

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
2:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
MONDAY, MAY 29, 1978

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Before calling the routine orders, I will give hon. members my decision on the matter on which I heard argument Friday and informed hon. members that I would I would give my decision today.

I will preface it by saying that it is the most difficult matter on which I have had to decide during the three years I have been in the Chair, much more difficult than other matters which were quite controversial and not without complexity, but this the most difficult one.

The matter on which a decision rests was formally and technically put forward under a submission on privilege, and argument was heard from two hon. gentlemen to my left, and two hon. gentlemen to my right, at that time. Substantively, the matter to be decided is in effect the following, and although there are two ways of putting it, it comes to the same thing. One way of putting it is: does an hon. member have a right to table the tape of a telephone conversation and transcript thereof involving another hon. member, without that other hon. member's permission? Another way of putting it is: does an hon. member have a right to require that his telephone conversations remain private? Because the decision I give will decide, in this instance, those two matters, they are two sides of one coin or two aspects of one question.

I should say that I am not aware of any situations which might be regarded as precedents in this House, in the Canadian House of Commons or in British practice. Beauchesne, section 159, subsection (3), which

7910

MR. SPEAKER: I will not read, deals essentially with the question of when documents must be tabled. We are now in a situation where I have to make a decision on whether certain documents may be tabled. That is what this decision is. The decision is not that at this time certain documents must be tabled, but whether certain documents may be tabled. And that is where I find paragraph (3) of Beauchesne, section 159, of no guidance to me.

In my opinion there are two rights involved, two rights of members. There is the right of freedom of speech which every hon. member has. It is not absolute, no right is. There are limitations; a reflection on the royal family, matters sub judice, unparliamentary expressions, and, obviously, that members are responsible for what they say. There is also the right of a member to privacy of communication with respect to his letters or correspondence in that sense, and with respect to telephone conversations.

In the submissions put forward on Friday, there were two areas on which I will not comment and I think I should point out why because the submissions were at some length and reasoned. There were submissions which were of a political nature dealing with Mr. Davidson, his alleged or possible relationships with others, alleged wrongdoing with respect to party financing, etc. I regard all of those matters as political and not matters on which my decision is involved. There were also submission with respect to the Criminal Code, the possibility of criminality involved in the procurement or use of this material, and the rules of evidence, the admissability of evidence, with reference to the hearsay rules and possible breaches of other statutes.

7911

MR. SPEAKER: I have to say as well that I will not deal with those matters. I do not have the authority to deal with those matters. These are matters which must be decided, if they are to be decided, in another forum. These are matters on which a court could, and has the jurisdiction to make decisions, not the House. What I have to apply, therefore, is not the political considerations and not the legal considerations in the sense of matters reserved for decision in court, but a very specific area of law, if one wishes, what May calls the law and custom of Parliament. That is what I am limited to, and that is what is applicable here.

Now I refer to two rights, the right of freedom of speech and the right of a member to privacy of communication. In my opinion, it is not possible in this instance to reconcile those rights. As I said, I have no direct precedents on which to go. I obviously cannot say, 'Well, there is no precedent, I will not make a decision.' I cannot say that, for I would be abdicating the responsibility of the House. The decision has to be made. What I have to do, since I cannot reconcile the rights, is to use the general principles to this specific instance. I have to establish a hierarchy of those rights. Since I cannot reconcile them, then I have to establish a hierarchy. They cannot both be fully operative in this instance. If I am to give a decision, these two rights cannot be fully operative, cannot be reconciled, so there has to be a subordination of one to the other or a priority of one to the other. In establishing that all I can do is go to general principles. I do not intend to read

MR. SPEAKER: them at length, but I will make two brief references to them, and it is these general principles that I apply.

Beauchesne, page 110: "Freedom of speech is a sacred principle and if there is a place where it should be fully respected that place is the Parliament of the nation, and it is the Speaker's responsibility to see that this principle is not infringed upon." The expression, "Parliament of the nation" also refers that to Parliament of the province. I not only assume, I am sure that that that principle applies here likewise.

Similarly, in May, page 73, I make two brief quotations: "Freedom of speech is a privilege essential to every free council or Legislature." And further on: "There could be no assured government by the people or any part of the people unless their representatives had unquestioned possession of this privilege."

Applying this general principle of the law of Parliament as I understand it, and given the necessity of establishing a hierarchy, then I give the weight in respect of those two rights, I give the priority to the freedom of speech. In saying that I think I should point out, as is obvious, that this is not licence, this is freedom. I would refer just briefly to a decision of Mr. Speaker Michener which I quoted earlier in a different context, the source being Hansard, House of Commons, Ottawa, April 9, 1969, a different context but it is the principle and the corollary, I think, to the principle of freedom of speech to which I have given priority in this instance, and I will quote it briefly: "I indicated that I did not

7913

May 29, 1978

Tape 3593

EC - 3

MR. SPEAKER: think a matter of privilege would arise unless he were prepared to assert on his own responsibility that the House had been deliberately misinformed by the minister, thereby imputing some impropriety or improper conduct to the minister which would raise a question of the privilege of the House." The point I wish to make is that having given priority to freedom of speech, obviously there is a concomitant responsibility on the hon. member with respect to its use. In short , my decision is that the documents may be tabled.

7914

MR. WELLS: A point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. WELLS: Since Mr. Speaker has made his ruling on that matter, I would ask that as these conversations have not been seen or not been shown to me, these alleged tapes of conversation that Your Honour has ruled may be tabled - they have been referred to in debate in this House on several occasions, the most recent which was last Thursday and again on Friday when these points were argued - I would ask Your Honour that these be tabled forthwith and that I, on the point of privilege, then be enabled to examine them as soon as they are tabled and to read them and to comment upon them to this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Your Honour knows I indicated to the House the other day, Sir, that these matters were under investigation by the police and I assured the RCMP that I would not table any future documents without consulting with the RCMP. The documents have not been quoted from, as my hon. friend knows. Therefore I am under no obligation, Sir, and neither is my friend, the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) to table the documents at this particular time. And I think it would be improper for the hon. gentleman to try to enforce that, because as the hon. Minister of Justice has so rightly pointed out so often in this House, that we must be careful about tabling documents about matters that are under investigation because it could impede the progress of the investigation. The hon. Minister of Justice I believe subscribes to that principle, when the police are investigating a matter or matters that it is far better to let them proceed on their own course and before, at least I would, Sir, table the documents, I think I would have to clear through them in all justice because I have already agreed that I would not table any more documents without

MR. NEARY: clearing it with the RCMP and I am sure my hon. friend would not wish me to do that. But if the hon. gentleman wants to see the document, Sir, I would consider showing the hon. gentleman the document. It does not necessarily mean that I am going to do it privately. I may consider it.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, a point of privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. WELLS: I do not want to see the document privately. I want nothing! Whatever has to be done now I suggest, Your Honour, be done in this House publicly. If the hon. gentleman does not propose to table them I would ask him to provide a copy to me and I will have a press conference this afternoon and read them to the press and deal with it that way. If he refuses to do that, Mr. Speaker, I can only say that I will go to the RCMP and use whatever legal or other means are open to me to get a copy from them, or to get from them an assurance that they have finished with this particular transcript or tape of my conversation, if such it is, in the investigation, and then come back to this House and ask again that they be tabled and dealt with.

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

MR. SIMMONS: There is one other aspect, Mr. Speaker, I think needs to be commented on before you make a ruling. The original request from the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) a moment ago in raising his point of privilege, was that the documents be tabled. My colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has commented on one aspect but there is another aspect and that is that except in those cases where a document is directly quoted from, and therefore Mr. Speaker would require that the document be tabled because of the document having been quoted, which is not the case here, Mr. Speaker, and I submit that it is somewhat of a hypothetical request from the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells) in that it is my understanding that Mr. Speaker cannot order a request that a member table any particular

May 29, 1978

Tape No. 3594

NM - 3

MR. SIMMONS: document except for the kind of
cause I have mentioned, where a document has been quoted from.

In the normal course of events it
would be my understanding that Mr. Speaker, or the House, cannot
order a member to table a given document.

MR. SPEAKER: As the matter is at this moment, the
operative effect of my decision was that the documents may be
tabled. The matter now raised is whether they must be tabled,
That is a matter to which I would have to give some consideration.
That is a separate matter and if there are any other submissions
I will hear them. If not, I shall have to consider that because
it is a somewhat separate matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Kilbride.

MR. WELLS: There is one brief submission I would
make and that is

7917

MR. WELLS:

for approximately three weeks now, to the best of my recollection, this has been referred to. I cannot remember if anything has been quoted out of it, but at least it has been referred to in the House and Your Honour is aware of these references. And one member particularly, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has on occasion got up with what purports to be a transcript and gone to another member and said, 'Look, read this,' - the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons). Now this, in my view, Mr. Speaker, is playing a game in the House, so that I would ask Your Honour to bear in mind that the person about whose conversations this is, which is me in this case, has not had the opportunity of seeing what is there. We do not know what is there. It is almost like a Kafkaesque trial where you do not know what the charge is or anything like that, but something is being constantly referred to but then in the end, not produced. So I would ask Your Honour to bear that in mind in considering the rights and privileges when Your Honour is making a decision.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the

Opposition.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

I have not been in the House

on all occasions when the documents have been referred to. I have been in the House on several occasions and have read press reports and so on, Sir, but it is my submission that in my experience in this matter there has been no direct quotation from this document, and therefore, Sir, there is no requirement that the document be tabled, no requirement that Your Honour force any member who has

7918

MR. W. N. ROWE: quoted from a document to table this document, point number one, Sir, and that principle has to be rigidly adhered to, I would submit, Your Honour. Secondly, Sir, we have no objection to tabling the document if, after my hon. friend here clears it with the RCMP, as we undertook to do and as I jointly with him undertook, Sir, some weeks ago to do with regard to all documents concerning the so-called Scrivener affair, Sir, once we have cleared it with the RCMP that it is not going to impede their investigation in any way or in any form. So we have no objection to tabling the documents if the hon. member demands that they so be tabled, even though they have not been directly quoted from. But, Sir, in doing so, if the hon. member insists that these documents be tabled and we, as a matter of courtesy, table them to oblige him in a matter of courtesy, then, Sir, he has to realize that there is no way that any member of the House who may have these documents in his possession and therefore tables them as a result of this request, there is no way, Sir, that that member can, of course, stand behind the validity or truth or otherwise of those documents.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. W. N. ROWE: But, Sir, with that proviso and with that consideration in mind and that condition in mind, we would gladly give the hon. member a copy of it, Sir, today for that matter, and when it is cleared with the police we will table the documents. We have no desire to cover this matter up, Mr. Speaker. We will table them, but there has to be that proviso and that condition attached to it, because we would be doing it, Sir, purely as a matter of courtesy to the hon. member.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HICKMAN: We seem to be getting into a much broader sphere now than just the compulsory tabling of a document. The proviso that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition seeks to impose I would find unacceptable because there is a fundamental principle -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: No, but the second principle that has been raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition. The most fundamental principle of all next to the freedom of speech is that if an hon. gentleman tables any document in this House, he or she stands unequivocally behind the truthfulness of every word contained therein. And if it is subsequently discovered that that person has been misled unwittingly, that is still not a defence. So that proviso, in my opinion, would not be an acceptable qualification to add to the tabling of any document, Mr. Speaker.

And the other thing, as I mentioned here on Friday; if a document that is tabled contains unparliamentary language which would not be acceptable and which would be in breach of the rules if said by an hon. gentleman, again the same rules prevail and apply to the document that is tabled.

MR. R. WELLS: If I may, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. R. WELLS: From what the Attorney General has said, yes, if the documents are tabled, I expect the hon. member tabling them to stand behind them, stand behind the truth of them. This is fundamental. Because, as I understand, what the Leader of the Opposition has said is that when they are tabled, well, that is all right, we tabled them, but we do not stand behind them. And as the hon. the Attorney General says, that is fundamental that when it is tabled it is stood behind.

MR. WELLS: I can say this much, that when they are tabled, Mr. Speaker, I will ask that they be referred to the Committee of Privileges and Elections so that they can be enquired into and examined into, and I expect them to be stood behind.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, Sir, cannot have his cake and eat it too. The hon. Speaker and hon. members of the House know that we have been pushing for a public enquiry into the Scrivener affair for a long time. Now we could slap these documents on the table of the House anytime we wanted to if we wanted to be irresponsible and malicious. But we have not done that, Sir. We are trying to press the government into public enquiry, at which time witnesses could be called, as Your Honour knows, before a Select Committee of the House, before the House resolving itself into a Committee of the Whole. Following which we could use this documentation to cross examine witnesses that could be brought before the House. It is about time, Mr. Speaker, that this House started to run its own affairs, and not as the Minister of Justice has so often done, pawned off things that have been raised in this House on lower courts, on courts below the House of Assembly, which is the Supreme Court of this land. And if we do that, Sir, then the documentation could be very easily put on the table of the House. The gentleman on the other end of the conversation could be brought in before the Bar of the House, could be questioned by my hon. friend as to why he taped the conversation. Was it for his own protection? Was it for any other reason? The Premier could do the same thing, the Minister of Justice. We could have witnesses before a Select Committee of the House, the transcript itself and the tape. I do not have the tape here but the tape could be laid on the table of the House, or present it to a Select Committee of the House.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman cannot

MR. NEARY: have it both ways, Sir. We have no objection, as my hon. colleague said, of tabling the transcript and the tape, the tape which goes with the transcript, to backup the transcript, and then bring witnesses into the House, because obviously, Sir, I was not on the other end of that conversation. I did not intercept the conversation and the only thing I can do in order to validate the authenticity of the tape and the conversation is to have the gentleman who was on the other end brought before this House. And I am sure my hon. friend would not object to that if he wanted to get at the truth.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may make but one comment in response to what the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has said: Let us make this abundantly clear, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) tables it, he does, whether he has the opportunity to cross examine Mr. Davidson or not, he does vouch for the authenticity of what is there -

MR. NEARY: Do not be so foolish!

MR. HICKMAN: - when he tables it.

Secondly, and this is subject to my checking with Hansard, but I feel reasonably certain that upon checking with Hansard, one will find that when this matter was first raised and the affidavits tabled, that the Opposition asked for a police investigation. And when I made a statement a couple of days later saying that I had directed there be a police investigation following consultation with my department officials, that it was a matter that fell within that scope of activity, I feel quite certain, but I say this without checking Hansard, that the hon. the Leader of the opposition got up and commended me, or the government, for the action that was being taken and said this is the kind of procedure that we feel should be implemented in this case.

7982

MR. NEARY: We could get the Public Enquiry or a select committee. We have been trying for two and a half years for that.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I just rise to make a few comments and one of the comments on what the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) had stated the Attorney General has already pointed out to the House, I think it is a basic principle that we all have to comply with, that if anything is tabled in this House, that the tabler stands behind the truth of the matter and the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) as I understood it, indicated that he could not verify the truth of it unless the person was here before the House.

MR. NEARY: No. No. I did not say that.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I misunderstood then. Because obviously the fact of the matter is before anyone dares to table anything in the House or make a statement there, they stand behind the truth of the statement alleged.

The only other thing I would say, Mr. Speaker, is that the document, as I understood it, as I heard, the document in question was referred to, The hon. member for Kilbride rose on an immediate point of privilege at that particular time and having been referred to, I think unless it is found to be in the matter of public interest that it not be tabled, that it so has to be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. members will recall that the decision I made at the beginning of this afternoon's session was that the material in question may be tabled.

1923

MR. SPEAKER: The point has now come up whether it now must be tabled. That is a matter on which I shall have to have some checking done as to questions of fact to see whether it must be tabled, but in so doing the decision will only be that it must, or that there is no need that it be. I will certainly not be making further reference to what what hon. members have referred to as a proviso. Hon. members are responsible for what they put into the possession of the House whether in a speech, in a tabled document, in a petition, whatever, and that is an always operative principle which accompanies freedom of speech. So that is operative and cannot be, in my opinion, in the House of Assembly, negotiated out, because that would go to the very root of parliamentary responsibility. So I do not think that can be negotiated out.

The other question on which I will give a decision is whether when the decision is given that the documentation must then be tabled or whether there is no requirement that it be tabled at that time.

So I will give my decision on that as soon as I can.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have the answers to some questions asked in the name of the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). The answer to Question Nos. 49, 1, 3, 4, 19, 62, 2, 82, 63, 61, 40, 17, 16, 5, and 75. That must be about 75 per cent, Mr. Speaker, of the questions asked.

May 29, 1978

Tape 3597

EC - 2

AN HON. MEMBER:

A bad performance.

MR. NEARY:

A little better - not quite good enough yet.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MR. MURPHY:

Mr. Speaker, this is in answer to a question by the hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) asked me on Friday with reference to the lead contamination of the Exploits River, and this is a tabulation of the past seven years, the amount of lead in the river as compared to Canadian standards - the year 1971, fifteen parts per billion and the Canadian standard is fifty - that is 30 per cent; 1972, five - that is 10 per cent; 1973, seven - 14 per cent; 1974, seven - 14 per cent; 1977, four parts per billion - that is 8 per cent; July 4, 1977 less than two parts per billion which is less than 4 per cent of the allowable, if you like, 50 per cent which is the permissible in drinking water of the inland waters of the federal government.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. N. ROWE:

If the Minister of Justice has come in, Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to him. Mr. Speaker, by way of preamble to the question, there has been now a number of serious fires in the Province, particularly in the area of St. John's. Elizabeth Towers had a serious fire some weeks ago, and there was fire which burned down a building or two there at the bottom of Signal Hill Road, and a house in St. John's the same day or the day after burned with a number of deaths involved, a school in Ferryland district a day or two ago, Sir,

1995

May 29, 1978

Tape 3597

EC - 3

MR. W. N. ROWE: a church in St. John's burned
down, two more houses, Sir, this morning, with some
serious injuries and certainly the risk of very,

1986

MR. W. BOWE:

very serious injuries if not death.

MR. NEARY:

The St. Bride's School.

MR. W. BOWE:

The St. Bride's School as well, Mr. Speaker.

It has now reached the point where any reasonable man must ask the hon. Minister of Justice if his expert advisors suspect there may be a lunatic on the loose, if there is any suspected arson in all of these or any of these serious fires, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER:

Hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. A. HICKMAN:

Mr. Speaker, nothing has come to my attention from either the Prosecutorial Division of the Department, or from the Fire Commissioner, which would indicate to me that there is any arsonist on the loose. That is in answer to the general question, I would repeat that because the last I would want anyone in Newfoundland to believe when it is not factual that there is an arsonist on the loose. That would be totally irresponsible of me to allow, and I hope it would not happen.

With respect to the fires, I went into some detail here recently with respect to the procedure that is followed whenever there is a fire.

Let me first deal with the City of St. John's. Because of the new rules which were implemented two or three years ago by the then Fire Commissioner at the request of my Department, and in particular the Director of Public Prosecutions, whenever a fire occurs in St. John's now, when the alarm goes in the fire station the C.I.D. division of the Newfoundland Constabulary are immediately alerted and they immediately go to the fire. Obviously, if it is a kitchen fire, or that sort of thing, they do not bother to spend very much time at it. The reason for it is very obvious that what we were finding was that if you left the investigation of fires to the normal procedure, particularly when a building has been destroyed or substantially damaged that the municipal authorities, not just in

1981

MR. A. HICKMAN: St. John's but in any municipality, have an obligation to clear up that debris as quickly as possible, and in the exercise of their responsibility they would do that sometimes within a day or so after a fire occurred. Then, when the C.I.D., or the R.C.M.P., and they both have officers skilled in the investigation of arson, went in looking to try to ascertain the cause of the fire, the evidence had all been disturbed and they were looking at a nice, level piece of ground. So that has all been overcome.

With respect to the fires in question, I checked with the Director of Public Prosecutions as late as Friday past and asked whether he has received the police report on any of these fires that the hon. Leader of the Opposition had referred to, and the answer was "No, not as of Friday". Now I did a check with him again this morning and I asked if he had any idea of the status of the investigation, and he informed me that the procedure that is followed in all of these investigations and whatever materials are taken by the Fire Commissioner's office that they consider to be relevant to their investigation and/or by the police, that they are then sent to the R.C.M.P. laboratory in Sackville for analysis, and that report comes back. But it is not until the total package is complete and the Fire Commissioner's report goes to the police, and the police attach the Fire Commissioner's report as an appendix to their report to the Director of Public Prosecutions — when the Director of Public Prosecutions receives the report, he does one of two things: If the report indicates strong evidence of criminality, obviously charges are laid; if, on the other hand, which is so frequently the case in fires, the Fire Commissioner and/or the Police say, 'cause of the fire unknown', if it is at all a major fire the Director of Public Prosecutions has the authority under the Act as amended just two or three years ago to direct a fire enquiry by a magistrate. The purpose for that fire enquiry is not really to determine the cause of the fire but it does mean that the witnesses who were examined by the Police, who were not under oath when examined,

May 29, 1978

Tape No. 3598

RT-3

MR. A. HICKMAN: are then put under oath, and at least you have the satisfaction of knowing they have been examined by a magistrate and sometimes by a crown prosecutor. So, in these cases, as I say, as of Friday the reports were

MR. HICKMAN:

not in but they are all being investigated. And if the cause of the fire is obvious, if the fire commissioner says faulty wiring file closed.

MR. W.N. ROWE: A supplementary please, Sir, on this.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I will start with the first of this recent state of fairly disasterous fires, Sir, the one in Elizabeth Towers. Did I understand from the minister correctly that he has received no report preliminary or otherwise on the possible cause of this fire? Is that correct?

MR. HICKMAN: That is correct, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, has he or his department received any oral report or any indication from his expert advisors, including the Fire Commissioner or people involved in the police force as to possible or probable cause of the fire?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, the only report- and I say, I have not received a report. I have not received a report on the status of the fire but hon. gentlemen will recall that immediately following these fires and two of them occurred on Wednesday, April 26th, that was when they started, and there was another one on April 28th that I asked for and another one on April 29th. I asked for a report then and I knew that they could not, no-one could tell me or it was unlikely they could tell the cause of the fire. I indicated to the house at that time that I had been advised that the - Let us take first Elizabeth Towers, the big concern immediately following the fire in Elizabeth Towers, as hon. gentlemen know, was the question of security and the fire precautions and regulations and fire safety programme that was being followed in that institution that within a matter of twenty-four hours the Fire Commissioner had met with the St. John's Housing Corporation and laid down fire protection methods and security to be followed forthwith and told me that the board said they would implement them without delay and

MR. HICKMAN: consequently he did not have to furnish an order or serve an order upon them. That is the only report I have received on Elizabeth Towers which I have passed on to this House.

On the others it is much the same but with respect to one of them that same day there was an indication as to what they thought may have been the cause of the fire but obviously I would be much more prudent to wait until the report comes in and gives a firm indication as to what caused the fire. I repeat that if the Fire Commissioner and the police say the cause of the fire was faulty wiring -

MR. NEARY: Have they said that in the case of Elizabeth Towers?

MR. HICKMAN: No, they have not said anything.

MR. NEARY: No, but the minister is leaving the wrong impression with the House.

MR. HICKMAN: No, I am not trying to. May I repeat -

MR. NEARY: That is a for instance.

MR. HICKMAN: No, no. For instance.

MR. NEARY: That is a for instance the hon. minister was -

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I was setting forth very clearly to this House as the request of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition the procedures that are followed -

MR. NEARY: And if it is proven arson, then what happens?

MR. HICKMAN: It is not a question of proving arson. If the evidence that is submitted by the police shows reasonable and probable grounds that there has been a criminal act then the Director of Public Prosecutions will lay a charge without reference to anyone, or whatever prosecutor is assigned that particular case.

MR. NEARY: Without reference to the minister?

MR. HICKMAN: He never comes to me. I repeat, I want to keep it that way and the hon. gentleman the Leader of the Opposition, if he will refer to the Steele Commission Report where he deals with Crown prosecutors

MR. HICKMAN: will recall that the Steele Commission Report recommended that we could give consideration here to virtually giving Crown prosecutors almost the same independence as judiciary. That is what I was dealing with but I said on the other hand if the Crown Prosecutor comes to the conclusion that whilst the police have acquired all of the evidence that they can acquire and that it is desirable that the same witnesses be placed under oath and appear before a magistrate or if it is a serious fire -

MR. NEARY: But that is a kind of a stall, is it not?

MR. HICKMAN: No, no, no, Mr. Speaker. Let me give this House an example. Hon. gentleman will recall two years ago or three years ago there was a lot apprehension and concern in the Province over a large number of fires in nightclubs that occurred during a specific period of time. All of these investigations had been completed and in some of them the cause of the fire was readily identified and in others the report was cause unknown. I directed the Director of Public Prosecutions to order Magisterial Enquiries into all of these fires as an added investigative process, which he did. They were all held but they did

MR. HICKMAN:

not turn up any additional evidence, but at least we were secure in the knowledge that we had exhausted every avenue -

MR. NEARY: A magisterial inquiry has not been ordered into any of these -

MR. HICKMAN: No, because none of the reports have been received yet, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: All right.

MR. HICKMAN: And I add, because I know that the comment from the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who was saying that my comments on where the cause of the fire is identified that I was trying to relate that to any particular fire, I am not. I was simply saying that the procedure is that if when the report comes in and says cause of fire - you know, faulty wiring, the file is closed.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

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

MR. W. N. ROWE: As I understand the hon. minister, as of Friday afternoon, no report on the Elizabeth Towers fire had been received by his department, is that correct? Anybody in his department?

MR. HICKMAN: I asked the Director of Public Prosecutions if he had received any reports on the fires and he said, 'No.'

MR. W. N. ROWE: Does the hon. minister have any idea or has he received any word from anybody who is investigating the fire as to when a report might be expected in this particular fire, Mr. Speaker?

MR. HICKMAN: No, not from anyone doing the investigation, but I inquired of the Director of Public

MR. HICKMAN: Public Prosecutions as to whether he knew when we could anticipate starting to receive reports on these one, two, three, four, five fires - six major fires that have occurred in the Province during the past few weeks, and he told me that he understood that a lot of that stuff was either in Sackville or on its way back from Sackville, and presumably, we will start receiving reports very shortly. But that is pure speculation on his part because of the fact he is aware of what progress is taken to date.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, just a final supplementary has come up -

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. W. N. ROWE: - as a result of the hon. minister's last answer. What is the procedure when this material or report or analysis of evidence comes back from Sackville? Where does it then go?

MR. HICKMAN: To the police.

MR. W. N. ROWE: To the police department?
To the Chief of Police? C.I.D? Who does it go to?

MR. HICKMAN: Not just with respect to fires, Mr. Speaker. I say this without detailed knowledge as to how an investigation is carried out, but it is my understanding that whenever there is an exhibit that in the opinion of the police requires analysis by the laboratories in Sackville, New Brunswick, that the investigating officer in some instances at least, takes it up himself and delivers it to someone in Sackville.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I am talking about coming back.

MR. HICKMAN: And then it is brought back the same way, because as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition will recall, on several occasions in criminal cases there

MR. HICKMAN: have been allegations by counsel for the accused that this exhibit that has been put in that was analysed in Sackville, New Brunswick, may have passed out of the hands of the Crown, because it was suggested it had been mailed back or sent by express and somebody could tamper with it. So my understanding is that in most cases, but do not hold me to this because I do not know in all cases, but in most cases the exhibit is actually delivered and then brought back by the police if it is an exhibit that is going to be used in evidence in a subsequent trial. So when the report comes back - you know, the exhibit with the report attached to it - that report is part and parcel of the investigative report that is submitted by the police. You know, they have statements from witnesses, they have the Fire Commissioner in the case of a fire, the Fire Commissioner's report and professional advice, and they would have the report of the laboratory in Sackville, all attached as part of the whole, being the total investigation by the C.I.D.

And we have pretty good inspectors in both police forces in the Province to deal with that kind of investigation. But I should alert this House that it is an investigation that is very onerous.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do I understand the hon. gentleman correctly that here you have a very serious situation where a fire occurred at Elizabeth Towers and there is a very great urgency to this matter because it involves members of this House and so forth, that the minister

May 29, 1978

Tape 3600

EC - 4

MR. NEARY: has not taken it upon himself to find out if the report is yet back from Sackville in connection with this fire? I mean, the minister must be responsible for the running of his department. The minister seems to be very vague and general about some of the answers that we are given, about procedures and so forth. I am sure the minister must have taken it upon himself to find out how this investigation is going, when the report will be in, if the evidence is now back from Sackville.

7936

MR. NEARY:

Can the minister give us any information at all on this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, not only did I think I was not being vague but in my own mind, I was thinking that I was being far too specific with respect to investigations that are ongoing because, you know, as the hon. gentleman said earlier today I do have an obligation to avoid being specific on any investigation that are ongoing, certainly not until I know what the outcome is going to be because if the outcome of any investigation results in some action being taken by the police, I do not want to be in a position, nor should I, where something I have said in this House prejudices the rights of any party. That is why I am always so careful. In this case I felt I was being much too detailed in my answer.

I repeat that because of questions that have been asked in this House on this particular matter and, you know, questions starting on May 1 or April 29 or thereabouts, I enquired, which I usually do not do of normal investigations going on, but in response to questions in this House I enquired periodically of the Director of Public Prosecutions as to whether or not he had received police reports on any of these fires. I feel quite confident that because of my enquiries when he does receive them that he will come and tell me. I am sure they all will not come in at the same time. But on Friday he was in my office and I asked him and he said no. And I said, "Have you any idea when we will start receiving them?" And he said, "I do not know precisely but I would imagine very soon because he said it is my understanding that at least some of the exhibits that have been sent in connection with some of the investigations to Sackville have now been returned." But that is hearsay to him. They do not tell him until they get the report. But obviously the police are in and out of his office every day on other matters. He has a pretty good idea what is going on.

So let this House rest assured that these investigations are being dealt with very promptly by the police, and I say that

Mr. Hickman: knowing the length of time they are so often involved in investigating fires. Because quite often the report will back saying, cause of fire unknown. And a responsible Crown prosecutor will go back and say, "I want more evidence. Try another angle," as we did on these cases that I referred to, always, unfortunately without any success.

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

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not trying to be stubborn with the hon. gentleman, Sir, but the hon. gentleman just made a statement that worries me considerably and that is that the Chief Crown Prosecutor happened to be in the minister's office on Friday, the minister asked the Chief Crown Prosecutor, Mr. Kelly, I presume, if any of the reports had yet been received on any of these fires, and Mr. Kelly, the Chief Crown Prosecutor, told the minister that as far as he knew some of the exhibits had been returned from Saskville in connection with some of these fires. But the minister then added, Sir, that this is hearsay. Mr. Speaker, this is frightening to me because -

MR. HICKMAN: Hearsay to me.

MR. NEARY: - hearsay. No, the hon. gentleman implied that it was hearsay to Mr. Kelly, and hearsay -

MR. HICKMAN: To me.

MR. NEARY: - well, I do not care if the minister indicates hearsay to him or Mr. Kelly. But, Sir, can you imagine the Chief Crown Prosecutor saying to the minister, "I understand that certain exhibits have been returned from Saskville." "I understand" -

MR. HICKMAN: Right.

MR. NEARY: - without making it a statement of fact to the minister, or saying, "I do not know, Mr. Minister, but I will find out," or "Mr. Minister, yes, exhibits have been returned." It is confusing, Mr. Speaker. And I would like for the minister to clear it up because it is really frightening, this kind of a conversation between the minister and the Chief Crown Prosecutor where it is hearsay, the

Mr. Neary: minister calls it hearsay. It should be factual or it should be nothing at all when the minister is dealing with a gentleman in a responsible position like the Chief Crown Prosecutor. Is it a fact or is it not a fact? Will you go out and find out, and let me know? Because I may be asked in the House and I do not want to go in and quote the Chief Crown Prosecutor as saying, well I heard, I heard, well I heard too, and so did the Leader of the Opposition. And that is what we are trying to find out, if it is true or not. And the Chief Crown Prosecutor should know, and the minister should know.

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

I must point out that the proceedings should be limited to questions and answers.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister is it hearsay or is it factual? Is it a fact that some of the exhibits have been returned from Saskville in connection with some of these fires?

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

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, you know, that has to be the most stupid question that has been asked in this House in a long, long time.

MR. SIMMONS: We are about to get the stupidest answer, too.

AN HON. MEMBER: In the doorway.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, you know, the common from some gentleman outside the House does not have to be responded to.

MR. W. ROWE: Your campaign manager.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition should not be nasty because if he does I am going to tell, I am going to suggest to the hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) that he read the first two years of Hansard on the Education votes -

MR. W. ROWE: That is the 110 votes you got.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKMAN: - in 1972 and 1973.

MR. SIMMONS:

I wrote it and he read it.

MR. HICKMAN:

In 1972 and 1973.

MR. SIMMONS:

Then he did not honour it when he got in Cabinet.

MR. HICKMAN:

But, Mr. Speaker, may I repeat that I have been asking, which is not normal practice but only because of questions in this House, the Director of Public Prosecutions whether or not he has received the report on investigations into the number of fires, police report, and he has told me no.

MR. NEARY:

But added.

MR. SIMMONS:

But when I spoke to him on Tuesday or Friday, I did exactly the same thing as the hon. the Leader of the Opposition asked me today, I said, "Have you any idea when we are going to start receiving some of these?"

MR. NEARY:

Yes.

MR. HICKMAN:

And he said, I do not know.

MR. NEARY:

He said, "I understand."

MR. HICKMAN:

But he said -

MR. NEARY:

Go ahead.

MR. HICKMAN:

He said, "I understand from the police," you know, understand and what I say is hearsay -

MR. NEARY:

No, you did not add the police before, by the way.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order!

MR. HICKMAN:

"I understand that some of the reports have been coming back to the police." A purely logical explanation -

MR. NEARY:

Not hearsay.

MR. HICKMAN:

- hearsay, because obviously if you are in the CID and the fellow who is investigating a particular fire, if you happen to know that it is on his desk, or he has just come back from Sackville with a bunch of exhibits, and if this other person tells the Director of Public Prosecutions, without getting into a long

MR. HICKMAN: dissertation on the law of hearsay, that is hearsay. It is only if -

MR. NEARY: He was not told by the police.

MR. HICKMAN: It is only if the police officer who is directly involved in the investigation comes in and says, "Mr. Prosecutor, I have today returned from Sackville with exhibits," that that is direct evidence.

MR. NEARY: Does the minister know if that happened?

MR. HICKMAN: But the hearsay rule, you know, and I welcome the opportunity, if this is what the House wants me to do is to give hon. gentlemen a lecture on the hearsay rule. But I see Mr. Speaker shaking his head and I do not know if that is because Your Honour is knowledgeable of the hearsay rule or if you have come to the conclusion that a lecture on the hearsay rule at this time will be totally irrelevant to the Question Period and assuming that it is the latter I will take my place.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: Is this on the hearsay rule?

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile and then I will hear a supplementary from one other hon. gentleman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Justice again, Sir. He has further confused the matter of the discussion between him and the Crown Prosecutor with regard to the exhibits being returned from Moncton. I am not asking the minister whether the report is final and in the hands of the Crown Prosecutor, but did the Chief Crown Prosecutor tell the minister in his office on Friday that the police were now back from Moncton with certain exhibits that were brought over in connection with these fires and brought back again? Did the Chief Crown Prosecutor say to the minister, "The CID who are investigating this, the investigating officers have told me this, or I just

MR. NEARY: heard it, it was coffee talk."

