



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XL

Fourth Session

Number 39

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable P.J. McNicholas

Wednesday

18 May 1988

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

Statements by Ministers

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BARRETT:
Mr. Speaker, the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador has long recognized that investment in science and technology is essential in order to ensure long-term economic prosperity in the Province. In a Province such as Newfoundland, which is highly dependent on resource based industries such as fishing, forestry, and mining it is crucial that we keep abreast of new technology. We must also be able to successfully transfer the new technology to these industries so they can maintain their viability in a highly competitive international marketplace. We cannot afford to become complacent and stand by while others capture the markets we have worked so hard to secure. Simultaneously we must explore the opportunities that these new technologies provide for both new products, processes and services.

It is for these reasons that the government has placed the advancement of science on a high priority list.

The 1981 white paper entitled "Towards a Science Policy" recommended that the Province should strive towards an

expenditure of 0.30% of the gross provincial product on scientific expenditures by 1985/86. When expenditures on both natural and social sciences are taken into account I am pleased to report that we have exceeded this goal. For example, the figures for 1986/87 reveal that the Province spent 0.41% of its gross domestic product in support of this activity.

In 1986/87 the Provincial government spent over \$25 million in both the natural and social sciences and it is estimated that the 1987/88 figure will be almost \$37.0 million representing a 45% increase above the previous year, a very significant revelation indeed.

The numbers I have just quoted were taken from a survey carried out by the Department of Development and Tourism and Statistics Canada to determine Provincial expenditures on scientific activities. A similar survey is carried out in six other provinces. The survey, which has been carried out on a yearly basis since 1985, provides us with information to compile an historic data base on how much money we are committing to scientific activities and where the money is actually being spent. It also provides a means for reasonably accurate comparisons with the other participating provinces.

Not surprisingly, the findings of the survey confirm this government's commitment to the advancement of science and technology. Although expenditures on social sciences are important, it is the expenditures on natural sciences that provide an adequate indication of commitment to science and technology. Major

departments supporting natural science and activities are Mines, Energy, Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, Development and Tourism, Culture, Recreation and Youth, Forestry, and Fisheries.

From a national perspective Newfoundland appears to be above average when compared on the basis of provincial expenditures on science and technology per capita.

The latest figures available from the Statistics Canada survey reveal that in 1986/87 the provincial government of Newfoundland and Labrador spent \$43 per capita which compares favourably with that of British Columbia's \$32 and Manitoba's \$42. Surprisingly, it is even higher than the \$38 the Ontario provincial government spent in the same year, but on the other hand much less than the \$94 spent in Alberta and the \$64 per capita spent in Saskatchewan.

The money that has been spent over the past years in the Province has produced encouraging results. The numerous research and teaching facilities now in place in the Province which are funded and supported by both levels of government have spurred the ingenuity of our private sector and the R & D community. This has led to the development of unique products and services which are becoming internationally renowned. For example, one local company has developed a hand-held spectrocolorimeter, known as colormet, for determining the quality grades in food products, while another company has developed an expendable current profiling system known as hydroball that measures ocean current speed and direction and water temperatures. The latest in

machining vision technology has successfully been incorporated by a Newfoundland company into an automated system capable of sorting fish by species as well as by weight. On the service side, a local group are providing the latest in microprocessor and programmable control technology for industrial customers, while another company is providing a complete, long range, wireless data communications network. These are but a few of the many exciting things which are happening in this Province.

You will also recall that the 1981 White Paper recommended the formation of a provincial science council to coordinate and advise government on matters related to science and science policy. I am pleased to report that we have recently formed the Newfoundland and Labrador Science and Technology Advisory Council.

This council, Mr. Speaker, is holding its first, its inaugural meeting in St. John's today. We are pleased with this milestone achievement and it further highlights government's commitment to the advancement of science in this Province.

The Government of Newfoundland and Labrador considers science and technology a high priority item for future economic prosperity. While there is much to be done, I believe we have a good framework established and with continued commitment we should be able to reap the economic and social benefits associated with investment in this new frontier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I thank the minister for the copy of the statement. It is coincidental, of course, with the inaugural meeting of the Advisory Council, which I think is important. As I have said in response to many of the other statements by the minister, when there are initiatives and programmes by government which we as the official Opposition feel are beneficial, we certainly are in support of government's actions. I think this is exemplified here. There are some good initiatives being taken. There are some good dollars being spent.

But within the whole context of all of that, Mr. Speaker, I find a little bit of a paradox in that there is a dedication to expending money on science and technology and that sort of development, but, at the same time, we continue to see an out-migration of our younger people from the Province. I would think that our younger people compare to any anywhere else in Canada, and I would like to see a more dedicated effort towards these young people in bringing them into the fields of science and technology so that we can draw on the resources of our own people in order to progress a lot further. Beyond that, the basic initiative of the minister's statement is one that we can support and we commend him for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of

Development and Tourism.

MR. BARRETT:

Mr. Speaker, in rising to present another statement, if I might be just given leave for a second just to respond to the hon. member opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

MR. BARRETT:

You are not going to do that? I was going to be complimentary.

Mr. Speaker, the move last week by the French authorities to arrest the Newfoundland fishing vessel **Maritimer**, was, as this hon. House so clearly indicated, a totally unacceptable act. Government moved quickly and decisively to express its abhorrence of this kind of tactic and have communicated extensively with the federal government to initiate broader based actions from a Canadian perspective. In the meantime, government announced its intention to cancel all existing and planned dealings with the French. As a result, I advised a company, Bouygues Offshore Canada, Newfoundland Design Associates and Pennecon Limited to suspend all activity related to the research project dealing with the development of a concrete floating production system for offshore Newfoundland pending further review.

I must now report to the House that this review has been completed and our conclusion is that to uphold that suspension would be harmful to Newfoundland companies and Newfoundland institutions without exerting any measurable influence on the French Government. It will also deprive Newfoundland interests of access

to the leading edge, world class technology. The contract at issue here is with a Canadian joint venture - albeit one of the three partners is wholly owned by a French company. All of the funding provided, Mr. Speaker, from the offshore development fund, all of it, is targeted for Canadian interests with the greatest share of those Canadian interests in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. BARRETT:
It is therefore Government's decision to continue with the original contractual arrangement involving Bouygues Offshore Canada, with Newfoundland Design Associates, and Pennecon Limited - the Nekton Joint Venture Group.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, it is a complete about face of the position taken by the government on May 6.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
And indeed by the House.

MR. WELLS:
Does this now mean that we cannot again insist that the Government of Canada use its trade levers with France in ensuring that the interest of our fishermen is protected?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
No. no.

MR. WELLS:
It most certainly does. Otherwise, we will be branded as hypocrites.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
Right on. Yes, it does.

MR. WELLS:
We all sat in this House last week, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER:
Be careful.

MR. WELLS:
Mr. Speaker, I would like time to be heard. The minister had time and he was listened to.

AN HON. MEMBER:
Name your salary. Do not get sooky.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. WELLS:
We all sat in this House last week, Mr. Speaker, and together passed a resolution expressing our concern and asking the Government of Canada to take steps that would help Newfoundland fishermen. At the same time, thanks to this side of the House, we added to the resolution a portion that would require the government of this Province to take the same kind of action. And the minister stood in the House and announced that that action was being taken. As of now, if members on the opposite side of the House have any principle, they will immediately seek to rescind that resolution that they so hypocritically

beached by this announcement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. TULK:

Right on. You are against Newfoundland fishermen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please!
Order, please!

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, what has obviously happened here is that the government realizes that they moved a little bit hastily on May 6 and, as a result of that, realized that if they were to cancel the contract they would end up with massive damages from the consortium, which would have sued the tail of the government then from here to Tuesday and back again. Clearly, on those grounds it was inadvisable for the government to even make that commitment at the start.

But having said that, Mr. Speaker, it does show that obviously the business interests of the partners there are much more important to this government than are the **Maritimer** or the fishermen of the South coast. It is clear, when it came to a decision on which group to support, that the fishermen be damned, it is about time when we went and supported our partners who are in this consortium, and who obviously are the people who support the PC

Party, and probably the Liberal Party as well, if the truth were known on it.

So, I think we have a true indication of where the best interests of this government lie as a result of this decision, and the cancellation of this decision.

MR. SPEAKER:

Before calling for Oral Questions I would like to welcome to the gallery Ms Jessie Bird, Mayor of Cartwright and President of the Combined Councils of Labrador, and also Mrs. Marion Pardy, President of the Eastshore Development Association and the Manager of Cartwright Fish Plant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome forty-six Level II and Level III students with their three teachers, the Principal, Hubert McGrath, Melvin Critch and Mrs. Barbara King from Fatima High School in St. Bride's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

I would also like to welcome fifty-eight Level I and Level II students with their three teachers, Anne Walsh, Majella Aylward and John Batterton from St. Mark's Central High School in King's Cove, Bonavista Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

Oral Questions

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. WELLS:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the Minister of Finance (Mr. Windsor) was interviewed on television, and amongst other things he said or was reported to have said, and I saw the television programme, was that he saw a whole new window of opportunity opening up as far as Hydro Quebec was concerned and the hydro potential in Labrador.

Would the minister indicate does that mean that Hydro Quebec has indicated they are prepared to renegotiate the Upper Churchill contract, or is he speculating that as a result of the change of government, from PQ to Liberal, they will probably be more receptive to discussions? It is important that the people of Newfoundland have a better handle on what the minister means by 'a whole new window of opportunity.'

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Finance.

MR. WINDSOR:

What I mean, Mr. Speaker, is that this government is doing everything possible to try to overturn the giveaway of Newfoundland's resources of the former Liberal regime. That is what it means.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

The hon. gentleman opposite will remember it well, Mr. Speaker, because I think he was a member of Cabinet when it went through, so he should be ashamed to stand in

this House and talk about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WINDSOR:

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that it pains them terribly to think that this government may be doing anything positive, but I can assure them we are going to do it in spite of their opposition over there.

What we are trying to do, Mr. Speaker, is start negotiations. I indicated quite clearly in television interviews yesterday that I held an initial meeting with the Minister of Energy in Quebec on Monday afternoon of this week, that I would anticipate further meetings over the next number of weeks and that I see some optimism that there is an opportunity now to negotiate a complete package on Labrador development, not just a renegotiation of the disgraceful contract hon. gentlemen signed a number of years ago, but also including further resource developments in Labrador. And we will do it if it is at all possible regardless of objections from opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Aylward).

Some 85,000 hectares of forest in Western Newfoundland will be

sprayed with fenitrothion this year, Mr. Speaker. Fenitrothion being a nerve poison, I would like to ask could the Minister of Forestry tell the House why we are not using Bt in light of the fact that Bt is used in other jurisdictions? Bt is now registered with Agriculture Canada. Bt, Mr. Speaker, in our own experiments in Newfoundland last year provided excellent results, according to the CFS. And, Mr. Speaker, Bt killed the hemlock looper and protected the surrounding foliage.

In view of all of these facts, Mr. Speaker, I ask can the minister tell us now, tell the people of Newfoundland now, why we are not using Bt 100 percent of the way in our spraying programme this year?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I guess for at least the seventh time, maybe the tenth time, I will explain to hon. members opposite the reason for the spray programme in this Province that has continued for the past several years.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, before April 28 of this year, two or three weeks ago, we had a choice of one registered substance in Canada to fight the hemlock looper. Bt has been registered to fight the budworm for quite some years, it had been used in other provinces, but there were no Bt formulas registered that could control the spread of the hemlock looper in any province, Mr. Speaker. This government, along with the Canadian Forest Service,

spent considerable time and money last year and the year before experimenting with Bt formulas to try to develop a formulation that would be effective for the control of the hemlock looper in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, last year, under well-controlled circumstances, on a spray of between 4,000 and 5,000 hectares under scientifically-controlled circumstances, we did find a very good formulation of Bt called Diapel 176 - there is another but I forget the name of it, and we will be using both this year - that was very successful in controlling the hemlock looper under scientific, well-controlled circumstances.

Mr. Speaker, this year we plan to go from some 4,000 to 5,000 hectares, where we found good results, to increase our Bt used to between 24,000 and 28,000 hectares, an increase of some 400 per cent, which is very significant.

Mr. Speaker, this year we would all like to see - the Department of Forestry, the industry, and the people who depend on the forest industry for their livelihood - our successful experimental programme of last year translated into a successful commercial spray programme this year, and that is what we are trying to do by increasing our Bt spray programme to some 25,000 to 27,000 hectares this year.

MR. FUREY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. FUREY:

Mr. Speaker, the minister will know that on Monday the Pesticide Advisory Board, which is a branch of the Department of Environment, met to approve the spray programme.

Will the minister confirm that the Pesticide Advisory Board recommended an increase of up to 50 per cent use of Bt for the total spray programme this year? If, in fact, that is true, that the Pesticide Advisory Board, which is a branch of his own government's Department of Environment, has recommended this, why did the minister ignore that very sensible recommendation?

MR. STIMMS:

It is not a branch of Environment. That is wrong.

MR. FUREY:

Well it is appointed by the Department of Environment. It is the same thing.

MR. SIMMS:

It is not.

MR. FUREY:

It has experts from the entire bureaucracy, from Health and Fisheries, from all across the bureaucracy.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Will the minister tell this House whether the Pesticide Advisory Council --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

I find it impossible to follow the question and answer if hon. ministers on my left are interrupting when a person is posing a question. I think his question was a little bit dragged out, but in the circumstances I think it is understandable.

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. FUREY:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Can the minister confirm whether or not the Pesticide Advisory Board has recommended to him this week that Bt spraying in this Province be increased to up to 50 per cent of the total spray programme?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, it is really ironic how the hon. members opposite are willing to play Russian roulette with the thousands and thousands of jobs that depend on our forest industry. One thing that they do not want to remember is that the studies we did last year on songbird effects stated there were no visible effects on the songbirds, no notable changes in any activities of the songbirds covered in our study.

Mr. Speaker, I am aware that the Pesticide Advisory Board, which is not a branch of the Department of Environment -- it is an advisory board; as the name implies it is an advisory board -- did meet

yesterday. I do not have any of their recommendations on my desk today, Mr. Speaker.

MR. FUREY:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. FUREY:

So what the minister is saying basically to the House and to all of Newfoundland is that he has declared chemical warfare on all living animals in the spray zone --

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Question! Question!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

My question, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: The minister has a choice; he can either spray chemical poison on the forests or he can spray a natural substance called Bt. Now, will he tell this House, Mr. Speaker, that he will do the honorable thing, the safe thing, the effective thing and spray Bt? Because Newfoundlanders and Labradorians are demanding safety first.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, myself, this government, the Department of Forestry and the Canadian Forest Service are doing the honorable thing, by continuing our mandate to protect the forests of this Province so that we will have a place for wildlife, for

recreational activities, for forest activities and for every other activity that we have in the outdoors of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker.

MR. KELLAND:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

In the absence of the Premier, I direct my question to the Minister Responsible for Agriculture, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, and ask him to explain the following: In view of the fact that the projections for the success of the Sprung project was arrived at using a base price of \$1.08, can he tell the House how these same cucumbers can be sold in Nova Scotia for fifty-nine cents each, in view of the fact that it costs about twelve cents a pound to get them there in the first place?

