

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, MARCH 5, 1981

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

There are a couple of matters which I would like to bring to the attention of hon. members.

First of all, with respect to a ruling which I reserved yesterday concerning the question asked near the end of the Question Period by the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) to the hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) and the subsequent point of order raised by the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall): Having at that time not clearly heard the question, I have since reviewed Hansard.

I quote from Sir Erskine May, page 332, paragraph Q, which says "Questions anticipating discussion upon an Order of the Day have been disallowed." Also, Beauchesne, paragraph 359, section 5, which says in part, and I quote, "The matter ought to be of some urgency. There must be some present value in seeking the information during the Question Period rather than through the Order Paper". And finally, Beauchesne, paragraph 359, section 12, which says "Questions should not anticipate a debate scheduled for the day, but should be reserved for the debate."

I believe it is fair to say that the question asked certainly falls under these parliamentary references and they are quite self-explanatory and thus I rule that the questions put yesterday anticipated debate upon an Order of the Day and were therefore out of order.

I also take this opportunity to invite the attention of all hon. members to Standing Orders 90 and 91 regarding the form of petitions presented in this House. Petitions may be printed or written, and if more than three petitioners sign it, at least three signatures must

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): appear on the page containing the prayer of the petition, and, also, every member offering a petition to the House must sign it with his own hand. I should stress that the petition should be original signatures and not Xerox copies. When a member rises in his place to present a petition, it is difficult for the Chair to know whether or not the petition is acceptable, since it only comes to the table after the member has presented it to the House. If members have any inquiries about petitions, then the Clerks at the table will be glad to assist them.

I would also like, on behalf of all hon. members, to welcome to the galleries today a number of Grade V students from Vanier School in the district of Pleasantville. Students are visiting the House of Assembly as part of their Education Week activities and I know that hon. members would like to wish them a warm welcome and hope they enjoy their visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: We have several other groups, in fact, from the Woodland Elementary School in Dildo, from the district of Bellevue, also Grade V students, the number totalling fifty-six, with their teachers, Mr. Woodrow, Mr. Smith and Mr. Craniford. We would like to welcome them as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: I believe that takes care of the groups that I have at the moment.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer).

March 5, 1981

Tape 112

EC - 3

MR. THOMS:

In the past few days, the
President of the Canadian Police Brotherhood, a
Mr. Bill Jamison, I believe was his name, was in St. John's
talking with the Police Brotherhood.

MR. THOMS: Could the minister advise the House whether or not a meeting was requested with him and/or the Premier within this last eight or ten days?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, yes, a letter was written to the Premier requesting a meeting to discuss matters before the grievance committee, or which could be before the grievance committee, and the Premier wrote back - I do not have a photostat copy of the letter here, - to the effect that while he was pleased to meet with people from outside the Province in general, that matters of a law enforcement nature, it was his opinion that - well, he stated the fact that the statutory authority in areas of law enforcement was with the Minister of Justice and that it was through him that any representation should be made.

I received a letter - I forget the date; around the 24th, I believe, of the month because we opened on the 25th; I think it was the 24th - requesting a meeting to discuss - these were matters before the Labour Management Committee and which could or could not go to grievance procedure as outlined in the Collective Agreement. I wrote back and said, yes, I would be pleased to meet with the President of the Canadian Police Association and those with him to discuss a number of matters of mutual interest, that I could not meet on the 26th, which was the day they requested because then - actually I left on the evening of the 25th. - I was due to attend a meeting of other Justice ministers with respect to some common action on the Constitution but that I would be able to meet at some other time, some other day - I was back on the 27th - to discuss with them a number of matters but not to discuss matters which were currently before the Labour Management Committee and which might go to the grievance procedure because that would be to interfere with the Collective Agreement. But I did point out my

MR. OTTENHEIMER: willingness to meet with them and to discuss matters in general. I did not hear back from them. I presume what happened is that they were leaving the day after. They did, in fact, meet with the Associate Deputy Attorney General, Mr. Goodyear. So I wanted to put it in perspective rather than just yes, no, yes, no.

MR. THOMS: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Banks.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I gather from the minister's answer that the Premier of the Province refused to meet with the - would the minister table the request from the Police Brotherhood and also the reply from the Premier to the Police Brotherhood? And I gather then that no meeting took place either with the Premier of the Province or with the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) between the Police Brotherhood around that period of time? Is that it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Yes, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Just to clarify, it was a request for a meeting with the President of the Canadian Police Association, I think the Vice President of that Association, accompanied by some members of the local union.

MR. THOMS: Yes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Right. And the Premier's reply was that he did not think it was appropriate to meet with them

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

because in matters of law enforcement that this was a statutory responsibility of the Minister of Justice. On the day they requested the meeting I had already a previous commitment to meet with ministers from six or seven other provinces. That was a commitment made at least a week previously so I could not meet with them. I wrote them to say I would be pleased to meet with them at another time, that I would not be in the Province on that day, gave them the reason and said that at such a meeting I would be pleased to discuss, you know, other matters of mutual interest but not matters currently being considered by the Labour Management Committee, which might go to the grievance procedure. But I would be pleased to table those letters, I can do that tomorrow.

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

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

MR. THOMS: Would the Minister of Justice undertake to obtain the - and I know the argument in the past has been that he did not want to divulge how many policemen were policing the city of St. John's at night because it would give the criminal element an unjust advantage. We certainly would not want to do that, but for previous rosters, would the minister undertake to obtain the rosters, say, for instance, the last five or six months and table those in the House and then we can see whether or not in fact - we can see the number of policemen who have been policing the streets of St. John's for the past five or six months?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, before answering that question what I would really have to know and decide and judge is whether in doing that I would be unwittingly doing what I think would be wrong to do and that is to give general knowledge of police strength in various areas at various times on various shifts, etc. But I would have to satisfy myself whether in complying with the hon. member's request I would be doing what the hon. gentleman knows that I am unwilling to do. I do not really know that now. I would have to think about that and look at it; you know, it is a question of judgement. I am not evading it, but the hon. gentleman understands why I cannot give an answer there now.

If in doing that I would in fact - or the results would be that I would be making known the general levels and changes of levels, the policing of various times and various shifts, then I would be doing what I think would be improper to do so I will have to think about it.

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for St. Mary's - the Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Transportation (C. Brett) seeing that he is soon going to Ottawa with his roads programme for this year. I am wondering if the hon. minister would inform this House if any of the 105 miles of gravel road in the district of St. Mary's - the Capes, the only district, I might add, with that much dirt road, are included in any of the proposals submitted by the Province for special cost-sharing agreements with the Federal Government?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, to the best of my knowledge none of them are included in any request.

MR. D. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. D. HANCOCK: I find that very disturbing, Mr. Speaker. Would the hon. minister tell the House why a district that has been so neglected and has more miles in gravel road in need of upgrading, re-construction and paving is not high on the provincial government's list of priorities?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, that statement, the preamble that the member gave is certainly incorrect. Something like \$17 million was spent in that district in less than ten years and I doubt if any district in this Province can boast of having \$17 million. And that was all provincial funds, none of that was federal funds; all of it was provincial.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C. BRETT: Now the hon. member may find it strange or may not understand why roads in that district are not included in any request to DREE and the answer is this, that all requests to DREE down through the years have been for major trunk roads like the Burin Peninsula Highway, the Bonavista North Loop road, the Burgeo road, mainly roads of that type that certainly could never be done or it would take years and years to do with provincial funds only. And we have never requested DREE to get involved, nor should we nor should we request DREE to get involved in local roads like roads in my district or the hon. member's district, only

MR. C. BRETT: major highways, major trunk highways. That is the way it has always been and I think that is the way it will always be.

MR. D. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. D. HANCOCK: It matters very little to me what the minister thinks is major, but to me those roads in my district and the people living there are just as major to the people in that area as the Trans-Canada is to the minister, Mr. Speaker.

And I have some figures here.

In Trepassey last year for an eighth month figure -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are debating.

MR. D. HANCOCK: No, I am not going to any debate, I am just leading up to my supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I will allow the hon. member a short preamble.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Last year in Trepassey, in St. Shotts alone, there were 11 million pounds of fish trucked over section of dirt road, a twenty mile section. If that is not reason enough for requesting funding from DREE, then would the minister please tell me what is so I can go back to DREE looking for money on my own?

MR. S. NEARY: Roads to resources.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, any district in the Province can make the same argument, any district almost.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. D. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: My hon. friend has a supplementary?

MR. D. HANCOCK: No, go ahead, 'Steve.'

March 5, 1981

Tape No. 115

DW - 3

MR. S. NEARY:

I will yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):
yields.

The hon. member for LaPoile

The hon. member for St. Mary's -

The Capes.

MR. D. HANCOCK:
Speaker.

A final supplementary, Mr.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final, final supplementary.

MR. D. HANCOCK:

It it just another example, Mr.

Speaker, that this government does not want to go to
Ottawa looking for help, then I would ask the minister to
try and include those roads under DREE because if he can
do his part I will damn well do mine.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation. Would the minister inform the House if the officials of his department, or of the Intergovernmental Affairs Department, but I presume it was the Minister of Transportation's officials, did they meet in recent days with officials of Canadian National to discuss Canadian National's proposal to get into a container service in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the officials from Terra-Transport and CN met with my officials all day yesterday, from some time in the morning up until late yesterday afternoon, and the proposal to shift to containerization was presented to my officials and I have seen it and discussed it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Could the hon. gentleman indicate to the House what plans CN have for getting into a container service in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe I should divulge that at this point in time. It is my understanding that Mr. Pepin and possibly one other member of Parliament may be coming to Newfoundland, probably next week or real soon, at which time announcements will be made with respect to Terra-Transport and CN's decision to move to containerization.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. minister indicate to the House whether the provincial government is backing a proposal by CN to get into the container service in this Province for the first time?

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

MR. BRETT: The answer is yes, Mr. Speaker, but I think I should qualify it. That is the type of service that people who use Terra-Transport want to see most, I believe, and not only is this type of service the one that is preferred by rail, it is also preferred with respect to the water mode, another mode of transportation.

It will have some effect on the hon. member's district and I believe that is what he is getting at but it is down the road a ways and I do not think Terra-Transport, CN, or government, the provincial government or federal government, will make any serious moves in that way, the laying off of staff, until the matter has been given a lot of consideration. But I suppose the bottom line, the answer to your question, is, yes, we are. We feel that probably this is the best way to go if Terra-Transport is to improve their service. And as I indicated I think it is the way that most people want CN to go.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member for Torngat wish to yield?

MR. WARREN: I yield.

MR. SPEAKER: He yields. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Is the minister saying that the provincial government will support CN's proposal to get into the container business whether or not the shipping magnates of Newfoundland or the trucking industry in Newfoundland objects, that the provincial government will ignore these objections and back CN in their proposal to revitalize the railway in this Province? Is that what the minister is saying?

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

MR. BRETT: What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is at this point in time we have not objected. The proposals put forward by Terra-Transport were discussed with my officials, and I have seen them and discussed them with the officials. And it has not been considered by the whole government, but I really do not see the government going against it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: As I indicated I know there are people in the trucking industry who may not want to see it, but I still feel that if CN is going to give a better service then this is the way they are going to have to go.

MR. NEARY: Right on. I hope you stick by that now and do not let your colleagues talk us out of it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Health (Mr. House). In the last session of this House, a senior citizen's drug programme was announced. Would the minister advise if the pharmacists in the Province have been given any special instructions with respect to issuing drugs to and for senior citizens?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: I would like to have the question again I could not hear it there was so much noise, the last part of the question.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) closes his mouth probably the Minister of Health could hear it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: Would the minister advise if the pharmacists in the Province have been given any special instructions in respect to issuing drugs to and for senior citizens?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, The Pharmaceutical Association or the pharmacists themselves have all the power in their own hands about dispensing drugs. Drugs are dispensed at the request of doctors, doctors write out prescriptions, pharmacists get them and that is totally in their hands. There were some pharmacists, or one or two, who refused to fill a 100 day prescription. We were asked what our attitude was towards that. And our own attitude towards that is the fact that from the point of view of the Department of Health we will pay for prescriptions up to 100 days. And that has been the only thing that has gone out from the department.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my supplementary one is - I think, the minister partly answered it - I would like to ask the minister when did this come into effect? Because it is only as of about three days ago I had a call from a senior citizen who had a ninety day prescription and a druggist is only filling it on a thrity day term, and the senior citizen is required to pay \$4 each time. So is this in effect today or was it in effect last week or will it

March 5, 1981

Tape 117

PK - 3

MR. WARREN:

be in effect next week?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE:

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a decision made by the pharmacists. The pharmacist can, he may not fill, as far as I can gather, the pharmacists

MR. HOUSE:

themselves have control of that, whether they will break it into three prescriptions or not. We have had a lot of cases that has happened to. We have no control over it. We are now, for instance, in negotiations with the Pharmaceutical Association, Talking about their relationship with us and the senior citizens' drug programme, that thing is under consideration.

