

FOR REFERENCE ONLY  
NOT TO BE CIRCULATED



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 16

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 22, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like to welcome to the galleries today twelve students from the College of Trades and Technology, in a course in Survey and Forestry, with their teacher, Mr. W. C. Parrott. I would also like to welcome to the gallery sixty students, I am not sure if there are sixty from the St. John Bosco School, but there are some here from St. John Bosco School plus some exchange students from North West River with their teacher, Mr. Frank Hearn. I welcome you all to the galleries today on behalf of all members of this honourable House.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN: Before presenting petitions, I am sure that I voice the sentiments of all honourable members when I express the shock and dismay of all of us and I am sure of all Newfoundlanders when we learned yesterday of the sudden and tragic death of Mr. Tim Horton, a man who was an exemplary sports figure in Canada. It is not usual for this House to extend condolences to people behind our shores but many of us who were involved in education and in sports activities in Newfoundland remember with fond affection the visits that Mr. Horton paid to this Province and the tremendous courage and leadership that he showed and the example that he passed on to the young people of Newfoundland. I move and I hope seconded by the honourable Leader of the Opposition that this House extend to Mrs. Horton and her family the sincere sympathy of this House.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I, of course, would ask to be associated with the tribute paid by the member for Burin, the Minister of Justice, to the late Mr. Horton. Those of us who watched hockey and had a knowledge of it were, I think, deeply shocked by the tragic nature of his death and also coming so suddenly. I believe that same night, the

night of his death, he played in a hockey game and had been awarded one of the three stars, one of the stars of the game. We are not happy to second the motion, Sir; we do second the motion and do it quite freely but as always in these cases we would infinitely prefer that there be no need for a motion at all. If there is to be one, as there is, we would very much wish to be associated with the tribute.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

HON. EDWARD MAYNARD (Minister of Agriculture & Forestry): Mr. Speaker, the Newfoundland Co-operative Insurance Act, 1973 regulations and regulations of the Dog Licensing Regulations, 1973.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Manpower & Industrial Relations.

MR. J. G. ROUSSEAU: (Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations): As Minister of Public Works and Services, I have pleasure in tabling the 1973 annual report of the Civil Service Commission for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. I have a few copies, eight copies for the press and I think about twelve or fourteen here, and there are more being printed. This is for 1973. The House and the press.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

On motion of the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy, a bill; "An Act Further to Amend the Gasoline Tax" read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow:

On motion a bill, "An Act Further to Amend the City of St John's Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow:

On motion, a bill; "An Act To Empower The St. John's Municipal Council To Raise A Loan For Municipal Purposes By The Issue Of Bonds." Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion, a bill; "An Act Further To Amend The Wildlife Act." Read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

Motion: second reading of a bill; "An Act To Bring Certain Forest Lands Under Proper Management And To Impose Varying Degrees Of Taxation In Respect Thereof."

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture: HON. E. MAYNARD (Minister of Agriculture and Forests): Mr. Speaker, it was my pleasure eight days ago, over one week ago, to outline to the House of Assembly the government's policy regarding the future utilization of the forest resource in Newfoundland. It is also my pleasure at this time to move the debate on second reading of the legislation that will back up most of the policy outlined.

The bill we are presenting relates only to the land now held under various tenure arrangements, whether it is licensed, leased, grants or whatever by various companies. There are only approximately three involved. There may be more. The prime purpose and intent of the bill is to make provision for the preservation and management and utilization of the timber resources of the province.

I explained in the policy statement a few days ago that there would be a necessity for dressing up of some of the other legislation we have in the province or on the statute books at this time, to allow us to carry out the same management techniques on the Crown timber lands which constitute not a really significant portion of our forest resource but is still a very valuable one.

Any people, persons, companies enjoying specific timber rights over lots of land, anything over three hundred acres, this legislation will be applied to. It will encourage these owners, these people who have the right to use the timber under various arrangements, encourage them to employ the proper standards of management. The bill contains very complex provisions and these I hope to explain in some detail as

I go through.

The bill will also provide for the imposition of varying degrees of taxation on persons holding timber rights over the lands in question. There will be two rates of taxation and I hope to, again a little later on, explain in some detail the way that the taxation will be applied. In general it is fair to say that for those people who carry out the proper management techniques on lands which are under their control, the taxation will be of a very minimal nature. It will be of a level which will enable us to sustain proper forest protection procedures on all the timberlands

of the province. This, of course, involves forest fire suppression, disease and insect control as well as many other items. Technically, up until this time the large land holders have been required to carry out their own protection procedures, especially in the field of forest fire suppression. Realistically, however, they have quite often used the facilities that the government have available such as the water bomber fleet. It is now necessary and we consider it necessary to have the protection of the forest lands, the responsibility for protection, listed in one agency and that agency as in many other provinces would be the government or a division of government. In this case it would be under the Newfoundland Forest Service.

I suppose it would be appropriate to go back over some of the thoughts that led up to a new forest policy for the province. I think it is also appropriate at this time to point out that the type of legislation being introduced here and the type of policies outlined a week ago are merely the first step in the government's desire to become more actively engaged in the total management and utilization of our resources, whether these resources be timber, minerals, water power or whatever.

The forestry was the one that was looked at as being the most critical in terms of management with the analysts and the experts advising the government that with the present methods of logging, present methods of utilization, our major industry in this province would run out of a merchantable timber supply, fibre supply, within perhaps thirty to thirty-five years. If that happened, of course, it would be a disaster to this province; a disaster which certainly no one wants to see come about. Therefore, the forestry resource was looked at as the most critical one. It was the first subject that the present administration set up a task force to study. They were given a time limit because we felt that we could not afford to have the regular type royal commission that could quite possibly go on and on for a number of years.

We looked at it in the practical sense that we must move within two years and therefore we must get together our information, we must formulate our policies and we must put them into action at the earliest possible date. I stated before and I think it is fair to say that the people who made up the Task Force on Forestry were some of the most knowledgeable people that could be gathered together in one group. The forty-five individuals who participated in preparing the committee reports and in preparing the final document for presentation to the government were certainly very knowledgeable. They read like a who's who in the forest industry of North America and they were drawn from various phases of the industry all across North America. The task force is operated under the co-chairmanship of the Assistant Deputy Minister of Forestry for the Province, Mr. Ross Sheppard and the Director of the Federal Forest Service in the Province, Dr. Joe Carroll.

I would like at this time to say that the Government of Newfoundland sincerely appreciate the amount of work, amount of study, the amount of expertise, that was used



to compile these very valuable documents. It was then based on the recommendations of the task force report, as government decided and formulated its forest policy, and it was based on the policy that was decided upon that we compile legislation to back up the policy.

In the past there has been very little that government could do to enforce good management practices in the forest resource of the province, even though the tenure arrangements, especially those that were worked out with Bowaters and with Price, had clauses stating that good forest management techniques were to be employed. It was an unfortunate omission in that there was very little that government could do to enforce those clauses if the companies did not use the best management techniques possible. So therefore it was necessary to devise new legislation that would help us to control and manage the forest lands.

The forests of Newfoundland continue and we hope will continue to play a major role in the development of this province. It has played a major role in our development in all the years since this province was discovered. Various projects have been started to utilize our timber resource, some of them have gone by the wayside, others are still with us, and we certainly hope the ones that are here today will be with us for a long time to come. But along with the fishing industry it has been the backbone of this province and since it was first discovered, the forestry has been the next most important thing.

However, it is quite evident that the forest resource cannot last forever unless it is properly exploited, properly managed and properly cared for. Back 100 years ago there were very few people in Newfoundland compared to what there are today. There was very little demand on the forest resource compared to what there is today and there was no need of an intensive forest management policy. I suppose it is also safe to say that even at the time that the tenure arrangements were worked out in the 1920's and 1930's, with the two larger companies,



it certainly looked as if there was not too much need of an intensive management policy and it is quite possible that at that time the technology was not advanced to such a stage whereby we knew, or the people at that time knew, much about managing and utilizing the forest resource.

In any case I would assume that government of the day though, and quite properly so, that very few people would be interested in this little rock out in the Atlantic and it would be very difficult for them to entice private enterprise to become interested in the resource that we had to offer.

The situation of course is quite the reverse today. We are no longer the rock off in the Atlantic. We have a resource. It is a major one and although the world is not knocking at our doorsteps and I am not trying to create that type of image, there is a demand for the resource, there is a market, and that demand will increase over the years. However the resource, even though it is a renewable one, can only sustain a certain yield and we must be careful that we do not over-kill or over-produced as far as forest resource is concerned. What we want to do is

to make sure that we have a supply of timber for the existing large paper mills. We have a supply of timber in perpetuity for the other industries that exist or the revised sawmill industry that we hope to see.

At least industries will be able to continue with their operations with the knowledge that the resource is not being depleted at such a rate that some day they will see the end of the thing. We also want to make sure that the people of Newfoundland, and these are the persons who would be most affected by it, the companies would move on to another area of Canada, more than likely. The people would still have to depend on something. We want to make sure that the people who are engaged in the forest industry at this time are going to be able to look ahead to a fairly prosperous future, a fairly lengthy time harvesting the resource.

It would be pointless and foolish for us to bring in industries that are going to deplete the resource over the next fifteen, or twenty or thirty years and then leave what will be a barren country for the next fifty to sixty years until the resource regenerates itself.

I would like at this time to turn to some statistics to give a fairly broad view of the potential that we do have as far as the forestry is concerned. These statistics are drawn from the global inventory that was done for the Island of Newfoundland and is now continuing in the Labrador Area. The Island has been completed over the past five years, I believe the agreement was drawn up in 1966 between the federal and provincial governments.

Although the global inventory does not give specifics on the ground measures, if you will, the number of cords per acre, it does give a fairly close view of the resource. The global inventory came up with some startling statistics. I might say that this inventory has to be backed up now over the next two or three years with an intensive on-the-ground inventory as that is the only possible way that we can get the exact figures. The figures that we do have now are close enough for us to justify the steps that we are taking as far as the resource management is concerned.

We have in the province some nine million acres which are capable of producing commercial stands of five or more cunits per acre, cunits and cords are much the same. The inventory was done up on the basis of federal standards and therefore the word "cunit" was used instead of cord. That would be approximately six cords per acre.

We have of course various large areas of fairly barren land and land that is not capable of producing the forestry but we have fairly extensive areas of hardwood, if it were taken in a concentrated area it would look like a great deal although a lot of our hardwood again is scattered all over the island and in Labrador. For the most part our forest consist of probably eighty-five per cent of the softwood content that is on the island.

The softwood content in the Labrador Area is probably even a little bit higher than that. Spruce and balsam fir are the main species. To take the island part of the province, the inventory was done by regions. On the island there were seven inventory regions in total. The number (1) region was the Northern Peninsula, north of a line stretching between Bonne Bay and Hampden. Surprisingly enough, the inventory shows that in that region there are seventeen million cords of timber in all ages and classes. 6,181,000 cords of that have reached maturity or is immature but the startling statistic here is that there are 10 million cords, 10,871,000 cords of wood, on the Northern Peninsula that is over-mature, 64 per cent of the total volume. That is the highest percentage in any area on the island. It ranges then down to a low of 13 per cent in area (7) which is the eastern part of the island. The overall average shows an over-maturity of 37 per cent of the merchantable timber have on the island.

This is a dangerous statistic as most foresters will tell you and as probably every one is well aware. Over mature timber is more susceptible to disease, to insects and to fire. It is therefore estimated that we are losing approximately 600,000 cords per year to these three factors, from the island wood supply. 600,000 cords per year, Mr. Speaker, is enough to run a mill the size of Stephenville and have some left over for the sawmills around the island. That is the amount that is being lost that we will never recap and it is worth a lot of money.

I gave one example of an inventory region. The second inventory region was the Humber Valley - Corner Brook - Stephenville and Codroy Valley Areas, down as far as the timberlines go. This region had the most timber, 25 million cords, 9 million of which are over mature and that area there came out - the average as far as over maturity was concerned - at 37 per cent.

In total, on the Island of Newfoundland, as is estimated from the global inventory, we have a merchantable volume of 99, 499,000 cords. Again, global inventory figures cannot be taken as being exact but they

are within the error range of five to ten per cent. Even if we assume that they are ten per cent off which is very unlikely, we would still have 90 million cords. Of that amount and by the way, I am saying cords but the inventory expresses it in cunits but I do not want to get the thing confused so I will keep on relating cunits to cords. Of the amount of 99 million cords 37 million cords are over mature. A lot of that over mature wood could have been harvested over the years. A great deal of it is in areas that were considered relatively inaccessible. Of course a stand of timber is only inaccessible until such time as the road is built to it. Once a road is built it is relatively easy to take that timber out to utilize it.