MR. BARRETT:

It is all marketed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. TOBIN:

What is your salary more than the Leader of the Opposition's in Nova Scotia?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. FUREY:

Name him!

MR. SPEAKER:

I mentioned some days ago there were some members on my left who continually interrupt, particularly at Question Time. There are two of them doing it today - three of them, in fact so I will call it to their attention by name if they continue to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, we received what was considered expert advice from members opposite that the facility in Calgary could not be moved to Newfoundland. We received expert advice from members opposite that cucumbers could not be grown in Newfoundland. We received expert advice from members opposite saying cucumbers could not possibly grow as fast as we said they could grow. Now, we are going to receive expert advice as to how to enter the marketplace in Nova Scotia.

Mr. Speaker, the expert advice that members opposite have given, in at least four of those five instances, proved to be totally and absolutely wrong, and inaccurate. As any person who was ever involved in marketing knows, if you are going to get into a marketplace for the very first time you have to do things like offer specials, give discount prices, and we are going to be in that Nova Scotia market. The corollary to that argument the member uses that we cannot possibly make money if we do not get \$1.09 for every single cucumber, is fundamentally,

market-wise, very stupid. What we are saying is that we must average out at a price in excess of \$1.00 or \$1.09. Everybody who happens to purchase or consume a vegetable product in North America knows that prices are not the same consistently throughout the year: Winter prices are always much higher when things are not on the market or not as available on the market. Every person also knows in the case of retailing, there are many retailing principles and philosophies with the supermarket chains and the small retailers, whereby you may go down the street and find that oranges are on for \$1.00 a pound in one place and \$1.50 someplace else. We have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of ever trying to control the marketplace to the degree that we set the price for retailers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

I ask the minister to explain the following, then: In view of the fact that the government has already invested \$22 million of our taxpayers' money -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Not true! Not true!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:

- why is it that the Newfoundland and Labrador taxpayers are now being forced to subsidize cucumbers so that Nova Scotians

can buy them at less than half what we have to pay here in this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Rural, Aricultural and Northern Development.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, I know you cannot say the word 'lie' in the House of Assembly, but I know you can say the word 'stunned', you can say the word 'dense', or 'thickheaded.' We have tabled in this House every single document about Sprung. If somebody can add up the figures to \$22 million, then I wish someday somebody opposite would actually take the figures and show us how you get that \$22 million. I will table those figures again, Mr. Speaker, if somebody over there is too dense to understand some simple figures. As it relates to the Newfoundland price of cucumbers and the Nova Scotia price of cucumbers, Mr. Speaker, to be in that Nova Scotia mainland marketplace. It is at a time of the year when a lot of local cucumbers in that part of the world come on stream. We intend to get into the marketplace. As cucumbers become more available in Newfoundland during the Spring and early Summer, then you will find that the price of cucumbers that come from the Sprung facility in Newfoundland will certainly drop off, as they do in most other places during the Summer and early Fall months.

MR. KELLAND:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Naskaupi.

MR. KELLAND:

In response to the minister's request, I now table the documentation which shows a total investment of \$22,475,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. KELLAND:

In asking my final supplementary, Mr. Speaker, I table a copy of an ad from **The Mail-Star** yesterday showing Sprung cucumbers in Nova Scotia at fifty-nine cents.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. KELLAND:

I present a Sprung cucumber bought in Newfoundland today for \$1.18.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has not asked a final supplementary.

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. LONG:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to follow up on the issue that has already been raised with regard to the application of fenitrothion versus Bt this Summer. I followed quite closely what the minister had to say with reference to the recommendations of the Pesticide Advisory Board.

I would like to ask the Minister of Forest Resources is he telling

the House that the decision that was announced yesterday at four-ten, according to the time on the press statement, was one that was made without any reference to any recommendations that might have come from the Pesticide Advisory Board?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources.

MR. R. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker, the decision that was announced yesterday on the spray programme was a decision made from about a year's planning, looking at last year's spray programme, and what is needed in the Province this year, Mr. Speaker.

MR. LONG:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, seeing that the Minister for Forest Resources did not answer my question, I would like to ask the Minister responsible for the protection of the Environment, who is also the Minister responsible for the Pesticide Advisory Board, could he tell the House if, indeed, the Forestry Department announced its decision on this year's spray programme without having received any recommendations from the Pesticide Advisory Board, for which the Minister of Environment is responsible?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted that

the hon. member for St. John's East has posed that question, because I have been sitting here listening with great interest to the information, or lack thereof, that the hon. member for St. Barbe was posing.

I do not know where the Official Opposition are getting their so-called information, Mr. Speaker. The Pesticides Advisory Board, a board which makes recommendations to me, did meet, but up until the time I left to come over here today I had not seen their recommendations from their meeting.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker, again I would ask the Minister of the Environment a similar question: Is he telling the House that the Minister of Forest Resources announced this year's spray programme without having received any submission from the Department of the Environment, in particular any recommendation that would have been made by the Pesticide Advisory Board? If so, is the minister saying that the Minister of Forest Resources is proceeding to issue licences which do not have the approval that the Minister of Environment and Lands is responsible for?

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. RUSSELL:

Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. House that the Minister of Forest Resources and I are working hand in hand, in close co-operation on any spray programme. The report of the Advisory Committee - it is merely a Committee to advise and make recommendations - the results of their meeting, I have not seen because they are not available as yet. I understand the minutes and the recommendations are being typed up and might be ready for me this afternoon, but I have not yet seen them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Spray the member!

MR. KELLAND:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. KELLAND:
I have a question for the Minister Responsible for Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. Is Newfoundland Enviroponics making a profit or taking a loss in Nova Scotia on the sale of Sprung cucumbers at fifty-nine cents each?

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. POWER:
Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned in my opening answer to the question about the regular Sprung controversy in this Province, everyone in Newfoundland realizes that the Liberal Party of Newfoundland has to hope that the Sprung organization fails - has to hope it! Their political future

is just as much tied to it as they try to tie government's political future to it. We know you are hoping that it is going to fail, but you have to face reality.

I was at the Sprung facility, the Newfoundland Enviroponics facility yesterday evening with six or seven of my senior Agricultural staff. It is absolutely amazing what is happening in the facility. As the Premier offered yesterday, if some of the Doubting Thomases still want to put their fingers in the holes to make sure that the holes are there, we will bring you in and we will show you - maybe the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Wells) and the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Fenwick) should come back in the Sprung facility this week as compared as to what they saw last week. It is absolutely amazing.

There are two tractor trailers up at the door being loaded with Sprung produce, with people going back and forth with little cartloads of boxed cucumbers as fast as they can go. There are 200 people in there packaging it. It is not Disneyland, but I tell you there is tremendous activity in there, as much activity as you will see in any fish plant around Newfoundland during the middle of July or August.

As it relates to the forty-nine cent price or fifty-nine cent price, we will sell cucumbers at a profit in any given fiscal year. If that means that today cucumbers are going to be selling for sixty-nine cents here in St. John's around four or five o'clock - and that is what I understand - maybe the hon. member should have waited and brought his cucumber this evening, and he would have saved himself fifty-nine or sixty

cents. If, in order to access the marketplace in Nova Scotia or the marketplace in Ontario, if, in order to make sure that certain cucumber producers in the other provinces do not have a very profitable year, we will do certain things in the marketplace to make sure that we are in there. We are going to be in there and we are going to stay in there and we are going to make a profit.

MR. BAKER:
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. BAKER:
Back to the spraying, Mr. Speaker. I would say that both ministers are wrong, because neither one of them knows what they are talking about when they are talking about the spray programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. BAKER:
Are we to understand, from the Minister of Environment and Lands, that he has, without a report from the Pesticide Advisory Board, given approval to the spraying of the nerve poison rather than the safe Bt approach, he has given that approval without going to that Pesticide Advisory Board and getting their report? Is that what we are to understand, that this has been environmentally approved and he has given the license without even reference to this Advisory Board?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Environment and Lands.

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, what I said was very true. The board only met yesterday afternoon. I was in caucus most of the morning and I understand -

MR. BAKER:
They have been meeting for years.

MR. RUSSELL:
Mr. Speaker, I suppose the Pesticide Advisory Board met two or three years ago. Yes, I do have that report. I am not as slow as the hon. member.

Mr. Speaker, up until the time that I came over here this afternoon, the minutes and the recommendations of the meeting, which only concluded late yesterday afternoon, had not reached my desk.

MR. BAKER:
Rubber stamped!

MR. RUSSELL:
The member is a rubber stamp.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I have question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Brett). It relates to the well-known Johnson - Metro Board land dispute. The minister will know that ostensibly the Supreme Court last year ordered his predecessor to intervene to find a final resolution to this land dispute. Has this been done? If not, why not? And what does the

minister plan to do to ensure that the Johnson family, and other families living in this general area, are treated fairly and justly?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. BRETT:

The Notice of Purchase was received by the former Minister. It was approved and forwarded to Metro Board. My understanding is that subsequently Metro Board made an offer on the Johnson property which they disagree with. It is now up to the Johnson family to say yes or no, which I understand they have not done.

However, if they say no, then the next step is an independent arbitration board. Until they take this final step of saying yes or no, then, of course, it cannot go to arbitration. But at this point in time, the government, or the minister, whatever, has no role to play in this particular case. We completed our role when the Notice of Purchase was acknowledged, and forwarded to Metro Board.

At this point of time, there is nothing that I or the department can do. Any further action is up to the Johnson family.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:

Does the minister honestly believe that the offer of \$7,300 made by

Metro Board for 6.5 acres of land in the Thorburn Road area is a fair market price? If so, can the minister indicate where that family can purchase a building lot in the Metropolitan area of St. John's for \$7,300? To say nothing of buying the equivalent amount of land, 6.5 acres.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. BRETT:

Mr. Speaker, it is not for me to say whether or not the offer of \$7,300 is a proper one or not. There is a vehicle, a route, whatever, that the family can follow if they do not agree with the offer, as I have already outlined. They first have to say yes or no, that they will accept the offer or they will not accept the offer. And if they are not prepared to accept the offer, then, as I have already told the hon. gentleman, they should say that they do not wish to accept it, it is too low, and then it will go to an independent arbitration board, and the decision of the board, from my understanding, is binding on both parties.

I also understand that either party can then go to court, not necessarily to have the price changed but it can be taken to court on a point of law. Since both Metro Board and the Johnson family would have lawyers, then I am sure they would find a way to get it into the courts. But whether I agree with the offer that been made is irrelevant, it really has no bearing on the case. And whether I thought I was enough or not, I certainly would not say in this House of Assembly, or anywhere else.

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary.

MR. LUSH:
The minister knows that Metro Board is an agency of this government, appointed by this government. Therefore, does the minister not feel any sense of obligation or political responsibility to protect our citizens from unjust and unfair treatment? Does the minister not feel that he is shirking his responsibilities in not playing a more active role in this matter?

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

MR. BRETT:
Well, Mr. Speaker, I have already told the hon. member that there is no role for the minister to play. There are some 324 municipalities in this Province and about 150-odd Local Service Districts, and the municipalities and the Local Service Districts operate under the Municipalities Act. They are, I suppose, autonomous in a sense. The government does not interfere as long as they operate under the Act, and I am not necessarily responsible for their actions as long as they operate under the legislation, and Metro Board does not have to report to me.

In this particular case, as I told the hon. member, there is vehicle, there is a route which the family can follow, and I would assume they will follow it.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

My question is to the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Tobin). At present there are about fifty to sixty refugees presently staying in Gander. I would like to ask the Minister of Social Services what is the policy of his department as far as paying for the accommodations of those people presently staying in Gander goes.

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

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of the situation to which the hon. gentleman refers, but I will certainly take it under advisement and give him the answer at a later date.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:
Does this minister know anything? I ask the minister, very clearly, what policy does his department have insofar as transportation and meals are concerned for a family is leaving Bay Roberts to travel to hospital in St. John's? Do they pay for transportation and meals, or just transportation?

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

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's first question was regarding

refugees and his second question was regarding Bay Roberts.

The answer, Mr. Speaker, is simple: Whatever they are entitled to.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Unbelievable!

Let me give the minister the answer and ask a question at the same time. Why is it that --

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

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

MR. SIMMS:
Mr. Speaker, the rules clearly state that a minister may or may not answer a question. They also clearly state that comments, because a minister does not answer a question, are not warranted during Question Period. That is clear. Thirdly, the hon. member is on his second supplementary and he prefaces that by saying he is going to answer a question and then ask a question. Surely Your Honour cannot permit that to go on. It is not permitted.

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, it is clear that for supplementaries and final supplementaries there should be no need for any preamble, so I ask the hon. member to ask his final supplementary.

MR. EFFORD:

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what I was going to do. I ask the Minister of Social Services why it is that a refugee coming into this Province is allowed \$750 a month for food, and all lodging paid, when a resident of this Island, a constituent from Bay Roberts, is only allowed \$14 to travel to the Health Sciences Complex and had to go all day without food? In fact, I had to take her to the cafeteria and buy her lunch. The Department of Social Services, either in the Confederation Building or in Bay Roberts, would not give her money for food.

MR. TOBIN:
What is the question?

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, I will repeat it again. Why is it that a refugee coming into this country is allowed \$750 a month for food, when a resident --

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

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. SIMMS:
The hon. member was up for a third time and is attempting to get up for a fourth time to ask a supplementary question.

MR. TULK:
That is not a point of order.

MR. SIMMS:
The Opposition House Leader (Mr Tulk) can respond to this.

The hon. member should be able to put a precise supplementary question, surely, so that

ministers can understand what the hon. member is trying to say. The other point is the minister does not have to answer the question anyway. I do know the hon. member is under a lot of pressure over there today with the nomination deadline for his district due at 5 o'clock. I also know there is another nomination about to be filed, and maybe that is the reason.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. SIMMS:
He is trying one last performance to impress his leader maybe.

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

MR. SPEAKER:
To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
First of all, Mr. Speaker, let me say that what the hon. gentleman said in his last sentence or so had nothing to do with a point of order. And, secondly, let me point out to Your Honour that the member for Port de Grave asked a very precise question. The truth of the matter is that I believe the Minister of Social Services could not hear the question because of what was going on down in that corner. Now, I believe that is the truth. Let me say one other thing, Your Honour. The hon. member does not have to put up with the Government House Leader telling the hon. gentleman how many supplementaries he can ask. As a matter of fact, if Your Honour wants to let him he can ask twenty. It is not for the hon. gentleman to say.

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

There is no point of order.

I think the hon. member did ask his final supplementary and the hon. minister asked him to repeat it, and I allowed that position to develop.

The hon. the member for Port de Grave.

MR. EFFORD:
Mr. Speaker, the reason why I asked the question is because the people in this Province are not getting enough money to live on.

MR. LONG:
Are you blaming that on the refugees?

MR. EFFORD:
No. I am quite happy that the refugees are getting what they are getting. All I am asking is that the Newfoundland people be treated at least on an equally fair basis.