For instance, what has happened, and I will just clarify a bit, the fact is that there are some doctors who are giving long-term prescriptions and that is quite in order. But the pharmacists are saying that there are too many of these long-term, and they are breaking them into three parts and it is quite legal to do it that way.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary.
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, It may be legal, but am I left to understand that the minister is not going to - although the druggists have been given this senior citizens' programme, they have not been given any specific regulations to follow - how this programme is going to be issued? I will just use an example: A senior citizen about forty miles away from a pharmacist is required to go back, to hire a taxi and go back to that pharmacist three times within ninety days at a cost of the taxi fare, plus the cost of the drugs - four dollars each time - when the doctor already gave the senior citizen a prescription for ninety days.

MR. WARREN: So apparently the pharmacist is ripping off the senior citizen. Am I left to believe that?

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, if that is his definition of ripping off, that may be the case.

I did mention that we were in negotiations with the pharmacists on the whole matter. The fact is that we will pay for the - we have not given any direction. The Pharmaceutical Association, the pharmacists themselves, are the professionals in this case and they know how they are operating. What we do is ensure that we are paying for the ingredients for senior citizens who qualify. We keep a check on that through the Blue Cross and we are ensuring that we are not paying for anything other than what is being dispensed.

I have had a lot of letters, I might advise the hon. member and this House, with the same kind of problems. We go back and tell them that if the doctor is indicating a one hundred day prescription, they should expect to get that. But some pharmacists are, as I said, breaking them into

MR. W. HOUSE:

three and there is very little we can do about it under the existing legislation.

MR. WARREN: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Does the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. T. Bennett) wish to yield?

MR. BENNETT: I do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my final question to the minister, would the minister consider sitting down with the Pharmaceutical Association and the Medical Association to discuss these prescription drugs and see if the senior citizens could be alleviated of this extra burden that the pharmacists are presently placing upon them?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, in the preamble to my two previous questions I said we were in negotiations now at the present time with the pharmacists on that particular matter, along with other things, of course, regarding the programme.

MR. WARREN: Roll them together.

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

MR. T. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) and is a follow-up from yesterday's Question Period which expired before I had a chance to ask it. The minister indicated yesterday that there had been a fair amount or much ongoing correspondence between his department and Eastern Provincial and those in authority with regard to lifting the services of EPA from either Deer Lake or Stephenville. Now in the minister's correspondence, has the minister tried to impress upon those in authority the detrimental effect that would be experienced in that general area by the lifting of services from

MR. BENNETT: either of these two airports?
MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Transportation.
MR. C. BRETT: Yes, obviously we have, Mr. Speaker,
otherwise, I suppose, there would not be any point in writing
to Mr. Steele, the Manager of EPA.

Yes, we have been very strong in pointing out to the gentleman what effect it will have particularly on the Baie Verte Peninsula and, probably to a lesser extent, the hon. member's district. We have also pointed out the economic impact it will have on the town of Deer Lake; we have done this over and over.

MR. BENNETT: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.
MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate the possible cash flow - is there any indication, Mr. Speaker, of the cash flow that might stop in the event of the elimination of services from either of these airports? If the service is denied Deer Lake, how much cash flow might cease to flow through Deer Lake, and if the service ceases at Stephenville, what effect the cash flow would be in that area?

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

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have these figures. I do not know if I could get them, I do not know if the staff has them or not. I would say that they could just as easily be gotten from probably the mayors of the particular towns who would know how many people are employed there. I would have to go look for the information the same as the hon. gentleman because the employees are federal employees and I would not necessarily have that on hand. As far as the subsidy is concerned, I do not think the owners of E.P.A. are interested in any subsidy. It is my understanding they just want to get out of one of the airports and that is it. But I think the hon. gentleman can probably get the figures from the towns just as easily as he could get it from me.

MR. BENNETT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BENNETT: In an effort to try to retain the services to both airports, Mr. Speaker, I think it is very important not only to think in terms of the cash flow as an isolated thing and the service generally to the area, I think we need to harness both together and display the need. So I am wondering, Mr. Speaker, if the minister would table any correspondence that has been ongoing in the past? Would he table the correspondence so that we can take a look at it and see what has really happened so we could probably give it a little extra boost in support?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I will take that under advisement. If I have to table every piece of

MR. BRETT: correspondence that I have in the department, you know, I mean, I could fill up the table there every day, but I will take it under advisement.

MR. WARREN: That is about all you are doing, filling up the table.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, Mr. Speaker. The question I have to ask is with regard to the craft centre down in Goose Bay that was closed last Fall by the minister. Could the minister inform us if there is any truth to the matter that the minister himself went and closed the craft centre and that very little notice was given to the employees working for the craft centre?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, no, I did not go and close the craft shop myself. I have no intention of ever doing that kind of thing. I issued the order to have it closed and notice was given to the employees.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Could the minister inform us why it was closed? And not only why it was closed; it is a great concern to the units out on the coast who depend upon Goose Bay craft centre as a supply for their materials. For example, now this Winter, not enough material has been going out to the small craft centres in Cartwright, in Pinware, in Nain and various other communities along the coast, and they

MR. HISCOCK: get their stocks from the one in Goose Bay. Can the minister inform us that, if it is going to be sold through a private enterprise, will the government still make sure that this material still would be available through some government departments to these craft shops on the coast?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, the craft outlet in Happy Valley and the wholesale section of that shop as well was closed down because when the shop was set up, as the hon. gentleman from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) knows, it was set up as an extension of the depot of my department at Northwest River. That depot subsequently was closed down and legally we were not allowed to operate the craft shop on a continuous basis under that particular system. Since the shop has closed down I have visited nine communities on the coast of Labrador, all of the North coast communities and the communities of Cartwright and Paradise River, met with groups in each community, explained why it was closed down, explained also that now, today, the wholesale operation of that craft shop in Happy Valley-Goose Bay has been operating, the raw materials are there. Any craft organization in coastal Labrador in any community can take advantage now of the wholesale operation the same as they could in the past.

And, yes, Mr. Speaker, when the craft shop, the wholesale section of it particularly, goes into private operation, which should be very shortly, by the way, we have a number of excellent proposals in from seven or eight different individuals and groups in Labrador to operate that facility. When it does go ahead, one of the conditions under

MR. GOUDIE: which it would be turned over will be that the wholesale operation, the provision of the raw materials will still be made available to any craft organization in Labrador.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): One final question, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: My question is for the Minister of Public Works. Could the Minister of Public Works inform this House whether the Department of Public Works is still paying rental on this building to the Anglican Church now that it is closed down?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Public Works.

MR. YOUNG: I will have to take that as notice, and I will let him know tomorrow.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Terra Nova. A very quick question.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask a question of the Minister of Transportation and Communications, following out of the question asked by my hon. friend, the hon. member for St. Mary's - the Capes (D.Hancock).

I take it from the question asked by my hon. friend and colleague that the minister is meeting with DREE officials soon to present the Province's package - is that right? Is the minister meeting with them soon?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Oh, I understood the question, Mr. Speaker, I thought that that was the preamble.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: It was a preamble to the question asked by my hon. friend, so will the minister answer that question?

March 5, 1981

Tape No. 121

EL - 3

MR. LUSH:

Is he anticipating meeting with officials of DREE in the near future to put forward his tactics for road improvements in the Province?

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

MR. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I will not be meeting with the DREE minister. If anybody meets with the DREE minister it will be the officials of Intergovernmental Affairs and Communications and the Premier (Mr. Peckford), because DREE has nothing to do with me. I suppose it is possible I could sit in on some meetings if we are discussing roads through DREE, but I think the hon. member is probably getting tangled up between the ministry of Transport and the ministry of DREE and I probably would be discussing road work and the Trans-Canada Highway, something of that nature with Mr. Pepin, the Minister of Transport. The Minister of DREE (Mr. De Bane) would not be coming here to discuss DREE projects with me as such.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has expired. Not wanting to be unfair, it has been brought to my attention that one of the groups of students introduced earlier from Woodland Elementary, their school is actually in the district of Trinity-Bay de Verde, although there are students from Bellevue and Trinity - Bay de Verde.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Annual Report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Computer Services Limited, and the Seventh Annual Report of the Newfoundland Liquor Licencing Board for the year ending the 31st. of March, 1980, and the Annual Report (1980) of the Newfoundland Liquor Corporation.

MR. THOMS: How much did you spend on Education?

MR. SPEAKER: Any further reports?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I want to give the answer to question number three on the Order Paper of March 3rd., 1981. The question was asked by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) in connection with the loss of one of our water bombers.

There are seven parts to the question.

I will read the answers.

The water bomber was being ferried to St. Jean in Quebec for major metal work on the hull.

MR. THOMS: St. John.

MR. BRETT: St. John. Okay. Maybe I should take the French course.

The type of work that we were getting done there could not be done at our air services facility in St. John's.

The cause of the crash was that

the -

AN HON. MEMBER: It ran out of gas.

MR. BRETT: That is true. As typed here, it says, "As a result of fuel starvation enroute to St. John-or St. Jean -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

March 5, 1981

Tape No. 122

NM - 3

MR. BRETT:

were encountered.

- but actually very heavy head winds

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is not very funny by the way.

MR. BRETT:

No, it is not very funny.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

It is not funny at all.

MR. BRETT:

We almost lost three people.

As far as the injuries are concerned, the captain and co-pilot suffered minor injuries in the forced landing. Injuries were confined to small cuts and bruises mostly about the face.

There have not been any lawsuits against my department as a result of the accident; to the best of my knowledge there will not be any.

It does not appear at this time that the aircraft will be replaced for the fire season. Whether or not it will ever be replaced I suppose is up to the Department of Forest Resources and Lands.

This particular aircraft was considered to be a standby. We had seven and neither one of them was designed to any specific area. There were seven water bombers there and wherever they were required they went. So no part of the Province will be without a water bomber as such. It just means that instead of having seven we have six and whether, as I said, whether or not the seventh one will be replaced is up to that department.

MR. SPEAKER:

Any further answers?

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I take great pleasure in presenting a petition on behalf of 163 residents of LaPoile and seventy-six residents of Grand Bruit, a total of 239 petitioners, Mr. Speaker. I had two petitions; I combined it in one if that is agreeable. I think that that is in order.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

MR. NEARY: I was hoping that the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) would have presented his petition by now because this is a similar petition as the hon. gentleman has in his possession that was circulated by the Lions Club in Burgeo. He wrote me and asked me if I would support his petition, but so far his petition has not been forthcoming so I have no choice but to present this petition on behalf of my constituents. I do hope the hon. gentleman will support the prayer of this petition which is similar to the one that no doubt he will be presenting in due course.

It has to do with a proposal by the Corner Brook Tuckamore Club to establish a wilderness area on the Southwest coast.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tuckamore?

MR. NEARY: Tuckamore. T-u-c-k-a-m-o-r-e, Tuckamore Club.

MR. HOUSE: Never heard of them before.

MR. NEARY: I do not know who they are.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, if I read the prayer of the petition I do not think it will be necessary for me to make any comments on it because it is self-explanatory.

MR. S. NEARY: "We, the undersigned residents of Grand Bruit and LaPoile in the electoral district of LaPoile, while keenly interested in the perservation of the caribou herds, herein express our determined opposition to the proposal of the Corner Brook Tuckamore Wilderness Club, published in The Evening Telegram January 10th., 1981." This proposal has been made to the minister concerned with this matter, Mr. Speaker. "The proposed wilderness area would eliminate or reduce five big game hunting areas, thereby seriously restricting opportunities for residents of this area to participate in an activity that provides them with an important source of food. Such outdoor recreation activities as snowmobiling, skiing, trouting and woodcutting would be severely restricted as well. Furthermore, residents of Grand Bruit and LaPoile would be completely barred from their traditional hunting areas. In short, the wilderness area proposed by the Corner Brook Tuckamore Wilderness Club would deprive people of the Southwest coast of their time-honoured right to enjoy the hinterland adjacent to their communities, a right enjoyed by all other Newfoundland communities. However, since we share the Tuckamore Club's concern for the protection of the caribou herds we propose the following for the protection of this invaluable resource; (1) increased surveillance of the Cabribou habitat by wardens, including frequent checking of vehicles entering the Trans-Canada Highway from the Burgeo road and vehicles along the Burgeo road as well;" -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: " (2) if the wilderness must be established it be located West of Grandy's River and extended no closer than fifteen miles to the South coast so as to respect the hunting traditions of coastal residents; and (3) an educational campaign be implemented aimed at making people aware of the value of wildlife and the need for conservation measures. It is our humble belief that these proposals of ours if implemented would preserve the traditional interest of the area residents and afford adequate protection to the caribou herds."

Mr. Speaker, that is well-spoken. I do not think I could add anything to it except to say that I whole-heartedly support the prayer of this petition and I do ask the minister to take into account, if they are deciding to turn this into a wilderness area, that the views and the opinions of the good people of Grand Bruit and LaPoile be taken into consideration.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. H. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this petition and it is my understanding that in my mail today there was a similar petition from the residents of Burgeo and Ramea. This is quite an issue in communities both in the district of LaPoile and Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. It appears to me that some citizens of Corner Brook in their overenthusiasm to protect the wildlife and the wilderness of Newfoundland are imposing their own value judgements that will seriously affect the residents of the Southwest coast.