MR. HICKMAN: I am perfectly happy to go back over it and over it and over it again. Did I ask the -

MR. PECKFORD: Go back over it again.

MR. HICKMAN: All right. I will go back over it again.

I asked the Director of Public Prosecutions on Friday if he had received any reports on the fires and he said no. I did the next logical thing, I guess as much out of - well I do not know why - for information and I said, "Any idea when I am going to receive them?" And he said, "I think it will be soon because I understand that some of the exhibits that went to -

MR. NEARY: From whom did he understand?

MR. HICKMAN: - Sackville, New Brunswick, have now been returned to the police.

MR. NEARY: From whom did he understand this?

MR. HICKMAN: There was only one person he could get it from and I -

MR. NEARY: From the CID.

MR. HICKMAN: - did not ask him from whom he got it. But the only logical conclusion you can reach is that in his daily discussions with police officers coming and going -

MR. NEARY: Okay. All right.

MR. HICKMAN: - on cases. But that is only an assumption.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated that that will be the final supplementary from the hon. member for LaPoile, that I would hear one additional supplementary and I will hear that from the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), and then I will recognize the hon. gentleman for Fogo (Captain Winsor).

May 20, 1978

Tape No. 3602

MM - 4

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Justice, in answer to one of the questions - I am getting more confused now than ever - but did I hear the minister correctly when he suggested that in some cases when the Director of Crown Prosecutions gets reports back on fires in the past and he feels that these reports are not satisfactory, the report presumably from the CID, that he would then return the report back to the CID or ask for a second report, did I hear

Mr. F. Rowe: the minister correctly on that one? And secondly, I will add this to the question, Sir, if that is so, could this have been the case in the case of any of these recent fires that we have had in and around the city in the last month or so?

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

MR. HICKMAN: To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, the Crown Prosecutors and/or the Director of Public Prosecution have not as of today, certainly as of Friday past, received any reports from these fires other than that verbal report that I referred to in this House on May 1 that the fires had occurred and are now being investigated.

But what I said was, and I have said this so often in the House, that quite often when the police are conducting an investigation that they come in and they submit to the Director of Public Prosecutions or the Crown Prosecutors a report of their investigation, the Crown Prosecutor reads it, and having read it he says, "Look, there are a bunch of holes in this that have got to be plugged!" So he goes back - it is not a question of sending back - he goes back to the investigating officer and says, "Will you go and re-interview the following witnesses and ask them about these aspects?"

MR. F. ROWE: Could this have been the case in the recent fires?

MR. HICKMAN: No. As I say, to my knowledge the reports have not yet come in.

MR. F. ROWE: The minister -

MR. HICKMAN: I mean, I cannot say; I said, to my knowledge.

MR. F. ROWE: - is not absolutely sure.

MR. HICKMAN: I would think that if the reports had been received when I put direct questions then I would be told, no, they have not received any reports. And as of now -

MR. F. ROWE: Would they have been sent back?

MR. HICKMAN: - I am not aware of any reports having come in as of Friday. It might be down there today for all I know.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: That is what I am trying to get at.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right, You know, as I say, to my knowledge they have not come in and been sent back. And if they were mind you that would not distrub me because that is the usual practice.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. HICKMAN: Orders of the Day. Motion 9.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. FLIGHT: I wish to move under Standing Order 23, Mr. Speaker, because of the Province-wide protest against the government's spruce budworm spraying programme by citizens who are convinced that their physical well-being will be endangered, as well as the severe damage to wildlife and the environment, I move under Standing Order 23 that this hon. House do adjourn to hold an emergency debate on the decision to spray, seconded by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I know it is not required to hear argument under this, As a matter of fact I think it is unusual to so do because our practice in this sense is the same as in the House of Commons. And Standing Order 26(1) there is comparable to our Standing Order 23. "Mr. Speaker shall decide without any debate whether or not the matter is proper to be discussed. I think that has usually been our procedure and I think it is probably a good idea to say that that is our procedure, and it will be done that way.

As hon. members know, Standing Order 23 is a matter whereby it is infrequent that leave is given. It has been done once during the past three years, and it is a matter in which the Speaker's judgment has to be used. Again I refer to Standing Order 26, sub-section (5) in the House of Commons. And our practice is identical but it is very well worded here. I think it is better worded than our own Standing Order, but our precedent follows them and it is a statement of our precedent

Mr. Speaker: as well as practice in the House of Commons.
"In determining whether a matter should have urgent consideration, Mr. Speaker shall have regard to the extent to which it concerns the administrative responsibilities of the government or could come within the scope of ministerial action, and he also shall have regard to the probability of the matter being brought before the House within reasonable time by other means." Obviously I am aware and hon. members are aware that there is an Address in Reply on the Order Paper, that there is a Budget debate on the Order Paper. We are also aware that under both headings hon. members are speaking in a context in which they have unlimited time. The matter must be urgent, That is the first criteria; and obviously I think the matter is urgent. debate must be urgent. And the Chair has to exercise discretion with respect to whether there is a reasonable expectation within a reasonable period of time that the matter be debated.

Here we are dealing with time parameters with respect to this matter. I have to use my judgment of what hon. members seem to consider urgent, and

MR. SPEAKER: not insulated from what the public appear to think urgent, and it would appear to me if Standing Order 23 has meaning - and I think it does, it must as long as it is there - then this is a matter which falls within that criterion and, therefore, the Chair's position here is to say that it is in order. By having said that it is in order, I now ask whether the hon. gentleman has leave. Does the hon. gentleman have leave?

Not having leave and at least twelve members rising in their place, I call upon the hon. member who moved the motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I can say for this side, Mr. Speaker, that we are grateful for Your Honour's ruling, and I believe that all of Newfoundland will have reason to be grateful for His Honour's ruling on this particular motion, because it is time that the spray programme in this Province that we are looking at be debated fully and completely.

And, Mr. Speaker, in opening the debate, I wish to refer to a passage of the Minister of Forestry's statement dated April 11, 1978, just one short paragraph of the statement.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman so early in his remarks, but it has just come to my attention that we have some students in the galleries whom I would like on behalf of all hon. members to welcome from Nova Scotia School for Girls in Truro, a number of exchange students, sixteen from Grade VII to Grade XI accompanied by Mrs. McNutt, and from Pleasantville School for Girls and Boys, Pleasantville, St. John's, Grades VII

MR. SPEAKER: to XI, sixteen students accompanied by their teacher, Mrs. Belbin. I know hon. members join me in welcoming both the students from Pleasantville, St. John's and the students from Truro, Nova Scotia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. FLIGHT: It is interesting to note, Mr. Speaker, that there are some students from Nova Scotia in the galleries, and I would suspect before this debate is over that Nova Scotia and Nova Scotia's approach to the budworm spraying programme in Newfoundland or their approach to the alternatives, as opposed to a spray programme will be referred to many times.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to read this passage from the minister's statement: "As you are aware, the current budworm outbreak began in 1971 and continues to present. In the Fall of 1976 the Canadian Forestry Service made a forecast that in 1977, budworm defoliation would be moderate to severe over three to four million and light over some four to five million acres of productive forest. The total area of infestation of 8.7 million acres represents about 90 per cent of the total productive forests there are in the Province."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister says that the outbreak began in 1971. Based on what we know about budworm and the effect that budworm has on a productive forest, it takes four to five years to kill trees so attacked and so infested, which means, Mr. Speaker, that this government or the administration, the people responsible, whether it was the minister or his department or the

MR. FLIGHT: Canadian forestry people in conjunction with the Department of Forestry in Newfoundland, aware that the attack was taking place, having watched New Brunswick's experience for the past twenty-five years and aware that with the kind of an infestation we had in 1971 that our forests could be totally endangered, made no move, Mr. Speaker. There had been no move made to combat the spruce budworm infestation in this Province until we got into a panic situation last summer, and that panic situation brought about an experimental spray programme.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to note that the minister set up an advisory committee to talk about the alternatives for the Labrador Linerboard mill. It is also interesting to note that the chairman of that committee was the President of Price (Nfld.). It is now very significant to note that recent

MR. FLIGHT: statements in the press indicate that Price (Nfld.) may indeed be interested and may be considering seriously taking over the Labrador Linerboard mill.

It is no secret, Mr. Speaker, that in this Province, the primary reason that the Labrador Linerboard mill had to close down was because they did not have an economic -

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): A point of order has come up.

MR. HICKMAN: As the hon. Speaker said when he allowed this motion, this kind of debate has to be strictly related to the motion.

MR. FLIGHT: It is strictly related.

MR. HICKMAN: And I submit that anything other than the danger to health and/or the desirability of spraying for the spruce budworm is not debatable in this House. What is happening with the Linerboard mill or whether the Linerboard mill could take dead wood is not part of this debate.

MR. FLIGHT: Yes it is.

MR. F. ROWE: To that point of order.

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

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, if there was ever anything relevant to this debate it is an industry directly connected to the woods industry in this Province and the effect the spruce budworm might have on the forestry in this particular Province.

Sir, I do not know why the hon. House Leader has gotten up on a point of order because it is simply not a point of order. Any reference to any industry related to the forestry surely, Sir, is directly related to the motion moved by my hon. colleague and I suggest that the so-called point of order suggested by the Government House Leader, Sir, is not a point of order whatsoever.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Hon. members will realize that this is a proceeding that we do not get into very frequently and

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): perhaps if I just read one item from our Standing Rules and also again re-read the motion it might clarify matters.

Subsection F (2) of Standing order 23 states, "Not more than one matter can be discussed on the same motion." Now the motion in question reads as follows: "Because of the province-wide protest against the government's spruce budworm spraying programme by citizens who are convinced that their physical well being will be endangered as well as severe damage to wildlife and the environment, I move, move, under Standing Order 23, that this hon. House do adjourn to hold an emergency debate on the question to spray." So it would seem from the subsection in our Standing Rules, one section and from the wording of the motion discussion should take place in regard to spraying, it should take place in regard to budworm infestation, and it should take place in regard to damage; it says severe here but I presume that would be a subjective interpretation so I would say any damage to wildlife and the environment.

So those are the areas it would seem to me that debate is concerned with; that is the budworm infestation, the spraying programme or proposed programme, and damage to wildlife and the environment.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, surely there is nobody in this House, and this is not to the point of order, it is simply to go on with the debate, surely there is nobody in this House who thinks that they can debate the decision to spray without talking about what the effect of the spray will be, why we have a spray programme, what are the conditions that have led us up to a spray programme? And I mean I am surprised, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. Minister of Justice would rise on such a point of order. If we cannot talk about the -

MR. HICKMAN: Are you surprised that Mr. Speaker held it?

MR. FLIGHT: - if we cannot talk about the effects that

MR. FLIGHT: the spray programme will have, because that is the basis of the fear of the people, and they are asking questions, they want to know why it is that we find ourselves into a position where we have to endanger, possibly endanger the well-being of our people and certainly possibly and most definitely damage the environment and the ecology. And so, Mr. Speaker, I intend to - until the Speaker calls me out of order - I intend to pursue what obviously is germane the effects of a spray programme on our forest and why we have gotten ourselves into a position where we have to spray and how we can get ourselves out of a position where we have to spray. And, Mr. Speaker, we cannot refer to the spray programme without referring to the cost.

Mr. Speaker, I will say again, that

MR. FLIGHT: there was an indication a few days ago that Price (Nfld) would take over the Linerboard operation. Now it is very significant when we look at the amount of damage that we have to our forestry and the alternative of spraying that an economic wood supply was withheld from Labrador Linerboard mill while we had five million cords of dead wood on the limits of the two paper companies, both of which were represented on that advisory board. One of the alternatives, one could make the case and say that had that advisory board met their responsibilities and made only the infested timbers on their stands available to Labrador Linerboard mill, then we would have salvaged that wood and, most importantly by way of looking at fighting the budworm infestation, then the land from which this wood was salvaged could have been now reseeded, reseeded with a strain of wood that is less susceptible to budworm infestation.

Mr. Speaker, we have the performances of - the minister has said time and time again that the decision to spray was not the result of pressure from the paper companies. Well, maybe it was not but I believe it was, Mr. Speaker, I believe the paper companies had a great deal to say on whether the Province would spray or would not spray and that again opens up the old forest management that this Province has practiced this past fifty years. Why is it? Let some hon. gentlemen opposite tell me why it is that Price and Bowaters have got to come to Central Newfoundland, in the Glenwood area, and cut black spruce. After cutting on their own limits for fifty years they have to come into Central Newfoundland to cut black spruce because they need, in order to make the pulp they are producing they need a mixture, there must be a mixture of balsam fir and black spruce. How is it that Bowaters if practicing the kind of forest management that we believe has to be practiced, how is it that they did not re-seed and re-forest in the areas. They knew, there is all kinds of evidence to indicate that when you cut the natural growth in an area what some people refer to as nuisance trees grow up, balsam fir replace. The pulp industry cannot survive on black spruce so why, if Bowaters were practicing the kind of forest management that we needed in this Province to sustain the kind of pulp operations we have had, and they were also aware of

MR. FLIGHT: the New Brunswick problems, why did they not re-seed and instead of having all balsam fir that is totally susceptible to the budworm, why did they not re-seed the areas they cut so that they would have had a mixture? It was costing them a lot more money to come to Glenwood and take black spruce. They were watching all the forest that they had on their lease on which they were cutting growing up in balsam fir and growing up so thick that a man was smothered when he walked into it.

Mr. Speaker, we may today be into a situation where we are looking at a dangerous situation in our forests. Let me say that every member on this side will have a chance to have input into this debate. We are as well aware as anyone on the other side or anyone in the Province of the value of our forestry to the economy of this Province. People, Mr. Speaker, for ten, twenty or fifty years have been challenging the government, have been saying-before this budworm debate is over, it may have been a blessing in disguise, Mr. Speaker; the budworm may have been a blessing in disguise because there were people who knew forestry in this Province who were questioning the ability of our forests without the budworm to continue to yield an allowable cut for the paper companies over the next twenty-five or thirty years, without a budworm spray programme. Because of the kind of forest management we have had in this Province questions were being raised as to whether or not our forestry could sustain the production of the two paper companies let alone a third one, without a budworm situation. The only reason was that there were some deep-rooted fears about the kind of forest management that we were witnessing in this company both by the Crown and by the two paper companies involved.

Mr. Speaker, the damage to date - we have five million cords dead on the stump that without a salvage programme will be lost. A salvage programme will accomplish two things, Mr. Speaker; it will give the Province the benefit, the economic benefit that comes from using that five million cords of wood in whatever capacity it is used;

Mr. Flight: going after that wood, we would put in the forest access roads that we need to practice the forest management that minister talks about so much, the thinning, the reforestation, the reseeding, The roads have to go in anyway, so we might as well put them in now into the areas that have the dead timber in the process of taking out the dead timber and salvaging it, and using it in a way that it will have some economic benefit to this Province. In the process of doing that we will be opening up our forest stands for re-seeding, reforestation, thinning and all of the things that will be needed anyway if we are going to guarantee that we will have a growth that can sustain our pulp operations over the next twenty to twenty-five, thirty, or forty or fifty years.

Mr. Speaker, all that has been happening, the people of this Province have been concerned and have asked questions of the minister- what are the alternatives to a spray programme? What is the effect of a spray programme? And, Mr. Speaker, except in general terms the minister has not addressed himself totally to one of the questions asked. He has never indicated as to whether or not this Province has looked at an export market. He has never indicated whether or not this Province is looking at real reforestation. There is a great fear going out in this Province, Mr. Speaker, that we are going into a spray programme in a way that we may get on a treadmill. If the Minister of Forestry was in a position to stand up and say we are going to spray this year, but at the same time we are spraying we are going to bring in effect, we are going to put in place a reforestation programme that might two years down the road make it possible for us to pull out of the spray programme, then maybe the people of this Province would accept it. They may accept the spray for one year, and accept the dangers that goes with it. But, Mr. Speaker, there is more and more reason to believe that we have started a spray programme with nothing else in mind but a spray programme and next year we will spray again, and next year we will spray again. The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy shakes his head. Well, I would like to be able to shake my head. I have seen no statement by the Minister of Forestry that would indicate that we are giving

7955'

Mr. Flight: consideration at this stage other than the spray programme.

The spray programme, Mr. Speaker, will have the effect of adding one year to the life of a tree, if we spray for ten years we will extend the life of that tree, assuming it is not cut, for ten years. Mr. Speaker, we are going to be spraying trees that Price (Nfld.) will not use for twenty years. We have today in this Province hundreds and thousands, ~~if not millions~~ of cords of overmatured timber. The paper companies at this point in time have harvested the most economical timber, that is, timber that is located closest to the mills. That is one of the reasons, Mr. Speaker. It is common knowledge based on research that the budworm attacks overmatured timber, and it has eaten its way out of overmatured timber, it will then go into the second growth.

And when the budworm infestation problem started in this Province there was plenty of overmatured timber and the people responsible did not move. They did not move. They did not say to the paper companies, "Go in and start harvesting. Leave the second growth alone. Let us go in and take the overmatured." They did not move to put in access roads to get into the overmatured. It appears that from 1971 to 1975, Mr. Speaker, there was no concern whatsoever about the spruce budworm was doing to the forests of this Province. There was an awareness, but there was no concern. There was no corrective action taken. And suddenly in 1977 with the paper companies doing tours on their limits, bringing people in and showing them the disaster, showing them the damage, the Minister of Forestry panicked, and said that we have a panic situation on our hands, we have to spray.

And, Mr. Speaker, there is a fear in this Province, there is a deep rooted fear and a real one maybe that the Province is going into something that they know nothing about. They have not been able to answer the questions on the long-term effects of either Matacil or any of the other chemicals that have been talked about. You hear the Minister of Forestry, Mr. Speaker, saying that if people use

Mr. Flight: **Raid** they should not be worried about a spray programme. No wonder the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker, mistrust the authorities who are talking on behalf of government. It is up to a person's self, I know hundreds of people, Mr. Speaker, who uses **Raid**, but they take all sorts of precautions with it, but at least it is their choice if they want to submit, if they want to - anyone who wants to use **Raid**, if they want to subject themselves or their children to any possible side affects detrimental of raid, they make the decision. But when we go into a massive spray programme, Mr. Speaker, where we know that we can only account for 30 per cent of the insecticide used landing, and we have no idea where the other 70 per cent goes then suddenly people have been subjected to a danger over which they have no control. Seventy per cent

MR. FLIGHT: of the spray that would be sprayed in this forest based on research done in other regions indicates that only thirty per cent of the spray used can be accounted for. And we are spraying within one-sixth of a mile of towns in this Province knowing that seventy per cent of the spray can go anywhere, not knowing where it is going to go. We are spraying over watersheds. It is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the most productive parts of our forest are in the river valleys and around the lakes, because any hon. members who took the time to look at the areas to be sprayed, you will find that. And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry says that paper companies had no input into where we spray. It is significant to note the majority of the areas to be sprayed are either areas that are presently undercut or areas that the companies will cut over the next two to three years.

It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that practically every headwater in this Province that means anything to the economy by way of wildlife or salmon runs, practically every headwater in this Province is going to be sprayed. And the people who have made the decision to spray know no more about what Matacil will do than I know about flying to the moon and back.

Mr. Speaker, I am surprised in an area such as Port au Port, the great salmon fishing rivers, Robinsons, Flat Bay, Harrys, Fishels, Highlands, that have contributed greatly over the years to the inshore sport fishery, and of course it provided the basis for our salmon runs, provided and fed the commercial salmon. I am surprised that we have not had more people uprising and demanding that before you spray you will tell us categorically, and they have got a right to do that, the people of this Province have a right to be told that the Government of Newfoundland, who is about to undertake a spray programme, can tell them definitively what will be the adverse effect of this spray programme. Is there a danger to our fish

MR. FLIGHT: population? Is there a danger to the wildlife population of this Province?

And, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry not in one statement - not only the Minister of Forestry; the Minister of Health, the Minister of the Environment, the Premier, not in one definitive statement have they assured the people of Newfoundland that they are aware of what the side effects of the spray programme will be.

The thing is, Mr. Speaker, we all know that it will not kill the budworm. It will prolong the life of the tree for one year. So 100 years from now we will still be spraying to prolong the life of the tree for another year. We will keep trees in this Province alive for 100 years. And in the process we may wipe out everything else in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, everything that I have seen done as a member in this House, most everything that was ever brought in, Mr. Speaker, is a precedent. We are only twenty-six years old as a Province and we seem to lean for legislation, the Minister of Tourism with his hunter capability test says it is totally, I think, New Brunswick's - New Brunswick's?

MR. CALLAN: Yes, it is.

MR. FLIGHT: Totally New Brunswick's, that is good.

MR. CALLAN: PC you see.

MR. FLIGHT: That is understandable. So, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to take that kind of an attitude, if the legislation we are going to bring into this House is going to be based on legislation on precedents set in other Provinces, it would do well to apply the same principle to forestry. And I will read, Mr. Speaker, some members have probably read this, but here is the hon. Vincent MacLean, Nova Scotia's Minister of Lands and Forests, and it has got to be understandable that any Newfoundland person, anyone in Newfoundland who has read this has got to question the logic of Mr. MacLean

MR. FLIGHT: as opposed to the logic of the Newfoundland Government in supporting and foisting on Newfoundland the spray programme.

"We feel that it is far better from a forestry point of view to suffer our loses now rather than spray and prolong the inevitable, as New Brunswick has done. The forests of New Brunswick," now this is the Minister of Forestry in Nova Scotia, "The forests of New Brunswick after twenty-five yeras of spraying certainly are not the envy of anyone involved in proper forest management." After twenty-five years spraying, this minister and his colleagues had the courage, faced with just as serious a budworm problem in Nova Scotia as we have in Newfoundland, a Province whose economy depends just as much on the forestry as ours does, has the courage to say, "We will face our loses now and

MR. FLIGHT:

as opposed
to spraying we will consider the alternatives. And it appears to be working. The egg mass count in Nova Scotia is down to 50 per cent without a spray programme. The egg mass count in New Brunswick is up 40 per cent with a spray programme. So obviously, the spray programme has had no effect on the budworm itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us get into the affects, the dangers of the chemical that we are going to use. It is a fact, Mr. Speaker, that whether one wants to read anything in this or not, Matacil is not registered in the United States for sale. The Minister of Forestry has leaned time and time again on the fact that six or seven federal agencies have approved Matacil. Well, the fact is the minister knows that those six or seven federal agencies know nothing about the adverse affects of Matacil and have not tested Matacil, and are not aware and could not give any evidence at all based on any research which they have done of the side effects of Matacil to the environment, its ability to break down in water, the effect on the nervous system of people or animals, wildlife, but yet, Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that the Forestry Advisory Committee because of these reasons strongly oppose the use of Matacil and recommended that penetrithion be used. The minister decided to use Matacil, and as a result, people in this Province are asking, Why are we using Matacil when we do not know the long term - or short term, for that matter - adverse effects on our ecology? Reye's Syndrome, Mr. Speaker. It was interesting. A few nights ago on T.V. there was a documentary on Reye's Syndrome, and the case was made that there have been seven or eight cases of Reye's Syndrome uncovered in

MR. FLIGHT: Toronto this past year or so, and obviously, there has not been a spray programme in Toronto, but it is very, very pertinent that the medical authorities there said they believe that every case of Reye's Syndrome in Toronto was associated with the use of a pesticide, that that child was exposed to pesticide. The fact is that all the research that has been done up to this point shows that Reye's Syndrome comes as a result of exposure to a pesticide. And, Mr. Chairman, we are about to expose a lot of our population to a pesticide, one which we know nothing about, and we are going to do it on the pretext that that is the only solution to the forestry problem in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, there is no short term danger to the wood supplies of the paper companies of the Province. The spruce budworm is not posing a serious short term threat;- it is the long term threat we are talking about. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we talk long term, we have already passed six years and we have done nothing. Long term can only be twenty years, one third of that is gone. Had we been practicing proper forest management, had we been thinning, had we been re-seeding with strains of timber that were less susceptible to the budworm, we might not be in the position today to have to force a spray programme on a province, a spray programme that may have no effect whatsoever in helping to control the budworm - indeed, it will not - but will place the health of our people and the well-being of our ecology in jeopardy.

Mr. Speaker, I do not have it to read from here now, but I have read articles where four million birds in one spray programme in New Brunswick were killed - documented, four million birds in 1975. And the minister stands up and says, 'There is no evidence that

May 29, 1978

Tape 3609

EC - 3

MR. FLIGHT:
environment.'

there is any danger to the

Mr. Speaker, we did an
experimental spray programme last summer and I simply
ask that the Environment people would go back now into
the area we sprayed. They know the bird population for
last year. They know as they did their monitoring
whether there was a good population of bird life in the
area.

Mr. Flight: They know the population of the shrew. They know the conditions in the watersheds and the ponds in the area that they sprayed. Why are they refusing to go in now and determine if the bird levels and the insect levels and the fish levels are as was then. That is the kind of thing we have to know, Mr. Speaker. We do not want to go back into a forest next Summer and find that everything including the natural enemy, and there are natural enemies in this Province of the budworm, they have all been killed. Why does not the Minister of the Environment send his people back into those areas and determine what the long-term effect of that spray programme was, and then come out and tell the people of Newfoundland. And if the bird population is the same and the insect population is the same, and there is no apparent damage to our fish, then fine. Tell the people that type of thing, and you may not get the kind of opposition to a spray programme that is building up in this Province right now.

Mr. Speaker, another thing that has not been done in this Province when we are talking about the spray programme, in defending a spray programme, I have not seen printed - and certainly I as a member of the Opposition with no more research assistance - the research staff that we have cannot be expected to reel these figures off the top of my head, but I would if I were the minister - I do not know what Price (Nfld.) and Bowaters required last year as a cut. What was their allowable cut, for instance, last year? Any debate as to whether or not the forests of this Province are in jeopardy because of the spruce budworm infestation would be premature unless the minister, defending his spray programme, could tell the people of Newfoundland exactly what Price's and Bowater's requirements were last year, what they will be for the next eight or ten or ten or fifteen years.

It is very well for an official of Price (Nfld.) or the minister or an official of Bowaters or any other paper company to stand up and say that if he does not spray the operation will be in

Mr. Flight: jeopardy. That is a pretty vague statement when we are looking at millions of acres of wood in this Province. They have not scratched the surface on their limits. I saw a recommendation not long ago that appears to me to make a lot of sense, that it is time we took a look at the limits that those paper companies have. We know that they have practiced bad forest management. They have not practiced any forest management. Forest management, their way of practicing it, where there are millions of cords of wood on their limits that will never benefit this Province, and would never have benefited if there had not been a spruce budworm problem and would never have been cut. We know that. But we need to know to determine whether or not the spokesman for Price and Bowaters are right. We need to know how much wood they cut per year. And how much they are proposing to cut for the next six, seven or eight or nine years as to whether or not their wood supply is indeed endangered. We do not have those kinds of facts. Why does not the minister tell the people of Newfoundland? By and large most people in Newfoundland are fairly educated. Let them relate to the amount of wood that we require to go on, to maintain our forestry as we know it now, to the amount of wood that is in jeopardy that will die over the next eight or ten or fifteen years as opposed to a blanket statement saying, "We have to spray. Our forest industry is in jeopardy."

Mr. Speaker, I have a statement here somewhere that would frighten you to death. Listen to this, the Minister of Forestry for New Brunswick says this, "I do not like to see people dying. This is one of the things that I really would not like to see, but at the same time knowing the forest is as it is, my decision would have to be with the forest." That is a statement from the Minister of Forestry in New Brunswick -

MR. F. ROWE: What did he say?

MR. FLIGHT: "I do not like to see people dying." And by the way, to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, I was not aware of it when he asked me a few days ago, but British Columbia have pulled out of the spray programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

7965

Mr. Flight: Pulled out of it, pulled out because they admitted publicly that they did not know what they were doing, and until they were sure, until they had a Pesticide Act, and until they were in a position to monitor and determine what the long-term adverse effects of a spray programme were, they would not go into it.

The Minister of Health in a recent press release in Newfoundland indicated, one could read into it, that the forest is more important than people. He indicated that in a press release that he made recently, within this past week, depending on how one read the press release. But our people are frightened. They do not need those kinds of statements from the Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: (Inaudible) stuck in my craw (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: What is that?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: What is that? What was that remark?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. FLIGHT: It could be interpreted as saying that. As a matter of fact, as the minister -

MR. FLIGHT: knows it was interpreted as saying that. People in the media in Newfoundland interpret that statement as being that. So I am not placing my interpretation. I am simply saying that the people of this Province- he said, "The reason we are into this debate is to try to ease the minds of the people in this Province who are concerned as to what a spray programme will do to their children, their Province and their -

MR. NEARY: They want to stop it.

MR. FLIGHT: It is the ministry who has the expertise available to them to answer. If the ministers were prepared to give the people of this Province all the evidence, or admit they do not have the evidence -

MR. NEARY: They do not have it.

MR. FLIGHT: - say, "We are going anyway. We are going to spray anyway, regardless." And that is the situation we are into, Mr. Speaker. We are going to spray regardless.

I have a statement here -

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order;

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. H. COLLINS: (Inaudible) because the record might show that the hon. member made the statement that I was more concerned about the forests of this Province than I was about the health of the people. I cannot permit that to go on the record unchallenged and I would -

MR. FLIGHT: I withdraw (inaudible).

MR. H. COLLINS: - I would ask the hon. member to withdraw that statement, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.
Mr. Speaker, what my hon. friend said, it would appear from remarks and press releases and statements made

MR. NEARY: by the hon. gentleman, it would appear that the hon. gentleman was more concerned about trees than he was about people and that is a fact, Sir, because everybody in this Province heard what the hon. gentleman said, including the hon. gentleman's constituents in Gander and that is the way they interpreted his statement, Sir.

Now the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) is not responsible for writing the minister's press releases. The hon. gentleman should be more careful in his choice of words. In my opinion, Sir, it is just a matter of opinion between two hon. gentlemen, Sir, and there is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Is the hon. member rising in support of the point of order?

AN HON. MEMBER: No. No.

MR. SPEAKER: The issue in the point of order is whether the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) has interpreted an alleged statement by the hon. minister in such a way that it leads to an impression that the hon. minister did not feel he gave or thought he gave.

I think this is more than just a difference of opinion between two members. Hon. members will realize that a statement cannot be made to be in order if it is out of order on its own strength. It cannot be made to be in order if it is ascribed to someone else or used in a hypothetical situation. So I would have to ask the hon. member if he would withdraw the statement unless he -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would point out that when a ruling is given from the Chair it assists the Chair greatly if hon. members do not interrupt.

I would ask the hon. member for

MR. SPEAKER: Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) if he would withdraw the statement unless he is himself making a charge. In other words, if he is reporting what someone else is stating but not himself holding that opinion, as this would relate to a ruling that the Speaker made earlier today, but if he is himself making a definitive statement, a definitive charge in that regard, well this would be an entirely different matter.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I have no desire to make any definitive accusations. I simply put an interpretation, I am entitled to interpret. When I read a press release it is up to me to interpret. Newfoundland has got to do it, the people who it is directed to, and I simply interpreted it as meaning - it could be read that way, I said. I have no desire to embarrass the minister. My concern is not with the minister at this particular time, Mr. Speaker, it is with the spray programme, the effects it will have on this Province, and whether or not it is necessary, being just as concerned and just as knowledgeable about the value of our forests as the ministry, as that minister or any other minister. My concern at this time is not making political points or embarrass the minister. It is to see that the right - try to expose this situation and try to force that government to prove that they are doing the only and the right and the proper thing and that the better interest of this Province is in mind.

Let me read from this - obviously here is a source that is going to have to be considered. Mr. Speaker, one of the ministers in speaking in some Question Period a few days ago, indicated that we were making a political issue out of the spruce budworm effect. Listen to what MacTaggart Cowan, former Chairman of the Science Council of Canada said, per se, generally about spraying. "The actual operation control programme

May 29, 1978

Tape No. 3611

NM - 4

MR. FLIGHT: is so complex and chaotic that except in the crudest sense we have no knowledge of how much spray will actually reach the spruce budworm or where the remainder will lodge in any given operation." And you wonder why the people in Gander are concerned? They are going to spray over Gander Lake. And here is the past Chairman of the Science Council of Canada saying that we have no idea where the majority of it will lodge.

MR. FLIGHT: "McTaggart Cowan, former Chairman of the Research Council of Canada, said that research into effects of the budworm programme done to date lacks vigour, planning and control, and one wonders whether there has been more concern with appearing busy than shedding light on the risks and the benefits." If those kinds of statements coming from those kinds of qualified people do not leave the people of Newfoundland wondering who is telling the truth, who is withholding what, does not make them worry, frightened to death as to just what will be the long term effects of the programme we are going into;

Mr. Speaker, having moved this motion then it is my understanding that it will be my responsibility to close the debate.

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

I do not think the hon. gentleman will have a chance to close the debate. This is not that type of a motion. I would like that clarified and I would like the introducer of that motion to know that before we close down.

MR. FLIGHT: I thank the hon. member, Mr. Speaker. When I have as much experience in parliamentary procedure -

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! That point that was brought up may not become an active issue in actual fact, but it will be looked into and I will inform the hon. member before the afternoon is out.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, as I understand it I have roughly four or five minutes left, I will say now that maybe one of the most important side effects of the proposed spray programme is to focus attention of the people of this

MR. FLIGHT: Province on the lack, the total and absolute lack of forest management or total lack of concern for what has been going on in our forests up to this point in time.

In 1971 we had the message that our forests were under a severe budworm attack. Nothing happened. Nothing happened this past four years, so maybe, Mr. Speaker, one of the effects of the spruce budworm controversy will be to focus attention again on the lack of concern that we, as a province, have had on one of our most vital and most important areas of our economy.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry has said, 'We will spray regardless of what the people think,' He said that. And, Mr. Speaker, I would say again that I do not believe in government by referendum, but I tell the minister that if the opposition to that spray programme builds up to the extent that I expect it to build up, if the petitions come into this House that I expect to come in, then he will find out that 75 per cent or 80 per cent of the population of this Province will be against the spray programme and he will have their names. Now if he is going to go ahead and spray then in spite of that kind of representation, then we may as well shut down this House of Assembly and declare this a dictatorship.