One of the prime requirements in the new management policy must be that we concentrate our efforts on harvesting the over-mature timber. It is estimated that if we concentrated on trying to get the over-mature stands, it could be done over a period of thirty years in which time we would bring the forest resource back on a natural cycle basis. In other words, we would be able to harvest the mature timber at so much per acre and we would be back on the sixty to seventy year cycle.

A lot of experts have told us that perhaps the most sensible thing to do as far as the over-mature is concerned, would be what they call mining the timber. In other words, based on our cycle - growing cycle, if the timber in Newfoundland could sustain, let us assume 2 million cords a year, annual, allowable cut on a normal basis, some of the experts will tell us that we should, in order to harvest the over-mature timber, cut maybe 2,500,000 cords a year or 2,200,000 a year for a period of twenty-five to thirty years so that we could get rid of most of the over-mature timber and then revert back to an ordinary cycle of 2 million cords a year.

That may be very difficult to do. What would be necessary, of course, is some large user of fibre that would come in for a thirty year period and then bow out of the picture. Certainly we could not

go on using 200,000 or 500,000 cords a year more than the annual allowable cut in perpetuity, we would defeat the purpose. It is necessary for us to make every effort in the next two or three years to get access to that timber and then over the next thirty years try to bring the timber resource of the province back on its natural cycle - growing cycle.

The global inventory has not been completed for the Labrador Area but there have been some estimates done on the amount of timber available. I think I have them here somewhere.

It is estimated that there are 33 million cords of merchantable timber in four major accessible forest areas in Labrador. Of that 33 million of course the largest amount is in the Lake Melville Area which has approximately 25 million cords.

The Lake Melville wood is in such a location that it is fairly well accessible. The only problem that I can see with harvesting the wood in the Lake Melville Area would not be in the harvesting itself but rather in the shipping of the product out of there because of the short shipping season. We are fairly confident that these problems are going to be overcome and it is easy to see that there is a fairly large potential resource and there is no reason why we should not make every effort to get that resource out.

Another thing that makes the Labrador wood very attractive from the paper mills' point of view is the fact that it is 70 per cent black spruce which is in very great demand as far as the newsprint mills are concerned.

The forest of Labrador, for some reason or another, have more even age spans and there does not seem to be as much over mature timber, percentage wise, as there is on the island. However, we will know more about the potential in that area as soon as we have the global inventory for the area done.

There are three other areas in Labrador that have fairly extensive stands. There are approximately 2,970,000 cords in Alexis Bay. There are another 3,500,000 cords in Sandwich Bay. There are another 1,530,000 cords in Kaipokok Bay. It is estimated that the annual allowable cut in Labrador could be 435,000 cords per year of which 350,000 cords could be harvested from the Lake Melville Area, and the annual allowable cut sustained in perpetuity.

The thoughts a few years ago that we could take 800,000 cords per year out of the Lake Melville Area or Labrador in general were a little bit far-fetched. However, there is certainly a potential there and it is certainly one that is not to be ignored in the context of



the whole province. When you take the annual allowable cut for the whole province you have something in excess of 2,000,000 cords per year.

At the present time the utilization is approximately 860,000 cords per year. We have a considerable amount left over, surplus wood if you will, and certainly a long way to go before we have maximum utilization.

I would doubt very much whether we will reach the level of maximum utilization within the next several years. I would think that there are some areas that are included in these inventory regions that are going to remain relatively inaccessible. Yet that is hard to say because with new technology and new harvesting methods, it is pretty difficult to predict what is going to happen in three or four years from now.

The fact that some 12 per cent of the merchantable volume of timber in the province is on slopes of greater than 30 degrees, and by the way the amounts on the slopes have not been mentioned in the inventory figures, that has been left out because up to this time it was considered inaccessible, yet with new methods of logging, these slopes now look as if they are going to provide a source of wood.

There are various methods being tried. One method which was tried in Western Newfoundland this year, the cable logging method, as far as the harvesting of the timber is concerned, works relatively well but I understand there is some problem with the economics. However, that has never been a great deterrent for people who really want to develop machinery and to develop technology to harvest the resource or do anything else for that matter. There is no reason for us to think or to suggest that probably this technology could not be developed in Newfoundland. Certainly we have the terrain that suggests it might be as good a place as any to try out new technology. Because of this we have to work, the companies, the provincial government, and the federal government, through the Federal Forest Service, have to do a great deal of work in research and in development. We have to do

research and development for instance in the harvesting of timber stands that have less than five cords or have five cords per acre up to ten or twelve cords per acre, because with the present equipment we have available it is not really economical to harvest the stands that have less than twelve to fifteen cords per acre.

So we have to develop new technology and in order to do that we have to have close co-operation with the major operators. We do not feel that we will have any problem getting close co-operation with the federal government since they are already extensively involved in development of this kind.

Again to run back over just a few things, we could in the province sustain in perpetuity, that is on the island rather, an annual cut of 1.65 million cords plus the approximately 435,000 in Labrador, which is in excess of 2 million cords. If we were to clean out the over-mature stands in a period of 30 years it would be necessary to harvest approximately 2.4 million cords per year for a period of 30 years, but again I doubt that this will be done in the near future.

However, we can get at this over-mature timber and get it harvested as quickly as possible.

MR. NEARY: When I get that tape and I have heard it all on the radio and read it in the newspapers -

MR. MAYNARD: If the honourable gentleman does not want to listen to it, he does not have to.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. MAYNARD: That is why there has been so much silence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. MAYNARD: I did not start this, Mr. Speaker. It was the gentlemen on the other side. Does the honourable member want to come over and give the presentation?

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. MAYNARD: I appreciate that very much.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. MAYNARD: If somebody wrote it, Mr. Speaker, they forgot to put it together because I am going through piles of notes here. In any case I am not reading a speech, I think that that is unethical when you are introducing a bill of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, to go on with the techniques and the utilization of the forest, we have the potential, as has been shown by the inventory figures, for a vastly expanded sawmill industry in the province. In order to build up the sawmill industry, we are going to have to again use some new technology and to get the present operators of the sawmills using new techniques and new equipment. Right now in Newfoundland we have licenced more than 1,000 sawmills. Ninety per cent of the sawmills have an annual production of less than 50,000 board feet. They are very small, the push-pinch class.

Mr. Speaker, the total output from the 1,000 sawmills of this kind, the push-pinch mill, was less than 9,000,000 board feet in 1970. In 1971, it went down to less than 7,000,000 board feet.

They are not a serious drain on the timber resource. They are inefficient in terms of utilization of the raw materials. The lumber is quite often of low quality. In this day and age when we have to use CMHC standards in housebuilding and this sort of thing, we are going to have the lumber of higher quality. This is not, of course, the fault of the operator. It is the fault of the equipment that he is forced to use because of the low output per year. I think it is very essential that we work with these smaller operators; help them to acquire better equipment; help them out in management techniques; (this we will be able to do) find markets for their residue, pulp wood and this sort of thing, and possibly even find some way of debarking and chipping the residue that is left over from the saw log and from the pulpwood that is harvested.

Mr. Speaker, there is potential here. The various lending authorities, with the province, have to get involved. In some cases the Rural Development Authority will be able to get involved in new machinery or new sawmills. In other cases it will involve the Industrial Development Corporation or the Industrial Development Bank or some other lending agency. Certainly, the push-pinch sawmill will have to become more efficient because the same criteria over the next two or three years will be applied to every one and, therefore, we are going to have to work very closely with these people in order to get the efficiency from them.

There are some larger sawmills in the province. In 1971 there were ninety-six licenced that produced more than 50,000 board feet per year. These are generally known as the medium-size sawmills. Nineteen of them had a capacity in excess of 200,000 board feet but only three produced more than 1,250,000 board feet. A large sawmill is considered one that produces somewhere in the vicinity of 10,000,000 board feet per year. You can see that none of the ninety-six were in the large sawmill class. Although the product is better, the finished product is better, the method of

operation is not all that efficient. Here again we are going to have to work very closely with the various operators, the various sawmills, to try and make them more efficient and to try and get them to utilize more properly the resource that they have at hand.

I mentioned a few days ago that there were about seven areas around the island that could sustain fairly large sawmill operations. There is one area, Stephenville, and we feel there is a potential there for a complex with an output of ten million board feet per year. There is potential in Roddickton for approximately ten million board feet. There is potential in Harbour Deep on the famous "Mooney Block" which we are certainly going to try and get back on the rails again. We feel that Harbour Deep could support a sawmill in the vicinity of five million board feet per year. There is a block commonly known as the "Triton Block" which has potential for ten million board feet a year. In Hall's Bay, and Price Newfoundland at one time were considering setting up a sawmill in Hall's Bay. I am not sure what has happened to the plans as yet. There is potential there for perhaps up to twenty million board feet per year. On the Baie Verte Peninsula there is potential for another mill of up to five million board feet per year.

These mills together, if they were set up, and some of them are already underway, there are possibilities there of up to sixty-five million board feet of lumber per year which could reverse the situation we have now, where we import, I do not know what the exact figure is for 1973 but I would assume it is around sixty per cent of the lumber that we use. A few years ago it was seventy per cent. Now we can actually reverse that situation and our import of lumber should not be any more than perhaps fifteen per cent, twenty per cent at the most; because of the certain large deminisons which we cannot produce here in the province.

There is also a mill, as I stated before, underway or in the planning stages for the Bay D'Espoir Area. Here you would have somewhat of a departure from the conventional softwood lumber type mill where it would have to be an intergrated operation for hardwood and softwood. There is

a potential for hardwood/softwood combined in the Bay D'Espoir Area of perhaps ten million board feet per year, ten million to twelve million board feet, employing a fair number of people. We are doing everything we can to get that one off the ground.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MAYNARD: No. No, not in Spencer Lake, Sir.

These mills if they were to be set up and we have no reason to believe that somebody will not set them up once the timber is made available, these mills could employ quite a number of people and turning quite a bit in to the economy of the province.

There is also a fair amount of potential for secondary wood products other than the strict lumber type, hardboard lumber. We have potential for furniture components, various other things. We have potential for plywood or at least we think we have. The Finnish people have drawn up their "specs" a little bit too strictly. We are sure that they are not going to be able to get that kind of timber they asked for, for very long, anywhere in North America or in Northern Europe.

There is a fair amount of hardwood in the province that is suitable for veneer but it is scattered. In order to come up with the amount that was required for so-called test purposes there would have to be a considerable amount of high-grading done. However, the Finnish people are not the only ones that are looking at it, the North American plywood people are looking at it as well. We will be able to, I feel sure, get into the utilization of the hardwood resource within the next two or three years. (I think I have lost my notes).

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentlemen are tired they can go out and take a nap. That is what they usually do anyway.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MAYNARD: We did not get McLean to do it this time, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MAYNARD: I wonder what kind of noises do I hear from the other side of the House, Sir?



AN HON. MEMBER: .... apes.

MR. MAYNARD: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MAYNARD: It is the first time since I left school that I have been able to understand Darwin's theory.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: This is the biggest reform this crowd have brought in in two years.

MR. MAYNARD: This is the biggest reform, Mr. Speaker, that has been brought in in the last fifty years.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MAYNARD: Well I did not state anything about Confederation at all, Mr. Speaker, I said in the last fifty years. I do not think Confederation has been around that long. The honourable gentleman would not understand the principle so therefore he would not know whether I was speaking to it or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MAYNARD: However, I have been speaking about the resource -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MAYNARD: In any case we will get to the management of the resource if I can continue without interruption from the other side.

The management of resources, at least forest lands in all parts of Canada is the responsibility of the provincial governments with the exception of the Yukon and Northwest Territories which are federal territories, I suppose. But in any case it is there right to exercise the control of the forest. It has been done in most other areas of Canada. Any provinces of Canada that had not previously had legislation regarding forest policy have enacted legislation of various kinds over the past two or three years. I think Saskatchewan went a little bit further than we would like to go and did what is close to nationalization of the forest resource.

We looked at various ways whereby we could manage the resource. The simplest one I suppose would have been if the government controlled or owned all the forest resource in the province. However, that was discarded because it was an extremely expensive one. We could, and



government have the power to nationalize and not pay companies that hold the timber rights any money. But that would leave a bad taste I think in the mouths of the people who might be coming to the province in some future years to set up an industry. I do not think any government working under the Democratic system wants to nationalize.

There was one other method

which was considered and was considered over the past years and that was expropriation, which is close to nationalization. However, in expropriation, you have the factor that compensation has to be paid. You are subject to an arbitration board and if we take the value of timber as the stumpage value, which is approximately or averages at least two dollars per cord, and we have seventy million cords of timber in the Province, then we would be talking about \$140 million or \$150 million dollars. There is no way this Province could afford to expropriate. There is no way that we could afford to but back.

The only other avenue left open to us was to enact legislation that will give the Government the power to control, impose controls on the people who hold the timber resource under a license, lease or grant arrangement.