The Burgeo road in particular and the suggestion that there should be a corridor along the Burgeo some two to three miles on both sides, I think sets a very dangerous precedent because it

MR. ANDREWS: eliminates, number one, the ability of people to cut firewood, particularly in the Wintertime, and to enjoy the only route to nearby Summer and Winter inland recreation.

It is a great pleasure for me to support this petition.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further petitions?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation Act For The Purpose Of Integrating The Newfoundland And Labrador Housing Corporation And The St. John's Housing Corporation", carried. (Bill No. 19).

On motion, Bill No. 19, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Development to introduce a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Canada Bay Lumber Company Limited (Agreement) Act, 1974", carried. (Bill No. 24).

On motion, Bill No. 24, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Premier to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Reorganization Of Certain Government Departments And Matters Related Or Incidental Thereto", carried. (Bill No. 1).

On motion, Bill No. 1, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend And Consolidate The Law Respecting Boilers, Pressure Vessels And Compressed Gas", carried. (Bill No. 28).

On motion, Bill No. 28, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Amusement Rides", carried. (Bill No. 29).

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

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Workers' Compensation Act", carried. (Bill No. 47).

On motion, Bill No. 47, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Environment", carried. (Bill No. 4).

On motion, Bill No. 4, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Drilling Of Water Wells And Use Of Ground-Water", carried. (Bill No. 6).

On motion, Bill No. 6, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Historic Objects, Sites And Records Act, 1973", carried. (Bill No. 18).

On motion, Bill No. 18, read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture to introduce a bill, "An Act To Establish The Newfoundland And Labrador Youth Advisory Council", carried. (Bill No. 31).

March 5, 1981, Tape 125, Page 1 -- apb

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

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Libraries Act, 1975", carried. (Bill No. 35).

On motion, Bill No. 35 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Financial Administration Act, 1973", carried. (Bill No. 41).

On motion, Bill No. 41 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Mining And Mineral Rights Tax Act, 1975", carried. (Bill No. 10).

On motion, Bill No. 10 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Finance to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Garnishment Against The Remuneration Of Public Officials," carried. (Bill No.9).

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

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Local School Tax Act," carried. (Bill No.7).

On motion, Bill No. 7 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Education to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Teachers' Association Act, 1974", carried. (Bill No. 8).

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

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Freedom Of Information", carried. (Bill No.3).

On motion, Bill No. 3 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Judgement Recovery (Nfld) Act", carried. (Bill No.16).

On motion, Bill No. 16 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Proceedings Against The Crown Act, 1973", carried. (Bill No. 15).

On motion, Bill No. 15 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Protection Of Personal Privacy", carried. (Bill No. 2).

On motion, Bill No. 2 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Attachment Of Wages Act", carried. (Bill No.53).

On motion, Bill No. 53 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Enable Insurance Corporation of Newfoundland Limited To Become A Federal Corporation", carried. (Bill No.51).

On motion, Bill No. 51 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Repeal The Income Tax Discounters Act", carried. Bill No. 27).

On motion, Bill No. 27 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Change Of Name Act, 1978", carried. (Bill No.26).

On motion, Bill No. 26 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Human Rights Code", carried. (Bill No. 23).

On motion, Bill No. 23 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Private Investigation And Security Services", carried. (Bill No. 22).

On motion, Bill No. 22 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Municipal and Housing to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Urban And Rural Planning Act", carried. (Bill No. 42).

On motion, Bill No. 42
read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the
Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing to introduce
a bill, "An Act To Amend The Assessment Act", carried.
(Bill No. 39).

On motion, Bill No. 39
read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the
Minister of Mines And Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act
To Amend The Electrical Power Control Act", carried.
(Bill No. 17).

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

Motion, the hon. the
Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a bill, "An
Act To Amend The Department Of Mines And Energy Act,
1973", carried. (Bill No. 20).

On motion, Bill No. 20
read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. LUSH:
a quorum in the House.

I do not believe we have

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):
count the members, please.

A quorum call? Clerk,

Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

According to the Standing Orders three minutes have expired. I will ask the Clerk to count the House and advise whether we have a quorum.

We have a quorum.

We were doing Motion 30, I believe.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Mines And Energy Act, 1973". Carried. (Bill No. 20).

On motion, Bill No. 20 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting The Newfoundland Association Of Optometrists And Governing The Practice of Optometry In The Province". Carried (Bill No. 48).

On motion, Bill No. 48 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, The hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Denturists". Carried. (Bill No. 49).

On motion, Bill No. 49 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, The hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Human Tissue Act, 1971". Carried. (Bill No. 38).

On motion, Bill No. 38 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, The hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Embalmers And Funeral Directors Act, 1975". Carried. (Bill No. 37)

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

On motion, Bill No. 37 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Medical Act, 1974". Carried. (Bill No. 14).

On motion, Bill No. 14 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Hospitals Act, 1971". Carried. (Bill No. 13).

On motion, Bill No. 13 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Health to introduce a bill, "An Act Respecting Dispensing Opticians". Carried. (Bill No. 21).

On motion, Bill No. 21 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister Of Forest Resources And Lands to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Timber Scalers Act". Carried (Bill No. 12).

On motion, Bill No. 12 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister Of Forest Resources And Lands to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Development Areas (Lands) Act". Carried. (Bill No. 40).

On motion, Bill No. 40 read a first time ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Motion, the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act", carried. (Bill No. 36).

On motion, Bill No. 36 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier Act", carried. (Bill No. 25).

On motion, Bill No. 25 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act To Provide For The Compulsory Use Of Seat Belts", carried. (Bill No. 45).

On motion, Bill No. 45 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Social Services to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Child Welfare Act, 1972", carried. (Bill No. 34).

On motion, Bill No. 34 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Fishing Industry Advisory Board Act, 1975", carried. (Bill No. 11).

On motion, Bill No. 11 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Co-operative Societies Act", carried. (Bill No. 30).

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Motion, the hon. the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Department Of Rural, Agricultural And Northern Development Act", carried. (Bill No. 33).

On motion, Bill No. 33 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Public Works and Services to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Department of Public Works And Services Act, 1973 With Respect To Government Printing", carried. (Bill No. 32).

On motion, Bill No. 32 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

A standing ovation is in order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Members know comments like that are out of order.

Order 2.

Motion, second reading of a bill,

"An Act To Provide For the Protection Of The Forests Of The Province From Insects And Disease". (Bill No. 54).

The hon. Minister of Lands and Forests.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. POWER: I began to believe there for a while that Bill 54 was like the old TV story that used to be on, 'Car 54, Where Are You?' and I was beginning to wonder where was Bill 54.

Mr. Speaker, in introducing Bill 54 which is, as you have just read, "An Act To Provide For Protection Of The Forests Of The Province From Insects And Disease," it would be worthwhile, I think, to summarize the situation of the forests industry in Newfoundland as it relates to the budworm and to other insect pests that we have and diseases that we have in Newfoundland.

I would like to say from the very beginning that our discussion, as it relates to Bill 54, for the benefit of my colleague from Naskaupi (J. Goudie) and the other members for Labrador, that this Bill relates particularly to the Island of Newfoundland as there is no budworm epidemic in Labrador. And in our discussions today when we emphasize the value of the timber resource in Newfoundland and we emphasize the importance of it and its protection, it does not in any way reduce the fact that we as a government also place great importance and emphasis on the development of the wood industry and the wood resource in Labrador. At this very day, my officials and officials of some of the paper companies in Canada, some of the officials of the Department of Development, are in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. They are having intense negotiations and discussions to see if we can put into place in Labrador a permanent, stable industry based upon the woods resource that is in unit management 19 in and around Happy Valley - Goose Bay. So our discussion today will basically be about the Island part of the Province and the Island resource and the need for its protection. It does not in any way take away from the value of the wood

MR. POWER: resource in Labrador or from government's emphasis to be placed on the development of that resource.

Mr. Speaker, the degree of infestation that has taken place in Newfoundland since 1971-and the budworm has been in Newfoundland, as all persons know; for many many years, written about as far back as 1923- Much of the information that we will be using today which in giving a background will be, of course, taken from Dr. Poole's Royal Commission Report which all members of the House of Assembly have received-and I can table this copy afterwards, Mr. Speaker, for the courtesy of the House even though all members have received a copy of it.

But certainly the degree of infestation has been extremely severe since 1971. We have had a loss of in excess of 16,000,000 cords of wood since 1971, extremely infested, and some of it about 8,000,000 - 9,000,000 cords of that wood has died and is now beyond, I suppose for all practical purposes, any use to the Province except what can be harvested in the next couple of years. So we have lost, in a sense, over twenty per cent of the productive forests of Newfoundland. The productive forests of Newfoundland run about 72,000,000 cords. We have about 16.9 million cords that are in state of severe hardship because of the budworm, half of that being dead and the other half being under severe states of attack and will die in the next few years if not protected.

It is very important, Mr. Speaker, to also realize that although it has not happened in most other jurisdictions where the budworm seems to have a lot of influence and a lot of control, in Newfoundland we have lost alot of acreage caused to young spruce and young fir stands, which is an unusual situation which has not happened as much

MR. POWER: in parts of Maine, Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, but for some reason in Newfoundland the budworm has done extensive damage to parts of young spruce stands and young fir stands.

I would just like to quote something from this, which is the Canadian Forestry publication, the Canadian Forestry Service, which I will also be reading from certain things today, Mr. Speaker, which I will also table and hopefully we can get copies for all members of the House. But certainly we have had an awful lot of infestation. This which was produced, by the way, in December 1980 and just as an adjunct, I suppose, to the Royal Commission because the Canadian Forestry Service were, to a large degree, the professionals that Dr. Poole and the other Royal Commissioners depended upon for an unbiased kind of information that went into the Royal Commission. They knew that when they went to the paper companies they were going to get the worst scenario because the paper companies have a vested interest. And they knew they would get the same type of scenario I suppose, from persons who were violently anti-spray, persons who were very environmentally conscious, maybe not commercially conscious, if you want, and therefore the Canadian Forestry Service, which produces this Woody Points publication, were an objective group which gave a lot of information to the Royal Commission.

They have given figures here which say that there is a large degree of mortality in young spruce and young fir stands in parts of Newfoundland, which is a very alarming fact because obviously young spruce stands are ones that you have to protect most importantly because they are the ones that you have to depend on. There is also a situation that arises when a young spruce or fir stand is under severe

March 5, 1981

Tape No. 129

EL - 4

MR. POWER: attack from budworm for three or four consecutive years, and that is that if those trees die in young stands then they have no ability to reproduce themselves. They are not of sufficient age where they have produced cones and seeds and natural regeneration will not take place as may very well take place in areas where older, more mature trees are being killed by budworm attack But certainly

MR. POWER: in the case of young spruce and young fir stands, there may not be any natural regeneration. This is an extremely critical situation. It would be better, I suppose, to lose millions of cords of over mature timber than to lose thousands or hundreds of thousands of cords of immature timber because that is really what you depend upon.

The Royal Commission, Mr. Speaker, in recommending how we are to deal with this problem. And the Royal Commission, last year the government suffered some criticism, I suppose, and some praise, depending upon what side of the public platform you happen to be on, about setting up a royal commission to examine all aspects of forest protection and management in the Province.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) spraying.

MR. POWER: Depending upon which side of the platform you were on. In our case, Mr. Speaker, we saw setting up the royal commission as a valuable way of finding out what the people of Newfoundland thought, giving the people of Newfoundland the opportunity on one hand to have input into the royal commission, and certainly on the other hand to give persons of Newfoundland the opportunity to receive information from the royal commission. Because information and communication, if it is to be effective about such an important issue, has got to be a two way transportation of ideas. And what has happened is that we had the royal commission travelling through many parts of Newfoundland, speaking to many individuals on one hand and giving them information, and obviously receiving from many individuals, groups, companies, town councils and interest groups in the Province their thoughts as to what should happen in the forest industry.

MR. POWER: The royal commission spent a considerable amount of time - and I would like to take a second of the House's valuable time just to give some praise to Dr. Poole, to Dr. Rowe and to Dr. Carroll, who are three persons who -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: - I do not know how we as a government, or anyone else in Newfoundland, could have found any three persons who could have undertaken such a difficult task and done it so impartially and so well. Dr. Carroll, who is an educator by trade, I suppose, but certainly a very loyal and dedicated and loving Newfoundlander; Dr. Rowe who is a medical doctor, and who certainly looked at all aspects of the medical nature of sprays and environmental aspects. Dr. Carroll, who is a professional forester, he has spent his life studying the forest industry and ways to make it work and work well. And also I think it would be fair at this state in the Province to give some credit to the legal counsel, a Mr. Hutchings from Corner Brook, and anyone who attended any of the royal commission hearings will realize that he played a very valuable part in giving valuable information and advice not only to the royal commission but to other persons who happened to attend the Committee hearings. And also to the secretarial help, one secretary in particular who did most of the typing and most of the work and it was a very difficult job done under very difficult time constraints. Some royal commissions have an open end and can take their time in giving their recommendations but because of the nature of the forest industry, because the forest industry was in such a crucial and critical stage, we demanded of the royal commission that we have recommendations from them by the last of December, which eventually came in in the middle of January, which was certainly quite commendable on

MR. POWER: their behalf because they did it so quickly and, even though maybe a couple of weeks late, it certainly gave us plenty of time to make decisions for 1981.

