

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.  
FRIDAY, MAY 15, 1981

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the  
Minister of Municipal Affairs. Last night my colleague,  
the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and our spokesman for  
Municipal Affairs, the member for Carbonear (Mr. Moores),  
attended a public meeting in the town of Bonavista attended  
by somewhere between 400 and 500 people who were very  
concerned about the implementation of property tax.  
And we could not explain to them, Madam Minister, maybe  
you can explain to them, why it is that the act has no  
provision in it whereby the people in a town like Bonavista  
have any choice about paying property tax, that it is  
enforced under the act, Mr. Speaker. It has been enforced  
under the act and the people could not understand why there  
is no provision in the act for them, either at a public  
meeting or in any kind of a petition, to have any choice  
over what would happen. The people just could not believe  
that they have no choice. They, the people in the  
district in the town of Bonavista, would like to know if  
the minister can explain for the benefit of the people in  
Bonavista why it is that there is no provision for the  
people in Bonavista to opt for a different form of taxation  
if that is their wish. Why is it that there is no provision  
in the act for them to do anything about it?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal  
Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, this government had  
a Royal Commission, the Whalen Royal Commission, to study

May 15, 1981

Tape 1580

EC - 2

MRS. NEWHOOK:

all forms of taxation in this

Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MRS. NEWHOOK:

- and the recommendation of the

Whalen Royal Commission was that the real property tax is

the only fair municipal tax. Also, the real property

tax is the tax that

MRS. NEWHOOK: has been accepted all across Canada as being the best form of taxation and our Province has adopted that.

MR. STIRLING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. It is too bad that the minister was not there last night to explain to the people of Bonavista what she just said, which was that in her judgment she did not think that the people of Bonavista had any right to have a choice in the matter because the Whalen Royal Commission had recommended it. Now the people in Bonavista, the 500 people that were there last night, they are not satisfied and they want to know what form they can take. They asked if there is a form. Would the minister allow them to have a plebiscite in the town or would they accept a petition from the people in the town or from the majority of the people or from a two-thirds majority or 90 per cent of the people? They reject it. It is not acceptable to them. Would the minister consider a change in the act to enable them to make a presentation?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, what the minister will consider is that all information will be made available to the residents of Bonavista, that they can have a citizens' committee, they can present to me all of the questions, all of their concerns and my department and I, and I am sure the member for Bonavista, we will get all this information back to the people and I am sure that all of the residents of Bonavista, when they have all the facts and we can apply it to their particular area, their particular town, I am quite sure

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1581

SD - 2

MRS. NEWHOOK: that all these concerns will be resolved and they will be quite satisfied with the information.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the hon. member is aware of it or not, maybe the member for the district did not communicate the message, the information, to the hon. minister, but the hon. minister was

MR. S. NEARY: invited to go to Bonavista to discuss this matter with the citizens of Bonavista. And the people are very disappointed that the hon. minister did not turn up to explain the situation to the people in Bonavista but instead decided to send out a brochure to the people, the householders. Now that brochure did not indicate whether or not people, fishermen especially who have a bad year in the fishery or somebody who gets sick -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) bad year this year.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Keep your trap closed now, keep your trap closed now. It was good until you came back here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! Order, please!  
The hon. member for LaPoile has a supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: - somebody who goes, for instance, who goes in arrears on their taxes through no fault of their own, there is no guarantee in that information pamphlet that the minister sent around to the householders-that seemed to make matters worse, by the way, and I will explain that later - no guarantee in that that if they did go in arrears that their houses would not be seized in lieu of taxes. Could the minister now give the people of Bonavista that assurance, a guarantee that they will not lose their homes if through no fault of their own they go in arrears on their taxes?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1582

DW - 2

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, the council in Bonavista has the authority to reduce taxation, the property tax, it has the authority to defer it, it has the authority to forgive it if it wishes. And I am sure that all of these matters, all of these taxations, or the ones who really have a legitimate claim to have been unable to pay the tax, can be dealt with by the council.

With regard to seizing -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) to embarrass. If it was not it will be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS. NEWHOOK:

With regard to seizing people's properties and selling it, in twenty-five years of the property tax in Newfoundland, I think there is only just possibly the city of St. John's that has ever really taken people's property for sale to recover arrears of taxes. And I understand that even with the city of St. John's it has been very, very old properties where there have been absentee landlords or absentee owners or where the property has been so dilapidated that it is to the benefit of the owner to let it be seized for the taxes rather than to pay them. And there is no need whatsoever for the people in Bonavista to fear that that will happen in that town.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would gather from the answer given by the hon. minister that she sympathizes with this principle of not seizing people's homes who go in arrears in their taxes through no fault of their own. The minister seems to favour that so why will the government not make that the law of the land? Why will the government not amend the Municipalities Act to make that the law, that no municipality in Newfoundland, including Bonavista, would be able to take a person's home ever? - including St. John's and Corner Brook, by the way; that is another place they have seized homes. Make it the law of the land that no person will lose his home because he went in arrears in his taxes. And the other thing that the people are concerned about down there is that they do not have a choice. Before this



MR. NEARY: act came into effect last year, the people of Newfoundland, the people in the municipalities in Newfoundland had a choice of whether they wanted to go for the property tax or not. In Bonavista and fifty-nine other communities they now have no choice. They have to accept it under this act; it is mandatory. And that is one of the big complaints in Bonavista. They cannot exercise their democratic right. They cannot vote by secret ballot. What is the minister's comment on that?

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that if we find that this particular clause in the act is being abused that government will certainly look at an amendment to it.

MR. STIRLING: Why not amend it now before there is abuse.

MRS. NEWHOOK: There has been no abuse -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MRS. NEWHOOK: - of this particular section of the act.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs was answering her question.

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the hon. member across the House that in Bonavista;

MRS. NEWHOOK: government has spent somewhere between \$7 million to \$8 million on the water and sewer distribution in the ground.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. NEWHOOK: I will further point out, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MRS. NEWHOOK: I would further point out that the Town of Bonavista is being very heavily subsidized in the operation of that system.

MR. STIRLING: What is wrong with that?

MRS. NEWHOOK: I would also like to point out that only -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MRS. NEWHOOK: - seventy per cent of the people have been serviced as yet. There are still thirty per cent more to be serviced and I do not think it is really fair that we have to cut back on services to other parts of the Province to install another thirty per cent services in Bonavista and for government then to more heavily subsidize them. And I can look all around this House here this morning and I can see where members in just about all the districts across the Province are still waiting for water and sewer projects.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MRS. NEWHOOK: And the more heavily, of course, we subsidize Bonavista, the more money is coming from the taxes of the people of our Province. And we would like to be able to spread the services as far as we can across Newfoundland and as quickly as we can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there was quite  
a strong -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - there was quite a strong feeling  
of resentment last night that the minister has not gone to  
Bonavista to discuss this matter with the people who opposed  
the property tax in that community. And there was quite a  
bit of opposition to that information sheet that the minister  
sent out.

Now first of all I would like to  
ask the minister if she would, sometime in the near future, go  
down to Bonavista and meet the people, the same as we met them  
last night, and discuss these matters. And the other thing,  
in the information pamphlet, the householder mailing or whatever  
it was that the minister sent out, the minister talked about  
CN property, that it would be to the advantage of Bonavista to  
have the property tax, they would be able to tax CN property.  
Well last night it was pointed out at the meeting that CN is  
downgrading its services in Bonavista and that pretty soon instead  
of taxing CN the Town Council would have to pay CN to stay there.  
There is not much possibility of getting taxes there.

And what federal property was the  
minister talking about? As far as we could learn last night,  
there is a small post office there, and that is about it as far as  
federal property is concerned, not much taxes from that. And  
we were told also that the fishery office that used to be located  
in Bonavista has now been moved to Clarendville.

MR. MORGAN: That is federal.

MR. NEARY: So what they are doing, they  
are pulling -

MR. MORGAN: That is federal.

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1584

NM - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

not say federal -

Well I said fisheries; I did

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

- I said fisheries. So what is happening is that all the services, all the things that they had in Bonavista are being moved out.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

So, if the minister elaborates -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! If the hon. member has a supplementary, I would ask him to direct his supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

So could the minister

MR. NEARY: elaborate a little bit on these matters and especially the question that I asked about whether or not she would go down to Bonavista to discuss this matter with the people who are violently, by the way, protesting this property tax?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MRS NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I have not been invited to go to Bonavista as yet to attend a meeting. I can -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MRS NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, I can table the telegram that came into my office requesting a senior official or my deputy minister to go down to explain the property tax and that was done. I am quite sure that the-

MR. NEARY: If you were invited would you go?

MRS NEWHOOK: There would be no problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MRS NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MRS. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, there is no problem whatsoever in going to Bonavista. I visit all municipalities; all councils who invite me to go, I have gone, I have never, ever yet refused.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews).

MR. FLIGHT: In view of the fact that the Newfoundland Wildlife Federation have come out and asked for a moratorium on the start up of Cat Arm until an independent environmental impact study can be done, in other words, they are asking that the act be applied and that an environmental assessment board be set up to do an independent environmental study, is the minister prepared to concede to their wishes or consider their request and call for a moratorium until this study is done?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know exactly what the Wildlife Federation is requesting. I heard something on the news this morning.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have not written you?

MR. ANDREWS: They have not written me. I do not know if they have written any other government department.

MR. FLIGHT: Give them time. They will write.

MR. ANDREWS: We are fully prepared at any time to discuss any concerns with the Wildlife Federation. As a matter of fact, I tried to contact Mr. Bouzanne myself this morning when I heard it. I have had no communications with him, but we are quite prepared - in my understanding, what he said this morning is he was asking for an independent committee. It is my understanding that that is not required under the act and, as I said before, we have fulfilled the act to the letter of the law.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, it would have been the responsibility of the Minister of the Environment

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1585

AH-3

MR. FLIGHT: (Mr. Andrews) to distribute the impact statement. It was not Hydro's responsibility, it was the minister's responsibility to see that the impact statement by Hydro got wide circulation in this Province and interest groups such as the

MR. FLIGHT:

Federation of Wildlife, Rod and Gun Clubs, these kinds of people, would have got a copy of that study. Could the minister indicate to this House how wide a distribution the Environmental Impact study by Hydro got in this Province?

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

MR. ANDREWS: I do believe that any interested party would have known by now that there was a proposed project underway in Cat Arm. That has been common knowledge for a number of years in Newfoundland. And I am sure that the Wildlife Federation, if they had asked for information either orally or verbally, would have received it.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, in the first instance, the study presented to the minister by Newfoundland Hydro was a total summary of preliminary studies. There was no in-depth study, but thirteen preliminary studies done over a period of five years. That is the impact statement and that is all we have; we do not have an environmental study, we have an impact statement by Hydro.

Now, the Newfoundland Wildlife Federation indicated, Mr. Speaker, that they were concerned. That is their main concern, that there is not enough public knowledge of Cat Arm from an environmental point of view and they are simply requesting that the minister call a moratorium until the information can be given to the public and meetings can be held and the people can satisfy themselves that the project is environmentally sound.

Now, Mr. Speaker, will the minister undertake, in view of that request from the Wildlife Federation,



MR. FLIGHT: to accede to their wishes and call for an independent environmental study as called for under the act?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, once again I have to say I have no written communications or no telephone calls from the Newfoundland Wildlife Federation. The first I heard of it was this morning. To this point in time, as I have said at least two or three times in this House, I am satisfied that the impact statement is sufficient and that the effects on the environment will be minimal. If the Wildlife Federation have other evidence, I will be willing to sit down with them at any time, as I have said already.

MR. FLIGHT: That is why we want the study.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the same minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CALLAN: - in his capacity as - I think his department is also called Recreation, Culture and Youth. I want to ask the same minister a question regarding provincial parks. This weekend, as the minister realizes, is the first big weekend for this year.

MR. NEARY: They are lined up up at Butterpot.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, I noticed that yesterday as I was driving home, there was a big line-up.

I want to ask the minister, how does he rationalize increasing the daily fees in provincial parks and also the annual permits by 35 per cent to 40 per cent? How does the minister rationalize increasing these fees when there has been nothing done to increase or to

May 15, 1981

Tape 1586

EC - 3

MR. CALLAN: improve these parks in any way?

MR. FLIGHT: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: So I want to ask the minister this question: Does not the minister agree that what his department is actually doing by increasing the daily and the annual fees in provincial parks is no improvement in facilities but they are driving campers out into the gravel pits and the roadsides all over this Province?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I am very surprised  
by the hon. member considering the fact that the provincial  
parks in Newfoundland are considered some of the best provincial  
parks in all of Canada, possibly in all of North America.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: And I am very proud to say myself  
that long before I got involved in politics, before I worked  
with CBC, I worked as a young boy with the provincial parks  
when the concept of the wilderness park, the nature park,  
was being developed long ago. It is the intention of the  
government to maintain that atmosphere in the parks, to  
maintain that wilderness approach to the provincial parks.  
Regarding the fee increases, I would say in defense of  
that that the fees have not been increased for at least  
three years, maybe four, and it represents a dollar a night  
and one dollar for a seasonal entry permit to the park. And  
I think with the continued inflation of today that is  
quite reasonable under the circumstances.

MR. CALLAN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for  
Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to ask the  
same minister a question about a park in Swift Current. I  
was in Swift Current two nights ago for a meeting, and one of  
the problems that arose there in the discussion, apparently  
the minister was down in Swift Current about a month ago and  
he told the people there that the Pipers Hole Park, the  
staff there would be increased from one person to possibly  
four, guaranteed three seasonal permanent and possibly four.  
Would the minister confirm or deny that that promise was made  
and will be kept in Swift Current?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Culture,

Recreation and Youth.

MR. ANDREWS:

It is quite obvious that the member has been doing a lot of travelling in his district since he became elected. I was in Swift Current, yes, and I did meet with, I believe, the Lions Club group there, about a half a dozen gentlemen. I did not promise four people four jobs, that would be a quadruple increase in the number of staff there now. I did say that I would consider discussing with my colleagues the possibility of another man for this Summer.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear.