Mr. Speaker, the people of this Province are worried. They are not getting the answers. They have been given no evidence that the spray programme as proposed by the Department of Forestry will have any effect in lessening the budworm infestation. They are frightened that in spite of all sorts of presentations opposing it the government is showing a lack of concern

May 29, 1978

Tape 3612

EC - 3

MR. FLIGHT: for the health and welfare of the people by deliberately spraying watersheds, deliberately spraying within quarters of miles, one-sixth of a mile of any given town. We are still into an experimental stage. There are millions of acres of valuable wood on Bowaters limits and Price limits and Crown limits that could have been sprayed this year in what is really only our second year in what is the emphasis of a spray programme. But instead they callously decided to spray the headwater, the water supplies, the fringes of municipalities, towns in this Province where there will be a direct - Mr. Speaker when one considers this:

MR. FLIGHT:

If there is any possibility at all that the chemical Matacil can have an adverse effect on people's health, then we are going to spray the people, we are going to test the people. We are going to be guinea pigs. Because we could have taken the same acreage. If we are going to spray one million acres in Newfoundland today we could have selected that million acreage without any fear that the population areas of this Province would have been effected, that is, effected directly, by the spray. But instead we selected areas that guarantee that seventy per cent of the spray that we are going to release from those aircraft might indeed fall on populated areas in this Province. Now does that make sense? Is there any member on that side of the House who believes that there may be a millionth of a chance that Matacil may adversely effect the health of our people, that there is a danger, knowing that that is a possibility we will stand up and defend the government's attitude to spray water supplies, to spray towns, to spray within one-sixth of a mile of a community?

That is absolutely stupid? That is absolutely callous and stupid and irresponsible to have ever selected the sites that are indicated on that map. We have all kinds, millions of acres of second growth, the kind of timber we are out to protect, and look what we decided. I want to hear the minister indicating, he has been asked a question already, Mr. Speaker, why the sites selected, why indeed they were selected, the sites selected within a mile, within one-sixth of a mile, within one-half a mile of populated areas.

And, Mr. Speaker, to allude to something else. The minister is lucky in a sense. There is not in this year's programme anyway and there may not be in next year's programme, there is no intention of spraying the Avalon Peninsula. And I

MR. FLIGHT:

suspect that may have been deliberate.

I do not know what the percentage of infestation is on the Avalon Peninsula. But I suspect that if the word went out that the Avalon Peninsula, the environs of St. John's were to be sprayed, we would have another demonstration in front of this building. But by and large the greatest percentage of the population of Newfoundland is on the Avalon Peninsula, concentrated in the St. John's area and away from - they are not afraid of the effects of Matacil or any spray being used. But I suspect if the people outside of St. John's who intend to get involved and intends to oppose the spray program, if they suddenly get the sympathy of the people on the Avalon Peninsula, of the people in St. John's and that portion of the population comes out opposed to the spray program, or not necessarily opposed to the spray program but simply demanding that the government indicate that they are aware of what that spray program is going to do in this Province, that is the issue in this debate. We are not opposed to the spray program. We are simply saying that we are entitled to know what the effect will be and whether or not it will do anything to improve our forests or to add years to the trees. What will it do to our environment? That is the purpose of this debate, not to oppose a spray program per se but so that we as a government are able to tell the people of this Province just what they can expect as a result of the spray program, what the long-term adverse effects will be and what the short-term benefits will be.

And to this point, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Newfoundland have failed dismissally to do this to the people and as a result we have the kind of protest that we are about to see shaping up in this Province right now. As a result we have people worried, concerned and afraid with no proof of what they are risking. If the government could indicate that this is the only possibility and that there are not other alternatives, that the spray program in itself will have a

MR. FLIGHT: financial or any other beneficial effect, and if the government could indicate what we can expect as adverse effects, what effect it will have on our environment, on the health and well-being of our people, maybe we would not see the kind of opposition we are going to see, Mr. Speaker. To this point the government have not addressed themselves to what the people of Newfoundland fear with regards to the spray program that is presently being forced on them without them having had the benefit of any input.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! If the hon. members will permit me just for one moment. The question has come up whether the hon. member who moved the motion can speak again in the debate and to clarify this perhaps I could just read subsection (b) of Standing Order 53 which states as follows: "A reply shall be allowed to the mover of a substantive motion but not to the mover of an amendment to the previous question or an instruction to a committee." So the question comes down to whether this is a substantive motion or not and I would refer hon. members to Erskine May,

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) page 277 which states as follows, part way down the page. "The motion that this House do now adjourn moved when there is no question before the House is a form of substantive motion." So this motion that we are now debating is a substantive motion; therefore the hon. member would have the opportunity to close the debate if the occasion arises.

The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: It appears nobody wants to speak over on the other side Mr. Speaker, I will certainly yield and have the back and forth type of -

MR. J. CARTER: I am prepared to speak.

MR. W. ROWE: As long as I am not giving up my right to speak, Sir. Obviously somebody has to rise. But it is understood, Sir, that in yielding I can speak later.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) It is understood that the hon. Leader of the Opposition has not spoken but is yielding his place to the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I just want to get clarification. Can we speak more than once on this motion or is that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please! Perhaps I could clarify. The mover of the motion, which has now been clarified as being a substantive motion, may speak in closing the debate. So he may speak twice, but other hon. members would speak in the normal way, that is, for forty-five minutes, except that the Premier and the hon. Leader of the Opposition would have their own prerogatives in this regard.

Did I understand that the hon. member for St. John's North was about to speak?

MR. W. ROWE: As long as I have it understood I reserve the right to speak.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) It is understood the hon. Leader of the Opposition has not spoken in the debate. If the hon. member for St. John's North speaks, that is understood.

Hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I think that there are some points that should be made in this debate and the first one I would like to make is that chemicals can be good servants but bad masters; chemicals in that sense are like fire. And the question arises should we leave the present infestation that we have to nature or should we attempt to do something about it? What should our attempts be?

If we do nothing presumably nature will heal these scars in one hundred or two hundred years.

MR. WHITE: Or ten or fifteen or twenty.

MR. J. CARTER: The hon. member said ten or fifteen. It cannot happen in ten or fifteen years by natural means because the spruce budworm will go until it is checked by lack of food or some -

MR. WHITE: (Inaudible) 1704.

MR. J. CARTER: There is another factor that the hon. member is overlooking. I would appreciate no interruptions but however I am prepared to deal with legitimate points as they come up. One of the points that has been made of course is that this present spruce budworm infestation, or really it should be called a fir budworm, I suppose, because the tree that it attacks is a fir tree and not a spruce tree. It is pretty voracious and it will eat almost any kind of coniferous tree but it seems to prefer the fir tree. Of course, the fact that we have mismanaged the woods for so many decades means that there has been massive regrowth of fir trees that have grown so closely together that a spruce budworm merely has to turn its head to be chewing on another tree. It does not have any difficulty getting from tree to tree so it is able to go through these trees like wildfire and that is one of the reasons why we have such a heavy infestation. In an ordinary virgin forest or crown climax forest this would not be the case. There would be some specie mix and some trees would die and others would, because of the room left to them, would be able to grow that much better and would take their place and you would hardly notice. There is always something in the woods chewing at leaves and trees. Insects should not be regarded as invaders, they are perfectly natural. It is only when the insect population gets out of control that they are a danger and a problem as the spruce budworm now is.

May 29, 1978

Tape No. 3614

AH-3

MR. J. CARTER: So if we do not do anything, given the state of the woods as they are now, with all due deference to the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), if we do not do anything we are looking at about one hundred to two hundred years before the woods look after themselves, by the time all the crowded fir trees are killed off and replaced by another species that can perhaps hold and regenerate itself in our forest land.

Mr. J. Carter: Now I am told that it takes a spruce budworm about five years to kill a tree, that a tree can sustain a bad attack one year, it eats some of the needles, there is still enough vigor left in the tree to produce more new buds for the next year and this can happen perhaps as long as five years before a tree is finally finished by the spruce budworm. So if in any point in its infestation the attack can be stopped so as the tree is given a breathing space presumably then it will live for another five years. In other words, if in year three you can somehow give it a breathing space it may then take until year eight before it is killed even given -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, no! Oh, no!

MR. J. CARTER: I have watched trees, infested trees, and, you know, I have observed them, I am not just talking off the top of my head, I have observed this, and I am concerned about it. And my observations plus what I have read lead me to believe that if a coniferous tree is given a breathing space, its natural ability to regenerate itself that it will last for, you know, it will last for another few years before it is finally killed. Now, of course, if the infestation is particularly heavy the tree will perhaps die in less than five years, and if the infestation is slight it may live for ten or fifteen years; and it may assume peculiar shapes if the top is killed and the bottom branches fan out. And, of course, whether the tree survives or not it is only of academic interest because it is so misshapened that it is no good for a saw log, it is not much good for timber or for pulp wood, it is probably only good for firewood, and it is a misshapen thing, it is more in the way than anything else.

So spraying is only a stopgap solution as far as I am concerned. I do not think anyone in their right senses thinks that we have in order to maintain our forests we should spray every year. I do not think we should spray all of our forests, I think spraying is not the ideal answer. I do not necessarily rely on spraying of the woods to solve our problem. The solution to our problems are much more long-term. And at the end of the few remarks

Mr. J. Carter: I have to make I will make some particular recommendations that I think would help out.

You know, we have to make the choice; do we want a forest industry or do we not? And what is our forest industry worth to us. And what can it be worth to us?

I think hon. gentlemen should be very, very grateful that this is 1978 and not 1878, because if we had an infestation back in 1878 and tried to attack it chemically, what kind of chemicals would we have had at our disposal? Now medieval man used Bordeaux mixture which is a mixture of lime and copper sulfate, which is quite poisonous, and not degradable. Our ancestors in the last century had arsenic of lead. I do not know if hon. gentlemen would prefer arsenic of lead. That is not degradable or self-degradable. If you spread that around your house and come back in 5,000 years it is still just as lethal, just as poisonous, and probably just as much of it around. So I am glad there is no arsenic of lead being proposed. I am glad there is no calcium arsenate, I am glad there is no mercury bichloride all these are extremely dangerous, very toxic, poisonous, and the death people die from them is a horrible one. So thank goodness we are not living in the last century.

The chemicals that we propose to use today at least have a very short life, and they revert to harmless elements very shortly.

Now a few years ago there was quite a fuss about DDT and Aldren. Aldren was an insecticide that was mixed in the fertilizer, and proved to be a boon against all sorts of root maggots and cutworms and various insects that attack crops. But it was found to persist, it persisted in the soil, and it persisted in the tissues of animals that ate material that had been sprayed or protected by Aldren, and it accumulated. Although a person could ingest some of it without any apparent harm, it stored itself in the body fat, and once the person, for one reason or another lost weight either accidentally or on purpose, then this DDT or Aldren, these particular chemicals, would reassert themselves, would reappear and cause problems. So these have been banned and very wisely so.

May 29, 1978

Tape 3616

EC - 1

MR. J. CARTER: And a great many crops do not need to be sprayed. Aromatic crops, herbs, onions, certain types of flowers, - calendulas, I think, are resistant to insect attack, because they are aromatic; so the problem does not exist, does not occur for all crops. In fact, it has been estimated that only a very small percentage of the world's crops need to be protected by spray of any kind. And also, most of mankind's efforts against insect attack and disease is done by breeding resistance stock, For instance, there is now rust-resistant wheat and canker-resistant potato, and in time, perhaps, there will be a spruce budworm resistant fir tree, but there is not at the moment. This would be the long term hope.

But in the meantime, what do you do while these resistant strains are being developed? And I think of a particular farmer in Coledale, Alberta, who by himself farms 2,300 acres of land. A lot of it is grain and a lot of it is potatoes. And when his potatoes break through the ground he sets them with a potato planter. When his potatoes break through the ground, there is the Colorado potato beetle just waiting to devour them. So he 'phones up the spray 'plane and asks them to come in, and they spray his acreage with some relatively rapidly degrading chemical and the Colorado potato beetle is conquered. And he goes ahead and has a good crop of potatoes.

And I would like hon. gentlemen opposite, and in fact all hon. gentlemen, to consider this following fact. I do not mind a person being against a particular spray - I think we should all look before we leap - but are the hon. gentlemen making a fuss about Matacil and yet sitting down and eating apples or having

7982

May 29, 1978

Tape 3616

EC - 2

MR. J. CARTER: a feed of pork and cabbage when they go home, because those two crops, apples and cabbage - apples particularly - are sprayed once a week during their bearing lifetime.

MR. FLIGHT: With Matacil?

MR. J. CARTER: Not with Matacil, but with various chemicals that presumably degrade. But an apple tree is first sprayed with something to cut down the amount of blossom, because the hybrid apple tree would produce so many apples that it would break its branches. And then it is sprayed against various insect attacks on the average of once a week during its entire lifetime. Now I cannot see a person being afraid of a spray 'plane in the distance that is hopefully keeping away from populated areas and from watersheds - and I would agree with hon. gentlemen there, that these spray 'planes should keep away from inhabited areas and from watersheds - but I cannot see hon. gentlemen objecting to spraying infested woods and yet at the same time not having something to say about cabbage and apples.

MR. WHITE: Spraying period.

MR. J. CARTER: Well, if the hon. gentleman wants to cut out all spray he had better tighten his belt because he is going to be a lot thinner than he is now and so will most of us, because we are supporting an unnaturally large population on this earth by virtue of chemical warfare of various kinds.

MR. FLIGHT: May I ask one question?

MR. J. CARTER: Yes, Sir.

MR. FLIGHT: Has the member familiarized himself with the areas being sprayed?

MR. J. CARTER: Yes, and I have also familiarized

MR. J. CARTER: myself with the intention of the government not to spray when they pass over watersheds and not to spray if there is any sign of human habitation so that the areas that we are talking about being sprayed are, I understand, uninhabited.

MR. FLIGHT: No. You are wrong.

MR. J. CARTER: No, I realize that there are inhabited areas within the boundary that is to be sprayed, as the member showed on the map, but, for instance, any town or settlement or any habitation whatsoever in the path of the spray 'plane, the pilot would turn off his spray at a sensible, reasonable distance from that inhabited area so that there should be practically no drift in any inhabited area. I think that is very important, and I agree with the hon. gentleman when he has concerns, but I would say that it is my understanding that the chemical, Matacil, is one that does self-destruct very rapidly and also is a very specific narrow guage chemical which aims itself at the stomach enzyme of the spruce budworm, so it is a very concentrated attack against not the spruce budworm, but against the stomach enzyme of the spruce budworm, without which it cannot digest its food and must die of starvation and

MR. J. CARTER:

that this chemical is not necessarily unsafe. It is a very specific chemical. It is a very specific poison against a very specific target, not even the spruce budworm but the colenestres enzyme in the gut of the spruce budworm. So some may not be touched by it. It depends on the particular enzyme makeup of the gut. So this is another point. It is not a broad spectrum insecticide like DDT or like aldren or like, say, the commoner poisons that I mentioned earlier like arsenative lead or calcium arsiniate. These are board spectrum that kill everything, birds, fish, mammals, man, horses, cows, pigs; whatever it gets in contact with it will poison including the hon. gentleman if he got to close to it or ingested any. Also these are poisons without any antidotes and they are very bad and thank goodness we are living in the present century and not a hundred years ago.

So, what should we do? Now these are the recommendations I have to make and I think hon. gentlemen opposite would agree with me. First of all, we spray very carefully. I do not think anyone in their senses would suggest that we blanket all of Newfoundland with the spray even if we could do it. Even if we could devise some method for blanketing Newfoundland with spray we would not do it. We spray very carefully. We avoid watersheds and we avoid people. I think that is the first thing.

The second recommendation is that either through harvest or through controlled burning we destroy some infested areas altogether, clear out the woods, clear out the infestation and start again where possible. Now it may not be feasible to do this over a wide area but some areas should be completely cleaned.

MR. J. CARTER:

We should investigate a specie change. We should look for a tree that will grow, will survive in our climate which will grow faster and resist the attacks of other spruce budworm.

We should encourage an active programme of reforestation. Every time a tree is cut a tree should be planted. We should not just clear cut and then allow for nature to replant. We should set out more woods roads, far more woods roads. Our forests should be accessible so that if trouble occurs we should be able to go where that trouble is and deal with it promptly, effectively and quickly. In fact, we should use what I call the Royal Newfoundland Air Force much more accurately as spotters, and this spotting should be done on a proper grid network so that the forests of Newfoundland are kept under constant monitoring, especially in the Summer, not only for fire but for insect attack, for any number of things that can go wrong with our woods.

I might mention that the State of Georgia monitors its forests on a daylight to dark basis all during the year. Now of course their climate is different. They have no snow cover. They have no Winter or very little Winter. Except for when there is a snow cover, they monitor their forests from dawn until dark and they are on the outlook for forest fire, for insect attack, for all sorts of things that can go wrong. And they send a crew in there within hours of spotting any trouble. So we could perhaps take a leaf out of their book. Now it so happens that their forest industry is worth \$1.2 billion a year and is growing. Ours is certainly not worth that, but it is a considerable industry and one that we should

MR. J. CARTER:

protect. And I am very glad that this debate is taking place. I am the last one who would object to this debate taking place. I am not trying to protect any particular stand. I just think that there are some facts that all hon. gentleman should be aware of and I make these points early in the debate while I have a chance.

Another thing that I think hon. gentlemen will agree with is that we should undertake more research. We do not know a lot about our forests. There is a lot that we do not know and we should undertake more research. One of the area of research is the kind of spray or the kind of chemical that we use. And a very encouraging line of research that seems to be opening up is the possibility of using a mould, a biological weapon against the spruce budworm. There is apparently a mildew that attacks the spruce budworm itself and attacks that and nothing else and is quite harmless to man or beast and

MR. J. CARTEP: could be very safely sprayed in this Chamber without any danger except to any possible moths that hon. gentlemen might have in their clothes.

The sixth recommendation that I would make, Mr. Speaker, is that we fertilize our woods. Our soils are deficient in trace elements. They are deficient in phosphorus, deficient in potassium, and massively deficient in nitrogen. They are also deficient in lime, very sour. Even the addition of a very small amount of fertilizer, a careful mix of fertilizer, will increase the growth ring of our trees by two or three hundred per cent, and if we have a forest industry that is worth protecting then we should consider fertilizing.

It is also my belief that trees that are growing marginally, as most of our forest trees are, are themselves much more susceptible to the spruce budworm than a tree that is vigorous and growing rapidly. After all, it stands to reason if a tree is growing vigorously and rapidly, a spruce budworm has to do that much more damage to the tree in order to harm it, to kill it, because there is that much more growth on the tree and that much more can be replaced that much more quickly. Remember, the spruce budworm only operates for the first few weeks of the year. There is very little late season growth in our trees. Partly this is due to our climate but it is also partly due to the very barren, or lack of fertility in our soil. If we had a late season's growth in our forests, any damage that the spruce budworm did in the spring could be repaired by the plant itself in the fall or later on in the season. So this is well worth considering.

So, to recapitulate, we should spray, and spray very carefully—no watersheds, no people; control burning or control clearing of some areas; a specie change; reforestation; more woods roads; more research; and fertilize. And I would say that some hon. gentlemen, not necessarily in this House, but some people, I think, are

MR. J. CARTER: using scare tactics. It seems to be popular to take a particular topic and use it, beat it to death. Now I do not think that, for instance, Matacil is a terribly dangerous chemical. I do understand that it is a new chemical. It is chosen because it degrades fast, and I think that this is a thing in its favour. But because it is a new chemical you can scare people with it; people do not know much about it.

I would ask hon. gentleman to consider how dangerous ordinary motor oil is. A few years ago, some unconscionable Arab traders in the Middle East sold a whole lot of motor oil for vegetable cooking oil, and something like 10,000 people went blind as a result of that. So, when we are talking about dangerous chemicals, we use a lot of dangerous chemicals; they are good servants but they are bad masters.

I do not think this is a simple debate or a simple subject, and I think everything should be made as simple as possible, but not simpler.

So with those few points I will take my seat and I would be very interested in what hon. gentlemen have to say.

MR. SPEAKER (COLLINS): Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. POWE: Mr. Speaker, I listened with great interest, Sir, to what the hon. gentleman had to say on this matter and as usual -

MR. S. NEAFY: You are not sure if he is for or against now.

MR. W. POWE: I do not know what he stands for, Mr. Speaker, as usual. One of his hon. colleagues, Leo Barry, who used to be a member of this House, once stood up and said, concerning some other member of the House who shall remain unnamed, that he was like a mackerel by moonlight; he both shone and stank. I would take from that, Sir, that he said the member both was brilliant, looked good and made sense, but also, Sir, on the other side did not look so good, did not shine and did not make too much sense.

May 29, 1978

Tape 3618

BT-3

MR. W. POWE: The hon. member talked in terms of the spray not necessarily poisoning the population, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour should know that this spray might not poison everybody in the Province. Not necessarily so, he says. It is not necessarily the case that this spray may pollute the rivers and kill the wildlife and wipe out the birds and pollute

MR. W.N. ROWE: all the sources of water in the Province, Sir. This may never happen. We maybe needlessly be alarmists in this matter, as if for some strange reason it is up to those who are protesting against being poisoned to prove that when poisons are being used, Sir, we have to prove that we are not going to be poisoned. If that is not putting the shoe on the wrong foot, Mr. Speaker, I cannot think of anything that would be putting the shoe on the wrong foot. Surely it is up to those who seek to poison us to prove that it is not going to harm us, Mr. Speaker. If we raise reasonable objections to the fact that a spray, a chemical spray is going to be used which in certain dosages can wipe every living thing off the face of the earth, if we raise objections and protests as reasonable human beings to the use of such a chemical, then let those who seek to use that spray prove beyond a reasonable shadow of a doubt not beyond a reasonable doubt, beyond a shadow of a doubt- that the use of such a chemical, Mr. Speaker, will not be harmful to human life or to animal life or to plant life. No, Mr. Speaker, it has not been done.

The hon. member stands up in his place and says, "Let us make sure we spray carefully when we are using this spray," and I supposed he must. He is sitting on that side of the House so he must be supporting the government spray program, but 'let us make sure we spray carefully' when it has been shown by my hon. friend, by everyone who knows anything about it that spraying is going to take place in the head waters, that he says it should not be taking place in, that it is going to be going in water supply systems, as the people of Gander are amply concerned about and not supported by their member in this matter either. "Spray carefully," he says, and spraying is taking place within two miles, one mile, a half a mile, one sixth of a mile, Sir, of communities, of liviers, settlements of people in this Province, and he says spray carefully!

MR. J. CARTER: (Inaudible) it the period it will degrade.

MR. W.N. ROWE: It may degrade, Mr. Speaker, we all degrade at some point in time. As Lord Keynes once said, "We are all dead in the long run,"

MR. W.N. ROWE: so why worry about the fact when you know you are going to die anyway so what difference does it make. A day! What cosmic significance does it have whether my hon. member is poisoned tomorrow or fifty years from now? Nothing, Mr. Speaker, in the unfolding of the universe, no significance whatsoever, except, I would submit, to him, himself and to people who may for some reason or other have some affection for that hon. member. It may make a difference to them, but no cosmic significance. And, Sir, we are talking about individuals here. The Reye's Syndrome for example is not an affliction which is nearly, for example, as bad on humanity as the motor car accidents; booze, for example, the consumption of alcohol and driving cars does much more to individuals than does chemical spray if it cause Reye's Syndrome. But, Sir, there are a half a dozen cases here and there throughout Canada involving the lifes, the destruction, the crippling of lives of innocent individuals and if we can prevent one such case, Sir, we should do so and we should not take consolation from the fact that the spray program is only causing this or may be causing this in a half a dozen cases per year when there maybe fifty thousand cases of automobile accidents. Therefore, Sir, there is nothing wrong with the spray program. Of course that is just a ridiculous type of argument, the kind of argument which was used by proponents of the Vietnamese War in the United States - fewer people being killed in Vietnam than on our highways, therefore the Vietnamese War is somehow acceptable. The same kind of an argument has been used by the hon. member on the other side of the House.

MR. J. CARTER: It comes back on you if there is no harm in spraying.

MR. W.N. ROWE: So the hon. member says, Sir. I did not know he was an expert in these fields.

MR. J. CARTER: I used the Federal Government figures.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well the Federal Government, the Provincial Government they have all been known to be wrong in this matter, Sir. Let the record show, Mr. Speaker, that we are having a debate on the spruce budworm spray programme and when the matter was raised by my hon. friend from Windsor-Buchans and allowed by the Speaker, not one member on that side

May 29, 1978

Tape No. 3619

JM - 3

MR. W.N. ROWE: of the House, Mr. Speaker, rose in their place in order to support the Speaker's prima facie ruling that the debate should take place. Only on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, was there enough concern and interest shown in this use of poison in our air and water and soil, only on this side was there enough concern

MR. W. ROWE:

to bring members to their feet in order to make sure that the required twelve members, the requisite twelve members had risen in their place and therefore the debate could take place. If we had had for some reason or other only ten members on this side of the House, Mr. Speaker, we would not be having this debate today in spite of the woolly words of my hon. friend from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) who is delighted this debate is taking place. Yes, Mr. Speaker, delighted now that it is thrust down his throat and like the other members on that side of the House, Sir, who will now take part in this debate and talk about the alacrity with which they do so and how good it is to debate this important subject in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker.

Not one of them, the Minister of the Environment over there, the Minister of Health, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), holier than thou, not one of them rose in their place in order to support a debate on an issue which is probably of the most crucial significance of any issue or any debate which will take place in this House this year.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: Not one of them. Let the public be aware of that, Sir. I will do my share of effort to make the public aware of that simple fact. I hope the media in this Province does so as well. Let the people know that there is a government here which is complacent, unconcerned, lacking in interest about these very vital matters.

MR. J. CARTER: Why did you not raise it?

MR. NEARY: We have been raising it every day.

MR. W. ROWE: Every single day, Sir. Every single day the matter has been raised. Mr. Speaker, why are the

MR. W. ROWE:

people of Newfoundland worried about this spray programme? Why are we as members on this side of the House worried about this spray programme? One of the reasons, Mr. Speaker, would have to be the unmitigated arrogance and ignorance in the sense, Sir, of lack of knowledge, not unmannerly, ignorance, lacking of knowledge of the Minister of the Environment sitting across the House over there, a minister, Sir, who has had one of the most powerful of the media in this Province come out in an editorial today, two editorials, as a matter of fact. One mentioned it briefly there over the weekend, I believe. This issue today devotes a whole editorial to the subject. That was The Evening Telegram. The Daily News did the same thing on Friday I believe. A few radio stations and television stations have mentioned it as well in an editorial capacity.

The Minister of the Environment, who we in this House and members of the public look to to protect our interests, Mr. Speaker, when it comes to the pollution of air and water and soil in this Province, those are his terms of reference. That is why the \$2 million or so is cut out under that subhead in the estimates, to protect us against pollution of air and water and soil, the very matters which are affected by this spray programme. That hon. minister, Sir, has the unmitigated, unprecedented arrogance to refuse to answer questions reasonably put with no malice or a forethought concerning the spray programme. Arrogant, Mr. Speaker, arrogant, an hon. minister who stands up in this House and says, oh he is going to resign this year now. He cannot stand what is going on in the House. He is going to resign, Mr. Speaker, and get out; a minister, Sir, who spends a quarter of his time in the House, I

MR. W. ROWE:

suppose, gets up and does not answer—or refuses to get up and answer questions about the most crucial issue facing us in this House of Assembly this year. Refuses to answer, Sir, out of complete arrogance or what is probably closer to the truth and probably, Sir, more dangerous, refuses to answer, Sir, because he does not know. As a minister of this government he does not know the answers to these questions. He does not know, Mr. Speaker, if there is any other Province or state in North America using Matacil. Some of his expert advisors in his department or other departments may know but that hon. minister, Sir, has not shown enough concern or interest in this vital subject to find out that information. If he did know, Sir, I cannot imagine anyone being as arrogant as not to stand in his place and say well, yes, such and such a state is using it or no, Mr. Speaker, no other Province or state is using this particular chemical. Why would he not answer the question? Ignorance, Sir, lack of knowledge is the only reason he would not answer the question. There could not be any other reason for it.

Mr. W. Rowe: And here we are in this House, and members of the public relying on that hon. minister to protect us against a poison being sprayed into the air and the water and the soil of this Province. And the hon. the Minister of Forestry will stand in his place and wonder why we are worried and concerned about this spray programme, Mr. Speaker. The same questions are directed to the Premier of the Province. Where is the Premier, by the way?

MR. NEARY: He has not been here now for two or three days.

MR. W. ROWE: The same question is directed to the hon. the Premier, Sir, responsible for the Cabinet. The man, Sir, from whom all of the other ministers emanate; without him, Sir, there are no ministers. He appoints them. He dismisses them. He is responsible for them to the Crown. Direct a question concerning the use of spray - where it is going to be sprayed, why other provinces have not sprayed, why other provinces are spraying - the hon. the Premier, Sir, has no knowledge whatsoever on the programme. He cannot stand up and assure the House or the public that he knows anything about it, that this is the right thing to do, that this is in the best interest of the public of this Province, because he also, Mr. Speaker, I would submit, is grossly ignorant, grossly lacking in knowledge about this spray programme and what its effects may be. I would say the hon. the Premier has not spend any more time than the time it is taking to sit down and talk to the hon. the Minister of Forestry, ten or fifteen minutes perhaps, had taken no more time than that to acquaint himself with the facts and figures and prognosis and possibilities of this particular programme, because the Premier is not concerned, Sir, about this. It is obvious from talking to him, listening to him in this House, he is not concerned and he is grossly ignorant and lacking in knowledge about this spray programme.

So we have the Minister of the Environment, who is too arrogant or lacking in knowledge, Sir, to give any answers to this House, and has been condemned by some of the most powerful of the media in this Province for his arrogance or his ignorance - I think it

Mr. W. Rowe: is the latter, which is even more frightening. Arrogance you can cope with. That is a psychological quirk. Ignorance, ignorance, Mr. Speaker, means that we all may suffer, we all may suffer because he does not know what he is doing, grossly incompetent, grossly lacking in knowledge, totally unconcerned, dying to get out of this House. If I were the Premier of this Province and I had that hon. member as a minister, Sir, he would be thrown out the day after he refused to answer a question concerning this vital issue in this House. Throw him out and put somebody in there who is concerned about it!

The hon. the member for the Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) would be more interested, would be more concerned and more knowledgeable, Sir, within two days after assuming the Portfolio than that hon. Minister of the Environment. And he would stand in his place, I am sure, as would any other member there, the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall), as pious as he may want to appear to be and holier than thou and so on, Sir, would at least acquaint himself with the facts, and would be in a position to make a sensible, detailed, reassuring statement to the House, if reassurance is required, or results from the facts, or in fact, Sir, stand, I am sure, as an independent member of Cabinet and convince his colleague, and advise the House that they decided against a spray programme because of a lack of scientific knowledge as to what might result from it. They would all do that, Mr. Speaker, but not this hon. minister, and the fact that he is still in the Cabinet after such an arrogant and ignorant display of contempt for this hon. House, Sir, is an indication as to the Premier's lack of concern as well, and his lack of knowledge for tolerating that display and for not himself making himself acquainted with the facts and figures and likely results and possibilities and probabilities of using massive dosages of poison throughout this Province, well within wind distance and drift distance of water and towns and communities and individuals.

7998

MR. W. ROWE:

So what are we left with, Mr. Speaker?

We are left with the Minister of Forestry basically, under whose control the spray program comes, to protect our interests as human beings and as people living in this Province.

Now the Minister of Forestry, Mr. Speaker, is a fine fellow, a gentleman, but, Sir, I would not be speaking the truth if I were to say that I thought that he had the grasp on this subject, the intellectual capacity regarding this subject, and the interest in this subject, Sir, to know that our best interests in this Province are being protected by that hon. Minister. I, Sir, do not have the confidence in that hon. Minister to trust him to spray poison into the air we breathe and into the water we drink, speaking collectively, in this Province, and feel that we were being protected in this Province against the possibility, or probability, of disaster resulting from a spray program that he is administering. I would be lying, Sir, if I said that I trusted or had confidence in that hon. gentleman, decent a man as he is, gentlemanly as he is, to administer a spray program involving a deadly chemical which is being sprayed near villages and towns and communities, headwaters of rivers, and into water supplies, Mr. Speaker, especially since he has no support, no back-up from either the Premier or the Minister of Environment in this Province.

In answer to a question that I put to the hon. Minister of Forestry three or four weeks ago - had he conferred as a minister with the ministers or the Premier of Nova Scotia to determine why they have decided not to spray in Nova Scotia - he answered, "No", Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Forestry. Oh, he gets some information from his officials and so on, but what kind of a minister, Mr. Speaker, would implement a spray program with possibly disastrous consequences without himself satisfying himself by going around, sitting down and holding consultations and talks with ministers in the government of Nova Scotia to determine exactly why they are not going ahead with the

8099

MR. W. POWE: spray program, with ministers in New Brunswick to find out why they are going ahead with their spray program. Is it because they are on a treadmill of twenty years duration that they cannot get off? Why has he not gone to B.C. and sat down and talked, and I understand he has not, sat down and talked with the minister in that government and the premier of that government to determine why they have pulled out of a spray program, as I understand from my hon. friend they have? Has he picked up the phone and called anyone in the State of Maine? Am I correct in assuming that the State of Maine has pulled out of a program as well?

MR. S. NEARY: They are phasing it out.

MR. W. POWE: Or phasing it out? Why does he not do that, Mr. Speaker? It is one thing to rely on expert advice, we all have to do that: it is another thing, Sir, to have the incisive mind, the ability to cut through the nonsense, the verbiage, the cloud of words that most expert opinions are couched in, and go directly to the heart of the matter and find out why intelligent men and intelligent women in other jurisdictions have taken certain stands that they have taken. And, Sir, if there is a premier in Canada that I have great respect for it is Gerry Pegan there in Nova Scotia, because he has shown the kind of courage and guts in the face of adversity, in the face of tremendous pressure to take these kinds of decisions. So why does not the hon. Minister go and find out why Nova Scotia has decided not to get involved in a poison chemical spray program? Why does he not go and have a heart-to-heart talk with his counterpart minister in New Brunswick and find out what kind of a panic they are in when, as a result of the spray program, what they have done is produce a super spruce budworm, one that is getting completely out of control, one that is requiring more and more, and larger and larger, dosages of the chemical they are using in order to just mark time, to keep pace with the problem, Mr. Speaker?

8000

MR. W.N. ROWE: I wish the Minister of Forestry would do that. This chemical, Mr. Speaker, Matacil, as I understand it although it may have the approval - Now what does that mean exactly, approval? For what use? It may have the approval of 150,000 Federal Government agencies, but what does it mean, approval? Approval for what? Approval to put it in a spray can so that you can spray your arms against mosquitos or something. Has it been approved by the Food and Drug Administration in the United States for usage for this purpose? I understand one state in the United States may be contemplating or may in fact be getting into using Matacil for some infestation of cotton fields. One state may be doing that, Sir, which by the way, Sir, is a far cry from wholesale spraying of forests and water and rivers and a whole province practically. The controlled spraying of a field of cotton is nowhere near the kind of thing that we are talking about, Mr. Speaker, in this Province. But I understand that aside from that very limited usage of this chemical, no other province in Canada and no other state in the United States is using this chemical for this particular purpose. Now is that correct?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. W.N. ROWE: It is not correct.

MR. NEARY: It is correct. Matacil.

MR. W.N. ROWE: This particular drug under the trade name of Matacil.

MR. MAYNARD: Matacil is now being used and used quite widely in Ontario.

MR. NEARY: No, in the United States we are talking about.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Is it now being used or is it going to be used contemporaneously with our program, is that what the hon. minister is saying?

MR. MAYNARD: It has been used since 1976 by the Province of Quebec.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well, why is it, Mr. Speaker? This is a piece of information here.