So, this is the step that we have taken. This is the bill that we place before the legislature and it is one step in the many that will be taken by this Government to control the natural resources of the Province. I will go through the bill. I will not go through it clause by clause, obviously but I will go through most of the principles of the bill.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MAYNARD: I hear some noises again, Mr. Speaker. Would you try to tell where they are coming from?

The bill sets out to define the management techniques to be used and the penalties, if you will, that will be available or the Government will be able to impose to make sure that the provisions of the bill are adhered to. The bill comes under two departments, for obvious reasons, the Department of Forestry, and the Department of Finance because of the taxation matter. It is not the intent of the bill nor was it the intent of government to enact a bill to raise revenue for the Province, as such. The bill will not raise any substantial amount of revenue and any revenue that is raised by the taxation method will not cover the costs of implementing the management techniques, unless, of course, the companies who hold timber on their license decide that they are not going to manage the land and then the revenue to the Province could become substantial.

However, I do not consider that that will be happening in the very near future. The Act applies to all land areas within the Province exceeding three hundred acres. Those are land areas that are described in any grant, lease, license, contract or any other arrangement. What the Act does not apply to, land areas within the limits, the boundaries of the cities, towns and communities in the Province. In other words, the Act will not apply to anything inside the boundary of the City of St. John's or the City of Corner Brook or the boundary of any other council, local government area in the Province.

If there are areas and there may be certain areas, small parcels of land that have been granted or leased, whatnot over the years, we can bring them all together into one management unit. We are looking at a management unit as being somewhere between three hundred and six hundred square miles. This will enable us to effectively carry out the management controls on an area by area basis.

Most of the management areas will be defined by geographic boundaries wherever possible. That is rivers, watersheds, lakeshores or whatever. The Province will be divided up into geographic areas, approximately nineteen on the company limits, and for each area there will be a comprehensive, detailed management plan worked out. These management plans will take into account all factors of the forest resource, the age of the timber, the annual allowable cut, the growth rate per cord, per acre, per year; the wildlife potential, the water power potential and many other factors.

We have at this time four persons who have visited various other provinces where similar management techniques are carried out, and are working on a manual which we will present to the operators. The manual will outline the procedures they are to follow when doing up a management plan for any one specific area.

Once the companies have completed their management plan for let us say, area "one", they will submit it to the department. Our people will scrutinize the plan very carefully and will quite likely go back and ask the companies to re-define their plan. In any case, once the plan has been

approved by the Lieutenant Governor in council, a certificate is issued to the company for that specific area, not for all the limits, not for their total limits in the Province but for one specific area. That certificate will be good as long as the companies carry out the techniques of utilization which are set out in the appendix to the management plan for the area.

The companies will be required to do the surveys and the cruises of their wood to determine how much is in each area. This will be done in conjunction with or under the supervision, if you will, scrutiny of the Forest Service staff.

Now, it is going to take perhaps three years, maybe a bit longer, to work out detailed management plans for all thirty-one of the various geographic areas in the Province. So, in the meantime, we can give the companies interim certificate to harvest wood off any area, providing they go by the annual allowable cut that we consider can be sustained in that particular area.

Let us assume there is a

geographic area where there is probably a potential of 100,000 cords per year annual allowable cut. The management plan is not worked out, it probably cannot be worked out for a period of one or two years for various reasons. Let us assume in one year we will be able to say to the companies; "Fine, we will give you an interim certificate providing you cut the annual allowable cut for that area this year." Once the details are worked out on paper, the details to be set out, and the regulations are worked out for the area, of course, we issue a proper certificate.

Now we have the assessor part of it. There will be a tax assessor set up in the Department of Finance who will handle all the tax assessments on various timber areas or various management areas. Tax will be assessed on the basis of management certificates being issued or not issued. If the companies fail to come up with a proper or an acceptable management plan, then we merely advise the assessor that the company has failed to come up with that and of course, the high level of taxation will apply.

If on the other hand the assessor is advised that the company has submitted an acceptable plan the assessor applies the tax on a minimal basis which we assume at this time will be somewhere in the vicinity of seven and a-half cents per acre or one per cent of the net present value of the annual allowable cut, whichever is the highest. In most cases, the seven and one-half cents per acre will apply.

The certificate, of course, can be cancelled at any time if the companies are not utilizing the resource properly. The certificate can be cancelled by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council, or the cabinet.

The management plans will be reviewed annually. A management plan can be set out for anywhere from five to twenty years but regardless, if they are reviewed annually, there will be a constant policing to make sure that the procedures set out in the plan are being followed at all times. If they are not being followed, then

you might say that the big stick is used.

There are various -

MR. NEARY: This government are noted for that.

MR. MAYNARD: At least we have the nerve, Mr. Speaker, to try to manage our resource. That is more than I can say for the gentleman that I heard speaking.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. MAYNARD: I suggested sometime ago, Mr. Speaker, that if the honourable gentleman did not want to listen he did not have to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Boring, tedious -

MR. MAYNARD: I assure, Mr. Speaker, I did not invite him into the House.

MR. NEARY: May we have a ruling, Mr. Speaker?

MR. MAYNARD: However, how many other parts of the bill are significant?

AN HON. MEMBER: Are we going to have a big bonfire? Put it all in, make a good bonfire while we are at it.

MR. MAYNARD: There are the usual provisions as far as assessment of the tax is concerned. In relation to the tax not being paid; if the tax is not paid the proper procedures are not followed and there are possibilities that the property, in this case the trees, will revert to the Crown. That is pretty well a standard provision.

That is the main principle of the bill. It is necessary for us to look at some other possible figures to substantiate the principle of the bill. We have here some figures relating to the resources that companies have and I find that over the last ten years; for instance, Bowaters have cut an average of 441,000 cords per year and Price have cut an average 327,000 cords per year. The annual allowable cut on Bowater's lands is estimated as 703,000, which leaves a surplus each year of 262,000 cords, Price, 599,000 cords annual allowable cut, which means that they have a surplus of 182,000 cords. With the small amount that is left on Reid holdings, we have had a surplus each year for the last ten years of 452,000 cords per year, just on the holdings of these three large companies alone.



Now then, in order to have a certificate of managed land supplied to them the companies are going to be required to cut the annual allowable cut. There are various ways that they can do this. They can cut the annual allowable cut, harvest it themselves and sell off the excess timber to other people. They can allow private operators or other operators or sawmill operators or whoever to go in and cut the amount up to the annual allowable cut or there is also the possibility that they may want to give some of the limits or assign some of the limits to other operators so that their annual allowable cut can be sustained.

In any case, they will not be allowed to leave a surplus of timber. There will be provisions and there have to be provisions for each of the companies to expand if they want to. There is a possibility that either or both of the companies may want to expand in the future. They do have the potential on their limits and if they want to expand, certainly the government would be only too willing to let them use the timber that is on their limits. Either one of them have plenty of potential. In the meantime, until they do expand they will be required to cut the amount that their timber limits can sustain.

Mr. Speaker, in order to carry out the various management policies it will be necessary for us to greatly expand the forest service of this province. Over the years there have been very few people employed in the forest service, the arm of the provincial government that looks after forestry. The forest service was mostly concerned with forest fire suppression, the staff, therefore, was very small. They were not too concerned nor there were no policies for them to be concerned with in regard to forest utilization. The Crown timber stands were not utilized any better, probably worse in some cases than the company stands. Now it is going to be necessary for us to take on many new staff. We are anticipating that we will need as many as ninety new positions this year. Some of these people, of course, are already on staff on a temporary basis but there are going to be a number of openings. If we are to enforce the management policy



certainly we have to have the people who are capable of doing it, who have the expertise to make sure that the management policies are carried out properly.

In the area of forest fire protection, this is going to become even more of a responsibility for the forest service now because we are assuming protection for all of the forest lands in the province. In this context we have to renew our present equipment, our radio systems and the water bomber-fleet. It is quite possible that we will have to purchase new water-bombers. It seems at the present time that we may be able to refurbish the Canso water-bombers, for perhaps two hundred dollars each

and give them a life span of another five to ten years. It may be the case where we will have to purchase the only other water bomber that is available, that is the Canadair model, which at the moment I think costs \$1,800,000 each and also costs \$1,000 an hour to operate. Let us hope if we buy them we will not have any fires. It is certainly very expensive.

We might say, or we could probably say that it is not necessary to keep a water bomber fleet on hand because it is only once every seven or eight or ten years when we have any major fires. Of course that is impossible for a water bomber fleet - if a fire started this summer, a major fire started this summer. We have to keep them on hand and we have to keep them available.

Newfoundland has been discussing with the other Atlantic Provinces the possibility of co-ordinating the efforts as far as forest fire suppression is concerned. However, the other provinces have pretty well said it: They do not need a water bomber fleet and therefore they are not too anxious to acquire new aircraft. Newfoundland is in a different position. We have very little chance of acquiring the use of Quebec's fleet of water bombers if they are necessary, whereas New Brunswick can, so therefore we have to have our own.

Over the next year we will either have to refurbish the Cansos which have given good service over the years or we will have to purchase new equipment which could be quite costly but not nearly as costly as if we should have a major fire and should not have any equipment to fight it with.

At the present time we are about to install a new modern VHF radio system for the whole province to assist in the communications network as far as the fire detection and suppression is concerned. This system is going to cost something in the vicinity of \$.5 million. The old HF system has been used for a number of years, has been outdated as well for a number of years and it is necessary to acquire a new, more reliable VHF system.

There are some statistics here regarding the number of acres

of productive forest lands that have been lost through fires over the years, which I will not bother to read but it is a substantial amount. The number, well I will give an example: In 1920 it was the year of major fires, there were some one million acres lost through forest fires. The worst year in recent history was 1960, when there was some 1,450,000 acres of productive forests land lost through fires. Last year was probably the best year in our history, very little significance in the way of fires, which is quite helpful. We were quite happy with it. But we do have to be prepared for the years which seem to fall into some sort of a cycle when fires are very major.

Now Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is much more to explain as far as the bill is concerned. I am sure that the other honourable gentlemen in the House will be asking many questions and will be making many statements and I will be doing my best to respond to them at the time. I have gone through I believe most of the details that can be gone through with the exception of a clause by clause analysis.

I submit, Mr. Speaker, that the bill is a good one. It is one of the major pieces of legislation that we have seen in this House of Assembly for many years. It is the start of this government's programme to take a more active participation or still more active participation in the management resources in total. We are quite happy that we have been able to come up with a new forest policy of this magnitude, of this type and we are certain that the forest policy as outlined will be of immense benefit to the province in years to come. Therefore, it is with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, that I move second reading of the bill.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, may I first of all, Sir, compliment Your Honour on the impartial and inspired way in which Your Honour has presided over the debate. I think the debate this afternoon, Sir, has been one of the quietest of a somewhat stormy session in the chamber.

MR. BARRY: That is because you were out of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh! I hear from the Minister of Energy, Mr. Speaker, If I were the Minister of Energy I would be hanging my head in shame, if the Premier of the province were off negotiating a major matter of energy and he had conspicuously and publicly humiliated me by leaving me behind.

MR. WM. ROWE: No confidence in the minister.

MR. ROBERTS: Obviously he has no confidence in the minister.

MR. WM. ROWE: None.

MR. ROBERTS: He goes off with the Chairman of the Power Commission, an official who reports to the minister and the minister is left behind. If I were the minister I would keep quiet and accept my subjugation or accept my humiliation and I certainly would not be interfering in the House, interrupting me. I was being mild and mellow and being, for me at least, very conciliatory, trying my best to be quiet and non-provocative and the honourable gentleman now, Sir, the honourable gentleman is setting out once again to make this House into a beer garden, a cock pit. Really, Sir, the honourable gentleman should be ashamed. If he is tender, Mr. Speaker, if he is tender because the Premier has left him behind then why take it out on me? Why does he not go and argue with his deputy minister or kick the door or take a long walk or a cold bath? Either of these might be acceptable ways, but Mr. Speaker, I stood up, I was merely complimenting Your Honour on the way in which the decorum of the House has been observed both when Your Honour was in the Chair and when Your Honour's predecessor Speaker was in the Chair, the member for Lewisporte, Mr. Speaker Russell, and the gentleman from Placentia West interrupts me, harasses me, tries to intimidate me -

MR. BARRY: I apologize.