MR. CALLAN:

Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Final supplementary, the hon.

member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder could the minister clarify, especially for the people in Swift Current, what is the status of that provincial park? There is no chain there, there are no rates, no fees charged, people go in there and camp but they camp on their own, you know, they do not have to pay any fee, they can stay there but they clean up their own garbage. Is it a picnic park? What kind of a park is it? There is nothing out front to indicate anything.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Culture,  
Recreation and Youth.

MR. ANDREWS:

Mr. Speaker, that park is classified as a day use park. I did tour the park when I was there and as a matter of fact I am convinced that some improvements need to be made. We do not encourage camping in day use parks, Mr. Speaker. And I have been talking with the park's

MR. H. ANDREWS:

officials about some improvements and some extra maintenance as I have indicated already in the first question.

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

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

MR. J. HODDER: On these provincial parks, could the minister tell me why it is that certain parks in this are opening now and certain parks will not open until open until mid-June? Some of those parks across the Province which are not opening until the middle of June, particularly with the seasonable weather that we have, some of those parks are in areas which would like to attract tourists. For instance, I have one in my district, in Piccadilly, which will not open until mid-June and that is an area where there is a spin-off effect. Can the minister tell me why these parks are not opening for such a long time?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. H. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, it has been traditional over the years, I think going back probably twenty years, that the parks opened when school was let out, around the middle of June, in recent years some of the busier parks, the ones along the main thoroughfares, along the Trans-Canada Highway and near centres of large population which would possibly get use. We have seen some considerable improvement in the environment in the last month or so as people will note. We did not predict that -

MR. STIRLING: Is that supposed to be funny?

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you going to take credit for that?

MR. H. ANDREWS: I will take credit for that.

These things are unpredictable. It has been budgeted that so many parks would open, these parks will open this weekend; the remainder will open on the 17th. of June and, knowing Newfoundland's climate as we do, it could snow tomorrow.

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

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

MR. J. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I just want to ask the minister is his department not flexible enough to be able to change? I mean, we know now that the snow is off the ground! Why is it that certain parks are discriminated against particularly in areas of high unemployment?

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. minister.

MR. H. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, there is no discrimination against parks, the parks are made up of trees -

MR. J. HODDER: Then why are you opening some of them a month before others? I mean, if you do not open them you are not going to get big traffic through them.

MR. H. ANDREWS: - and park benches and highways and roads. The parks that are opened are selected where it is believed they will be greatly used.

MR. J. HODDER: But they will never be used if they are not opened.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member has asked his question once.

MR. H. ANDREWS: Some of these parks have been opened on occasion and the use of them does not warrant them to be opened any earlier. Particularly, Mr. Speaker, there is another thing that comes in to play there, that generally speaking with our climate, the land and the countryside is not prepared to take a heavy amount of traffic this early in the season, the vegetation has not come back. And we would like to keep the parks by themselves without man interfering with them as much as possible until the Summer comes.

MR. B. TULK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. W. CALLAN:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. B. TULK:

I will yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo yields for a supplementary from the hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. W. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, while we are on the parks, I wanted to ask the same minister. Three years ago I asked a question in this House to a former minister and it was the policy of the department at that time to turn over as many provincial parks as possible to private enterprise. Now I know and the minister knows - or the former minister knew - that the park at Swift Current was in demand; two gentlemen in Swift Current wanted to take it over as private enterprise, but the provincial government said, 'No, we want

MR. CALLAN:

to keep it as a provincial park! I want to ask the minister, how many parks in this Province which were former Provincial parks are now in the hands of private enterprise?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, that potential policy change had been under consideration. It is my own opinion that the provincial parks that exist today should not be turned over to private enterprise for a number of reasons. First of all, for private enterprise to operate these parks at the standard at which we believe they should be operated, the cost of entry, the cost of usage would have to double, quadruple, God only knows how much the citizens would have to pay to use those parks then.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: These parks are highly subsidized by the taxpayers of Newfoundland. They are subsidized so that Newfoundlanders can get overnight accommodations at a very minimal price. I believe to turn over these parks where the fee is four or five dollars, you will see a fee rise to fifteen to twenty dollars a night. I do not believe that the Newfoundland people want that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

Hon. members, I know, would like to join me this morning in welcoming to the galleries, forty students from St. Bernard's Elementary School in Witless Bay, Ferryland district, accompanied by their teachers,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: They are accompanied by their teachers, Sister Theresa Devine and and Mrs. Barbara Kerry. We hope



MR. SPEAKER (Simms): they enjoy their visit this morning.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I have a request for leave to revert to Statements by Ministers by the hon. the Minister of Labour (J. Dinn). Is there leave at this time?

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) what is it about?

MR. SPEAKER: A Ministerial Statement. The hon. minister would like to make one.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman indicate what it is about?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, we have, the reports of the McCarthy Royal Commission into three industrial accidents in Western Labrador, The hon. Opposition critic was not here at the time and -

MR. SPEAKER: Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: We revert to Statements by Ministers. The hon. the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I am today releasing the report of the Royal Commission into the causes of the industrial accidents which occurred in January and February of 1977 at the Iron Ore Company of Canada mining operations in Labrador City.

Members of the House will recall that following three tragic industrial accidents involving death at the Iron Ore Company of Canada mining operations in Labrador City in 1977, a Royal Commission was appointed to inquire into, one, the cause or causes of three industrial accidents involving death which occurred in January and February 1977 within the mines and property of the Iron Ore Company of Canada situated near Labrador City and into the circumstances surrounding the same;

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1589

EL - 3

MR. DINN: two, all questions relating to occupational health and safety adopted by the Company in carrying out its mining and other operations at its mines and property situated near Labrador City.

Three, the compliance of the operations of the Company at its mines and property near Labrador City in all respects with those provisions of the Regulation of Mines Act, the regulations made there under and any other statutes of the Province related to health, safety and convenience of employees working therein;

Four, the justification for review of

MR. DINN:

such acts and regulations, or either, to ensure that proper procedures and practices are followed in mining operations.

The Royal Commission, with His Honour, Judge Vincent P. McCarthy, as Commissioner, has completed an extensive and thorough study into the cause or causes, and the circumstances surrounding the three industrial accidents involving death and has compiled a report of some 700 pages comprised of two volumes which has been distributed to the hon. members of the House today, or will be.

Volume I, this part of the report deals exclusively with the cause, or causes, of the circumstances surrounding the three industrial accidents involving death. No recommendations are contained in this volume of the report. It mainly covers a description of the mining operations at Carol Lake, the causes of the accidents, and testimony of the persons directly involved in the events relating to the accidents. With respect to the cause of two of the accidents, the report finds the company guilty of negligence and the other accident, having occurred as a result of a malfunction of equipment. I can inform the House that the company has taken steps to prevent a repetition of the accidents described in the report.

However, Volume II of the report addressed a wide range of issues concerning occupational health and safety which extend well beyond the specific causes of the three fatalities.

Volume II, This part of the report deals extensively with questions relating to occupational health and safety adopted by the company. The compliance of the operations of the company at the Carol Lake project in all respects with statutes of the Province and regulations made thereunder relating to health, safety and convenience of the company's employees at Carol Lake and the justification for review of such statutes and regulations, or either, to ensure that proper procedures and

MR. DINN: and regulations, or either, to ensure that proper procedures and practices are followed in the mining operations.

It is not my intention to attempt to comment in detail, at this time, on the recommendations which total forty-nine in all. However, I am pleased to report that a total of sixteen of the recommendations have been actioned and another eight are under active consideration by government toward implementation. A further seven recommendations involve legislation and will be reviewed in consultation with the Department of Justice, whereas the remaining eighteen recommendations require implementation by the company and will be pursued by a senior level tripartite committee which I propose to establish with representation from the company, the union and the Department of Labour and Manpower. The function of this committee will be to oversee, in an orderly manner, the follow-up action required as a result of the Royal Commission Report.

Mr. Speaker, early in 1979 government authorized a major study into the dust problems in the mining operations in Western Labrador. That study

MR. DINN: is progressing on schedule and is expected to be completed in early 1982. Undoubtedly the report of the dust study will touch on many of the issues raised in the Royal Commission report and I will request the tripartite Committee to be cognizant of the dust study as it pursues the recommendations contained in the report being tabled today.

Mr. Speaker, the tabling of this report marks yet another important step in government's commitment to emphasize the importance of health and safety in the work place. As mentioned earlier, the major dust study which is presently ongoing in Western Labrador and also the introduction of new occupational health and safety legislation in 1979, are all part of government's policy to improve working conditions in this Province, and in doing so hopefully avoid the kind of tragic accidents which are reported in this report. I want to assure the members of the House that the matters raised in this report will be given immediate and full consideration and I intend to make further comments on this report once my officials have had an opportunity to consult with the parties involved.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Terra Nova has about three and one-half minutes approximately.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for his courtesy in waiting for my arrival to get a learned and informed comment on his statement before presenting it.

Mr. Speaker, the question that immediately comes to mind is but many reports, how many studies must we have with respect to the iron ore operations in Labrador before we make that a safe and healthy place for workers? Mr. Speaker, we have had so many reports now, and this report certainly again points out the credence and the credibility of the concerns of the workers and the

MR. LUSH: union when they have expressed those concerns re the lack of safety and good health measures with respect to that mining operation. And this report, Mr. Speaker, substantiates their concerns with two major findings of this report, namely, that the company was found to be negligent with respect to two of the industrial accidents and that one of the accidents was related to a malfunction of the equipment, point number one. And then point number two, of course, finds a lot wanting with respect to the health and safety measures as adopted and complied with by the company.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to remind the minister - the minister ended his statement by alluding to the success of this government by the presentation of reports relating to measures for improving health and safety in the work place. Let me remind the minister that the mere presentation of a report does nothing, Mr. Speaker, to make the work place healthy and safe. The measure of success, Mr. Speaker, is found in the follow-up action. And one again wonders, Mr. Speaker, just how many reports we have to have respecting the operation of the iron ore mines in Labrador to make them a safe and healthy place in which to work.

I hope the minister is right.

I hope right now

MR. LUSH: that the minister will take the appropriate action. And in conjunction with the dust committee that is now set up and in conjunction with this committee that he plans to set up to look into the remaining eighteen recommendations, that for once and for all we can do something about Labrador, that we can allay the fears of the workers and the union, Mr. Speaker, I hope. And that will, Mr. Speaker, be the success of this report. If the minister follows through, if the minister acts upon the recommendations made and follows up on the appointment of the committee that he suggested he would today and make the committee on the dust level more aware, make them aware of some of the recommendations, then we can say it was a success. But until that time, Mr. Speaker, it will only be a report like so many of the other reports that we had done on Labrador and I hope it is not going to be this way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HANCOCK: They will not be so happy to  
clap after I finish with the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: My old buddy, my old buddy.

MR. HANCOCK: This is a petition, Mr. Speaker, that,  
I might add, was hand delivered to me about twenty minutes  
before the House opened. And the prayer of the petition is:  
"That we, the teachers at Stella Maris and Holy Redeemer School,  
Trepassey, are completely dissatisfied with government's  
latest salary offer of 5, 6, 6 and 5 per cent over a two year  
period. It is actually less than the salary offered in the  
conciliation board report, which we rejected. We wish to  
express our disappointment in the representatives of the NTA

MR. HANCOCK: for tentatively accepting such an offer. We intend to vote to reject this offer. We voted with a majority of approximately 95 per cent to strike if offered anything less than 14 per cent, our position has remained unchanged.

We pray that you as our elected representative will petition government on our behalf. We trust our demands will be met. We will continue to pray."

I might add, Mr. Speaker, this petition is signed by twenty-two teachers from that area, in the school, it is only one school, and I would imagine there will be more of those come in in the future. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that the petition is self-explanatory and I would just like to have the petition laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates. I support the petition whole-heartedly, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if by leave - we had passed by the submission of reports.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. BARRY: No, Mr. Speaker, pursuant to -

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I have to see. Is there leave to revert to Presenting Reports.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. BARRY: It is the annual report of Hydro, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand there is agreement. The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if they do not want to see it, of course - the annual report of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, Mr. Speaker, for 1980.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Clerk at the table please get the tabled document.



ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order 12, Bill No. 4  
Motion, second reading of a bill,  
"An Act Respecting The Department Of Environment".

On yesterday the debate was  
adjourned by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) but he is  
not here so the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the member for  
Eagle River is unavoidably absent this morning so I will carry  
on for a few minutes and then I hope my hon. colleague, the  
member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock), who is our  
expert on the environment, the outdoors of this Province,  
will also add his few pearls of wisdom to the debate.  
And I am sure the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms) can be  
persuaded, although it is not an educational matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: But perhaps, Mr. Speaker, he  
could be persuaded.

MR. NEARY:

Now, Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate my colleague the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), for making an outstanding speech in this House yesterday. The hon. gentleman obviously did his homework. He researched the matter very carefully and made -

MR. BARRY: What was he speaking on?

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what I am coming to - and made an outstanding address to this House, Mr. Speaker. His arguments, his points were indefensible. It is virtually impossible for the government to knock down his arguments, his points that he made - indefensible.

And, Mr. Speaker, do you think that that speech that had such a tremendous impact on the House yesterday - when I left you could hear a pin drop in the House. Members were hanging onto the edges of their desks waiting for the next word, waiting for the next paragraph to fall of - the pearl of wisdom to fall of the hon. gentleman's lips.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, maybe as a result of my praise of the hon. gentleman, I might be able to get fourth or fifth on the Question Period on Tuesday. Well, anyway, Mr. Speaker, how much coverage did the speech get?

MR. BARRY: It got what it deserved, I suspect.

MR. NEARY: No, I would submit that it did not get what it deserved.

MR. HANCOCK: That is pretty low. That is pretty low.

MR. HANCOCK:

He even kept you quiet for awhile, you listened.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to launch into an attack on the coverage of this House. I could if I wanted to, but I am not going to do it. But I must say I was awfully disappointed that the wonderful speech, the excellent speech made by my colleague yesterday was not reported widely by either the electronic media or by the Daily News. We have not gotten the Evening Telegram yet, so we will just have to wait and see what coverage that gave it.