MR. F. ROWE: Quebec has the highest egg mass count in any area.

MR. W.N. ROWE: This is a piece of information here. I mean, my hon. friend said Quebec has the highest egg mass count of any province, but that

MR. W.N. ROWE: may or may not be relevant to this. But I have been asking for this information from the hon. Minister of the Environment a week or so ago. No information on this. Now in a cursory type of fashion, off the cuff, casual way the hon. Minister of Forestry says, "Oh yes, yes, a couple of Provinces have been using it or are using it. Quebec has used it since 1976."

MR. NEARY: That is not true either.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I do not know whether it is a fact or not. I am not accusing the minister of uttering untrue statements or anything but I have no confidence in that minister, Sir, to tell or state the facts of this particular case. Are there any states in the United States using it for this purpose in forests?

MR. MAYNARD: No.

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, or the minister does not know.

MR. MAYNARD: No. N-o.

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MAYNARD: Is the letter too large for the hon. member?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Oh, listen to him. Pretty soon now! See, Mr. Speaker, this is what you are talking about. The hon. minister has gone past the point, Sir, where he can debate this thing in an objective, rational, sensible way and thinks, Sir, that what he is doing now is protecting his own toy or something against these onslaughts.

MR. NEARY: He thinks it is politics.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He thinks, Mr. Speaker, he thinks that he has some proprietary interest.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not. It is the health of our people.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister will not even listen without getting snarky and testy and joining the hon. Minister of the Environment in the same attitude he expresses. They are trying to protect some proprietary interest here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MAYNARD: No, Mr. Speaker, I am really relaxed.

MR. F.B. ROWE: He has been relaxing ever since he got in office.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Relaxed. Yes, Mr. Speaker, relaxed is probably

MR. W.N. ROWE: correct. Relaxed. Relaxed about this, relaxed about everything. Relaxed, Mr. Speaker, I mean I have seen fellows with frontal lobotomies who were relaxed, totally relaxed. Mr. Speaker, totally relaxed but, Sir, I would not put them in charge of a spray program. What are a couple of hundred people you know getting sprayed on? That is nothing.

MR. MORGAN: Play politics.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Play politics, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Listen to the Minister of Tourism. You are going to have the tourists all sprayed this summer. Wait until the tourists get in and get sprayed. They will never come back here again.

MR. W.N. ROWE: What kind of research is being done by this government, Mr. Speaker, on other ways of attacking the spruce budworm problem in this Province in conjunction

MR. W. ROWE: with the Government of Canada, other provinces and states of the United States? What kind of research, Mr. Speaker?

MR. NEARY: Zero.

MR. W. ROWE: Lash out the millions of dollars in the easy way out, send the planes over and let them spray, Mr. Speaker, but what kind of research is being done? Solid research. For example, everybody is aware if they have read any news magazines in the last couple of weeks of a situation where there was a boll weevil down in the United States which could only be controlled at one time by chemical sprays and so on. Then some fellow got the idea to try to develop chemically or by synthetic means the odor producing chemical which attracted males and females for mating and so now they are spraying with absolutely no toxic effect whatsoever, all they do is confuse the male and the female and the result is, Mr. Speaker, that once you cut out the mating of the boll weevil and so on you can be pretty well assured that within one generation that particular insect is going to be wiped out of existence particularly when if they evolve a new odor and so on you can track that and develop synthetics to follow it along and finally wipe out the insect. That kind of realistic, sensible research, Mr. Speaker, which is going to control that insect now with no damage or harm done to human beings whatsoever and within one generation or a couple of generations will have the effect of wiping out completely that insect.

No research along these lines being done, Mr. Speaker. Just take the spray and dump it into the air and let the consequences fall where they may. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this move by the minister and by this administration is a panic move, it is a panic move. It is a gut reaction by the minister and his colleagues to aid what they perceive to be a crisis situation. And I can see the minister's concern if he realistically believes and sensibly believes that all the forests in this Province are going to be wiped out in a year or two. Then the lack of action or the lack of whatever research

MR. W. ROWE: was needed, the lack of forest management, the neglect of the forest industry by company and government alike, Mr. Speaker, I can see why now he is reacting in panic, He does not want to be responsible for the forestry industry in this Province going out of existence. But, Mr. Speaker, if it is a panic move and a reaction, a visceral emotional reaction by him to a crisis situation, let him tell us about it. Let him admit it like a man and say, "Look, we are in desperate straits." And then we can see where we go and then we can lay blame, if blame need be laid, for past neglect or we can encourage him into some other activity. Maybe the expenditure of many millions of dollars may be necessary for a forest management programme, thinning, reforestation and salvage operations, Mr. Speaker, but let us know the facts. We do not know the facts. I defy any hon. member in this House to say that he or she can stand up and give the facts on this situation except for some woolly and fluffy stuff that the hon. Minister of Forestry utters from time to time. On radio this morning, I understand - I heard on the news today, I was not listening to the programme itself, it was taken from the Open Line programme on VOCH - he was talking about if proper procedures had been undertaken, if proper forest management had been undertaken fifty years ago there would not be a problem now.

AN HON. MEMBER: And that is right.

MR. W. ROWE: Why was not proper management instituted six years ago, or five years ago or two years ago? I would say, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. J. CARTER: What about twenty years ago?

MR. W. ROWE: -or twenty years ago or ten years ago? That is right. Look at the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter)! Silly as a loon.

MR. SIMMONS: You made his day.

MR. W. ROWE: What a devastating body blow I just received from the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter).

"What about twenty years ago, Mr. Speaker?"

8005

May 29, 1978

Tape No. 3624

AK-3

MR. W. ROWE:

A man living, Sir, consumed, steeped in ancient history, motivated, Sir, by what was not done or what was done twenty years ago. That is what keeps him alive now, Sir. If there was ever the burning of the books here and all knowledge of twenty years ago wiped out, that hon. member would then turn into a bag of bones so he could rattle. The life would go out of him.

8006

MR. W. ROWE:

He draws his very sustenance from what happened twenty years ago. But, Sir, let us talk about what is happening within, say, recent memory, four or five years ago, six years ago when this administration took over the office and the responsibility of running this Province. Where is the forest management, Sir, over that period of time? What is going on now? Can the hon. minister rise in his place and tell us that fifty years from now as a result of proper forest management, thinning, whatever else is necessary to control this budworm problem, can he say that fifty years from now the Ministry of Forestry in this Province will rise and say, "Thank God for the Minister of Forestry in 1977 who put into effect a programme that had the effect of saving the forests from the spruce budworm and no longer requires the use of any foreign agency or poison or chemical to control it." Can he say that? No, Mr. Speaker, he cannot say that. Yet he talks about if only they had the foresight fifty years ago. Fifty years ago, Mr. Speaker, when - what was going on fifty years ago? - the depression was just about upon us, one year away from us. And this hon. member goes on open line programmes and says that when even now, Sir, the measures are not being taken to save the forests, to save this Province's industry, forestry industry from this kind of an infestation. Instead, Sir, he takes the easy way out, spray, poison the atmosphere with a chemical and hope for the best on a year to year basis.

The minister has said in answer to accusations that the paper mills in this Province have not pressured, have not put on the pressure for spraying. Is that correct, the paper mills in the Province have not put on any pressure to get involved in the spray programme? Well, Mr. Speaker, that is

MR. W. ROWE:

significant in itself. If the paper companies who stand to lose most economically, financially, stand to lose most as a result of this infestation of the spruce budworm, if they, Sir, have put no pressure on the minister, the obvious question that has to be asked is why have they not put pressure on the minister. Is it because they feel that there is some other method of controlling this infestation and saving the forests in the long term?

MR. MAYNARD: We would lose the most.

MR. W. ROWE: I am talking about them as a corporate entity, as a company. They stand to lose the most, naturally.

MR. MAYNARD: Go somewhere else and -

MR. W. ROWE: What nonsense, Mr. Speaker! See, Mr. Speaker, if the minister would only utter a little bit of sense every now and then, show a little bit of wisdom and maturity in this very crucial subject, then, Sir, you could sit down and nod your head at him and say, Yes, everything is under control, he is doing the right thing, Sir. But when he keeps uttering nonsense, the paper companies, Sir, all they will do if the Province is wiped out or the stands are wiped out, they will just move elsewhere, no problem, Sir, start up expense elsewhere. Totally ridiculous, Sir.

If, as I suspect, Mr. Speaker, the paper companies have put incredible pressure on the minister, behind the scenes if not publicly; if, as I suspect, he has been lobbied by the paper companies - and I am not blaming them for doing that. I do not expect the paper companies to look after my interests or the interests of the people of Gander, Sir, whose water supply is in danger of being poisoned. I do not

8008

MR. W. ROWE:

expect that realistically. I would expect them to look after their own corporate interests. And therefore I expect that they put incredible pressure on the minister behind the scenes and lobbied him mercilessly and said that the most economic and financially best way and easiest way out of this is to spray and control it from year to year and we will harvest what we want and we will keep going year to year. The fact that the spruce budworm may increase over a twenty year period and develop into a super budworm and so on that will be completely uncontrollable is nothing because to them all you have to do is keeping it going from year to year, year to year

8000

MR. W. DOVE: for the next fifty years, or a hundred years, for that matter, Mr. Speaker.

So I would suspect that the Minister is perhaps being a little less than frank with the public of this Province when he says that the companies have not put on any pressure for him to spray. If they have not, Sir, you have to ask why they have not, Why have they not shown the greatest concern and why have they not in fact pushed him to get involved in it? If they have, Sir, which I suspect, and the Minister has been a little less than frank - but, Sir, if they have put on this pressure we must remember the Nova Scotia experience where the paper companies, Sir, put on a massive program of lobbying the government, PR, Sir, advertisement, all kinds of efforts were made by the paper companies to frighten the people of Nova Scotia into accepting a spray program in order to hopefully control the spruce budworm problem in that province. And the government of that province said, "No", Mr. Speaker. They did not give in to this pressure, as I suspect the Minister of Forestry has given in, in a way that I do not think is in the best interests of this Province. I think he has succumbed to pressure.

Nova Scotia said, "No, we will not pollute the environment of our province; we will get immediately involved in a proper, rational, forest management program that involves the salvaging of wood already destroyed, or practically destroyed by the spruce budworm, money from Ottawa will help us do that, the money we save from the spray program will help us do that, and we will then try to energetically market this salvaged wood". They have gotten involved in a thinning program, Mr. Speaker, that has the added benefit of providing employment in a province which is saddled with heavy unemployment, not as bad as we here, Sir, but a province which is saddled with very heavy unemployment are getting into thinning programs, management programs, reforestation programs, all of these

MR. H. BONE: things, Sir, creating employment, getting help from the Government of Canada. Does the hon. member happen to know how much money Nova Scotia is getting from the Government of Canada to help in this program?

AN HON. MEMBER: - million dollars over the next four years.

MR. W. POVE: Millions of dollars, Sir, over the next number of years to help with this kind of a program that has the added benefit of creating employment, Mr. Speaker. Surely, if any kind of a cost benefit analysis was done, the spray on the one hand, the easy way out, and the forest management program involving the employment, involving the forest management which the hon. Minister says should have been done fifty years ago, and the natural peaks and troughs in the spruce budworm infestation in any event, I am sure that this alternative would be at least as effective, at least as efficacious as the spray program and would have the added benefit, as the government of Nova Scotia is finding out and has decided, would have the added benefit of creating employment in our Province, in a province which desperately needs employment to be created, not just make work programs, digging holes and filling them in again, Mr. Speaker, but worthwhile, useful programs which would have the added benefit of saving and salvaging the destroyed forests, and also making sure that the forest which remains is managed in the best possible way and the spruce budworm problem is controlled in a natural sort of way, not by polluting the atmosphere and the water and the soil, Sir, but in a natural sort of way.

I believe, Sir, and I believe this sincerely and I believe it firmly, that we are looking at a government which is dispirited, a government, Sir, which the good is gone out of, a government, Sir, which no longer has the will, or the morale, or the energy, to look at a problem such as this one which is now facing us

Mr. W. Rowe: and try to solve it in the best possible way, a way which might require some intellect, a way which may require some energy, a way which may require some effort, and thinking and thought.

MR. J. CARTER: Would the hon. the Leader of the Opposition yield for a moment, Mr. Speaker?

MR. W. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker, He had his opportunity. If I had an experience, Sir, if I had an experience of listening to sensible, reasonable questions and comments from the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) I would yield gladly, Sir, but my experience in this House, Sir, has been the complete reverse. I know, Sir, from experience that we are about to listen to a little more nonsense from the hon. member, Sir, so I will not yield my place.

Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member had forty-five minutes to make all the suggestions he wanted to make. How much time do I have?

MR. NEARY: Fifty minutes left.

MR. W. ROWE: That is what is frightening, Mr. Speaker. That is what scares the people of this Province; we have a government which collectively is dispirited and has the good gone out of it, and individually as ministers, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of the Environment, the Minister of Health over there, Mr. Speaker, who will not rise in his place except to come out with a smart-aleck comment, the Premier of the Province, Sir, who when he is here is satisfied if he is the master of the one-liner, Mr. Speaker, some smart-aleck, one line comment. One depths or profundy to anything uttered by that hon. Premier, no knowledge about this programme, and what scares me and scares the people of this Province, Sir, is that we know that this government will not take the alternatives available to it if these alternatives mean more work, more intellectual energy demanded, more research, more effort going around Canada and North America, Sir, trying to find out why other provinces have done what they had done; the easy way out, Sir, go and see the

Mr. W. Rowe: paper companies, find out what they had to say, spray, use Matabil, go probably to the chemical, the strong chemical lobby, Mr. Speaker, and hear what they have to say, and take their advice on the subject, and spray the forests with a poisonous chemical which I would need more than the word of the hon. Minister of Forestry -

MR. NEARY: Or Tourism.

MR. W. ROWE: - or Tourism or Environment before I am convinced, Sir, it is not damaging or dangerous to the environment surrounding us.

What used to be a leading light in that administration, the Minister of Mines and Energy over there, Mr. Speaker, used to be a leading light until his true arrogance was displayed when my hon. friend for Baie Verte-White Bay (Mr. Rideout) made public a letter and my hon. friend for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) followed it up in his brilliant Budget speech, Mr. Speaker, or speech in the Budget debate, disclosed the arrogance of that hon. minister as well, Sir. That hon. minister, Sir, who used to be a leading light, has displayed his attitude, too, when some time ago he was reported publicly, I know he came in with some apology from someone or other, Sir, but I heard him in the House talking about it, that hon. minister, Sir, obviously wants to show his energy and push and drive, Sir, and so, Sir, has come up with little slogans like, Productivity over health or whatever, maybe those were not the words he used, Sir, but that would be the slogan which would be developed from his statement; jobs are more important than industrial health or environmental health for that matter.

MR. PECKFORD: I never said that.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, I do not know what he said, Mr. Speaker. He certainly gave that impression when I have been listening -

MR. PECKFORD: I did not say that.

MR. W. ROWE: When I have been listening to that hon. minister here, Sir, -

MR. SIMMONS: It is very difficult to know what he says from one day to the next.

MR. W. ROWE: It is hard to say, Sir. You can only listen to the words he utters. I am quite prepared to believe that he does not mean the words he utters. But in listening to the words he utters, Sir, and trying to put some objective meaning on them, the meaning that I have gotten from it is that he will put productivity in the mining industry or some other industry over the occupational health and the people concerned. That is the

8014

MR. W. ROWE:

impression I have gotten and the impression that my hon. friend has gotten and the impression that hundreds and thousands of people in this Province have gotten. What kind of a minister, Sir, of Mines and Energy would not have his department prepared, geared up to take full advantage of an act brought into this House and passed by this House concerning the occupational health and safety of workers in this Province? Instead we have got to delay it a year.

MR. PECKFORD: No, you are wrong.

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, I am wrong.

MR. PECKFORD: You are. You are wrong.

MR. W. ROWE: No, Sir.

MR. PECKFORD: What would you know about the health and safety legislation (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: You have to be in the House to know what is going on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker -

MR. PECKFORD: What a Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, what a Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS: What a leader. Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear,hear!

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, this hon. minister, Sir, is so eager to give -

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

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. PECKFORD: The hon. Leader of the Opposition is incorrectly articulating policy that was laid down in this House a number of weeks ago as it related to health and safety of miners in this Province. It was stated in this hon. House while the Leader of the Opposition was here

8015

MR. PECKFORD:

that the Health and Safety Act that was brought in would be simultaneously adhered to by all the mines in the Province through amendments to the mining regulations to reflect all the changes and more for the mine workers of this Province.

Therefore that completely contradicts the Leader of the Opposition's statements that the mines are going to have to wait a year before the same health and safety standards were to apply.

MR. W. ROWE: That is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I understand the minister's desire now to defend himself on a matter of opinion and interpretation.

MR. NEARY: And used the point of order to try to do it.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes. Abuse of the rules of the House again, Mr. Speaker. But I will yield to Your Honour. I would submit, Sir, it is not a point of order. It is a difference of opinion.

MR. SPEAKER: I agree that the minister's point of order was not really a point of order and it is probably a misinterpretation between one member and another.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member may in fact be technically correct but we all know, Sir, that this particular act is subject to proclamation. So what does he do? He hold off the implementation of the Occupational Health and Safety Act as far as proclamation is concerned until he gets around to bringing in the amendments. When are the amendments coming in?

MR. PECKFORD: You have not been in the House. I feel very sorry for the hon. gentleman.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker -

8016

MR. PECKFORD: You have asked me a question. Do you want an answer?

MR. W. ROWE: You have got, Sir, a minister who -

MR. PECKFORD: Do you want an answer?

MR. W. ROWE: - wants to be the great giant killer, the champion, Sir, of the government against the great oil companies, the multinationals, Sir. So he cannot attend to these mundane little details like, for example, answering a constituent or a person in the Province civilly by letter. That is a little mundane detail, Sir. Much easier, Sir, to vent your spleen and your venom on some poor harmless individual, Sir, looking for information or help, much easier to do that, use the big blunt weapon approach. There he goes again, Sir, look, writing down more spleen and venom to utter forth now when he gets up in the House.

Mr. Speaker, yes, Sir, the very champion of the government, the very Goliath, as a matter of fact, of the government, Mr. Speaker. He used to be a leading light, a rising star in this government. But, Sir, in view of his attitude of arrogance and the concerns which he has shown I have to say again in all sincerity that just as we cannot expect anything from the Minister of the Environment regarding this very important matter, and just as we cannot expect anything from the hon. the Premier, Sir, who is as ignorant, lacking in knowledge, as the Minister of the Environment and just as, Sir, I do not believe we can have any confidence in the Minister of Forestry, Sir, unfortunately we cannot have any faith in the ability of the Minister of Mines and Energy, who used to be a leading light but has destroyed himself politically in this Province, Sir, we cannot have any faith in his ability to protect our interests when it comes to this matter.

MR. NEARY: Somebody pulled the switch.

MR. W. ROWE: And as far, Sir, as some of the other -
who are the other leadership candidates? - the Minister
of Fisheries, Sir. Well he is concerned and all week
long he will spend getting together his Friday afternoon,
or Friday morning rather, Ministerial Statement for the
weekend paper, his contribution to the leadership campaign.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I am not sure if the Minister of Environment is up or down. He seems to be up.

MR. A. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, we are on a specific topic here. I do not know what leadership, debate or anything else has to do with this topic under discussion. The hon. gentleman has ranged and abused everybody in his path the past twenty minutes or a half hour. I would suggest, Sir, possibly the Chair remind the hon. gentleman what the subject under debate is, and that is affecting the health and environment of this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member on the point of order.

MR. S. NEARY: I am not quite sure whether the hon. gentleman was standing up or sitting down when he made his point of order, Sir. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not a point of order anyway because, Sir, my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition was merely going down the line and showing the House and the people of this Province how the light had gone out for certain members on the Government benches who aspired to becoming leader of that party, that the people of Newfoundland would not now look upon them as leaders. My hon. friend is pointing out, Sir, in his debate, and doing it very effectively although the members might not like it, their feelings may be hurt slightly, Sir, but if they follow this, squirting this poison, spraying this poison on the people of this Province, my hon. friend is saying the people will not look upon them as leadership candidates. I believe that is a very valid point, Sir, and I think it is in order, and my hon. friend does not have a point of order.

MR. W. POPE: Not at all.

MR. SPEAKER: (COLLINS) On the point of order. I can only again bring to the attention of the hon. members that the particular motion, the motion for adjournment, has to deal with one matter, and that the matters in the motion concern spraying the budworm infestation and the destruction of wildlife and environment. It would seem, therefore, that

MR. SPEAKER: in making their remarks, hon. members in bringing up points should relate them to these matters. If it is not clearly apparent that they are related to this matter the Chair may have to intervene. But, of course, if an hon. member brings up a point and then relates it to these matter this clearly would be in order.

Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: I thank you for your ruling, Your Honour. That is exactly what I was doing. I was trying to point out in a way which is maybe irritating to hon. members opposite -

MR. A. MURPHY: (inaudible) Oh, no!

MR. W. ROWE: - maybe very irritating, Sir. Look at them!

MR. A. MURPHY: It shows the mentality of the young kid opposite.

MR. W. ROWE: Look, Mr. Speaker. The seasoned statesman, Sir, who does not know if he is punched or bored when it comes to the environment of this Province we are depending upon him to protect.

MR. S. NEARY: He knows all about car wrecks though.

MR. W. ROWE: And he knows all about the environment down about 2000 miles south of here, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: He knows about Mulally and the car wrecks.

MR. W. ROWE: He knows all about that stuff.

Mr. Speaker, the point I was making was that some of the leading lights - I do not expect the member for St. John's Centre (Mr. Murphy) to really protect my interests, Sir; I really do not expect that, that would be expecting too much - but I expected some leading lights in this Government, the member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford), the Minister of Mines & Energy, the Minister of Fisheries, and a few of these leadership candidates, I expected them, Sir, to protect the interests of the people of this Province when it came to the spray program. But, Sir, the point I was making, and I will make it again - I know it is irritating to the Minister of Environment - the point I

MR. W. POVE: am making, Sir, is that they have shown by their attitude and by their past action, Sir, that we cannot have confidence in them to protect us against the deleterious effect, or the adverse effect, or the harmful effect, of this poison spray program going on in this Province. The hon. member for Green Bay (Mr. Peckford) showed that, Sir, shows what he thinks about people especially what has been called contemptibly, I think, 'the little people', shows what he thinks, Sir, by the letters he sends out, abusive and insulting.

So, Sir, we are left to our own devices to try to decide whether this is, in fact, a good program or not. What, Sir, do we see happening by the Government collectively and as a whole? We see a Government, Sir, which does not even have conviction or belief in the rightness of what itself is doing in this respect. We get the Minister of Forestry who announces in this House and announces publicly, "No way will we stop the spray program, we are determined to go ahead with it".

MR. W.N. ROWE: No way they will withdraw the program now. I heard him. Randy Simms was interviewing him on the Hot Seat on NBC-CJON television, Sir, and no way will they withdraw from the program. The next night, Sir, he, the Minister of Forestry, accompanied by the Minister of Health, the member for Gander, both they go out arm in arm to a meeting of concerned citizens in Gander and as a result, Sir, of the feelings shown at that meeting and the arguments put forward and the criticism they both had to take for shoving this program down the throats of every Newfoundlander, Sir, what do we hear publicly on the air waves the next day? My hon. friend, the member for Fogo and I were on our way back from Fogo Island, we were waiting in line to get the ferry across to Carmanville, I turn on the CBC news on Saturday morning and what do I hear? What do I hear, Mr. Speaker? I do not know if Your Honour heard it or not. We could not believe our ears. One day later the Minister of Health and the Minister of Forestry are saying they are going to reconsider the program. They are going to reconsider it, Mr. Speaker. One day there is no way they are going to withdraw it and the next day they are going to reconsider the program and that of course, that statement was reconfirmed by other news media, news papers and radio stations and so on afterwards. I believe there was something in the Daily News today and the Evening Telegram either Saturday or today, today I believe, a report from Gander where the Minister of Health and the Minister of Forestry have agreed to reconsider the program.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what could be more calculated to undermine the confidence of the Newfoundland people in this spray program than this kind of wishy-washy, insecure, shaky attitudes expressed publicly by the Ministers of Health and the Minister of Forestry regarding this program? Nothing, Mr. Speaker, nothing. If you had to spend a week, Sir, if you were given a Canada Council Grant to go out and dream up, use your imagination to dream up something, calculated to undermine the faith and confidence of the Newfoundland people in this government's administration first of all their decision and then their administration of this poison spray program, Mr. Speaker, you could not come up with a

MR. W.N. ROWE: better way than these two hon. members managed to blunder into spontaneously and without the exercise of any imagination whatsoever. 'No way we are going to withdraw from this program. We do not care what public pressure is put on us, and they go to a meeting, 170 people, Mr. Speaker, concerned about the fact that their water supply is going to be poisoned by Matabacil sprayed into it and then the ministers come out and say they are going to reconsider the program. Clear evidence, Mr. Speaker, of a government which itself knows itself to be on very shaky ground as far as this spray program is concerned. A government, Mr. Speaker, that does not know what it is doing. A government which has chosen what it thought to be an easy way out to control this big problem facing us all and has now shown conclusively beyond a reasonable doubt. Men have been hanged on less evidence than this government has shown and given out publicly that they do not know what they are doing when it comes to this spray program. They feel insecure. They feel unsure of themselves. They feel shaky, bluster, big powerful positions assumed, 'No way we will back down on this program' and one little meeting of 170 concerned citizens, and they are reconsidering.

Now, Sir, they either feel uncertain or we have seen another example of a government by its ministers, the Minister of Health and the Minister of Forestry, Sir, fling out at

MR. W. ROWE:

a public meeting any old thing at all, careless and heedless as to whether they believe what they saying at the time, calculated to deceive the people there present, calculated to try to mollify them for the instant until they could get out of the meeting. It is either that, Mr. Speaker - there is no ground in between. Mr. Speaker, there are no other alternatives - either those two ministers when confronted by the impact of emotion and concern expressed at this meeting, either got so frightened, so scared that they would throw out anything to try to mollify this group of concerned people that they would say, "Yes, we are going to reconsider it. Oh yes. We have not taken a firm stand yet. Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for your input here. We are going to reconsider it now and make another Cabinet decision." Either they did that, calculated to fool the people there, having no intention whatsoever of reconsidering the spray programme or, Mr. Speaker, you are talking about a government which is so weak and wishy-washy and uncertain of itself and insecure and feels itself to be skating on such thin ice and feels itself to be so shakey and lacking in control of the situation that they will make two categorically opposite statements concerning the same subject on the one day and on the next day, in a twenty-four hour period, Mr. Speaker. That is what you are talking about.

And they think that we in this House should have some confidence in what this government is doing with the environment of this Province, with a poison spray which they are going to squirt all over the Province into the head waters of the rivers, into the drinking water of communities and within spitting distance of towns where people are living, communities where people

MR. W. ROWE:

are living. What nonsense, Mr. Speaker!

MR. J. CARTER: Gross exaggeration.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not exaggeration.

MR. W. ROWE: What kind of exaggeration, Mr. Speaker! If there is anything, Sir, that is disgusting to anyone, Mr. Speaker, it is somebody who gives the appearance of being of independent mind, being intellectually independent, going to make up his own mind on these vital issues and every single time he is required to make a decision he flops over in a purely partisan way on the side of his own buddies, his own government, a government, by the way, Sir, which treated him and a Premier who treated him with the most complete contempt when he took him by the scruff of the neck and flung him out of the Cabinet ignominiously four or five years ago. But his partisanship, Sir, is so great that he cannot get over it, he cannot see around it in order to try to decide whether this programme is a good one or a bad one. And I defy him or any other hon. member, or any member of the public, Sir, to say that my statement there a moment ago where I gave the two alternatives based on this government's action in Gander on Friday night, Mr. Speaker, where it either calculatedly deceived the people of Gander in an effort to extricate themselves, run away from the problem which was facing them there or, Sir, made a complete about face, turned around from a strongly held position on a Thursday night into a wishy-washy insecure and shaky position on a Friday night, a twenty four hour period. How can you have an confidence, Sir, or any respect or any feeling of security and safety when you have a government which shows that kind of ineptness and incompetence on a daily basis? There is no way, Mr. Speaker.

8025'

MR. W. ROWE:

Getting to the actual physical nature of what is going to go on now beginning in the month of June, Mr. Speaker, let us not forget what this government is going to do. It has been stated by my hon. friend, I have touched on it once or twice here already but it bears repeating and I hope that hon. members who speak will also touch on the physical nature of what is going to go on in this Province.

We are talking about a programme, and my hon. friend from Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) had a map and showed us, we are talking about a programme, Sir, which is spraying this poisonous chemical dangerous close to towns and communities. There can be no gainsaying that. There can be no denying that simple fact. They are going to do it. We see whole vast tracts of Newfoundland forest, Sir, far away from towns and communities which are not going to be sprayed.

8026

Mr. W. Rowe: And we can only assume that this is an attempt by the government, hand and glove with the companies to aid and abet them in their desire, as they have been doing, and has been done in the history of this Province -

Mr. J. CARTER: Something stronger.

MR. W. ROWE: As they have been doing, Sir, and that is to -

MR. NEARY: Matacil.

MR. W. ROWE: - take the cream of the crop from the forestry, the areas which are easy of access.

MR. FLIGHT: They call it economic supply, the most economic supply.

MR. W. ROWE: The most economic supply, Sir, happens to be in these particular areas. And so we are talking about a government and the companies joining hands in order to effect a spray programme in these areas which are most beneficial to the companies themselves, Sir, heedless, really, of the potential dangers to the people living in the towns and communities where the spray is going to take place within a sixth of a mile, a half a mile, a couple of miles, the spray, Sir, you probably saw it from the map, Your Honour, where the spray area comes up to Gander Lake and then starts again on the other side of the Lake. What that means, Sir, is the Lake itself should have been coloured in the same colour as where the spray programme is taking place, because Gander Lake is going to be continuously bombarded with this chemical spray for as long as the spray programme goes on in that area, and people are going to be drinking that water. Perhaps it will not have a bad effect on health. Perhaps it will not have a bad effect on the Gander River which flows out and on down to the sea. Perhaps it will not, Sir. But I for one, and I doubt if any of my colleagues, I doubt if any person in this Province is prepared to accept the word of this government with the incompetence, and the ineptitude which they have shown, that it will not harm the health and safety of residents of this Province.

It is going to be a danger, I submit, Sir, in spraying into the watersheds and spraying into the headwaters in this Province. It is going to be a danger to human life and it is going to be a danger to wildlife. At least enough expert opinion and enough concerned people have

Mr. W. Rowe: that worry and fear, Sir, to make it abundantly clear that this government have not relieved themselves of the burden of proof that there is going to be no danger to human life. It is their burden of proof and they have relieved themselves of it. I doubt if they can relieve themselves of it, which is the reason why Nova Scotia is not prepared to take the risk, B.C. is not prepared to take the risk, the State of Maine will not be prepared to take the risk any longer ~~for~~ it is going to phase out. And I would say, Sir, that New Brunswick, the Premier and ministers of that Province wish to God they were in a position where they were not on this treadmill where if they give it up now you are likely to see an explosion take place of these super budworms and the whole province wiped out as far as this forest is concerned in probably a month, That is the fear there as I understand it.

MR. F. ROWE: P.E.I. has rejected it.

MR. W. ROWE: P.E.I. has rejected it out of hand, Mr. Speaker. They do not want to get locked in to the New Brunswick experience.

We are talking about spraying, Sir, in an uncontrolled way as well, Not only are we dangerously close to human beings and human settlements, not only are we spraying headwaters and sources of water supply and so on, Sir, but we are talking about spraying in a province which must be one of the windiest areas, the hon. member will agree, in North America, one of the windiest areas, Mr. Speaker, So they do not spray when there is too much wind, they will not spray above a certain kilometer per hour wind factor.

Now, Sir, what do you have then? Then you have, Sir, spraying in calm weather when there is no wind. And anyone, Sir, who is familiar—I am not a pilot, an airplane pilot or anything—but anyone who is familiar with Newfoundland here and our Maritime climate, and the land, and the water, and the sea surrounding and so on, Sir, knows on a calm and smooth day, Sir, you have got all kinds of, as my hon. friend says, thermal updrafts; you spray this stuff here, and the next thing you know there is an updraft and it is deposited over here.

MR. W. ROWE: My hon. friend knows that. That is what happens in this Province. There is no period of time, Mr. Speaker, between the wind and the updrafts in this Province when it is safe to spray. And I would submit, Sir, that that is as close to a statement of fact that is possible to come in this very problematical and questionable area. There is no time when it is safe, no time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Early morning.

MR. W. ROWE: A romantic, Sir, we have a romantic in our midst. We will talk now, Sir, when we are talking about Matacil, let us talk poetically and allegorically. Let us talk about the rosy fingers of dawn -

MR. S. NEARY: Moonlight nights.

MR. W. ROWE: - and the bright moonlight nights and so on. Let us talk about that, Mr. Speaker. Let us talk about it as romantics. While the chemical goes into the water supply and is drunk, and goes over the wildlife and is consumed, and is sprayed next to communities and is absorbed or consumed, let us talk romantically now about the times when the spraying can take place. Rosy at dawn and bright moonlight nights.

MR. S. NEARY: What was it we used to call them, 'moonlight parties'? Have a moonlight party and go out and spray.

MR. W. ROWE: Totally ridiculous, Sir. Totally ridiculous. You have, Sir, added to this, the possibility, the very great possibility of crashes of aircraft. Now who was it, the Minister of Environment? - who said it would be all right to crash, that would not hurt anyone.

MR. S. NEARY: "Go into Windsor Lake", he said. You could crash -

MR. W. ROWE: Go right into Windsor Lake, Sir, with a tankful of the stuff. Let her go!

MR. A. MURPHY: You are a bunch of schemers, the whole lot of you.

MR. W. BOWE: I beg your pardon.

MR. S. NEARY: We are what?

MR. A. MURPHY: I never heard of it.

MR. S. NEARY: The Minister said it the other day.

MR. A. MURPHY: I never heard of it.

MR. W. BOWE: I am prepared to believe he has not heard of it.

MR. S. NEARY: The Minister should check the Hansard.

MR. A. MURPHY: I never said Windsor Lake.

MR. S. NEARY: Check Hansard. The Minister did say 'Windsor Lake', in the City water supply.

AN HON. MEMBER: He could not say 'Windsor Lake'.

MR. S. NEARY: He could not pronounce 'Windsor Lake'.

MR. W. BOWE: I am prepared to believe he does not remember saying it, Sir. I am prepared to believe he said it and does not know he said it. I am prepared to believe that. I will accept the hon. member's word for that.

The possibility of crashes, Mr. Speaker -
 Now I do not know what the statistics are but judging from the number of crashes that one has heard tell of and read about in New Brunswick, for example -

MR. G. FLIGHT: Fifteen. There were whole planeloads going down.