MR. ROBERTS: There he goes again, Sir, all because the Premier has gone off to talk about energy and has taken with him the Chairman of the Power Commission and the Minister of Industrial Resources but

has not taken the Minister of Energy. I think the honourable gentleman should be ashamed of himself, humiliated in this way by the Premier. I must say if his intellectual mentor, the Minister of Finance, who has obviously found more important business this day than the House of Assembly, along with the Premier, the Minister without Portfolio -

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, this is not relevant to the bill which is under debate in this House right now and I think the honourable Leader of the Opposition should be asked to confine his remarks to the bill.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, this is directly relevant, I submit, to a bill, "An Act To Impose Varying Degrees Of Taxation In Respect Thereof." As I was saying, before the gentleman so rudely interrupted me, we have the junior division today. We have not even got the gentleman from Bonavista South. How low, how low have we fallen? All this started, Mr. Speaker, because I was merely complimenting Your Honour on being in the Chair, an honour, Sir, to this House, to the District of Fogo, an honour to the people of Newfoundland, Sir. There will be meetings tonight in Northeast Crouse in my constituency to pass resolutions. I expect at Fishot Islands, Sir, they will be having a resolution. This forestry bill means a lot to Fishot Islands, for the gentleman from Harbour Maine, because there is a tree on Fishot Islands. They found it, Mr. Speaker, they found the tree on Fishots Islands. It was three and a half feet high and there was a motion that it be cut down but it had been taken under advisement.

Now Mr. Speaker, and I compliment Your Honour, Sir, on the wise and impartial way in which the gentleman from Fogo carried on the debate. I welcome Your Honour back and I hope it was a good cigarette or whatever it was.

Now, Sir, to carry on with the bill, I listened to the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Where were you? Where were you?

MR. WM. ROWE: Be quiet.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the school-boy debater is at it again. Now we can do this debate one of two ways -

AN HON. MEMBER: Make your choice.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir, it is not for me to choose. I have a few things which I wish to say -

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell him to shut up. Tell him to be quiet now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Either I shall be allowed - Oh! Look who is in the front benches.

MR. EVANS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to be in the front benches if the gentleman from Burgeo is behind me.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!



Yesterday afternoon we saw a tragic example of honourable members interrupting and interjecting and I have no intention of putting up with that this afternoon. The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition is not being relevant to the principle of this bill. I trust that he will get on with the principle which was just introduced in second reading.

MR. ROBERTS: I am finding my way to the principle, Mr. Speaker, I was talking about the forest lands on Fischot Islands most recently. Your Honour was not in the Chair but Your Honour will understand that on Fischot Islands there is great concern about a forest policy. There is a tree - Fischot Islands is in my constituency, Sir, it took them a while but they found the tree. It is interesting to know it is going to be brought under proper management.

As I was saying, Sir, the gentlemen opposite can either allow me to say what I have to say without interruption or as Your Honour has so pertinently and so properly and appropriately reminded us that they can put on the sort of display that we saw from them yesterday. They can take their pick, Mr. Speaker. They can take their pick.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman for Placentia West is at it again. If he persists in interrupting me I shall be forced to deal with him, if he persists in ignoring Your Honour's rulings. Now let him be quite. As I was saying, Sir, if he is chagrined because the Premier has left him behind then let him, Mr. Speaker, go elsewhere.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. the Leader of the Opposition is not being relevant to the principle of the bill.

MR. ROBERTS: That is fine, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that and I shall try and be relevant but I trust Your Honour will not hesitate as Your Honour has not hesitated to draw to order the Member for Placentia West, who is trying to make his name by harassing me in these debates. That is all I ask from Your Honour the impartial protection from the Chair which we have enjoyed and which we shall continue to enjoy I am sure



as long as Your Honour is in the Chair.

Now, Sir, I listened to the speech of the gentleman for St. Barbe South, the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. I was not in the Chamber the full-time but I think it is well known that the proceedings of the House are carried on a limited broadcast network. The rooms on either side, the government common room, Your Honour's office, the Clerk's office, the Opposition common room, my office, the press gallery are wired for sound. So although I may not have had the pleasure of hearing the honourable gentleman while I could look at him, I certainly heard what he had to say.

Now that I have heard his speech, Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am disappointed. I am disappointed in the extreme. The government, Sir, have put forward the policy allegedly represents in this bill, Bill No. 20, as being a major policy, as being a major step forward. They have lashed out \$20,000 or \$30,000 or \$40,000 of the public's money in advertisements attempting to promote this bill. The newspapers are carrying full page advertisements, the radio and television stations are carrying the sibilant tones of the minister, being interviewed on the television in the equally sibilant tones of announcers on the radio. The government obviously feel this is a great step forward.

Indeed, Sir, I would go so far as to say that the government feel that this is the only major bill which they will be bring before this House in this session. A number of them have said that to me in one way and another, privately. A number of people have said so to some degree or another in various public ways. So we all looked forward with eager anticipation to the great forest policy announcement.

Last week the minister stood and read very badly a statement which had obviously been written for him by his officials.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentleman has a point of order let him raise it, if not, let him be quiet. I will teach the schoolboy debater yet.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Now go ahead.

MR. BARRY: If he wants me to raise it, if he does not have the courtesy to withdraw it. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition is out of order and is insinuating that somebody has written a speech of any honourable member of this House. I ask that the Hon. the Leader of the Opposition be asked to withdraw that line.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I said the Hon. the Minister of Forestry had read a statement which obviously was written for him. If the minister comes in and assures me that he wrote this document -

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, can we have a ruling on that point of order?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, could I speak to the point of order first?

MR. BARRY: Oh, is that what you are doing?

MR. ROBERTS: There is no citation, there is no reference and I submit, Sir, there is no authority for that statement at all. There is nothing in any authority for that statement at all. There is nothing in any authority that says that one must be the author of a statement. Indeed, I would venture to say, Mr. Speaker, if there were such a rule 98.6 per cent of what is said by any honourable gentleman opposite would be out of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, there is no authority for that statement at all. If Your Honour would like to make a ruling I should be happy to hear it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I cannot recall any standing order but if the Hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy can refer one to me I shall certainly be glad to take a look at it. To my knowledge the honourable member is not permitted to read a speech as such in this honourable House. But I do not recall reading anything about somebody else not being allowed to prepare a speech.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: So there is no point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, as I was saying before the schoolboy debater

was at it again, the Minister of Forestry read a statement obviously written for him by his officials, Sir. That is not an insult. I am paying the minister a compliment. I think the minister has more intelligence than to write this sort of thing, just as I feel sure that the statement which the Minister of Energy made at Ottawa was not written by him. My Lord, I have more respect for his intelligence than that!

The statement on forestry made by the minister gave us no information, Sir, any substance about the policy. You can read that statement one hundred times, all thirteen pages of it, and you come to nothing. It could have been written, Sir, by any forestry student in any forestry school in the world equally applicable to any part of the world. There is no indication here, Sir, there is no indication here of exactly what policy the government intend to adopt, to lay before the House or to ask the people to approve.

There are some figures cited, allegedly in respect to Newfoundland. The minister contradicted these figures in his speech today. He referred to Labrador as allegedly having annual allowable cut, an annual allowable cut of 513,000 cords, all species (that is found on the bottom of page eleven). Today in his speech he referred to an annual allowable cut in Labrador, 465,000 cords.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: 435,000 cords.

MR. ROBERTS: 435,000 cords. An error of 80,000 in round numbers, an error of approximately twenty or twenty-five per cent.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Not to mention ....

MR. ROBERTS: Now that in turn contrasts with the figure we have been repeatedly given by the Minister of Finance that the most wood that will ever come out of Labrador for linerboard in any year is 125,000 cords.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I did not say it was an allowable cut. The Minister of Justice inserted himself into the debate.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, I know the difference, if the minister does not, between allowable cut and economic cut. It is an important point and one which I hope to make because this statement and the minister's statement represent a misleading of the people of Newfoundland and these advertisements are misleading of the people of Newfoundland, by pretending that the annual allowable cut whatever it may be, in fact can be cut. Because, Mr. Speaker, there is a big difference between the annual allowable cut whatever it might be as determined by the forestry experts and the annual economically feasible cut. That is the difference, Mr. Speaker. That is the difference between night and day. That is the difference between a forestry policy that can work and this pile of jargon.

The minister, Mr. Speaker, made this statement, vague, general, lacking in specifics, and even the specifics that are in it were contradicted in some respects by the statement he made today. Then, Mr. Speaker, the minister distributes a bill. The bill is sent around on Tuesday or Wednesday. It is a very technical bill. Then the government rush it on to debate on Friday. Hardly much time, Your Honour, to study a bill this complicated and this important. The explanatory notes are even less explanatory than most explanatory notes.

MR. W. N. ROWE: It must be written by this PR firm.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, these were not written by a PR firm, these were written by a lawyer. I may say the lawyer who drafted this bill, Sir, is not obviously the lawyer who draft most of the government's bills because this is not a good piece of legislation technically. In fact it is a very offensive piece of legislation in its technical provision. We will come to them in due course but the Minister of Justice should be ashamed that a bill like this would come up to this House because it is

technically bad. It is offensive in the civil rights sense. We will deal with that in detail. It is sloppily worded. I have had it suggested to me by eminent lawyers that if this bill becomes law and anybody chooses to contest it, the litigation to interpret this could take years or require innumerable further amendments by this House. We have the statement; we have the bill; we have all the advertisements; the high-priced advertisements, slashing out the public money without tender, needless to say, using a Tory firm, McConnell and Eastman of Montreal, a well-known firm with strong connections with the Tory Party. It is obviously more of the patronage referred to by the Member for St. John's West, the Minister of Finance, in his remarks a week or two ago. All of those together, Sir, give this House no information nor give the people of Newfoundland any information. It was with great anticipation I listened today to the minister's speech. He stood, Sir, and he proceeded to read to us a very long and I submit a very boring speech. I do not mind that.

Mr. Speaker, what I do mind is that it was an uninformative speech. It had little substance. So, Sir, we are now at the position of having before us, for second reading, a bill that we are being asked to approve, to enact unto law certain very major powers to be given to the government. We do not know what they are going to use it for. We do not know what they intend to do with it. We do not know what they intend to do with the forestry policy. I think the first point which I should make is just that point that the minister has not given the people of Newfoundland any information. I will not say that there is a deliberate attempt to mislead because I do not believe there is. I think the people of Newfoundland are being misled. It has been put about that this bill will somehow introduce the new millennium, that instead of building a green and pleasant land, as William Blake said in that



great poem, we will somehow build a land of forestry, heavily treed. Sir, this bill will do nothing of the sort. The government's policy may or may not be a good policy. There is nobody in Newfoundland outside possibly a few members of the government who has any knowledge whether or not it is a good policy. Why? Because the government have not told anybody what their policy is. I think that that is shameful. I think it is wrong. I think it is against the public interest. I think the government should act immediately to set it straight.

Now, Mr. Speaker, nobody, nobody in this province could oppose a policy to enable us to get better utilization of our forests. Nobody, not even the worst fool, not even the gentleman from Trinity South could oppose that.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. REID: Do not get personal now.

AN HON. MEMBER: It takes a fool to know a fool.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so sensitive, boy.

MR. REID: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: As I was saying, Sir, not even the worst fool, not even the Member for Trinity South, if he be the worst fool in the province, and that is up to him to judge -

MR. REID: Better than a jackass.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would rather be the gentleman from Trinity South and be the worst fool than be some of his colleagues and be a jackass, sure. Mr. Speaker, not even the worst fool in this province could for one minute oppose any plan or policy to improve the utilization of our forests. I think anybody the



least bit familiar with the forest lands of this province, the forest resource, knows and grants readily that we must get better utilization. We are not getting full utilization now. We are not making the best possible economic use of our woods. If that is what the government are trying to do (They say that is what they are trying to do. They have not told us how they are trying to do it. There is no way anybody can judge) then more power to them. If that in fact is their policy I would support it. Mr. Speaker, they have made no such case. The simple assertions by the minister that such is the case will not suffice. Evidence must be needed. Proof must be brought forward. The people must be enabled to judge. Repetition of advertising, repetition of clichés on the radio that the forests are our heritage will not add to the public knowledge; will not strengthen the calibre of the debate; will not in anyway enable the people of Newfoundland to be better fitted to judge the soundness of the wisdom or otherwise of this policy.

The first point I make, Sir, is an appeal to the minister, to the government, to level with the people of Newfoundland to tell them what they plan to do and to tell them how they plan to do it and what they plan to achieve. I submit that nowhere in all of the expensive advertising; nowhere in the long winded, platitude-ridden statement the minister stumbled out with last week; nowhere in the speech he stumbled through today, has there been any quantum of information for the people of this province. I say to the minister, Mr. Speaker, that we on this side ask for this information. I say further, Mr. Speaker, that the minister does not provide this information, does not outline the policy in detail - I had hoped he would do it. I said nothing publicly, none of us have, Sir. We caucused on it, Sir, and decided to say nothing until the minister made his opening statement. I say to him, Sir, that if he does not provide this information,

(He has not as yet) then the people of Newfoundland will draw one of two conclusions, they must draw one of two conclusions. The conclusions are; either he does not have the information or that there is no policy in detail but that there are just a few, vague, windy platitudes which take their part along with all the other vague, windy, empty platitudes with which his administration are so enamored. Either the minister does not have it or he is ashamed to give it. He is hiding something. It is one or the other.