I would like to, for a few moments, just repeat and reinforce some of the points that were made by the hon. gentleman. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I would like to state categorically that the opinion is becoming widespread in this Province that the biggest destroyer of the environment in Newfoundland is Newfoundland Hydro - the biggest destroyer. They are out there leveling the countryside and, Mr. Speaker, this is a shame. It is a Crown corporation, it is a creature of the government, it is an agent of the Newfoundland government. The Newfoundland government and Newfoundland Hydro are all and the same, there is no difference in them. There is no difference in Newfoundland Hydro and the Newfoundland government and if the government wanted to they could pull back their Crown corporation and say that you will not go ahead with future developments in this Province unless an independent board is set up to study the impact on the environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

In the case of Cat Arm, Mr. Speaker, which was the most recent project announced that triggered this debate, and then this bill, it was rather timely that it came in around the same time, but the Cat Arm

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1593

AH-3

MR. NEARY: development was the thing that triggered the remarks made by hon. gentlemen in the House yesterday. Now what happened in the case of Cat Arm? Under the Environmental Assessment Act, the minister responsible for that act had the right, had the right to appoint a board to do an environmental study on the Cat Arm

MR. NEARY: development before Hydro received approval to go ahead with the project. The minister had the right to do that under the act. Now, did he do it, Mr. Speaker? Did he do it? The answer, of course, is no he did not do it. Instead of an independent board being appointed to do the study on the impact on the environment in the Harbour Deep area on the moose population, on the salmon rivers, on the muskrat in the area. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that this particular area, this particular wilderness area has the highest moose population in the whole Province, the highest. There are thirty-nine wilderness areas in Newfoundland and the Harbour Deep area, the wilderness area and the wintering of the moose in that area is the highest in the Province, the highest. I underline that, quotation marks, parenthesis. 'It has the highest moose population' Out of the thirty-nine wilderness areas in the Province, that particular area has the highest moose population and the minister did not see fit to appoint an independent board to look at the impact on the moose population or the caribou herds or the salmon or the muskrat and other fur bearing animals that exist in that area.

Mr. Speaker, what did the government do? What did Hydro do? Hydro did their own study. Hydro did their own study. Well, that is just like asking Eaton's or Simpsons to do a study on themselves. What else would you expect Hydro to do or say? What would you expect them to say but, yes, we can safely proceed with this project? And then to take their report, as the minister told us, and put it in the libraries throughout the Province. How many communities in Newfoundland do not have libraries? How many? I would say several hundred small communities in rural Newfoundland but, of course, this government cannot think about rural Newfoundland. They have seven members, seven St. John's members in the Cabinet and the Cabinet thinking is St. John's oriented.

MR. NEARY: And so, therefore, when they talk about libraries, they are talking about the public library downtown, St. John's. But there are several hundred communities, several hundred communities in Newfoundland that have no library and even if the library was there, nine chances out of ten the information would not filter out to the people. So, what silly nonsense, what a silly answer the minister gave this morning to a question posed by my colleague, that the report - the report of whom? Of Newfoundland Hydro. And who is Newfoundland Hydro? Newfoundland Hydro is the Crown corporation that wants to carry out the project. So, that is just the same as asking Simpsons or Sears or some other department store to do an assessment on themselves. And what would you expect them to say?

And not only that - and even that report, Mr. Speaker, contradicts the argument put forward by the government. There are certain aspects of that report that are frightening, that cannot be dismissed lightly, items in that report that the government and the minister should have paid attention to.

And then we have the report done

MR. S. NEARY: by Dr. Barnes a few years ago, a preliminary report that stated the importance of that particular wilderness area to the wildlife in this Province. And so, Mr. Speaker, there is no excuse. There is no urgency, and it is an insult to the people of this Province for the minister or the government, and the minister speaks for the government, to say that we refuse to follow, to obey our own law that we made a couple of years ago, we refuse to recognize our own law passed in this House by members on both sides of the House because laws are not made by government, Mr. Speaker - although I hear sometimes ministers and government members saying that it is government that makes laws, it is not government that makes laws, it is this House that makes laws. And that law was passed by this House, members on both sides of the House voted for it. The only real objection we had to the bill at the time, if my memory serves me correctly, was that it gave the minister too much power. We argued at the time, Mr. Speaker, that environmental impact studies should be mandatory, should be compulsory by law. But the minister put in this little legal term that the minister 'may' appoint a board - 'may' - and in this case the minister decided not to appoint the board. Dr. Barnes pointed out the importance of this wilderness area, one of the few left in this Province, and one of the most important wildlife habitats in this Province, in the Harbour Deep area.

So, Mr. Speaker, here we are faced with the dilemma again, the government riding roughshod over everybody, the government using their dictatorial powers. The government makes an arbitrary decision to proceed with the project, to destroy the water, the ponds and the rivers in the Harbour Deep area, flood the whole area, chase out the moose population, get rid of the muskrats, destroy the salmon rivers without any regard. They are going to proceed with that project without any regard whatsoever to the environment.

MR. S. NEARY: And I am sure that the young people in the galleries who are listening to this debate today and listening to my voice will be disappointed and shocked to hear that we have a government that is so callous and so cruel that they would go out and wreck the only last - probably about the last wilderness area -

MR. L. STIRLING: The last game reserve.

MR. S. NEARY: The last game reserve left in Canada, the last, and this government with the stroke of a pen would go out and wipe it out.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House,



MR. NEARY: of course, we on this side of the House are very frustrated.

MR. HANCOCK: You should have heard a couple of comments I heard yesterday about -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: They do not call him that, they call him -

MR. NEARY: We are very frustrated. The people of the Province, Mr. Speaker, are extremely concerned and frustrated over this matter. And only last night the - what is the name of that organization? -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No. What is the name of that organization that - Rod and Gun -

MR. FLIGHT: The Newfoundland Federation of Wildlife.

MR. NEARY: The Newfoundland Federation of Wildlife this morning, I heard their spokesman, I heard their spokesman on the radio, on CBC early this morning saying that the government should call a halt, postpone that development -

MR. FLIGHT: Until.

MR. NEARY: - until an independent environmental impact study is done.

MR. HANCOCK: And we get a new minister.

MR. NEARY: And I say to that, hear, hear! And I understand that every rod and gun club in Newfoundland supports that federation. So I would think, Mr. Speaker, that we are going to hear more -

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible).

MR. FLIGHT: The member for Deer Lake -

MR. NEARY: If I was the hon. Minister of Health -

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible). my district.

MR. NEARY: - if I was the Minister of Health I would not stick my nose into this debate. I would rather that the hon. gentleman went down and tried to solve the medical problems down in Placentia, something that he has been unable to cope with.

MR. HOUSE: - very, very well.

MR. NEARY: Well, not according to the correspondence that we have, and the complaints that we have from Placentia where a doctor is not allowed to go in the hospital to visit his patients. The doctor wanted to go in the hospital, the minister's department refused to allow him in to visit his patients.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: That is the kind of arrogance, Mr. Speaker, and kind of contempt that this government has for the people of this Province. The kind that we just heard from the Minister of Health, and I am not going to be sidetracked or distracted off the main issue, which is the Cat Arm development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: But this is an indication, Mr. Speaker, this is typical of the reaction that we get from ministers in this government, nothing but arrogance and contempt.

MR. FLIGHT: Why was your final explanation -

MR. NEARY: Know-alls. They are know-alls. And in the process they are riding roughshod - they are riding roughshod over everybody in this Province.

The Premier sets himself up as an emperor, a dictator, and they think they all have to follow suit. They are all mini-dictators.

MR. HANCOCK: Particularly with oil, they do not know if they have got something or -

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious matter indeed. And I am hoping that before this debate is finished that the government will come to its senses, come to its senses and have an independent study done on the impact on the environment in the Cat Arm development in the Harbour Deep area. Why not? Why not?

Mr. Speaker, this particular development we are talking about, by the way, which will cost the taxpayers of this Province in the vicinity of \$300 million, just to use round figures, the same thing

MR. NEARY:

could have been accomplished by expanding the thermal generating plant at Holyrood - \$150 million.

AN HON. MEMBER: You would burn more oil.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let me knock down that argument about burning more oil.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! Order, please!  
The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Let me knock down that argument about burning more oil by expanding the thermal generating plant at Holyrood. Well, we are told one of the arguments the government is using is that this is only a stopgap measure. And if it is a stopgap measure, then what happens two or three or four years down the line? Because there is no indication in this House that Muskrat Falls or the Lower Churchill will be developed to give us the supply of electricity that we need.

MR. BARRY: There is in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is every indication in Ottawa, but there is no indication in this Province. Ottawa does not own - it is a provincial matter we are talking about. Ottawa does not own the Muskrat Falls or does not own the Lower Churchill, it belongs to this Province. What does Ottawa have to do with it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Fund it.

MR. NEARY: Fund it? Oh, I see. You hit them over the head one day -

MR. HANCOCK: And you want funding the next day.

MR. NEARY: - you hit Ottawa over the head, you give them a punch in the gob, a punch in the mouth, and then you want them to fund the Muskrat Falls and the Lower Churchill. Well, is it not about time, if you want that,

MR. NEARY: that you sat down and had some serious common-sense, meaningful negotiations with Ottawa on those projects?

MR. WARREN: We do not have sensible government.

MR. NEARY: It is several months and probably a couple of years -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: It is probably, Mr. Speaker, a considerable period of time since this government had eyeball to eyeball, head-on negotiations with the Government of Canada on this particular development we are talking about, the Lower Churchill.

So \$150 million could have done the same job. The government is telling us that this project will only give us the electricity we need for the next four or five years and then we are in trouble again.

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if you put this proposition to the people of this Province - let me put it this way to the Minister of Health (Mr. House) who suddenly now has become an expert on the environment - he knows nothing about health, his officials run that department; now he is going to tell us all he knows about the environment. It is a well-known fact in the Department of Health that the minister does not make decisions - he is incapable of handling that department - that the officials have him in their pockets and he is like a puppet on a string, when they grind the organ he dances to the tune. And that is the way the Department of Health has been running. We will find out more about that on Tuesday. When the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) comes back into the House on Tuesday, we will hear some more about that Placentia situation, I hope.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman cannot tell us anything about Placentia, because one of the big complaints about Placentia is that the member has refused to act on this serious matter of a doctor being barred from the hospital, not allowed to go in and see his patients.

MR. PATTERSON: He was not barred from the hospital (inaudible) that is a lie.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

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

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1598

EL - 1

MR. NEARY: You heard the remark, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): No.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Placentia (W. Patterson) used a very unparliamentary term and I ask Your Honour to ask him to withdraw it. If he cannot stand the heat let him get out of the kitchen.

AN HON. MEMBER: He said it is a lie. It is a lie.

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is right. That is unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I did not hear the hon. member's comment but I will certainly - if it was unparliamentary I will check Hansard and -

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: I will undertake that for the hon. member.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. SPEAKER: I will undertake that for the hon. member.

MR. NEARY: Thank you. You know, Mr. Speaker, before I sit down -

MR. THOMS: Stand up and withdraw it.

MR. HANCOCK: Come on be a man.

MR. NEARY: No, he is not a man.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Everybody heard you, come on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I thank Your Honour for the protection of the Chair. I must say, before I conclude my few remarks, that I am pleasantly surprised at the competence that Your Honour has developed in his position. And I ask the hon. member for Placentia, if he has the courage, if he has the intestinal fortitude to repeat what he said a few moments ago, repeat it. He does not have the courage. I ask him to repeat, -

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1598

EL - ,2

MR. NEARY: not make a speech -

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): A point of order.

MR. NEARY: - repeat what the hon. gentleman said.

MR. PATTERSON: I said, it is an untruth, that the doctor withdrew his services.

MR. NEARY: Ah, that is not what the hon. gentleman said. The hon. gentleman does not have the courage to say it.

MR. PATTERSON: I said the doctor at Placentia withdrew his services, he was not barred.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON: Quit worrying about Placentia district. Come up and run against me, any of you fellows over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The fact of the matter is -

MR. PATTERSON: That is the way to settle it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on 'Bill' (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The fact of the matter is that the doctor was thrown out of the hospital. He is barred out of the hospital by the Minister of Health (W. House). He is not allowed to visit his patients in the hospital and I think that is outrageous and scandalous. That is not the topic under consideration here, Mr. Speaker. We are talking about the Cat Arm development and the impact it will have on the environment.

Now, I think I have dealt adequately with that matter except I want to conclude that part of my few remarks by saying that this is only a stopgap measure. There is no indication down the road, two or three or four or five years, that the Lower Churchill or the Muskrat Falls will be developed. As a matter of fact, anybody following the proceedings in this House and following the activities of the government, will come to the conclusion that the government has thrown up its arms



MR. NEARY: in defeat. They have given up on the Lower Churchill. They have given up. And, Mr. Speaker, again I have to use the example that what else could you expect from a government that is dominated by ministers who represent districts in the city of St. John's?

This government has no concern for rural Newfoundland, none at all. You can see that every day. There is more discontent, more discontent out in the rural parts of this Province, in the outports of this Province, as we saw last night in Bonavista, as we will see in connection with this Cat Arm development, more discontent because the Provincial Government does not have a realistic policy for the fishery, discontent, everywhere I go, Everywhere we go we run into people who are disappointed with this government, discouraged and discontented.

Mr. Speaker, I would not be a bit surprised by the end of the year if you will not see -

MR. HANCOCK: A rebellion in this Province.

MR. NEARY: No, not a rebellion -

MR. HANCOCK: Do not count on it.

MR. NEARY: But you will see, you are likely to see all kinds of demonstrations. You are going to see more people kicking up their heels.