MR. W. BOWE: Mr. Speaker, there is obviously a statistically much greater probability of crashes in these aircraft than any other aircraft, probably because the pilots themselves, flying back and forth through the spray that they are spraying out there, get poisoned. Load variance, Mr. Speaker, updrafts, proximity to the ground, all of these things, Mr. Speaker, make this a very hazardous undertaking, an undertaking, Sir, which can cause disaster. A crash now in the Town of Gander, Sir, that would be nice, would it not? Spraying over Gander Lake and then crash into the Town of Gander.

May 29, 1978

Tape No. 3633

RT-3

MR. FLIGHT:

Read the headline.

MP. W. ROWE:

"Budworm Spray Plane Crashes", - Daily Gleaner.

"Crashed this morning on McLoughlin Road sixteen miles north of here. The plane is reported to have hit a telephone pole." Recovering spray plane. Area now contaminated. Spray plane crash lands." A warning has been issued to residents of the Stanley and Cross Creek areas to stay away from the crash scene of a budworm spraying aircraft. The plane, a double wing Steerman, crashed in a field at Cross Creek last week while attempting to make a forced landing. Forty gallons of chemical mixture used for spraying was spilled on the crash area. The spray plane forced to loose pesticide." The spray plane was forced to jettison a load of pesticide into a farmer's field in the Cole's Island area Thursday morning. Mechanical troubles and they had to unload the tanks, Sir. The farmer who owned the land was very co-operative. He probably was, Sir. He was probably in a comatose state, very co-operative.

Mr. Speaker, it is a very hazardous undertaking and the possibility of crashes, Sir, the probability of dangerous crashes especially where the spraying is going on close to areas of human population and residence, Sir, makes this spray program as outlined by the Government a very questionable activity at best just from the possibility of crashes along.

Then, Sir, you have the Air Traffic Controllers in Gander coming out and uttering a public statement. Now who are

8032

MR. W.N. ROWE: more reasonable and more rational and have their heads screwed on better than Air Traffic Controllers, Sir, who are dealing with emergencies, crisis situations and peoples lives as a matter of minute to minute activity and operation in their careers if it is not these Air Traffic Controllers represented by the group in Gander. Now, Sir, they have reserved unto themselves the right not to control, not to exercise their jurisdiction, to have nothing to do with these spray planes as far as Gander Airport is concerned because they recognize the hazard, Mr. Speaker, as I understand it from reading the reports on their statement, recognize the hazards involved with pilots who may themselves not be compos mentis to a certain extent as a result of proximity to and close to this spray, perhaps made a little groggy, perhaps made a little bit less alert, less able to deal with emergencies than they ordinarily would be. The Air Traffic Controllers, Sir, we have - Oh, it is a big joke over there. It is so disgusting, Mr. Speaker, it really is you know.

AN HON. MEMBER: Look how serious they are.

MR. W.N. ROWE: It really is, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Yes, that is what it is like.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Disgusting, so disgusting, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: This is non-political. It involves people's health.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: It has to do with politics.

MR. NEARY: What does it have to do with politics?

MR. W.N. ROWE: Treat this as a joke, Mr. Speaker! We will hear somebody now, probably the member for Grand Falls - Where is the member for Grand Falls by the way? We will hear him tomorrow now, Sir, talking about the irrelevance of the House of Assembly. He will talk about that. He will talk, Sir, about the meaningless of the House of Assembly in his leadership statements, daily leadership statements. We will hear all that, Mr. Speaker. Where is he now? His colleagues are in here grinning

MR. W.N. ROWE: like -

MR. NEARY: Hyenas.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Laughing like hyenas and grinning like jackanapes and finding it all very funny, Mr. Speaker, one of the most serious problems that any government would have to face treated with levity and joking and -

MR. MORGAN: Nobody is trying to get funny.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well why is everyone laughing over there?

MR. NEARY: No but over here they are.

MR. MORGAN: Nobody is laughing here.

MR. NEARY: Over there, look. Turn around and have a look at the laughing hyenas behind you.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The members colleagues are all laughing over there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Probably laughing at him.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, they probably are laughing at me. I am prepared to accept that, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to make a serious contribution here so I fully expect to be laughed at by the members opposite. I expect that, Sir. I would not be trying to root this crowd out and put in another government, Sir, if I did not expect that they would laugh at something serious. I would be quite happy to live with the government, the Premier and his colleagues, Sir, if I thought they were any good. Mr. Speaker, they are not. They are not concerned about this matter. None of the ministers who are primarily responsible for the matter are concerned or concerned enough or have a grip on the situation that could give any confidence at all to anybody who has seen them in operation.

The people of Gander, Sir, have expressed by a public meeting their views on it and have apparently persuaded a couple of ministers to change their views - either that or they just decided to throw out something for that occasion which they did not believe in. CJON television, Sir, one of the most powerful medium in this Province, Sir, has come out editorially against the spray program.

MR. NEARY: NBC editorial.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The minister does not know that, the Minister of Justice.

May 29, 1978

Tape No. 3634

JM - 3

MR. W.N. ROWE: He was not listening to his colleague the other day being torn to shreds by one of the newsmen here on the Hot Seat program where the minister came out and said, "No way we are going to withdraw."

MR. NEARY: Got up and walked off.
Practically walked off the program.

MR. HICKMAN: I read the editorial in the Daily News.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The editorial in the Daily News, Sir, decries also the lack of any imagination or forest management by this government over the last six or seven years as well, Sir, which might have precluded, might have stopped the necessity of getting into this poison chemical treatment that we are now having to suffer. Some very concerned bodies in the Province, Sir, have come out flat against this program.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that I have not heard any government comment on, Sir, is one of the aspects which I mentioned there a little while

8035

MR.W.ROWE:

ago concerning the fact that New Brunswick now is on a treadmill that it cannot get off. Anybody who has a simple basic knowledge of the science of genetics, Mr. Speaker, knows that when you use a pesticide such as this one you are going to create a situation, an evolutionary situation which will require that there be a survival of the fittest syndrome take place in the spruce budworm, or any other insect for that matter. You are going to have a situation where the strongest of these budworms survive and of course give their strong properties to their progeny in succeeding generations. And you are going to have, Mr. Speaker, produced by the long-term use of this spray, they are going to develop here, as they have developed in New Brunswick, a super budworm problem, a budworm, Sir, which is genetically much stronger, much more capable of surviving than the budworm which started out fifteen or twenty years ago, a budworm now created by man made devices, the spray itself and which may not be able to be coped with at all by natural or by chemical means.

MR.F.ROWE:

It has Matacil for desert.

MR.W.ROWE:

Matacil, Sir, is a joke, any other spray is a joke unless you use quantities which are dangerous to wildlife and to human beings, and then of course, what happens then is that a stronger budworm again comes out of that milieu as well.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the situation. I believe I have outlined in general terms the fact that this government by its ministers has not shown the concern necessary to convince us or the people of the Province that they know what they are doing. In fact, their positive actions have demonstrated that they do not know what they are doing, they do not have a grip on this problem, that they feel themselves to be on shaky ground, that they can be persuaded, they can get up on their high horse one day and be persuaded to reconsider the next day, they can say, "No reconsideration, We are convinced of the necessity of this programme" one day and the next day come out and say, "We are going to reconsider it, maybe we are wrong."

MR. W. ROWE: Now I admire their frankness, Mr. Speaker, I admire the honesty of these ministers who, if they believe that, would come out and contradict themselves in the space of twenty-four hours. But, Mr. Speaker, it is hardly cause for rejoicing, it is hardly cause for us or their supporters or the people of the Province to jump up and down and say that our rates are in competent hands, that this is a government which is going to look after our best interests. No, Mr. Speaker, You are talking about a government, Sir, which has chosen this artificial device because it does not have the morale or the heart or the energy to look for other alternatives which may be more difficult to implement, may be more expensive, may require more hard work but, Sir, which may in the long run be much more productive, much more positive, much more beneficial to the people of this Province and the forests that we are trying to protect.

We have a government, Sir, which has shown in all the ministers who have been questioned and have made public statements, we have seen a government, Sir, which has shown abysmal ignorance, lack of knowledge, on the use of this particular spray. Sure, Mr. Speaker, when we have asked questions ministers have gone down and gotten a little bit of basic research done by their advisors in their departments, then they come up and the next time the question is asked they know the answer to it. But, Mr. Speaker, from start to finish when this thing was first mooted in this House some weeks ago, as far as this year's programme is concerned, from start to now, Mr. Speaker, this government has

MR. W. ROWE:

shown lack of foresight, lack of energy, lack of frankness with the people of the Province, lack of confidence, self confidence in their own knowledge of their own ability to cope with this problem and, Sir, have not convinced anybody that they have sized up and considered all the many dangers involved or that they are doing anything but taking the easy way out, a way out which New Brunswick took twenty-odd years ago or so and which is now ruining the day it ever took that easy way out. And with strong administrations such as the one in Nova Scotia and the one in B.C. having rejected out of hand, Mr. Speaker, resort to this kind of a programme, they have shown confidence in their ability to deal with this problem in other ways with other alternative measures. They realized, Mr. Speaker, that they are accountable to the people. And if they are going to get involved in a programme which on the face of it looks dangerous and risky to the health and welfare of the people, then they have a burden of proof, Mr. Speaker. They have to prove without a shadow of a doubt that this programme is safe and that this programme is not risky.

The government of Nova Scotia and the government of B.C. and the government of Maine and the government of P.E.I. have been honest with themselves and with the public, Mr. Speaker, and they have admitted that they cannot make that guarantee to the people of the provinces that they are elected to govern rationally and sensibly. They cannot make that guarantee. They cannot guarantee that there are no serious risks attendant on this poison spray programme involving Matacil or any other chemical pesticide. They cannot make the guarantee, Sir. They have said that

MR. W. ROWE:

they cannot relieve themselves in the public eye of the burden of proof, the burden of proof being that this is a safe programme which will not cause any harmful effects on the human or animal population of the provinces. And because they are governments with courage, Sir, and all kinds of administrations involved - Bill Bennett's administration in B.C. is Social Credit; a Liberal Administration in Nova Scotia; I do not know what is down in Maine down there, Mr. Speaker. Republican, I believe.

MR. NEARY: No. It is Democratic, probably.

MR. W. ROWE: Probably Democratic.

MR. NEARY: That is the equivalent of the Liberals.

MR. W. ROWE: But it could in fact be Republican which is the equivalent of Conservative.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is.

MR. W. ROWE: It is Republican in Maine.

MR. NEARY: Oh it is. Well what about -

MR. W. ROWE: So you are talking, Mr. Speaker -

MR. HICKMAN: No.

MR. W. ROWE: It is Democratic, is it? What is it?

MR. HICKMAN: Both parties are (inaudible). They are independant.

MR. NEARY: Oh my. Well now that is good.

MR. W. ROWE: So, Mr. Speaker, we have an independant governor.

MR. HICKMAN: The member for LaPoile (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I would understand that, Sir. That is right. That is my territory. I should be down there running for governor.

MR. W. ROWE: He should run as independant premier, no party, no nothing, next time, Mr. Speaker. Just put

MR. W. ROWE:

himself out as independant premier of this Province.

MR. NEARY: Do not give me any ideas here now.

MR. W. ROWE: I can see it now, Sir, the Liberals and the P.C.s and the NDP and then the hon. member for LaPoile district running as independant Premier, Mr. Speaker. That would be -

MR. NEARY: Do not put any ideas in my mind there.

MR. W. ROWE: I withdraw that, Mr. Speaker, for fear that I might have put ideas in the hon. member's mind.

But, Sir, it is a very serious matter and governments of all stripes and all political persuasion, Sir, have shown the courage and the guts and the intestinal fortitude to say, "No. We cannot relieve ourselves of the burden of proof, we cannot make the guarantee that this will be risk free, that this will not jeopardize seriously the health of animals and humans in this Province or this state, Mr. Speaker. Therefore we will not exercise our decision making power to put such a programme," insidious programme, I would say, "into effect. We will take alternative measures. We will take other measures, measures which will be more difficult to implement, will cost more money which will have the byproduct of employing men, Mr. Speaker, in high unemployment areas by the way which we could do with here in this Province. But we are not going to get into this chemical spray programme."

Mr. Speaker, if this government would be wise, then this government would go down in history as a government which, at last after five or six years of power characterized by political expediency and unkept commitments,

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, at last this government has shown the moral courage necessary to say, "No, we will not impose this programme on the people of this Province," take a firm decision, Mr. Speaker, not the wishy-washyness, not the one thing one day and the other thing the next, Mr. Speaker, take a firm decision and say, "No, we admit we made a mistake. We admit that we were duped by certain interests and certain people who might have had an axe to grind or may have been carrying somebody else's brief, who knows? But we admit we were duped. We admit we did not receive the good advice that we should have received. We now take the firm,unalterable decision, Mr. Speaker, to halt the spray programme, to seek alternate measures of salvage, of forest management, of reforestation, of afforestation, of thinning, and all the other attributes of a good forest management programme in this Province, Sir, and with the determination and the will and the energy to lick this problem by the expenditure of the money and the work necessary," I am sure, Sir, that this Province and the people in it would be forever grateful to this government for showing some courage, for showing that it does not intend to get into this risky programme and that we will implement the programme which has the best interests of the people in mind, and which does not run the risk of causing danger and serious jeopardy to the health and welfare of this Province, Sir.

I hope, Sir, that this government, now after this debate, will take that kind of a strong stand in favour of courage and in favour of the right kinds of things with our forests and our forest industry, Mr. Speaker. I do hope that the government will show the same kind of courage that other governments in Canada have been able to show, Mr. Speaker, BC, Nova Scotia, PEI, and perhaps others will follow suit later on, Mr. Speaker. This government should show that kind of courage and at last redeem itself in the eyes of the Newfoundland people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

8041

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is getting near six and I do not know if Your Honour will want me to start now because I -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do start.

MR. NEARY: Okay, I will start. Well, Mr. Speaker, when this debate started, Sir, I believe my hon. friend who moved that the regular order of business of this House be adjourned to have an emergency debate on the government's decision to spray as opposed to looking at the alternatives, I think my hon. friend meant it to be a non-partisan, non-political debate, where members of this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is right.

MR. MORGAN: It is not that anymore.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, where members of this House would vote according to the dictates of their own conscience.

MR. FLIGHT: Right.

MR. NEARY: And now, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend, the Minister of Tourism, has interjected a little bit of politics into it.

MR. MORGAN: Not anymore.

MR. NEARY: Squirted a little bit of poison.

MR. MORGAN: I have not spoken yet.

MR. NEARY: Squirted a little bit of poison into the House, let alone the poison they are going to squirt outside the House.

MR. MORGAN: You have poison on the brain.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman, Sir, who is Minister of Tourist Development in this Province, where tourists may be sprayed in this Province, if they come in the first week in June and the second week in June and maybe the whole of June month they stand to be sprayed with this Matabacil, with this poisonous chemical that will be floating around in the air of this Province for days and days after it is unleashed from these spray planes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, how do we get it back to becoming a non-partisan, non-political debate? How can we give members on the government side, the backbenchers and the ministers

8042

MR. NEARY: who are opposed to spraying, how can we give these people an opportunity to vote yes or no?

Now over supper time, Sir, I am going to think about that and I am going to try to figure out how we can give members on both side of the House -

MR. MORGAN: We know our own conscience.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, because if we -

MR. SIMMONS: If you find it let me know.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if we keep debating this matter until eleven o'clock tonight, the debate will merely peter out and no decision will have been taken and therein lies the problem. I am on the horns of a dilemma because I do not know -

MR. MORGAN: The last speaker was partisan.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MORGAN: The last speaker, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. ROWE: Go away.

MR. NEARY: I do not know, Sir, how we can bring about a vote because I do know there are members on the government side, both ministers and backbenchers, who are deady opposed to this spraying programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Now, Sir, how do they get a chance to express their feelings and to vote for or against, aye or nay?

MR. J. CARTER: The motion does not call for it.

MR. NEARY: Well, perhaps we will amend the motion.

8043

May 29, 1978

Tape 3638

EC - 1

MR. NEARY: That is right, the motion does not call for a vote and that is a problem.

MR. W. ROWE: Well, it is the nature of this kind of a debate unfortunately.

MR. NEARY: That is the nature of the debate. Now we have to figure out a way over supertime to let some of the members on the government side - the member for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), I believe, might be opposed to the spraying programme. The hon. gentleman has been very conscientiously listening to the debate this afternoon and I believe the hon. gentleman, if he were given an opportunity to vote, might vote against it. And I could be wrong, but the hon. gentleman might vote for it. I believe the hon. the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power) would like an opportunity to put it to a free vote, and Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow). The hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) has already indicated what he would do - he would straddle the fence with a big picket right up the middle.

MR. SPEAKER: (Dr. Collins) Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I move the adjournment of the debate, Sir, if it is in order.

MR. SPEAKER: As it is now 6:00 P.M., I leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M.

8044

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MAY 29, 1978

QUESTION #1

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) Amount in fees paid by M.C.P. for consultation and surgery performed by doctors on staff of the Medical School.
- (2) Are these fees paid directly to individual doctors on staff of the Medical School or are the fees deposited in a common fund to be used at the discretion of the Dean of Medicine and/or a special committee of his staff?
- (3) List of disbursements from this common fund for the years 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977.

ANSWER

- (1) Amount of M.C.P. fees paid to doctors on staff of the Medical School 1978, \$1,971,069
- (2) Payment of fees are made directly to physicians who rendered service.
- (3) We have no involvement with any common fee fund that might exist.

March 30, 1978

*This replaces #2 previously
compiled, dated March 14*

#2

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

What plans do the Government have to supply prescription drugs to citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador who have no other income except Old Age Security?

ANSWER:

Drugs are supplied free of charge to residents of the Province who have been assessed by the Department of Social Services and certified as being unable to bear the cost of buying prescribed drugs. As previously indicated in the House, Government presently is considering the possibility of introducing a program to provide subsidized prescription drugs to citizens over age 65.

MAY 3, 1978

#2

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What plans do the Government have to supply prescription drugs to citizens of Newfoundland and Labrador who have no other income except Old Age Security?

ANSWER:

Drugs are supplied free of charge to residents of the Province who have been assessed by the Department of Social Services and certified as being unable to bear the cost of buying prescribed drugs. The requests of the Senior Citizens of the Province for some form of assistance is now receiving the very active consideration of the Government.

June 6/78

QUESTION # 3

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What plans do the Government have to supply eye glasses to needy people of all ages?

ANSWER:

Our program for the supply of eyeglasses primarily covers all school children for whom parents have been assessed by the Department of Social Services as being unable to pay the cost of prescribed eyeglasses. A few adults qualify where there are extenuating circumstances.

While we continue to review our program to consider extending coverage to needy adults, the cost would be prohibitive, especially in a time of constraint. For example, if the age group of over 50 years were considered, we would anticipate approximately 100% application with rough cost estimate of over \$1,000,000 for examination and eyeglasses in the first year. To this we would have to add costs that would have to be borne by the Department of Social Services for transportation and board and lodging.

QUESTION # 4

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

What plans do the Government have to supply dentures to needy people of all ages?

ANSWER:

In addressing the dental needs of our residents, our efforts and expenses have been primarily directed towards expanding the availability of dental services to all rural areas. We are pleased with progress to date, although there still remains some areas that are underserved. We will continue our efforts with recruitment and placement of dentists until the whole Province has reasonable access to dental services. Once this is accomplished, we can then direct our attention towards extended coverage, one area of which is dentures for needy residents.

MARCH 15, 1978

QUESTION #5

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) Number of times commercial aircraft were chartered when Government aircraft unavailable for emergency air ambulance service in 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977?
- (2) Total cost of chartering commercial aircraft for the years 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977 to transport patients to hospital?
- (3) Name of company or individual from whom aircraft was chartered when Government aircraft unavailable for emergency air ambulance service?

ANSWER:

(1)	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>CHARTERS FOR AIR AMBULANCE</u>
	1974-75	59
	1975-76	71
	1976-77	60
	1977-78 (to Jan. 31)	65
		<u>255</u>

(2)	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>COST</u>
	1974-75	\$26,839
	1975-76	47,230
	1976-77	30,521
	1977-78 (to Jan. 31)	84,795

- (3) Names of Charter Company used for Air Ambulance Flights

Newfoundland and Labrador Air Transport Ltd.
Universal Helicopters Ltd.
Viking Helicopters Ltd.
Seven Islands Helicopters Ltd.
Labrador Airways Ltd.
International Grenfell Association
Gander Aviation
Port aux Basques Air Services
Wentzells Flying Service
MacKenzie Air
Business Flight Ltd.
Executive Air

QUESTION #16

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) As of January 1, 1978, is there a waiting list of persons awaiting admission for treatment or care at the Waterford Hospital and, if so, how many persons are on that waiting list?
- (2) As at January 1, 1978, what is the in-patient capacity of the Waterford Hospital in accordance with proper accreditation standards?
- (3) As at January 1, 1978, how many of the in-patients at the Waterford Hospital are susceptible to improvement in their mental or nervous condition as a result of psychiatric treatment as compared to the number of in-patients who are not susceptible to improvement through psychiatric treatment but who require primarily supervision, nursing and medical care?
- (4) As at January 1, 1978, how many medical doctors were on the full-time staff of the Waterford Hospital, and of these, how many were psychiatrists?

ANSWER:

- (1) No waiting list for active or forensic services, as of January 1, 1978.
- (2) Rated bed capacity, including new wing, is 500 beds, as of January 1, 1978.
- (3) About 75 patients were susceptible to improvement in their mental conditions as a result of psychiatric treatment. The remaining approximately 300 will require extensive if not permanent hospitalization and supervision although a few with extensive treatment, behaviour modification programs, etc., may be advanced to a point where they can be transferred to a supervised program other than as an in-patient of this hospital.
- (4) On January 1, 1978, there were 8 full-time medical doctors on staff and of these, 7 were psychiatrists.

April 26, 1978

QUESTION #17

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) As at January 1, 1978, how many persons were in-patients of the Waterford Hospital, showing how many of these were male and how many female patients?
- (2) With reference to the in-patients of the Waterford Hospital as at April 1, 1977, how many of these in-patients were resident in the Topsail Road wing of the said Hospital?
- (3) As at April 1, 1977, how many patients were being treated by the Waterford Hospital as out-patients?
- (4) As at April 1, 1977, with respect to the in-patients of the Waterford Hospital, how many of these in-patients require care as gross defectives and how many of the said in-patients require care because of senility?

ANSWER

- (1) As at January 1, 1978, there were 358 in-patients in Waterford Hospital. Males 231 - Females 127.

QUESTION #19

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) How many Occupational Therapists were recruited outside the province in 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977?
- (b) In what provinces or countries were these Occupational Therapists recruited?

ANSWER

(a)	1974	8
	1975	5
	1976	6
	1977	<u>6</u>
		25
(b)	Other Provinces	6
	Ireland	9
	England	4
	U.S.A.	3
	Australia	1
	Japan	1
	India	<u>1</u>
		25

QUESTION #40

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Have any financial arrangements been made with the other Atlantic Provinces to construct a new dental school for Atlantic Canada?

ANSWER

No financial arrangements made with the other Atlantic Provinces to construct a new dental school for Atlantic Canada.

April 21, 1978

QUESTION #61

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Table a statement showing incidents of stomach cancer in Newfoundland and Labrador for the years 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977.

ANSWER:

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>MALE</u>	<u>FEMALE</u>	<u>NEW CASES</u>
1974	74	33	107
1975	65	26	91
1976	69	22	91

Figures for 1977 are not yet available.

April 26, 1978

QUESTION #62

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

Total number of deaths in Newfoundland and Labrador for heart failure for the years 1974, 1975, 1976 and 1977?

ANSWER

Deaths from diseases of the heart

1974	1053
1975	1109

Tabulations for 1976 and 1977 are not yet available from Statistics Canada.

April 20, 1978

QUESTION #63

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) List the members of the Medical Care Commission.
- (2) Date of appointment
- (3) Duration of appointment

ANSWER

- (1) Chairman

Mr. Roger Crosbie

Members

Dr. Ivan Woolfrey

Dr. H.J. Blackwood

Dr. P.A. Spurrell

Mr. John Lloyd

Mrs. Ford Neal

Mrs. George G.R. Parsons

Mr. John W. McGrath, LL.B.

Mr. Stephen Gallagher, C.A.

Miss Maureen Green, LL.B.

Ex Officio Members

Deputy Minister of Health or his designate
Executive Director of the Commission.

- (2) January 1, 1978
- (3) Two years.

April 21, 1978

QUESTION #75

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

A report by the Canadian Public Health Association into possible effects of fluoride contamination from the ERCO phosphorous plant at Long Harbour.

ANSWER

Copy of the Interim Report of the Canadian Public Health Association is tabled herewith.

Final report is expected in June 1978.

April 21, 1978

QUESTION #82

Mr. Neary (LaPoile) - to ask the Honourable the Minister of Health to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) Statement of number of ambulances in the province operating under the Government's Ambulance Program.
- (b) Number of ambulance drivers who have complied with the regulations, standards and training set by the Public Utilities Board and the Department of Health.

ANSWER

- (a) This part of the Question was tabled previously in answer to Question #26.
- (b) The Public Utilities Board has only set standards that apply to the type of vehicle and equipment that must be used in operating an ambulance service. All ambulances must comply with the regulation, otherwise they cannot receive a permit to operate.

Regulations governing the training of ambulance drivers have not yet been implemented. My Department is continuing its efforts to first establish a course of training for drivers which will be followed in due course with regulations.

April 21, 1978

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
8:00 p.m. - 11:00 p.m.
MONDAY, MAY 29, 1978

The House resumed at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at 6:00 P.M. for supper, Sir, I was thinking out loud of ways and means to devise a method whereby there would be a free vote taken on this matter of spraying, Sir, as opposed to looking at the alternatives to the spray programme.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, if members on both sides of the House were able to vote according to their consciences, to break party ranks - the trouble is, you see, Mr. Speaker, as Your Honour knows, we are into a situation where we are merely debating, and when we reach 11:00 P.M. the House will then adjourn and no vote will be taken. And I believe, Sir, that this issue is important enough that a vote should be taken. And before I take my seat I will propose an amendment to the motion made by my hon. friend that will give members on either side of the House an opportunity to vote on this urgent and serious matter according to the dictates of their consciences.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Right.

MR. NEARY: If they believe in the spray programme, then vote for it. If they believe as we do, that we should look into the alternatives, the alternatives, of course, being harvesting the wood, reforestation -

AN HON. MEMBER: Forest management.

MR. NEARY: - harvest the wood that was damaged by the spruce budworm, and that can be done, Mr. Speaker, by just taking out of mothballs the equipment that was used in the Labrador logging operation here on the Island of Newfoundland and in Goose Bay to harvest the damaged wood, get assistance from the Government of Canada, funding from the Government of Canada, a job creation programme whereby

MR. NEARY: our unemployed - and God only knows we need it in the worst kind of way - would be put to work cutting the damaged wood, open up the Linerboard mill, feed some of the damaged wood into the Linerboard mill and if necessary, give some of the wood to the sawmills that are closed down in this Province for lack of raw material. Now, Mr. Speaker, does that not make a great deal of common sense? Rather than go out and spray the whole Province with this poisonous chemical, why not go for the alternatives? Why not approach DREE and the Minister of Manpower in the Government of Canada and put a proposal forward to the Government of Canada whereby we would explore the alternatives, and that is to build roads to the damaged timber, cut the wood damaged by the budworm and then simultaneously carry out an intensive forest management programme - thinning, reforestation and reseedling with a strain less susceptible to budworm attack.

MR. J. CARTER: How long do you think it would take that to grow?

MR. NEARY: How long would it take it to grow? Well, Mr. Speaker, it really does not make that much difference because what we are talking about here is about five million cords of wood that have been damaged by the spruce budworm and I would think that over half of that at the present time is unsalvageable, cannot be recovered - it is gone, lost to this Province forever for the simple reason, Mr. Speaker, that the government have sat on their haunches since 1971 and done nothing.

MR. J. CARTER: Some of the wood in this Province is not able to be harvested.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman had his chance to speak today, Sir. The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, Sir, made a statement today and he has made it before in this hon. House, that the first signs

MR. NEARY: of spruce budworm were back in 1971 and the major outbreak, Sir, of spruce budworm in this Province, coincidentally with the change of government, by the way, was discovered in 1972.

MR. J. CARTER: Sabotage.

MR. NEARY: No, but that was just a coincidence, Sir, that that was the same year that the government changed. The major outbreak of the spruce budworm in Newfoundland came the same year that we got a Tory Government. Now that is just a coincidence, I am not blaming that on the Tories. And so, Mr. Speaker, the government have sat back on their haunches for over six years and did nothing about this. They should have started to salvage that wood back in 1971 and 1972. They did not do a thing about it and now as a desperation move they have hit the panic button and now they are going to spray this matacil, this poisonous chemical all over the Province.

MR. J. CARTER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order has been raised.

MR. J. CARTER: So far I have been the only one on the government side who has spoken. The impression is being left by the hon. gentleman and by the previous speaker, the Leader of the Opposition, that the proposal is to spray this whole Island with poison. Now no such proposal has been made by the government and certainly no such proposal has been espoused by myself. I said one has to be extremely careful but thank goodness the chemical that is being proposed is a lot safer than some of the chemicals that might have been used and I would like this point to be absolutely and clearly understood. I feel there is misrepresentation here.

MR. SPEAKER: I do not think there is any matter on which the Chair has to make a decision. There is no point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I thank, Your Honour, for the protection of the Chair. Back in 1976, by the way, for the benefit of hon. members of the House who may have grave doubts about the spray programme here in this Province as well as in the other provinces - in New Brunswick, for example, where they carry on a spray programme, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the gentleman that had his salary reduced to \$1.00 this year, the gentleman who is now going tooth and nail at this spraying programme, Sir, is quoted in the Halifax Herald back in December, 1976 as saying that there are just too many unanswered questions relating to both the effectiveness of a spray programme and the environmental consequences. That is the present Minister of Forestry and Agriculture who was quoted in the Halifax Herald in December of 1976 who made that statement. And now the gentleman has done a complete reversal, turned himself inside out, a complete flip, a turnabout and is now going all out to carry on, Sir, the kind of a spray programme in this Province that was outlawed by the League of Nations following the First World War.

Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. J. CARTER: Does not the hon. member remember that the Liberals were calling for a spray programme ever since 1971?

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture too, Sir, is putting forward an argument that Bowaters use 800,000 cords of wood a year and that the government in their programme are only protecting the annual harvest, only protecting the annual harvest, which brings me to the question raised by the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) about the other wood that is being damaged by the spruce budworm. There it is just laying there and if it is not cut within five years after it is attacked by the spruce budworm it is lost to the Province forever.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Less than five years.

MR. NEARY:

Less than five years, Sir, and now here we are into our sixth year and some of that wood, I would suspect over half of it, has been lost to Newfoundland forever. And if we are going to salvage the other couple of million cords out of the five million cords that has been damaged then we have to get cracking on a harvesting programme that will at least save some of this wood to be used in the Linerboard mill, to be stockpiled, to be used in sawmills, some of it could be exported, some of it could even be used, Mr. Speaker, in a process to generate electricity in this Province. There are techniques now, Sir, where you can use wood-fired plants to generate electricity and God only knows with five million cords of wood now dying or dead on the stump that that wood, Sir, would be used to generate a lot of electricity here on the Island by using the process that is being developed in other countries and other states and other provinces where they are using coal and wood to generate electricity. That would be a good use to put that wood to and in the process we would create badly needed jobs here on the Island, Sir, and in Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I saw the hon. Minister of Health on television tonight, Sir, standing up as if he had the infallibility of the Pope, shouting and roaring and screeching and howling and saying, "I am the Minister of Health and I am" - it is unparliamentary to use the language that the hon. gentleman used. "I am the Minister of Health and do you think because I am the Minister of Health that I am going to allow anything to happen to my people."

May 20, 1978

Tape No. 3640

AM 3

MR. NEASEY:

That I take this, as the minister says, I think, "damn serious, my job damn serious." Well, Sir, for every scientist, for every chemist, for every expert that the minister will put up saying that matacil is safe-and I do not think anybody has said it yet, the minister himself cannot say it, that matacil will not damage the health, it is not a threat to the health of our people. The minister in a statement recently covered himself by saying that you cannot be sure,

MR. NEARY: the minister is unsure whether or not there will be any side effect to the health of our people, to the environment, to the wildlife, and to the fish. The minister could not say that and the minister cannot say it tonight because the minister has no backup evidence, has no hard evidence to say that matacil is not dangerous to the health of our people. So the minister can stand up all he wants and say to a public audience, "But I am the Minister of Health" and I say to that, so what? For every expert the minister can bring forward I can bring forward two to counter his experts and his scientists and his chemists. And the minister cannot produce that many experts in the first place. We can produce more on this side to verify the fact that matacil is unproved.

MR. W. ROWE: It is a numbers game.

MR. NEARY: It is a numbers game, Sir. matacil is so far unproved, and it is only used in the United States under very controlled circumstances and the Minister of Forestry, his colleague says, "But the National Research Council and six or seven federal agencies tell us that matacil is okay." Well Sir, did they not say the same thing about thalidamide, is it?

MR. WHITE: thalidamide and DDT.

MR. NEARY: And DDT, Did they not say the same thing? They will always approve, Sir, they will approve until it is proven that it is detrimental to the health of the people. Then it is too late, Mr. Speaker. It is too late. And I am surprised at the Ottawa authorities sitting back and letting this experimental programme go on here in this Province, with Matacil that has not yet been proven. Even down in the United States it was only registered a couple of weeks ago and it was registered then to be used under extremely controlled conditions.

MR. W. ROWE: And cotton.

MR. NEARY: And used on cotton. And so, Mr. Speaker, that argument does not hold up.

MR. NEARY: We can put up just as many. We can put up two to one if we have to. Scientists, experts, chemists, that can knock down any argument that the hon. gentleman can put up, and the hon. gentleman is no expert in this field, no expert. The hon. gentleman is a lay man. And I will take the word, Sir, of the doctor in Gander who was at that meeting, Dr. Thurlow, who says that there could be very serious side effects to matacil. It could cause cancer.

MR. W. ROWE: Sure Dr. Severs admitted that.

MR. NEARY: And Dr. Severs admitted it, the gentleman's own Assistant Deputy Minister, is he?

MR. W. ROWE: Yes. Well no, the Medical Health -

MR. NEARY: Well I do not know what he is.

MR. W. ROWE: There are Carcinogenic agents in it he said.

MR. FLIGHT: Chief Medical Health Officer.

MR. W. ROWE: He said there were carcinogenic agents in that matacil.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir. And this -

MR. W. ROWE: Proven.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon. Did the hon. gentleman say, "Prove it."

MR. W. ROWE: No, I said 'proven!'

MR. NEARY: Oh, proven.

MR. W. ROWE: I said, "Proven carcinogenic agents in matacil".

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what are we doing? Has the government taken leave of their senses? Has the government gone completely berserk gone as my hon. friend says, crazy, completely out of their minds? Going around this Province in the next few weeks squirting and spraying this poisonous chemical all over the countryside where men and women and children are out having picnics, where Girl Guides

MR. NEARY: and Brownies and Cubs and Scouts are out camping, where fishermen are out fishing, where people will be out picking berries in a very short time.

MR. WHITE: Ruin the bakeapples.