Never, Mr. Speaker, in the history of this House never to my knowledge has such an allegedly major policy been brought in and given so little explanation and giving so little information.

MR. WELLS: Would the honourable member permit a question?

MR. ROBERTS: A serious question, yes.

MR. CARTER: Is it the Leader of the Opposition's intention during this debate to suggest an alternative forestry plan?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh.

MR. CARTER: This is a serious question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. CARTER: It is a perfectly serious question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition did permit a question asked by the Hon. Member for St. John's North and there is no cause for other honourable members to interrupt.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I would say that if I had access to the data, if I had access to the Task Force Report, I would, of course, present an alternate plan. Indeed I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that even on access to what little data I have, which is all in the public realm, (I have access to no data other than that which is in the public realm) I would be prepared to present a better

forest plan that the minister has. I do have an alternative. I shall be moving a motion before I finish that I submit will enable us to test the government's policy. Maybe the government have a good policy, I do not know. That is my whole point. The gentleman from St. John's South, I submit, does not know. Certainly, if he knows it is because he has been told it in caucus. The people of Newfoundland do not know. Nobody knows. The minister's statement does not tell us. The bill itself does not tell us. The minister's speech an hour or so ago, whenever it was in this House, did not tell us. The advertisements did not tell us. We have seen an intensive public relations campaign, one that is trying to persuade people and convince them that something good is being done. Obviously the campaign is the act of a group of politically desperate men who will stop at nothing to try to spend public money to try and get themselves re-elected.

Even that campaign, Sir, gave no information. Is the advertisement in that paper there?

MR. W. ROWE: I will see if there is one here.

MR. ROBERTS: Let me read the advertisement in full, written so grandiloquently by somebody.

MR. WILSON: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, would the Hon Member for Port de Grave like to make a speech?

MR. WILSON: Carry on!

MR. ROBERTS: I am grateful to him, Sir, for giving me the right to carry on.

MR. WILSON: Carry on!

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe the people of Port de Grave are listening. I believe the people of Port de Grave have a message for the Hon. Member for Port de Grave and I believe he will get that message.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is not being relevant.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour: I hope Your Honour will not hesitate to call others to order.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall read the entire advertisement. It is from the "Daily News", St. John's, Newfoundland, February 22, 1974. There is a lovely picture of a tree there, a lovely picture.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Beautiful! Beautiful! A spruce tree.

MR. ROBERTS: It says our forests are our heritage. We hold them in trust and now we are beginning to know why the United States of America has adopted as its motto "In God We Trust". Proposed Forest Policy, 1974, and I am deadly serious, I think the Minister of Forestry has an obligation. I told him, Sir, two or three years ago, we were sitting outside the House as two friends, as two people who may disagree on politics but have a common interest in Newfoundland. I envied him, in a way, his appointment as Minister of Forestry because there was a great reform in this forestry field and I said to him that I thought it would be an achievement worthy of any man in public life, an achievement any man could be proud of, an achievement far greater than most men would ever achieve in public life if he could do something about the forest situation, and I say to him, Sir, that he has an obligation to the people of Newfoundland to explain this in detail, to give the people the information, not this sort of -

I do not think the Minister of Forestry wrote this, Sir. Indeed, he did not even sign his name to it. It is merely signed the Department of Forestry and Agriculture. It begins, "Proposed Forest Policy, 1974." "To achieve management control by the province of all our forest lands ..."\* The asterisk says, "Newfoundland Federal Provincial Task Force on Forestry Report" I shall come back to that. We are at the headline, Sir. It goes on. "Almost half of our forest lands are held under tenure by a few major operators who have acquired rights to cut our timber. Government now recognizes responsibility for total management of our forest industry to fully exploit the opportunity in increased product, new jobs, new technology and maximum development of our forests to the benefit of all Newfoundlanders." A laudible objective. Perhaps I am offended by the bad syntax and the bad grammar but I suppose a firm like McConnell Eastman could not be expected

to provide good English but a laudible objective.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: I say nothing about the minister going to high school or not. If the minister did not go to high school, I did not even know that. It has nothing to do with the minister. I made a point in saying I did not think the minister had written this. The minister seems to feel that the fact that he did not go to high school is relevant. Maybe it is the high school's loss the minister did not go to it. It is Newfoundland's loss that the minister did not get more education. Well, anyway, as I said, a laudible objective, Sir, a laudible objective.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, because the minister has an education and does not have common sense.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may carry on, Sir, if I may carry on, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Labrador West has the unfortunate habit of once in a while exposing himself and he should not, if I were him.

It goes on, Sir. "Government will introduce legislation whose objective is sound management of our forest resource in co-operation with the operating companies." Again, syntactically bad because that final clause could refer to legislation or it could refer to management but leaving that aside, a laudible statement of aim but no inspiration. It goes on, Sir, and still in the bold-faced type, "A task force consisting of federal and provincial officials with consultants drawn from related fields have studied the situation for the last eighteen months. There are recommendations in nine volumes; believed the most thorough study of its kind undertaken in Canada, providing the basis of the legislation."

Again the grammar is bad. Even in grade one we were taught that a plural subject "recommendations" requires a plural verb "provide". But leaving that aside, maybe I am the only one in Newfoundland who is at all offended by bad grammar in a publication, in an advertisement paid for by the public.



AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: A statement - how trivial can I get? Not as trivial as the member from Bonavista South.

The statement, Sir, the statement - there is no evidence to support it, so we shall accept it as an assertion, as an unsubstantiated statement, but as that it stands. It does not say who believed it to be the most thorough study of its kind undertaken in Canada. Possibly the minister believes it. Possibly the minister's stenographer believes it or possibly the minister's nephews believe it. I do not know who believes it. I have no way to believe it or disbelieve it. I have not seen the study. I am in the same position as all the people of Newfoundland and we only paid for it. We are yet to be allowed to see it, at least not until the bill is debated. We are not to be allowed to see the nine volumes. The minister has refused to lay them on the table of the House. We have all sorts of interesting things tabled. We have had Civil Service Commission annual report tabled and I must say if it like the previous reports of the Civil Service Commission, it can stay tabled. We do not get something as important or as significant as that document.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, we have the computer services and we get reams of regulations, all of which have been published in the Gazette anyway.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: We are getting yellow covers, so we can take home and commit to memory the hallowed words of the Hon. Gerald R. Ottenheimer, Minister of Education. We do not get the Task Force Report. The minister has said we will not get it. He has said we will only get a summary volume.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, that is all. Sure. Who makes the summary? I would like to see the nine volumes laid on that table.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the schoolboy debater -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance's intellectual camp follower is attempting to shine in the absence of his superior.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am quite willing - the honourable gentleman to a point of order -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On several occasions, the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy has, I feel, made comments which are not very necessary and I would request him perhaps not to do so again.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would it be in order to ask the minister to withdraw these statement, Your Honour?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I have no intention of asking the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy to retract any of his statements.

MR. ROBERTS: Sir, different from Your Honour's ruling: The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy just called me a brothel keeper. I submit that is not parliamentary. He should be asked to withdraw it, Sir.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, if it is unparliamentary, I withdraw it. Unfortunately, it is the provocative words of the Leader of the Opposition - I cannot stand the abuse that he is heaping upon me. I cannot stand it Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Could we have a ruling, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The language used by the Minister of Mines and Energy may be a little offensive to the honourable Leader of the Opposition but perhaps nothing more than offensive, not unparliamentary.

MR. ROBERTS: Fine, Sir. We can now add brothel keeper to the list of permitted words in this House.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I - but, the honourable gentleman, no, the honourable

gentleman said if they were unparliamentary he would withdraw them.

The Speaker says they may be offensive. All I can say is if the honourable gentleman has the guts to repeat them outside the House he can name his solicitor and I will leave it at that.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Obviously, he .... (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: No, I certainly should not. If the honourable gentleman, Mr. Speaker, has the guts to repeat that statement outside the House -

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

The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy and the honourable Leader of the Opposition are getting involved in a personal debate on certain issues and I suggest both of them get on with the business on hand.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman should listen and if he has any guts he will do the manly thing and name his solicitors, if not we will take him for what he is, a cowardly and base fellow.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, is that necessary?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, it is necessary. Mr. Speaker, if I may carry on as Your Honour has directed me to.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Never before, Sir, have nine, have nine managed to awe thirty-one in such a way.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: White face, turn red face, not one normal face over there.

MR. ROBERTS: I must say I had some respect for the Minister of Mines and Energy but it is gone.

Now, Sir, to carry on. We come down to the left hand column of this document. It says in bold type, "Present State of the Force", remember we have been given no information up until now. "The economies of

private industry have dictated the present state of the resource in Newfoundland." It is a statement, Sir, there is no evidence to support it. At best it is an argumentative argument and I submit the minister has not proven it. It may or may not be true but as a statement it is only an assertion. The economies of private industry may or may not have dictated the present state of the resources in Newfoundland. In some cases they obviously have and in other cases I submit they have not. It goes on; "About one-third of our softwood trees are being lost through over-maturity. (2) We still import more than seventy per cent of our lumber. (3) The new mill at Stephenville does not yet have

an adequate supply of wood. (4) In recent years low volume stands have been by-passed and high volume stands have been over cut.

(5) There is no positive planning with regard to reforestation."

Some of those statements, Sir, I think are correct, other are not.

In each case there is no information, there is no evidence, there is nothing except the statement.

It goes on in bold type again, large headline type, about twenty-four point, upper and lower, U and L, caps and lower, New Planning. "The province is to be divided into a number of management units. Each unit will require an operating plan to achieve its maximum potential. The operator will be required to manage accordingly and will be penalized if he fails to do so."

That is as close as they have come to a statement of policy but again, hardly any information, hardly any details. At best it is a very vague statement of aims, the sort of thing we saw in the ministerial statement but not the sort of thing, I submit, should be laid before the House when it is being asked to enact legislation such as that bill.

Now, developing hardwood industry. "Spruce and fir have been the basic crop trees in our industry. They are 'softwood' trees basically used for pulp and paper. The hardwoods, birch, have been neglected because of the lack of a market."

Again no evidence. I think the statement is correct but a significant statement, Sir. "They have been neglected because of the lack of a market." It seems like a fairly good reason to neglect them. Over in my friend's constituency on Bell Island there is a little bit of iron ore, several hundred million tons, deserted. Everybody knows it is there and it is not being mined. Why not? Because there is no market for it. Down in Labrador in a number of places, Sir, there are large occurrences, I understand of uranium or the ores in which uranium is found.

AN HON. MEMBER: Monkey Hill.

MR. ROBERTS: Monkey Hill and places like that. Again it is not being mined or developed. Why? Because of the lack of a market. In my own

constituency - in Canada Bay there is marble, lovely stuff, Sir, but it is not being mined nor quarried. Why? Because of the lack of a market. In Goose Cove there is a copper mine. In Goose Cove in White Bay North, the Minister of Mines did not know that, there is a copper mine, a copper deposit, it was mined briefly during the first World War, the gentlemen can look it up the reports are down there. It is not being mined now. Why? Because there is the lack of a market. We have oil on the West Coast of this Province, Sir, oil, black gold. The only thing is that there is not enough of it or that anybody has proven anyway to be economically feasible. We have coal in St. George's, we have salt south of St. George's, Hooker Chemical were working on that. We have resources all over this province, Sir, that we know about, we may have God knows what that we do not know about yet, that is not being developed because of the lack of a market.

That is a true statement that is made in this advertisement but it is a foolish statement. Until economics make it possible that hardwood will be undeveloped and will be neglected. Does that not stand to reason? What we want from the minister is some indication of the economics.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about our deep-water ports? They are undeveloped.

MR. ROBERTS: We have deep-water ports that are undeveloped. The statement goes on here; "Present day world markets present new opportunity in this area. We plan to develop this market and supply it and so the sawmill end of our industry will be developed accordingly. The veneer producing areas such as Scandanavia have already demonstrated their interest." That is what this thing says, Sir. That is what it says and the people of Newfoundland are graciously permitted to read this, by the government. The only problem is the Minister of Industrial Development, the other day in the House, was forced to admit that the Scandanavian interest is rapidly evaporating. It is coming out that Newfoundland has not the birch stands that are



needed to meet the needs, the requirements, the specifications of the people in Scandanavia, the veneer producing people.

In other words, Sir, the Minister of Industrial Development said - I venture to submit, Sir, there are twenty reports in this government's possession, in the files of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, investigating the birch industry and the hardwood industry all of them coming to the same reluctant conclusion, that we have the resource, we have millions of cords of birch in this province but nobody has ever found a large-scale commercial use for it. If the minister's policy is aimed at that, Sir, he owes it to the people of Newfoundland and to this House and to himself to explain it.