MR. S. NEARY: you are going to see more people who are upset by the arrogance of this government, by the high-handed tactics that they use. We are going to see more of that. And I am not one to fan the fire of discontent. But I will guarantee you this, Mr. Speaker, these people will be well justified; with the high cost of living in this Province, record unemployment, the highest taxes in Canada, the highest per capita public debt in Canada, or the second highest in Canada, and the government concentrating its efforts on foolishness like sending the Norma and Gladys around Newfoundland. They are not concerned about the environment, they are not concerned about rural Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, they are St. John's oriented. And I do not have anything against St. John's and I am not trying to stir up that old controversy of St. John's versus the outports, but I think it is very unfair, Mr. Speaker, it is unfair to have seven members out of eighteen, seven Cabinet ministers representing St. John's districts. That is unfair. You have eleven districts in St. John's, eleven members elected in St. John's, when right from Cape Bonavista right up to Cape Chidley and including Labrador, there are only ten members and one minister.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the thinking of this government is city, is urban-oriented? Is it any wonder they have no regard for the environment? Is it any wonder they would go out in a callous way and wipe out the last habitat that we have for wildlife in this Province? Is it any wonder they fling the property taxes at the outports, at the rural areas? And the argument they use - and I am surprised the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) got sucked into this one - 'Well, we are changing it in St. John's, St. John's pays the property tax, so why should not Bonavista and why should not all these other places'? That is typical St. John's thinking!

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. S. NEARY: My hon. friend just said, 'That is right', well, he just confirmed what we already know, that this government-seven ministers-out of eleven districts in St. John's, seven of them are in the Cabinet.

No wonder, Mr. Speaker, no wonder the rural areas of this Province are being neglected! No wonder the wildlife habitats are being wiped out! All they can think about is St. John's. And if St. John's only had one member in the Cabinet, through the mere fact that it is the capital city they would get all kinds of attention, the media being here and the newspapers and everything being here. But seven members in that Cabinet is unfair.

And that is the real reason, Mr. Speaker, that is the real reason they ride roughshod. Once you go outside the overpass it is a different atmosphere in this Province altogether! Different atmosphere altogether!

AN HON. MEMBER: They come cap in hand.

MR. S. NEARY: No, they do not come cap in hand. They are proud Newfoundlanders, disappointed with some of the outport members on the other side who have suddenly become city slickers. They have as much say now in the Cabinet as my litte chihuahua. They do not care about the medical problems in Placentia, they do not care about the wildlife, they do not care about the environment, they do not care about the fishery, they do not care about the property tax. Sock it to them! Give it to the poor old peasants out there! Give it to them. I remember

MR. NEARY: 'Joey' used to say one time, he used to refer, jokingly of course, in this House to Her Majesty's outport government. He used to refer to it as Her Majesty's outport government. Now, we have Her Majesty's city government - seven out of the eighteen in the Cabinet, eleven members elected in St. John's. The member for Humber Valley (Mr. House) has as much chance now of getting his point across in the Cabinet as the man in the moon. He is outnumbered and out-classed. And so, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to have an opportunity to say these few words about the Cat Arm development and the impact it will have on the environment. I would have liked to have more time to talk about the offshore oil developments and the environment and so forth and the impact it will have on the fishery, but perhaps I will save that, Mr. Speaker, for the Committee of the Whole when I have a few more points to make.

And I want to thank Your Honour for being so tolerant and I want to thank Your Honour for giving me the protection of the Chair.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I want to say a few words in support of this bill. I know from the speeches that we have heard that nobody would know exactly what bill we are debating. It seems like we are talking about cottage hospitals and you name it, and presumably it is the bill respecting the Department of the Environment and not the Environmental Assessment Act. So I am going to have to respond somewhat to it in referring to the particular topics under consideration. But I want to congratulate the minister, of course, the new minister who, I think, started off tremendously in his portfolio by getting this bill before the House and, of course, the other actions that he has taken. And I feel I should speak on this because, of course, environmental health is also a

MR. HOUSE: part of the Department of Health mandate and, of course, this particular one now, which is a separate Department of the Environment, just goes to show the kind of emphasis that this government is placing on the environment. And we hear on the other side, of course, us being castigated because of the fact that we are running slipshod over the country. The very fact, Mr. Speaker, of the Environmental Assessment Act, the very fact that last year there was an assessment in Labrador on the Kitts-Michelin project and it was deferred, the very fact that we went with a Royal Commission last year to look further at the effects of the spruce budworm spray, they are all indications of this government's interest in seeing that the environment is improved and kept in a good state for the environmental health of the people of this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I had not intended to talk on this particular bill except for the fact of the speech yesterday by the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight). And I went home last night and I went through the Environmental Assessment Act to see exactly where we were breaking the law, where we were falling down on the legislation. And the fact is, that everything has been followed to the letter of the law. And when you get to the Department of the Environment, the people working there are capable people, people working in the best interest of the Province, they are working for the people of the Province. The tourist people, the wildlife people are working in the interest of the Province. Hydro is working in the interest of the Province. These are not running slipshod and doing things that are adverse, it is being done in the best interest of the Province. And I am very, very happy with the decision that has been reached. The Department of Environment sent back to Hydro to get further information and that information was received.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know something about the area; I have canvassed fairly well the area concerned,

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1600

SD - 3

MR. HOUSE: the bottom of White Bay to Jackson's  
Arm, Pollards Point, Sop's Arm area and, of course, the people  
are very delighted that the project is going to go ahead.  
They are delighted because of the fact

MR. HOUSE:

it is going to be a \$287 million project that will stimulate the total area of the West Coast. And, of course, they are certain, they are confident, that there is not going to be any detrimental environmental effects.

I think if you know that area - anybody who knows that area knows that a small amount of flooding in that particular area of the Province is not going to have any impact whatsoever on the habitat of that area, the wildlife habitat of that area. It is the beginning of the Northern Peninsula, a complete stretch of high land running almost to St. Anthony. And, of course, it also spreads out across the interior.

So it is not going to have an impact. As a matter of fact, it certainly will not affect the communities at all. It is so far away from any community as to not have the slightest chance of an impact. And, of course, it is such a small area to be flooded, that it just cannot have the effects that we are talking about over here. And I am confident -

MR. FLIGHT: Why do you not look at it?

MR. HOUSE: I have looked at it. I have looked at it. I have flown over it, and I know the area and I will say that there is hardly anybody over there who knows anything about the area and knows the contours of the land.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Flight has never been there?

MR. HOUSE: Never been there.

MR. BARRY: He has never been there?

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, so I am confident, and I put my defence, we have followed the letter of the law. Now, the wildlife people -

MR. FLIGHT: You have not. You have not.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: The letter of the law has been followed. The Wildlife Federation, obviously, are going to have concerns. But that information has been available for some time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HOUSE: Well, Mr. Speaker, there were two arguments given by the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) yesterday about why this should not go ahead. One was because of the habitat, the wildlife habitat being ruined, which has been proven to be wrong by the studies that have been made, and the other was, of course, the opening up of the country, to the people, from possibly White Bay, getting in the country.

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

MR. HOUSE: Those are what the two were, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): A point of order, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: A point of order.

MR. BARRY: Isolate them (inaudible) not trust the people to go in there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, if the minister is going to quote me then he is going to have to quote me properly and he cannot attach motives. At no point in my speech yesterday did I indicate that the project should not go ahead. Nowhere in my hour long speech did I indicate the project should not go ahead. I simply said it should not go ahead until it has got the benefit of an environmental study, that it has not had. So, Mr. Speaker -

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. House Leader.



MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is disgraceful. The hon. gentleman has gotten up in this House and interrupted the Minister of Health (Mr. House) in his debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shocking.

MR. MARSHALL: It is disgraceful.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: Like I said before, it is (inaudible). You have got more time (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

We have a point of order.

I would like to hear the hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, Mr. Speaker, it is not. It is a matter of disorder. Somebody gets up - you know my thin-headed friend on the other side, who is interrupting continually there, when you get up on a point of order you have to have a point of order. When you get up on a point of order, Mr. Speaker, just to interrupt for the purpose of saying that what somebody said you said in debate is untrue, it becomes disruption of the debate itself. The hon. gentleman has an adequate time to speak in this debate, has his turn in accordance with the rules and should use them.

The fact of the matter is the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, is smarting over what the hon. Minister of Health is saying, that he is against development in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, I think there was no point of order. The hon. member took the opportunity to clarify remarks that were attributed to him.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I was just saying that what the member was talking about yesterday, about the two basic reasons why he was against it -

MR. FLIGHT: Against what?

MR. HOUSE: Against the project going ahead.

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

I will stay on the point of order until the hon. member's time runs out.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): A point of order, the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: I am entitled to the protection of the Chair and I have been told since I have come into this House, that another member cannot attach motives to something a member said. And I did not - he clearly said then, Mr. Speaker, that I am against the project. And at no time in my speech did I indicate that I was against the project -

MR. BARRY: Are you for the project?

MR. HOUSE: Are you for the project?

MR. FLIGHT: I am not against the project, but I asked for an environmental study.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want him to stop.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL: Again, if the hon. gentleman wants to set up rules let him refer to Beauchesne. Now, what is in Beauchesne is quite clearly that one is not allowed to attach unavowed or base motives.

MR. MARSHALL: Now, you know, if the hon. gentleman gets up to speak he has a motive, he has a motive to get up, Mr. Speaker. His motivation is to stand up. His motivation is to move his jaws, which we see quite an exhibition of daily from the hon. gentleman, but that is not necessarily a bad motive. It is hard to bear but it is not a bad motive.

So, I mean, if the hon. gentleman wants to get up on points of order, he should know what the rules of the House are.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if I could address that point of order.

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

MR. BARRY: I think what we see here, Mr. Speaker, is

MR. BARRY: the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), not being able to have anybody listen to him when he was making his own speech, trying to get some attention by interrupting another member when he is giving a very good speech which completely demolishes the points; the frivolous and weak points that were raised by the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) yesterday. So it is like the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) would say, a holding of one's breath in an attempt to get attention. He is continuously disrupting the order of this House in an attempt to draw attention to his weak arguments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To the point of order.

The hon. -

MR. HODDER: Methinks they do protest too much.

MR. BARRY: Can you not get them under control?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! To that point of order. There is no point of order, it is a difference of opinion between two hon. gentleman.

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I was discussing the two arguments being used by the member yesterday, one about the habitat being destroyed and the other about people getting into the country from Jackson's Arm, Sop's Arm or from any part of Newfoundland, I suppose. Now, these are two noble arguments. You know, these are two great arguments but that same member, Mr. Speaker, that same member is not so concerned about people getting into the country around the Buchans area, where you have the road going from Buchans to Howley opening up the country to would-be

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1602

AH-2

MR. HOUSE: people who wanted to go in there hunting. He is not so concerned about the opening up of the country between Buchans and Southwest Brook -

MR. BARRY: Cutting the Island in two.

MR. HOUSE: - and cutting the Island in two and opening up wildlife to the total population. So, Mr. Speaker, I think we all want to look at it, perhaps, from our own perspective. I am looking at it from the total Newfoundland perspective.

MR. FLIGHT: The Environment Act was a -

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: I am looking at it from the Newfoundland perspective. We have followed the letter of the law and -

MR. BARRY: And the spirit.

MR. HOUSE: The letter and the spirit certainly. And I say that I am very delighted that this side of the House, this government, is going to go ahead with this project. You cannot stand the prosperity, seeing something good happening in Newfoundland. So, Mr. Speaker, I am supporting the bill and I am certainly supporting the project.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. Mary's-

The Capes.

MR. HANCOCK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK:

I make no wonder they are going to support it, Mr. Speaker. We all realize it is the first thing that this administration has done since they got

MR. HANCOCK: elected a little over two years ago. I guess they are going to support it. If they do not soon do something, they will be kicked out of office because the people of this Province are going to revolt against them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: There will be riots in the streets by the Fall of the year.

MR. HANCOCK: There is a lot of discontent, Mr. Speaker, around this Province right now. And after visiting my district yesterday, I can tell you they are not at all pleased with the actions taken by this government and not only in environment, Mr. Speaker, but in the well-being, the way this Province should be run and the way they thought it was going to be run by the administration that was elected by the people to run it. This Province has gone backward, Mr. Speaker, in the last twelve years. We have seen very little improvements. We have seen study on top of study, on top of study being carried out and authorization given by the minister. Mr. Speaker, this bill- the only beef I have about this bill, and it is a good bill in a sense, Mr. Speaker, because it sets up a separate Department of the Environment, which we should have had twenty years ago and probably the environment would not be in the mess it is in now, but this bill, Mr. Speaker, gives too much power to the minister, it gives too much power to the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: And that is one of the biggest beefs that I have with this bill, Mr. Speaker. We have seen exactly what this bill can do. There are people around this Province, groups around this Province who will be looking for an independent study and it is up to the minister, Mr. Speaker, whether or not they get that study,

MR. HANCOCK: one man, Mr. Speaker. One man, Mr. Speaker, is going to determine whether or not there should be an independent study done in this Province, Mr. Speaker, and I am telling you right now there are going to be a lot of people revolting against Car Arm. There are going to be a lot of people revolt against Cat Arm going ahead in the first place, because it is only going ahead, Mr. Speaker, because of the inaction by this government over the last three or four years, and ever since the Tories got elected. We have seen the Upper Churchill developed, and some people say given away, under the Liberal administration, Mr. Speaker. We have seen blasts go on both sides of the gulf during the administration of this government that is now in power, Mr. Speaker. We have seen nothing started on the Lower Churchill, Gull Island or Muskrat Falls and if it had have been started, Mr. Speaker, and this government had taken the initiative that was put into them by the people of this Province when they elected them some twelve years ago, we would not need Cat Arm.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: We would not need Cat Arm, Mr. Speaker, and by not needing Cat Arm, you would not need to tamper with the environment in that area and destroy one of the large moose hunting resorts that we have in this Province, Mr. Speaker. Because by destroying the environment you destroy this Province and when you destroy this Province, Mr. Speaker, you destroy everything in it.

MR. HANCOCK: The environment is very important to this Province, Mr. Speaker, as is tourism, and I would say tourism is probably the only industry outside of oil and gas if it ever comes onstream - and I doubt very much at times, with the actions we have seen by this government, if we are ever going to see oil and gas. I have said it before, you will see oil and gas come onstream, production will start, when Peckford goes. Mr. Speaker, I have said it before and I will keep on saying that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: Sooner or later we will -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible) Barry.

MR. HANCOCK: Yes, I think the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) would make an excellent Premier.

If the Province keeps going the way it is going right now, Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are going to be in power in this Province in the next general election. I will be surprised, Mr. Speaker, if we will not have to appoint an Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

It is quite difficult for the Chair to hear.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: I would have to check Hansard.

