political hay out of it.

MR. THOMS: Let the government do their own spraying, then they do not include the independent contractors.

MR. BAIRD: When you are talking about independent contractors, let us look at it boys instead of trying to fool ourselves and others. The government could commission somebody to do their own spray, again additional costs to the consumers, to the people of the Province. So they must put it out on contract. You cannot very well come up against the government, what they are saying, they are acting on our behalf. We do not want individuals to get up and try to delay a programme,

MR. BAIRD: lose another year for it. We know we are going to take some flak about it. I am quite prepared to take the flak about it, I think I would take a lot more flak if we let the situation continue as it is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Exactly.

MR. BAIRD: So I have no hesitation whatsoever in supporting bill 54 and the spray programme, had we not, I would probably be voicing my opinion with some of you fellows.

I understand a few years ago the member for Kilbride (Mr. Aylward) was caught in a spray area. Look what happened to 'Bob'. 'Garfield Warren' must have been caught in the same area, as was 'Wallace House'. I saw it coming and I got out of it and saved a little bit.

But going back, some of the boys are against a lot of these programmes. Probably that is the role of Opposition to - it does not say alternate government, thanks be to God, or we certainly would be here the rest of our lives, it says Opposition so, I guess, their duty is to oppose. But I think when we oppose something we should have some grounds for opposing it, not opposing

MR. BAIRD:

it with your lips when deep down you know damn well that it has got to be done. Sometimes when I see some of the boys on the opposite side there get up, it reminds me of the story about the individual - talk about a mixed emotion - who sees his mother-in-law go over the cliff in his new Cadillac. He does not really know where he stands on it and wishes he did. So again, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to re-emphasize my position, that Bill 54 - certainly reluctant to do it - is damn well necessary and I support it 100 per cent.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT):

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Hopefully my words shall be brief. I do not mind admitting that last year I think that I was a little bit vocal in my opinion about the spray and I am reluctant to go back and rephrase those exact words because I can hardly remember. But should I have opposed the spray at that time it was because I was then afraid and did not understand. I undoubtedly was afraid of your ability to do the spray job because I felt you people in government did not understand. I was afraid of your ability to do the spray programme.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What about now?

MR. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker, in answer to that question, when you put a bill before this House indicating for or against spray then I will express my views accordingly. But right now that is not the issue, Mr. Speaker. The bill before the House today, Bill 54, is for protection for the minister and is not for the protection of the spruce budworm or the forests and it is surely not for the protection of the people of the Province. The Royal Commission did not write that bill. I have not digested completely, I have not read very thoroughly the Royal Commission Report. I do find I have an awful lot of reading to do and I must apologize

MR. BENNETT: for not having read that in total. But I am wondering if in those recommendations, Mr. Speaker, the Royal Commission in their wisdom recommended or suggested or touched on alternatives to the existing matacil spray for the Province. I suspect they must have done. Because undoubtedly they were influenced by research that has been done in New Brunswick, undoubtedly they must have been influenced by research by professional people and the results of the research that has been done, They must have been influenced. And we are told and we are admitting ourselves, Mr. Speaker, that by spraying the forests with matacil it is a perpetual thing, we do it and we continue indefinitely, we continue to do it always, forever and a day.

Now, in the remarks by the hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) yesterday, he said something about the good Lord would take care or something of that nature. Now, Mr. Speaker, in the beginning we suspect that the good Lord did make allowances for such things as the spruce budworm. But the good Lord at that time did not create the matacil. He did not provide us with matacil. We are not supporting today or even debating, some of the remarks that have been made and especially those that are relevant to the Creator, we are debating something that has been put before us in the law of man, a law that is made by mankind and not by the Creator. It seems to me that it is too late to lock the barn when the horse has been stolen. That is what I am trying to say, Mr. Minister, it is too late to lock the barn when the horse has been stolen.