MR. NEARY: Ruin the blueberries, and ruin the bakeapples and then, Mr. Speaker, we are told this afternoon by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, who certainly made a non-partisan, non-political speech, we are told that even under ideal circumstances, the ideal situation, that there are only five days in Newfoundland at the most, out of a whole year, that you could spray. Only five days. And we are told that is verified by the Air Traffic Controllers who are against this spray programme, only five days and they have grave doubts about these five days. Even then, as the leader told us, there may be an updraft and that spray, even though it is dropped under ideal conditions, may get caught up in an updraft and may be carried for miles. It could very easily be carried in here over the city of St. John's. Although everybody thinks here that it is not going to affect them. It could drift for miles and miles.

MR. WHITE: You would hear some screaming if it were going to be in St. John's.

MR. NEARY: I guarantee you.

MR. NEARY: And that is why the minister and the government steered away from the Avalon Peninsula. They did not want to get the population of the Avalon Peninsula worked up, but the people in the rural parts of the Province, it is alright to squirt the poison on them. And then you have fishermen out in boats bring in loads of codfish with that stuff drifting around in the air. The next thing you know you will kill our market for codfish. And then what about the tourists? My hon. friend this afternoon, who seems to be in favour of the spray programme - and if he was not, Sir, let him get up and say so in this House tonight that he is against it, break party ranks - what about all the tourists who are coming in here? When they hear tell of the 'planes taking off from Gander International Airport - and I might say, Sir, that to my knowledge this is the first time that an international airport has been used to launch the poisonous spray. Usually they use airports that are completely removed from the population, airports that have to be reactivated, that were probably used during the Second World War somewhere for training purposes or landing strips away off in the country. Here we are going to use the International Airport and all that has to happen, Mr. Speaker, is one of these spray 'planes - and I believe there have been seventeen crashes, have there not?

MR. W. N. ROWE: Something around that number.

MR. NEARY: - about seventeen or eighteen crashes over in New Brunswick. All you have to do is have one of these plow into the runway, go off the end of the runway, have that stuff get in the air out there and the next thing you know all the big 'planes coming over from Europe will stop using Gander Airport because they will be afraid that the captains and the first officers of the airplanes could very easily be affected by this stuff. Because I am told,

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, and I have it here in front of me somewhere, the hard evidence that this stuff gets into your skin everywhere, goes in through the pores of your skin. So, Sir, nobody can be safe against it, not even the big airplanes that are coming in to Gander, into my hon. friend's district. And as I say, Sir, it is not good enough for my hon. friend to get up and say, 'I am the Minister of Health. I have the infallibility of the Pope. I am right and everybody else is wrong.' What the hon. gentleman reminded me of on television tonight was the time that the Premier went down to the Waterford. He was walking through the Waterford and this guy came up to him and said, "Excuse me, Sir, but," he said - he hurled an insult at him - and the Premier said, "Do you not know who I am? I am the Premier of this Province." And the fellow said, "Well, I would not worry too much about that. You will not be in here too long because when I came in here I thought I was Napoleon." Well, that is like the hon. gentleman. He reminded me of that story this afternoon. What does it mean? 'I am Minister of Health.' So what? Does that give me the right to go out and threaten the lives of our men, women and children, and children yet unborn? Because this matacil, this spray, Sir, could have an affect on children who are not yet born -

MR. W. N. ROUE: Not conceived yet.

MR. NEARY: Not even conceived.

Mr. Speaker, another aspect of this, Sir, that is frightening, that would frighten the life out of you is the monitoring of the programme. The monitoring committee now, I understand, is comprised of a group of students who are inexperienced in this field, and a doctor over at the university the other day, Dr. Rice, I believe it was, was asked for his professional view on this matter, and he made a statement that undermines, certainly, the

MR. NEARY: credibility of the government's report of last year's monitoring programme and what they intend to do this year. We are told, Sir, that they are going to have a bunch of students out in the field. And these students are inexperienced - I believe they are twelve part-time students. Perhaps the minister can confirm this. Now we are told that these twelve part-time students have been sworn to secrecy - if they come across insects or animal life or birds or fish that die because of the spraying of this poisonous chemical all over the Province that they are not allowed to say a word about it. They are sworn to secrecy.

MRS. MCISSAC: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Is that right? That is correct, Sir. I have the statement in front of me. The people who are inexperienced, who last year admitted that they could not do an effective job on monitoring - and this has been confirmed by Dr. James Curtis Rice of the Biology Department of Memorial University - undermines the credibility of the government's spray programme last year

Mr. Neary: and throws very grave doubts on the monitoring of this year's spray programme, Sir. I would like to hear the minister's views on that, Sir.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the decision to release large quantities of poison over this Province, Sir, is a political decision. And it is, Sir, a political decision. Spraying, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, is an admission of defeat. It is short-sighted. It is a very short-sighted approach to the real problem in the forests of this Province. Mr. Speaker, we know that 60 per cent of Newfoundland's forests, according to the experts, is mature or over-matured timber, timber that has been left to die and rot by the two big paper companies who up to now have refused to let anybody get at it, the sawmill operators, the government's Linerboard mill. And, Mr. Speaker, we also know that spraying, Sir, does nothing to protect this mature and over-mature wood. The only way that it can be salvaged is, as I said a few moments ago, develop a positive approach, a positive programme whereby roads will be built to the mature and over-mature timber and the damaged timber and that it be used to operate the Linerboard mill, the sawmills, the paper mills, and export some of the wood, if possible.

It cannot be claimed, Mr. Speaker, that spraying halts or controls an outbreak of the budworm. Over in New Brunswick, Sir, it has been proven, as my hon. friend said this afternoon, that all spraying does, Sir, is create a new race of budworm, a super budworm. It is the survival of the fittest, a new budworm is developed, and that is why they have to keep spraying in New Brunswick to try to cope with the super budworm that they have created over there in New Brunswick. Are we going to do the same thing here in this Province, Mr. Speaker? Or if we continue on the disaster course we are on, Sir, proceed with the spray programme, we are going to get locked in to the same kind of situation as they have over in New Brunswick. We have not explored the alternatives. And the Newfoundland people have not been told the facts about the benefits, if there are any, and the risks of areial spraying to control the spruce budworm. The political decision, Sir, has been made, and the people have

Mr. Neary: been misinformed, misled, and are frightened.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what has happened up to now? Well, Sir, there seems to be a rapidly growing movement against the spray programme. So far we know that various women's institutes in the Province, and women seem to be more active in this movement than men, more informed, women's institutes have come out against it. The Canadian Council of the Blind in Corner Brook is against it. The Newfoundland and Labrador Association for Full Employment are against it. I believe Mr. Locking, who is a representative of the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees, is against it. The Status of Women in Corner Brook are against it. The Gander Town Council is against it. The Air Traffic Controllers are against it. The Newfoundland Federation of Indians are against it. Echowatch in Corner Brook are against it. The people of Green Bay, Gallants, Stephenville against it. There is an anti-spray committee even in Grand Falls, Mr. Speaker, You would expect that Grand Falls, which depends so much on the forest industry in this Province, would be all for spraying, but there is a committee, Sir, in that community headed by some very well-known names, very

MR. HEALY: well known people are against the spray programme. And, Mr. Speaker, I might say, in case anybody has any doubts about where we stand on the forest industry in this Province, that we are all for protecting our forests and we are all for making sure that the two paper mills will have, and the linerboard mill if its going, have a sufficient supply of wood to keep them going on a long term basis.

We are all for that, Sir, and I hope nobody in Grand Falls or Corner Brook gets the idea that if we do not spray, if the government reconsiders and decides not to go ahead with the spraying programme that it is going to affect their future livelihoods because it is not.

We know that in Newfoundland, Sir, the egg count is gone down. In New Brunswick it has gone up. In Newfoundland it has decreased by sixty per cent.

AN HON. MEMBER: On the West Coast.

MR. HEALY: On the West Coast. And in New Brunswick, where they have been spraying for twenty-six or twenty-seven years, the egg count has gone up by thirty per cent. Then we have the Status of Women in Corner Brook against the spray programme. The Springdale Hospital Association are considering opposing the spray programme.

So, Mr. Speaker, the movement is growing but our time is running out, Sir. The first week in June we are told the government are going to spray, like it or lump it. We are told by the minister that there is no turning back even though the majority of people, citizens of this Province, say, "No, do not squirt this poison on me." The government in its arrogance, and probably in its ignorance as my hon. friend says of the facts, are going to go ahead so the minister tells us, with the spray programme whether the people like it or not, and if they do not

MR. MAIN: like it then can lump it, so the minister says.

That is democracy at work, Mr. Speaker, the majority of our citizens say, "We are frightened. We are in fear that this matabil is going to affect our little children and our women and our men and we want it stopped." But the big government who is committed to it says, "No." The government that apparently has the support of people who earn over \$20,000 a year, who do not have the support of the average person, the ordinary Newfoundlander who is earning, say, an average of \$7,000, this government that has the support of big business and people in the higher income bracket says, "Okay, we are going to go with the paper companies and we are going to go with the people in the higher income bracket. We are not going to pay any attention to 99.9 per cent of the people of this Province. We are going to spray them anyway and spray their children and spray the countryside."

Mr. Speaker, what kind of insanity is this?

It is callous, Sir. The government are on a disaster course as I said. It is shortsighted, unimaginative, it is dangerous, Sir, and it is dishonest, and a majority of the people in this Province, Sir, are against the spray programme.

My hon. friend indicated Maine is phasing out, BC is getting out of the spraying business, New Brunswick would love to get out of it, Nova Scotia would not touch it with a barge pole. Yet, Sir, here in Newfoundland, where we always boasted about having the only wilderness area left in Canada with unpolluted air - remember how we used to boast, Mr. Speaker, over the last couple of years, "Come to Newfoundland where you have unpolluted mid-Atlantic fresh air." The Minister of Tourism will not be able to say that after another week or ten days, when the salmon rivers are filled with this poisonous chemical, when the

MR. MATHY. parks are filled with it, hares, wildlife, and Mr. Speaker, one thing that was not mentioned today, although my hon. friend behind me hinted at it, Sir, is the fact that millions and millions of insects were found dead last year after the spraying programme, insects that fish feed off, the trout feed off, the salmon feed off.

MR. FLIGHT: Ninety-five per cent found were found dead.

MR. NEARY: Ninety-five per cent of them were found dead. Insects that they never knew existed in Newfoundland before. Well how many fish died as a result of that, starved to death?

Mr. Speaker, it is a very, very serious matter indeed and I am glad that hon. gentlemen are not grinning and sneering and laughing tonight as they did they afternoon and that they are taking this matter -

MR. WHITE: They were watching TV tonight, I would say.

MR. NEARY: They were watching the TV and they should have been watching it Sunday afternoon when the programme was on too.

MR. WHITE: It is going to be like that all over the Province next week.

MR. NEARY: Nova Scotia is not spraying, Sir. They have better sense, they are constructing wood-gas hydro electric generating stations to utilize the salvaged wood and to cut power costs for the ordinary citizens. Besides that, Sir, they are boosting the construction industry by feeding some of this wood into their sawmills, they are stockpiling some, they are trying to export of the wood and they are using the rest of it in the paper mills. Forest management. Mr. Speaker, forest management, Sir, has long been the accepted way, it is the only means of reducing the risk and effective budworm epidemic. Forest management, Sir, must begin in this Province and we intend here on this side of the House anyway I think, I can speak for myself, intend to do something about that in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I only have a few minutes left, Sir, and I want to again, I would like to be able to go into more detail, I am not a scientist or a chemist but I have all kinds of data here in front of me, Sir, that can prove that matacil has not been really tried, that Newfoundlanders are being used as guinea pigs, white rats in this whole game that is played by the chemical companies and by the paper companies in Canada and in this Province, that Newfoundlanders are just the pawns in this whole game that is being played, used as guinea

MR. MEYER:

pigs, white rats because, Mr. Speaker,

we know and the minister has admitted, both the Minister of Health and the Minister of Forestry, Sir, that matacil has not been proved. And as I said a few moments ago, for every expert that the minister can put up I can put up two and probably more who will state, Sir, that matacil has not been proved and is in all probability, Sir, a threat to the health and well being of our Newfoundland people. And how anybody in conscience can sit on the government side of the House and allow that spray programme to go ahead, Sir, is beyond me. They must have reached the stage where they figured the jig is up, they are going to get the boot anyway after the next election and they could not care less. Take it out on the people, spray the poison all over the Province and all over our people. A most irresponsible thing to do, Sir, most irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, in order to try and get this matter, Sir, brought up to a free vote whereby members on either side of the House—and I might say, Sir, that I do not know the feelings of all my colleagues on this side of the House. There may be colleagues of mine who may vote for the spray programme, there may be people on the government benches who will speak and vote against the spray programme but at least, Sir, we should be given the chance. The member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) has been calling now for some time for a truce amongst the political parties in this Province. He did not call for that truce when he was up in Ottawa attacking the government but now when the government is under fire, when the government is being attacked he says let us have a truce and let us do something for the people. Well here is a chance to do something for the people, Call a truce, break party ranks, have a free independent vote and let every man vote according to the dictates of his conscience. And since he cannot vote I am going to put an amendment to the motion, Sir, if the amendment is not in order then I would ask leave of the House to have a vote before this debate winds up and let every man vote according to his own conscience for or against the spray programme.

MR. SHAW:

So, Mr. Speaker, before my time runs out the amendment that I wish to move is this, to amend the motion made by my hon. colleague the member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight), to amend the motion and add the following word; that at 10:45 p.m. this evening the debate ends and a free vote be taken amongst members to decide on an individual basis those who are for and those who are against the spruce budworm spraying programme and proceed, Mr. Speaker, instead with the alternatives, namely, harvest the wood damaged by the budworm; two, carry out an intensive forest management programme by: one, thinning; two, reforestation; three, reseeding with a strain less susceptible to the budworm attack.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a reasonable proposition and if it is not in order, Mr. Speaker, Your Honour can take a look at it - I still have I believe about three or four minutes left, I have five minutes left, Your Honour can look at it and if that is not in order I will make an appeal to hon. members on either side of the House by leave of the House to let us have for God's sake a free independent vote for the sake of the health of the people of this Province. I will give Your Honour a chance to rule on the amendment

Mr. Neary: now and then maybe in two or three minutes
I can make my pitch to hon. members to give the unanimous consent of
the House to have a free vote.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The matter before the Chair is, of course,
not that of unanimous consent or leave, but the amendment as proposed by
the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), Beauchesne, Section 99, subsection
(3) will establish that this particular motion is not amendable. It
is a motion for the adjournment which allows a discussion on a particular
matter of urgency after it was ruled in order by the Chair and meets other
criteria, but it is not susceptible to any amendment, this or other.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I regret having to put Your Honour in that position
to make that kind of a ruling because Your Honour already ruled today
that this was a matter of urgent public importance where an
emergency debate was necessary. And I know that in Your Honour's
heart Your Honour finds it very difficult indeed to make that kind of
a ruling.

But, Sir, I would ask the Government House Leader,
I appeal to the Government House Leader to give unanimous consent of
this House that before this debate ends up this day that a free,
independent vote be taken, of members of both sides of the House
I do not have any idea how my colleagues would vote, and I am sure
the hon. gentleman does not know how his colleagues will vote. But
this is one of these matters that is non-partisan, non-political,
this is a matter of high moral principle, a matter that members have
strong feelings and strong views on and they should be freed up and
allowed to vote according to the dictates of their conscience.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Now would the Government House Leader
agree to that, give unanimous consent? Should we spray or should we
not spray? That is the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. House Leader.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not participating in the debate,

MR. SPEAKER: No, the hon. gentleman is yielding.

MR. HICKMAN: I am simply responding to a question posed by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). The hon. gentleman will recall that the whole purpose of this motion is to debate an issue and the argument that was used earlier today when the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. Flight) put the motion was this was an issue that should be debated in the House. And there is only one vote permissible under the rules, and that vote is a vote on whether or not this House do adjourn. That is the only vote that is permissible under the rules. It is not a question of unanimous leave of the House. Whether you have a free vote or not is a matter for the caucus of each individual party to decide whether or not, when a vote is taken, the Whips come off, and if hon. gentlemen say on this side of the House that the Whips are off then they can vote, but unless and until that is decided, which is a party matter, not a matter for this House, I submit that the request of the hon. member for LaPoile is not realistic and certainly I would not be prepared to give that unanimous consent.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I have one minute left, and, Sir, I want to point out for the benefit of the hon. gentleman that the House is the master of its own rules, that-

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. NEARY: - by unanimous consent the House can do anything and I would be prepared, and my colleague just told me, if the minister is prepared, the Government House Leader to put the question. See if we can get unanimous consent. If not, let us rise the House for a half an hour, meet in caucus, and then come back to the House.

MR. HICKMAN: You wanted the debate and we are having it.

MR. NEARY: We are having the debate, but we can still have the vote too. The minister left the impression we could not have a vote.

MR. NEARY: We can have a vote. The House is the master of its own rules. The House by unanimous consent can have a vote, and if the minister is not sure of the feelings of his caucus they can go in caucus for half an hour, we will caucus for half an hour, then we will come back and take the vote.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the urgency of the debate?

MR. NEARY: The urgency of debate, Sir, is one thing, but then once eleven o'clock comes the debate runs out and we do not get a vote.

MR. HICKMAN: We will have had a debate.

MR. NEARY: A debate, well that does not mean anything. That is all hot air, wind, and that is all it is, just wind.

MR. HICKMAN: That is what you asked for.

MR. NEARY: We are trying to persuade the government to reconsider this matter, and the only way it can be reconsidered is have a free vote.

MR. HICKMAN: I am not prepared to admit what the hon. gentleman just said, that all the debate has been so far is hot air and wind.

MR. NEARY: Well that is all it will be.

MR. HICKMAN: I thought it was a legitimate debate.

MR. HEALY: Mr. Speaker, that is all it will be unless we can take a vote, that is all it will be.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in rising to speak on the motion I note that there are not too many of my colleagues in the House and I hope it is not because they are not concerned over this matter because it is a very grave concern. I think that was clearly demonstrated a few nights ago at a public meeting in Gander. The motion of course is not a motion whether to spray the forests of our Province or not to spray. It is a motion that is asking for the House to be adjourned for an emergency debate and that debate then would decide whether or not we would or should spray the forests.

Now, Mr. Speaker, tonight I am going to speak as a free individual and not as a member of the Cabinet, but as a member of the House. I am going to express my concerns, as I see them, in the hope that my concern, which I will also relay to my colleagues in Cabinet upon the next meeting, and I do them after talking to scores of people over the past number of days in my travels in Central Newfoundland in particular and I think these concerns cannot be overlooked.

Now first of all the decision to spray the forests, as was announced by my colleague and announced as a government decision, was not an easy decision. It was not, as my good friend in the Opposition said it was, a decision that we felt we were down and out and we were going to get out and going to lose the government and decided to spray anyway and forget it. It was a decision made after gathering the most up-to-date technical and scientific expertise and the opinions of these expertise and experts around the country. And after analysing the information available from the expertise and not only that but after very careful study of all information available to government from these various scientists and professional people, only after careful study and careful analysis a decision was made.

May 19, 1973

Tape 3647 (Night)

AM-2

MR. MORGAN: Now I would say today that if a petition was circulated throughout the Province of Newfoundland and even in my own district of Bonavista South which has very little or practically no forest industry, and my concern is not because of the voters concerns, I speak as an individual Newfoundlander and as an individual member of this House looking at the overall concern for the Province in general. I would say that if a petition was circulated tomorrow or next week that practically every single individual would sign and protest the spraying of our forest, practically every individual. They are all against the spraying.

I do not like the idea of, I would say and I have to say irresponsible actions of people who want to raise the emotions of the people. I am not saying the Opposition is doing that. I do not like the idea of stirring up the people and getting their emotions all fired up over this issue and that is being done by certain groups in the Province and I question their motives, I do question their motives, I will go so far as to say that that kind of action is irresponsible. The very question and the very serious situation is that we do have right now 2.1 million cords of wood dead in our forests; these are facts from the Department of Forestry. We have 3.5 million cords of wood that is not likely to survive the spruce budworm. That is 2.1 million cords dead and another 3.5 million cords that is going to die and we have 2 million acres severely damaged by the spruce budworm.

May 29, 1978

Tape 3648 (Night)

EC - 1

MR. MORGAN: Now it seems that we have lots of experts. I hear comments in the media, I hear comments today in the House from the Leader of the Opposition and from the Opposition House Leader with regard to the spraying and the chemical or toxic used in the spraying, but I have not heard one other solution to the spruce budworm problem. I have heard tonight a couple of alternatives put forward by the Leader of the Opposition which were outlined by my colleague, the Minister of Forestry, in a statement a few days ago, but I did not hear and I have not heard any alternatives to the very gigantic problem of the spruce budworm.

If we cannot spray with matacil, if we cannot spray with some other chemical, what is the answer to the spruce budworm? And I am sure today all of us realize that looking at the vast forests we have, looking at the importance to our economy of the forests that we have, none of us want to see these forests destroyed. So what can we do?

I know that matacil - I have read the information over the past number of days, the information available to me about the toxic - it is a poison, although I know it is accepted by a number of the people who are concerned and should be concerned about the use of this substance, the research which has been carried out has satisfied the Pest Controls Act of Canada, it has satisfied the Food and Drug Act of Canada, it has satisfied the Migratory Birds Convention Act of Canada, it has satisfied the Canada Water Act, all federal pieces of legislation, and the use of matacil, this very substance we are talking about, has satisfied these pieces of federal legislation as a result of the research work carried out to determine the possible effects of matacil and its use

MR. MORGAN: and the effect it would have on our natural environment. But the only thing that bothers me, Mr. Speaker, and it bothers me, and I think it bothers all of us as members of the House, as people who make decisions; it bothers me in the back of my mind as a Newfoundlander, and I am sure it bothers my colleague from Gander and it bothers my colleague, the Minister of Forestry, who is responsible, It bothers all of us as government leaders, that although there has been no conclusive scientific, and I repeat, there has been no conclusive scientific evidence that this substance, matacil, will cause any significant adverse side effects. There has been nothing conclusive in a scientific way to research that can show there is or there will be any adverse side effects. I am sure all of us are concerned that the possibility is still there that there could be some very serious side effects. We do not know that. None of us can act the role of God - we do not know. The House Leader may think it is a bit funny, a bit of a joke. I am not God and I am sure he is not God, and I do not pretend to be God. And any member of this government who pretends he is God and can act like God should not be in power today.

What I am saying is that when we look at the destruction, first of all, of the wildlife - and I should be concerned about wildlife - and when I say destruction, I should say possible destruction, the elimination of what we have to offer as a country to the tourists of the other parts of the world who look at the free air and the waters and streams that are free of pollution - we look at all these things - surely we have to all search our own minds and search our own conscience and say, although there is no conclusive scientific evidence that there will be any

May 29, 1978

Tape 3648 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. MORGAN: adverse effects on our
natural environment, on the wildlife, on the rivers and
streams, on the insects and the birds and the animals,
and least, but maybe most important of all, on human
beings - these are the kinds of things we do not know
for sure, we cannot say for sure. And

MR. MORGAN: that is a very serious thing to ponder in your mind when you are asking yourself a question, should we or should we not?

But of course the only alternatives at this time to spraying is to do what? Is to go out on an all out attempt to salvage the forest that we have that has been destroyed, and the fact that the Department of Forestry points out that only fifty per cent of the dead wood that is now lying around the Province, fifty per cent is the only amount we can effectively utilize. The capabilities of the utilization of the dead wood we have there to salvage that we can only utilize approximately fifty per cent. So salvaging of the forest that has been destroyed, has been affected, is not the answer. It cannot be done.

Number two alternative is forest management. And I take strong exception tonight, I am not going to be partisan because it is far from being a partisan debate, but surely the Opposition members in - I sincerely hope they are not attempting to make it a partisan issue in the Province, not attempting to turn it into a political issue and say, "Look, the people are against it so we should be against it because it is votes for us."

DR. KITCHEN: It is not a partisan issue.

MR. MORGAN: I am glad to hear my hon. friend from St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) saying that. But again in saying that nothing has been done for forest management in the Province and forest management is the second alternative, look at what has been happening since 1973 to 1978 this year. This government has spent a total of \$54 million strictly on forest management, \$21 million for access roads, \$4 million on a forest inventory, \$11 million on forest protection, \$4 million on reforestation, management plans - \$1 million, surveys and buildings a further \$1.5 million, harvesting and utilization - \$3.3 million, a total of \$54 million. So the Opposition in any attempt, I hope they are not making an attempt but if they are

MR. MORGAN: making an attempt to show look, the alternative was not take up by government, one of the alternatives which is forest management. It has been taken up to the point where we spent \$54 million since 1973 to try to counteract the situation which we knew existed since '71 when it came over to the Western part of the Province, it started from there.

So these two alternatives are not the answer. So we are here as a government and I as one individual Cabinet minister, we are all responsible for decisions made by Cabinet. Cabinet is a collective decision making process. I cannot, as one minister, come out and say I disagree with what my colleagues have done. Because I agree. I have to agree. If I did not agree I could not stay in Cabinet. But I will say after talking to hundreds of people over the past number of days in Central Newfoundland in particular, and indeed listening to the views this morning from people all over the Province who are calling in my colleague on the open line show and expressing their concerns, and it was not political partisan conversation, it was not. They were calling in and genuinely putting forward their concerns about this matter, a network hooked into all the local stations around the Province. Listening to these, listening to others whom I have talked to individually in the St. John's area, exclusive of my visit to the Central Newfoundland area over the weekend for at least two full days, I will say tonight that I sincerely hope, it will be my view as one minister, although the decision has been made to spray, and I support that position which has already been announced, my position tonight as an individual is that I will be asking my colleagues as one minister in a Cabinet, to reconsider. And I am saying it in a sincere genuine way. I am not breaking ranks with government, although it may be

Mr. Morgan: interpreted that way, but I am not.

And I take the exception to a comment just made, resign! resign!

That is playing politics. Do not say that.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no. He said that the party should remain together.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, okay.

MR. J. CARTER: You hang together or you hang separately.

MR. MORGAN: Because what I am saying is I would like my colleagues to reconsider along these lines that at least we should not spray in any area where there is a water supply system, anywhere near a water supply system, number one. And number two, that we not spray in any populated areas of the Province; in other words, away from populated areas, communities. I noticed last week a petition was brought in from Port Blandford, Port Blandford is filled with friends of mine, but that is not the reason why I am saying it, they are not voters of mine, there are lots of friends of mine in Port Blandford, and they were concerned because of the spraying so close to their community. That was their concern.

AN HON. MEMBER: And ours.

MR. MORGAN: What I am saying is that we should look at this whole programme and reconsider these two major points spraying near to watersheds or water supply systems, and spraying near populated areas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: I would like to be able to say that I am against the spray totally, but what choice do we have? What can we do? I wish the House of Assembly could tell my colleague the Minister of Forestry the answers, and could tell him what to do. Do not spray, but do this to control the spruce budworm problem we have.

Mr. Speaker, that is my view I do not think there is any need to come to a vote. The motion is that we adjourn, and I think that we, that is the reason why I will end up my few remarks, we do have at least a full two hours to debate this matter. And in

Mr. Morgan: debating this matter, and actually in debating this motion itself is opening up, and it can open up the opinions and views of all members of the House, providing we do not take the full time of each of us to express our views. Well, I said I am sincere in saying , and I surely hope that in the next number of days through our deliberations as a government that we can recognize the concerns of the people in many areas of the Province and at least these two I mentioned the possibility of giving these two considerations.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. the member for St. John's West.

MR. KITCHEN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I must, Mr. Speaker, congratulate the last speaker in what I consider to be a very courageous and a very well spoken few words. I too would like to congratulate previous speakers on bringing out many strong points on what is one of the greatest problems facing this Province today, the question of the infestation of the spruce budworm, and what we can do about it. The spraying is just part of the whole problem as I see it. And I am not too sure that my views are going to be the same as the views that were uttered on this side of the House. I would like them to be as similar as possible, but I have to depart from views from time to time just as the previous speaker did.

It is frightening, this budworm; it is really frightening what it has done to the forests of this Province, and what it will be doing in the future regardless of what we may do. The financial costs of spraying or the financial cost of putting up with the budworm are pretty frightening for a province in our economic situation at this time. But yet the spray itself we have to look at carefully. Its effects on people, its effects on animal life, its effect on the trees that we are trying to protect. We also have to look at some of the evidence that has been brought forth. And I do not know very much about this. I have though consulted with some biologists friends of mine to ask them, these experts in the field, I am not an expert other than just pick up and read

Mr. Kitchen: letters to the editor, and people who wander in from other provinces, with certain views that they want expressed. I think we have a duty to listen to the experts in our own Province and we do have biologists in this Province, and we do have economists in this Province who have views who are worth listening to.

Now I am going to propose at the conclusion of my remarks that we should perhaps strike some sort of a committee of the House to look into this in greater detail. It is very difficult for us here to address ourself to this problem and to come up with an answer in a House situation. It is probably a little easier for a minister to do that with the advice of experts over a period of time.

DR. KITCHEN: We have a duty though to say what we have to say here, but then I believe we have to take some steps other than just conclude the debate right now. It has been brought to my attention, for example, that there has been a monitoring programme in this Province, or was last year, in which they experimented with three chemicals. The one that was used before - it is the hard name, the one that I cannot pronounce too well. Let me see if I can have a try at it - fenitrothione, whatever it is - and the matacil. As I understand it, in the spray programme last year the ingredient that was used was judged to be undesirable in comparison with this matacil.

It has been brought up here in the House, for example, that experiments have been performed in other provinces, Cape Breton and Quebec, and I am not too sure whether these experiments have any validity when translated here. The temperature in these areas is higher than it is in Newfoundland, which means that the chemical breaks down in this Province much less quickly and therefore hangs around a little bit longer - not an awful lot longer, but a little bit longer. And also the soil in this Province and the water has more acid in it. It is soft water here as opposed to hard water somewhere else which makes it even harder for these chemicals to disappear. The acidity of our water plus the lower temperatures here makes it a little longer for these chemicals to disappear. That is what I understand from biologists.

MR. NEARY: Our water is not filtered yet, is it?

DR. KITCHEN: Yes. But it does indicate though that the experiments that are performed elsewhere have very little meaning when transcribed here. We cannot go by the experiments that have been carried out in other places and we should really have an extensive experimental programme

DR. KITCHEN:

in this Province.

Last year's experimental programme, I understand, using this fenitrothione, that was the chemical that killed all the insects. It was not the matacil that killed the insects in the water. I think it is important to realize if this information that I have is correct, and I think it is, that it was not the matacil that killed all the insects in the water and on top of the water. It was the other one, the one that they decided not to use.

MR. J. CARTER:

Fenitrothione.

DR. KITCHEN:

That is it. The member for St. John's North has it. Fenitrothione, was it? Okay, that is the one. That is the bad one. I am not saying the other one is a good one.

The other point though is that the research that has been carried on in this Province from what I can gather is only one year, and biologists do not like to do research in one year; they like to look at the long-term effects - and by long-term effects they are talking about more than one year. They are not talking about eternity, they are talking about probably three or four or five years, that type of research. And it is pretty hard - maybe this chemical will prove in the long-run to be dangerous over a period of three, four or five years. That is one of the things we have to look at. What about the effect on higher animal life other than these insects that are around? What is the effect on trout? What is the effect on other things? Well, I understand that there was no effect on the trout in that year.

MR. MURPHY:

There was one bird killed.

DR. KITCHEN:

One bird. Well, there may be an effect over a period of years. This is the stuff we do not know about the long-term effect. It would be nice if we could look back over five years and say that there is no

DR. KITCHEN: long-term effects, but we have not been monitoring any long-term in this Province yet. Now it would be good if we did to have a long-term effect so that we could look back and see if there is any long-term effect on trout. We do not know that yet in this Province. I think probably part of the problem is that it may have stunted the growth of these trout. That is another thing we have not looked at - or higher animals - it may have that type of effect on birds and things like that. That is something that should be discussed.

So I believe we have to have a long-term research programme, looking at the long-term effects of spraying. And it has to be planned not in a year-to-year possibility but over a period of time, an experimental programme that is designed to last a number of years rather than one that is funded for one year and maybe funded next year and maybe the next year. I think if we are going to look at controlling this tremendous, ravenous pest, this spruce budworm which can kill us all

DR. KITCHEN: Economically as far as the forest industry is concerned, if we are going to deal with this creature then we have to deal with it and use all the tools of research and we have got to fund our researchers to the point where they can handle these longer term experiments, and find out for sure in a better way what is presently doing.

Now the other point is, what is the effect of this programme of this particular chemical and others on human beings? I understand that this particular chemical that we are using this year, this matacil, is not carcinogenic, that it is not a cancer linked one; others may be but not this one. That is what I understand. I do understand though that this chemical does affect the nervous system. It does not affect the other part. But I do also understand that it does not affect as bad as a few squirts of Raid that people use in their homes from time to time.

MR. WHITE: They do not squirt it on their head.

DR. KITCHEN: You see, this is the point, that the spray that is to be diluted into the atmosphere over the forests is not as bad, not as effective, as hurtful on human beings, as people spraying Raid in their kitchens, and in the normal way which it is used. So we have to be honest about this. Perhaps some of this information that has been fed to me is incorrect, in which case we should correct it. But we should not go off half cocked on false information.

I have also been told that the chemical strips that people use in their campers and trailers are much more injurious to health from the nervous system point of view than is this matacil. So whatever the truth is it has to come out, the truth rather than lies or false information. We do not want to win an argument by bringing out false information. We have to bring out whatever the truth is, and base our conclusions on the truth.

DR. KLECKEN: I also understand, on the basis of the spray programme, that to find traces of the material, of the matacil after it had been used in the spray programme, the experimental part, that they had to use entirely new techniques to find it. They could not even find any traces in the usual way of finding it. They had to invent new techniques to find this relic, the remnants of the matacil.

I understand too that diesel fumes are more noxious than this. I understand also that this Reye's Syndrome which people talk about is not associated with Matacil. If that is a fact then there is no point in arguing about Reye's Syndrome if that is not linked with matacil: if it is then we should link it with it.

Now this is not so say of course that this business of spraying things with pesticides, whatever it is, is innocuous to all of us, and it is bound to be dangerous and bad, I suppose. Any spray is kind of frightening to use, especially when we are not too sure what the long term effects are. My feeling might very well be that we should not spray anyway, because it is such a frightening thing to have to do, to spray all sorts of things. Whatever we do, I believe we should monitor it and monitor it carefully over a long period of time, so that we can do two things; so that we can stop it the instant we realize something goes wrong, or we can change whatever programme we have to control the budworm as time goes through.

Now I believe that if we go ahead, if the minister and the government go ahead with this programme, that we have to have some assurances that there will be long term research carried out with this, that we will have to have long term research and that it will be very carefully monitored, not in a very cheap way or a very slight way but very carefully done. Now what are the alternatives to spraying? What are the alternatives? That is what the former speaker brought out. What are the alternatives?