The Royal Commission after having looked at all of the situations in Newfoundland, having talked to all of the people who they possibly could talk to, after having received recommendations that were strongly in favour of spraying and received recommendations and reports that were strongly opposed to spray, after having travelled to all other jurisdictions in Canada where spray programmes had taken place, where you had a lot of budworm damage, after talking to medical experts, environmental experts, after having talked to forestry persons, after having talked to in many cases persons who think there are other ways to manage the forest resources by bringing in new species and by doing different types of management plans, after having talked to all those persons, the Royal Commission in their wisdom came back to government with a recommendation for an integrated approach to forest spraying. And I will be, as I have said publicly before, I believed then before the Royal Commission and while the Royal Commission was doing its work and I believe now, that a spray programme, a chemical spray programme of whatever type, of whatever magnitude, will not and can never be the sole answer to the forest problems in Newfoundland. And spray programmes certainly, in some jurisdictions, may become that. It may become the panacea for all of the problems that are in any given industry, whether it be agricultural or forestry. That is certainly not the approach that the royal commission took in Newfoundland. It was not my belief nor government's belief then, nor is it now.

The Royal Commission came back and recommended to us a several pronged attack to straighten out the

March 5, 1981

Tape No. 130

NM - 4

MR. POWER: forest industry in Newfoundland,
to hopefully make it more stable. And I hope that some
persons here might realize that there is a forest base in

MR. POWER: Newfoundland, the 72 million cords of wood that we have. Based upon an annual allowable cut, the 16 million acres or so that we have to work with - well, I guess there are about 9 million acres on the Island and 7 million acres in Labrador, but all told the 9 million acres on the Island part of the Province, that we could sustain five or six or seven newsprint operations of the type that we have now. It is going to take a long while for that to happen. It is a sixty or seventy or eighty year planning programme that has to come into play. And we have begun that with the introduction of certain recommendations of the Royal Commission, certainly the first one being a production programme.

There are persons in Newfoundland who will say that you can solve all of the woes of the forest industry by not spraying, by simply bringing in a better management scheme. That simply does not work. The more money that you invest in silviculture, the more money that you invest in reforestation, the logic and the arguments are there that you have to protect on one hand, but by not protecting you can just solve the problems by planting and replanting and getting site preparation and pre-commercial thinning. What happens if right now we are protecting a natural forest which is very valuable to us and has a certain dollar value - how much more valuable will a forest be thirty years down the road that we have grown starting from a seedling, and a seed and a cone that we collected in the woods, with a seedling that we grew in our own nurseries, to something that we planted in the forest ourselves, to something that we went out and weeded, took the weeds from it, something we went out and actually, I suppose, used fertilizers on parts of it, something that we went out and did commercial and pre-commercial thinning

MR. POWER: on: How valuable is that forest going to be thirty or forty years down the road?

 And what happens, Mr. Speaker, if you find that an insect, whether it be - one of the insects, you know, the insect of spruce budworm or the others - I hope some people in the House are aware of the fact that the spruce budworm is not the only insect that we have. I am going to table this document after, and as I say hopefully get copies for all members of the House, but I will just tell you, Mr. Speaker, a couple, I will just read down some of the list of insects that we have in Newfoundland that have attacked the forest, and obviously the largest one is the spruce budworm. There is a thing called the Eastern hemlock looper, which some persons are aware of. There is a spruce cone worm. There is a balsam woody aphids. There is a large sawfly. There is an Eastern spruce bark beetle. There is a birch case speaker. There is a satin moth. Those are all insects which are today, or will be this Summer, attacking our forests.

 There are major diseases which attack our forests, from cankers to witch broom of black spruce, broom rust of conifers, shoot and leave blight, stem and branch cancer, root rot. There is black knot of pincherry. There is tip blight of balsam fir. There is witch's broom pinch needle rust. There is needle cast. There are leave spots. There is wind storm, there is frost and there is Winter damage. All these things attack the forest in Newfoundland.

 Now, Mr. Speaker, if someone comes to us today and says, 'You do not need a protection programme. All you need is a better management programme.' How does one have in that case when all those things attack the

MR. POWER: forest, and man needs them so valuably, how do we arrange to have 18,000 Newfoundlanders earn their living directly or indirectly from the forest industry, if we do not protect the forest resource against such a wide variety of enemies. And thirty or forty years down the road anyone of those insects that I have mentioned, anyone of those diseases may require a chemical or other solutions. It is simply not a management scheme.

So when the Royal Commission came back to us and said -

MR. NEARY: Why do you not get to the legislation?

MR. POWER: We are talking about forest protection.

AN HON. MEMBER: That has nothing to do with the legislation.

MR. POWER: When the Royal Commission came back to us, Mr. Speaker, and said that we should have an integrated approach to the forest industry, spraying on one hand being the first part of it - you have to protect. It is nonsense to invest more money, additional money, if you do not already protect what is there and a natural sense of what man has maybe done some work to make it into a high yield kind of situation.

We took their advice. And my department and officials and I and others went to the paper companies and we demanded of them the fact that they must get more directly involved in silviculture, reforestation, site preparation, thinnings. I suppose experimentation with certain species which can give a better yield, and species which are not now used in the making of newsprint or pulp. We went to the paper companies and we have worked out with those paper companies for the first time in Newfoundland history, it never happened before, it has not happened in the 400 to 500 years

MR. POWER: that Newfoundland has been around. But this year the paper companies are beginning a five year programme, both Abitibi-Price and Bowaters, and they should be commended for, I suppose, realizing that they have to do this type of management this day in age. They have agreed to put in \$24 million over the next five years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: \$24 million.

AN HON. MEMBER: How many jobs?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: They realized partially because of the damage that was being done.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: We had, and

MR. C. POWER: I do not mind saying intensive negotiations, but certainly this government's attitude is that we are not simply going to spray as was requested by the companies last year, "Spray! Please spray and we do not have to do anything else!" We did not believe it then and we do not believe it now. What we did say was that you have got to do several things and put several things into place before you can have a stable and healthy forest resources in Newfoundland. We have gone to the paper companies, so on one hand we have a spray programme.

And let me say also, Mr. Speaker, while I am talking about funding from the companies: We also have a spray programme this year that is going to be funded on a one-third basis as opposed to the '78 spray programme which was done 50 per cent by government and 50 per cent by the companies. On a \$4.5 million cost by the government paying 33 per cent instead of 50 per cent, we are saving the government, the taxpayers of Newfoundland, close to \$700,000 by a new financial arrangement to make sure that the spray programme is shared equally by the persons who participate in the forest industry.

MR. WINDSOR: Hear, hear.

MR. C. POWER: So on two hands the companies in Newfoundland have taken a more responsible attitude as it comes to forest management, one in the sense that they are more directly sharing and more proportionately, fairly and equally sharing in the cost of the spray programme; and second, in the sense that they are investing \$24 million in silviculture. That, combined with the \$21 million from government, allows for \$45 million to be spent in this Province over the next five years, creating in the area of 1,500 jobs in silvicultural work alone along with the other things that are happening in the forest industry.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. C. POWER: I said from government, a DREE programme shared between federal and provincial government -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. POWER: - and for a long time to come the Newfoundland provincial PC government.

MR. WINDSOR: What else are they going to do with their money?

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. POWER: - along with those two major bold initiatives and changes that we have taken in managing the forest resource in Newfoundland, one being a protection programme, one being a very active silvicultural programme, we are not content, this government is not content, to give away ownership management and control of our resources to anybody.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. POWER: Now we may realize that in 1905 or 1938 it may have been necessary to give 99 non-conditional leases to the paper companies to get them to come to Newfoundland but, Mr. Speaker, the companies are realizing, as the government realizes, that this is 1981 and that this government intends to control and manage the resource; particularly the forest resource which we have absolute control over in this Province.

We have, Mr. Speaker, arranged with Abitibi-Price, negotiated with them to change what remains of their 99 year leases, which runs from forty year to about twenty-two years, we have arranged with them, Mr. Speaker, to work towards twenty year renewal management agreements, management agreements that are based upon conditions of performance. On the lease part, Mr. Speaker, I do not have copies of this map, and I assume it is proper

MR. POWER: to table a map - I know the other day we had some argument about tabling exhibits, but I assume it is proper to table a map. I want to table a map that shows for Mr. Speaker and for all hon. members of this House the actual lands that we are talking about. And we are talking about not the charter lands, leased land to Abitibi-Price or to Bowaters or their freehold. We are talking about their licenced limits which can easily be picked out from this map and I will gladly get a copy taken off for any member opposite or on this side of they want one. But, Mr. Speaker, this map shows exactly the land we are talking about, we are not trying to deceive anybody. There are about 10 million acres of land that are in control of the paper companies today. The lands that we are talking about, the licenced land takes about seven million acres of that. To this stage we have taken 2.5 million acres of that land from Abitibi-Price, they have agreed to put it under a twenty year evergreen licencing system where they have got to perform or they do not get that land back. They have got to perform and that is the important criteria. I, Mr. Speaker, would not even be disappointed if I had been able to negotiate, and our officials have, with Abitibi-Price for 99 year conditional leases as long as they were conditional on them doing something, but we have worked back to what is an advancement, what is a modern progressive approach to managing the forest resource which is a twenty year management plan based upon performance, based upon silviculture investment, based upon proper site preparation and based upon proper cutting habits.

MR. FLIGHT: What happens in the Abitibi-Price case?

MR. POWER: In Abitibi-Price's case, about 10 per cent of their land runs out in the year 2000, 5 per cent in 2002, another 5 per cent in 2006, 90 per cent of their land runs out in twenty-eight years' hence

MR. POWER: and over 63 per cent of their land is left between the year 2019 and 2027. So anybody who thinks that we did not get back something from Abitibi-Price, that they did not give up an asset is not also acknowledging the fact that we did, that we have gotten those back.

Now we have not been able to work out the same agreement with Bowaters, but Bowaters has about 4.4 million acres that we intend to negotiate very hard, a very aggressive approach, Mr. Speaker, to get back from Bowaters control of those 4.4 million acres, we intend to work them back.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about ERCO?

MR. C. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, this is better than ERCO, ERCO only got us back dollars, this gets us back a resource that we have to have control of and one that we can develop and prosper and grow upon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. C. POWER:

It is a major, major initiative that we have taken and I certainly do not mind saying that it is on the same level as ERCO. It is on the same level of other things that we have done to get control of our resources. I do not mind saying it, Mr. Speaker, and as a member of the PC Government of Newfoundland I am even proud to say it.

Mr. Speaker, the bill that we are talking about, Bill 54, talks about 'An Act To Provide For The Protection Of The Forests Of The Province From Insects And Diseases.' Hence because of the things I just talked about, the nature of the resource that we have and the nature of the infestation which all persons acknowledge on both sides of the House and in many parts of the Province, is an extremely severe infestation. We have agreed to do a spray programme spraying in the area of one million acres although our actual figures, Mr. Speaker, will be somewhat less than that a little, around 960,000 acres we will be spraying this year, with matacil, a chemical, a poison, toxic substance which it must be to kill the budworm. But while it is on the one hand toxic to the budworm, it is quite life-giving to the loggers and to the workers who work in Grand Falls, Corner Brook and other parts of Newfoundland where an awful lot of persons make a living from the forest industry.

MR. C. POWER: There are a lot of safeguards involved, Mr. Speaker, We will certainly be following every environmental procedure that is laid down both by the federal licensing authorities, we will be following every environmental procedure laid down by our provincial Department of Environment. We will be getting approvals from the Pesticides Advisory Board, which is being expanded for this programme and other things that are happening in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, all of those things put controls on myself as minister on one hand and on the department on another, and certainly on the government, to make sure that the spray programme does, in fact, take place in a wise and safe and cautious manner for the benefit of all of the persons in Newfoundland who make a living from the forest industry.

There has been some discussion, Mr. Speaker, that one of the things as a result of this bill that we are, I suppose, taking away some rights from some Newfoundlanders. And that may, in fact, be true.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. C. POWER: It may, in fact, be true, Mr. Speaker, that when we on one hand have to do a spray programme and some Newfoundlander does not want to have a spray programme, that we are infringing on a right.

MR. L. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. C. POWER: I am saying, Mr. Speaker -

MR. L. THOMS: No rights are being taken away.