We are told

MR. T. BENNETT: that there is a vast, a fantastic, an unbearable, unbelievable amount of destruction already done to the forest of Newfoundland by the spruce budworm, and that has come about in the last seven or eight years. And we have had our spray but it has not been a programmed spray and it seems to me that that programme was very ineffective at the time. It also seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that there has been very little management of the forests of Newfoundland, very little management in view of the fact that we knew a few years back, like six or seven years, that we were going to be invaded by the spruce budworm. We made no plans to harvest any wood that would be killed. If we look at the harvesting at the moment, in Glenwood, I understand Bowaters are presently harvesting 70,000 cords of wood this year and possibly every year down the road in the future. I understand they can take 70,000 cords of wood out of the Glenwood area. And this year they are taking absolutely no infested timber. My information is, Mr. Speaker, that they are harvesting absolutely no infested timber. They are taking out completely new and green timber. And to me this seems to be the case all around the Province. And this is what our Minister of Lands and Forest is telling us; that they have a management programme. Now, I would like to see that management programme harvest some of the dead and the dying timber of the Province and leave the green timber that we can harvest in later years. We are also told, Mr. Speaker, that the budworm cannot live on dead trees, it has to have green, it has to have good timber to live on. If that is the case, I understand the spruce budworm may soon run out of food.

March 13, 1981

Tape No. 384

RA - 2

MR. T. BENNETT: And all we seen to be doing, and I could be so entirely wrong but I am afraid that we are killing, now, the natural predators of the spruce budworm by spraying what remains of a green forest, and by letting the paper companies harvest what remains of a green forest. Surely, goodness if we believe in any creator, there has to be an allowance to take care of our forests, to accommodate the spruce budworm, they must have had a purpose. And we are trying to dictate, we are trying to change the laws of nature, the rule of nature that was set down many, many years ago.

MR. T. BENNETT:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we are not debating to spray or not to spray. We are concerned on this side of the House, like you are on that side of the House, for the people of this Province. And if what you are telling us and telling the public has got one glimmer of truth, with regards to the jobs that you professed you have been able to create in the last year and a half and you continue to do that for the next three years, then I know that you are not telling the truth, it is political. But if there is a glimmer of truth in that and you are able to do that, in four years we will not need the paper companies, because we will have no unemployment in the Province, we could close them down next week. Now, if you have created those jobs, if these jobs have been created from offshore oil, Mr. Speaker, the way I understand most of them have been created and not from the forestry, if they have been created, it is only for this part of the Province and not for the area of the West Coast where most of our people get a livelihood from the forest, a lot of our people, not entirely from the forest - we have the fishery - but most certainly a lot of emphasis is placed on the forestry for a livelihood. We have a lot of NIP programmes, thanks to the federal government, a lot of other federal programmes too, like roads programmes, and if we had a reforestation programme for \$47 million - and I would like to see how many dollars that is per working person in the Province. If you divide \$47 million by - the total work force in Newfoundland is something like 175,000, and when you realize that 60,000 of these 175,000 are civil servants, non-productive, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker - not

MR. T. BENNETT: necessarily non-productive but certainly not into the forest industry, certainly not into the forestry.

MR. WARREN: Not in resources.

MR. T. BENNETT: We are not resource development people-

AN HON. MEMBER: 118,000.

MR. T. BENNETT: - if there are 175,000 employees and 60,000 of them are living off tax dollars as they come through the treasury. All I can see in this Mr. Speaker, this Bill 54 -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. T. BENNETT: - all I can see in this Bill 54 Mr. Speaker, is politics again, and a cover-up and an excuse to make the people of Newfoundland look like the Liberal Party is against the spray when we vote against Bill 54 and I shall vote against Bill 54 .

MR. WARREN: Good show. Good show.

MR. T. BENNETT: But when you bring in a bill based on spray, for or against, then I shall decide at that time how I shall vote. And possibly, Mr. Speaker, we may vote for it, I may vote for it, when it comes to that, but only then will I make up my mind.

AN HON. MEMBER: To spray or not to spray
(inaudible)

MR. T. BENNETT: No, that is done, To spray or not to spray is done, We do not need this bill, the die has been cast. There was no bill came before the House a few years ago -

AN HON. MEMBER: If that Bill never came into this House the department would still spray.