MR. HANCOCK: Well, Cat Arm will go ahead, Mr. Speaker. I have to support it because Newfoundlanders need the jobs. There is not a Newfoundlander who does not need the job.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HANCOCK: But once again let me reiterate, Mr. Speaker, that it is only going to go ahead because of the inaction by this irresponsible government. They should have had Labrador developed years and years ago



MR. HANCOCK: and they should continue to push to have Labrador developed so we will not have to have any more Cat Arms. I am sure if it were put to a vote tomorrow and the people of this Province were asked what they would rather have -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: - would they rather see another generating plant in Holyrood at extra cost - I know the hydro rates are ridiculous right now - but if you surveyed this Province, and I would advise the minister to do it before he goes ahead and develops Cat Arm, what would they rather see, another generating station at Holyrood or would they like to see the environmental action of that whole area just thrown out the window, Mr. Speaker? I would be surprised if the people of this Province would not rather pay in the short-term. And this is only in the short-term, Cat Arm is only in the short-term, that is all. It is only going to look after our needs for four or five years after it is developed and then we are going to have to go ahead and develop Labrador to continue the power supply for this Province, that we need in this Province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PATTERSON: We are not going to develop it and give it away.

MR. HANCOCK: You are not going to develop it and give it away. You should never have to develop Cat Arm. If you were doing the job you were elected to do, Cat Arm should never have to be developed.

MR. PATTERSON: Or the Upper Salmon, nor Hinds Lake.

MR. HANCOCK: That is right. We have one of the largest, richest resources in Labrador just sitting there and it would have about one-tenth of the impact on the environment that Cat Arm is going to have; it would have

MR. HANCOCK: one-tenth of the impact on the environment that it is going to have in the Cat Arm region, Mr. Speaker. Here we are talking about an area where the moose population is going to be affected and I understand it is - I do not know if it is the biggest but it is the second biggest moose population on the Island. They are going to flood several hundred miles of feeding ground for those animals. Birds and beavers, every species in that area is going to be endangered, Mr. Speaker. You have the beaver, the otter, everything - and here we are trying to protect our environment, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: It will be too wet for the trout.

MR. HANCOCK: It will be too wet for the trout, yes.

It will be too wet for the minister to go up to catch them, because I am afraid he is not going to be around when it is developed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HANCOCK: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is what we have seen. This Cat Arm is the result of the inaction of this government since they got elected, Mr. Speaker. I say it and I will keep on saying it and I hope to hell the press picks it up, Mr. Speaker. Because this is exactly what is happening right now. We have one of the richest resources in Labrador and for the benefit of Labrador and Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. And I mainly say that because of the residents of the Labrador portion. Once again they feel that they have been neglected, they have been betrayed by the people they have elected to represent them in the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not on this side.

MR. HANCOCK: I cannot say on our side, no, that is true, because all of the members on this side, Mr. Speaker, if they had a choice and it were put to the

MR. HANCOCK:

Liberal Opposition tomorrow:

What would you develop, Cat Arm or Gull Island or the Lower Churchill or Muskrat Falls? I am sure we would get 100 per cent support to develop one of the sites, and the most economical one to be developed in Labrador. We would not be discussing it - because if Mr. Smallwood had stayed around or any of the Liberal member on this side, the Lower Churchill would now be onstream.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me point out that there is definitely a need for a separate Department of the Environment and the minister has his work cut out for him if he stays there. He only has a couple of years left and he may not be there after that, but somebody on this side will be responsible for that department. But with onshore oil and gas coming onstream, Mr. Speaker - and I do not know when it is going to come onstream, it will come onstream shortly, we hope. But there is definitely a need for a separate Department of the Environment to protect what little we have left, Mr. Speaker. We have seen this Province being polluted over the years by hunters, people driving in cars, and the act needs to be enforced more. There should be heavy penalties put on people for tampering with the environment and littering the environment, especially with offshore oil and gas, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that regulations are in place in case an oil spill ever occurs. We have to have the measures put in place to make sure that nothing happens to our fishery, Mr. Speaker. And that will come under the Department of the Environment, which is, like I say, one of the most important departments to be set aside by this government and it is one of the few things that they have done in a positive way.

Well, once again, Mr. Speaker, I say that this bill puts too much power in the hands of the minister. A lot of people in this Province -

May 15, 1981

Tape 1603

EC - 5

MR. HANCOCK: I had it said to me yesterday,  
Mr. Speaker, 'We are starting to live under a dictatorship.'  
That was said to me on no less

MR. D. HANCOCK:

than five or six occasions yesterday, Mr. Speaker. I never asked for it, people came up and told me that they feel that right now this Province is being ruled by a dictator, it is under a dictatorship. And the older people, Mr. Speaker, are the ones who are most upset by the attitude displayed by this Premier because they were the people who went over and fought so that this Premier and guys on opposite sides of the House could have the freedom that they fought for. They are very -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. HANCOCK: - concerned about their rights that are being taken away. There are a lot of rights being taken away by this government, from the people, and the people are going to soon realize what rights have been taken away from them. This bill takes away rights of the ordinary people. The ordinary people do not have a say. It is all in the hands of the minister, Mr. Speaker, which developments are going to take place in this Province over the term of this administration.

MR. WARREN: It sounds like a mafia.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Like Hydro - this is what I get a kick out of, Mr. Speaker, Hydro goes and comes up with their own study, no independent study. And what is Hydro going to recommend to government, that they do not go ahead with Cat Arm or Upper Salmon or Bay d' Espoir? Like beans they are, Mr. Speaker, like beans they are!

Well, Mr. Speaker, there are other things in this bill that surprise me and these are the waterways around this Province. It gives the minister the right to designate which waterways or which water supply systems can be used for swimming, boating - or if you have swimming and boating going on naturally -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hunting and fishing.

MR. D. HANCOCK: - and hunting or fishing, that you are going to have pollution and the pollution - they will soon be landing aircraft and handling gasoline in those waterways if the minister -

MR. WARREN: They do. They do, I have seen it.

MR. D. HANCOCK: They do now, that is right, we received a couple of calls last year in one of the areas of Stephenville. Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with it. I think there are about two areas in this Province that can probably be designated, that the minister can say can be used for public swimming or boating. Gander Lake would have to be one and there is - somebody told me yesterday where the other one was that definitely could be used. I do not think the people of St. John's will stand for people swimming or boating or fishing or landing aircraft in Windsor Lake, Mr. Speaker. I can tell you right now - a few years ago we heard what happened on the Open Line programmes when people were seen fishing around Windsor Lake. And I will tell you, you go out around the smaller communities - I visited some of them over the last few days and I have said to people, 'How would you feel if someone was allowed to go swimming or hunting or boating in your water supply system'. 'What? Why who is going to do that to us', they said, 'there is nobody foolish enough to do that'. Well, this is power that will be vested in the minister by this bill. I do not think it is right. I do not think the minister should have the power to do this. I think the people in the area should have the power. The minister can have a cabin up on Gander Lake and he go up now and say, 'I want to go swimming in my lake. It is my lake'. And the minister can go ahead and designate Gander Lake as an area where swimming, boating, hunting and fishing can take place. I do not think it is right. I think there is too much power vested in the minister.

MR. D. HANCOCK: With these few comments, Mr. Speaker, I would like to wind up. But once again I would like to say that we have to go ahead with Cat Arm because of the jobs, Mr. Speaker. And that is the only reason I am supporting Cat Arm. If it were not for the jobs, the Newfoundlanders needing the jobs, I would delay it, or if I could do anything to delay it I would delay it until Lower Churchill, Gull Island or Muskrat Falls are developed. And if this government had taken the initiative some years ago, Mr. Speaker, this project would need not take place and, therefore, we would not need to tamper with the environment in the area. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we are seeing members opposite straining, doing their utmost to try and develop an issue here, an issue which does not exist. I sometimes think members opposite forget the legislation that is before the House. They are delaying a bill to set up a new Department of the Environment, a department which is needed, which is needed, Mr. Speaker, in this Province, which, when members opposite formed the government in this Province, you never heard the word 'environment' mentioned. 'Environment' was a dirty word, it was not a four letter word but it was a dirty word nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, as far as the crowd opposite were concerned. And all of sudden they are holier than thou, they are holier than thou, Mr. Speaker, if they think there is any way they might be able to delay this government from getting on with what is an excellent project, a project, Mr. Speaker, which is going to save the electrical consumer in this Province millions of dollars every year. Now there is a rate hearing, Mr. Speaker, presently going on before our Public Utilities Board here in this city. I was interested to see today that in addition to Newfoundland Light and Power, which usually intervenes, and in addition to the Federation of Municipalities, which government funds to permit it to intervene on behalf of the consumer, we are going to have the Liberal

MR. BARRY:

Party of Newfoundland intervening at the rate hearing. Now I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the Liberal Party's position, as set out before the consumers of this Province at that rate hearing, is the same as they are setting out here today except for the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) who, because of the jobs, not because of the electrical consumer, because he has the same short term mentality that Liberal Parties have had in this Province, the Liberal governments when they were in have had, the same mentality, build it because it has jobs. Well, in this case he happens to be right for the wrong reason because in addition to jobs, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Baird) Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - in addition to 700 jobs at peak or some 15,000 person months of employment that this great hydro electric project -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - will provide -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - in addition to the jobs, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would ask the member for LaPoile

(Mr. Neary) to restrain himself.

MR. NEARY: All kinds of fish plants.

SOME HON MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, Barry's theorem applying again, that as you start to get to the bone, as you start to get them where it hurts over there, they try and drown you out. That is the Liberal Party's notion of democracy, shout



MR. BARRY: down anybody who opposes you, Mr. Speaker, try and shout them down, that is the great parliamentary democracy we see shown on the other side of the House. Well, Mr. Speaker, we on this side will not be shouted down.

Now, the member opposite was right when he said that this project should go ahead. He was wrong when he said it should only go ahead because of the jobs. This is not just a make work project, Mr. Speaker, this is a project which is going to displace 1.1 million barrels of oil annually. And, Mr. Speaker, if what they were saying was true -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. BARRY: - that it is not needed in this Province, Mr. Speaker, we are part of a greater nation, we are part of the nation Canada. We have a federal government which is trying to save oil, to save the expensive foreign imported oil wherever they can. And here we can help them save 1.1 million barrels of oil a year and members opposite are saying we should let that be wasted.

Mr. Speaker, we will displace that 1.1 million barrels a year and by so doing we will save the consumer millions of dollars a year. Now when the Liberal Party intervenes before the Public Utilities Board over the next few days, I hope that they have the courage, the intestinal fortitude, to get up and tell the electrical consumer in this Province that they want them to spend in 1985 something in excess of \$40 million a year more than they would have to spend if Cat Arm were not going ahead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY: Is the Liberal Party and members opposite, are they going to have the courage to do that? Are they going to have the courage to go down to this rate hearing and say to the consumer, now, listen, there are fifty-five moose - is it? - or 555 moose -

AN HON. MEMBER: Fifty-five.

MR. BARRY: - there are fifty-five moose, there are ten salmon -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY: - twenty salmon, Mr. Speaker,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY: - Now we want you to spend -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - in excess of \$40 million a year electrical consumer of Newfoundland, we want you to spend in excess of \$40 million a year in 1984-85 because, Mr. Speaker

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible)

MR. BARRY: - 'we, such as the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), who have never seen this site who have never been there - hands up who on the other side of the House has ever been to Cat Arm, hands up. Not a arm raised, look at this and here they are getting up and they are talking about 'oh, the damage that is going to be done.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. BARRY: Oh, what a bunch of frauds, Mr. Speaker. I am not sure that is parliamentary, I take it back if it is not, Mr. Speaker. What an attempt to run red herrings across this great project, this great Hydro electric project which will save the electrical consumer in this Province millions of dollars and which will show a very responsible position on the part of our government and the people of our Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: -where we are prepared to help the federal government get the imports of foreign oil down.

Mr. Speaker, consider how lucky we are. There

MR. BARRY:

are other provinces, our neighbouring provinces, Nova Scotia going wild trying to get additional electrical energy, having to go for coal, having to go with the great environmental problems created by acid rain as a result.

We have our little Province of PEI over there, less people in the province than here, paying the highest electrical rates and with nowhere to turn, with nowhere to turn to get their electricity except to continue to burn oil. We have, Mr. Speaker, New Brunswick which has had to fall back upon nuclear power. Now, are members opposite saying they would rather see nuclear power for Newfoundland or for Canada? What they are saying is that they would rather see us burn oil at Holyrood, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

The Chair is having great difficulty in hearing. Hansard must be recorded and I am sure that the Hansard employees will have great difficulty in hearing what is going on with so many people talking back and forth the floor.

While I am on my feet, I am sure all members would like to welcome to the Gallery fifty members from the Wind Ensemble Band from Oakland Collegiate in Toronto, along with several members of the teaching staff.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, these young men -

MR. STIRLING: Say something nice now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: These young men and women from Canada, I am sure, from Toronto, I am sure are going to quite interested -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: in this debate and I am sure that they, who are faced with having the nuclear reactors that they have around them in Ontario, if they had our options with respect to hydro electricity, Mr. Speaker, it would not take them very long to chose to develop hydro electricity - clean hydro electric energy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: And, Mr. Speaker, we see members opposite who are desperate to try and reverse their failing fortunes. Mr. Speaker, there are as many policies over there as there are members. And I have, just in the last couple of days, I have seen some of the most glaring instances of people either not understanding, or attempting to confuse the people, attempting to fool the people, which had been a definite approach of their party when they were in power for many years, and the people showed them that you cannot fool all of the people all of the time. You can fool some of the people some of the time,

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

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY: - all of the people some of the time -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: -but you cannot fool all of the people all of the time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: You cannot fool the majority of the people all of the time.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

We have a point of order.

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: It is not unusual for the Mines and Energy Minister (L. Barry) to get up on every excuse, on every bill

MR. STIRLING: and make a mines and energy speech but we are talking about the Environment Bill and the environment bill that he is trying to confuse the people about is the fact that under the Environment Bill, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are too late, too late.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Under the Environment Bill, the first project under the Environment Bill, they do away with the Bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have listened now for most of the man's time and he has not talked about the Environment Bill and the fact that he is going to allow people into the water supplies of the various systems and he has not talked about the fact that this is the first project and they have not used the Environment Bill and the Assessment Act. Now, Mr. Speaker, let us get back to the main -

MR. BARRY: It is not his speech, Mr. Speaker. It is my speech. Do you mind?