MR. C. POWER: And they are not. We may infringe or postpone. For instance, this bill, the purpose of it is to prevent an injunction, to cause it not to be allowed to happen in Newfoundland that some individual, whether he

MR. C. POWER: be misguided or sincere, of stopping a spray programme which indirectly affects the individual rights of 18,000 individuals who make their living from forestry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have to balance off the fact of whether one individual is losing a right or whether the larger rights of a much larger group of individuals also are being protected.

Mr. Speaker, certainly we do not intend in any way to take away any rights. And with that in mind, Mr. Speaker, certainly when it comes to part 75(b) of the Act where it says, 'No action may be taken in nuisance or trespass,' that certainly is not the sole and complete intention of government. We intend to allow any individual in Newfoundland who was either personally injured or has his property damaged because and as a result of the spray programme, that we intend to allow that person, Mr. Speaker, to bring action against the government and we will be proposing an amendment in committee to make sure that our intentions of government are fully and clearly understood by all persons in the public.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding these opening remarks I just want to say that what this Act does is basically to make sure that a spray programme which has to take place, it is really crucial that we have this Act that prevents injunctions. As all persons who know the budworm and its life cycle, you know you have to spray in a very short amount of time. It is an emergency, critical situation. You only have two or three weeks in the life stage of the spruce budworm when you can spray it and it would have some kind of degree of effectiveness.

MR. C. POWER: Therefore, Mr. Speaker, we need this Act. It is done solely and completely so that on one hand we can protect the livelihoods of all Newfoundlanders. The amendment, as I have said, that we will introduce in committee will clarify and verify government's intention to allow any person who either sustains personal or property damage as a result of the spray programmes to take action against the government. And we are not anticipating any, Mr. Speaker, because as I have said we as a government and as a department are taking every possible action to make sure that our spray programme is done in a safe and cautious manner.

Mr. Speaker, all I want to say is that certainly our intentions are to protect the

MR. POWER:

rights of 18,000 Newfoundlanders who make their living from the forest industry, We have decided on a spray programme and that will take place, I guess, sometime in early June or the middle of July.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. the member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me say that perhaps first of all, I may not take as much time as the minister, although I understand both of us are allowed an hour.

Let me in the next breath congratulate the commissioners on the job that they have done, although I suspect that there are those people in Newfoundland, perhaps, who will not congratulate the commissioners themselves.

Let me also congratulate the minister because, Mr. Speaker, he has tried to do a job of covering up a bad piece of legislation by talking about the spray programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, the truth of the matter is that this piece of legislation has nothing to do, absolutely nothing to do with the spray programme. It does not mean that you have to spray, it does not answer the question whether we are to spray or not to spray. That decision has been already made. It was made by government some two weeks ago. So I would suggest to the minister that perhaps out of the twenty-five minutes - twenty-six, I think, to be exact - that he used, he spent twenty-two of them needlessly. The question is academic. As I said, the decision has been made and it is no longer important. The fact of the matter is that regardless of who likes it or

MR. TULK: who lumps it there will be a spray programme in Newfoundland in 1981.

Perhaps the sad part of that spray programme, Mr. Speaker, is that we could be locked into a spray programme for ten, fifteen, twenty, thirty or fifty years and that will depend upon, I suspect, whether the budworm is destroyed through natural causes or whether new methods of control are found or whether indeed the government finds the decision too unpopular to hold on to. And I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that that third reason will be the biggest one.

I want to suggest, Mr. Speaker, without reflecting upon the Commission in any way, that I believe that that was one of the most important, if not the sole reason for appointing the commission in the first place.

The spruce budworm problem is not a new problem. It has been serious, perhaps critical for some eight years. And we have had spray programmes in this Province. We had two major spray programmes - I believe one was experimental - in 1977 and a major spray programme in 1978. Mr. Speaker, that was, I suppose, again, carried out under the former administration, and there are only twelve of the sixteen people now sitting over there. And I suggest to you that that administration found it politically unpopular to carry on the spray programme and backed off. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that this administration wanted to spray the forests of this Province last year, but I do not believe that they could find the courage or the intestinal fortitude to do it. Therefore, what did they do? They sat down and they appointed a commission to do a study so that they could maintain a good PR image in this Province and the commission would then make their judgements for them.

MR. TULK:

Because, Mr. Speaker, that is what has happened. This is a judgement call. There are no sure fire answers to that question of whether you spray or whether you do not spray. It is a judgement call. There are those people who call themselves environmentalists who say we should not spray and there are those people who are not environmentalists who say that we should not spray. And then there are people who say you have to spray because you have to protect the jobs, as the minister said, of some 18,000 people.

The whole point is, Mr. Speaker, that the decision to spray has been made and there was absolutely no point in the minister spending most of his time this evening saying why they had to spray and pointing to the fact that along with forest protection there had to be a forest management programme. Sure there has. There has to be forest protection and there has to be forest management, that is self-evident. But, as I said, with the Commission's report and with the Commission's help, the government has decided to spray.

I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the minister that there is no new information. I suggest that what the Commission has done is it has compiled the information that was already available last year this time and there is no new information this year. But with the crutch of the Commission they have made the

MR. TULK:

decision to spray. So, I repeat, it must be absolutely clear, and it must be clear to everybody in this House, that that is not the question of what we are debating in this Bill. We are not debating whether we should spray or not spray, we are debating two or three principles.

Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest, as I suggested in the beginning, to list all the reasons that the minister listed for taking the action that he is taking in this bill. It is academic. The real intent and principle of this bill are, perhaps, twofold and perhaps threefold. Perhaps there is one hidden. The principle of the bill before us, Mr. Speaker, is that the minister may take such measures, and I emphasize the word 'such', as he deems necessary to protect the forests of the Province from insects and disease.

The second principle, Mr. Speaker is this: When the minister deems it necessary to hire independent contractors, independent contractors who are really responsible to nobody in this Province to carry out any measures that he deems necessary, then these contractors may become agents of the Crown, they become Crown agencies and, Mr. Speaker, as such—and the minister knows this, he admitted it in the last few minutes of his speech—they cannot be served injunctions on behalf of any group or person who wishes to have such an injunction served.

Mr. Speaker, if you look at the first principle, and if you only read section one of this bill, section one reads: "Without limiting the generality of section 7, the minister may take such measures as he deems necessary to protect the forest of

MR. TULK: measures as he deems necessary to protect the forests of the Province from insects and disease."

If you read section 7.3 with that, you will find out that the minister still has to get authority from Cabinet, from the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, to make any decision that he makes regarding the spraying of either chemical pesticides or any other form of biological control.

Mr. Speaker, you have to ask yourself several questions. And I have asked several people on this side of the House and some people on the other side, is it possible that the minister did not have this power before, upon the approval of Cabinet, to make a decision to spray?

MR. FLIGHT: The previous minister. The minister who was opposed to the spray programme in the first place.

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, one would suppose that in this House that is normal procedure, and that this right was already there. And I understand from people in the House that he did indeed have that right, that is that the minister, if he wishes to put in a programme of spray, or any minister of the Crown, then he can go to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council which is the Cabinet, and the Cabinet can give him approval.

Now the Act that we have before us gives him statutory authority. That is it makes it legal for him to do those things. So the natural question, and the question that I asked the minister yesterday, and I am going to ask him again today, is this: Is he telling us - I do not believe he is - but is he telling us that the spray programmes that were

MR. TULK: carried out in 1977
and 1978 were illegal? Is that what he is saying?
Is he saying they are only measures to control insects
that we do not know anything about?

MR. YOUNG: You would get an
answer but he is not in the House.

MR. TULK: No?
Are they legal? Are
they legal the decisions that have been made in this
House? If they are, Mr. Speaker, then this piece of
legislation is a nuisance piece of legislation, it is
not necessary. Sections 7.1 and 7.3 should be taken
out of that bill.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I
said the minister, when I asked him the questions
yesterday - I could not believe what I was reading and
I was forced by some curiosity and concern to ask the
questions. And the minister came out of his seat, with
some prompting, I understand, from some of his colleagues,
in what I call the 'Peckfordian fighter stance' that
comes from that side of the House and he would only
answer in two ways: 'We will debate it in legislation
tomorrow, and the answer is no.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, if
the answer is no there must be other measures planned
or the government is taking illegal action in this
Province, or they are wasting the time of this House
by bringing in a nuisance piece of legislation.

MR. HANCOCK: Look, boy, you already
have the power, why do you need it again?

MR. TULK: If they have the power why give it to them again. That is it exactly.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I said that there was in this Bill a second principle -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. TULK: There was a second principle in this Bill and it was stated like this. 'When the Minister deems it necessary', this is in the explanatory notes, 'to hire independent contractors to carry out any measure that he deems necessary, then these contractors become agents of the Crown and cannot be served injunctions on behalf of any person or group who wishes to have such an injunction served.' Now, the minister says, and I think I quote him accurately, that they intend to introduce an amendment to allow persons - and my friend from Grand Bank (L. Thoms) will probably correct me if I am wrong - to allow persons to take action against the government if the government has caused that person personal injury.

Now, as I understand the -

MR. THOMS: They already (inaudible) that.

MR. TULK: That is right. As I understand the legislation, that is already there in the proceedings against the Crown Act in 1973 so that is another piece of

MR. WARREN: -of garbage.

MR. TULK: That is another indication of the

MR. WARREN: - of garbage, garbage.

MR. TULK: - the minister standing up in this House and trying to tell the people up in this Gallery -

MR. WARREN: - and making a show of himself.

MR. TULK: - that he is going to do something

MR. TULK: about a legislation that is nonsense and that is exactly what the minister is doing.

MR. WARREN: - garbage.

MR. TULK: And he is going to put more garbage in to take care of the garbage that is already there.

MR. WARREN: Right, right and make a show of himself.

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, it must be clearly understood again that anything that is debated in this House on either one of those two sections, on either one of those two principles, has nothing to do with the government's decision to spray or not to spray. It has nothing to do with that. The minister stands up and says that he is trying to protect the rights of 18,000 individuals. He is trying to make believe that anybody who opposes him in this piece of legislation would do something different and I suppose it will probably come true from that side over there again before we are finished that you will be anti-Newfoundland if you oppose this piece of legislation.

MR. NEARY: It is the worst piece of legislation ever brought (inaudible)

MR. WARREN: It should die, it should die now.

MR. TULK: He also made the same point, Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening, I understand in the news media. He also, and I believe that he made the point -

MR. WARREN: That was for television too.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. TULK: I believe that he made the point that the spray season is so short that he has to go full speed ahead and nobody can get in his way.

MR. WARREN: No reverse gear, no reverse gear.

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the minister is right when he says that he has a short time to spray and we agree that the minister is responsible for looking after the forests and the people employed. But we have to ask ourselves a very basic question and that is this: Should the minister or the Cabinet or the Government be given the legislative power in law to deny others a hearing. And I understand that is what they deny to them, a hearing and the protection of their rights as human beings or as elected organizations.

Somebody made the comment from the other side of the House when the minister was speaking that what they are trying to do is stop crackpots. Now, I do not know, they may have been saying that the environmentalists in the Province are crackpots and they have been saying that.

MR. WARREN: No, the minister (inaudible)

MR. TULK: They may wish, Mr. Speaker, to play those people, the environmentalists, they may wish to play those people off against the general public or those who earn their living from the forests. That is not impossible for that crowd.

MR. NEARY: Even Greenpeace can go out and protest. They allowed to protest and so forth but in Newfoundland you are not allowed to do that.

MR. TULK: It is a political play. That kind of comment, Mr. Speaker, is a political play on the part of the minister. It is a shameful play on the part of the minister of the Crown -

MR. BAIRD: He would not understand, Fred.

MR. TULK: - to play off certain peak groups in this Province against each other.

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would remind the minister that environmentalists are not always right but they are not always wrong either. But I would tell him this, that environmentalists have sometimes been right and that they do have, Mr. Speaker, rights which this piece of legislation that the minister is proposing tries to take away from them.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to him too that for those people who are in authority, as the minister is, that groups such as environmentalists play a very important function in playing off against him. It is the nature of a democratic society. But even more important, Mr. Speaker, there are elected organizations in this Province, elected by the people, such as municipalities, who may wish to take some sort of action against an independent contractor that the minister has hired to do a spray programme. And, Mr. Speaker, the largest of those municipalities, with the exception of St. John's, are found in the areas that I believe the minister is going to spray, are found around those areas. For example, Gander, I understand, is in that area. I understand the member for Stephenville's (Mr. Stagg) district is in that area, Stephenville. Grand Falls is in a spray area, Corner Brook is in a spray area.

AN HON. MEMBER:

How about Fogo?

MR. TULK:

Fogo is not, thank the good Lord for that.

The Commission, itself says that the buffer zone around any community water supply or community sprayed should be 1.5 kilometers. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think it is fair to say that if you read that Commission report and read between the lines that the Commission has some reservations about that 1.5 kilometer limit, because, Mr. Speaker, in that report they point out that there is little conclusive evidence of what happens to a spray drift. They do point that out. It has been known to drift up to, I understand, 80 kilometers. A certain amount of the spray has been known to drift up to 80 kilometers.