MR. T. BENNETT: They have made up their minds,

March 13, 1981

Tape No. 385

RA - 3

MR. T. BENNETT: and they did this a few years ago. They made up their minds a few years ago to spray. I would like myself to know how much research has been done with regards to wildlife and and fish stocks and all the rest of the things

MR. T. BENNETT: in the areas that are being sprayed, like New Brunswick as opposed to Newfoundland? We have a lot of New Brunswickers, and Nova Scotians, Prince Edward Islanders who come down here to enjoy our good fishing. And it is going to be interesting in a few years after we have gone with a thorough spray programme to see how much devastation has been caused to our tourist industry. Because I am very much afraid, Mr. Speaker, there will be devastation to the forest industry, there will be devastation to the forest industry with the spruce budworm, there will be devastation with the spray to other parts of the industry. It might be a little difficult to decide which is the lesser of two evils. We have other industries, Mr. Speaker, that are equally as important if they were worked and developed, nurtured and blessed by a government in power. Last year, I believe it was, the Minister of Lands and Forests at that time, I think the ministerial position has changed since, mentioned, I think, about fifty or sixty per cent of our timber - or rather, lumber I should say - was not coming into the Province any more, we were processing lumber enough in the Province. Hopefully, we were going to get into the processing of enough lumber to accommodate our needs for building. And he led us to believe then that there was about sixty per cent, I believe, production in the Province to satisfy our needs in lumber. And when I look through the Commission's report I am led to believe, Mr. Speaker, that the death knell has been sounded for the lumber industry in this Province, for the sawmilling industry in the Province. There may not be a sawmilling industry in this Province and I cannot for the life of me see where this government is doing anything to correct that situation. They are letting the paper companies cut green timber, they are not insisting that they cut dead or dying and I know a lot of the hazards that can be involved with regards

MR. T. BENNETT: to harvesting dead timber.
I know there is a hazard to harvesting dead timber. But I would like to see this government insist that the paper companies harvest more of this dead and dying stock and let some of the small sawmill operators get into the dead and the dying stock, which they are not doing at this time. And if you take this approach to it, Mr. Speaker, we shall have a good timber industry, I feel, both for the sawmill industry and for the paper industry. The sawmills today are producing less than half of our requirements for lumber, and they are being denied the right to get into the timber stocks that belong to the paper companies. But at the same time, the paper companies are allowed to take their resource from Crown lands. Crown lands will be devastated and cut out by the paper companies leaving absolutely nothing for the individuals for lumber, for stages, for home construction, leave absolutely nothing for them.

MR. S. NEARY: Correct.

MR. T. BENNETT: There is a closed shop today, so I understand, for anyone wishing to get into the sawmill industry. I would like to see this government, through some department, be it Rural Development or through Lands and Forests, I would like to see this government open up areas of dead and dying timber and let some of our small independent sawmill operations get into it. We all know it is going to be absolutely no good to anybody in four or five years, to the paper companies or to the sawmill industry. Instead of having so many people unemployed and living on welfare.

MR. T. BENNETT: make this resource available.

There has been a DREE grant allowed to an energetic operator on the Northern Peninsula, the area that I represent. North of Hawkes Bay, I am told practically no sign, Mr. Speaker, of a spruce budworm- North of Hawkes Bay.

MR. NEARY: Good forest land.

MR. T. BENNETT: It is a good stand of timber.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. T. BENNETT: But that is the area now dollars are being brought into the Province. They are DREE dollars mind you, it is federal money coming in, and it is going to harvest the timber in the district represented by myself and by the hon. gentleman from Baie Verte- White Bay (Mr. Rideout). They are going to harvest a lot of timber and it is going to be green timber, it is not going to be dead and dying timber. I would like to see more effort put on that dead and dying timber, to create jobs in the Province.

MR. S. NEARY: No, they got to give it all to the arts and Arts Council.

MR. T. BENNETT: I would also like to see this government come up with an agreement of some sort with the paper companies which would put restrictions on them getting their timber from Crown lands because we need it for people who have not got leases, like the Bowaters and the Abitibi, the local fellows.

MR. NEARY: They are all going to confession over there today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. BENNETT: We all know -

MR. NEARY: One after the other.

MR. T. BENNETT: - the Province has been devastated by the spruce budworm.

MR. S. NEARY: Bless me Father, for I have sinned.

MR. T. BENNETT: But we also know Mr. Speaker, -

MR. S. NEARY: They should genuflect, by the way.

MR. T. BENNETT: - that we have a very healthy environment in Newfoundland at this time for people who live here. When you can still drink from a river...

MR. S. NEARY: Genuflect.

MR. T. BENNETT: -when you travel the Central and the Northern part of the Province especially, you can take your drinks from the rivers and you need not worry about having to have it boiled or whatever. It is very -

MR. MOORES: Decontaminated.

MR. T. BENNETT: - decontaminated. I understand it is very acceptable to drink from most of these rivers.

MR. S. NEARY: Come back Tom' boy before they (inaudible) , come back.