MR. STIRLING: Let us get back to the main issue, Mr. Speaker -

MR. BARRY: Do you mind?

MR. STIRLING: - and some relevance.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, while some degree of flexibility is allowed, I think that debate has been far-reaching on both sides. The Chair has exercised some degree of flexibility.

The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, the point that I am making is just as they have on two other instances in the last week attempted to fool the people of this Province, they are attempting to do it again on their interpretation of the Environmental Assessment Act. Sit down and let me finish my speech.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): A point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, if you check Hansard there is no question now that he is imputing motives when he says we are attempting to fool the people.

MR. TULK: That is correct.

MR. STIRLING: Now, Mr. Speaker, he has gone completely out of order, Mr. Speaker. And he has to withdraw that and get back to speaking on the Bill where there is some relevance, Mr. Speaker.

I know he is upset because he is very weak on this, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order -

AN HON. MEMBER: God has spoken.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Would the hon. the Leader of the Opposition restrain himself, please. You got up on your point of order. I would like to rule on it.

To the point of order. Because of the noise-and I have called order several times this past few minutes- the Chair unfortunately did not hear the remarks. I would have to check it out with Hansard so I will reserve judgement.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, just as they have , and I repeat, I am not saying that they are trying to mislead this House. They know that they cannot mislead anybody over here. We see right through them

MR. BARRY: every time. And we will make sure that the people of this Province see right through them. Just as they attempted to distort the whole notion of parliamentary democracy yesterday, when they tried to say that there was some limitation on the conditions that the Premier set for who was in his Cabinet, as if it was not under our parliamentary system of government, the Premier's choice as to who he has in his Cabinet. He does not have to give any reason for who he brings in or who he does not take in or who he asks to leave. He does not need any reasons. And instead members opposite get up and portray these guidelines, these conflict of interest guidelines -

MR. NEARY: What has that got to do with the environment?

MR. BARRY: - which I suppose they are afraid are still going to be in force if they ever get back in power again, and that is why they are trying to fight them. That is why they are trying to fight them.

MR. NEARY: It all started -

MR. BARRY: Instead he is portraying it as if the Premier were giving himself additional power. I would suggest to the Leader of the Opposition, he had better do a little bit of reading on parliamentary democracy if he ever hopes to get the government of this Province, because he is not going to do it the way he is going now. What is he going to do? He is going to have a vote amongst his caucus as to who his ministers are, who his Cabinet is going to be. Is that the way he is going to do it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh yes.

MR. BARRY: Good luck. I say good luck to you, Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: You would be happy.

MR. BARRY: And then we have the Leader of the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - Opposition and the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hancock) on the question of sharing of offshore revenue. They get up and they say, "No, we are not going to vote with the government on this division of revenue -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! To the point of order, the hon. House Leader for the Opposition.

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The member is not being relevant. His remarks are straying from the bill. Mr. Speaker, the point of this bill -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: - the point of this bill deals with the creation of the Department of the Environment. And members on this side of the House have been making points regarding that particular bill and the Assessment Act that comes with it. As well, Mr. Speaker, we have made some points which obviously sting the member over there -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HODDER: - in that the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think that I have heard the point of order.

MR. HODDER: I have not gotten to my point of order yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I suggest that you do, please.

MR. HODDER: Obviously, Mr. Speaker, the hon. members opposite are stinging because since 1972 they have been promising that the Lower Churchill -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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



MR. BARRY: A point of privilege, Mr. Speaker, and I am serious about this now. I am serious about this.

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

MR. BARRY: The members have been going on with their little games but I want, Mr. Speaker, a ruling from yourself on a matter

MR. BARRY:

of privilege to as whether I am entitled to have my time cut back by the spurious points of order which members opposite, not just today but on just about every occasion when I have gotten up and started getting at them over the last week, they started getting up on points of order and I ask the Speaker, and whoever helps you in the House in doing this, to check back over the record of Hansard and see how many points of order have been upheld and how many times they have gotten up on spurious points of order and the amount of time that has been cut into my speaking time as a result and I ask the protection of the Chair so that I can give a speech in this House the same as any other member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

To the point of privilege.

The hon. House Leader.

MR. HODDER:

There is no point of privilege, Mr. Speaker. I rose on a point of order because the minister was not being relevant and I was attempting to explain why I rose on that point of order. There is no such thing as a point of privilege here. It is just an attempt by the member to try and justify his conduct and his straying from the words that he has been saying.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of privilege.

The hon. House Leader.

MR. MARSHALL:

There is a point of privilege and a very real point of privilege that the hon. minister brought up. It is in this book and it is quite clear that points of order themselves can become disruptive, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) the book.

MR. MARSHALL:

If the hon. gentleman wants

MR. MARSHALL: to see the page, it is page 11 and page 38, Mr. Speaker, as well. Now these points of privilege constitute interruptions in the debate and by bringing up these points of order they are infringing on the privileges of the hon. member, and indeed of this House, for the hon. member to be able to speak. All the hon. member is doing, Mr. Speaker, is entering into this debate and giving back into the debate answers which were, in effect, raised by the hon. gentleman there opposite. All day yesterday and all today we have heard nothing. This is the Environmental bill and was about Cat Arm, Mr. Speaker, and it comes under the responsibility of the Hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). What more natural but for him to get up and rebut it? And these points of order, Mr. Speaker, in effect, are a very grave breach of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird):

Order, please! I think

I have heard enough on the points of privilege from both sides. First to the point of order, there was no point of order but a difference of opinion between the hon. members. With regard to the point of privilege, I think that on occasion this House has tolerated, although we should not.

Sometimes there are spurious points of order. I would ask the hon. member to continue his speech but to get back to the bill we are talking about which is Bill No. 4.

MR. BARRY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the point on Bill No. 4 is that members are delaying this bill, members opposite, in setting up a new Department of the Environment because of the way they say the minister has applied the Environmental Assessment Act. And members opposite are interpreting the Environmental Assessment Act as though there must be an independent study - whatever an

MR. BARRY:

independent study means.

It is an awful insult to people who have been trying to do a half decent job for this Province in protecting the environment to say that they are less than independent. Mr. Speaker, they are giving the impression that for every project that in any way impacts on the environment there must be a panel set up, a panel of -I think there are three members required on the panel - there must be public hearings. Maybe there is only one. Maybe you only need one member. There must be public hearings. And, Mr. Speaker, there must be a report brought in. Mr. Speaker, can you imagine the expense, the time involved? The people of this Province would do nothing else except attend public hearings. They would do nothing else except pay taxes to pay for the public hearings if every time government turned around to do something, there had to be a formal enquiry, a formal assessment. Mr. Speaker, the whole point of the Environmental Assessment Act is that there must first be shown that there is something serious. It must first be shown that there is going to be a serious negative impact on the environment. In other words, if there is going to be a serious problem if a project goes ahead. And the whole point of this Cat Arm project is that it has not been shown, there is nobody not even members opposite. they are getting up and calling

MR. BARRY: an inquiry, an assessment,  
and they are not pointing out if there is any problem.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: What is the problem? Would  
members opposite point out what is the problem?

We have the member for Windsor -  
Buchans (Mr. Flight), who is complaining in great detail  
about the Cat Arm project - and I will submit, Mr. Speaker,  
that the amount of caribou in the area of Cat Arm is very,  
very few whereas the number of caribou that would be  
affected by a Southwest Brook road, I suppose there is a  
hundred times as many, maybe a thousand times as many,  
and I have never heard the member for Windsor - Buchans  
raise one question about not doing a Southwest Brook road  
because it might affect movements of caribou. I have not  
heard him say once in this House that a Southwest Brook  
road might interfere with some caribou and therefore  
should not be built. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no question  
that there is a moose population in the area of Cat Arm  
but, Mr. Speaker, everybody, I believe, agrees that moose  
do not have the same sensitivity to civilization or projects  
that caribou do. Moose have no - as anybody who has driven  
out over the Trans-Canada Highway and seen them coming in  
through windshields of cars - they do not have any great  
hesitation about crossing roads, Mr. Speaker. And the main  
point, as far as the moose population in this project is  
concerned, is to maintain adequate control over the roads  
once they are constructed, and the minister has laid down  
conditions for this. So we have, Mr. Speaker, the same  
attempt to mislead and deceive the people of this Province  
on their interpretation of the Environmental Assessment Act  
as on their way of dealing with the offshore minerals question.

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

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order has been raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, the member used the expression 'mislead and deceive', which is unparliamentary and he will have to withdraw that.

MR. BARRY: No, it is not unparliamentary. Mr. Speaker, to the point of order, it is not.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes. In the context to which it was said, I would ask the hon. the minister to withdraw.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, do I get a chance to speak to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, the hon. the minister could speak to the point of order. I did not think he was -

MR. BARRY: I was rising to speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Put forward your argument and I will hear the argument.

MR. BARRY: The point of order, Mr. Speaker, is that it is unparliamentary for us to say that a member opposite is misleading or attempting to intentionally mislead, to deliberately, intentionally mislead this House. But, Mr. Speaker, the whole basis of politics is for us to point out or for them to point out about us if there is an attempt to deceive the people of this Province in a policy. We are not talking about deceiving this House, we are talking about misinterpreting a policy of government to deceive the people of the Province. Now, that cannot be unparliamentary or we may as well pack up and go home.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The way the Chair heard it, I rule that it is unparliamentary and I ask the minister to withdraw.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, of course, I withdraw. If that is your ruling I withdraw it unequivocally, but I will say that debate is going to be severely limited in this

MR. BARRY: House from this point in time,  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. the member for LaPoile  
has a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would submit that  
the minister in withdrawing his statement, challenged,  
really insulted the Chair and I do not think we should allow  
that sort of thing to stand on the public record.

I do not know if Your Honour wants to direct the minister to  
take it back, but it is certainly not in good taste and has  
a tendency to lower the decorum of this House when you make  
snide remarks about the Chair like the hon. gentleman just  
did.

DR. COLLINS: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon.  
the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, all members of this  
House know quite well that it has happened time and time  
again and it certainly happens with regard to members  
opposite, that in withdrawing an unparliamentary remark -  
and I must say, the hon. the minister said he withdrew it  
unequivocally - there is often a little phrase added on  
to that. It probably should not be so, but it is certainly  
not of the magnitude to insult the Chair. It is frequently  
done and I have heard it myself many, many times in the  
House and I am sure Your Honour has heard it many times.  
I think it is quite a frivolous point of order.

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

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, the hon.  
the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: I think it is very important.  
I would suggest to Your Honour that you check Hansard,

MR. STIRLING: because the withdrawal was complete and then the slur, the comment that was made against the Speaker was, 'This will certainly limit debate,' and it was a reflection on the Speaker's ruling, Mr. Speaker. I think it is very serious and I would suggest that you check Hansard, because the minister cannot be allowed to get away with that kind of comment.

MR. BARRY: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker, and to save you time -

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

MR. BARRY: - I withdraw anything attached to the comment. I withdraw anything attached to my comment, Mr. Speaker, anything that members opposite might feel a little perturbed about.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. BARRY: I should just point out that Your Honour was not in the Chair when I was being harassed and interrupted on a continuous basis by spurious points of order which is continuing on after the change of members



MR. L. BARRY: in the Chair, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Okay, well, I think the point of order has now taken care of itself really. The hon. the minister has about six minutes to clue up his remarks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to use every second of those four minutes, every instant that I have to make up for lost time while members opposite - again proving Barry's theroem - were trying to shout me down as I got too close to the weaknesses in their policy. I think that is not unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker, to say that they are weak, weak, weak, weak, weak, weak, weak, weakest weak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. BARRY: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what we have on the other side of the House. If we had one more over there, Mr. Speaker, we would have a week of weakness. There are only six of them, if one more would come in we would have a week of weakness over there. Now, Mr. Speaker, what I was attempting to point out was that members opposite have distorted the Environmental Assessment Act, to attempt to have it read that before government can do anything, it must set up an inquiry, it must have the taxpayer pay for that inquiry, it must have -

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. BARRY: This is shocking! This is shocking!

MR. L. STIRLING: Again if the Speaker will check Hansard he will find that he used the word 'distort' and that he is using a word that is unparliamentary and he is challenging the Speaker's ruling time and time again. I would ask him to withdraw the remark 'distort'.

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

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Very quickly again, I mean, these are unnecessary interruptions by the hon. member. There is nothing - if the hon. member says in debate that somebody has distorted something that obviously is not out of order, it is parliamentary. Now, if the hon. member is going to get up on points of order and be a leader of an Opposition, if the hon. member wants to get up on points, let him quote authorities. I mean, he just cannot invent points of order out of the air and he is doing it, Mr. Speaker, and where he is doing it, he is interrupting and infringing on the privileges of the hon. member to participate in the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: There is obviously no point of order. I would ask the hon. minister to conclude his remarks. He has about three minutes left.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we see what happens, the House - who is the chap who is supposed to handle the rules for the leader over there? What do they call him? The, the -

MR. MARSHALL: I do not know what they would call him.

MR. L. BARRY: I do not know what they call him. The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), he leaves the House and they fall into a state of disarray, Mr. Speaker, immediately.

MR. L. BARRY: Now, the point is that they are distorting and misinterpreting the Environmental Assessment Act. They are doing it for partisan political reasons, they are attempting to minimize the benefits to the electrical consumer of Cat Arm -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Ah, cannot take it.

MR. L. BARRY: I have never seen such a shocking display of interruptions since I have been in this House.

MR. S. NEARY: It is not a matter of taking it, Mr. Speaker. A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I believe the hon. member for LaPoile has a point of order.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I believe if Your Honour refers to Beauchesne and a list of all the words that are unparliamentary, you will discover that 'deliberately distorting' is an unparliamentary phrase, Mr. Speaker, definitely unparliamentary.

MR. L. THOMS: Page 106.