Another example, Mr. Speaker, of what can happen to spray, I understand, is that in the government's own spray programme in 1978, I believe, in the Gander area,

MR. TULK: only 7 per cent of the spray hit the target area and 93 per cent went all over the place. The minister has the figures. He should table them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us suppose that the town of Gander, for example - and I understand this to be correct - the town of Gander is not satisfied that a 1.5 kilometer buffer zone around the town of Gander is enough to protect the citizens of that town.

MR. LUSH: Or their water supply.

MR. TULK: Or their water supply. Let us suppose that that is the case. Mr. Speaker, suppose they wish that ten kilometers or ten miles, whatever it happens to be, and the minister, who I believe, Mr. Speaker, has some concern for the environment, says, 'Okay, you have that ten kilometer zone or the ten miles.' In other words, he accepts in view of the fact that the Commission, itself, is uncertain - and that is there, there is conflicting evidence that 1.5 kilometers is not enough - and the minister takes all that into account and he says to the town of Gander, 'Indeed you can, you can have that ten kilometer zone, or he agrees to spray that sensitive area, again another recommendation of the Commission that you may if you wish, spray a very sensitive area with Bt; now, Mr. Speaker, the spray time arrives, and there is some contractor who is hired by the department either intentionally or unintentionally - and I suggest to you that it can be intentionally, it is a great way to get rid of a load of spray, you know - drops a load of spray inside that ten kilometer zone, or perhaps what is even worse, Mr. Speaker, may indeed drop a load of spray within the water supply of the town of Gander itself.

MR. HOLLETT: Into the tributary running into the lake.

MR. TULK: Now, where is the town of Gander? If this legislation passes this House, Mr. Speaker, the town of Gander is left in a situation - now we are not talking about

MR. TULK:

environmentalists, we are talking about the town of Gander - the town of Gander is left in a situation of not being able to obtain an injunction against the contractor, but must engage in what could be a long drawn out affair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Rather than interrupt the hon. member's train of thought a little later on, although it is not quite 5:00 P.M., I can inform the House that I have received notice of two motions for debate at 5:30 P.M., when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House.

First of all, notice is given by the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) arising out of a question asked the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) and the subject matter is upgrading of 105 miles of gravel roads in that area.

The second notice is given by the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) arising out of a question asked the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and the subject matter is the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary.

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. STAGG:

How much time do you have left?

MR. TULK:

Sufficient. Thirty-three minutes,

Mr. Speaker, if he wants to know.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, the town of Gander is left in a situation where they have had one bad experience with a load of spray. And yet if this legislation passes in this House, that municipality will be unable, as I understand it, to obtain an injunction against the contractor because the contractor has now become a Crown agency. If they are to get any satisfaction at all, if the minister's amendment is going to do what is already done, they must engage, as I understand it, in a long, drawn out affair that will last much longer than the spray programme and in the meantime the contractor is free to do as he pleases.

So, Mr. Speaker, I want to suggest to this House as I said before, that whether you are for or against the spray programme has nothing to do with what I am saying here this evening and the bill that the minister is introducing.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the actions that this bill proposes and that the minister is taking I suggest to you are undemocratic and they infringe upon the rights of the citizens of this Province.

Let us take another example. Suppose some independent contractor wishes to store matacil on somebody's property. Can he now go in and do it? That is a good question. It is a good legal question which perhaps some of my legal colleagues will answer. And I would suggest to the minister, Mr. Speaker, that if the minister is at all reasonable, what he should do in this case is either drop the legislation or amend it while at the same time allowing himself to do the job that he feels that he has to do.

MR. NEARY: He is going to have to withdraw that.

MR. TULK: I think the safest way out, as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is suggesting, is to withdraw

MR. TULK: the legislation and if he needs more, to bring it in.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is one other point in this bill. It also gives the minister authority to take any measures he deems necessary. Now, Mr. Speaker, he can take those measures other than chemical or biological control measures, he can take them without even going to the Cabinet. Now he does not have to get—what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that he does not have to get an Order in Council to take any other measures other than those that are biological or chemical. Now at first glance somebody is probably looking around and saying 'Well that is all there is' and it is true. And at the present time that is all there is. Those are the only means that we have to control the spruce budworm. They have to be either chemical or biological. But suppose, Mr. Speaker, in the next five years that research turns up - as I understand it it may be possible - other methods of control yet those measures have not been proven to be satisfactory, to be safe and to keep the health of the citizens in this Province in the way that it should be. I suggest to you that with this piece of legislation—a minor point is that with this piece of legislation the minister has the authority to do whatever he wishes without even the consent of Cabinet.

Besides the fact, Mr. Speaker, that this whole piece of legislation infringes upon the rights of the individual to take action against the government and to protect himself against a minister of the Crown and the Cabinet that does not have his welfare at heart anyway, it also, in my opinion places too much power in the hands of a single individual or even, Mr. Speaker, in the hands of a Cabinet. I would suggest to you that even though, perhaps, it is not the traditional way to do those things, if we are going to spray in this Province year after year after year, then we should certainly debate any measure to spray, within the confines of this House, so that

MR. TULK: people have the wherewithal to find out what is happening, not as the government has done, Mr. Speaker. In the last two weeks the government has made the decision, a Cabinet decision, I presume. It may have been a decision of the Premier and of the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power), I do not know, but I presume it was a decision of the Cabinet to spray. I would suggest to the minister that, perhaps, in an area that is as sensitive as spraying that decision should be made in this House so that everybody's cards can be laid upon the Table and the decision made.

Mr. Speaker, perhaps the third worse thing - and I am going to conclude on this point - perhaps the third worse aspect of this bill is that it shows intent or the leanings of a government that wishes to control everything and everybody that stands within its path. Now, Mr. Speaker, the member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) has, perhaps, been the champion of what should go on in this House, and I suspect that many of us - and I want to apologize to him for this.

MR. STAGG: Apologize for him yes indeed.

MR. TULK: Not for him, to him. He has been warning us for the past two years that many of the things that should have been done in this House are being taken outside because it would make the government unpopular to have them in here. He may be right, He may be right. But one thing has become very apparent about this government, Mr. Speaker, it is that over the last two years it has been totally ignorant and totally arrogant towards the people's needs and rights in this Province. For example, Mr. Speaker, let me take a very current affair and give you one that happened last Summer, for example, the fisheries strike, the fisheries strike where the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) ordered his people in this Province to go in

MR. TULK: and look in the kitchen cabinets of people before he would assist them with Social Assistance.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Now, is that a government that has some concern for people? Not at all. Another example, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: - is right now. Collective bargaining -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. TULK: - in this Province is practically at a standstill. The unions and the professional associations in this Province are being subjected to what I call - you cannot call it anything else, it has not been legislated in this House - but certainly this Province is now in the midst of wage controls. There is no other name for them. All public employees in this Province know that the government - not even the government, the Premier, the Premier walks along by them and says, "Eight per cent is it. We can go no higher. That is our first and final decision." For example, I understand that there is a set of negotiations going on right now with no - no, there are no negotiations, there are no negotiations. But there is a group of people in this Province on strike right now where the negotiating team for the government walked in and said, "Our first and final decision is 8 per cent".

MR. STAGG: Relevance, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: It is relevant, Mr. Speaker, in that I am pointing out the arrogance of this government and what type of bill this is. For example, the people that I speak of, Mr. Speaker, are the people at the College of Trades and Technology, and there are at least five or six of those people who are making less today than you could get on Social Assistance. The government refuses

MR. TULK: to negotiate or listen to them. When they make their point, Mr. Speaker, when they make their point, the ball game is over and they do whatever they wish to do and that is what this legislation is. That is what this legislation is, Mr. Speaker, it is another example of this government's intention to control and muzzle the people of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in summary I want to point out again that this debate has nothing to do with the decision to spray or not to spray. I want to suggest to you that perhaps it was unnecessary in the first place. I want to suggest that it infringes upon the individual rights and the organizational rights of groups within this Province.

MR. CARTER: Now I agree -

MR. THOMS: Come down to earth, boy!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, could I have some order, please?

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. CARTER: I agree that there are a number of forest pests that we should be on guard against. There is the Tulk tunneler. There is the Hancock hooper, the Stirling slime rot, the White weevil, the Rowe root rot, the Thoms thrips -

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

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, without quoting the appropriate authority, I fail to see the relevance of this to the debate on the spruce budworm which - or not the debate on the budworm, actually, it has nothing at all to do with the budworm but giving the authority to the minister and the taking away of certain rights of individuals of the Province. I fail to see any relevance between what - maybe he is afraid we are going to spray his savoury upon Mount Scio.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order I was merely outlining the type vermin that we have to contend with in this House. I feel that a spray programme is very necessary. I will await your decision.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To that point of order: Apparently there is quite a difference of opinion. Some of these insects I have not heard tell of either. I would suggest to the

MR. TULK: I want to say that it shows you that the government cannot stand the heat in the kitchen, they want to stay in the kitchen and remove the heat.

And, Mr. Speaker, finally I want to suggest to you that it will help hide the actions of the government from the House and the public.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. TULK: Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker -

MR. HOLLETT: He is going to transplant savoury now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the person who just sat down for taking us on this tour of the Middle Ages. I take it he does not believe in chemicals at all. No aspirin, no soap, no anaesthetics, no food colouring, no toothpaste, no deodorant, no salt - his meals must be very dull. I do not think I will accept an invitation to eat at his house.

Now, I do not know whether -

AN HON. MEMBER: No savoury.

MR. CARTER: - we should spray or dip the Opposition.

I suppose we will let them judge that for themselves.

AN HON. MEMBER: Rust proof.

MR. CARTER: I take it these hon. gentlemen would not paint their own bedrooms. They will not paint their houses. You know, they are entirely against the twentieth century.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): hon. member that he may be straying from the topic.

MR. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To be serious, though, the problem of spraying is not a new one, and I take it that the hon. members, since many of them represent out-of-town districts, have travelled the Island. I suppose, they visit their districts once a year, or once every two years, and I would imagine that -

MR. THOMS: That is more than you do and you live there.

MR. CARTER: - they cannot help, on their way to their districts, to go through some wooded areas. And anyone who has seen the extent of the budworm damage in this Province, has to conclude that something has to be done.

Now there are a number of ways of approaching this. Perhaps we should let the spruce budworm or the Bennett borer or the Thoms thrips devastate the woods entirely, and then hope that since the host has died, the guests will also die and the woods can begin again from scratch. But as we all know, the period of regrowth in Newfoundland is something approaching fifty years. Even with new species it is unlikely that the regrowth period is likely to be any less than thirty or forty years. So that would mean that we would

MR. CARTER:

do without forests for a long period of time. Now, I agree that spraying is not the final solution, as someone once said, but nevertheless we must do something. I would prefer to see forests privately owned, privately managed and managed on a perpetual yield basis with permanent woods roads and permanent care, the cutting done a little at a time, very selectively, and I think that way the forests would yield much greater quantities of wood and would last a lot better.

So, I would suggest that any spray programme that is embarked upon should be of a very temporary nature merely to give us a chance to control and break the present cycle. The problem is you see, if the woods are wiped out then they will regrow all very quickly, very thickly and just be waiting for another outbreak of spruce budworm or any other type of insect that may attack it, and then we will just have the same thing over and over again.

So, I would hope that in conjunction with any spray programme that government would look very seriously at the possibility of partly a species change, a different type of harvesting approach and, also, a different type of ownership approach.

I have long held, Mr. Speaker, that the ownership of forest lands in Newfoundland should be in private hands and I think that we can take a lesson from other parts of the world, especially other parts of North America, and specifically I am thinking of the Southern States, where forest holdings are relatively small and scattered with a good standard of woods roads that are all very accessible. The land is divided into counties, the counties take responsibility for pest control and also for fire control and the

MR. CARTER: production from these forests is many times what a so-called wild forest will produce. I would suggest to the government that this type of forest management be looked into very seriously. I think that that is the long-term solution. Pest control in the Southern States is done by spot control. In fact, at the moment any infestation is spotted, crews go in, cut and burn and so far the results seem to work very well.

But in the meantime, I think we have to spray. Now, the important thing about spraying the spruce budworm is that there is a very short window, a very short space of time when the worm can be sprayed and the effect of this legislation is to prevent any injunction from interfering with that very short period of time when the spruce budworm may be sprayed. And I fully approve and fully support that aspect of the legislation.

I understand there is some objection to the injunction aspect as opposed to the prevention of injunction against spraying. The prevention of any injunction is probably objectionable to any lawyer and I quite understand that and I think that the administration is very mindful of this objection so I do not fear to give them this power. I think they will handle it sensibly and wisely. I think they are well aware of that danger -

MR. HISCOCK: Then why is it there?

MR. CARTER: Well, it is just there, as I understand it, to prevent any accidental interference, to make assurance doubly sure that some of these environmentalists, who, I think, take more delight in opposing than in proposing, will not be able to interfere with a multi-million dollar programme.