MR. T. BENNETT: A few years ago there was a spray programme done North of Deer Lake -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) is already in there.

MR. T. BENNETT: - and in that area very shortly after the spray Mr. Speaker, -

MR. WARREN: You can sit here, 'Tom'.

MR. T. BENNETT: - my boys were catching trout-

MR. WARREN: You can sit here.

MR. T. BENNETT: - and these trout were bloated on shrews that apparently had been killed by that spray a few years ago.

MR. CARTER: Can you prove that?

MR. T. BENNETT: Yes. Now I do not know -

MR. STIRLING: Yes. The shrews were dead. They were.

MR. T. BENNETT: The shrews, apparently, were dead and the trout got the shrews. I do not know if the shrews went to the water, I doubt very much if the trout came up on the land.

MR. STIRLING: Only on Mount Scio farm that could happen.

MR. T. BENNETT: But I do know that the trout were were bloated with shrews and it was in the area of the spray.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where did they come from, the shrews?

MR. T. BENNETT: They came by a programme that was brought in a few years ago, and the minister was a liberal at the time, and I was ashamed of him at the time like I am ashamed of this bill today. Because I certainly do not believe in interfering to the extent -

MR. NEARY: He was always a Tory. He was never a Liberal. (inaudible) down with his buddies at the telephone Company.

MR. T. BENNETT: I do not believe - I am concerned Mr. Speaker, with disrupting -

SOME HON MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. T. BENNETT: - the balance of nature. I am concerned with disrupting the balance of nature, Mr. Speaker -

MR. WARREN: The Premier is the one.

MR. T. BENNETT: -and I do not think that we had any more right to bring in the shrew at that time, I doubt if we knew what we were doing, and today I doubt if we know what we are doing when we spray. But we are not talking about the spray when we talk about bill 54.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. STIRLING: We are taking away people's rights.

MR. T. BENNETT: We are talking about taking away my rights and everybody else's rights around the Province.

MR. T. BENNETT: And we know what has happened to areas where spray has been carried out, like New Brunswick for the last thirty years and the longer they do the spray programme the more they have to continue doing it. They are not resolving the problem. We have not yet entered into the spray, so there is time for a debate on that.

MR. NEARY: Go on home. You are not going to get your bill today you can go on home.

MR. MOORES: Definitely not going to get it today.

MR. T. BENNETT: I would like to see a bill before the House of Assembly and then we would show our colours on the spray like we are showing our colours on this bill; then we would talk about the spray programme. But in talking on this bill, Mr. Speaker, I have strayed I know from bill 54.

MR. STIRLING: A little bit.

MR. T. BENNETT: A little bit, but I have

MR. BENNETT:

been talking about resource generally, and I would like for this government to take a real hard look as a resource that we have today at our disposal in timber, Mr. Speaker, in lumber and in pulpwood, the resource, Mr. Speaker, that we have at our disposal in Central and Northern Newfoundland that is today dead but harvestable, and it is money, millions of dollars of money, and our people are unemployed. And I wish that we could get more sawmill licences for people up in my part of the country; they are denied the right to go and cut timber. Yesterday a man called me, 'I wonder if I can get a permit to cut timber on Bowater's land, because there are no Crown lands around here that has any timber left on it.

MR. WARREN: He could not get one though, could he?

MR. BENNETT: He is not going to get a permit to cut on Crown land, he cannot get a permit to cut on Bowater's land, he wants to cut stock for a house, so he is being obliged to buy his timber from Mainland Canada. To me that is uncalled for. There is no need for that.

MR. NEARY: No bill today.

MR. BENNETT: In my opinion, Mr. Speaker, we are at this time able to produce more than 60 per cent of our needs for house construction, timber for house construction, in the Province. If we have 16 million or 18 million cords of dead and dying timber, we do not need bill 54, Mr. Speaker, we need a bill brought in here to go out and harvest that dead and dying timber to generate dollars and jobs in the Province.

Just North of Gros Morne National Park, where there is no more timber being cut - just North of

MR. BENNETT: Gros Morne National Park, Mr. Speaker, the devastation is just unbelievable. And it is not the spruce budworm, it is poor management of the forest resource that we have there or we had there. It is clear cutting, and it is gouged, you have it landscaped, and most of it is Crown land. Some of it is Bowater land. And I feel myself if these companies were being brought to task for poor management of the forest resource, they would be left possibly to paddle their own canoe a little bit more. And why should we worry about their having timber stands available in fifty years time while we today go hungry for jobs?