Why is it the people of this Province cannot get at least food and transportation money when they have to travel to a St. John's hospital, when refugees in this Province can get ten times what we are allowed ourselves?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

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

MR. TOBIN:
Mr. Speaker, basically what the hon. gentleman is saying is, "Why do people living in Newfoundland not get as much as people who are refugees coming in." The Department of Social Services have

never backed away, Mr. Speaker, from helping people who are in need and people who are eligible for social assistance. We have increased the budget of the Department of Social Services every single year, and every division, Mr. Speaker, has gotten an increase, including the total department.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, this year, effective the first of May, there was an increase to all social assistance recipients in the Province, including the ones from Bay Roberts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the hon. gentleman is coming from on this. I guess it is the tactic that he uses in everything he brings up in this House. I can tell him that the people in Bay Roberts and the people in every part of Newfoundland got an increase effective the first of May as it relates to social assistance.

Mr. Speaker, he wants to talk about why does somebody not get something as much as anybody else. Why does the Leader of the Opposition get paid more money, Mr. Speaker, than any other Opposition leader in Canada, if he wants to talk about parity and these types of questions?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TOBIN:

We do not have to back away, Mr. Speaker, from our support to the people who are on social assistance, whether they live in St. John's, whether they live in

Bay Roberts, or whether they live in St. Anthony.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. minister does not appear to be answering the question. He is under no obligation to answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has now elapsed.

Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Health.

DR. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answers to question No. 140 asked by the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick), and Question No. 88 asked by the hon. the member for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford). I think I will just table them, and they can be read rather than my reading them out.

Private Member's Day

MR. SPEAKER:

This is Private Member's Day.

MR. TOBIN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. TOBIN:

Mr. Speaker, I understand from your ruling that I did not answer the question. I wonder if you would care to point out to me what aspect of it I did not answer?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Oh, oh!

MR. TULK:
Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:
To the point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:
The Speaker ruled that the hon. gentleman was not answering the question. Now, it is his choice whether he answers it or not, but the hon. gentleman has to understand that if the Speaker feels that he is straying or he is taking too long in answering a question, the Speaker has the right to bring him to order. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, he has to understand that he cannot jump up in a temper tantrum and challenge the ruling of Your Honour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:
He has to understand that as well. Your Honour did the right and proper thing and he knows it, yet he is smarting over it.

MR. SPEAKER:
There is no point of order.

MR. SIMMONS:
Name him!

MR. SPEAKER:
And the Chair does not appreciate being asked questions by any hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:
This is Private Member's Day and the debate was adjourned by the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH:
Mr. Speaker, I concluded my remarks on this resolution the last day by saying that we certainly support this resolution. I did not like the wording particularly, I thought it was worded rather weakly. I also had a further complaint that the first WHEREAS in this resolution which states, 'WHEREAS the Provincial Government has had considerable success in strengthening the forest industry on the Island of Newfoundland through mill upgrading and silviculture,' gave the impression almost that since the provincial government had done everything that is possible with the development of the forestry in this Province, then we should move to Labrador. I thought that was not accurate. I thought we should develop both together and there was certainly no necessity for that particular WHEREAS.

And, Mr. Speaker, I sort of indicated that I rather doubted that the provincial government had done everything necessary in terms of ensuring the maximum development of the forest industry in this Province. I sort of doubted that, and I referred particularly to silviculture and forest management. I referred to that and, low and behold, Mr. Speaker, on the weekend I read in one of the good papers of this

Province, either **The Evening Telegram** or **The Sunday Express**, where officials of the Department of Forest Resources were concerned about the depletion of our forest on the Avalon Peninsula, they were very, very concerned about it.

AN HON. MEMBER:
And so are we.

MR. LUSH:
Now, Mr. Speaker, gentlemen on the other side say, so are we. Well, what are they going to do about it, Mr. Speaker? Did they not know that our forests were being depleted because of the increased use for fuel consumption and commercial use? Did they not know this, Mr. Speaker? They are just sitting idly by and watching the forest being ruined.

Mr. Speaker, I will go a little further. I would suggest that it is not only happening on the Avalon Peninsula, that there are several areas in this Province where our forests are in danger of being completely depleted, all, Mr. Speaker, through neglect and lack of foresight on the part of this government in developing a solid, sound, efficient, effective forest management programme. They have not been doing it, Mr. Speaker. Otherwise, they would not be caught in this situation. Anybody driving the Trans-Canada Highway over the past ten or fifteen years knows, Mr. Speaker, what a raking, what a beating our forest is getting because of the increased use with respect to domestic usage, in particular. Mr. Speaker, it is a sad, sad day. It is neglect on the part of this government who have not had sufficient foresight to put in the proper forest management programme so that we would not be caught in that situation today.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, that it extends further than the Avalon Peninsula, that it is in areas in Central Newfoundland, Western Newfoundland, right throughout the Island part of this Province, and it comes through extreme neglect and lack of foresight, lack of planning by the provincial government, and particularly by the Department of Forest Resources of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope they will heed the advice of their officials, they will take action based on the advice and the concerns presently being expressed by the departmental officials. So, Mr. Speaker, I hope that they will take immediate action, else we are going to find ourselves in this Province without any kind of a forest, either for commercial purposes or for domestic purposes.

Mr. Speaker, do we support the main thrust of this resolution, which says, 'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this Hon. House go on record as encouraging the Government to continue its efforts to bring a Forest Industry to Labrador'? Yes, Mr. Speaker, we support this resolution and we will do all in our power to encourage the government. And not only encourage, we will plead with them, we will beg them, we will exhort them to do it, Mr. Speaker. We will do all of these things. And when they do it, if they want us to pat them on the back, slap them on the back, we will do that too. We will do that, Mr. Speaker, for the development of the forest industry in Labrador. We want to see the forest industry in Labrador developed to its maximum.

But we also say, take a look at what is happening on the Island

part of this Province, and, Mr. Speaker, take action immediately to save the forest for present and future generations of this Province. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. STIMMS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am pleased, first of all, to have an opportunity to speak on the resolution so ably presented by my colleague and friend, the member for St. John's East Extern, who, I must say, despite the fact that he is a rather new member to the Legislature, and despite the fact that his background and history, I guess, is associated with the fishery, did an admirable job presenting that particular resolution, and I give him credit and commend him for it.

Before I get into the resolution, I listened last week to comments made by members opposite and tried to focus in on some of the critical points they were making with respect to the resolution which specifically talks about encouraging the government to continue efforts to bring a forest related industry to Labrador.

Unfortunately, a lot of the comments that were made were not related at all to that specific topic, but in a general way related to forestry, and, I suppose, that would be acceptable. But I must point out to the member for Bonavista North (Mr. Lush), who very infrequently says anything to upset me, and I am not sure if he realizes what he

said, or if he believes what he said, or if he is fully committed to what he said, because I cannot for the life of me believe that he would be if he just thought about what he said for a moment, that he criticized the government, talking about the lack of silviculture effort. He pointed out that a few days ago there was a story in a newspaper quoting forestry officials as saying there was a concern on the Avalon Peninsula with respect to a lack of the resource, mostly for those in this area who would use it for domestic use, in their woodstoves and so on, and he says that this government should be nailed for not doing more in silviculture so as to overcome that particular problem.

Now, surely, the member realizes, Mr. Speaker, that it would take forty years to grow a tree, and this government which came into power in 1979, this particular administration, began silviculture - it began slightly before that, in late 1978. We have been doing it.

But if the party of which the hon. member is a part and a member had in the twenty-three years they formed the government, back from 1949 until 1972, whenever it was, if that government, that Liberal administration for twenty-three years had undertaken silviculture programmes, then the problem that the hon. member alluded to, here on the Avalon Peninsula, might not be a problem at all. Because that is forty years ago, and we may have had more resource on the Avalon to assist those people.

But fortunately for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, they elected a government back in 1979 which had foresight, which had

determination, and which was prepared to undertake massive silviculture programmes, massive programmes compared to what had happened before. In the hon. member's own district, as a matter of fact, and in the hon. member's district over there, there have been programmes, and in other member's districts from all over the Province, but done by this administration.

So the hon. member for Bonavista North, to be perfectly frank, was very unfair in that particular criticism. Now, I do not know if he was deliberate, if he meant to be unfair to the government, but that is certainly possible. I would not say now that that would be an unusual thing to happen, but it is unusual from the member for Bonavista North, Mr. Speaker.

Your Honour knows full well how important silviculture programmes are, because in Your Honour's own district there have been massive numbers of silviculture programmes undertaken over the years, perhaps more than in any other district in the Province, I am not quite sure.

Your Honour's district is an area where particularly sawmill operations are major, and Your Honour has done a magnificent job in encouraging government to spend funds on silviculture in his particular constituency. Now, Mr. Speaker, enough said about that.

AN HON. MEMBER:
(Inaudible).

MR. SIMMS:
No, I was not talking about His Honour the Speaker, His Honour who actually occupies the Chair right now, who is the Deputy Speaker. He has done a magnificent job in lobbying and encouraging and

fighting and scraping for money to put into silviculture in his own particular constituency and should be commended for it. Anyway, that is enough of that, Mr. Speaker. That was just a response to an outburst by the member for Bonavista North, which disappointed me considerably.

Now, Mr. Speaker, to get to the resolution. Obviously, as a former Minister of Forestry for the Province, having spent three and a half years in that particular position, I have an interest still in forestry matters.

MR. KELLAND:

In hunting.

MR. SIMMS:

No, I do not have any interesting in hunting. The hon. member for Naskaupi can imply all he wants, but I do not hunt. I am not a hunter, despite the little insinuation there from across the way.

Mr. Speaker, I have an interest in the forest industry, itself, in forestry generally speaking, having been born in a community, for example, which was a logging community, where my father worked for a pulp and paper company in those days, Bowater, over in Howley.

MR. TULK:

Is that where you were born?

MR. SIMMS:

That is where I was born, in Howley, yes. Then, having been raised in Corner Brook, where there is a major forest related industry which everybody is familiar with, which has had its ups and downs, I suppose, but more recently it is up, I believe - the people of the Corner Brook area

are very positive about that - and then having spent the last number of years, twenty years or so in Grand Falls, again another major pulp and paper town, I have some interest and I have some knowledge I suppose, not a lot. I am not suggesting that I have more than members opposite, but I have some knowledge and I certainly have an interest.

So this particular resolution encourages me when I see and hear from members opposite that they are prepared to lend their encouragement to the government so that they will continue to try to develop a forest related industry in Labrador, rather than getting up and criticize and condemning the government. I am delighted to hear all about that kind of approach from the members opposite. It is very important, Mr. Speaker.

With respect to Labrador, Mr. Speaker, to put it in perspective, first of all, it is important that members have some knowledge about the forest resource in Labrador, the current situation, if you wish. As a former minister, obviously I had many occasions to go to Labrador, and not only to the Goose Bay - Happy Valley - Churchill area. I was also on the Coast of Labrador and further North, Churchill Falls and in the Labrador West - Wabush area. In fact, there is some forestry potential, believe it or not, up in that particular area. So I had occasion to visit the Labrador part of the Province on a number of occasions, Mr. Speaker, and I could see for myself the potential.

In addition to that, being the minister I had occasion to talk to people who were interested in developing some sort of forest

related industry in Labrador, interested parties, incidentally, not only from Newfoundland and Labrador but also from other parts of Canada, and, indeed, from outside the country of Canada, particularly the Scandinavian countries. I talked to people from Finland and Sweden who have had an interest in developing a forestry related industry in Labrador.

After doing their own studies or assessments or surveys, one thing they all did was come to the same conclusion, that the wood fibre in Labrador is, without question and without doubt, the best wood fibre in the world, absolutely the best wood fibre - black spruce - the best black spruce in the world. So that is one difficulty, one problem they do not have to face, anybody who might be interested in developing a forest related industry there.

Mr. Speaker, the forest resource in Labrador, the total area there is 290,000 square kilometres, and there is an underdeveloped forest resource there greater than the resource on the total Island portion of the Province - greater than the total Island portion of the Province has, approximately 334,000 cubic metres of wood.

I would like to thank His Honour for his note reminding me to stick to the subject.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that needs to be done, of course, in the development of a forest related industry in Labrador, is to overcome the problems and difficulties that exist in that area of our Province.

There are some plans underway, I understand from a conversation

with the Minister of Forest Resources, to get into a more aggressive access road programme which is badly needed. But the potential is there to do a number of things aside from the creation of jobs to harvest that overmature wood, in particular, that needs to be harvested.

One of the biggest difficulties they have in the case of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area, which the member for Naskaupi would be familiar with, would be accessibility to the Southside of the Churchill River, where fully 66 per cent of the total volume of wood lies. That is a serious problem for any potential development, for any future development.

But the department has slowly been doing more. With respect to silviculture, they have a small greenhouse operation there - I think they have four greenhouses and a small nursery operation there. They are doing a bit more in access roads, and they are doing some other cone collection work with the jack pine from Labrador, as I understand it. In the nursery in Wooddale, in particular, is where they are trying to nurture it, if you want.

So, they are doing all of those things. But Labrador has a sizeable resource as it is. In any event, silviculture is not their major need at this particular point in time, although silviculture needs to be carried on, as the member for Bonavista North pointed out.

Mr. Speaker, given the vast area of the coast of Labrador, it might be interesting to note that the total wood volume on the coast of Labrador, although it is difficult

to ascertain specifically and clearly, is estimated to exceed that of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay area - the coast of Labrador - which is rather interesting. I was not fully aware of that myself, to tell you the truth.

MR. FUREY:

Your Press Secretary did that up for you, did he?

MR. SIMMS:

No, no, this is from Hansard. If the hon. member had the interest, he could have gotten the speeches from last Wednesday in the House of Assembly on this very issue; these kinds of points were made at that time. I have an interest in the topic so I read the speeches, believe it or not, usually over here during Question Period, because there is not much coming over in questions.

Mr. Speaker, we also should be aware that there are some activities ongoing. We would not anybody to think there are no forest related activities underway in Labrador, because there are. Most of them, I agree, are directed in another area, export pulp in particular, with some of the operations up there. I remember when I was minister issuing permits to Eastern Wood Harvesters, I believe, who have a five-year commitment right now. I understand they have been having some difficulties getting off the ground, but I also understand, from recent conversations I had with the minister, that that operation, Eastern Wood Harvesters, intends to expand and improve over their production of last year.

They do engage a number of people, they hire a fair number of people; there are jobs related to it.

They also sub-contract, if you want, to some of the smaller operators around the area, small local sawmillers. So it is a benefit, the kind of thing that is happening with export pulp. The thing you always have to be concerned about is not giving away too much of the pulp so you will not be able to encourage or entice some operator to come in to put a larger forestry related operation there.

Terpstra is another operation that is a relatively new entrant to that area. They have also been involved in the export pulpwood market and, I understand at the present time, they had a one-year permit but they intend to get operations under way again, if they have not already started.

MR. KEILLAND:

(Inaudible) during the Autumn.

Yes. They are an operation that came from Central Newfoundland somewhere, rather than around the Gander area somewhere.

I thank Your Honour for another note reminding me to keep to the topic and not to stray too far.