MR. CARTER: I would ask - I would also hasten to say that I think it is unfortunate that the government has to spend so much of its own resources on these spray programmes. Again, I think if forests were in private hands, the private owners could well manage and it would pay them to look after the spray programmes themselves.

I think a massive spray programme can be a very unwieldy thing and I would not like to see the government continue in this manner. But for now, for this year, probably for next year and probably for the year after that, they are going to have to do this if they want to break the present cycle and -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) to do it.

MR. CARTER: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) would like (inaudible).

MR. J. CARTER: No, I think this government can be trusted, Mr. Speaker. I have some confidence in this government. I know the Opposition do not but then that is their job, I suppose, to have no confidence in the government, no trust, no decency at all. So I would ask, what does the Opposition propose? It is all very well for them to get up and say, 'Oh, no, do not do this, do not do that, do not do the other'. If you want to get a fat man out of bed you have to put another fat man in. I am not looking at anyone in particular. So what does the Opposition propose? What do they suggest we do? Let us hear it from them. I suppose they are all going to speak on this.

MR. FLIGHT: Resign! The minister should resign and let someone who knows what he is doing take over.

MR. J. CARTER: Surely that is an extreme point of view.

MR. HISCOCK: Call an election. Call an election.

MR. J. CARTER: And that is another extreme point of view. Something less than that. So I will ask the hon. gentlemen, what are their proposals? If they have a concrete proposal that is better than the spray programme, I would like to hear it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: We are not against the programme.

MR. J. CARTER: Just against the injunction. Well, if you are against the injunction legislation I suggest you are against the spray programme because you are very much aware, you must be aware that an injunction, by the time it is sorted out would take even two or three days, perhaps a week. By that time the optimum time for spraying will have passed and the government's programme will have been nullified.

So there it is, Mr. Speaker. I certainly support this legislation and I hope it passes very quickly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT):

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is difficult, Mr. Speaker, to follow this debate after the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has gone through giving us the facts as they are. He has covered pretty well everything there is to say about the spray programme. He was right on in everything he said. I want, Mr. Speaker, to put before the House some of the concerns of mine as they relate to this report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I originally, in this House, opposed the spray programme. I introduced - what is the name of that emergency legislation?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Order 23.

MR. FLIGHT:

An order 23, Mr. Speaker, if the House will remember, opposing the spray programme. And the Speaker of the day felt that it was important enough to put aside the business of the House to debate that particular Order 23 and in the succeeding vote I opposed the spray programme, as did other people in this House. Now, Mr. Speaker, when one takes this report - and it will be interesting, Mr. Speaker, to see the number of people who speak in this debate and to have them indicate to the House whether or not, intending to speak on this issue, they have read the report. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that not too many people on the government side of the House have read that report.

MR. LUSH:

Hands up.

MR. FLIGHT:

Hands up of the ministry that have read the report. So, Mr. Speaker, let us look at the facts. When one recognizes - let me say this, Mr. Speaker, because I want to make sure that I am clearly understood - when one recognizes -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: - when one recognizes that 6,000 people are directly employed in the forest related industries in this Province today, when one realizes \$84 million is pumped into the economy directly by the forest industry and then when one realizes, based on this report, that the people who - the commissioners indicated that they could find no conclusive evidence that matacil poses any immediate threat to the health of the people of this Province, or no conclusive evidence that there is any long-term or short-term threat to the environment of this Province, when one has got to juggle those two facts, if one is responsible it becomes very difficult to oppose the spray programme.

But now, Mr. Speaker, having said that - and let me say that I have nothing, as every other member of the House, have nothing but total and complete respect for the integrity of the three commissioners. As the minister indicated, they took on a job that most people would not have touched with a ten foot pole and they gave an excellent report. But, Mr. Speaker, if ever there was a commission appointed in this Province that was used for political purposes, this is the commission. Mr. Speaker, this is the commission. The Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) should be ashamed

MR. FLIGHT:

Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) should be ashamed to mention the 1978 spray programme in this House. He should be ashamed to mention it. Here was a Cabinet, Mr. Speaker, of which the minister was a member. The present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), Mr. Speaker, approved the programme. He was opposed to a spray programme. Mr. Speaker, the present minister was the only member of the government who stood up and said, 'There will be no spray programme while I am a member of this Cabinet.

Now, Mr. Speaker, any turnaround that I might have done was based on the facts as they were presented by the Commission. I would like for the present Minister of Fisheries to tell me what he based his turnaround on.

Mr. Speaker, in 1978 this Cabinet, this government, made a decision that 'We will spray the people of -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have to stand on a point of order to correct -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): On a point of order, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: - to correct statements which the hon. gentleman is now saying I made back in the House of Assembly during a debate. If the hon. gentleman took time to go back to Hansard, he will find that the accurate statement I made in the House was that I was opposed to the spray unless there would be buffer zones established around communities and watersheds. Now, that is a big difference from what the hon. gentleman just said.

MR. SPEAKER: There is obviously no point of order, but the hon. the Minister of Fisheries rose to clarify remarks attributed to him.

The hon. the member for Windsor -
Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I accept the minister's presentation on his own behalf. But now I will give him another chance to stand on another point of order, Mr. Speaker. He indicated that he was not the Minister of Forestry who approved the 1978 spray programme. Would he indicate to me who was? Will the Minister of Forestry - who was the minister when we had the 1978 massive spray programme? Mr. Speaker, I know it was the present Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan).

MR. MORGAN: No, no. I did not become minister until 1979. Get your facts straight, boy.

MR. FLIGHT: Who was the minister?

AN HON. MEMBER: No one knows here. Rousseau?

MR. FLIGHT: Maynard.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I recall that minister's performance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I recall that minister's performance in the debate.

The debate on the spray was the important thing, who stood for what, Mr. Speaker, and I know what that minister stood for. And it is quite possible, Mr. Speaker, that because he was prepared to stand, we had a spray programme put off a little longer than it might have been. In 1977, he was saying he was not in favour of a spray programme. We did not have it. In 1976, he was not in favour of a spray programme. We did not have it. But in 1978, Mr. Speaker, when we did have the massive spray programme, I do not recall his raising his voice against that spray programme. And here was a government that was prepared to have a massive spray programme in Newfoundland, a total and complete spray programme using matacil, a government that sprayed the forests of this Province and then, Mr. Speaker, in 1979, the next year, said, 'We cannot

MR. FLIGHT: have a spray programme, we have to determine what a spray programme using matacil will do to the health of our people.'

Now, they have sprayed, Mr. Speaker.

If there is any possibility that matacil is injurious to the health or a threat to the health or the welfare of the people of Newfoundland, it is too late. They sprayed in 1978 without the benefit of any medical advice. So what happens in 1979? They decided to call an election, Mr. Speaker. Sometime in May, 1979, they decided to call an election.

Now, even today with this report, with the facts as they are, a referendum in this Province today would not give you better than 50/50 for or against a spray programme. 50/50 is not very good to face in an election, Mr. Speaker, and this government, having sprayed in 1978 - sprayed with no regard to what matacil would mean to the health of our people - implemented a commission to tell the people of Newfoundland - to dig out the facts and to let us know whether or not there was any threat.

MR. POWER: It was only logical that we sprayed the year after (inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: It was too late.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister should do his research. You have to spray in the first two weeks of June. The election was held on the 18th. of June. It was too late. The Minister of Forestry at the time wasted \$150,000 on a test program for Bt. So, Mr. Speaker, let us put in perspective, let us put in perspective what has happened here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Let us put in perspective what happened here, Mr. Speaker. We have a government which recognizes, which had every fact - there is not one shred of evidence in this report that was not available to the Government of Newfoundland in 1979, not one shred. I attended some of the presentations, Mr. Speaker. Every shred of evidence in this report was available to the people of this Province, the minister, the Cabinet and anyone interested. There is not one shred of new evidence in it on which this government can base a spray program, not one shred of new evidence. So why now? I throw the question back to the minister. Why did he not spray in 1979? If he is so right, Mr. Speaker, and if this report is so right, then he has cost the forests of this Province at least a year's production. Why? If it was so necessary, why did you not spray in 1979? You had all this evidence. There is nothing in it, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: The only medical authority talked about here is Dr. Crocker. So, Mr. Speaker, we cannot debate this bill without separating out the politics that were played with the forestry of this Province, the politics that were played with this spray program, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FLIGHT: In 1978, Mr. Speaker, we had a spray program and, as the House knows, there were objections all across this Province about the way the spray program was being carried out.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) spraying
(inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: I am glad the minister is in because - the Speaker - because I would tell the Speaker, I would tell the Speaker, Sir, as he will well know, although the forestry in his constituency depends greatly, totally, almost completely on a healthy forest, a great many of his constituents are concerned about the spray program.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! I am having difficulty hearing the hon. member.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, since it is 5:30 I will adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 5:30 a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. The first matter for debate raised by the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes is upgrading 105 miles of gravel road in that area. The hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In the next few minutes I would like to point out to the minister why I requested or tried to get the minister to include sections of that road on a road program that can be cost-shared between the federal and provincial governments, which I was not very successful doing according to the minister's answer today. But I will point out a few facts to the minister.

First of all, I will deal with the fisheries, and I think the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan)

MR. HANCOCK: should take note of what I am going to say in the next couple of minutes. I have some of the fish landings here. The fish that was landed had to be trucked over dirt roads, Mr. Speaker, it was the only way of getting it out. First of all, in the community of Branch in 1978, there were 2.1 million pounds of fish trucked over that section of road. In 1979 there was two million exactly and this year and last year in 1980, there were 2.2 million pounds of fish in that community alone in the last three years. In St. Bride's, in the community of St. Bride's -

AN HON. MEMBER: Trucked from Branch you say?

MR. HANCOCK: Trucked from Branch. If it left Branch it had to go over dirt road. It had to be trucked.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: In the community of St. Bride's in 1978 there were 1.7 million, in 1979 there were 1.9, in 1980 there were 1.9.

MR. ANDREWS: Northern cod?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: I cannot identify the cod, Mr. Speaker, but I imagine a portion of it was Northern cod, but if I am going to get into a debate here I will only use up my time, Mr. Speaker. So that in that section, Mr. Speaker, that road can be considered the loop road, the same as the roads that were paved under a cost-sharing program with the federal and provincial governments the same as the Baie Verte Road, the Bonavista Bay Loop Road, the Northern Peninsula Road, the Arterial Road which we see here, the Bay d'Espoir Road, which this man over here should be proud of, the Burgeo Road. All those roads, Mr. Speaker, were paved under a cost-sharing program between the federal and provincial governments. All I am asking is for fairness in this matter, Mr. Speaker. We have roads out there, they are not fit to go over. They need upgrading and I am sure the minister will agree with me.

MR. HANCOCK: In the community of Trepassey last year, Mr. Speaker, and that fish plant only operated for eight months, there were 8.6 million pounds of fish trucked out of that plant. The manager of that plant told me that 99 per cent of it went over dirt roads.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, it is true.

The community of St. Shott's,

Mr. Speaker, there were 2.6 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: - there were 2.6 million pounds

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: - of fish trucked out of St. Shotts last year, Mr. Speaker, over a distance of twenty miles of road.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is Crosbie. Mr. Crosbie (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is not reason enough to have the roads, that loop road as you call it, placed on a federal-provincial cost sharing programme - I know the Federal Government has not got the money. It has not got enough money to do the 105 miles of dirt road in that district much less the roads which are needed around the Province. That is why I urge the government at this time to try and co-operate and get more money out of Ottawa because those things are badly needed things, Mr. Speaker, in my district.

I recently had an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to - I made it a point one morning to drive to North Harbour to come through Mount Carmel on the school bus, a distance of about twenty-one miles -

MR. HISCOCK: And Ottenheimer's.

MR. HANCOCK: - and I have back problems, Mr. Speaker, and I can assure you for a week and a half I could hardly walk after coming over that road. You can imagine now what those children have to go through every morning. I have talked to parents over there who cannot feed their children and put them on that bus, they have to give them a lunch to take. It is bad enough to have to take dinner to school but when you have to take your breakfast to school - because you cannot eat it after coming over a distance of approximately twenty miles, Mr. Speaker.

And I would urge the minister to go down and have a look at the road conditions in that area.

MR. HANCOCK: There is nothing there really. The bog is taken off, there is no gravel, there is no upgrading of that road, nothing in the last, I do not know, ten years, I guess, since anything was done with that road. The bridge there is about ready to collapse any time. Although his department says it is safe, the people in the area feel that it is not safe.

I have to give credit where credit is due, Mr. Speaker. Walter Carter, when he was the member for that area brought a lot of improvements out there. I will give him credit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: He is going to run for the Liberals next time.

MR. HANCOCK: I would give him - I do not care where he runs, Mr. Speaker, but he did -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: . (Inaudible).

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

MR. HANCOCK: But do not forget at one time Mr. Carter -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member.