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. BENNETT: And we are going hungry for jobs, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: We certainly are, but in the meantime let the water flow into the Gulf from the Lower Churchill. Sit on the oil until hell freezes over. Keep it for our great grandchildren (inaudible) excuse.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, since I have been big enough to talk politics or cast a vote or read or listen or hear, I have always heard of the great democracy under which we live.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WARREN: Now it is taken away.

MR. BENNETT: The government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BENNETT: That is not what bill 54 is saying to me.

MR. WARREN: Now it is changed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

Take it all away.

MR. BENNETT:

Bill 54 is giving me no

indication -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(inaudible) no, never again, boy.

I voted against it in 1971.

MR. BENNETT:

If the Premier wanted to call

an election on bill 54 today and we put that bill to the people, he would lose. He would lose the government.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. WARREN:

He would lose on a lot of things.

MR. BENNETT:

But if he clouded bill 54

with forestry management or spray programmes people might very well be sucked in. But if he stayed away from clouding the issue and playing politics with people's lives, if he stayed away from that, Mr. Speaker, and if he went to the people on bill 54, he would go down to defeat.

MR. WARREN:

Oh yes, on many other things too.

Education, Grade XII.

MR. BENNETT:

The people in the Province of

Newfoundland understand more about freedom -

AN HON. MEMBER:

- Constitution.

MR. WARREN:

The aboriginal rights.

MR. BENNETT:

- and liberties than most parts

of the rest of the world.

MR. NEARY:

There you go, you can go on

home, boy.

MR. BENNETT:

People have been free to do and

MR. BENNETT: as they please since I can remember and many, many years before I could ever remember. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid that bills such as Bill 54 coming into this Legislature and being forced upon the people of this Province, to me it is a very dark day.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why the spray programme all of a sudden this Summer - I should not, I suppose, I have seen some of the Commission's report. But last year, contrary to the hon. gentleman for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) when he suggested the Port au Port member (Mr. Hodder) now is displaying where matacil is stored, last year we spoke about that matacil being stored in Stephenville. We talked about matacil until we were blue in the face, asking what you were doing with all these wasted dollars stored up in Stephenville, \$500,000 or so worth of matacil, government money. Now, are you just using matacil on our forests today because you have it available, or are you using matacil today because there is nothing any better?

MR. WARREN: Good question! Good question!

MR. BENNETT: Are you just using it to dump it on the forests of our people and onto the people of our Province.

MR. NEARY: The member for Exploits now will get up and tell us how we have to -

MR. BENNETT: Is this just a convenience -

MR. NEARY: - spray to save jobs.

MR. BENNETT: - for the government to save face?

MR. NEARY: It has nothing to do with jobs, nothing to do with saving jobs.

MR. WARREN: I would say the member for Exploits is going to be against it.

MR. BENNETT: To save face, Mr. Speaker, is the government of the day trying to save face by using matacil to get

MR. BENNETT: rid of it? They have it in Stephenville and do not know what to do with it. They have have wasted the taxpayers' dollars, and now they have the excuse, they are going to dump it on the forests.

MR. NEARY: Dump it on the people.

MR. BENNETT: By dumping it on the forests, Mr. Speaker, they dump it on the people.

MR. NEARY: The bombing of London and the Second World War will have nothing on this, what is going to happen.

MR. BENNETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have wasted -

MR. WARREN: I would say the member for (inaudible).

MR. BENNETT: - my time talking to the House of Assembly today on this bill, like on many other bills and so has everybody else who spoke on this bill, wasted their time. Because we can take that bill and we can throw it in the garbage can and that is as far as it will be heard or seen in the Province.

MR. NEARY: They are going to use brute force to shove it through anyway.

MR. BENNETT: All we need have done, Mr. Speaker, is come in and put it to a vote without a word of debate. And the government of the day have the edge. They have the majority.

MR. WARREN: Time is running out.

MR. BENNETT: So all they need do, Mr. Speaker, is stand up and vote. It really does not matter what this government brings in to be debated, all you have to do is take a vote on it.

MR. MOORES: Fundamental weakness of our parliamentary system.