DR. HITCHCOCK:

Suppose we do not spray. Supposing we say, "All right." Supposing the government reconsiders and they say, "We will not spray. We will not spray." What are the alternatives? Is the alternative a dead forest? And if the forest is dead, will not the animals be dead too? Will not the birds be dead? Will not the whole works be dead until what? Until the spruce budworm decides to go away, or things can happen, it can be regenerated. Maybe the forests can be regenerated in forty or fifty years. And maybe the birds will come back then, and the forests will come back. What happens with spray? Will we kill a few birds? Will we kill a few animals?

Dr. Kitchen: We do not know for sure about matacil, but we have not had a long-term research yet. We did not kill the first year, but we may over a period of years. But if we do kill them now and we control the budworm, will they come back? It is easy for animals to wander back from one part of the forest into another part that has not been sprayed last year or the year before. Perhaps what we are doing is, I am not too sure what - it sounds like I am speaking- I do not know quite what to do with the programme, but I am groping with the information that has been brought to my attention and the thinking that I have been able to do to date. I see dead trees in the forests, I see a fire hazard, but we have been able to control our forest fires in the past few years. What happens with all those dead trees in the forest when something catches fire? There will be a conflagration from one end of this Province to the other if we do not watch our bobbers here. That is frightening.

And what about this budworm? What about the environmental affects of the budworm? We talk about the environmental affects of the pesticide. What about the environmental affects of the budworm? What will that do to the environment? I understand if the spruce budworm takes over, continues to take over and kills the forest, that what will come back is not spruce and fir but some other type of trees, they think. They are not sure yet, but maybe it will be cherry trees on the West Coast, and that is about the worst type of wood, I understand, that we can get. And then again if that is so and improper growth comes back, trees that we do not want, cheap laurel on the East Coast, that sort of stuff, if that is what is going to come back here in growth then we are going to have to chop all that stuff down and reforest again, and that is going to take a long time.

Another problem that I am a bit worried about is what other techniques are used to control this budworm? It is going to be here. How are we going to control it? I have read somewhere that we should be holding out for biological control, that some new biological thing will come along, and some insect or

Dr. Kitchen: something smaller, fungus or something like that. But I understand too from people that biological control of the spruce budworm is a long, long way away, they do not see it in the immediate future. And if we do get biological control, what do we have then? The control of the biological control is another problem. How do you control this agency, this living organism which we are going to bring in to control the budworm? How do you control that? What experimentation would have to be brought about as to how that is to be controlled? Mr. Speaker, I have no solution. I do not really know how to vote on this because the information that I have is as I read in the papers it seems to me to be well meant, but I am not sure that the facts are all there. I believe that this House, Sir, should impress upon the government the need for long-term research, and the importance of being very careful in what is going on. But I also believe that we should have a Committee of the House, several people from each side, I do not know what the mechanism of doing that, perhaps the people more skilled in the runnings of the House can come up with a procedure for doing this, but if we had a committee with several sat down, and brought back a report to this House, as to what we should do, then I would be more inclined to vote. But I cannot vote on the information that is presently available to me on whether to spray or not to spray.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I must say that I was impressed in listening to the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen). He was very rational, and very calm, and cool, and collected, and in my view has made a lot of sense. Some hon. members opposite I must say made some sense, and some, I believe, went a little bit overboard in terms of trying to score some political points. I do not believe that the Leader of the Opposition really meant it when he said that at the meeting at Gander on Friday night that myself and my colleague and the officials whom we had with us - the Deputy Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, and the Deputy Minister

May 29, 1978

Tape 3653 (Night)

PK - 3

Mr. H. Collins: of Health, Dr. Klippert, who is a physician,
and Dr. Severs, who is the Provincial Chief Medical Health Officer,
who is also a physician - I do not

MR. COLLINS: I believe the hon. leader of the Opposition meant to say that the purpose of the meeting was to deceive the people, although, Mr. Speaker, those are the exact words which he did use and, as I said, I would hope that he did not mean to say it that way because I can assure him and you, Sir, and all of the hon. members in this House that that was not the name of the game at all. It was a meeting which was requested of me by the Gander Town Council, all of them personal friends of mine, a great number of them I served on council with back in the middle 60's and a number of others were people who were leading unions and people who were in the teaching profession and the Chamber of Commerce and others. I thought it my duty, and I was happy that my colleague the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture could go in with me and take along the best experts which we had on hand to try and point out to the people at the meeting our views and our thoughts on the issue and also of course naturally to listen to those people. After all they were directly involved and naturally concerned because part of the spraying programme is to take place in the immediate Gander Lake area, both on the Southside of the lake - people who know the lake on the Southside opposite the town of Gander, opposite the water intake, the Southwest Gander River area, which is one of the main tributaries to Gander Lake, and also up on the Northwest side, Northwest River side, which is the major contributor in terms of water inflow into Gander Lake, that is the area in which the spray programme is proposed to take place in. So naturally, Mr. Speaker, those people were concerned and I think that they had every right to expect their member to come in and bring whatever expertise he could with him to get across his point of view and to also listen to the points of view which constituents might want to offer.

Mr. Speaker, we went through that process - and I did not see the programme this evening on television. Some of my friends told me that they saw it and if one were there one would have sensed very quickly that it is a very emotional issue. There are a number of people who raise a lot of valid points in their minds and in their view because they are not sure, they are not sure of what

MR. COLLINS: effect the spraving of this insecticide catacil might or might not have on human health, on the environment in general, such as the hon. member alluded to, the fish and the birds and the bees and the animals of the forests and indeed the forests themselves. As all those issues are, as I said, Mr. Speaker, charged emotionally. It is very difficult for a number of people in a relatively small confine who have some very strong opposing views, it is very difficult to come to any understanding. And I am not sure, to tell you the truth, whether our going to Gander meant that much or not in terms of changing anyone's mind but at least we had the meeting, we spoke and we listened and listened quite a bit.

We are living in a different age, Mr. Speaker, from what we were used to in years gone by. I can remember back in 1967 and 1968 - I think it was 1966, 1967 and 1968 and maybe 1969 - when the past administration, and I am not being critical of the past administration, but the past administration undertook a spraying programme with little fanfare, no fuss, no public relations work done. I do not suppose many people in Newfoundland - certainly if it was in the thousands it was within one or two thousand who really knew that the spray programme took place. I was living in Gander at the time and I remember driving from Glenwood to Gander and back and forth fishing on the Gander River and I am not exaggerating, Mr. Speaker, but any morning on the trip from Gander to Glenwood, which is a distance of thirteen miles, one would possibly see fifty or sixty robins belly up on the road, gone, a few sparrows and a few jays and different birds. It was one of the only times that I fished on the Gander River when one could take off every stitch of clothes and lie down in an Alder bed, if anybody knows what I am talking about, and there were

MR. H. COLLINS: No mosquitoes, and no black flies, they were all gone. Really we were almost praising the spray programme for that one thing.

But at any rate, Mr. Speaker, that spray programme was done and I am sure it was done with the best of intentions. But we have learned since then, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of insecticides which were used in the past did have a very damaging effect on the environment and on living animals, mammals and so on in that environment. DDT was used, Mr. Speaker, and as we all know in this hon. House, DDT has now been banned. DDT cannot be used any more. And a lot of other insecticides have since been banned because of research which was done.

Mr. Speaker, I am not going to get into the details of why the spray programme is needed. I think I should confine my few remarks to what I know, and what I know of, I should say, is based on not having studied it in university, not because of any degrees which I have or anything like that - I am not a biologist and I am not a physician - but anything I know is based upon the best medical advice which I can obtain, - I think that God gave me the common sense to be able to listen to advice, and after considering it, and talking it over with different people in different fields that finally we can come to a conclusion, and hopefully come to the proper and right conclusion.

What we are talking about tonight, Mr. Speaker, is a spray programme using matacil. There has been a number of arguments used that matacil has not been approved for use in the United States. And I believe that is true. In fact I am sure that that is true, apart from, as some hon. member alluded to over there, it is used, I think, in some of the cotton fields right now.

But, Mr. Speaker, there have been things in the past in terms of insecticides and others which have been approved in the States and not approved in Canada. And I happen to be one,

MR. H. COLLINS: especially after the episode of the
since the vaccination programme, I happen to be one who believe
that our own researchers in Ottawa, our own food and drug
Directorate and others, have just a good a reputation as
their counterparts in the United States. In fact I believe
if someone did some research in that field, Mr. Speaker, one
would find that maybe our record in Canada might be a little
bit better. In fact I feel reasonably sure that that would
be the case.

Now my friend from Bonaville South (Mr. Morgan),
mentioned the fact that matacil had been approved by different
federal government authorities. Matacil is registered in
Canada under the Pesticides Products Control Act, which is a
group of people made up to look into different insecticides
and different other types of materials which might be used bearing
in mind their effects on whatever or their effectiveness in terms
of whatever purpose they might be used but above all what effect
they might and might not have on human health.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we say that matacil has
been registered and approved by the Government of Canada under
the Pesticides Products Control Act, I should also say that that
particular insecticide to get such registration and approval has
been assessed and reviewed by the Federal Department of Health
and Welfare, by that department's food and drug Directorate, by
that department's health protection service. That is two federal
agencies which comes under the Federal Department of Health and
Welfare, the Federal Department of Agriculture, the Federal
Department of the Environment, the Federal Department of Fisheries,
and on and on it goes, and this particular insecticide, matacil,
has been approved as being useful and safe for the purpose of
forest spraying.

Mr. Speaker, it goes without saying that if we

May 21, 1958

Page No. 1455

101 - 2

MR. W. BRIDGES: are going to spray the forests with
malacil then people must be involved. People must be involved
in the mixing of the insecticide and the diluting material,
people must be involved in putting it onboard aircraft, people
must be

MR. H. COLLINS: involved in flying the aircraft. People must be involved in all of the work which that entails. And there will be a number of people, I believe it is something like seventy-five or eighty people, involved in Gander. I do not know how many people will be involved in Stephenville, but a number of people will be involved. Those people, of course, Mr. Speaker, will be at some risk, because in some cases they will be dealing with the undiluted liquid. But precautions are taken, of course, to look after those people.

Mr. Speaker, I have been told, as I said, by my medical people - and I think that Dr. Severs - who is the chief provincial medical health officer - is a man of some knowledge; I think Dr. Klippert, who is physician, is a man of some knowledge; I think those people in Ottawa who have researched this material and reviewed all of the information on it are people of some knowledge - and I am told by those people, the best advice which I can get my hands on - I am not interested, Mr. Speaker, in approving a programme to go out and deliberately spray Newfoundlanders without giving some thought to 'Well, my God! What is going to happen?' You know, we are not going to spray people purposely to get rid of them. There have been some remarks made by some people in this Province that it is another way of the Moores Government going about indiscriminately doing things and now they are going to spray us all and kill us.

The best information I can get, and I am sure that this is right information, is that the matacil which has been used is being used to the extent of one ounce of the liquid per acre - one ounce per acre per spray, and it is proposed in the spraying areas to conduct two sprays over any given area. So each acre will receive one ounce properly diluted on one day and whenever the next one is

MR. H. COLLINS: whether it is two days or three days afterwards another single ounce properly mixed for the second spray and that is all that is done.

On the basis of one ounce of matacil diluted in the appropriate carrier, we have a safety factor of 1/1000. If we consider what the federal guidelines are, which is 0.1 part per million, one ounce per acre gives us a safety factor of 1/1000. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we would have to use one thousand times more than one ounce if it were going to pose any threat at all to human health. Now, Mr. Speaker, these figures are irrefutable. Nobody can argue and say, 'Well, that is not right, the hon. the Minister of Health does not know what he is talking about. And if he does know what he is talking about, whoever is giving him this information, they do not know what they are talking about.' You know, some people do know, please goodness. But the information, as I said, Mr. Speaker, is that on the basis of one ounce per acre there is a one thousand times safety factor built in. And that, Mr. Speaker, is a considerable safety factor in anyone's view.

I might also add that after the spraying programme in Corner Brook on the West Coast last year, there was some monitoring done, and the most that was found in the water over there - I am not sure if it was the Corner Brook water supply, I think it was, but a water supply on the West Coast - the most that was found was a trace, barely a trace that would be measured in parts per billion, merely a trace for one day, whereas the Canadian drinking water standards tells us that 0.1 part per million over a year, Mr. Speaker, is the tolerance - you know, that is the danger point, it should not go above that. But here we are, Mr. Speaker, with just a trace measured in parts per billion for a period of one day. And one of the reasons

May 29, 1973

Tape 3656 (Night)

EC - 3

MR. H. COLLINS:

for that, Mr. Speaker,

as non. members might have heard, might have read, might
have been told,

MR. H. COLLINS: one of the reasons why matacil is being used as opposed to DDT or some of the other insecticides which persisted in the environment for months and years, sometimes years, we could very well have the effects of DDT in the environment in some places now. But one of the good features about matacil is that it does not persist in the environment. Matacil disintegrates, that is not the proper word but non. members will know what I am saying. Matacil disintegrates in the environment depending upon the -

MR. SIMONS: Alkaline.

MR. H. COLLINS: - depending upon the acidity or the alkaline content and so on- I will get around to that in a matter of days or in the worst situations, Mr. Speaker, in a matter of weeks. So that if we find a trace in the water for a day, it is not a nice thing to have in one's water I suppose, I would prefer not to have it in mine, I am sure the people in Gander would prefer not to have it in theirs, I am sure the people all over Newfoundland would prefer not to have it. There is no one spraying because we like to spend \$3 million or \$4 million of public funds to go flying around aircraft, dropping spray, just for the fun of seeing a bit of fog or mist or something around the countryside. We think that we have embarked upon a realistic programme, based upon the economic need, but at the same time protecting the health considerations and the health needs of the people.

But I am convinced, Mr. Speaker, on the basis of the information which has been given to me and which seems to be well researched, which is approved by the federal government, that matacil will disintegrate very quickly in the environment, it certainly will not get into the food chain, Mr. Speaker, as DDT would. We have all seen the programmes on television where the little fish ate a little - whatever the insecticide was and a bigger fish came along and ate that fish and a bigger one came along

MR. H. COLLINS: and see that one and pretty soon every size fish in the pond was infected.

Matacil disintegrates very quickly in the water, in the soil, in vegetation, and for that reason it has been approved by the federal authorities, considered effective against the spruce budworm in terms of killing it, and considered to be safe in terms of the environment and the public health of the people.

Mr. Speaker, someone also alluded to the fact that insecticides causes cancer. It was only this afternoon when this debate began to take place, we could see it was taking place, I had a meeting for about half an hour with my officials again and there has been no medical evidence so far, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker is a physician himself, there has been no medical evidence so far to relate cancer with insecticides, no medical evidence so far to relate cancer with the use of insecticides, or directly relate cancer to insecticides. There has been no medical evidence to relate Reye's Syndrome with insecticides.

MR. FLIGHT: That is wrong. That is totally wrong.

MR. H. COLLINS: The hon. member is a great expert. If he wants to refute that he can refute it. I am saying, Mr. Speaker, there has been no medical evidence to relate Reye's Syndrome with insecticides.

MR. FLIGHT: That is wrong. What happened in Halifax?

MR. MAYNARD: What happened to the six cases which were found since 1972?

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes, six cases were found in Newfoundland down on the Northwest Coast a few years ago. Considerable examinations and so on took place, no relation to insecticides, but I was not thinking about that case, that is another case in point.

But, Mr. Speaker, I am told, the best advice again which I can get, that research which has been done now shows clearly that there is no relationship between Reye's Syndrome and insecticides, and no relationship between cancer

May 19, 1978

Tape No. 3657

BT - 3

MR. H. COLLINS: and insecticides.

Now we could go on, Mr. Speaker all night and talk about the benefits of insecticides, benefits and -

MR. WAYNARD: Number two fuel oil, stove oil.

MR. SIMMONS: What about the emulsifier?

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I sat here all night and listened to eight or ten members speak. I never opened my mouth, never opened my mouth, and what I am saying now I think is based on sound advice and I can only pass along the best advice which I can get, the best medical advice and that is what it is.

Mr. Speaker, someone will say, "How do you know? Can you prove to me that if we use matacil this year that it will not have some effect on me down the road in twenty years time?"

Mr. H. Collins: There is nobody, of course, in their right mind would ever stick their necks out- not a case of sticking one's neck out, it is a case of exercising some restraints, I suppose, on one's self - there is nobody can say that. But again the best advice we can get is that there is no danger in using matacil at the rate which I am referring to, and that is one ounce per acre.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. H. COLLINS: Would the hon. member for LaPoile say - is that directed to me?

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. H. COLLINS: I do not know what the hon. member said.

MR. NEARY: I am talking to the hon. gentleman's colleague.

MR. H. COLLINS: Very good. I thought he might have asked a question.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman's colleague is threatening me, and I am just answering him back. That is all. Is that all right?

MR. H. COLLINS: Very good.

But, Mr. Speaker, I hope that some of those things will set the record straight as we see them, and this is the advice which we are getting. I undertook last night -not last night, but Friday night when we met in Gander, I said to the people, you know, I am not sure they listened to us the way they might have, because, as I said, it is a very highly charged emotional issue. I will not go any further than that, but we got some points across. We listened to those people and respected a lot of the things which they had to say. Some very important charges were laid by people who are supposedly knowledgeable in the field. And I undertook at the meeting, when asked what I was going to do about all of this, I said when I get back to St. John's I will certainly have my medical people review the information which was read and tabled at that meeting that night. That review is now underway. It will be further reviewed and co-ordinated with the co-operation of the federal authorities tomorrow morning, When I say tomorrow morning, we will be in touch with them tomorrow morning, and a

Mr. H. Collins: review will take place. And, of course, as soon as we get that I will be glad to let hon. members know.

MR. SIMMONS: Will the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. H. COLLINS: But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member - let me finish this sentence and I will take a question. These few points, I think, Mr. Speaker, are worth making. And I would hope that members, speaking from now on to 11:00 or however long the debate lasts, will try to devote their energies and their thoughts and their knowledge, you know, to the issue at hand. It is not something to score cheap political points on. The forests are too important for that. Certainly the health of our citizens is too important. As I said, Mr. Speaker, I look forward to a good debate and maybe there are some ways the hon. member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) alluded to a possible, not solutions to the problem, but a possible way of getting our points of view across to the people a little bit better and so on. I am sure other hon. members who want to allude to that, anything we can do, I think, like that will be in the best interest of all concerned.

But that is the few remarks I have to make. I am sure my colleague the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture will deal with the forestry aspects, which I am sure he is capable of.

MR. SIMMONS: May I ask one question before the hon. member concludes? He made reference to the 1/1000 matter a moment ago. At that point he pointed out that his advice or his information came from people who thoroughly researched it and so on. I notice some film of the Gander meeting. There was a Dr. Thurlow there, I never met him, Dr. Thurlow, I think, is his name.

MR. H. COLLINS: Dr. Thurlow.

MR. SIMMONS: He looked to me to be a sincere fellow who had a concern. How does the minister -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) Dr. Klippert, by the way.

MR. SIMMONS: How does the minister reconcile the two? His concern, the minister's concern, is obviously genuinely based. I would assume that the doctor who was on T.V. and at the meeting Friday night

Mr. Simmons: was also genuinely based. Is the minister suggesting that his advisors who have expressed these concerns, these fears to him, are less knowledgeable or there is some mischievousness going on here? I mean how can the minister reconcile the two? He has not addressed himself to that question yet, the real question that there are a number of people who have genuine concerns no matter what the cold facts may say or may be interpreted to say. There are very genuine concerns about possible health implications here.

MR. H. COLLINS: Yes. I suppose, Mr. Speaker, we could say that doctors are only human in terms of disagreeing with any medical problem. That is not a fair thing to say. It is not a good response to the hon. member for Burgeo-Lapointe, Do I have it right this time? Yes.

MR. SIMMONS: The hon. gentleman is not right.

MR. H. COLLINS: It is not right.

MR. SIMMONS: Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. H. COLLINS: Bay d'Espoir.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Do not mix the two.

MR. H. COLLINS: There have been some people in the past, some medical doctors, no doubt, who are opposed vaccination, inoculation, and the use of different types of drugs and so on. The only response

MR. H. COLLINS: that I can give, Dr. Thurlow is a surgeon in the fee for service field in Gander, and he presented a paper which I do not mind admitting went to - to read the paper one would have to stop and think and know that he is a doctor. He signs his name, you know. He is a doctor, there is no doubt about that.

But under questioning from Dr. Severs, I think it is only fair for me to say, too, he indicated that he did all of his research one afternoon in a library in Halifax. He admitted to that. And he also was quick on the draw when Dr. Severs tried to say, Well, you know, that is not very much research. "Well", he said, "I know more about it than you did and you have been at it for years." Now, I do not want to get involved in that argument but his paper, apparently, was produced on the basis of an afternoon in the library in the medical school, I presume, in Halifax. Now, it might be a good paper, but that is the sort of -

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not judge them by the research of one person.

MR. H. COLLINS: I did not say that. But that is the paper which we are now having reviewed. Because if Dr. Thurlow thinks this, it is only right we should go to the best people we can find in Newfoundland and the best people in Ottawa and get their views of what he is saying as well and the references which he used.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, having presented a petition here last week on behalf of the residents of Port Blandford who were protesting the spray programme, I feel it my responsibility to speak here this evening.

Actually, most of what I wanted to say was said by the Minister of Tourism, particularly as these were the points that were raised in the petition and these were the points that I emphasized here last week

MR. LUSH: when I spoke to that petition. You Honour will recall that the residents of Port Blandford objected to the spray programme insomuch as that one, the watershed area surrounding Port Blandford was being sprayed, that was the area included in the spraying, this was the area from which they get their water supply.

Secondly, from that watershed area flowed three major rivers through Port Blandford and then lastly, the spray area came within one half mile of the town which is dangerously close, Mr. Speaker. There is no wonder that the people of the town are concerned, worried and frustrated, certainly on the basis of what they have heard about spraying and what they themselves have recognized.

Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this issue I have no great degree of scientific background behind me to support or to substantiate what I am going to say. Neither have I read an awful about the subject, but what I will say is contingent upon the little bit of reading that I have done and secondly, from a lot of common sense information which the people that I represent have to tell me.

Mr. Speaker, I grew up in a logging area and the district that I represent is largely a logging area. It does not take you long, Mr. Speaker, when you talking to people who know the forest, who know logging, it will not take long for these people to give you some of their common-sense ideas as to what has happened with respect to spraying and our exploitation of the forest by spraying.

The hon. Minister of Health mentioned DDT. By spraying with such chemicals as DDT and our exploitation of the forest, we have disrupted the balance of nature and in essence we are the ones who have caused the spruce budworm.

MR. LUSH: The Minister of Tourism mentioned, What is the alternative to spray? Well, Mr. Speaker, it might oversimplify the case when I advance some of the suggestions that I will be advancing here this evening because I realize it is a complicated affair that we are involved in and we are talking about the viability of our forest, the future economic viability of our forest, a most important and a most crucial matter affecting this Province.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, as I have said earlier, we are the people who have caused the spruce budworm because of our exploitation of the forest. We have eliminated the kinds of forests from which other insects, the predators of the spruce budworm thrive and we have, in exploiting the most economic timbers in the forest, we have allowed the growth of forest on which the spruce budworm thrives, mainly the balsam fir and over-mature trees.

Mr. Speaker, when we look into the cause, or look into the alternatives of spraying we must understand something about the spruce budworm, we must understand what has brought it about, the kind of forest that keeps it alive, the kind of forest on which it thrives. In other words, we must look at the causes and try to eliminate the causes as much as possible. As far as I can understand, it seems to be pretty widely accepted that the spruce budworm thrives on balsam fir and on overmature trees and the only way to correct that is through a scientific forest management programme.

Mr. Speaker, one wonders how much or what percentage of fir makes up the total volume of our forest, what percentage of the total volume of our forest is taken up by overmature trees. Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this Province has never made much of an effort to harvest overmature trees. We have always gone after the companies and the contractors, we have gone after the most economical wood with no concern for the economics of the future with taking down, harvesting the mature stands to make room for regeneration of other trees, newer stands. That is what our carelessness has brought us to today. It did not happen overnight, Mr. Speaker. Indeed, the spruce budworm has been around for a long time, but because we did not exploit the forest in the same way, that there were other predators there that took care of it, but when we exploited

MR. LUSH: the forest and used various insecticides like DDT, killing some of the predators of the spruce budworm and making the situation right for the spruce budworm to thrive, this is the situation we brought ourselves into.

So obviously, Mr. Speaker, we have to know - as I have said before, it seems pretty widespread that we know on what conditions the spruce budworm thrives and naturally we have to eliminate these conditions and naturally we are not going to do it overnight. But certainly it does not seem wise to spend money on a spray programme when through experience and experimentation it shows that spraying is not very effective, to say nothing at this moment about the threat or the danger imposed to people's health. Leave that aside for the moment, to talk about the effectiveness of spraying and, Mr. Speaker, none of the literature that I read indicates that spraying is very effective. Indeed, it does not do anything at all.

In New Brunswick they have been spraying since 1952 with no effective results at all. Manitoba carried on an experimental programme which again proved that the spraying does not at all cut down or cut out the level of population of the spruce budworm. Quebec has been spraying since 1968 and I think has the highest spruce budworm population in all of Canada. Nova Scotia, they have decided not to spray; P.E.I., they decided not to spray; British Columbia, they have decided not to spray. Mr. Speaker, if all of those provinces decide not to spray because of the evidence that is available, on what basis is this Province spraying? How can they substantiate their stand to spray when all of these provinces have decided that it is a futile effort, that that is not the cure for the spruce budworm, that rather we should be looking into some sort of scientific forest management programme emphasising the techniques of

MR. LUSH: harvesting and salvaging the infested wood, harvesting and salvaging the over-mature forest, and reforestation and thinning. These are some of the alternatives that we have to look to, that is the direction in which we should be going.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the substantial evidence that spraying is not effective then I see no reason at all why the government is embarking upon this spray programme. We know the causes, we know what the conditions are under which the spruce budworm multiplies and proliferates, we know that. Mr. Speaker, if we know that then we have to do something about it. What we have to do is restore the balance of nature again. It is not easy, Mr. Speaker, it is not easy but certainly the money that we are wasting in a programme, a spray programme that we know is not going to be very effective, it would be much wiser to put that money into a scientific forest management programme, without wasting money on this spray programme.

And, Mr. Speaker, certainly the government is inviting trouble when they do what they propose to do in Gander and in Port Blandford knowing the concern that people have about this spray. To spray a watershed area and to come within a half mile of a community, or residents, Mr. Speaker, it is crazy, and as I have said, it is inviting trouble, inviting protest and demonstration. This is what it is doing. If the government exercised a little more discrimination and if they wanted to carry on this spray programme, I am sure they could have chosen areas much further removed from watersheds and residents. Certainly goodness there is an awful lot of wilderness in this Province they can spray for experimental purposes to find out what the results will be without spraying, dumping spray, insecticides that have people worried sick, and justifiably so, dumping spray in people's

MR. LUSH: backyards. That is not necessary, Mr. Speaker, not necessary.

I too, like the Minister of Tourism, would ask the government to reconsider what they have done. I heard ministers say that they are going to reconsider the Gander situation, Mr. Speaker. Well, I certainly hope that they will reconsider the Port Blandford situation too, and every area where the spray programme is coming within a watershed area and close to a community. I would hope there is going to be no discrimination here. If they decide to stop in one to stop in all of the areas that are affected.

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, I made no reference to the health problems that are associated with insecticide or aerial insecticide spraying. I have not mentioned that but, Mr. Speaker, there seems to be some evidence to suggest that it is harmful to people's health and if this is the case, Mr. Speaker, we cannot expect our people just to sit back and watch their environment being sprayed with the great danger of threatening people's lives, and wildlife, animals, birds. Mr. Speaker, there is no question about it that insecticide spraying in the past has done that. It has affected our wildlife, animals and birds, it has done that. Talk to any forester, any logger and he can verify that for you beyond any doubt, beyond any shadow of a doubt.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the government certainly would reconsider their actions in this respect and if they are not going to cancel the spray programme in its totality, certainly that they would not spray in those areas that are selected to come within a half mile of a community, two miles of a community, and to come within the watershed area.

Mr. Speaker, there are many factors about the spraying programme, aerial spraying that

MR. LUSH: need to be brought forward.

It is a delicate operation, to say the least. It has already been alluded to here today that when spraying wind conditions have to be exactly right and that is a very difficult set of circumstances to come by here in this Province, a Province that has such a high wind velocity. It is very difficult to have that condition, ideal condition

MR. LUSH: all of the time. And, Mr. Speaker, it does not take too much of a change in the velocity to change the direction of that spray.

Really nobody knows, there is no scientific evidence to say how far it goes and how far off target it goes with just an increase of a little bit in the wind velocity. There are so many other variables with respect to the malfunctioning of the plane, anything could happen, Mr. Speaker. It is a very dangerous, it is a very dangerous situation and it should be the last thing the government should do, the last thing.

Mr. Speaker, I believe at this stage to spray is to acknowledge defeat, that we cannot solve the situation by any other means. Mr. Speaker, this defies the scientific knowledge that is now available. It is not effective. The way to go about it is through a scientific forest management programme, a programme that is not going to solve the situation in the short-term but, Mr. Speaker, our forest is a matter that has to be looked at in the long-term. And for the long-term, it is the scientific forest management programme that this Province must be following, the same as was the case in Nova Scotia. That is the kind of example we should be following, Mr. Speaker, and the example of all the other provinces that decided to scrap this programme. Because on the basis of the knowledge that was available they were convinced that spraying was a futile effort in terms of controlling the spruce budworm.

I would hope that this government could understand this situation in the same way that these other provinces have and cancel the spray programme entirely the way that they have done in New Brunswick, the way they have done so in Nova Scotia, and the way they have done so in Manitoba. Then on the basis of the results in New Brunswick, certainly not very convincing

MR. LUSH: results on which to conduct a spray programme, but were we to look at the results of New Brunswick alone that we would say no, that you would not spray, and that has been over a twenty-odd year period. Then, as I have said before, Quebec, ten years of spraying and with the highest population of spruce budworm in all of Canada, I believe.

So, Mr. Speaker, these facts ought to be convincing enough and I certainly hope that the government will take a hard look at what they are doing. Mr. Speaker, let me finish by saying that I certainly hope that in reconsideration of this, and if the government does not stop its programme entirely that they will not spray in communities where the spray area comes within a mile, a half mile, two miles, but that there is a sufficient distance away from communities and away from watersheds. I think that is an obligation, the government must do this, and this is not asking very much. Mr. Speaker, with these few words I will finish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker

MR. SPEAKER (Capt. Winsor): The hon. member for Grand Falls.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I want to offer my comments of support and encouragement and praise to the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) for one of the most analytical speeches that I have heard in the Legislature, particularly on the issue that we are now dealing with which is one of great emotional overtone. The hon. former colleague of mine at the university certainly did not do anything I did not expect him to do. Because he does have a logical mind, he is a man of great strength of conviction and I think tonight - from St. John's West, I am talking about - the member showed the quality that he does have. I am encouraged by the fact that he stood back from this issue, the emotional issue which has a political overtone as well,

May 29, 1978, Tape 3662, Page 3 -- app

MR. LUNDRIGAN: a fantastic political dimension to it, stood back and really clearly and analytically expressed many of the concerns that I have. As a matter of fact, I could have put a full stop after his speech and pretty well ended it there in terms of anything I would like to say myself.

I am going to speak on the topic as a little bit of an environmental nut myself. I have been involved since I can remember with the environment as a person who has spent half of my lifetime involved with the woods, trapping and hunting and things of that nature. I spent four months one Summer in pure research in the Grand Falls area live trapping beaver and doing research. I spent seven Summers at it

MR. LUNDRIGAN: as a person involved with biology, with various aspects of government moose programmes and the like and I developed a lot of affinity to the outdoors like the hon. member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight), who is a great outdoorsman, I am aware, and I speak with that kind of a feeling.

I also would like to indicate to the House that it took me long days and many dozens of hours in the Committee process, particularly with the Resource Policy Committee of government, interacting with the professional people in Forestry and Agriculture to be convinced of two things; first of all, the dimension of the problem of spruce budworm, the extent of the problem, the implications of the problem, that was something that really was startling, when people like the members on this side who had more opportunity to get involved in the background when they were given the facts on the extent of the problem - and the member for St. John's West in raising the question about what happens if you have a dead forest, what happens then? Where is the damage then to your total soil, to your water systems, to your watersheds and the like? Why you raise these questions and look at the extent of the problem then you realize that we are always faced with a situation which is tantamount to having to declare some kind of warfare on what is a pest that is infesting the countryside of this Province of ours and endangering the total economic future of the people of the Province.

The second thing was the question of what the alternatives were. We were convinced, as I was, a member of the group who made the decision about what to do having had the pilot project of a year ago, we were convinced that the forest management techniques that are being talked about here today and that are being talked about as the solution by many people in the Province, is one way to

MR. LUNDRIGAN: go about it having a part of an answer, a part of an answer. It can help putting people in the woods thinning out, cleansing, reforestation all of those kinds of things have to be done but we are also convinced that it was not a solution to the problem, it was not addressing the problem right square in the teeth, and the government took the leadership decision fully aware of the fact that the problem was going to emerge into an emotional outcry in the Province.

My contention is, and it took me quite some time, I raised hundreds of questions on the issue about the aspects that are raised here today, the health problem, the environmental impact, using the particular chemical involved, my concerns after several days of interaction with experts and several months over a period of time, was that the right thing to do was to go ahead with the programme, that was the safest solution to one of the most massive problems confronting our Province today. That was my conclusion but it took me a long time.

I went through a process of being very skeptical, very skeptical to the point - if I would say I was against it - to the point that I was clearly, rationally and logically aware that it was the best alternative for the Province today. I talked to several people in the Department of Forestry who are friends of mine, who are trained people in their fields - none of them biologists - but trained forestry people, I asked them, "What did you do? How did you come to the conclusion?" These people, the leaders in the department told me that they took quite a bit of time, first of all to understand the dimension of the problem, to be convinced about the extent of the problem, and also quite a bit of time to be convinced of the proper solution, the approach.

I have heard that one of the persons who was on the New Brunswick task force, one of the

MR. LUNDRIGAN: three task forces that were set up in New Brunswick, independent of government, to analyze the approach to the problem in New Brunswick was totally against it. I understand he was a sociologist of some renown, and in the process of dealing with the problem he came to the conclusion that it was the proper thing to do.

Now, I am suggesting, really, an answer to part of our problem that we have. A large part of our problem is that we do not know the issue.

MR. MAYNARD: The head of our own task force last year, Dr. Randell, was totally opposed to it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: A Newfoundlander, right?

MR. MAYNARD: A Newfoundlander who subsequently said that there was no other choice.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: There is information I was not aware of. As the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture indicated, last year in our own task force Dr. Randell who was a very, very skeptical person, against it as a matter of fact, the minister indicates, reached the conclusion having been exposed to the issue, the information and the available documentation, came to the conclusion that it was the alternative, it was the choice, the right choice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not matacil.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

The hon. member can get up and have his few little words. Spraying: Now, in any event, Mr. Speaker, I am suggesting here that a part of the problem is that many, many people, and I would say the vast bulk of the population of the province, are not aware of the implications of what the lack of action will be or the implications clear precise knowledge on the use of the spray and what it means, what it can do. It is a matter, in my opinion, of a lack of information and that is partly the result of the fact that it is a new thing, it is a new process and it has not had time to have whatever kind of osmosis takes place with people understanding things: that process has not gone through. I remember myself like the member for Gander (Mr. H. Collins) who made a tremendous presentation this evening, very logical, very cool and level-headed - I remember being in Gander when the last program was going on. I was fishing half my time down on the Gander River and I remember the planes and the spray and the concern that people had; and I remember one little side story which was always an amusing one. Jiggs Boland, who is well-known to a lot of people in this House, one of the great characters of this province, a farmer on the old Botwood highway, sent out his few thousand bees one afternoon to collect him some honey and none of them came back. And the member for Gander - that was in 1968, was it, or something?