There are other commercial sawmill operations in Goose Bay, all kinds of them, I guess; a lot of small ones. The hon. member would be very familiar with it. And there is, I understand, some interest already being shown by other operators in the same field - export pulp. I am not going to say who the company is at this stage, obviously, because those discussions are still ongoing.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I want to sum up, since I have only five minutes remaining, by giving an overview, first of all, of what I have just

been trying to say in leading up to my final comments about the potential for larger operations. The woods operations currently in Labrador have an estimated value, I guess, of about \$1.5 million to the local economy in Labrador. Now, that includes all of Labrador, not just Happy Valley - Goose Bay.

\$1.5 million is about the value of the forest related opportunities to the economy of Labrador. The work force obviously fluctuates, because of the seasonality of the industry, but anywhere from 50 to 150 people are employed in forest related operations of some sort or another throughout Goose Bay.

But, in 1988, the expectation is that this could increase to possibly \$3 million to \$4 million worth to the economy, and, obviously, 200 to 250 jobs as opposed to 50 to 150. So there are some existing initiatives underway, and work underway and projects underway that are already helping to boost the economy of the Labrador area from forest related industries.

There is a potential for industries in the sawmilling area. In Wabush - Labrador City, I understand, there is an operator who is very interested in establishing a sizable sawmill operation, which would be good for the Labrador part of the Province and that part of the economy. But the issue that has always been talked about, for the last couple of years, has been the issue of trying to develop a much larger industry. First, there was the instant pulp proposal which was developed by MODO - Chemetics, I think was the name of the company, who had a patent on that particular process, instant pulp.

They then tried to interest other Scandinavian interests in developing an instant pulp operation there. In fact, the largest pulp and paper company in Finland was the company that showed interest, and if I remember the name, I believe it was Enso - Gutziet.

MR. FUREY:
What?

MR. SIMMS:
Enso - Gutziet. They were very, very interested in taking over this instant pulp process that had been developed by Modo - Chemetics, and hopefully they may still have an interest. The problem was they had difficulty with their currency in their own country.

MR. SIMMONS:
Who were they?

MR. SIMMS:
Who was what?

MR. SIMMONS:
This company.

MR. SIMMS:
A Finnish pulp and paper company, Enso - Gutziet. They are not related to us, I can tell the hon. member that. I do not think they are, anyway.

Mr. Speaker, that is where that proposal came about and what happened was there was a delay, or a stop, I guess, in their interest because of their currency problems in their own country. Subsequent to that, the government and the Departments of Forestry and Development, in particular, wanted to try to encourage somebody else, so we had to look elsewhere in North America. There was a Canadian company which had a look

at the feasibility of developing some forest related industry. We tried to get them interested in the instant pulp process, but it turned out that they were more interested in the potential for a pulp and paper mill. Of course, we all know there are a lot of difficulties associated with that kind of an operation: the capital cost factor, transportation problems, the improvements that are needed to access roads and bridges, docking facilities, all of these kinds of things are concerns. One other interesting concern is, that in that area there are not enough trained loggers. That was one of the things that came out of the surveys.

MR. SIMMONS:
They would have to be brought in.

MR. SIMMS:
Yes, they would have to bring them up from the Island to work in the area. But if you can develop these sawmill operations, get people in the woods harvesting and so on, logging, then maybe they will be able to develop a workforce so that one day, whenever and if a major undertaking gets underway -

MR. SIMMONS:
There are a lot of loggers on the Island who need work.

MR. SIMMS:
Absolutely. I am very familiar with it. Perhaps more familiar than the hon. member, as a matter of fact. I think I would be safe in saying that I think I am. I would put my money on the line with him. I am more correct about that than the hon. member was the other day when he talked about wrinkled cucumbers.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I guess my time is just about up. I simply want to say that I want to commend my colleague, the member for St. John's East Extern, who, as I said, is a new member and has an interest in this area, even though his background is fisheries, on bringing in this resolution. I am encouraged by the comments from most members opposite with respect to their intent to support this resolution to give the government the encouragement and support it needs to develop a forest related industry in Labrador. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):

Before recognizing the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, I would like to welcome to this hon. House Mayor Rex Matthews, Councillor Newman Bartlett, Councillor John Cumben, and Town Manager, Gene King, from the town of Grand Bank.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I stand in the House to consider this resolution put forward by the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons), it is hard not to support it because it did not say anything. When you have to stand with regard to that, it is a very weak resolution at its best.

But, I suppose, when you take into consideration that I heard the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) say the other day that when he crossed the House he took his resolution with him and he wanted to use it, but, then he said he could not, because they sent down from the Premier's office and told him the resolution he had to use. Although this is Private Members' Day, it seems that the member for Bellevue told us exactly what it is. Private members have very little to do about it and the resolutions are developed in the Premier's office. So it would certainly seem to me -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) sprung.

MR. GILBERT:

Yes, maybe it sprung from the Premier's office.

It would seem to me that this resolution would have to have been made up by somebody who was trying to say nothing and still be able to pat himself on the back for saying nothing. This is exactly what this resolution has done.

It states, "WHEREAS the provincial government has considerable success in strengthening the forest industry on the Island of Newfoundland through mill upgrading and silviculture."

I intend to get into that a bit later. I am sure the previous speaker, the former Minister of Forestry, will be aware of some of the points that we can make on this. There leaves a lot to be desired.

I think to single out Labrador and say, 'we want to develop the forest industry in Labrador,' I would like to see us develop the

forest industry in the Province. To me it would be a more meaningful resolution if the resolution encompassed developing the forest industry in the Province.

The final resolve was that this hon. House go on record as encouraging the government to continue in its efforts to bring a forest industry to Labrador. I would say if we had that stating 'To continue in its efforts to bring a forest industry to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador,' I would be much more happy to speak on it and to make some recommendations, which I intend to do, as to what should happen to the forest industry in this Province.

I listened last week to the Minister of Forest Resources (Mr. R. Aylward) when he talked about the forest industry in Labrador. He was able to talk about the fire-fighting operations in Labrador. They have sawmilling on a local basis and they have some export wood. They also have a small silviculture operation going in Goose Bay. That is very commendable, but the whole forest industry in this Province has to be looked at as a whole, not segmented, although we must do something about the Labrador part of it.

The former Minister of Forestry got up and talked about the potential of the forest industry in Labrador. I would tell him there is a potential for the forest industry in the complete Province. He talked about the new technology, the instant pulp.

When I hear that government talk of any new technology, like instant pulp, it brings to mind

the technology that we are just seeing the benefits of now, the Sprung operation in Mount Pearl. That was the new technology the Premier said was developed in Disney World.

By the way the marketing is going, I think Mickey Mouse must be doing the marketing for him too.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

I can assure you right now that it is not a business decision they are making to sell cucumbers for half the cost in Nova Scotia. That is not a good, sound marketing process.

I am afraid when I hear hon. members opposite talk about new technology. I really worry.

Anyhow, the forest industry in Newfoundland, for the benefit of members opposite, is the second largest employer in the Province. We have a forest area about three and half times the size of New Brunswick, and that is including the whole Province. When I look at the forest industry, I consider Labrador to be a part of this Province. I do not think we should separate it.

In the Island portion of this Province alone, 27 per cent of the forest area in this Province is controlled by Price-Abitibi; 30 per cent by Kruger; and 40 per cent is Crown land; with 3 per cent privately owned. This is an interesting thing I see in this Province.

If we are going to develop a forest industry in Newfoundland, something must be done to put the land into private enterprise and

let those people work. We hear this government give lip service to private enterprise all the time. If we are going to do something with the forest industry in Newfoundland, the first suggestion I would make for them to do is to privatize the industry. Put the land in the hands of private individuals so they can develop the woodlots.

They could go and send the Royal Commission to Nova Scotia somewhere where the reverse is true of what we see in the forest industry here in Newfoundland where about 90 per cent of the forest in Nova Scotia is controlled by private woodlots. We go into New Brunswick and you have again a very large private ownership. So I would say that that is one of our problems with the forest industry in Newfoundland and one that this government, instead of talking about the new technology and the instant pulp and things like that, they could talk about developing an industry based on the private woodlot.

Another interesting statistic is 90 per cent of the forest industry in Newfoundland is made up of pulp and paper production, 90 per cent of the industry in Newfoundland. It is good that we have a strong pulp and paper in Newfoundland and we realize that it is there. It is one of the very few industries in Newfoundland where the final processing is done here.

Normally in Newfoundland we have been used to scooping out minerals and sending them off in their raw form to be produced somewhere else where the secondary benefits are found. Our fisheries was a classic example of this. There are attempts made now to carry on

into the secondary processing in fisheries. In Newfoundland, we have been a great giver away of our natural resources to let someone else develop it. Pulp and paper is one of the few industries where we take it from the stump and we see it rolling off and into the paper we are using here today.

The interesting thing I have noticed in some of the comments made from members opposite is, again, the locked in history theory. Everyone of them, as they got up, talked again about the Churchill Falls giveaway. That was the only contribution I heard them make. Any time they get up to speak in this House about anything, they tie it into Churchill Falls.

As I have said many times before, when I think about what has happened in the development of the oil industry in Newfoundland, in years to come, when we are talking about the oil industry and the Atlantic Accord, I think the Atlantic Accord will go down in history to be a lot bigger giveaway than anything that ever came out of Churchill Falls. Let me tell you that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

Now, there are some other things I would like to point out to members opposite concerning the forest industry in Newfoundland. When I say Newfoundland, I mean the Province, Newfoundland and Labrador. I would recommend to the hon. member for St. John's East Extern that he read the report of the Royal Commission that was established to look into the forest industry in this Province. It reported back in

1981.

At that time, one of the salient points of the recommendations was they reported that there was going to be a shortage of economic wood - by economic wood they meant for the pulp and paper industry - early in the next century. That was one of the most important recommendations of that Royal Commission report, I tell the member for St. John's East Extern who was given this resolution by the Premier to put forward here. So we know it was not his. We heard members admit how they get their resolution. That is all right.

At the present time in this Province, 25 to 30 per cent of the Newfoundland forests are mature or over-mature. It must be harvested now. That is the thing.

We heard the member for Grand Falls and former Minister of Forestry (Mr. Simms) talk about the over-mature wood or mature wood in Labrador. Well, there is no doubt about it, it is there. But 25 to 30 per cent of the wood in this Province is over-mature or mature and ready to be harvested.

What we are going to see, if this is not harvested, Mr. Speaker, is in ten to fifteen years time this mature wood will be destroyed by insects, blown down, or, also, it is in this over-mature wood that the natural forest fires start. It is God's way of doing the job that now man has taken over with the reforestation programme that is taking place. This is where we are losing our effort in the forest industry in Newfoundland.

Another interesting thing, Mr. Speaker, as far as the forest industry in Newfoundland is

concerned, is that 40 per cent of the Newfoundland forest is immature and will not be available for harvesting for another fifty to sixty years. So that means that the shortage of economic wood we are talking about is going to occur early in the next century. In Zone one, and Zone one for the technical people is the area where we harvest the wood now for the paper companies, the Central Newfoundland area and that strip along the South Coast in the Bay d'Espoir area, this is where the shortage of wood is going to come from. This is the economic zone where you are going to have the shortage of economic timber early in the next century.

So, what we have is a forest industry in the whole Province that we have not been able to economically use. This is why the member for St. John's East Extern was told by the Premier, as the resolution came down from the Premier's office, 'Make a resolution and say something about Labrador.' It is in Labrador where we find this vast forest that we have all heard about, and we have just heard it from members opposite when they get up and talk about the forest, the black spruce and how it is available. But we have never been able to economically harvest this wood. This where our problem is coming from with this resource.

If the forest industry was developed in Newfoundland, we would find, instead of the 2,000 to 3,000 people that we have in it, we could have 10,000 people. The first thing that we have got to do now, is we have got to start getting this mature wood to market, otherwise it is going to be destroyed by insects or forest fires.

I heard the former Minister of Forestry admit that forest management was relatively new in Newfoundland, and it has to be developed. There was an attempt made to develop the forest industry in Newfoundland too, Mr. Speaker. Up until about three years ago, there seemed to be progress being made in the development of a forest management industry in Newfoundland. They started a silviculture programme.

But during the last three years forest management seems to have decreased. The main reason that the management of the forests has decreased is the fact that there has been a lack of money to implement the programmes. There is still some planting being done, but we have seen a cutback on the thinning. Herbicide and the insecticide programmes to protect the forests are still being used and sometimes too much is being used, as we heard today.

For us today, if a forest is to be successfully managed, it must be treated to same way as a garden. We must plant, and we must weed, and we must protect. If we are to wait for natural regeneration in Newfoundland, it takes fifty to sixty years for a forest to naturally regenerate. If it is managed properly, we can get that same forest in about forty years time.

What that means is when we cut, we go in and we cut in a scientific way so that the whole area is handled and cut properly.

I will take one of the best areas in the Province and I will tell you how we can improve forest industry in the Province. This model could be used for any other place, if they wanted to do it.

We can take the Bay d'Espoir area of this Province.

As everybody is aware, the Bay d'Espoir area of my district has been associated with the forest industry since people settled there. First of all, there were the small individual sawmills. Then came Bowaters and the export wood. Then Bowaters moved out and then there was the hydro development which made work, and those people became construction workers. The forest industry died.

Then, in the mid 1970s, when federal money started to come, they used the federal money to once again start a forest industry in Bay d'Espoir. There was a large sawmill started which did not work. It was over-zealous, I think.

A recommendation of the 1981 Forestry Royal Commission was, instead of large sawmills, they should possibly go back to the smaller, more manageable ones which could provide a better service to the Province of Newfoundland. That, in itself, would then start to do away with some of the problems that we have in the sawmilling industry in Newfoundland because you must remember that the real problem that we have is we have about 75 per cent to 80 per cent of the lumber used in this Province brought or shipped in from the outside.

I am sure the Speaker is aware that the lumber industry in Canada works from a West to East basis. In other words, a car load of lumber starts in British Columbia and as it comes across it sells for a certain price. Finally, when it hits Sydney, somebody

says, 'Let us dump the lumber that is left in Newfoundland.' So they pick up the phone and phone a lumber producer in Newfoundland and say, 'Will you take to the two carloads of lumber we have and take it off our hands for whatever the cost.'

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that members opposite would recognize it because now we are seeing a little bit of the reverse of it. We are seeing Newfoundland, a great producer of cucumbers, now dumping cucumbers in Nova Scotia in the same way that the lumber-producing provinces in Canada are dumping lumber into Newfoundland.

To get back to Bay d'Espoir, with the sawmilling operation developed there, we could create more jobs in Bay d'Espoir.

If you put people to work on site reclamation, the cutting out of the trees that were cut over by Bowater and the sawmill operations around this Province over the years, we could now be creating jobs for the people who are in desperate need of work.

The Forest Economic Stimulus Programme, that I am sure the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) is aware of because it put a lot of people to work in his district, as it did in my district, is another one of the federal initiative programmes that has disappeared since this great co-operation between the two Brians when they went to inflict prosperity on Newfoundland.

This is one of the things that has happened in this whole deal. They have decided to inflict prosperity by cutting out all of the federal programmes that were helping the

poor and the unemployed in this Province.

The other things that could happen, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

The hon. member's time is up.

MR. GILBERT:
In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would say that to develop the industry, the foresters say that a day's work for a man today in silviculture is a year's work for a man in forty years time harvesting the wood products.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for Humber Valley.