MR. BENNETT: Take a vote and it is passed. You are toeing the line. You government members really and

MR. BENNETT: truly toe the line. I am almost to the point of being ashamed of you. You do not speak your mind. At least I feel at liberty here to speak my mind and I think most of the gentlemen on this side of the House speak their minds and they could not care how the leader feels. We will thrash it out.

MR. STIRLING: Do not go that far now.

MR. BENNETT: Well, we do care to a certain degree, Mr. Speaker, how our leader feels but at the same time we do have a lot more freedom. And that is the way, when we take government, that we will govern. We will have a good leader and bills such as this, Mr. Speaker, will not go through the House of Assembly because they will not be presented.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BENNETT: This will not be presented.

MR. STIRLING: The first bill we rescind will be that one.

MR. BENNETT: My leader is suggesting this one might be rescinded.

MR. STIRLING: It will be the first bill we rescind.

MR. BENNETT: Once we take office.

MR. WARREN: And that is not very much longer either.

MR. BENNETT: So if the Premier would go to the people -

MR. NEARY: We will get the Union Jack into the flag.

MR. BENNETT: - based on Bill 54 and give this party on this side of the House an opportunity to govern the Province, probably we could manage the resources of the Province and create the employment that people so desperately need.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: I know my time has run out,
Mr. Speaker, and I would like to have spoken a lot more
on -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BENNETT: I would like to have spoken
a fair amount more on the employment factor because we
all know, Mr. Speaker

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) is going to get
the benefits.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible) no giveaway.

MR. NEARY: You (inaudible) and Crosbie (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for St. Barbe
(Mr. Bennett) has the floor and I cannot listen to both
at the one time. The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Well, Mr. Speaker, I know my
time is running short in this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. Barbe
has about fifteen seconds.

MR. BENNETT: Oh, about fifteen seconds. Well,
I need to be in haste, Mr. Speaker. I know, Mr. Speaker,
that the timber is in a disastrous situation at the moment
in the Province and I know the government has a difficult,
very difficult decision to make. They have made the
decision to spray.

MR. BENNETT: Why are they bringing in this bill? Because this has got no relevance to the spray programme at all. It is just taking away my freedom and my rights and it is taking away the rights of the people in this Province. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): The hon. member for Exploits.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support Bill 54.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY: And I do it for many, many reasons: One based on emotion, one based on my own logic and one based on the patriotism that I feel for this Province. I feel that there is only one right and that is to control and to save as much as possible the natural resources of this Province.

MR. THOMS: You can do that without this bill.

DR. TWOMEY: We have only one natural resource that we can control at this moment. We do not have full control of our fisheries. We do not have full control of our hydro. This is the only thing that is left to us and I look upon it as one great effort to carry out as much as humanly possible the protection of these forests. The spray itself is not one particular unit that will destroy the budworm, the spray has to be used in conjunction with roads to resources, reforestation, cutting of the dead wood and various other things. But if this spray cannot start this year we are losing at least one more year of viable growth in our viable trees. And if there is any law or act that if brought in is to give one more year of life to these particular trees, I feel it is worthy of our support.

MR. THOMS: Stick to the bill.

DR. TWOMEY: I am sticking to the bill with sincerity and with honesty but I think that there is a preamble to every debate and that has been freely given

DR. TWOMEY: to all of you gentlemen over there. You have at times and many have mentioned, have suggested civil disobedience. What does one injunction mean? Why not mention sequential injunctions? We all know that the courts work very slowly in the interests of justice as far as justice can be obtained. And during the period of time that we have to spray our forests with matacil, however unpleasant it is to most of us, we have to go ahead. I look upon the spruce budworm as an invasion, as malignant as any army that could come into this Province. So far it has destroyed approximately 20 per cent of our usable forest products. If this pestilent is allowed to continue on year after year, I cannot tell you the permutations and the combinations of what amount of our trees will be destroyed within the next ten, fifteen or twenty years. But, however, I am sure that we can all assess that a fair amount will be destroyed.

This bill, it might be unwelcome to many of us on both sides. I am sure all of us -

MR. NEARY: What is the bill all about, can you tell us?

DR. TWOMEY: - are imbued with the principles of justice. No one will deny that. But, however, it is our duty as legislators to try and protect what is much more important than justice, is the future of our forests, of our country, of our economy and the economy of Canada. Because without the forest products we certainly would not be able to trade on the other markets of the world thus bringing into us foreign currency, particularly the U.S. dollar, the British pound and the German mark. These are the foundations not alone of our economy here in this Province but of the foundation of Canada.