The Minister of Industrial Development made a lot of noise recently, I think it was probably during the Bay D' Esprit election, he made a lot of noise about it at the Hermitage District election,

in Bay D'Espoir about developing hardwoods. We were going to have 3,000 cords of wood(was it?) sent from the Springdale Area to Scandanavia and now it comes out that we do not have in Newfoundland birch of a sufficient size to make veneer. Hardly a new conclusion, I would submit that anybody in the forestry field would have come to essentially the same result some time ago, but it just shows that there are plans to develop the hardwood industry and I hope there are and I would like to see them, but certainly here in the minister's statement has not given us any such indication at all. So I say to the minister; are there any such indications? If so let us have them, if not I shall be forced to conclude that there are no such plans and that this whole statement represents an attempt to mislead. Two, four, six, eight, let us have a quorum call, Mr. Speaker, please.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir, I am grateful to know there is.

MR. WM. ROWE: They are so concerned.

MR. ROBERTS: It shows the concern of the gentlemen opposite that they cannot even stay in their - I noticed that one stayed, Sir, when the Minister of Forestry was speaking, that there were nine men on this side sitting in their chairs and I think eight on the other side. It just shows what little concern they really have.

I wonder if one of the pages could drop by and pick up the glass and get me a drop of water? Well, the member for Placentia East might do something that he has not done in the House yet, something useful, and get me a drop of water.

AN HON. MEMBER: The member might spike it.

MR. ROBERTS: The member might spike it. Look the other page is there staring out at the city, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, I dealt with the apparently - well I was going to say apparently specious, that is unfair, the unproven and possibly specious claims about developing the hardwood industry.

Now we come down to the next one -

"The environment: Art of total management" (it sounds like 1984) "the province recognizes that its new role in protecting the forest involves protection of the total environment. Affluent controls, controls of river driving, to protect our streams and rivers are a key part of the new plan."

I still wish the minister would have sent this over to somebody at the university in the English Department and said; "Look put it in English." It is inextricable, inextricable English. There is nothing, Sir, to give any information to the people. Affluent controls and controls of river driving aimed at protecting our streams and rivers have always been part of forestry practices in this province. They may or may not have been effective. You could make an argument there. For example you go up to the upper end of Deer Lake where Bowaters have been driving wood down through Deer Lake I suppose for forty or fifty years now, driving it down on the Grand Lake system and down that spillway across the Trans Canada Highway and into Deer Lake, just by the Hinton Bridge, by the power house bridge, leaving Deer Lake going down to Corner Brook, you look at the bark piled up there. And in river after river I understand, Sir, throughout our province, we have bark concentrations which poison the water. They, I understand, consume oxygen and they also release tannic acid into the water and both of these are undesirable effects and affect the water environment, the environment of the marine resources.

So obviously our controls in Newfoundland have not been affective but there is nothing to indicate here they are going to be any more affective. But maybe there is hope in the new thing, new technology. Government has alerted the private sector to new technology we

required for a low volume stand harvesting. What that means in English, in plain language, as I understand it, is simply that there are some new ideas for cutting wood and the government have said to industry, "Why do you not try them." They have done nothing to bring them into practice.

Existing machinery is geared to high volume stand. Technology must be developed to offset neglect of the low volume stand. Again, Sir, that is like saying that what a grand world it would be if the fish would all swim right in through the narrows and into the National Sea Plant.

AN HON. MEMBER: Jump into the boat.

MR. ROBERTS: Jump into the boat. No statement of policy there, at best a pious platitude, at best a hope.

It goes on: "Twelve per cent of our wood grows on slopes considered too steep to log." Says who? Considered by whom? Just to give a statement, Sir, no evidence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Obviously there is no evidence.

MR. W. N. ROWE: How about savoury, will savoury grow on a slope?

MR. ROBERTS: "We must experiment with systems to make this wood available." I am told, in British Columbia, I find it hard to believe but I am told by people who should know that in British Columbia they are using blimps, dirigibles.

MR. ROWE, W.N. No shortage of that.

MR. ROBERTS: I would suggest some gentlemen opposite who might wish to join in that effort.

MR. ROWE, W.N. Maybe McLean will do that job.

MR. ROBERTS: Now that is not fair now. It is not fair. I mean it is true but it is not fair. Blimps that just float along, Br-r-r-r!" Sort of fasten, and the tree is fasten on to the blimp and then it is carried on off to the mill or to an assembly point. The Minister of Social Services would be right at home.

MR. W. N. ROWE: He would be puffed up enough.

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe that is the sort of system they got in mind, I do not know. They have not told me. They have not told anybody else. Their expensive advertising does not tell us. Now where are we? Oh, yes! "Research has already created at least one viable system - " maybe that is the blimp. We must continue to seek the ideal technology. That is like the Holy Grail, Sir, Many have sought and none have found the ideal technology.

"The Department of Forestry already have in operation in Central Newfoundland a nursery for research and to grow seedlings for planting old burned cut-overs where necessary." Again, I cannot forebear from commenting on the inextricable grammar, it is a shame, on an advertisement paid for by the people of this province, cannot even be in the language of the people of this province.

But in any event, Sir, it is an interesting statement. Even if it is true it does not show how it is particularly relevant to this. Are we going to start planting on all of our burned - everytime I drive to Gander, you drive along the northside of Gander Lake, leaving Gambo Hill and coming up by Square Pond and coming on up to the northern side of Gander Lake to the southwestern end of that great body of water, and you drive through the burns. Your Honour has possibly driven through that stretch of the Trans-Canada, most members I guess have, or flying up to Gander or flying out to Wesleyville - huge areas of land that have been destroyed by fire. The minister mentioned the 1960 fires, That tragic summer when the fire that began in behind Rodney Pond I think it was but somewhere to the south of Gander Lake, burned north to the sea.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, I am sorry - the honourable

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well provided - go ahead how can I be that with such a -

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, does the Leader of the Opposition recall at the

time of those disasterous fires in 1960 and in 1961 which did lay waste to a great deal of Newfoundland that there was inadequate provision for forest firefighting. Was not that before the time of the water bombers?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not really recall, Sir, it was fourteen years ago - I was nineteen years of age. I know our water bomber fleet - Dr. Stuart Peters and Mr. Ed Ralph were the men directing the operation. I remember Dr. Peters moved up to Gander for three or four weeks, in the hotel, in their operational headquarters. I think the water bombers were in use in 1960 but I could be mistaken.

AN HON. MEMBER: I think it was the result of that fire -

MR. ROBERTS: Certainly the fire gave the impetus to it. We developed, subsequent to that perhaps, the best areial protection, fire protection service in North America.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well you know fourteen years ago, I rather thought they were in service but if they were not -

MR. W. N. ROWE: So what!

MR. ROBERTS: So what! In 1947 there was a fire began in behind Alexander Bay and burned right up, the time that Glóvertown was destroyed in 1947.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry? When was it?

AN HON. MEMBER: In 1945.

MR. ROBERTS: The Alexander Bay fire? 1947



MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman was older than I was in 1947, he should remember. Look, here is a fellow who lives down there. It was 1947, Sir. It was started by a railway spark, as I recall it. What do they call them? Flankers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hot boxes.

MR. ROBERTS: Hot boxes, was it? It was from a car on the train.

The point I was making were the 1960 fires - we did not seem to find out if the water bombers were in operation. I rather thought they were but I could be wrong. I certainly could be wrong on that. I have little expert knowledge of what passed in this province fourteen years ago - little expert knowledge. If Dr. Peters would remember - he is around. I ran into him at a cocktail party last night. Mr. Ed Ralph, I saw him coming in here in the House a week or so ago. They are both in St. John's, and both certainly very much compos mentis, as it were. I am very able to give testimony on the point.

Mr. Speaker, we have had bad fires in Newfoundland. I always wondered whether we could reseed them. I do not know the answer. I do not know the answer. The minister has not told us the answer. It is his job not to provide the answers. It is nonsense that the minister or I or anybody else could work out all this information. He should be able to say what the technologists tell him, what his expert advisers tell him. Let him table something. I know foresters who say that the best way to regrow a burned area is natural reforestation. I do not know if that is correct or not. One of the things that strikes me about the forestry world is the complete divergence of opinion, Mr. Speaker, on most of the major questions - clear cutting versus select cutting. I have almost seen forestry experts come to blows over that one. There are some men who swear that clear cutting, just levelling the ground - I can remember once (This will

please the gentleman from St. John's North) flying with Mr. Smallwood to Corner Brook and we flew directly across the Island which meant that we passed to the south of Buchans and over the large areas in that area that had been cut over by Bowaters, coming in on the Grand Lake Watershed and down into Deer Lake to the airport there. Mr. Smallwood was horror struck at seeing (we were flying fairly low, 1,000 to 1,500 feet, quite a clear day) the clear cutting. There was nothing below but scars, just the earth, everything, the underbrush plowed under. There was not a tree standing. I can remember him subsequently sending for Mr. Ralph who was chief forester at the time and asking: "Is this the sort of thing the company should be doing on their limits?" We were deeply into this forestry policy type of thing. He was being told that some people swear that it is, well qualified experts and other equally well qualified saying that it is suicide, that it is a rape of the forests. I do not know the answer. I do not pretend to know the answer. I think it is up to the minister to give us some guidance, to give us some information.

Anyway, it goes on, Sir, new employment: "Part of the findings of the Task Force is that there are at least seven locations for sawmills, employing about 500 workers in the woods and mills. Their findings indicate that for each new person working directly in the industry, at least two new supportive jobs are created: the man who drives the machines to move the wood and the man who delivers the fuel, etc..."

My first comment on that, Sir, applies equally to the minister's statement, is how things change. I can remember - I was in the House, Sir, as a member, four or five years ago, when the multiplier concept was first introduced in debate in this House and as always in those days the initiative was taken by Mr. Smallwood. I forget what the issue was that brought it up. It might have been

industrial incentive grants or it might have been anything. In any event he went on at some length about the multiplier concept. Honourable gentlemen who were then over here, who are now over there, some of them were consumed with scorn for this concept. "Thank God, he was coddling them." They thought he was making it up. They thought he was putting them on. They thought he was fooling them, trying to circumvent the point, trying to obfuscate the argument - possibly at times, Mr. Smallwood did all those things just as the present Premier, whenever he makes a statement, always does it. The difference between Mr. Smallwood and the present Premier is that Mr. Smallwood at least understood and nobody has ever accused our present Premier of being in that position.

Now we have exactly the same thing - I think the statement is correct. Indeed I would be surprised if the multiplier effect is as small as two. I would have thought that it would be higher, possibly as much as three to one or even four to one. In any event I have no quarrel with that statement. I find it interesting coming from the lips of a government, including in its ranks men who scorn.

Mr. Speaker, the vitriol that was poured on the chamber, why they had to replace the carpet. They had to replace it right here where the member for St. John's West walked back and forth and wore it out and they had to replace it in other places where vitriol was poured. Scorn came forth on the concept of the multiplier, the economic multiplier, the proposition that a basic job created would provide other work.

Do you want some interesting figures, Your Honour? This is in a magazine called "Canadian Business" January 1974. I am sure Your Honour reads it regularly, perhaps even religiously. You have to read this it has a picture of our Premier there. It points out that the percentage distribution of production in the main commodity producing sectors of the economy is roughly as follows; da-da da-da da-da da-da da-da da-da "Forestry two and one-half per cent." Mr. Speaker, the multiplier, they finally admitted it, finally recognized, good! The only problem is again, the minister has not told us what the seven locations are. He has mentioned Roëdickton, that is not new. Peter Gardner has been playing around down there for a couple of years. He was playing around - the minister mentioned that, I know - he was playing around while I was in the government. I have a great interest in the area because my constituents are affected. Mr. Gardner or Canada Bay Lumber Company are still playing around. Hopefully, they are coming to the point where they may soon cut a log or soon saw a log.

AN HON. MEMBER: How long are they playing around?

MR. CARTER: Shame!

MR. ROBERTS: Shame on them. Why?

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker -

MR. ROBERTS: No.

MR. CARTER: Would the honourable member permit a comment?

MR. ROBERTS: No. No. I would not permit a comment.

MR. CARTER: Permit a question then.

MR. ROBERTS: No. I -

MR. W.N. ROWE: Tell him to put it on the order paper.

MR. ROBERTS: Put it on the Order Paper, that is what I am told to do.

The point about the Roddickton-thing, I do not mean to make scorn of - and I was not making scorn of Mr. Gardner, estimable gentleman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is the honourable member aware of how much is going on down there?

MR. ROBERTS: I am aware of what the people of Roddickton know. I do not pretend to be aware of everything about Mr. Gardner.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you aware of the output?

MR. ROBERTS: Of the output? The honourable member means the outlay?

AN HON. MEMBER: The output.