MR. S. NEARY: Page 106.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister is not accusing any individual member of distorting or misleading the House. He is referring to the Act -

MR. S. NEARY: No, the Opposition. He says, 'The Opposition -

MR. SPEAKER: - therefore there is no point of order.

MR. S. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, he said, 'The Opposition is deliberately distorting the facts', and that is unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The Chair is listening, you know, very carefully to this debate. I would ask the hon. minister to continue, he has about one minute left.

MR. NEARY: His time is up now anyway.

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, again I think it is scandalous that members of the Opposition - the tactic they have to fall back upon is to interrupt and to try and drown out and shout out members opposite when they get up to try and point out the fallacies in their weak, weak, weak, weak, weakest and weak arguments on the other side of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the same way in which they have misinterpreted the Environmental Assessment Act they have attempted to misinterpret this government's position on offshore revenue sharing. And we have the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) and the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) getting up and saying they were not going to accept the government's figures because we were accepting less than the Prime Minister offered, and at the same time they were saying that we had the member for the Great Northern Peninsula, St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett)

MR. BARRY: getting up and saying we are being too greedy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): Order, please!

MR. BARRY: And the Leader of the Opposition, the day before, was saying we were too greedy. Mr. Speaker, they are a party of inconsistencies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. BARRY: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

I hope to bring some sanity back into the debate on this particular bill creating the Department of the Environment.

Mr. Speaker, you know, sometimes it is not as frustrating being in Opposition as it usually is. Sometimes the concerns of the Opposition that are expressed in this House and in committees get sympathy from the government and from the ministers. I believe that the question I asked a couple of days ago in connection with the mortgage situation in this Province is going to bring about some very needed reform -

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear.

MR. THOMS: - to Section 5 of the conveyancing Act in this Province. I believe that because of certain questions that I directed to the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) at yesterday's Estimate Committee hearings, that the French programme in the expanded programme for our high schools is going to be given a higher priority than this government had made it in their expansion programmes. So sometimes there is encouragement in being on this side of the House, and it shows that our form of government, where we do have an Opposition,

MR. THOMS: and although it may not always be that we should oppose—but I think we are here to be an Opposition, not to simply stand up and to agree to every piece of legislation or agree to everything that is brought into this House.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned - one of the blessings, Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Of Confederation.

MR. THOMS: - it is not of Confederation, but one of the blessings that we have in this Province is the environment. It is the environment, It is not something that should be taken lightly. And a clean, pure, healthy environment is something that every member of this House and every citizen of this Province should concern themselves about. Nothing bothers me more, Mr. Speaker, than to travel throughout this Province and see beer bottles, pop bottles, cans littered all over our highways, the Trans-Canada Highway, in our fields and meadows and even in our gravel pits throughout this Province. I think the only thing that bothers me more is to be driving behind a Newfoundlander in a car who indiscriminately just tosses a cigarette out the window. And this is the sort of thing that we should be putting a great deal of effort into trying to prevent - you are not going to eliminate it, you are not going to cut it out. You are always going to have those people in this Province or any Province of Canada or anywhere in the world, I guess. And you know, we never miss the water until the well runs dry. Newfoundlanders have never missed the fishing in this Province until they go to places like Rodney Pond where, when I was a teenager growing up in Gambo, you could go - or North Pond or any of the ponds around there - and you could get a good catch of fish, an excellent catch of fish. Now go to Rodney Pond, go to Rodney Pond this weekend, there will be literally hundreds of fishermen on that pond and no fish and no control. You will have beer

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1611

SD - 3

MR. THOMS: bottles, you will have cans, you will have anything, you know -

DR. COLLINS: They are only following the hon. member's example.

MR. THOMS: No, they are not following the member's example. You see, Mr. Speaker, this is what puts

MR. THOMS: the devil in somebody who gets up here and tries to express a concern and what do I get, Mr. Speaker, from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)?- an accusation that they are only following my example. Now, if the Minister of Finance has any evidence whatsoever that I have abused the environment of this Province, then let him produce it. Let him produce it. I have evidence that he does not know any simple mathematics. We have that in this House. And if he has any evidence let the minister produce it.

I am concerned. You are obviously not concerned or you would not sit there and listen to another hon. member of this House express a concern and make a wisecrack like you just made. Well, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned. I have expressed my concern to the member for Burin-Placentia West (D. Hollett) as I have explained the same concern to the Minister of the Environment (H. Andrews) about a garbage dump that is on the Burin Peninsula Highway. I will be driving to the district of Grand Bank tomorrow. I have to speed up going past that dump if the wind is blowing because if not, I am going to find my car covered with paper and garbage from that garbage dump. I would like to know who gave permission, I would like to know who gave permission for this particular dump to be on the side, right on the side of the road leading to the Burin Peninsula.

MR. CARTER: It must have been a Liberal.

MR. THOMS: If it were a Liberal, then I think he should be castigated. If it were a Tory he should be castigated. I mean, the member for St. John's North (J. Carter) cannot sit there and look at me. I was not in any previous administration. I have never been a minister of the environment so I could not have given permission for somebody to put that dump right on the side of the road. It is an eyesore, it is a disgrace and I do not care if it is in my own member's district or if it is in my own district or the Minister of the Environment's



MR. THOMS: it should not be there and they should be made to remove that garbage dump, take the eyesore out of it. If I were a tourist, I would not go down to Fortune and take the boat to St. Pierre and have to drive past that particular garbage dump.

Mr. Speaker, we have a Minister of the Environment. Thank goodness it is not the member for St. John's North (J. Carter). Thank goodness! We have a Minister of the environment. I will take my concerns into this House and I will take them to the Minister of the Environment (H. Andrews) and I will ignore the member for St. John's North. You spend your time now defending your ministers when they come before the Estimate Committee -

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: You interject and interrupt and take care of the Minister of Education (L. Verge) who is under fire these days.

Mr. Speaker, I am trying to express a concern which is obviously being taken lightly by the member for St. John's North and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)!. If people of this calibre, if members of this House take it lightly that our Province is being desecrated, and by the people of this Province -

DR. COLLINS: By Liberals.

MR. THOMS: Yes, and Tories and NDPers. And if we have any communists out there, they are probably doing it as well.

MR. NEARY: Is he a physician or a doctor, which?

MR. THOMS: Well, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: It is too bad he did not get a bit of that stuff that is on that dump, right between the eyes.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I expressed before the minister in Committee the hope that this government would see its way clear to create - not to create, but to appoint a full-time Minister of Recreation and Youth in this Province. I believe that the Department of the Environment should have its own minister. I am not looking for a proliferation of Cabinet Ministers. But it is that important to me and above all, Mr. Speaker, the environment of this Province is that important to my children and to my children's children.

MR. NEARY: And appoint an outport man.

MR. THOMS: - and for generations to come.

MR. NEARY: Appoint an outport man, and not a city slicker.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, you know the destruction of the environment, as my friend from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has said, the destruction of the environment is not just by the individual citizens of this Province, it applies in a real way, in a real way, to the corporate citizens of this Province. In connection with some - I believe it was on Blackmarsh Road here in St. John's, which is an unkempt, unclean, dirty piece of property with old car wrecks, etc., on it, and they determined who the owner was, they determined who the owner of this particular piece of property that needed cleaning up - who the owner was, and lo and behold, who was it? None other than a Crown corporation. It was none other than the Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation who owned the property.

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible) criticizing the (inaudible).

MR. THOMS: There goes the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) again, Mr. Speaker. There goes the Minister of Finance again mumbling under his breath.

MR. NEARY: MCP must not be too good these days.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell him to take a drive along the Southside.

MR. THOMS: The quack Minister of Finance. But, Mr. Speaker, you know, it has always bothered me, and I have seen it here in the City of St. John's. I have seen properties developed, large tracts of land in the City of St. John's. I do not blame the contractors if they can get away with it. They will take their bulldozers in - You have all seen it - they will take their bulldozers in and they will just clean out everything, without regard to the landscape or the environment or anything else, to build their houses, or to build their apartments, or to build their office buildings, and we let them do it. And we let them do it.

Mr. Speaker, I am concerned, and I guess one of the reasons why maybe my position as far as the offshore oil and gas is concerned. One of the nice things about the present Leader of this Party (Mr. Stirling) is his understanding and his sympathy and his ability to listen to a person when you have a point of view that may not be exactly like the point of view of some members of the caucus. But I have a little difference of opinion and the reason for it is one of my concerns about the environment.

Mr. Trudeau in February of 1979 -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: If the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) would only listen. If he only had the ability.

MR. STIRLING: 'Frank Moores' warned him about that many times.

MR. THOMS: Well, Mr. Trudeau at that time not only said that Newfoundland would obtain 100 per cent of the revenues, now that has been further -

AN HON. MEMBER: 43 per cent.

MR. THOMS: Well, what you are talking about is 100 per cent of 40 per cent. That part of it has been re-defined or further explained recently. Whether or not it was done properly or not is something that you could argue about. But at the university during the 1979 election,

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Trudeau not only said that you would have 100 per cent of the revenues, but he also said this, which I think is the key and which is the reason why I would caution the Premier of this Province, and the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), I would caution them, because at that time the Prime Minister of Canada not only said that you could have 100 per cent of the revenues, but he also said that Newfoundland would have the principal control. Now, recently when the Prime Minister was here and I listened to the Prime Minister -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) 43 per cent?

MR. THOMS:

I am talking about the environment, I am talking about the effect of offshore oil and gas and I am trying to explain why, I am trying to explain why this administration, why the Premier of this Province and why the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) should be very cautious before getting into bed with the federal government on the offshore oil and gas.

MR. BARRY:

I agree.

MR. THOMS:

Okay? Because as I am saying -

MR. MARSHALL:

He would never get into bed with them anyway.

MR. BARRY:

I would never get in bed with them anyway.

MR. THOMS:

That may or may not be. It may never be developed in that case, I do not know.

But, Mr. Speaker, in February of 1979 the Prime Minister said that we would have 100 per cent of the revenues -

MR. BARRY:

(Inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK:

Well, what do you want? The oil companies are not going to get anything. Do not be so stupid, boy. You are just as stupid as your bake.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT):

Order, please! Order, please!

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1614

NM - 2

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Nothing for the oil companies,  
nothing for the Government of Canada.

MR. HANCOCK: The oil companies are going to  
develop it but they are not going to take anything back. Do  
not be so naive, boy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK: You are as stunned as your bake.

MR. NEARY: Under this formula, by the way,  
the Province gets more.

MR. HANCOCK: Right.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: The hon. member for Grand Bank.  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.  
I have been trying now for five  
or ten minutes to get the particular point across.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) 46 per cent and going down.

MR. NEARY: But in your regulations it is  
less than this - it is -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: -40 per cent in the regulations.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for Grand Bank  
has the floor. He is having great difficulty trying to get the  
attention of the House.

MR. NEARY: Heave it out of you, 'Les'.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.  
But as I was saying,  
my advice to the Premier of this Province and to the Minister  
of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), and to this government -

MR. CARTER: Boring. Boring (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I told you not to be nice to them.

MR. HANCOCK: Would you not like to take a crack at him, boy?  
For the love of God, come over until I gets a dart at you -

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. HANCOCK:

- and knocks some sense into that big head of yours.

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Speaker, I am determined to get the attention of this House before I -

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. THOMS:

I am determined.

MR. BARRETT:

You will never make it. You will never make it.

MR. THOMS:

And if the member for St. John's West (Mr. Barrett), and the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) are not prepared, Mr. Speaker, then I should name them if they are not prepared to listen to what I have to say.

Mr. Speaker, in February of 1979 the Prime Minister of this Country made what I consider to be a commitment, because I believe that promises made during an election should be kept. I believe they should be kept. But he made a commitment to some 2,500 students at Memorial University that Newfoundland would receive 100 per cent of the benefits of the offshore oil and gas. Now, he further elaborated on that statement in a recent visit to St. John's. But the difference between his statement in February of 1979 and his speech in his television interview recently is this, that in February he made the statement that Newfoundland would have the principal control over the offshore oil and gas, the principal control over offshore oil and gas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in this most recent pronouncement by the Prime Minister of Canada,

MR. THOMS: he has left out any reference that I can see to control. And I am concerned for the environment of this Province. You see, Mr. Speaker, a resolution that was before this House on Wednesday carried a 'whereas clause' in it which said that 'WHEREAS Newfoundland has the expertise'. To me it is irrelevant whether Newfoundland has the expertise, it is irrelevant whether or not, if the federal government says, 'Newfoundland you own the offshore oil and gas, you own it, it is yours', it is irrelevant that we would then have to turn around and develop that resource with Ottawa's assistance. But the point is that it would be coming from us. And when you think that the district of Grand Bank is entirely, 100 per cent, dependent on the fisheries, the environment of this Province, the environment as far as the offshore oil and gas is concerned, is important to them. I have a problem. Because I have spoken with people who have visited -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. THOMS: - I am sorry what did the minister - I have spoken with people who have seen the North Sea operation. One of the complaints, one of the things that bothered my friend from Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) was the fact that that development was controlled from London, was controlled by the central government, people who are remote. People in Ottawa are remote from the environment of this particular Province. They may not care about the environment of Newfoundland the way that I care about the environment of this Province. They may not care about the environment of this Province, as I hope members on the other side care about the environment of this Province. To Ottawa the rate of development may be everything. They may be prepared to sacrifice the environment of this Province for the sake of development. That is why I believe that this Province must have the principal control over the development of the offshore oil and gas. How you define principal, how we are prepared to define principal,



MR. THOMS: how the federal government is prepared to define principal but I have yet to see a definition.

MR. NEARY: What does joint development mean?

MR. THOMS: Joint development, is it going to be a 50/50 deal or is it going to be 51/49 - in whose favour?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: That is part of what they have to get together on. That is where negotiations come in. Our position is we have to have control, as we said on the (inaudible) 51 per cent.

MR. THOMS: We have to have control and this is what I am saying, we have to have control. Whether we are capable, as far as I am concerned, of developing the offshore oil and gas to this argument is irrelevant, completely irrelevant. I mean, we deserve the ownership of the offshore oil and gas,



May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1616

AH-2

MR. THOMS: But what is joint management?  
What is joint management? Now, before though it was principal control. Now we are reduced to joint management, whatever that might mean.