It has been said many times that we on this side of the House lack a natural desire to become fully fledged Canadians. This is untrue. We will play our part as diligently as any other

DR. TWOMEY: man or woman in this whole country of Canada. What we want to we will do with a certain degree of pride, and pride in being Newfoundlanders. And it is to these ends that I support this programme.

MR. NEARY: What do you support? Do you know what you are supporting?

DR. TWOMEY: I support - yes, I do as well as you do, Sir, absolutely as well. I support it, I endorse it. I cannot imagine any of you hon. gentlemen opposite, if there was an invasion of this country by an enemy as malignant as the spruce budworm, that you would in any way try and impede by standing on the principle of law, the right to fight that enemy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Well said.

DR. TWOMEY: I honestly cannot -

MR. THOMS: I would not (inaudible) justice and democracy (inaudible).

DR. TWOMEY: There are very important things but survival, survival is the first principle of nature and of law.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY: And that is why I support this. Because it is known at times that people with the best intentions in the world, would often try and frustrate, not intentionally, but the principles of self-preservation in any country.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY: I bet there are many other people who are doing it now. We have not brought in a law to prevent the Greenpeace. No, we have tolerated this, but we have only about ten days to two weeks when we should spray

DR. TWOMEY: this forest, and lost there is one year.

MR. NEARY: Greenpeace does not come under our jurisdiction or we would have -

AN HON. MEMBER: We will not be deprived, Mr. Speaker.

DR. TWOMEY: Well, it might have been justified. I would possibly have voted for you.

MR. STIRLING: What other liberties would you take away?

DR. TWOMEY: The liberties to defend our Province in a time of turmoil.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: The War Measures Act.

DR. TWOMEY: Call it what you will. A gentleman said over there, not too long ago, that we are not doing this with emotion. I can assure you that I am doing it with emotion. I have learned -

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) last year.

DR. TWOMEY: - through history and by word of mouth, of what pestilence and famine can do to one's country, and I think of the famine in Ireland in 1845, 1846, and 1847. The population of that country was desolated. Nine million people; at the end of the famine there were 3 million left. And if you can think of any pestilence in our woods that is equivalent and similar -

MR. NEARY: Did they take away the people's rights when they were fighting over there?

DR. TWOMEY: These rights were taken away too.

MR. NEARY: They were not (inaudible).

DR. TWOMEY: And there were many people - yes they were, sincerely and honestly. And because of all these things I have read about famines in other countries,

DR. TWOMEY: possibly as diligently as most of you, can you think that any legislation in any country would in any way interfere or hinder the right of a government of that country to protect its natural resources.

This bill, it covers a twelve to fourteen day period in our Province, no longer, no longer. And if in preserving or hoping to save in some way our forest resources do you not think that we should all support it in earnest?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY: There is not one of you you who would not be a member of an army, there would be no rights, civil rights or anything else, to anyone coming in here to try to devastate our land. The spruce budworm is just as attackable as the atomic bomb is to our forest.

I only got up to speak for a few minutes on this particular act, but I wanted to express my views strongly. The gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), an able debater, got up and he read something from the Toronto Globe and Mail about the effects of a spray postulated by some writer that it had created a certain degree of mental retardation in the Province of New Brunswick.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

DR. TWOMEY: Well, they had a higher - by implication you insinuated that possibly matacil did play a part in this.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

DR. TWOMEY: Hon. members have spoken about the danger to our fish, and farming of our country. This

March 13, 1981

Tape 391

PK - 4

DR. TWOMEY : again is an unproven fact. And I am sure that if there was a real need for injunction during the spray season, that our government through the Department of Health, through the Department of the Environment, and through the Department of Forestry would martial all its forces and abort the mission,

DR. TWOMEY: should any life be endangered or destroyed by the use of this spray.

MR. STIRLING: That is the very right that you are taking away.

AN HON. MEMBER: What do you know?

MR. STIRLING: What you just said there is the very right that you are taking away with this bill.

DR. TWOMEY: There are no rights that are taken away by this bill. And there is one right that supercedes everything, that is the right of self-preservation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. TWOMEY: I feel to speak further would be unnecessary. I thank you gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Carbonear.

MR. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MOORES: You do not wish to call it one o'clock, do you?

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to call it one o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. MOORES: I adjourn the debate.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 p.m. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, at three of the clock.