MR. WOODFORD:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:
Mr. Speaker, with reference to the resolution by the member for St. John's East Extern; it states:

WHEREAS the Provincial Government has had considerable success in strengthening the forest industry on the Island of Newfoundland through mill upgrading and silviculture; and

WHEREAS there is considerable merchantable timber in Eastern Labrador; and

WHEREAS the government has been

making efforts to develop a forest industry in the Goose Bay (Lake Melville) area;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this hon. House go on record as encouraging the government to continue its efforts to bring a forest industry to Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I will just have a few words in regard to the first Whereas and speak about the generalities in the Province itself, overlapping into Labrador. I remember in 1975 or 1976, when they were talking about an agreement between the feds and the Province, it was often said and referred to at that time that the forest is Newfoundland's forgotten resource.

I just heard the hon. member from Bonavista North (Mr. Lush) talking about the disaster in the forestry over the past years, and this administration and one previous to it, the Moores government, was responsible for it, Mr. Speaker.

Bowater came to Corner Brook, I think, in approximately 1929. I do not know the dates on the other one, Abitibi-Price in Grand Falls, and I think it was in the late '60's for the Stephenville mill.

Now, from 1975 to 1978, Mr. Speaker, it was recognized in this Province that the forest industry was a disaster, there was no clear-cutting, it was cut wherever it was most accessible and whatever was closest to the mill, thereby generating huge profits which were spent in other parts of the world and not necessarily in this Province.

Who was there at that time, Mr. Speaker? When you talk about years gone by and the situation

today, I do not have to say what administration was in power in 1975-1978. Why was there not a silviculture programme between 1929-1978? It was brought to a head in 1976 and 1977, the destruction of the forest industry in this Province. What happened?

It was right at the height of the budworm and the looper infestation in the Province that finally it was addressed by the federal and provincial governments that something should be done with regard to our forest industry.

I was aware of what was going on in the Buchan's area, as some of the hon. members know, up through the Exploits, up through the Victoria Lake area where Abitibi-Price were doing most of their cutting and sending it down Red Indian Lake and down through Exploits to Grand Falls. It was the same thing over where I live now, in Humber Valley area, whereby they deluged and destroyed the Upper Humber area of the Humber Valley region.

Those two rivers, the Exploits and Humber Valley, that is how they sent their logs to the mill, and thereby, easy access again, Mr. Speaker, no trucking, no roads to maintain, and so on.

This agreement was put in place to try to salvage the industry. As the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Gilbert) just said, and he is quite right, that it was identified at that time by the year 2000 our forest industry in this Province would be in jeopardy. There is no doubt it would have been, except for the agreement put in place, I think it was in 1978, or around that time between the feds and the Province, with regard to the forestry. I

think it was called the Forest Resource Development Agreement, if I am not mistaken. I think that agreement expires March 31, 1990.

The forest industry in the Province as a whole contributes to around 14,000 jobs both in the forestry, the actual pulpwood part of it, and the sawmilling industry. The Labrador section is down now, I think, to between 50 and 150, with the possibility of it going in the next two years to probably 250 or 300 employees.

There was a twenty year management agreement. That is what was started approximately ten years ago to try and salvage the forestry in this Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can look and say that the three paper mills that exist now in the Province, that there is enough sustainable cut now, or annual allowable cut on the Island itself to sustain those mills indefinitely.

MR. TULK:

Is there enough there for additional mills?

MR. WOODFORD:

There is enough there for additional mills on the Island part itself, Mr. Speaker, after approximately another ten years of the silviculture programmes.

A prime example is in the Main River area of the Province, in the White Bay area. When Kruger started that they came up with a total cut of approximately 1.6 million cords with a twenty to twenty-five year cutting programme. Now, that is increased to fifty to fifty-two years because of the silviculture programme and the thinning programme that was put in place by

the provincial government.

That is very important because the actual natural growth of, especially the Fir and the spruce in the Province, I think, is between fifty and seventy years without thinning. With a good thinning programme, that natural growth is down to around forty or fifty years when you can start to harvest again, or better in some cases.

MR. TULK:

What did you say the time was if it just grew on its own?

MR. WOODFORD:

Fifty to seventy years natural growth if you do not thin, if you have other brush, such as the birch, often referred to as something else in other parts of the Province, the aspen and stuff like that, but in any case, it is fifty to seventy years. With a good thinning programme, you can cut it in forty to fifty.

MR. TULK:

You can take about ten years off it, and maybe more.

MR. WOODFORD:

Probably twenty. In the White Bay area, they figure because of the high spruce content that you could cut it down something like twenty-six to twenty-seven years.

It is not only the attaining and the saving of the jobs that are already there, there would also be an increase in jobs if a good silviculture programme is put in place, a good thinning programme, we can thereby sustain another mill on the Island and also in the Labrador section of the Province.

In the Province, I think, it now takes approximately one million

cords of wood annually to sustain the three existing mills. I think it is approximately one million cords. That could be down to around 850 now because of the modernization programmes at the Abitibi-Price Mill in Grand Falls and the Kruger Mill in Corner Brook.

In any case, there is approximately 360,000 cubic metres of wood that could be cut in Labrador alone. That is the AAC. I often refer to the TAC when it comes to the fisheries, the total allowable catch, but when it comes to pulpwood, I say the AAC, which is the annual allowable cut of 360,000 cubic metres of wood in the Labrador area alone.

Mr. Speaker, that can sustain a pulp mill alone. That is not counting anything to do with the forest with regard to the sawmilling industry or the actual pulp itself, because of the use of other wood.

MR. BAKER:

What about all the saw logs that are rotting?

MR. WOODFORD:

I am getting to that. I am not going to take away from the fact, Mr. Speaker, that in this Province I have been an advocate of it for years, and I do not mind being perfectly blunt about it. One of the things I was against when Bowaters were cutting on the West Coast of the Province and out around the Gander Bay area and down around the Bonavista area, there was no clear cutting, as I stated before, and the loggers had to go in on Bowaters and Abitibi-Price lots and sneak them out in the night or early in the morning in order to get them to their sawmills. I am well aware,

Mr. Speaker, of what went on over the years.

We have to take into consideration that we do have areas in the Province, areas held by Kruger, areas held by Abitibi-Price, both on the Island portion of the Province and Labrador, that have mature and over-mature stands of timber.

The result of that, Mr. Speaker, is that we going to have hundreds of thousands of hectares or acres, whichever way you want to say it, because there are 2.8 million hectares of wood on the Island itself today that could be harvested, 2.8 million hectares.

Right now, today, the sawmillers, for instance in my area of the Province, are very shy. Logs are at a premium. They are scarce. We had Bowaters go in and cut certain pockets. They took the best out. They left the smaller stuff. It is there now to be cut, two, three, four, and five acre lots, but they will not let anybody in there. They will not let anybody cut it.

This is a sad thing when you see sawmills in your area or anywhere in the Province or even in Labrador now, where there is a total of approximately fifty sawmills, albeit they may be small in size but they are employing about 150 to 200 people at this time. I think that that is being addressed now.

I know in my area, the Abitibi-Price holdings in the Sop's Arm - Pollard's Point area have been addressed now where they took back the three-mile limit around that area a few years ago. We are trying to get that now to revert back to the Crown so it can

be managed by the Province and, thereby, the permits issued to the sawmillers in that area.

The same thing, as I mentioned before, in the Chouse Brook area of Hampden whereby Kruger has approximately 500,000 cords of over-mature timber. Now, with 1.6 million in the Main River area and 500,000 on the other side, I do not have to tell anybody in this House or outside when that is going to be harvested. It will probably never be harvested. So the idea now is to go in with a plan to Kruger saying, 'Look, let at least 60 per cent of this go to the sawmillers and you take the other 40 per cent,' or forget the percentage and say, 'Look, whatever is good for logs let the sawmillers have it, and whatever is good for pulpwood, let them sell it to you,' but at least give them the right to go in and cut so that the timber can be harvested and then we can put a good silviculture programme in place -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODFORD:

- so that in twenty to twenty-five years time, someone else will be able to go in and cut it and then revert back to the other side of the river to cut the pulpwood. It is a very simple procedure, but it is getting it through the higher echelons of those companies that is where the work comes in. But it is there.

It is the same thing in Labrador, Mr. Speaker. We have places there now, for instance, the Lake Melville area. It is only open around six months of the year, if I am not mistaken. I stand to be corrected. So then you cannot have a year round operation with

the actual export of wood. If you create the markets in Scandinavian countries and other places for export, you really cannot keep up the exports year round.

That can be overcome. Some of the pulp, for instance, can be stored for the six months or eight whichever, and the sawmilling industry can work year round in Labrador because they can export it in the Spring of the year.

I think forty-nine million board feet of lumber was produced in the Province in all of 1987, forty-eight or forty-nine million board feet. That is a small increase from 1986, I think, it is 7 per cent or 8 per cent, but the projections for this year for 1988 should see it go approximately another 8 per cent or 9 per cent. Small, but it is definitely an increase.

When you look at the amount of timber or the amount of lumber that is coming into this Province, I mean I can stand by the Irving Station in Deer Lake or the Deer Lake Motel any day of the week and count at least 200,000 to 250,000 board feet of lumber passing through Deer Lake going East, at least, at a minimum. Each tractor trailer load takes approximately 25,000 board feet of lumber.

When you equate that with the potential that we have and the markets that are there, it is unreal what can happen in that industry.

The potential is identified, but we have to get something in place, especially in the Labrador area of the Province, Mr. Speaker, where especially sawmills can get going. There is a move a foot now whereby there is \$10 million

sawmill set for Goose Bay and it is going to be done by a company called Innovative Project Concepts Incorporated that would produce approximately 10 million to 20 million board feet of lumber a year.

When you put that in perspective and when you look at what is being done now, 10 million to 20 million board feet that could be put out by one mill in Labrador, and when you look at what is being put out by the whole Province today, which is approximately a half, twice as much, and this one mill alone could put out approximately 50 per cent of the total production on the Island portion of the Province itself, it just goes to show what is happening. That mill alone could employ anywhere from 100 to 150 employees year round.

MR. GILBERT:

In Bay d'Espoir?

MR. WOODFORD:

No, it is not in Bay d'Espoir, but there is potential all around this Island. It is a matter of getting something in place whereby the sawmillers themselves can take advantage of the logs in certain areas. The pulp companies, let us face it, I do not care who they are, they want to take the easy, accessible timber and the stuff that is far away adds to the cost of the ordinary sawmiller or the ordinary jobber because he has to put in roads and then he has to put his equipment in and get the actual product back out.

So there is a large expense there for the sawmillers of the Province. Now the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle, talked about the wood chip thing for the plant in Roddickton. It is going to take approximately 25,000 cords

of wood a year to keep that plant going.

One of the reasons why the Canada Bay Lumber Company could not operate to its fullest potential was because they had no place to sell their pulp wood. Now, with the wood chip plant there they can go in and clear cut everything; the logs can go to the lumber mill, the pulp wood and the other trees, no matter what they are, can go to the wood chip plant, thereby creating, I think, 4.5 megawatts of power for that area, which would take in Main Brook and St. Anthony.

The same thing could apply to Labrador with regard to the power plant. The only thing about it, electricity from Churchill Falls could create a lot better base for the actual pulp mill in Labrador because of the easy access to the power. That certainly would depend upon the actual location of the mill itself. Labrador holds great potential both in the actual installation or the start of an actual pulp mill, a pulp process whereby the actual mulch is exported, and in the actual sawmill business in the Goose Bay and Lake Melville area. The potential is great!

Now, Mr. Speaker, the 800,000 cubic metres of wood that are used for just domestic use in the Province, including Labrador and the Island, that is approximately 250,000 cords of wood. And when you look at the total, it is the approximate amount used by one mill in the Province. Now there are areas of the Province whereby it cannot be taken into consideration like the Eastern area, the Avalon area, because they just do not have the stand of timber anyway, they are just

cutting the small spruce.

I remember when I used to visit my father in Harbour Main he used to say, "My son, come out and see the lovely logs I cut. I have them out by the door. I am going to take them to the mill next week." I would go out and they would be twice the size of the glass, about four inches or five inches in diameter, and he thought he had a great thing, cutting out here on the Avalon Peninsula. So when he came to my area and I took him over and showed him some that were probably 12 inches or 18 inches in the butt, he did not have much to say about his little spruce he was cutting here on the Avalon.

Anyway, it is good for domestic use, for firewood consumption, all along this area, and as you get into the Bonavista area, the Glenwood area, you are getting into the heavier sawmill production because of the fact that you do not have access to the actual pulp mills in the Province. As you know, when you talk about accessibility, over the years they always had to haul it and ship it by train from Glenwood to Corner Brook and Grand Falls.

Now those days are gone, Mr. Speaker. They have the distance cut down and it is all done by truck, so really the stands in that area now, especially the Crown stands, are all pretty well going to sawmillers and exporters who are exporting it out of the Province.

My time is just about up, Mr. Speaker, but this resolution is a good one. It is pertaining to Labrador and giving support to the government in their efforts to increase the forest industry in Labrador. I think every member of

the House should vote in favor of it, so that the resolution will pass and give some credibility to the sawmill and pulpwood industry in the Labrador section of our Province. It might be one mill, but when you look at that area and the unemployment rate in some of those places, it would be something that this government and all members would be proud of. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Menehik.

MR. FENWICK:

Mr. Speaker, I do not have a huge number of comments that I would like to enter in the record on this particular resolution. Personally, looking at the resolution I do not think it says a heck of a lot, but, at the same time, there are a number of comments I think that are important. The debate as pursued by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir has really broadened it to a question of the whole forest industry in the Province I think, and I think that is appropriate. Because it is important to look on the Labrador resource as part of the Province's resource, and the fact that it is a relevant resource to develop in the future.

Mr. Speaker, we have a very poor situation in terms of utilization of our forest resources. We have essentially three large mills in this Province which have a stranglehold on the wood supply on the Island. We have a large supply in Labrador that is not being used, and we have essentially a forest policy that leans over backward, if not actually gets down on its hands

and knees, and kisses the feet of the paper companies that really control what is going on, and I find that a particularly objectionable way in which we run a Province.

One of the things we have always asked ourselves is, what do we get out of this forest industry besides employment? Because, after all, the natural resources of this Province are what we are giving to these paper companies in order to get them to locate here.

One of the interesting things is that if you look at the taxes, the direct taxes for stumpage, for royalties and for everything else that are paid by Abitibi-Price and Corner Brook Pulp and Paper, Kruger, together, the whole combination comes out to something about \$2 million in total, in the last year that we have any records for it.

Clearly, the indication then is that we are getting very little in return for this major resource that we are allowing these companies to use on a continuing basis.

We have a situation, then, that just a tiny fraction of what we spend in spraying different kinds of chemicals on the forest comes back to us in terms of these forest utilization taxes, and, Mr. Speaker, I think that on that basis it is extremely important that we realize that we are giving our resources away. We have been doing it since 1904, when the A.N.D. Company established the first of the modern mills in Grand Falls, and then was followed by the other mills in Corner Brook, and later, of course, in Stephenville. We have rarely gotten anything back in resources

from it, but we have tended to put a tremendous amount in in order to support them.