MR. ROBERTS: The output? There is no lumber being sawn in Mr. Gardner's plant in Roddickton.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not the plant but there are private concessions.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh Sure! Concessions? Sure there are! Mr. Canning is cutting, Leander Feltham is cutting over in Main Brook, Jim Pushie is cutting and Malcolm Hodge is cutting, a number of people are cutting down there.

MR. W.N. ROWE: You are talking about Peter Gardner are you not?

MR. ROBERTS: I am talking about the Canada Bay Lumber Company which has built a large - I may be acting as agent - buying this lumber, I am told, for seventy-five dollars a thousand. Other dealers are paying one hundred and one hundred and twenty a thousand, a fact which I reported to my constituents so that they will at least know that they have a choice. Roddickton is not a new venture.

The minister mentioned as well, I believe, Gambo. Again that is not new. Lewis Griffith who has now sold to Mr. Osbourne, the so-called Rayo Company Limited, whatever the technical name is, Rayo operative part, they were there for three or four years.

Indeed, I can recall when we were the government, one hundred and twenty-six years ago, Sir, that we contributed to access roads in

that area.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Bonavista South will find out what access is the moment his constituents get at him.

MR. MORGAN: One road in ten years.

MR. ROBERTS: He will find out about egress as well as access.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please?

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is two of the seven. The minister has mentioned, I believe, Bay D'Espoir. We heard a lot about that during the election. In Hermitage District we heard a great deal about it but it has dropped since.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Not a word.

MR. ROBERTS: Like all the other things that were going to happen in Hermitage District. I would like to know what the other four are? Spencer Lake? All he has had is a round around from this government.

AN HON. MEMBER: Nobody was talking about Spencer Lake and Bay D'Espoir.

MR. ROBERTS: Who was not talking about Spencer Lake and Bay D'Espoir? The Premier was. That may be nobody but, I mean, it was the Premier.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Ah! The "P.C. Times." A laudable production, Sir. Great stuff. You Honour, I am sure it would have warmed the cockles of Your Honour's heart, or something.

MR. W.N. ROWE: It won the election for us.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it helped to win the election for us. Lovely blue stuff went out, there were four or five editions of it. They thought -

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. We have been listening to this kind of tripe for the last half hour. I will ask the Speaker now, to rule that the debate be relevant to the bill before the House of Assembly at the present time.

MR. ROBERTS: If I may speak to the point of order, Mr. Speaker? I submit that a comment on the proposal to build a forestry operation in Bay D'Espoir



reported, I had to report my source. Your Honour being a member of the Bar would of course not want to see a statement made without reference to the - and I am prepared to table it if need be. It is surely in order and I submit that I should be allowed to continue my few remarks without harassment by a gentleman trying to worm - well that is not parliamentary - worm his way into the cabinet.

MR. MORGAN: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker, I am not referring to the sawmill operations, I am referring to the colour of the P.C. times which I am sure is not relevant at all in this debate.

MR. SPEAKER (CAPT. WINSOR): Order please! The opposition will continue to bear in mind the rule of relevancy.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Your Honour. I shall of course attempt to continue and I shall not mention the P.C. times are blue. It was white too, with blue on white.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (CAPT. WINSOR): Order please!

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Black and blue.

MR. W. ROWE: Black and blue, muddy and everything else after the election.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, I invite the minister again on this part to give us an explanation. We have had none, had none at all. Again, Sir, he is telling us he has got a policy, he is asking us to give him a great vote of legislation, legislative authority, dictatorial authority, because that is what this bill confers, a Court of Star Chambers, inquisitors. I invite Your Honour's attention to the clause that says; "the assessor."

The board holds office at pleasure. We used to hear so much from the gentleman from St. John's West about; "Oh they must hold office at good behaviour." The board holds office at pleasure and in addition the Minister of Finance can replace any of them if he

wants to. Disgusting! Disgusting!

What about the assessor being given the power to examine persons under Oath at times and places designated by him, upon all matters pertaining to the duties imposed on the assessor? Dictatorial authority they want and the minister will not even tell us what they propose to do with it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Mr. Speaker, I am unable to understand the minister because I have only the same intelligence as most people in Newfoundland and they are unable to understand it too.

Now, Sir, I realize I have not reached the levels of the gentleman from Bonavista South, Sir, and I devoutly pray that I never do.

MR. WM. ROWE: You have not plumbed the depths yet.

MR. ROBERTS: The statement goes on, Sir, a little headline again, "The New Tax Level Proposed in Legislation quote," it does not say what it is quoting. It may be quoting the P.C. Times. I did not mention the colours, Sir. It is not quoting the Bible, the language is too bad for the King James version or any other. It may be quoting the minister. It may be quoting say the main news or perhaps the Newfoundland Herald Television guide. It may be quoting The New Liberal in which case it will be very good stuff.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: A what? The honourable gentleman cannot even get his abuse in order, Mr. Speaker, he is trying to say hammer and sickle. It is that sort of comment that got him flung out of the cabinet for incompetence.

MR. WM. ROWE: Is that our new flag, the hammer and the sickle?

MR. ROBERTS: "The provincial government should initiate action to acquire management control of any native forest lands by introducing a property tax system and where possible by renegotiating current tenure agreements. Such action will encourage limit holders to improve forest management and maximize utilization, discourage the holding of large forest areas in reserve and provide a wood supply for

potential users. The tax structure should include provisions for a levy to cover the cost of fire, insect and disease prevention."

I suspect that is the quotation from the Task Force Report. I would like to know. Maybe it is the minister's opinion, it could be, I do not know, Sir. But it is some kind of dishonesty to print a statement in quotation marks and not identify the source of the quotation. I suspect it is from the Task Force Report. It has that jargon ring about it, written by the people who write such reports.

The statement goes on; "The operating companies will pay one of two levels of tax, tax on management will be the lesser of the two, thus compelling these companies to adhere to government management plans." Again, Sir, a statement of air, a statement of what they are attempting to do but no information.

Now, Sir, I have taken a little while to read that but I want to be sure - the honourable gentlemen opposite might not be able to read.

AN HON. MEMBER: Let us have a quorum call.

MR. ROBERTS: Not a quorum again, quorum call please, Sir. It is Friday afternoon

that is why Bill Marshall is left, Frank Moores is left, Bill Doody is left, John Crosbie is left, Gerry Ottenheimer is left.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am relieved to know there is a quorum, Mr. Speaker. I congratulate the "whip" on his job. I think he is doing very well and I think that is splendid, simply splendid.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, I went through this statement, this advertisement. After all we are paying for it. We cannot afford to build houses for people who need them but we can afford to pay for that.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I simply want to hear the gentleman from Burgeo, Sir, it is such a treat to hear him. He brings such lucidity to the debates.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: What did he say?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What did he say? Are you asking me?

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know he said. Does he know what he said?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Winsor) Order, please! Order, please! ...(Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir.

MR. B. ROWE: Ask the Minister of Health if he understands?

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Health might know in his professional capacity about the member for Burgeo but that would be breaking professional confidence. I would not ask the Minister of Health to do that.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, I went through it at some length because this is the primary statement of the Government policy. I could go through and I would be delighted, if honourable gentlemen wish, to go through the thirteen pages delivered so badly by the minister, not written by him, I believe. I do not think for a moment he authored this document. Indeed, for his sake I hope he did not because it is really a very bad piece of stuff. I could go through that if the minister or any of the honourable gentlemen wish, piece

by piece, word by golden word but it would only be to the same effect. It would be that this policy has not been explained to the people of Newfoundland in any detail.

Now, Sir, that is important. That is very important and I put it to the minister that he has an obligation to this Province, to this Province to explain his policy and I call on him to do it before this Bill is put to the vote. Indeed, Sir, I shall in due course move an amendment, I am not yet moving it, Your Honour, but in due course I shall move an amendment to refer this Bill to a select committee so the minister can appear before it and give us some information and so that unions can appear before it and the men who operate sawmills can appear before it and the loggers can appear before it and the companies can appear before it and anybody who has anything to contribute can appear before it, the contractors and everybody else. We are being asked to rush through a policy that I submit has not been thought out, that I submit has not got any relevant information. The minister has refused to produce this report. He says he will table it when it is printed, the summary, but there is no sign of it and now this Bill is being rushed through the House, pushed through. They would like to have the debate over, I am sure before the document is tabled. Why? What are they hiding?

They have not given the report to the companies who have a vital interest in it. They have not given it to anybody, the unions, the men who make their living in our woods do not have that report. Who is to say, Sir, what that report recommends? I say, Sir, that the minister must produce that report now and let members study it. If not, Sir, I say that his motives are suspect. I say that people will draw the conclusion that he has something to hide.

Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. We are talking about a major resource. We are being asked to talk about it without having any information. Your Honour, I submit, Sir, has no real information on this. Your Honour must trust to what Your Honour gleaned over the years and I venture to suggest that Your Honour's professional life has not often lead one into the

February 22, 1974.

. Tape 416

RH - 3

woods. It may have lead Your Honour up some garden paths but I do not think into the woods. Other than that, Your Honour must



rely upon the trust, upon trust of the minister and I am not prepared to trust him. I do not distrust him but I am not prepared on a matter of this gravity to take the minister's word unsupported. I know he has some evidence and he is refusing to produce it. He has had this report, Sir, since 31 March, 1973. That is eleven months. They may say it is a secret document. The school boy debater feels that it is an internal document.

MR. W. ROWE: The minister said that he would table it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: That is not abuse. I can give the honourable gentleman at least the credit of calling him a debater. That is more than most of his colleagues. I submit, Sir, that even if it is an internal document that can be tabled. There are no rules or laws saying it cannot. Furthermore it is the government who have time and time again dragged out this report as being their alleged evidence. Well I say let them produce the evidence. If not, what are they hiding? Are the figures in this statement, the figures which the minister differed with today? What are the true figures? What does the report say? Furthermore, Sir, even if the figures are as outlined in here I do not believe for a moment the minister would be so foolish or so dastardly as to misrepresent a report knowing at some point it will become public because it shall. But, Sir, on what basis were those figures computed? That is an important question.

Mr. Speaker, it is all very well for the minister to stand and say that the annual allowable cut in Newfoundland on this island is 1.9 million cords of one. I will assume for the basis of this I will grant him that that figure is in the Task Force Report. I do not think he would alter it. He is not that foolish; he is not that dastardly.

I submit, Sir, that the basis on which that figure is computed should be made known and should be tested. I do not care whether the figures are correct or not. I would hate to see us rely on a figure that is proven to be incorrect. Mr. Speaker, the whole heart, pith and substance of whatever policy the government are working towards is based on annual allowable cut. I would think that the minister would agree with that. That is the key figure, the annual allowable cut. That is the crucial question. That is the point which must be determined. That is the point which the minister's officials will look to when they come to decide whether a management plan submitted under this bill is an adequate and proper one or not. What is the estimated annual allowable cut? I say, Mr. Speaker, the figures -

MR. BARRY: Does this have anything to do with the principle of the bill?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes it has everything to do with the principle of this bill because this, Mr. Speaker, is a bill respecting or to bring certain forest lands under proper management. It has everything to do with it.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir, it has everything to do with it. Let the school-boy debater go back to debating - resolved that this House stands for free trade or whatever they are debating in the school-boy leagues. I say, Sir, that the annual allowable cut, that figure is the heart, pith and substance of the government's forest policy. That is the key, the crucial, the important matter. I invite the minister who is not in the House to come back in. He is within sound of my voice, I have no doubt. If I am wrong on that, to stand and say I am wrong. I will yield the floor to him for that purpose. I do not invite the Minister of Energy because he does not even know anything about energy, let alone about this.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, this bill is an act to impose - the minister has not even read the title - it says; and to impose varying degrees of taxation in respect thereof - the rest of it is period.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Passed second reading.

Mr, Speaker, the hon. gentleman is really trying too hard. He has been very trying. Now I for one am quite willing to put up with him but if he cannot make points of substance - he is not a man of any integrity and we have proven that in this House today. He is a man of no courage, no integrity and I should say little intellectual honesty -

MR. BARRY: Getting personal.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not getting personal. I am merely describing the gentleman's public statements.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition should continue.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. I would like to continue if Your Honour would be good enough to ensure, as Your Honour is, that the rules of the House continue to be applied not just against me but for me, where applicable.

As I was saying, Sir, before the school-boy debate went at it -

MR. W. ROWE: He is smartening under the insults.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I am not getting nasty. He is only giving me fuel to carry on.

AN HON. MEMBER: Born nasty!

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I agree the minister was born nasty but I was not going to say that

the gentleman from Burgeo had not. Mr. Speaker, the whole heart and pith and substance of this policy is annual allowable cut. The point I was making before the minister tried to harass me, throw me off track, is worth making. I realize that the gentleman from Trinity South would not know about it because there is not conflict of interest involved in it but he will find a way. If any man can, he will.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How do you know there is not?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I do not but I am willing to bet that if there is a way, the gentleman will know about it and find out about it and act upon it. Yes, I can guarantee he will. I can guarantee a lot about him.