MR. HANCOCK: Do not forget that at one time Walter Carter also was a Liberal, Mr. Speaker, and the Liberals know the basic needs of the people of this Province and that is why Mr. Carter brought improvements to that district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HOLLETT: Just before he left, yes. He would have still been there, Mr. Speaker, if he could get along with the bunch on the other side. He would still be there and we

MR. HANCOCK: would probably still be getting improvements.

MR. WARREN: Right on.

MR. TULK: Something to give, they have something to give over there.

MR. HANCOCK: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) knows that the quality of fish is being deteriorated by going over that road. There is no two ways about it. School children are suffering. The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) should take note of that, Mr. Speaker, and press the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Brett) to try and get up. God love her, I hope she does something about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: It is bad enough, Mr. Speaker, but the old aged people on the Cape Shore have to travel to Placentia for medical facilities or to pick up drugs. We were discussing it today, the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), and they have to go every month or every thirty days to pick up drugs over a section of dirt roads. The cost to those people is phenomenal, Mr. Speaker.

MR. BRETT: Okay, you have got it.

MR. HANCOCK: I got it, yes. I would be standing here for an hour and I could not pump something into their heads over there, Mr. Speaker. They are just too bloody arrogant to realize what the people of this Province need, Mr. Speaker.

In the town of Trepassey -

MR. BAIRD: You are talking too fast.

MR. HANCOCK: You have to talk fast to get in the five minutes, Mr. Speaker. I do not hear the minister from Corner Brook (Mr. Baird) up talking too often.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I would urge the government, Mr. Speaker, to do something about those conditions.

MR. HANCOCK: I know you have not got the money. The minister has said he has not got the money to do it and that is why I would ask the minister to place this loop road on this programme when he takes it to Ottawa and I will take it from there, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is frustrated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: Would you not be?

MR. BRETT: He is very, very frustrated and I do not blame him for being frustrated. The hon. member for St. George's (.R.Dawe) is frustrated too. And so is the hon. member for Humber Valley (W. House) -

MR. LUSH: Do not forget me.

MR. BRETT: And so is the hon. member for Terra Nova (T. Lush) and so is the member for Trinity North (C. Brett). He is probably more frustrated than anybody in the House.

MR. BAIRD: He was born that way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BRETT: And as I indicated I can understand why. I have said it before but I am going to say it again. There are over two thousand miles of road in this Province that need to be upgraded and paved and it is going to take a long, long time to finish it all. If you had a million dollars, even ten years ago, you would hardly know what to do with it, it was so much money. If you have a million dollars today it is a drop in the bucket.

March 5, 1981

Tape No. 145

EL - 5

MR. BRETT:

If you talk about action, I wonder does the House realize that in the past ten years this Province has spent almost one billion dollars in roads. That is a fact.

March 5, 1981

Tape No. 146

RA - 1

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. C. BRETT:

Almost a \$1 billion in the last ten years.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

Order, please!

MR. C. BRETT:

We spent over -

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

Order, please!

MR. C. BRETT:

- we spent over \$500,000 in reconstructing and paving and we have spent close to that amount in maintaining our roads. So that is almost a \$1 billion and we are a small Province and our tax base is small and there is only so much you can do and to say that you have nothing to show for it, well that is, of course, that is a ridiculous remark. The position that we are in now is in addition to the 2,000 miles that we have that is not upgraded and paved, we also have some of our major trunk roads that are breaking up. We have large sections of our Trans-Canada Highway that will break up very shortly if we do not do something about it. Apart from the sections that were upgraded last year, the remainder of it is below the standard of any part of the Trans-Canada Highway from British Columbia to North Sydney.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Mr. Speaker, I cannot hear.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. C. BRETT:

.Now, I suppose we could list every gravel road in the Province and send it up to the federal government.

MR. THOMS:

Why not?

MR. C. BRETT:

No, but it just does not make sense.

MR. THOMS:

Why not?

MR. C. BRETT:

Because it does not, I mean there are some major projects and I agree that, you know, there is a lot of gravel road in the hon. member's

MR. C. BRETT: district, but there are some major projects that will never, ever be finished without the help of the federal government. Southern Labrador which we talked about in the House yesterday - it is useless for the provincial government to start it if we do not get some federal funds because it will take twenty years to complete it. So you must have some priorities and in prioritizing, as I indicated, you could send up a list as long as your arm but I know, and anybody who has dealt with the federal government knows, that when they get down to making the decision they are only going to take four or five projects.

MR. FLIGHT: Then why send up the rest?

MR. C. BRETT: No, it just will not work. There is not point in setting up every mile in the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. C. BRETT: -that is in the Province. We have not neglected and I know I have said this before, but, I mean, that district has not been neglected. There has been a lot of money spent there. In 1978 alone there was \$2 million spent there. There was not much money spent there last year. I recognize that some sections of the road are extremely bad. Obviously, I cannot tell the hon. gentleman that we are going to spend a lot of money up there this year, I do not even know if it is in the budget. I do know that there are some very bad sections of road and I suppose, if we do not get capital funds then the maintenance crews can have a look at it. All I can say to the hon. gentleman is that I understand why he is frustrated and he is not the only one that is frustrated. And the Province will continue to do all that

March 5, 1981

Tape No.146

RA - 3

MR. C. BRETT: it can -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. C. BRETT: - to pave the remaining roads in the Province but it is going to take time.

MR. SPEAKER: The second matter for debate raised by the hon. the member for Grand Bank (Mr. L. Thoms) is respecting the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. the member for Grand Bank. Oh no, not again!

MR. L. THOMS: The hon. Minister of Fisheries says not again. The people of Grand Bank, Mr. Speaker, are waiting for the first visit from the hon. Minister of Fisheries -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. L. THOMS: - who refuses to go down. Who made a promise, made a commitment -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L. THOMS: - made a commitment and refuses to go down.

MR. SPEAKER: The matter for debate is respecting the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary.

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak on the subject which I want to speak on without interference from the one who comes up to blow every minute or so.

MR. HANCOCK: He has to. He is in the whale section.

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the morale in the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary is probably at the lowest time it has ever been in the history of that excellent and fine force. Mr. Speaker, I have it on some very good authority that approximately one-third, thirty-seven or forty of the

March 5, 1981

Tape No. 146

RA - 4

MR. C. BRETT: members of the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, have applied for positions for jobs outside the force because they have become so frustrated trying to operate within the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary today. We have a policeman sitting here, Mr. Speaker, sitting at the bar of the House who cannot say a word, not a word because of the rules I understand it one of the rare - now, he cannot speak in the House of Assembly but neither can he speak outside of the House of Assembly. We have a regulation which prevents policemen in this city from airing their views or complaints or comments on any subject whatsoever. They, Mr. Speaker, are muzzled in this city. Now, I do not know there may be other police forces

MR. THOMS: in the democratic world, there may be others, I do not know of them, I do not know where they are, but I do know -

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible) a police state.

MR. THOMS: No, I do not want a police state. All I want is a regulation which permits the President of the Police Brotherhood in St. John's to go to the public, to the media, and explain what their position is. What can be so inherently wrong with Sterling Wells calling a press conference and saying, "Look, these are our grievances. These are things which we would like to see changed. These are things that we believe would improve the policing of the City of St. John's." But he cannot do it. He cannot do it.

The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) has that privilege. The Chief of Police has that privilege. The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) has that privilege.

MR. TULK: Take any privileges she has got away.

MR. THOMS: But this man here cannot speak in the corridor of Confederation Building. There is a regulation that says that that man cannot open his mouth.

MR. WARREN: Shame!

MR. THOMS: And you call this a democratic regulation, a democratic society!

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) Shut him up! Muzzle him.

MR. THOMS: Of course it is not. There is no reason for it. Now you may have hit it right on the button. There are only 200 and some odd policemen.

MR. TULK: Yes, he hit it.

MR. THOMS: Maybe you think there is very little sympathy among the voters of St. John's for the police force, because they have gotten a ticket, or they were caught going through a stop sign. So there is no political brownie point

MR. THOMS: to gain in being decent towards the police force of this City.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), since I first raised this matter in the House of Assembly quite some time ago, and like on any other matters, has a tendency to hide his head in the sand. I said it the other day during Question Period that there are rosters available which will show, Mr. Speaker, which will show that this City has been policed at night by six policemen. Now, the minister comes up and says, 'Well, I cannot tell you how many policemen are policing the city. I can say there is a minimum of such - because if I give that information then the criminal element' - Mr. Speaker, five minutes is really not long enough in a situation like this.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it is not.

MR. THOMS: Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Justice has refused continuously the Police Brotherhood, he has refused a call from the Federation of Labour, he has refused a call from me to appoint an independent commission.

Now, the Minister for Bally Haly (Mr. Dinn) yesterday came in and appointed a City lawyer, who was an employee of Jim McGrath, to study the women in the work force. There was no problem there in appointing somebody to make a study. There is nothing wrong with it. There is absolutely nothing wrong with it. But when the policemen of this City says, Mr. Minister of Justice, appoint a commission to -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. THOMS: - look into all of the problems -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave! By leave!

MR. THOMS:

By leave!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I understand - is leave granted?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

I understand leave is not granted.

The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman

has been looking for a bandwagon for a long time. The hon. gentleman opposite has been looking for a bandwagon. He tried the matrimonial property one, there was a lot there, he did not like and that did not work. He tried the Jury Act bandwagon and there were a lot of things there did not work. The Ku Klux Klan, that really looked promising because who could be for it. We had the Ku Klux Klan wagon and that really did not get him, and now he is on to the Royal Commission Constabulary bandwagon and he is endeavouring to get on that one.

MR. THOMS:

(Inaudible)

MR. OTTHENHEIMER:

And I did not interrupt the hon. member -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

- once when he spoke, and he can have the courtesy and intelligence to extend the same to me.

Now, just on one point, if the hon. gentleman is interested in the facts, on one point, I would

MR. OTTENHEIMER: like to point out, and he was talking about the present regulations and the difficulty of the Union or the Union President or Executive speaking on matters. On March 26, 1980, the first draft of a whole new set of regulations, including the change of a regulation which would allow the Union President to speak on matters related to collective bargaining and working conditions, those areas.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

On March 26, 1980, a new draft of regulations was sent for their comment, and it was ten months later, after five requests either by writing or by phone, we got the first reply back. Now, you know, what happened to them and with whom they consulted - I am not saying it is anybody's fault, but it was ten months later before we got a reply. Ten months after we got a reply to those draft regulations.

Now, since that time a number of them, changed regulations, have ended up in court so we cannot complete the whole new draft regulations until we have the court's interpretations of the existing ones. But I just want to point that matter out.

Now, with respect to some of the other matters: I think everybody is aware that during the past year, or even less than a year, under new police management, under Chief Roche, under Deputy Chief Randell, Deputy Chief Scott, a lot of changes have been made in the Constabulary. For the first time, open advertising and open competition. That was never there before. For the first time, women. For the first time a planned, consistent training programme including all new recruits at Holland College, the Atlantic Police Academy, a whole new approach. The Crime Prevention Unit, a whole new approach.

Now, change can be difficult for everyone, but there is no doubt that there has to be change in society and no element in society is immune from it. There has to be change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Some people adapt more easily than others and that is understandable. But there is one thing that is sure and that is this government has confidence in the Chief of Police and in the Deputy Chiefs and in their associates.

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If the hon. gentleman would do me the courtesy I did him. He cannot expect courtesy -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - on one hand and then not have -

MR. THOMS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - the decency to extend it on the other. It is somewhat typical of what I call the bandwagon, if you cannot get on it by logic get on it by lung.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: And we do not intend to take the responsibility for the management of the force away from the Chief and give it to the hon. gentlemen opposite or to anybody else. The management of the force is in the hands of the Chief and we have confidence in him. We do not intend to help the hon. gentleman get on his bandwagon, we hope that eventually he will be successful in finding one.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, March 6, 1981, at 10:00 a.m.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MARCH 5, 1981

ANSWER TO QUESTION NO. 3 ASKED BY THE MEMBER FOR FOGO DIRECTED TO
THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS
APPEARING ON ORDER PAPER OF MARCH 3, 1981.

- 3(a) The Government water bomber was being ferried to St. Jean, Quebec for major metal work on the hull that could not be performed at the Air Services facility at St. John's Airport.
- (b) The water bomber made a forced landing at Sherbrooke, Quebec, as a result of fuel starvation enroute to St. Jean.
- (c) The Captain and Co-pilot suffered minor injuries in the forced landing at Sherbrooke. Injuries were confined to small cuts and bruises, mostly about the face.
- (d) There have been none nor will there be any lawsuits against my Department as a result of the accident.
- (e) It does not appear at this time that the aircraft will be replaced for the forest fire season this year.
- (f) The decision on the replacement of the aircraft is in the hands of the Department of Forest, Resources and Lands.
- (g) This particular aircraft could be considered as the standby water bomber, used to supplement the fire fighting efforts at any point where an emergency situation might arise. All bases will continue to have normal fire bomber coverage with the remaining six aircraft.