MR. BARRY: He has never said principal control.

MR. THOMS: Yes. I am sorry, I have a transcript.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) university  
formula, we have it.

MR. HANCOCK: The Minister of Finance  
(Dr. Collins) just said he said it.

MR. THOMS: Oh, there is no question but  
that he said it.

MR. HANCOCK: Great federal/provincial  
relationship he has, is it not?

SOME HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, what I am trying  
to say here -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon.  
member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: The Minister of Mines and  
Energy (Mr. Barry) should be able to appreciate this. I only  
have just two or three minutes.

MR. THOMS: What I am trying to say is this, that the offshore oil and gas will have an effect on the environment of this Province. I am concerned about the effect that the offshore oil and gas is going to have on the environment of this Province. I hope members on the opposite side care about what happens to the environment of this Province. And this is why it is just not enough for the Prime Minister of Canada to say that Newfoundland owns its offshore oil and gas as if it were on land. We not only have to own it, we have not only got to get 100 per cent of the benefits, but we also have to have the control that comes with ownership. And that is the commitment that I want to see out of Ottawa. I do not want any wishy-washy statements anymore. I do not want to see them. I want to see the government of this country and the Prime Minister of this country give us - and maybe they do not have to give it to us.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. THOMS: What is wrong? The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) will not be able to go around now saying how much I am against Newfoundland having the ownership of offshore oil and gas. That bothers him, does it? Mr. Speaker, the bigotry, the absolute bigotry, that comes out of that man's mouth is enough to make anybody throw up in the House - any assembly.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

That remark is unparliamentary and I would ask the member to withdraw it.

MR. THOMS: I withdraw it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: What did you say to him?

MR. THOMS: I called him a bigot. He could make me puke all over the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has about two minutes to wind up his remarks.

May 15, 1981

Tape 1617

EC - 2

MR. NEARY: To call anybody a bigot is not  
unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker. That is not listed.

MR. HANCOCK: You call him an idiot and you  
will probably get a standing ovation.

MR. THOMS:

I am trying to take a responsible attitude towards Newfoundland, towards the environment, towards the development of the offshore oil and gas. But members on the other side, such as the member for St. John's North (J.Carter), make it awfully, awfully difficult. He makes it difficult.

Mr. Speaker, there are other things in this particular act that need to be discussed. I am a bit concerned about the minister being able to define and prescribe any areas surrounding any source of public water supply. It is much more difficult, Mr. Speaker, much more difficult to unpollute or depollute, or whatever the terminology is for it, a water supply once it has become polluted and I think the Minister should go with, any minister, a great deal of caution as far as this particular -

MR. THOMS: rather than see it there. To be quite honest with you, I would rather not see it there. You have some areas in the Province now, some water supplies where boating is allowed, where fishing is allowed, where swimming is allowed.

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Order, please!  
I must remind the hon. member that his time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave, by leave!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, if I may just sum up. I was hoping that the members on the other side of the House cared as much about the environment, but it is obvious that the members for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) and St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) are not as concerned as I am about the environment of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
The hon. Minister of the Environment. If the minister speaks now he closes the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, being new to this - relatively new to this House of Assembly, I do not know what words to use sometimes. But I believe the expression 'political hypocrisy' might be appropriate here. We just heard -

MR. NEARY: To describe what?

MR. ANDREWS: The attitude of the loyal Opposition on all these matters. There certainly is confusion -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman starts off unparliamentary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ANDREWS: That is not unparliamentary. 'Political hypocrisy' is not unparliamentary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
The hon. the minister is not referring to a member of this House as being a hypocrite.

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1619

DW - 2

MR. S. NEARY:

The Opposition are members.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

It is the policy he is talking

about not the member.

MR. FLIGHT:

No, it is the members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

That is how I interpret the rules. The hon. the minister please continue. He has about twenty minutes.

MR. H. ANDREWS:

There were so many points brought up here in this last couple of days in debating this proposed bill, that I do not really know what the Liberal Opposition



MR. ANDREWS: stands for, such things as saying that the ministers of the Crown on this side have no feeling for the outports of Newfoundland, the member for LaPoile (S. Neary). I believe that there are just as many people on this side of the House who feels for outport Newfoundland and know probably more about it than the member for LaPoile.

I would like to ask the member for LaPoile what outports he lived in all his life and how long he lived in these outports and how he got that outport feeling that he talked about?

MR. NEARY: Born and raised in an outport.

MR. ANDREWS: Which one?

MR. DINN: Bell Island,

MR. ANDREWS: Bell Island is not - I -

MR. NEARY: Bell Island is the biggest outport of all.

MR. ANDREWS: But by the standards of the district that I represent, it is certainly not a far-flung outport, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: It could not be anymore outportish -

MR. ANDREWS: I happened to be born in the large metropolitan area of Twillingate.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS: Ottawa - the last speaker, the hon. member for Grand Bank (L. Thoms), made a most interesting speech, I think the most sensible one on the other side of the House on this bill. But he seems to be also a little bit confused. When he talks about the need for control of our environment as close to home as possible. I too was in Scotland and the Shetland Islands, and I saw the need there and what happened in Northern Scotland as opposed to the Shetlands. We need to control this environment, Mr. Speaker, we certainly do. The only way we can do it is

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1620

EL - 2

MR. ANDREWS: by owning and controlling the off-shore gas and oil resources off our coast.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: And it is most interesting to me that only two days ago in this House all the members on the Opposition voted for 'Be it therefore resolved that this hon. House urge the Federal Government to reconsider its position on off-shore minerals and recognize the Province's legitimate right to ownership and control.' Two days ago you voted against it. I am talking about political hypocrisy.

MR. HANCOCK: Carry on. Read on, read on.

MR. ANDREWS: You are full of it over there.

MR. DINN: Keep going, you are doing well.  
Keep going.

MR. ANDREWS: The Cat Arm project - this bill -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: This bill is debating the introduction of the creation of a government department, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order has been raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: I would like some direction from the Speaker. Do I understand that the Speaker has now ruled that to accuse the Opposition of political hypocrisy, as long as he does not refer to individual members, is acceptable from the Speaker's point of view?

MR. SPEAKER: To say that - the Chair has ruled that to call a policy hypocritical or what have you, or hypocrisy, is not unparliamentary; however, if the hon. the minister referred to a member as being a hypocrite, then that would be unparliamentary. But as I interpret it, the hon. the minister is referring to hypocrisy as it relates to the policy, therefore it is not unparliamentary.

Now, I would ask the hon. the minister to continue.

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

MR. SPEAKER: On a point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: I would ask the Speaker to check Hansard and you will see that what he specifically said was, 'the Opposition', referring to us collectively as a group of individuals, 'were guilty of political hypocrisy'.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has listened to the debate very closely and I can assure you that the hon. the

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): minister, the way I interpret it, was referring to the policy; therefore, it is not unparliamentary, and I would ask the hon. the minister to continue. He has about fourteen minutes left.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) had the most to say on this bill and I would like to refer to some of his comments yesterday.

The member expressed the opinion that the Cat Arm hydro project has been exempted from the Environmental Assessment Act. I would like to point out to the member that this project has not been exempted. This project has followed to this point in time the full letter of the act,

MR. ANDREWS: the full letter and intent of the act.

MR. DINN: Hear, hear.

MR. ANDREWS: No other project, Mr. Speaker, in Newfoundland, except for the Kitts-Michelin one in Labrador, has followed the full letter of the act. Of the two major proposed projects in Newfoundland and Labrador since this act came into law, the two major projects, the one near Makkovik, the uranium mine and this one, both of them have followed the letter of the law.

MR. DINN: Hear, hear.

MR. ANDREWS: And if you do not think that the proof is in the eating, one of these major projects was denied because of environmental reasons.

MR. DINN: Hear, hear.

MR. ANDREWS: In this case we do not see the effect on the environment as being that serious. Now, there is going to be some effect on the environment, there is no doubt about it. You cannot make an omelette without breaking a few eggs, Mr. Speaker, there is no possible way to do it. I do not know how you are going to have any hydro in Newfoundland or Labrador without flooding some territory or without building a transmission line, without building a dam or without building, possibly, an access road. This will happen but it will be controlled like it was never controlled in Newfoundland or Labrador before.

MR. DINN: Hear, hear.

MR. ANDREWS: It is quite interesting to listen to the hon. member talk about the necessity of doing things in Labrador. We would not need this you say, we would not need the Cat Arm if we went with the Lower Churchill, if we went with Muskrat but it was never once mentioned in this debate in the last two days in this House, the environmental potential impact, the danger of doing things in Labrador, much greater than this.

MR. ANDREWS: The same hon. member proposes a road to Southwest Brook from Buchans, proposes another road to Howley crossing some of the most dense caribou migratory routes in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. FLIGHT: You do not know what you are talking about.

MR. ANDREWS: Would you like to have an environmental impact study done on that, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: Yes, yes.

MR. ANDREWS: Political hypocrisy, I will say again, political hypocrisy -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: - in the politics being expressed by the other side of the House. Which political party flooded 26,000 square miles of Labrador?

MR. DINN: Without anything.

MR. ANDREWS: Which political party did that?

MR. FLIGHT: Talk about Bay d'Espoir.

MR. ANDREWS: There was an impact study done on the Upper Salmon.

MR. DINN: Hear, hear.

MR. ANDREWS: Who flooded the original Bay d'Espoir project - 270,000 square miles?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Perhaps the hon. minister could direct his remarks to the Chair and that might eliminate some of the comments that are coming back and forth rather than directing the remarks to a particular member.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman.

MR. ANDREWS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1622

SD - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS:

With reference to the reports that make up the environmental assessment statement presented to the Department of the Environment by Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro -

MR. FLIGHT:

That is the key - by Newfoundland Hydro.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: -these reports are written for Hydro for their environmental assessment statement, generally speaking, by independent groups in conjunction - and these consultants are picked with consultation with the Department of the Environment.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is supposing that the people who wrote these reports are biased -

MR. FLIGHT: Of course they are.

MR. ANDREWS: - and are scientifically biased in their results.

MR. FLIGHT: Of course they are.

MR. ANDREWS: I would like to say, Mr. Speaker, that the people who write these scientific reports are very qualified scientists who live in Newfoundland and the rest of Canada. If they lie, they lay their professional credence on the line.

MR. FLIGHT: They lied. They lied about this.

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

MR. ANDREWS: If they lie they do not work -

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

MR. FLIGHT: They lied. They lied through their teeth.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: If they lied it will have to be proved to me, Mr. Speaker, by the hon. member that they have lied.

MR. FLIGHT: They lied They lied (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Perhaps the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), who I believe had an opportunity to already speak in this debate, would like to hear some of the responses to the questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!



MR. SPEAKER (Simms): If the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) does not want to hear it then I assure you the Chair wants to hear, but I cannot do it when there is a lot of shouting back and forth. Please, I would ask the hon. members to restrain themselves.

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The greatest rapists of the environment in Newfoundland and Labrador talking about protecting the environment. 26,000 square miles of Labrador flooded. No reference to what could happen on the Lower Churchill or Muskrat Falls, no reference at all.

MR. FLIGHT: You are the minister.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, could I be heard please?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. ANDREWS: It is quite obvious to me that nobody on the other side of the House understands or probably has even read the act. I would say that the member for Windsor-Buchans has read the act. But he certainly does not understand it.

We have followed this act to the letter of the law on the Cat Arm project, Mr. Speaker, to the letter of the law, down to the bottom line where it says, "The minister may." "The minister may," and the minister did not, and the minister did not because the minister - it says why. 'If there is enough public concern expressed by people in this Province over the Cat Arm project the minister may' - the minister may. But the minister did not because there had not been, up to this point in time, any representation from any person or any groups of people concerning or worrying about the environmental impact of Cat Arm.

May 15, 1981

Tape No. 1623

NM - 3

MR. FLIGHT:

to?

Are you going to? Are you going

MR. ANDREWS:

Up to this point in time,  
Mr. Speaker, we have no representation at all to this  
department.

MR. ANDREWS: This project will go ahead at this point in time without the board being appointed but with stipulations to Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, stipulations, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to point out to this hon. House. We will appoint, this government will appoint a full-time environmental monitor to be employed by this department, and having the powers of all similar resource protection officers of the Crown, for the purpose of maintaining regular surveillance of all project-related activities on and adjacent to the project site. We have instructed the Department of Municipal Affairs to exercise direct control over development within and adjacent to the communities of Jackson's Arm and others which may be affected by the construction on the project.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: And we have instructed Newfoundland Hydro to set up continued and regular meetings with local residents in the area on a regular basis or when demanded by the residents. Other stipulations; Hydro shall adhere to all commitments made by its environmental impact statement for the Cat Arm development including the amendment, particularly those relating to the protection of the wildlife resource. Hydro is to notify all or any holders of mineral claims in the area. Hydro is to ensure that any claim posts encountered during the construction of the line are not removed. Hydro shall encourage all natural vegetation of all temporary access roads and temporary camp sites within the project area, following their use, to be distributed to be respread with top soil if such was the original or reseeding. Hydro shall prohibit public use of any or all access roads constructed by Hydro until such time as it further receives instructions from the government regarding this

MR. ANDREWS:

matter.

These are some of the stipulations. I could go on and read for hours, Mr. Speaker, about the tight control that we have put on this project -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS:

-down to where they can dump their garbage, where they can dump their empty oil cans, how they are going to be able to use their all-terrain vehicles to construct the power line. Mr. Speaker, this project will be more tightly controlled than any major construction project that has ever taken place in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS:

Mr. Speaker, with reference to the dense caribou population and herds on the Great Northern Peninsula, the latest wildlife studies that I have, Mr. Speaker, indicate that caribou will not be affected at all by this project.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to

MR. ANDREWS: this bill, there are a couple of points I would like to get across here. One of the amendments to this act is to increase the maximum fine to a corporate body, which is now \$500, to an amount of \$10,000, an amount deemed more appropriate as a deterrent to a polluter.

Mr. Speaker, I move second reading of this bill.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

On motion, a bill, "An Act Respecting The Department Of Environment," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 4).

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

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

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, May 19, 1981 at 3:00 P.M.