At the same time, Mr. Speaker, government members over there may argue back, Well, besides the employment we also get corporation taxes. I find the whole argument on corporation taxes to be a particularly difficult one to attack, because none of the members have ever stood in their place and said to us, This is how much in corporation taxes we get from Abitibi-Price, this is how much we get from Kruger, Corner Brook Pulp and Paper.

And there is a very important reason for that, Mr. Speaker. Because, quite frankly, they are paying so little that it would be embarrassing for the government to ever release that kind of information to us. Look at Abitibi-Price, which is a good example. We have two mills in this Province, one in Stephenville and one in Grand Falls. These two mills, we know, have been modernized, are efficient, are operations that can produce a tremendous amount of paper. With the price of paper being up and full operations last year, they are in and of themselves quite profitable. So the question would be, how much money should we then be making off these particular operations. Well, we receive 16 per cent of the corporation taxes levied by the federal government against the corporations that do business in our Province.

So the question you ask yourself is, Well, what does that amount to? Well, let us look at Abitibi-Price for starters, and then we will go on to Corner Brook Pulp and Paper. With Abitibi-Price, we have a company

that is part of a multinational one owned by the Reitman Family of Toronto. The Reitmans not only own Abitibi-Price, they own mining interests, as I understand it, they own oil companies, and so on. So when you start breaking down the profits of this particular organization, what you end up with is a corporate statement of what their income is for this particular year.

Mr. Speaker, since all the profits of Abitibi-Price and all the mills across Canada and around the world where they are are merged in with the profits or losses of Gulf Oil, what we end up with is a number that is totally divorced from the operation of the mills, both in Grand Falls and in Stephenville. In fact, Mr. Speaker, if we went and checked it out, we may find that Abitibi-Price paid no corporate tax last year at all to the federal government, because with all its mills across Canada and all the losses they have had in oil revenues and so on, they probably wrote the whole works off and paid nothing.

Now, you ask, why is that important? Well, if our corporation taxes are 16 per cent of what the federal government levies against the mills in our Province and the company makes no profit because it writes off its oil losses, then 16 per cent of zero is the kind of revenue we get out of Abitibi-Price, which means we get nothing in corporation taxes, as well. We already pointed out when we started this debate that they are getting virtually nothing from them in terms of forest usage taxes, because there is a total of \$2 million per year for all the users, and that includes the fellow from Joe Batt's Arm who

goes out and pays his ten or twenty or twenty-five dollars for his permit to go and cut a few logs. That is included in that total of \$2 million.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have a situation in which those resources are being given away to these companies and, I suggest to you, we would be much better off to find some other taxation regime so that these individual companies could start paying more. In Abitibi-Price's case, of course, you have an additional problem, in that they are not liable to taxation in either Stephenville or Grand Falls on a municipal level. Therefore, the municipalities have to tax their individuals higher in order to supply the services for the whole area. So we have a further travesty, where these companies pay no taxes there as well.

In the case of Kruger, or Corner Brook Pulp and Paper, we have a combination of problems there. Kruger, as most members know, is a private company, it is not publicly listed. It is almost impossible to find out what their profits are and we, therefore, have to take their word on what kind of profits are made in the Corner Brook operation. Again, Mr. Speaker, they can end up with a highly profitable operation in Corner Brook, have two or three mills they are working on elsewhere and have a lot of writeoffs there, and, as a result, end up with virtually no federal taxes being paid because of the corporate interest they have that way, and since again we are stuck with 16 per cent of the federal taxes, if the number is zero, we, in turn, receive zero.

I would like to see the Minister

of Finance or the Minister responsible for Forestry, somewhere along the line actually get up and tell me that my numbers are far off, because I would like them to give me the numbers to indicate that these companies are actually paying their fair share. It is our impression, Mr. Speaker, that virtually nothing is being paid by these particular corporations.

Of course, we all know that in Corner Brook, Kruger, which took over the rights from Bowater, took over, also, the 1938 agreement which exempted it from municipal taxation. We were in the House on that shameful day when we told the people of Corner Brook that they would have to pay taxes for the rest of their lives at a much higher rate because we were not willing to tell Kruger, 'Look, you are a new operator. We do not have to give you the deal that Bowater got in 1938. You can negotiate a new one, and pay legitimate municipal taxes to the people of Corner Brook so that you can pay your part of the services there.' Mr. Speaker, that is another one of the problems that we have with it.

In getting to the specific question of the wood in Labrador, I think it is important for us to bring up a theme that was raised by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir. He said that the Poole Royal Commission of 1980 - 1981 said that we will see a wood shortage in the year 2,000 for about twenty years. Now, anybody who has looked through that Royal Commission will see that that, indeed, is the case, that is the projection that they had there. I think the reason that is important, Mr. Speaker, is I have here in front of me some briefing

notes from the Minister of Forest Resources, when he was talking to the people in Corner Brook - these are the representatives of the Joint Mill Unions - and one of the things he said there - he was, by the way, talking about the rebuilding of paper machine No. 3. This was the one, if hon. members will recall, back in late 1984, we passed legislation making it mandatory, in return for \$45 million, that Kruger, or Corner Brook Pulp and Paper, would rebuild No. 3 and then keep the machine operating at a reasonable level.

Well, these are the notes the minister had at a meeting with the Joint Mill Unions, when he was telling them that that no longer looks like it is going to be done. The deal, of course, was that we gave them \$7.6 million and the feds gave them \$38 million, and in return for that they were supposed to do machines 1, 2, 3 and 4, and they were supposed to do a study on Machine No.7, and, then, if it was viable, they were, at that point, supposed to go ahead and do No. 7 as well.

The minister in his briefing of the Joint Mill Unions says and I am going to quote here, 'It is felt by the company that any further modernization and resulting capacity expansion would result in a fibre requirement beyond the ability of Corner Brook Pulp and Paper Limited to support.' I think it is important to have that, Mr. Speaker, read into the record. Because what it seems to say is the minister is looking at getting Kruger, or Corner Brook Pulp and Paper, off the hook because they are saying that they do not have enough wood to go through this period of time, that there is an indication that

there might be a shortfall.

The reason I think it is appropriate in this debate on Labrador resources and on Labrador wood supply is, Mr. Speaker, that Poole Commission report, when it predicted this wood shortfall, took into account none of the forest resources in Labrador whatsoever. It indicated that none of those were considered to be, at that point, economically viable to be used in order to support the mills on the Island part of the Province. And I would suggest to you that that was a tremendous oversight on their part, or a deliberate oversight on their part, and that when those resources are factored into it, there, of course, is plenty of wood in those circumstances to get over this wood shortfall.

The economics of it is challenging, but, Mr. Speaker, with the possibility of putting either a chipping plant up there or a primary pulping plant or something like that, there is no reason that some of these vast forests, which the President of the Council has just finished saying are vaster than all the resources on the Island part and are of higher quality because they are that excellent slow-growing black spruce, that there should not be enough wood for this company to continue on to produce as much paper as it sees fit.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, the problem is why is the government then seemingly indicating that it is allowing this company, which we have given \$45.7 million from combined levels of government, off the hook in terms of its contractual obligations?

If the Minister of Forest

Resources has a chance to speak in this debate, I would really like to hear what he has to say about whether or not - or maybe some other time he can respond to it - they intend to introduce legislation and a change to the actual agreement that was brought in late 1984. Because, Mr. Speaker, my reading of it, in every reading by people who have looked at it and have been reasonably neutral on the thing, is that there is a contractual obligation by Corner Brook pulp and paper, or Kruger, to do No. 3, to modernize it. That was part of the agreement.

And the wood supply is not a reasonable argument for them, to make especially, Mr. Speaker, when all we have is an assertion by the company that they are at the extent of their timber limits, when, in fact, no evidence whatsoever has been produced by either the minister or anybody else in this House to document whether or not they actually are going to the length of their limits on it. Mr. Speaker, I think it is appropriate, in the question of the utilization of the forest resource in Labrador, that we summarize in sort of point form what we have here:

First of all we have a company which received in excess of \$45 million from both levels of governments in order to contractually do a number of things. One of the things they contracted to do was to modernize machine No. 3. Mr. Speaker, they have five years in order to do that under the contract. My understanding of the contract - the minister may correct me if he wishes - is that that is a binding contract and they have not been let out of their obligation. If

they have, I wish he would stand up in this House somewhere along the line and tell us if they have. Since we as a Legislature passed the legislation and the agreement was part of it, it would seem to me, Mr. Speaker, that the contract can only be amended back here in the Legislature, and it will be interesting to see if the minister does come back with a piece of legislation later on to do it.

It is clear in the report referred to by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, the Poole Royal Commission Report, just to continue on with the points, that we do not have the shortage of wood that is alleged in that report, when one takes into account the possibility of using wood from Labrador. And if anybody is familiar with the map, and if everyone knows where Corner Brook is, you can see how close Corner Brook is to the shores of Labrador; it is not a large distance for people to travel, and under those circumstances it is clearly possible to do some sort of wood harvesting arrangement on the Southern Labrador in order to bring more wood back to increase the production level.

Mr. Speaker, just in summarizing the comments we would like to make on this, we are very disappointed with the government's approach to the management of our forests in general. We have shown, or at least we have alleged, and I am waiting to see evidence that it is not, that virtually nothing in terms of donations to the provincial coffers comes from anyone of our major paper companies, because it is virtually impossible for us to see what they pay in corporation taxes since the government has not divulged it.

We know they pay virtually nothing in terms of stumpage fees or wood management fees. The total, in fact, was, I think, less than \$2 million, in the last statement we had, in 1986 I believe, and on that basis there is clearly an indication that they are not doing very much.

So, Mr. Speaker, what we have is a resource that is one of the fundamental pillars of our economy, along with iron ore and fish, and what we also have is very little coming from the corporate owners of this resource into the coffers of the government in order to provide things such as the woods roads, which we do under our agreements with the federal government, in order to do the spraying programme, which is done, even under questionable circumstances, by the minister over there, when he will not listen to the advice being given by his experts; he decides to actually eclipse them by going and making the decision before he can get expert advice in order to find out whether he should do the kind of spraying he is doing.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, what is needed is a good New Democrat kind of policy in woods management, and that is that the first thing is the companies which are there reaping the benefits and the profits must pay their fair share in order to maintain that woods resource. That means, Mr. Speaker, higher stumpage fees, more of a contribution to the woods roads programmes, more of a contribution to any kind of spraying programmes that are necessary, more corporate taxes, and not fiddling around by sticking them under companies that are existing all over the country and which pay virtually little to

us. So they have to pay for their resources.

Mr. Speaker, I say to you, and I say it now because it is time to say it in this Legislature, that that is one of our absolute priorities to see happen. If we cannot increase the stumpage fees and the other kinds of management fees that are required of these companies in order to make them pay their fair share, then we will attack them on the terms of their corporation tax, and, Mr. Speaker, we will attack them in a way that I think is novel in the future. Instead of hoping for some sort of corporate profits on a national level that we can get 16 per cent of, which is our normal procedure, what we will demand is that they actually start paying on the profits that they generate in our Province itself, irrespective of whatever corporately is done by federal Ottawa. If money is being made in Grand Falls, then let us have them pay some taxes on what is being done in Grand Falls. If they are making money in Stephenville and Corner Brook, then let us see some corporate taxes being paid on them, no matter what kind of financial gobbledygook they go through in order to write off their profits with their other losses in oil industries and so on.

Mr. Speaker, that is the only way we can start making them pay their fair share in the tax system. Mr. Speaker, we must make them, especially Corner Brook Pulp and Paper, live up to their obligations that they signed contractually and we sanctioned here in this Legislature. That is to finish machine No. 3 so that we will have a future base of employment in Corner Brook, and stop making the weak excuse that

there is not an adequate wood supply, when, in fact, this very resolution points out the massive wood supply that is available in order to be used to prop up that particular operation and expand it to the level it should be.

Mr. Speaker, having said that and having given you an indication of what a good New Democrat kind of government, which is really working for the people and not the corporations, will do, I will sit down and allow whoever else wishes to, to join the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

The Minister of Forest Resources (Mr. R. Aylward) does not know whether to stand up or not when the Speaker says, Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. I am standing up, I suppose, in my previous capacity as Minister of Forest Resources and Lands for a few years in the early 1980s.

Mr. Speaker, I was not going to speak to this resolution, even though I certainly enthusiastically support this resolution by the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons). It is a very well-worded resolution and certainly one which this government is very firmly committed to.

I was not going to waste the time of the House today to give you my

few comments on forestry, but having gone over for a little query with the Opposition House Leader (Mr. Tulk) about another matter, and listening to the silly comments of the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) and the absolute frivolous, silly and irresponsible comments of the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Furey) about spray programmes, I just thought it was right, from my perspective, that I should make a few comments about spray programmes, forest management and the range of forest opportunities we have in this Province.

MR. FENWICK:

What about taxes?

MR. POWER:

Taxes are part of it, but I also have to say, and I might as well say it -

MR. BAKER:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

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

MR. BAKER:

Mr. Speaker, I wonder would the minister care to outline the silly and frivolous statements made by the member for Gander?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! There is no point of order.

MR. POWER:

I have two lots of silly, frivolous comments to react to. One is the idea that Abitibi-Price and Kruger contribute nothing to the people or the Province or the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. The second silly

position I wish to react to, and it has been silly, it has been irresponsible for the member for Gander (Mr. Baker) since I first met him back in 1981 when we were going to spray the forests of this Province in order to protect the thousands upon thousands and even tens of thousands of jobs in many, many parts of Newfoundland. The Liberal Party position in 1981 for the spray programme was then - it has not changed - and is now against chemical use of spray in our forests. It is irresponsible and poorly thought out. They want to have a forest that is managed by insects.

I remember once in this House asking, 'Do you want us to get more water bombers to protect trees? You do not want us to have planes that will spray on insects to protect our forest. It will kill a tree just as certainly as a forest fire will.' The Liberal Opposition's comments are just as silly as that.

They want us to do in this jurisdiction what is being done no place else, to spray only Bt on large acreages which has not been proved effective. All that can happen, Mr. Speaker, if the forests of this Province were being managed, God forbid, by the Liberal Party, then what we would have in this Province is another bunch of people laid off because of a poorly managed resource.

MR. FUREY:

I wonder would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. POWER:

Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. Barbe.

MR. FUREY:

Did the minister read The Canadian Forestry Service's scientific paper with respect to the limited experiment on the timber stands last year in Newfoundland with respect to the Bt spraying that said the results were exceptional and safe? The hemlock looper were killed and no foliage around was spoiled.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. POWER:

The point of it all is that, yes, it might be exceptionally safe. But what happens if it is not economic? What happens if you cannot spray something economically? That is where these socialists take their irresponsibility -

MR. FENWICK:

You do not care what you do with the people, it is just economics now.

MR. FUREY:

Yes, kill them.

MR. POWER:

Well, if somebody could prove to someone in this Province, which I have not seen, and this Minister of Forest Resources (Mr. R. Aylward) and the President of the Council (Mr. Simms) now has not seen in his term as Minister of Forestry, nobody has been able to prove there have been substantial, significant or even miniscule health damages by the spray programme in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Show me somebody who has been sick because of our spray programme. Show me someone who is in hospital.