MR. H. COLLINS: 1968.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: 1968. The member for Gander, who was then in opposition, came in and kicked up a heck of a stink about it and he got compensated for his bees because, supposedly, they were impacted on by the presence of the spray. He did not tell anyone except a few of his close friends, like myself,

MR. LUNDRIGAN: that they were killed by the frost and -

AN HON. MEMBER: That was a decision made by the former premier.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The decision was made by the former premier for days there was a great debate going on with the former premier and the present member for Gander over the death of the bees of Jiggs Boland from Dotwood and, of course, that was a - he got paid for his bees in any event. It was a cold evening that evening and, of course, and the premier of the day did not argue against the few dollars for his bees. I am going to make a couple of comments on something, but I would just want to indicate the extent of how things can become a bit political. I was talking the other day to one of the congressmen from the United States who travelled down to the seal fishery. I did not have much regard for him. I had gone to his constituency and we got involved in a big fuss down in San Francisco, that was Congressman Leo Ryan, who is a bit of a political, what would you call it? - what is a nice word so we can be parliamentary? I will not use the language the member for Cape St. - what?

AN. HON. MEMBER: an opportunist

MR. LUNDRIGAN: an opportunist, alright an opportunist. It is not like the cheap words you could use. In any event, his constituents said that if everybody in his constituency were against blacks, he would come out against blacks, that is what he would do. Now, there is a little danger here and it reflects on all of us in the House that when people have a particular type of feeling that we sort of tend to lead the opinion, rather than to try to divert or correct or adjust or whatever the case you might want to use. Now, here is an example of something, I just want to quote a little article here which is

taken from the Daily News of December 23, 1976. So-and-so said Wednesday that in view of the inability of scientists to establish any scientific evidence of a connection between the anti spruce budworm chemical and the incidences of Reye's Syndrome among children, the province of Newfoundland has absolutely no excuse for failing to undertake a spraying program immediately." The quote continues, "We said that enough analyzing, hesitating and passing the buck has gone on on this particular issue for the past three years. Now it is time for action. Now is the time for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to stop fiddling before his department goes down the drain. He went on to say that if Health Minister Harold Collins is willing to push ahead with the swine flu vaccine program in the face of the cancellation in other provinces and the U.S. because of statistical evidence of danger and lethal side-effects, the Minister of Forestry should be prepared to activate a technique that has no proven strikes against it." That was December 23, 1976, the title of that story is 'There's no Excuse for not Spraying - Neary'. Now, is that not something? Is that not an interesting quotation?

MR. W. CARTER: Why do you not read it again?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Is that not a fascinating revelation?

MR. W. CARTER: Read it once more, read it again but use Neary's name, that is what it says.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The member says I did not put in proper context. The story reads "There's no Excuse for not Spraying - Neary", December 23, 1976, Daily News, "M.E.A. for Lapoile, Steve Neary said Wednesday that in view of the inability," and on it goes, get on with the spraying program, provide the leadership; he tells my colleague, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, he tells my colleague, the Minister of Health, get on with the spraying. That was December 23, 1976,

May 20, 1973

Tape 3464

GM-4

MR. LUNDRIGAN and the reason he said it, he had just come back from out in his own district and he had just come back across the province and there was a lot of evidence of dead trees, half the province were saying "What are they going to do about all the cobwebs with the millions of budworms on the end of them? What are they going to do about it?"

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The place looks like it is going to be a waste desert around the province. It looks a real disaster zone. Let us get on with the job and do something about it." And that is what I think the government has done about it. I am proud that the government of the province, in spite of the emotional concern, have been prepared to provide the leadership on this issue. I am very pleased that they have been able to provide the leadership on the issue. My recommendation is that every single effort be made to provide whatever information is necessary to enlighten the people of the province, give every opportunity for the people to express themselves in a good democratic fashion.

MR. W. CARTER: You should table it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: But the information, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has challenged me to table this document. I suppose I should because there are an awful lot of people who would want to put one of these in their pocket just to wave it around and I would ask the Clerk if she would not only lay it on the table but maybe the members would like to have copies of it and have it taken off and passed around, especially to the leader of the Opposition.

MR. J. CARTER: Ten thousand copies.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The member for Windsor-Buchans (Mr. G. Flight) talks about being political. He will find about opportunist before this issue is fully over because it is like the hon. member for Lapointe (Mr. Heary) waving his little things around at the member for Kilbride (Mr. R. Wells). He scored a little bit of an early round victory, didn't he? And now he would like to be out of the ring entirely.

AN HON. MEMBER: Get off it.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Now he would like to be out of the ring entirely. I would at least if I were taggling with the

MR. LUNDRIGAN: member for Kilbride and I would say right now that that hon. member would like to call a truce on the issue - I doubt if he will get one. I will say to the Minister for Windsor-Essex, he could very well be very right today on this issue in terms of the political aspect, in terms of the emotional aspect, he could very well be very right, and I am not suggesting that is his motive, but he could very well be very right; but I am also going to suggest, Mr. Speaker, as the issue starts to unfold and develop and people start to become conversant with the extent of it and conversant with the extent of the problem, then I am going to ask him who is going to be right. More important than that, I am not worried about that, Mr. Speaker; it is very possible for good governments to be dead right to get themselves in deep dead trouble over an issue - that is very possible; but I would rather see us ten years from now with a healthy economy in the forest sector of our province knowing then that we were right. I would like to see us if we make a decision here today or any other day not to spray, what happens to us ten years down the road? The people who make the decision not to spray today, if we did it - took that decision, they will be in the kind of a position, Mr. Speaker, that they will be written up in the history books because of their destruction of the economy of our province.

MR. FLIGHT: Is not the opposite true?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: And Mr. Speaker, let me just go on and make a couple of observations. The member for St. John's West (Dr. H. Kitchen) raised a lot of questions. I have heard the answers to a lot of the questions. Many members of the House have heard the answers, many members of Cabinet have, some of the backbenchers on this side might not have heard some of the evidence presented, many of the members of

MR. LUNDRIGAN: the opposition have not heard some of the evidence. Perhaps there is a need for us one day in the near future to have a meaningful session of the legislature on this particular issue, not a political debate or a debate which is part of the parliamentary system as we are doing here today, maybe a session. Mr. Speaker, where we have a committee and we can bring in witnesses, bring in people from the New Brunswick end of things - the pros and the cons for and against - bring in your Chief Medical Officer, bring in your deputy minister and his officials if they want, bring in some people who have had exposure to the problem, people who have been involved in spraying of the fruit orchards, where I understand, they spray directly on fruit something like 24 times as much as they spray on the forest, and we turn around and eat the fruit, bring these people in and let them sit here in the legislature and the committee of the whole and let us raise the questions.

MR. FLIGHT: What do you mean? We are raising questions?

MR. NEARY: Should not we do that before we spray?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the government just made the decision, the government. The government has responsibility, as the Leader of the Opposition says on a daily basis. The government has a responsibility, not the Leader of the Opposition, not the member for Labrador. The government has the responsibility to make the decisions, to provide the leadership -

MR. NEARY: Then why do they not do it?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: and this is what the government has done. You do not govern by a committee of the legislature. You do not compose a symphony with a committee. As a matter of fact, if there is any problem Mr. Speaker, is that I would like to see that the type of - a little bit of a more balance between the former hypocrisy of the former leader, if I have any criticism of the premier and the government and the

MR. LUNDRIGAN: bureaucracy of the government of this day.

I would like to see a bit more autonomy and a bit more cracking the whip and getting on with it. That is what I would like to see, not carrying democracy to the point that the member is saying, why did they not bring in the whole thing and have it out before. And the government have to make decisions. That is what decisions are about. In any event I do not see anything wrong if members want more information. I am going to go one step further. Aside from the Committee here where we could have a meaningful interaction with people who are knowledgeable, I think that distinguished gentlemen to my left right here, the Ministers of Forestry and Agriculture and Health have distinguished themselves with their acquisition of knowledge and the way they presented it on this issue, more than you would expect normally from a minister who is dealing with a complicated, technical question. I am particularly pleased with the way here lately on television the other evening, the CJON television, that the Minister of Forestry handled himself, cool, level-headed, common sense, the only approach on this kind of an issue that anybody can maintain.

I would like to go a step further and suggest to the minister that there might be a requirement. There is not only a requirement, there is a responsibility on the part of the government to totally make available to the public the considerable amount of information which is available, that would require circularization of the people of our Province perhaps as an observation. It might require us to set up some kind of a semi parliamentary system where we can go around and let us call people before the Committee, perhaps, of some sort. The member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) suggested setting up a Committee, not a Committee that is going to necessarily do much in the way of changing a decision but a Committee which allows witnesses to be called forward so that the public can see an interaction with professional people. Because the whole bulk of knowledge and information on this issue is in line with the recommendation of going ahead as the government have decided to do.

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

The problem of the day, as I see it, is that there has not been an opportunity, maybe because of a lack of information presentation, there has not been an opportunity for the public, the masses of the people, to see the sides of the story. I mentioned to somebody at supper hour about the - I have asked 1,000 people, like we all have - and I said what about the spray. The first comment was that I do not see any reason for us to be spraying poison around. And I said, "Have you got any apples in the fridge?". And the party said, "Yes." I said, "Do you think they are sprayed." "Well, I do not know if they are or not. I did not think they were." And I went on to give an indication of the extent of the spray in the use of apples that we eat and the magnitude of the amount of spray. And the party said, "Why did this information not come forward? . I did not know that before." And I went on to try to tell what I think are the facts that I have been told about the -

MR. HOUSE: The world would be starved if it was not for insecticide.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is right. And I went on to explain the information I had about insecticides on this particular issue and the dilution effect and the extent of it and how much tolerance we had and so on. And when I finished talking there was no doubt in my mind that that person was totally, rationally aware to the point they were all a bit more relaxed about it. And that is what I think is a little bit of the problem. I think the public have not yet had time to engurgitate the extent of the information.

So I am suggesting that we do have more opportunity to provide information. I commend the two ministers for going before the people of the Province out in Gander and to have taken their bumps. I think that is a good sign of democracy at work. It takes a little bit of gumption and backbone because you have to be a bit of a hero to stand up before a public that is so emotionally adamant on an issue. I also think the member for St. John's West made an observation which I would like my colleague to touch on, the Minister

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

of Forestry, in terms of the acquisition of long term knowledge so that there is a tremendous day to day monitoring in a way where we can always say at some future point if there is any concern, any observation, any awareness beyond what we already know, that there is a hazard or an imminent danger, that we be able to take alternate courses of action. I would like to have some knowledge of what fact he can tell the House on the monitoring procedures.

Lastly, I will say this. I think, Mr. Speaker -

MR. FLIGHT: Is the report out yet on last year's monitoring?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Is the member going to send his speech out to Grand Falls this time? Now the last time I promised I was going to send his speech out. I did not do it out of respect for him. Is he going to do it this time? I would appreciate that because maybe this time I will send his speech out. But, Mr. Speaker, what I will say as a concluding comment is this, I think this is a real test of leadership, of the people of the Province in terms of their party system, their political system of government. I think in this particular case the government of the Province - the Leader of the Opposition is not interested in that. The Leader of the Opposition is so political that he would come out in favour of anything today which would capture him a few votes. Of course, that is a sign of a political leader. That is the sign of an Opposition leader in lots of cases. It is also the sign of somebody who is so ambitious for power that he will do anything in the world, Mr. Speaker. So do not the Opposition leader look across at me with his sneering grin on his face tonight or I will take a few strips off his back on this issue because

Mr. J. Lundriann.

this is the kind of thing. He will capitalize on anything right now. He cannot go to sleep for excitement. He cannot go to sleep for excitement, Mr. Speaker, because of the fact now that he thinks he has got the government on the sticky end of a wicket with respect to a political issue. That is why he is all carried away about it. Look, he is grinning like a Cheshire cat, Mr. Speaker. He knows exactly what I am talking about.

Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that this is an opportunity for the government -

MR. M. BOWE: I saw him in Gander.

MR. LUNDRIAN: Saw me in Gander. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am in Gander every second day. I am in Gander and I am in Grand Falls every second day, seven trips in the last month.

MR. M. BOWE: I saw him in Gander.

MR. LUNDRIAN: And I saw the hon. Leader of the Opposition on his way back from his sojourn down to Clarendville. I understand he had a very good meeting down there. He thinks that - he is almost celebrating, and he has not got anything yet to celebrate, and I want to remind him of that. I wonder what the former leader thinks of the issue. I wonder what the former leader thinks of the issue, Mr. Speaker. I understand the former leader of the party who, I think, maybe has the admiration of many of the people of this Province, I understand that he has some concerns himself about the fact that we have a real serious economic problem confronting us. We have in the forest industry - the member for LaSalle-or for Twillingate, rather, may not be aware of this - but we last year exported in shipping value out of this Province \$260 million worth of product in a Province that has less than \$1 billion worth of export, in a Province that had \$160 million in the fisheries sector, \$260 million, and we stand here in this House today and talk about the forestry as if it affects one or two towns in the Province today. We have got towns in this Province

Mr. LUNDRIAN:

today that will drive up like a prune if we are not careful about the forest industry in this Province.

MR. KITCHEN: Or the government can drive up.

MR. LUNDRIAN: Mr. Speaker, the government can very well drive up. I have had that happen to me before, and I am going to have it happen again if I keep at politics long enough. That does not concern me too much about who gets defeated or who gets elected. But it does concern me a little bit if we look down the road at \$260 million, about twenty-five per cent or more than twenty-five per cent, thirty per cent of the total shipments out of our Province down the drain. That is a matter of some concern. The member for Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) over there with a town that would be on the broad of its back without the forest industry right down the drain.

MR. FLIGHT: I was almost on my back with it.

MR. LUNDRIAN: Mr. Speaker, I cannot blame the people. That is the people's choice when they elected the hon. member. That is the people's problem.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) is getting ready to get up and unleash an attack, if he gets up.

MR. WHITE: Who is going to keep the discussion on a decent level.

MR. LUNDRIAN: In his area, Mr. Speaker, you have got half of his population dependent on the forest industry. So I am saying let us put this political nonsense aside and let us, Mr. Speaker, recognize that we have twenty-five per cent of the economy of our Province, in terms of the export value of our industries, on the verge or in danger of some kind of serious economic effect. If we do not provide the leadership, if we do not provide the initiative to try to do something about

Mr. Lundrigan.

that, we endanger the entire economy of our Province. It is not a matter of one or two towns going down the drain. It is a matter of the fact that this Province cannot survive without a forest industry. We are in danger of not surviving very well as it is, and I will agree with the hon. member on that particular issue. But let us put aside our concerns about who is going to get what political benefits. And if we are really seriously interested, Mr. Speaker, about the problem, why do we not take the opportunity to ask people at some time to come before this Committee, and let us raise the questions. I listened to the Leader of the Opposition. He did not raise a question. I listened to the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who got up and rambled on, he did not raise a question. Every question they raised, most of which was just an attack about poison going into the air, poison pouring down on the people, poison pouring down all over, and he tells me about playing politics across the way. He tells me about playing politics. This is what he said, Up gets a gentleman here,

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

who is the minister, who is backed up by the best medical brains we have in our Province today, who is backed up by the best medical brains in our country and he tells us statistical evidence to refute everything which was said. The member got up from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) - I understand there are one or two cords of wood in Terra Nova district - he got up from Terra Nova, he did not hear a word! Now I can understand many people not hearing, I can understand people becoming emotional on an issue, but I certainly have a little bit of concern and when I see members of our legislature who do not hear, that you cannot communicate to them, that they have built up a blind wall against it and cannot hear and cannot listen, that is a real problem. That is the kind of attitude that, you know, can really get us into trouble. That is worst than the spruce budworm as far as I am concerned.

So I am saying, Mr. Speaker, press on. The government have taken a leadership decision. It is going to cost us some concerns. We have responsibility to inform our public to whichever extent we can on the issue. I think we have got a responsibility to make sure we set up whichever ways and means we can at our disposal to interact with our public in a way so that they will become aware and so that they can vent their emotions and express their concerns. We have a real responsibility. We might even have responsibility to adapt our approaches from time to time, Mr. Speaker. There is why I think that the government are on the right track on it and I say to the member who is interjecting back there that I will look for his leadership and I will send his speech out to Windsor-Buchans because I will -

MR. FLIGHT: I will match my views with yours any day on good forest management (inaudible).

MR. LUNDRIGAN: I will be very interested, Mr. Speaker, in what the people of the central region have to say about his remarks today. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Port de Grave.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I am sure we have all listened with interest to this debate here today. I do not think I am going to add anything

MR. DAWE:

new to what has been said. I think every point has been brought out, those who support this spraying and those who are against it. My position is, as I have given a lot of thought to this matter, my position is quite clear. I do not think for one minute that the government should, in this present spraying programme, spray in the heavily populated areas in this Province. By doing that I think we would put some of our people under great stress and concern. There is doubt in a good many people's minds actually to the result of this spraying. We have two or three of our sister provinces who are definitely against it. I am sure they have got probably justified reasons for doing so and I would like to join in with the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) to make a strong appeal to the government and to the minister that they would probably declare a moratorium this year for spraying in these populated areas where the water supply could be in jeopardy and until such time as the people of our Province could probably be exposed to this more than they have been.

I am not going to delay the House tonight but I have one little suggestion that I am going to pass on to the minister. And as I have said, every point I think has been raised in this debate that possibly could be thought of. But I would suggest to the minister that we have a limited and very isolated spraying programme this year. What I mean to say is limited and isolated, that is some part of the Province that could be completely monitored by all those concerned. And I would suggest to the minister that they appoint members of these concerned citizens from Gander and from Glovertown and around the Province, some representation from these concerned citizens to this monitoring committee and then they will be able to see for themselves. I am sure it will

Mr. Sarge.

be non-partisan, non-political and then they could bring this information that they would gather to their various groups and they then may come to their own conclusions that this is the only alternative left to the government to try to rid ourselves of this very, very serious problem. And it may be, Mr. Speaker, in my point of view, that we may need a combination of two or three programmes that have been suggested here tonight. And I can probably suggest three to the minister: To salvaging the wood in the populated areas could be probably one solution: a partial salvaging of the wood in the populated areas so that the people could rest assured that there is no pollution problem; and where there were proven that this matacil spraying is not injurious to other forms of life, that probably they could have a combination of the two programmes, one of spraying, and one of reforestation and one of harvesting. That may be some solution. I know it is a very serious problem. I understand that almost ninety per cent of the Province in some form or another is infected with this spruce budworm. It is a serious problem and it got to be tackled.

What is the answer? I do not know. We have had so many points raised here today you only get more confused. But I would say to the hon. minister that I do not think for one minute that our people should be put under this stress or this concern, because again, I say, in the populated area where their water system could probably be polluted - it may not be polluted but the people are really concerned. I do not think it is political on their part. I do not think it is fair for the government to put these people in this position. I could not support a full spraying programme, Mr. Speaker. But I would say again, and I can only repeat what I have already said, that we should, in my opinion,

Mr. Dore,

probably have an isolated spraying programme this year and that probably we could try to combine the two, spraying and the harvesting of this spruce budworm infestation - it could be harvested, I say, in the populated areas so that people then would not be so concerned with the pollution problem. And I would repeat again to the minister that I think it would be a good idea and a good suggestion for the government to take if they decided to go ahead with some of the spraying programme that at least some representation from these serious minded people should be appointed to this monitoring committee so they could see for themselves, and they could come to their own conclusion, in their own way, and I am sure that they would pass that information on to the other citizens, these concerned people who really feel sincere in their objections to this spraying, that they could come to their own conclusion that probably it is not the risk that they feared it might be.

I think the minister would be doing a good service to these people if he could at least appoint some of these people to this committee if they decide to go ahead with this programme this year. I think it would be a good public relation's job, and these people would come to their own conclusions themselves. But bearing in mind the indecision of the other provinces, Mr. Speaker, I feel that at least this year we should have some moratorium with this spraying. It is not a solution that is going to be found overnight. It has been with us, as I say, for so many years, and I do not think that by rushing into such a thing as this that we would help matters at this time. I am not influenced in any way by the opinion of the paper mills at all. They are only going to take their own selfish motives in any suggestions that they would make. They are not concerned

Mr. [Name]

with the feelings of our people. They naturally want to get the best return for their investment, and to get the wood at the cheapest price. But I would say to the minister in all sincerity that I would like him to reconsider this matter,

MR. DAWE: especially, as I again stress, in the populated areas that some limitation would be put on this part of the programme and that probably then next year, after another season passes, people may be more enlightened and they may come to the conclusion the government has no other choice.

I would support some restraint in that programme this year. I do trust that the minister will take this into serious consideration.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have just a few words before we clue up tonight on this matter. It is obviously one that is a very important matter. I think this has probably been one of the better debates we have had in the House of Assembly for sometime. It is a very important issue.

I have taken a number of notes as I have gone through the day and I would hope to be able to answer some of them. I am sure that the time will not allow me to answer all of them. It would seem to me that the biggest fear that has been expressed in the House of Assembly here today is the fear about the type of chemical we are using, and whether or not it is necessary to use or to embark on a chemical spraying programme.

The chemical that we are using - the subject has been brought up on a number of occasions over the past few days and I have tried to allay the fears of hon. members as much as I possibly could, the last time being a very lengthy statement on Friday morning of last week where I outlined in some detail, I thought, the system that has been gone through in, first of all, coming up with the decision to embark on a chemical programme and secondly, the decision to use the particular chemical, matacil.

MR. MAYNARD: Now matacil, Mr. Speaker, is a trade name. It is no more or no less than when one goes into a drug store and buys toothpaste and says that they want a certain type of toothpaste. The fact is that the same kind of chemical is included in that as there is in any other. It may be a different type of tube, it may be a different colour tube and this sort of thing, but it is the same type of chemical. The chemical is aminocarb or more commonly known in the coppermate family of chemicals.

The fact is that these chemicals have been tested in Canada by the federal people who are very responsible people, who I am sure are not perfect, but who are very responsible. Since 1965 they have been testing this chemical and finally in 1976 they registered the chemical for forestry application.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to say to myself at some point in time that there must be some responsible people in the Department of Agriculture (Canada), there must be some responsible people in the Department of Health and Welfare (Canada), there must be some responsible people in the Department of Environment (Canada) and that these people are not absolutely out of their trees to be able to say to me that this chemical, aminocarb is very safe for usage in Canada.

There has been a big issue made of the fact that it has not been registered in the United States. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not go South of the border to find out whether they want to use a chemical or whether they do not. I could not care less whether the United States have approved the chemical or whether they have not. I have known the United States to make some very sad mistakes in some of their approvals

MR. MAYNARD: so I am not going there, I am looking at our own controls which have been instituted - they have been proven to be pretty, pretty accurate for a long period of time - to tell me whether or not that a chemical is safe.

I have no quarrels with the United States. If they want to have a different system of registration, that is fine, they can use their own system. But I do not think that I have to bow down to the United States or I have to bow down to any other country, I am quite happy with the system that we use in Canada.

There has also been the suggestion, not a suggestion, but a sort of implication, Mr. Speaker, that suddenly the government is embarking on a programme and they are going out and they are going to rain death from the air and they are going to destroy all the people in Newfoundland which is total, absolute nonsense. There is no one in this government, there is no one in this House of Assembly, there is no one in my department that wants to do a spraying programme, no one. We have never said that we are happy with doing a spraying programme. What we have said, is that weighing all the evidence, taking the thing in total context that right at this point in time we do not know of any other method, short-term method. And hon. gentlemen are quite right in saying that it is not a long-term solution. We have never proposed it as a long-term solution. What we are proposing is that in the short-term we have to do the chemical spraying programme, in the long-term we have to do intensive forest management. There is no question about that, no question about that. We have to put a lot of money into forest management and I will not question the fact that we have not put much money into it in the past but I will say to you, Mr. Speaker, that we have to put a lot of money into it in the future.

We have to do a two-pronged

MR. MAYNARD: effort in my estimation. I may be wrong, I am not an expert in ecology, I am not an expert in health, but I take the best advice that I get, but we have to do a two-pronged effort.

Number one, in the short-term, protect the foliage, the trees that we have now. In the long-term, try to ensure that we are going to have a healthy forest forty-five or fifty or sixty years down the road. And we are putting out money into that at this point in time and we will continue to put out money into it as long as this House of Assembly, at least, gives us the leeway by voting the number of dollars.

We have talked about a number of things here today and I find it very disturbing, Mr. Speaker, that an issue that is so important to this Province would suddenly get into the political arena, into partisan politics.

MR. STRACHAN: You are talking about the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Lundrigan) are you?

MR. MAYNARD: I am talking about any member who would bring the issue into the partisan, political sphere.

MR. STRACHAN: You already did.

MR. MAYNARD: If the hon. gentleman from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) wants to speak I am sure he will have a chance.

MR. STRACHAN: I am only giving an opinion. I listened to forty minutes of political diatribe.

MR. MAYNARD: The hon. member listened to forty minutes of political diatribe. Well, I can refer-

MR. STRACHAN: That is right.

MR. MAYNARD: Well, I can refer back to Hansard, Mr. Speaker, with the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) and the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and if I remember correctly, one person had

MR. MAYNARD: three days of political diatribe, the other one has had two days so far, and I would suggest to the hon. member for Eagle River that if he is going to talk about political diatribe, a monologue and boring conversation, then he had better put it in the right context.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: No wonder his salary was reduced to one dollar.

MR. MAYNARD: No wonder the salary was reduced to a dollar.

MR. SIMMONS: Boy, oh boy, oh boy!

MR. MAYNARD: Here is the way that the hon. member for LaPoile operates, and my colleague read it out there a little while ago. "Now is the time for action, now is the time for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture to stop fiddling before his department goes down the drain," Mr. Neary said!

MR. SIMMONS: That is right!

MR. MAYNARD: That was one year ago, Mr. Speaker. All of a sudden for political purposes he has changed his tune right now, a 180 degree switch.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MAYNARD: There is a very nice name for people who do that but unfortunately this House of Assembly with its rules and regulations will not let me say the name. I could say it.

MR. NEARY: There are too many unanswered questions about the spray programme and the environmental consequences. That is the difference between now and December 1976.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, when I -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He has it from the hemlock looper and the budworm combined.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman lost his cool in the Cabinet. lost his cool in Ottawa and is losing his cool here.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We should spray you.

MR. NEARY: He cannot handle it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
We cannot have several hon. members speaking at one time, or we should not have.

MR. MAYNARD: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me get back to a few of the questions that have been asked. I think the Leader of the Opposition asked why we did not confer with Nova Scotia. The fact is, Mr. Speaker, we have conferred with Nova Scotia. And let us put the Nova Scotian situation in context. The fact is that Nova Scotia has a problem in one part of Nova Scotia, in Cape Breton Island. It does not have the problem with the budworm on the mainland of Nova Scotia. Now, we do not have that healthy a situation, we have the problem all over Newfoundland except for Labrador. But we have the

MR. MAYNARD: problem all over the Island of Newfoundland. We do not have the problem in Labrador. But Nova Scotia has the problem in one area. Now I would suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, that Nova Scotia can afford to write off Cape Breton Island and say the heck with it, but we cannot do that in Newfoundland, we just do not have that much timber around.

Mr. McLean in Nova Scotia - and I am sure that hon. members are going to say that I should not criticize my colleague; well, he has criticized me and he has criticized his colleague in New Brunswick - but if Mr. McLean wants to write off Cape Breton and say to hell with it, that is fine for Mr. McLean. But I cannot do that in Newfoundland, I cannot afford to do it. Have I conferred with Nova Scotia? Yes, I have conferred with Nova Scotia. I have not been in on their Cabinet meetings. There was some suggestions over there today that I should know why the Cabinet in Nova Scotia made a decision. How ridiculous can you get? I do not attend Nova Scotia Cabinet meetings anymore than Mr. McLean or Mr. Regan or whoever attends the Newfoundland Cabinet meetings. Nonsense! But I do know the situation they went through in trying to make a decision. I do not know why they came up with the final conclusion, it is not my problem, but I do know that I have to make the decision as far as Newfoundland is concerned.

Now the State of Maine has been tossed around on television and radio and this sort of thing. The State of Maine: Mr. Walker in the State of Maine made the big announcement that the State of Maine was going to phase out of the spraying programme. It sounds good! It sounds lovely! But, what we have to ask ourselves is how much was the State of Maine putting into the spraying programme? And I did a little bit of checking, 4 per cent, 4 per cent of the cost of doing a spraying programme in the State of Maine was provided by the State the rest of it was

MR. MAYNARD: provided by industry and the federal government of the United States, so they are withdrawing 4 per cent. It sounds great.

Now, they also qualified that statement by saying that the State of Maine would not be putting any money in but the federal government and private industry could go on spraying, which they are doing. So they will go on spraying after 1980 if they want to. But everybody suddenly gets all hot and bothered about the State of Maine is going to stop spraying. Nonsense! The State of Maine is not going to stop spraying! The State of Maine is just asking that private industry and the federal government pay the extra 4 per cent that they were paying,

MR. MAYNARD: and they will control it. So, big deal! B. C. has been mentioned. British Columbia, compared to Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, is like comparing battleships to the dories that we use and that I rowed quite a few times when I was growing up - the punts, dories, whatever have you. There is no comparison. British Columbia does not have a problem. Why should they stop spraying when they do not even have a problem. The question was asked, "Where is matacil used?" Matacil has been used since 1976 in Quebec, Ontario, New Brunswick and in Newfoundland. Is it a new chemical? No, it is not a new chemical. It has been very well tested, very well researched and it is mixed with a petroleum product as are all other chemicals that are used in forestry application; it is mixed with a petroleum product. And when No. 2 fuel oil, which was the ordinary mixture, was found to have some sort of a link, a possible link with a disease, the emulsifier was found to have some sort of a - the Department of Health and Welfare in Canada said "No, you cannot use that", so there is a new petroleum formulation, but it is still a petroleum base. The mixture is 20-1 and Dr. David Severs, the Chief Medical Health Officer of the province, and my colleague can back this up, says that the formulation which is approved by Health and Welfare Canada is one/one-thousandth of the approved dosage. One/one-thousandth - you would have -

AN HON. MEMBER: One thousand times less than.

MR. MAYNARD: It is one thousand times less than the dosage that would even make you ill. Last year, and if anybody cares to read the environmental monitoring report last year, in direct spray over a water body the testing was done and the amount of matacil found in the water body was 24 parts per billion. The amount allowed over a prolonged period under the Canada Safe Water Drinking Standards is 100 parts per billion. It was one-quarter - a direct spray right into the water body, one-quarter of the amount that is allowed on a prolonged basis -

MR. FLIGHT: I find it hard to believe anyway.

MR. MAYNARD: - and I have checked with the medical people and they told me that a person in their estimation would have to use that water supply at 100 parts per billion for a period of six months, eight months, before they would even find that they were having a problem.

MR. FLIGHT: But the Minister had told us there was no problem.

MR. MAYNARD: That is right, I am telling you there is no problem and I am also saying to anyone in this House come up with the evidence, the conclusive evidence, that there is a problem, and then I will reconsider my decision.

MR. HEARY: But the Minister should come up with the answers.

MR. MAYNARD: I have, Mr. Speaker, I have come up with the documentation and I have made it available and I have put it on the table in this House, I have made it available to the public that says there is no conclusive evidence that there is a problem.

MR. FLIGHT: That is now.

MR. MAYNARD: Now, if honourable gentlemen are going to get up in this House and say that there is a problem then produce the evidence. That is what I am saying. I do not want a spraying program; no one in this House wants a spraying program, but we are into a situation where we do not have any choice except to control the budworm. Now, if some honourable gentlemen either on the other side or on this side can come up with some conclusive evidence that there is a problem with the chemicals that we are using or the method we are using, then put it on the table. Let us not make off-the-cuff remarks. If you are going to make off-the-cuff remarks, then you should be able to back them up, and I would suggest to you that the remarks that have been made today and

May 23, 1973

Tape 1673

GN 3

MR. MAYNARD: over the last week or so, Mr. Speaker, there is not one that can be backed up and show me the evidence, Mr. Speaker. Never mind sitting back in the seat. Never mind sitting back in the seat and taking it easy. The members of this House have a responsibility: if they are going to make a remark, they had better be able to prove what they are saying.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: But will you let us bring witnesses into the House?

MR. MAYNARD: Bring it in. Bring witnesses in, bring the evidence in. You will not bring it in because you just do not have it to bring in.

MR. NEARY: Will you give us the opportunity?

MRS. MCISSAC: Will the minister. before he finishes -

MR. NEARY: He is finished. He is in
over his feet.

MRS. MCISSAC: Oh, he is finished.

MR. NEARY: He is finished. Carry on.
Go on, speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Go on, speak.

MRS. MCISSAC: No, I thought the minister
was not through. I just want to make a couple of comments
or ask a couple of questions, really.

One of my concerns was the
fact that there had been drums leaking in Stephenville.
I was quite concerned about that and wondering what the
danger was there with leaking drums in Stephenville since
it is a very poisonous substance, so I am told. It may
have been taken care of, it may have been satisfactorily
taken care of. I thought the minister was not finished and
I had intended to ask him that question.

I also have to wonder about
last year's programme and the fact that there were only
twelve part-time students used to monitor 200,000 acres
that were sprayed. Now, also, I am not that familiar with
the programme but there are two questions that I would like
answered and that is one of there.

Is the minister satisfied for
that twelve part-time students could monitor 200,000 acres
and come up with a satisfactory answer? Has the cleanup
in Stephenville been done to the satisfaction of the
minister? And the safety of the people, that is another
question. Last year I was under the impression that there
was some of the spray that got into the water system in
Corner Brook, but I also understand that the airplanes were
about a mile-and-a-half off target. Is this going to happen
again? What can we expect? Do we know enough? I am as
concerned about it as everybody in Newfoundland is concerned

MRS. MCISSAC: about it. Everybody in my district, I would say, that I have talked to has questioned me about it. I do not have the answers. I do not know if any of us here have the answers. We say that we have evidence - of the minister says he is sure that it is not harmful but are we sure? Are we certain? Do we have enough evidence to go ahead with the spray programme and ensure that we are not endangering the environment and human beings?

The fact that this is going to be mixed with something else, has this been tested? I do not mean -

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

It being eleven o'clock I am now obliged to put the motion which is before the House and the motion is that the House do now adjourn. Those in favour please say 'aye', contrary 'nay'. In my opinion the 'ayes' have it. I therefore adjourn the House until tomorrow Tuesday at 2:00 p.m. This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, May 30, 1978, at 2:00 p.m.