MR. HICKEY: Cannot stand competition.

MR. ROBERTS: One of the more interesting royal commissions is going to be the one into him.

MR. MORGAN: Make some more charges now, personal charges.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, make some more.

MR. ROBERTS: Sure. Want me to tell them about Bill Saunders and personal charges? Now, Sir, of course I will attack the minister's policy and the minister's public actions.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may carry on, Sir, if I may carry on. The Minister of Health is being tender again on something. I do not know what. Mr. Speaker, can I carry on without the Minister of Health getting agitated? Well, I do not know why he is getting agitated. Why is the Minister of Health getting agitated? Is he not well? Do I have the floor or not, Sir?

DR. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The member for Bell Island indicates that I am implicated in the Saunders affair. I would like for him to substantiate the charge.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, all I said was that every time Saunder's name is mentioned in this House, the minister gets agitated about it.

DR. ROWE: That is not true.

MR. ROBERTS: Is there a ruling Your Honour wishes to make or may I carry on? I did nothing to the Minister of Health. He is over there jumping up and down. That is his problem.

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. AYLWARD): The Minister of Health has said that the honourable member for Bell Island had made reference that he was implicated in the Saunders case. Did I understand the honourable member for Bell Island to say he did not say that?

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. AYLWARD): Does that answer your question? Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition will continue.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to. I have been trying for five minutes to make one simple point.

MR. SPEAKER: (MR. AYLWARD): With reference to the annual cut.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. Your Honour may stay on in the Chair. Bingo! Of course he can. I have no problem saying it. It is making the honourable gentlemen opposite understand it.

Ah, the minister is back. Now, I said in the minister's absence that the concept of the annual allowable cut is at the very heart, the very pith and substance - and I am not lisping - the very pith and substance of the -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course I am. I would rather lose my shirt honestly than the way the gentleman from Trinity South loses his.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the point I am trying to make -

MR. MORGAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable Leader of the Opposition on two occasions this afternoon has cast inferences in the direction of the honourable Minister of Rural Development, that

he is somehow doing something that is not above board. If the honourable Leader of the Opposition feels that the honourable minister is doing something that is not legal, that is corrupt or of that nature, let him make the charge in the House of Assembly this afternoon. If not, stop casting those inferences in the future.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order all I say is that I made no charges but I do say, *Honi soit qui mal y pense* which - look, the gentleman from Trinity South, if he has nothing to say, could keep quite. I said, *honi soit qui mal y pense* which means, evil be to him who evil thinks. If the gentleman from Bonavista South feel I made a charge, let him say what the charge was.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! Again the remarks made by the honourable Leader of the Opposition may have been offensive to the honourable Minister of Rural Development but it is a matter of opinion between the honourable minister and the Leader of the Opposition and not a point of order.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, as I was saying, the concept of annual allowable cut is at the very heart of this whole concept. I was about to invite the Minister of Forestry that if I am wrong, if my thinking is off base on this, please to tell me so because my whole approach - I have taken advise as wisely as I could and from a wide variety - quite a catholic with a small c - variety of people interested in the forestry and wood field. The concept of the annual allowable cut is the key concept when we come to talk of forest management policies. The idea is to determine what the annual allowable cut is and then to say, all right, you must cut that much wood. If you do not, we will tax you at one level and if you do, we will tax you at a different level. Am I correct? Is that - you know, I am explaining the policy better than the minister did but is that not it?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It has been explained over and over again.



MR. ROBERTS: Well, the minister may have explained it but nobody has understood it. We have graveled our way through. Now, Sir, that being so

I think it is all the more important that the minister produce the Task Force Report and allow the bill to be referred to a select committee. Because, Sir, because the annual allowable cut - we have the figures and I am willing to believe the other figures in the report but that is not the question, Sir. The question is how are those figures computed? I say to the minister, Sir, that there are forestry experts in this province who challenge these figures, who say they are not correct. Now I do not know if they are right or if they are wrong. How do I know? How do I know?

They are reputable men, Sir, who say that the task force can have no way to know with this sort of precision. I do not know if that is right or wrong, Sir. I think the minister should at least explain the methodology adopted by his officials. The way to explain that, Sir, is by producing the report, letting people look at it, letting the loggers unions look at it and letting the contractors look at it and letting the companies look at it and letting the sawmill operators - all the people with knowledge in this field look at it. Then let us see. I do not pretend to be a forester. I do not know but there are people who do and the minister has not given us any evidence. He has brought in the report but he has not brought in any evidence and he will not allow his witnesses to be heard or to be cross-examined. The very basic principles evolved over a thousand years of jurisprudence - the test, the truth and accuracy of statements the government have not -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable schoolboy debater is at it again. Let him go back to learning more about the brothels he informed me about yesterday.

Now, Sir,

AN HON. MEMBER: That is scandalous.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir, it is not scandalous, truth is a defence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The whole point -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: The whole point of what I am saying is that the heart of this policy, the policy which this bill allegedly will implement or give the government authority to implement, the policy has not been explained but the heart of it is annual allowable cut and the method by which that has been achieved has not been explained. The minister who has had four opportunities, four, Sir, five, he has had his statement in the House, he has had his press conference thereafter, he has had his newspaper advertisements, he has had his speech on the bill. All of these opportunities, Sir, could explain how that concept was arrived at and he has not done it. Why?

Does he feel that the people of Newfoundland do not deserve to know? Does he feel that his methodology or the methodology adopted by his officials is not good enough? He has brought in, Sir, a verdict in his trial but, Sir, he has not given the evidence, he has not given the companies the report. The companies sat and listened to the minister and the Premier and other honourable gentlemen for three hours. The methodology was not explained in any detail, I understand, I was not there. A curious meeting, Sir. No reference throughout the meeting of the Linerboard Mill. No reference to what is one of the major reasons the government are acting on that. Mr. Speaker, not a word, not a word.

So I say to the minister again, Sir, that for that reason too, for the reason of the necessity to test the methods by which the annual allowable cut is to be assessed for that reason too, the minister must produce that report before this bill is discussed further in this House.

Now, Sir, I said the bill is being pushed with indecent haste and I think it is. The minister has not given us any reason for the haste. It is the government's prerogative to call business in order

on every day except Wednesday. Then it is set by the Order Paper, by the private members motion. The minister has not told us why it must come on now. He said in the House, Sir, and twice in this session, they are both recorded in Hansard except one night, no, here they are, that the Task Force report at least a summary volume would be out by the end of February, page 857, page 764 of Hansard. They are trying to get the printing done.

Now, Sir, there is no particular urgency on this Bill. It does not have to go through today or tomorrow or next week. We will deal with it in this session and I venture to say, Mr. Speaker, this session will go on for a few days yet. We have not even seen the budget. We have not seen any legislation. There may be little to come but we have not even seen that. There is nothing on the Order Paper, other than this Bill, of any substance. So, why not produce the report. Let the bill stand over. I will adjourn the debate in seven or eight minutes. Let the Bill stand over and then let the minister produce the report. I realize it has to be printed and I realize that that takes time and then let the Government refer it to a committee, Sir. This is the Government that used to talk so much. Oh, the House Leader, that noble gentleman, used to go on at such length about committees and indeed, Sir, there is standing on the Order Paper in the House Leader's name, the Government House Leader's name, a motion to amend standing orders. One of the orders to be changed would set up a committee to be called a "Resources Committee". Now, if this is the Government's policy and I happen to think that is a wise policy, then let them set up a committee to deal with this.

What are they hiding? Anything or nothing? Why will they not produce their evidence? What are they afraid of? They bring in a bill and ask for sweeping powers, Sir, sweeping powers, maybe justifiably, maybe not. Mr. Speaker, I submit that nobody in this House knows whether those powers are justified or not. I submit that nobody in this House knows whether

this policy is right. We do not know and nobody in Newfoundland knows except the minister, perhaps the cabinet and the favourite few who have had access to that report. The minister has consistently up until the past week or two refused to make it public. He refused. Then he began to see the errors of his ways. So I say to him now, tell us, I will yield the floor for that purpose at any point. Tell us if the report will be made public that the debate will be adjourned until the report is made public and until people have an opportunity to study it and that the bill will be referred to a committee and that people may come in.

If it is a major bill, as they say it is, if it is a government bill, if it is one that they believe in and if the policy is sound, surely it will be to their advantage to put it to the test.

MR. ROWE, W.N.: Sweeping powers, make regulations.

MR. ROBERTS: Sweeping powers, make regulations. Confiscatory powers without compensation, without recourse, a board set up that would make the Court of Star Chamber look like Democracy in action - a board.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: On a point of law only.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: This great Minister of Justice who used to talk so eloquently -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: So eloquently about appeals from the Workmen's Compensation Board and so rightly - had draft a bill with a board where appeals are denied.

Now there are precedents for the suggestion I made, Sir. A few years ago, eight or nine or ten or eleven years before I was a member of the House there was a great question in Newfoundland about whether or not the island would all go on sixty-cycle power, large parts of the island, roughly the area west of Buchans were served with fifty-cycle power, the power generated by the Bowater Power Company at Deer Lake that is the power cycle, Sir, that the mill in Corner Brook still operates on to this day, fifty-cycle power.

Now, Sir, when that question came up, a great policy question, the government of the day, Mr. Smallwood as Premier, set up a select committee of the House. The meetings were held here in the Chamber, witnesses came, presented their views, experts came and presented their views -- the matter was debated at some length and at end as I recall it, Sir, unanimity was achieved and all agreed that we should have sixty-cycle power throughout Newfoundland and that is what we have. The Atlantic Development Board put in a lot of money. Other people put in a lot of money. Why not do that here? Why not? Is there any reason why not?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please!

I am sure that the Hon. Member for White Bay South is aware that when he speaks, if he is in order, he should speak from his proper place.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, the government have not given us any reasons. All their expensive flakery in the media, their attempt to try to fool the people of Newfoundland -- coming from a crowd who believe that the reason they lost in Hermitage was because they did not get their message through. The reason they lost, Sir, was they did get their message through. All of that, Sir, they have given no explanation. They have given no definitions. They have given no information. It is a shameful display. The schoolboy debater should be ashamed of himself for being part of the government that does this. I expected better from the Minister of Finance. I did not expect better from the gentleman from Burgeo. I confess that, Sir. I expect nothing from him except ill manners and ignorance. That is all we have seen.

MR. EVANS: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I submit, Sir, that the government have not worked out detailed plans. I submit that there is no detailed policy. I submit, Sir, that the minister's statements represent a fraud because there is



Because there is no such policy.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, let me read a letter written to me. "We have now been advised by officials of the Ministry of Transport that they have discussed the matter of an overall pulp wood shipment plan with officials of the Newfoundland Government on several occasions.

"However, they further state that the Province of Newfoundland has not provided them with any final details and until they do so it will not be possible to assess the need for the construction of any new wharves or the improvement of any wharf facilities for a shipment of pulp wood.

"Departmental officials will be pleased to give further consideration to the request of wharf improvements at" --- "as soon as the province provides the basic planning information such as; volumes of wood to be cut in particular areas; sustainable yield of wood; the type and size of ship to be used etc.

"In the meantime, your continuing interest in this matter is appreciated. I wish to thank you for bringing it to my attention."

Now, Sir, who wrote that letter? Somebody with no notion, I suppose, no idea of what is happening. No, Sir, that letter was written by the Minister of Public Works for Canada, the Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shame! Shame!

MR. ROBERTS: But when was it written, it must be back in Liberal days, I mean after all, no possible information, no supply of details. That must have been at least five years ago, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: When was it written? It must have been at least five years ago, The gentleman for Trinity South asked why I did not get it approved? Well I will tell you why I did not get it approved, Sir, the letter was dated December 20, 1973, two months ago. It was written to me by the Minister of Public Works of Canada, the Hon. Jean-Eudes Dubé and it shows - I wrote to him because I was interested in Main Brook in my constituency, a community that thank heavens Bowaters are going back into this year, to cut 40,000 to 45,000 cords and chip them.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Is the honourable Leader going to move that amendment today or wait until tomorrow?

MR. ROBERTS: I will move the amendment - I mean I shall be moving the amendment, the press can use - like I will be moving the amendment.

but I am not going to move it today. In a minute -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Why, of course they are gone. They are gone out to report the scandalous attempt by the government to defraud the people of Newfoundland.

Your Honour, if nobody on the other side moves it is six o'clock, we will come back at eight. I assume that is not their plan. I move the debate do now adjourn in that case, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition has moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until Monday next at three of the clock and the House do now stand adjourned.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Monday at three of the clock, February 25, 1974.