We found there was a big racket because some kook, who happened to have a medical degree up in Nova Scotia, who came from Newfoundland, a kook, a kook who did not understand, did not forest spray, who said that Reye's syndrome, this terrible disease which affects some children, was caused by spray programmes.

It was found that painting the kid's bedrooms was the main source of the problem. It was not the spray programmes in Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, or Newfoundland.

MR. LONG:

Are you saying (inaudible) is absolutely not dangerous?

MR. POWER:

It is very dangerous if you are an insect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

if you are the insect that is in competition with man for a resource, in order to employ people and make our economy better, then I want the insect to lose that battle. I am not in favor of the insect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

They are also a natural predator of trees, which man needs to create employment and to make our society better. Now, what are you going to do in any kind of a battle? Are you going to take your lumps with the insects and

let nature play its course? Should we also say that fire is quite natural? Fire is a natural enemy to old forests. When forests get old, they die from something. One of the things that old forests die from is forest fires. Now, should we not touch forest fires? Should we allow forest fires to consume our forests the same as we allow insects, if we have the Liberal and NDP opposition comments to prevail in this Province.

The facts of it are that we have an extremely well managed forest in Newfoundland. The resolution from the member for St. John's East Extern talks about extending that good forest management, those good economic advantages and opportunities to the people of Labrador, where there happens to be a very substantial wood resource that we want to develop. Now, how anybody could be opposed to that, for the life of me, I will never know.

How you could be against good forest management, how you can quibble, how you can talk about the economics of forest spray programmes, and say that by spraying Bt, just spray it, whatever the cost is beyond me.

If we wanted to do that, I suppose we could send people in with fly squatters. We could hire 5,000 to 8,000 people, and attach one to the bottom of each tree, and pay them \$20,000 a year to kill every insect that shows up there.

If you want to have something that is absolutely safe, then we would not even spray Bt because of the danger with Bt. If you live in Gander, and there is a plane taking off across the runway with a load of Bt, who is to say that

the plane will not crash? That is a danger. It is a danger if you live around an airport. It is a danger.

Well, if you want to have something that is absolutely safe, no danger to anybody, and all you want to get is that little small insect, if that is the kind of world that the Opposition parties live in, then I hope they never get the chance to be responsible governors of any part of this country.

MR. LONG:

You say Bt is too expensive.

MR. POWER:

Bt is expensive, it cannot be done effectively over a large range of forests and dead forests, as the Minister of Forestry says, dead forests are very expensive.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Hear, hear!

MR. POWER:

I remember the comment that was made by the Newfoundland Medical Association when we talked in 1981 about the spray programme for the first large spray programme we had in Newfoundland for many years. The Newfoundland Medical Association, who are the people you ask for medical advise from, all these terrible sick people that I do not know where they are to, I have not had one case, I do not know if the Minister of Health has one. I do not think the government has one of one case of somebody who has gone to hospital who has died, or who has had a shorter life span because of a spray programme in Newfoundland. There has not been one, and this was all the alarmists, things that we heard in 1981.

The Newfoundland Medical Association are medical advisors who had a lot more common sense than members opposite when they said, the Medical Association said, 'We know the effects of unemployment. They are wife abuse, child abuse, alcoholism, sickness, a lot of health problems,' a whole range of social problems related to unemployment. All they said was, 'The known effects of unemployment are an awful lot greater than the unknown effects, whatever they might be, of any spray programme.' So we managed the forest resource really well for the last ten years.

I remember when the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) was Minister of Forestry just before I took over. In 1978, we planted 100,000 trees in Newfoundland. This year, the Minister of Forest Resources tells me we are going to plant 12 million. That is not a bad increase over less than a ten-year period. It is a very substantial forest management programme that we have.

The members opposite have to realize that you cannot just have pretty green trees growing up when you have insects and fires that attack those trees. You have to have programmes to defend those trees, and we call them spray programmes. We are in favour of it.

I guess the other part I should make a comment on, because again it is just a sign of the irresponsible attitudes of members opposite sometimes, who talk about the Krugers and Abitibi-Prices of the world, particularly these two members here who are, but very often down here at the same time, saying that these people do not contribute to the Province. Try

and tell somebody who works in Corner Brook that they do not pay their fair share.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. POWER:

I tell you what now. In 1984, I was involved every day in the negotiations for Kruger and Bowaters. If somebody said to the council in Corner Brook and somebody talked to the unions in Corner Brook, that are now gripping because Number 3 machine is not being upgraded, even though Kruger is spending well in excess of what they said they would spend on modernization, spent it faster than anybody believed they would spend it, if somebody said in 1984, 'You can have Bowaters, but only if you pay municipal taxes.' The people of Corner Brook made a decision. The council of Corner Brook, the members of the union, made the decision that it was better to have Kruger operate in Corner Brook than it was to have a change in municipal taxation so they can get \$500,000 a year.

The reality of it was that the people of Corner Brook, the council in Corner Brook, took a responsible position. They accepted the fact that in order to have a large operating mill with many employees, with many, many benefits to the City of Corner Brook, that they were willing to take that and accept the 1938 Act as it was and go along with Kruger.

That is why Kruger today is one of the great success stories in this Province. When I hear the Leader of the NDP (Mr. Fenwick) get up and criticize Kruger for being a poor corporate citizen, for not taking the responsible role in

paying taxes, in giving things to the people of Newfoundland, I just think that it is really, really irresponsible.

If we could get Kruger to go into Lake Melville and start a new pulp and paper mill, do you think the people in Lake Melville will say, 'No, they cannot come in unless they pay municipal taxes?' You know they will not say that because any town council and any municipal government will be glad to say, 'You bring me in 500 jobs, you bring me in a payroll of \$8 million, \$10 million, or \$12 million a year, you bring me in buying power of another \$10 or \$12 million a year, and any council knows that the benefits are going to be there for that community.' That is the reality of economics in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. LONG:

You are saying create jobs at any cost. (Inaudible).

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker, yes, the people of Corner Brook decided at any cost, the cost of municipal taxation, they preferred Kruger. The people of Corner Brook had a chance to voice either support for that agreement or non-support, and it was very enthusiastically supported by the council in Corner Brook, by the unions in Corner Brook, and by all the people of Corner Brook.

I can remember going to the press conference with the Premier. I tell you right now, if anybody thinks that in Corner Brook in 1984 there was disappointment because we had found a sale for a plant that Bowaters really wanted to close down, I tell you you were not in Corner Brook. The members of Humber East and Humber West

were certainly there, and I tell you that there was a lot of joy and a lot of happiness in Corner Brook and nobody was upset because they could not have municipal taxation.

Everybody was delighted because they had a great business opportunity and the community was not going to be closed down, which it very likely could have been.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMONS:

No press conference (inaudible).

MR. POWER:

Well, that happens from time to time. It depends on what you are at, I suppose. We had them on Sprung last week, or the week before.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. POWER:

Again, I do not know whether these are socialists down here or more socialists over here.

MR. LONG:

I am from Gander (inaudible).

MR. TOBIN:

They are conservatives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. POWER:

I wish that you would go down to Labrador and ask the town council, ask the Mokami Project Group, and ask the other persons that we talked to in Labrador who have an unemployment problem. I hear it from the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) about the unemployment problem; I hear it from the member

for Menihek (Mr Fenwick) about the unemployment and social problems in Labrador. We are talking about bringing in a resource and we have people here who are criticizing a company that might be the principle operator of that resource.

MR. FENWICK:

We are criticizing the fact they pay no taxes.

MR. POWER:

You are criticizing the fact that you do not want to compromise, you want absolutely everything given by the companies when, in reality, there has to be a give and take in all business opportunities. There are not a lot of businesses lined up to go into Lake Melville to do a large pulp and paper forest industry, so if there is only one prospective buyer or user of that resource, do you think that we have to make deals? The Newfoundland government has to make some concessions; the town council in Lake Melville might have to make some concessions, because if you do not believe, then you will never get a project. You persons who talk about having full employment in Newfoundland, you cannot do it unless you make those kind of arrangements.

All I can say, Mr. Speaker, in closing is that I am glad to see the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons), in the short time he has been in this Legislature, has an interest in not only his own riding, not only his own part of Newfoundland, not only in the only industry that he has lived with, the fishery, but also has broadened his perspective and his horizons to talk about other things in Newfoundland.

I am just glad to see that the forest resource in Labrador, which has tremendous potential, might be developed for the benefit of the people of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to speak in this debate for a few minutes in the short period of time that we have left, and also, at this present time, congratulate my colleague for Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) on his successful nomination. He is now going to be the candidate for Port de Grave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

The first of many to go.

With reference, Mr. Speaker, to the resolution, we support the trust of the resolution. We would like to see an industry in Labrador when it comes to the forest industry.

Looking at the Canada Newfoundland Forest Resource Agreement for 1986-1990, Mr. Speaker, there was a reference to Labrador and it indicates that the forest resource in Labrador is scattered and so on but that there is an excellent opportunity for development of a forest industry there and for a pulp and paper mill. It is something that we should pursue.

It is in the forestry agreement that was signed with the federal government, Mr. Speaker. There are exact references to the future development of Labrador and specifically the Goose Bay area.

I know the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Kelland) has been working on a full-time basis to get interested parties and development there that would see employment created in that area. There is great potential for a viable forest industry there. Zone four, as it is on the map, Mr. Speaker, has a very strong potential.

There is a good supply of quality saw timber that could see a large sawmill complex a possibility. As a matter of fact, in the agreement that was signed with the federal government, it talks about promotional material to market the resource can be developed and distributed to interested agencies.

On behalf of this side, Mr. Speaker, we hope that that marketing material promoting the possibilities of a forest industry in the Labrador region will be completed. Since this agreement was signed in 1986 we have seen some developments towards that end. So some marketing expertise and some marketing work needs to be done to let companies know that there is an opportunity in Labrador that should be developed and that it should be looked at very seriously and pushed by this provincial government, along with the federal government.

It is something that has not been allowed to progress, Mr. Speaker, despite many efforts, and it is something that we on this side support in supporting the thrust of this resolution put forward by

the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons).

Mr. Speaker, I have a mill in Stephenville, an Abitibi-Price Mill, and a very good one, one of the top notch mills in the world, as a matter of fact, not only in Canada.

I want to give good credit, Mr. Speaker, to the former Liberal government in Ottawa that saw to it that monies were supplied to the mill in Stephenville to get it reactivated. A \$70 million reactivation was undertaken, \$13.5 from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. The late Don Jamieson was Minister, Mr. Speaker, and they made sure that that mill was started in Stephenville. We had \$1.5 million contribution from the provincial government but you know, Mr. Speaker, the federal government at the time saw that it was important and they went and they put it to work, and they were able to get a viable industry out of the former linerboard mill. Today that mill survives very well. It has gone into markets, Mr. Speaker, in Europe that the Abitibi-Price Company were unable to do before and those markets are expanding. The product at the mill is quite good and the productivity is one of the highest in Canada. So, they have come a long way since those years in 1978.

We also have seen the development of an access road down to the mill which is something that was intended at the time and that occurred.

But I point out, Mr. Speaker, that it was the big bad Liberal government at the time in Ottawa that helped with lots of money to make sure that that agreement was

signed and that Stephenville had a second life and was able to survive. It is doing very well, Mr. Speaker, it is doing very well.

I would like to make one other point before we let the member clue up on his motion. The former agreement that was signed with the former federal government was signed in 1981 and saw \$60 million spent jointly, most of it, 90 percent of it spent in this Province, was funded by the federal government.

What we see with the new agreement, Mr. Speaker, was something that we brought up at the time. The new Canada-Newfoundland Forest Resources Agreement, signed in 1986, which will last until 1990, saw less money, Mr. Speaker, being spent here in the Province, through the plain fact it was a 70/30 deal. At the time we asked the Minister of Forestry why he would sign a deal that sees a 70/30 cost share with a government of same stripe, then when you had a former government, which you were always attacking, which had with you a 90/10 deal. Those questions have remained unanswered.

They concern me, Mr. Speaker, as a person who represents an area that has a very big dependency upon the forest industry because the amounts of money that is allocated, and the figures shown here show it, though we are preaching silviculture and we want to see it, the figures here are a lot less than they were in the former agreement. That concerns me as it concerns all members on this side of the House. That intention may be there but the money to make it a reality is not there and that question has to be addressed either by the provincial

government coming up with more funding and putting forward more monies for silviculture and forest access roads, or by renegotiating the agreement with Ottawa. There is less money.

The two agreements can each be held up and you will see there was less money being put by the federal government into the forests of Newfoundland and Labrador. This is something I feel should not be allowed to go on. There should be a stronger commitment made by the federal government to the forest industry in this Province.

If that is done, along with a co-operative provincial government, we will see the forest industry here in the Province being revitalized and continue to contribute a great deal to the economy of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I feel that these considerations should be given by the hon. Minister of Forestry and this government when it comes to developing the industry. I think that Labrador is an excellent example of where the development of the industry can occur. While it is in and there is a reference to it in this agreement that has been signed since 1986 - it is two years since this agreement has been signed - we would like to see some examples of where this marketing of that possibility is going to happen.

We would like to see the reality of what the words are here become true, Mr. Speaker, so that the people in the Goose Bay area, and all of Labrador, will be able to avail of the opportunity and will see initiatives started that will help cure the unemployment problem that we have.

Hopefully, we will see that, Mr. Speaker. We, in the Opposition, will continue to pursue that and we look forward to bigger, better, and brighter things in the next few years.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:
The hon. the member for St. John's East Extern.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is really delightful for me to be able to get up this evening to close this debate, and be able to say that there was some great input from all members of this hon. House.

I think that all Newfoundlanders and Labradorians agree, both inside this House and outside, that there is quite a potential in Labrador, and certainly this government has tried its best to address those situations and to bring about, in an orderly fashion, the development of the resource of Labrador, so, again, it will help Labradorians and Newfoundlanders.

Mr. Speaker, I think, first, I should address some of the questions that were asked of me by the hon. member from the opposite side. The first one was asked when we were speaking about Labrador. One of the hon. members from the other side - he is not in

his seat now, I wish he was - asked where I was when the factory freezer trawler situation came about.

MR. GILBERT:
Is this going to help the fishery (inaudible)?

MR. SPEAKER:
Order, please!

MR. PARSONS:
I will remind the hon. member over there, it was the member for Fortune - Hermitage who asked the question. All I am doing is answering his question, Mr. Speaker. He wondered where I was.

Well, I was not in the hon. House. I was not a member of the Legislature, but my colleagues here were, and, even though there was a government in Ottawa at the time with the same stripe, it did not sway them or hinder them in any way to fight Ottawa tooth and nail to try to stop that, Mr. Speaker. We all felt the same way. There is one factory freezer trawler out there now. Mr. Speaker, that is why I address it, all my colleagues here, even though, Mr. Speaker, and I repeat myself, the same government, with the same stripe was in Ottawa, they did not stop there. They tried their best. The same could not be said for the members on the other side.

Then the other question was asked, where was I on the Canada - France deal? I felt the same as the hon. the Premier and the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) did. I stated so in this House. In fact, Mr. Speaker, I said a monument should be built to the two people, to the hon. the Premier and the Minister of

Fisheries for their stand.

MR. FUREY:

Where were you on Confederation?

MR. PARSONS:

Where was I when Confederation was being put? Mr. Speaker, I was going to say I was not born then, but they would not believe me.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt where I stood on the Canada - France deal and I still stand the same way, with the same drive within me. It should never have been in the first place. I asked the hon. member from the other side, where was he to in 1972? This is the agreement where all of this came from. The 1972 agreement. Let me ask the hon. members from the other side about the Liberal Government in Ottawa who brought this about. Yes, they gave away the fish in 2J and 3KL. They gave away the fish in 1972. There was not one word about it.

MR. FUREY:

You must be crazy (inaudible) 200-mile limit.

MR. PARSONS:

Let me tell you, it states: 'In the event of a modification to the judicial regime relating to the waters situated beyond the present limits.' They were talking about 1977, when we got the 200-mile limit. They took that. But they said they were given the rights to fish within those limits. Now we hear so much about the Canada - France deal. These were the perpetrators of the insult to Newfoundland, of the degrading aspect of it.

MR. FUREY:

So will there be trade sanctions against France?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. PARSONS:

Will there be trade sanctions? I think that the Minister of Development and Tourism (Mr. Barrett) explained that truthfully today and fully when he stated that to bring in sanctions would not interfere really with any thing they are actually doing in France, but to deprive our own people of work and dollars that are certainly needed in our Province.

I want to go back to when he asked me about the fish deal and where I stood on it. I wondered where those hon. gentlemen stand on the 1972 treaty. I mean, that is it. There is very little emphasis placed on it, but that is the whole sum and substance, the body of this whole deal that is out there now. That is what it was based on. They had right to keep the 1904 treaty. It was much better than that.

MR. TULK:

What about the forestry in Labrador?

MR. PARSONS:

Instead of that, what they should have done in 1972. I am getting to that.

MR. TULK:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I do not like to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but there is such a thing as relevance and Your Honour knows that we are talking about the hon. gentleman's

own motion. We are talking about the forestry industry in Labrador and he spent the last six or seven minutes on the fishery. I would ask Your Honour to call him to order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order. I do think that the hon. member was straying from the resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

I am sorry about that, Mr. Speaker. It upset me in such a way when he was asking me all those questions over there that I thought I should have the right to answer the questions, and this is the only time that I can get the right.

Mr. Speaker, again, we are going back to the Sprung situation. There were questions on the Sprung situation, and this is relevant, Mr. Speaker. I was surprised this morning with the comments from the member for Naskaupi, but glory be, I cannot address that either. I am going to address the Sprung technology, the initiative--

MR. TULK:

From fisheries to Sprung to where next?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I would ask the hon. member for St. John's East Extern to confine his closing remarks to his resolution.

MR. PARSONS:

Mr. Speaker, I am going to address it. I talk about Sprung because I have heard from people that, down the road we are going to be able

to have seedlings in the Sprung greenhouse that will grow in a proportion like, one year in the greenhouse might be equivalent to ten years in our environment. That is true and this is relevant.

MR. SIMMS:

You have done some marvelous research.

MR. PARSONS:

And there is some research going on now, Mr. Speaker. If it comes about, Mr. Speaker, it will be relevant. It will be great for Labrador, and, indeed, Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, as far as the forest resources in Labrador are concerned, we have a programme now of silviculture in Labrador where I think last year there was 360,000 seedlings there, and with improvements in the greenhouses there, I think the acquisition of one or two more, that should be brought up to 600,000. I know that that is nothing great but, Mr. Speaker, it is an improvement and it certainly shows this government's interest in Labrador and its forest potential.

Mr. Speaker, let me ask a question of the hon. Opposition. They asked me a lot of questions during my resolution. I would like to ask a question. Where were the members from Labrador today when they were invited to a meeting with Marine Atlantica? Where were the members from Labrador then? They had invitations to the meeting.

MR. FUREY:

What has this to do with trees?

MR. PARSONS:

It has everything to do with it, it pertained to Labrador in general and to shipping. Shipping

is one aspect of Labrador's resources which include forestry. But where were they to today, Mr. Speaker?

Then we had our own socialists down there in the corner get up. I was listening to them this evening. All they wanted to do is throw out all the corporations, throw out all the businesses, and bring in more social programmes. Mr. Speaker, they are for the birds, there is no other description for them. They are gone out of it altogether. I should not be even relating to the nonsense that the hon. member got on with when he rose today from in his seat. 'Throw out the good co-operative citizens, bring in more social programmes!' I do not know what he even wanted!

There were concessions made in those areas as it pertains to taxes. Why not? I mean, if that is to bring someone in, I would like to see the town that would not forego some forms of taxation to increase its potential as far as work is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, again I have to talk about the spray programme, a programme that is so essential for our forests.

Mr. Speaker, it is a known fact that in the 1960s, I am not sure which year, the Smallwood government used fenitrothion and show me something today that says it was a mistake. What did it do? Last year, from what I hear in this House, there was one songbird killed - one songbird killed - and now they will get up and go on with this old, foolish dialogue, everyday in Question Period. You know, one songbird! How many jobs were created by keeping the forests intact from

those pests? But everyone in the Opposition gets up, including their leader, and all they say is, What about that poor songbird? The poor songbird! Glory be to goodness, if that is all they have to talk about, then how much time is being wasted in this hon. House. Wasted! And I love birds. I do! I love all animals.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. PARSONS:

I do not mind the hon. members. Sometimes their minds are in the gutter.

MR. TULK:

(Inaudible) turrs?

MR. PARSONS:

Turrs, ducks, you name it. Mr. Speaker, on the spray programme and silviculture, the enthusiasm from this government exceeds all our expectations.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about Labrador and its forests potential. In 1985 there was a forest fire in Labrador and acres and acres were destroyed. Mr. Speaker, there is a programme underway now where they are going in there and they are cleaning it out and silviculture will again be a part of the ploy to-

MR. KELLAND:

I have five dollars on you to (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

I do not mind the hon. member from Naskaupi. He should be at that meeting today, learning about the things in Labrador that are essential to Labrador. That is

where he should have been, not worrying about my eight minutes. I can manage my eight minutes.

Since you are talking about the eight minutes, one of the hon. members got up there and said that the Premier gave me the resolution. Well, now, he did not. He did not give me the resolution. But I am sure that he felt I was quite capable of getting up and speaking on the resources of Labrador and Newfoundland, either one of them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PARSONS:

And if he played some role in my obtaining that resolution, then my hat is off to him.

Mr. Speaker, we will go back to Labrador and the Lake Melville - Goose Bay area. There are problems down there, Mr. Speaker, there are problems existing in every facet of our environment. And there are problems there with the production of wood.

Mr. Speaker, if this government sees the positive side, and they are seeing it, of the Lake Melville - Goose bay area and brings in that thermal mechanical plant, that will do this wood in a different way. All we can conceive is logs being shipped, and that in itself, Mr. Speaker, was the problem. It created a problem because of the season, the six months when the place is covered with ice and is very hard to navigate by ordinary shipping. But, Mr. Speaker, if that thermal mechanical plant were built there, I can see where this process could go on for the twelve months of the year and the product could be stored there even if the

navigational aspect of it was not looked into. Because of the ice, Mr. Speaker, the navigational part of it may not be feasible, but if it were not, then I could not see - I am told it is like bales of hay - why those bales could not be stored in the Lake Melville - Goose Bay area and shipped out when the season was right for it.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close, because hon. members are tired over there. They are always tired, and they are off the beaten track. The hon. member for Fogo was up telling me that I had no right to talk about cucumbers, and I had no right to address the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage. I must say, sometimes those hon. members come up with some good things. But you will all get lots of rest after the next election.

I would like to close, Mr. Speaker, by quoting a great Newfoundlander. And when he retires, about twenty years from now, he will go down in history, Mr. Speaker, for doing what we all should be doing, not be filled with negativity, but be positive and try to get people in here to develop our resources so that they will be beneficial for Newfoundland and Labrador. The Premier, the hon. Brian Peckford, states: 'I extend an invitation to you in the world business community to become familiar with the excellent opportunities for the development of our Labrador forest resource.' Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

I am going to blush here next, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order.

MR. TULK:

There is no need, I do not think, for us to have a division on this. Certainly we on this side, at least the Liberal side, would like to support the hon. gentleman's resolution and we want the record to show that it is unanimous.

MR. SIMMONS:

Record on division.

MR. SPEAKER:

Are you ready for the question?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

MR. SPEAKER:

All those in favour of the resolution please say, 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:

Those against 'Nay'.

MR. TULK:

Not a sound.

MR. SPEAKER:

The resolution is carried, unanimously.

MR. TULK:

Now, we expect to see this done in Labrador within the next year.

MR. SPEAKER:

The House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 p.m.

Index

Answers to Questions

tabled

May 18, 1988

3)

Tabled by Hon. Minister
of Health 18 May '88

QUESTION #140

QUESTION: Mr. Fenwick (Menihok) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) A list of all individuals appointed in his Department since April 2, 1985, that did not go through the Public Service Commission, were not subject to an advertisement and a competition.
- (b) The names of the individuals appointed into each of these positions.

RESPONSE: For the period referred to above, there were no appointments to permanent positions within the Department of Health that were not subject to advertisement and a competition.

It is noted that a number of physicians have been recruited by the Department to provide services in hard-to-fill medical practices throughout the Province. Medical positions are exempted from the provisions of The Public Service Commission Act.

(4)

QUESTION NO. 88

Tabled by Hon.
Min. of Health,
18 May, 1988

QUESTION: Mr. Efford (Port-de-Grave) - To ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) How many people currently work on the Minister's staff?
- (b) How many of these persons were appointed by Order-in-Council?
- (c) List each title and salary applied to that title.
- (d) Table a job description for each Order-in-Council appointment.
- (e) Were any of these jobs advertised in order to give the unemployed the chance of applying?

RESPONSE: (a) There are currently three people working on the Minister's staff.

(b) The three members of the Minister's staff were appointed by Order-in-Council.

(c) Secretary to the Minister - \$25,785
Secretary to the Minister - \$25,785
Special Assistant to the Minister - \$37,241

(d) Position Descriptions Attached for Secretary to the Minister. There is no position description for the Special Assistant to the Minister.

(e) The Public Service Commission Act does not apply to appointments to these positions. Therefore, these positions were not advertised.

SECRETARY TO MINISTER

*Added by Hon.
Minister of Health,
15 May, 1988*

DEFINITION OF WORK

This is secretarial work of an administrative nature involving responsibility for facilitating general ministerial duties and details for a minister.

Employees of this class serve as secretaries to ministers, performing responsible and complex secretarial work in carrying out important delegated detail duties involving general ministerial responsibilities. Duties require the confidential processing of correspondence and other work details, and sensitivity to the nature of the minister's position. Incumbents must use independent judgement in resolving varied problems which do not involve major deviation from established policy or procedure. Responsibility for the conduct of varied public contacts is a major component of the job. The evaluation of work results is made through discussions with the superior.

ILLUSTRATIVE EXAMPLES OF WORK

As secretary to a minister, takes and transcribes dictation and prepares correspondence, memoranda, and similar papers.

Prepares correspondence for superior's signature.

Conducts correspondence and answers inquiries from constituents and other members of the public, adjusting complaints or supplying information explaining government policies and departmental procedures; receives, interviews, and directs office visitors; interprets regulations according to defined standards, and applies rules to a variety of work situations.

Acts as a secretarial intermediary for the superior, maintaining frequent contacts for the minister with public and private officials, professional persons, and members of the public.

Makes appointments and arranges minister's schedule; determines suitable times for meetings; completes travel arrangements.

Performs related work as required.

DESIRABLE EXPERIENCE AND TRAINING

Extensive secretarial experience of a progressively responsible nature; graduation from high school including or supplemented by courses in business practices including stenography and typewriting; or any equivalent combination of experience and training.

CONTENTS

WEDNESDAY, 18 MAY, 1988.

Statements by Ministers

Science and Technology Advancement Update:

Mr. Barrett.....	2059
Mr. Kelland.....	2061

Canada/France Boundary Dispute Update:

Mr. Barrett.....	2061
Mr. Wells.....	2062
Mr. Fenwick.....	2063

Oral Questions

Upper Churchill:

Meaning of 'window of opportunity' Minister referred to in interviews. Mr. Wells, Mr. Windsor.....	2064
--	------

Forest Spraying Programme:

Why Bt is not being used for all spraying. Mr. Furey, Mr. R. Aylward.....	2064
---	------

Did the Pesticide Advisory Board recommend Bt be used for up to 50 percent of the programme. Mr. Furey, Mr. R. Aylward.....	2065
---	------

Was the decision announced yesterday by the Minister made without reference to the recommendation of the Advisory Board. Mr. Long, Mr. R. Aylward.....	2069
--	------

Same question to the Minister of the Environment. Mr. Long, Mr. Russell.....	2070
--	------

Has the Minister of Forest Resources issued licenses with the approval for which the Minister of Environment is responsible. Mr. Long, Mr. Russell.....	2070
---	------

Forest Spraying (continued):

Has the Minister granted a licence for spraying without as reference to the Pesticide Advisory Board. Mr. Baker, Mr. Russell.....2072

Sprung Project:

Since the success of the project was predicated on the base price of \$1.08, how can the cucumbers be sold in Halifax for fifty-nine cents. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Power.....2067

Why are Newfoundland taxpayers subsidizing Nova Scotia consumers. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Power.....2068

Is Newfoundland Enviroponics making a profit or a loss on the sale of cucumbers in Nova Scotia. Mr. Kelland, Mr. Power.....2071

Johnson - Metro Board Dispute:

Has a solution been found; plans to ensure fair treatment for families living in the area. Mr. Lush, Mr. Brett.....2072

Does Metro Board's offer represent a fair market price. Mr. Lush, Mr. Brett.....2073

Obligation of the government which appointments Metro Board. Mr. Lush, Mr. Brett.....2074

Social Services:

Departmental policy on paying for
refugees' accommodation at Gander.
Mr. Efford, Mr. Tobin.....2074

Departmental policy on paying for
transportation and/or meals for social
service recipients travelling to hospitals
in St. John's. Mr. Efford, Mr. Tobin.....2074

Why does a refugee receive \$750 per month
for food and have lodging provided while a
recipient living in Bay Roberts receives only
\$14 to travel to the Health Sciences Complex.
Mr. Efford, Mr. Tobin.....2075

Claims Newfoundlanders do not receive
enough money for food and transportation
when they visit the Complex. Mr. Efford
Mr. Tobin.....2076

**Answers to Questions
for which Notice has been Given**

Employment in the Health Department:

Dr. Collins.....2077

Private Member's Day

Mr. Lush, resumes debate.....2078
Mr. Simms.....2080
Mr. Gilbert.....2086
Mr. Woodford.....2091
Mr. Fenwick.....2097
Mr. Power.....2103
Mr. K. Aylward.....2109
Mr. Parsons, concludes debate.....2112

On motion, Mr. Parsons's motion carried unanimously....2117

Adjournment.....2117