

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, APRIL 29, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I have today filed with the Resource Policy Committee on the Estimates a copy of the two letters concerning offshore ownership which passed between our Province and the federal government in 1974 and 1975. These letters followed several years of fruitless negotiations.

I have asked the Clerk to distribute copies of these letters to all hon. members. And you will notice in the letter from the Government of Newfoundland that we requested, at that time as a basis for negotiation, federal acceptance of our right to have a substantial degree of control over offshore petroleum activities.

The federal government in its response was not prepared to accept this pre-condition for further negotiations and took the position that the matter should be referred to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Our government, as you know, has since continued to assert our ownership of offshore resources and the right of control which flows from such ownership.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have taken the opportunity of filing these documents at this time because of the confusion which has been created by the assertions of members opposite that there is no real difference between their position and the government's position or between the government's position and the position taken by the federal government in Ottawa. I would just like to refer you, Mr. Speaker, briefly to the letter sent by the Government of Newfoundland where it asks whether the federal government will agree to the Province having a substantial degree of control, and the response written by the then Minister of Energy, Mines and

MR. L. BARRY:

Resources, Mr. Donald MacDonald,

where it is stated that they have reviewed our position referred to in the letter and say, "This review has demonstrated that substantial differences exist between our respective positions on ownership and jurisdiction."

So, Mr. Speaker, I would say that out of the documented evidence filed here today you will see as a matter of record that the federal government acknowledges that there is a substantial difference between the provincial position and their position. And I might note that this exchange of correspondence took place following meetings between myself, the hon. John Crosbie, the hon. Donald MacDonald and the present Leader of the Opposition, who was then a member of the federal Cabinet. And the first letter by us refers to the fact that this Fall discussions that were held

MR. L. BARRY: with the present Leader of the Opposition and Mr. MacDonald, so that the hon. member opposite should have had available the clear position of this government on the question of offshore ownership and jurisdiction and it should be clear to him that there was, when he was a member of the Federal Cabinet, a substantial difference between our position and that accepted by the Federal Government. And really what the people of this Province now want to know is whether there still exists that substantial difference of opinion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I ask that the Clerk arrange to have copies of this distributed to hon. members.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to abuse the rules of the House, as I suggest the hon. minister has, by entering into debate. It is not even a Ministerial Statement, I suggest to you, Sir, it is a tabling of a document. Furthermore, it was an ad lib statement which I did not have the opportunity to examine ahead of time. It is interesting that on this particular occasion, when it suits the hon. member's purpose, he is quite prepared to accept some of the acts of the previous administration. On a great many other occasions the previous administration and what it was prepared to do or did do, is anathema to hon. members opposite.

I, therefore, say simply, Sir, that I suggest to the hon. member once again that I quite sincerely believe that it would be far better to discuss this whole issue in what I am quite prepared also to say would be a non-partisan way. And I think also that if documents of this kind are to be tabled, that is, a partial record then I think also that it would be appropriate for this House and for the people of Newfoundland to see what happened in subsequent years, particularly as it relates to the planning for and the build-up to

MR. D. JAMIESON: the Federal - Provincial Conference on the constitution and also many of the documents which were discussed among the officials and some of the agreements that were actually reached. I am aware, as the hon. member knows, that these documents exist. I will show them to him privately if he so desires. But, in any event, Mr. Speaker, I do not think that this is the appropriate time for me to say anything other than that we will take a look at these documents now that we have them.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: I have a question for the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins). Can the minister indicate anything further with regard to the unfortunate confusion that continues to exist surrounding the Come by Chance oil refinery? I ask him the initial question; I may have a supplementary for the Minister for the Minister of Mines and Energy (L. Barry). But we have seen now two or three different statements, one indicating that the chances are minimal that Petro-Canada will be interested in this facility; others, from the minister, I believe, giving a more optimistic outlook; could he please give us an up-to-date assessment or an up-to-date report on what is happening with regard to the Petro-Canada involvement?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the last time I had a conversation with the President of Petro-Canada, which was approximately ten days ago,

DR. J. COLLINS:

I believe, he told me that they just about had their team of experts in place at that time and this team of experts had been gathered together from across Canada and, I think, to some extent down in the United. It was necessary to do that because these people had to have a lot of familiarity with the intricate details of the technicalities of a refinery and especially in view of the fact that there have not been that number of refineries that have been mothballed for this length of time, certainly at tide-water where the possibility of deterioration from salt water spray and so on and so forth may be more serious than, say, inland mothballing, so this team of experts have to be very carefully put together. But at that time my understanding was that that team had just about been put together and that the first members of that team were about to visit the refinery.

Subsequent to that, a short while later, I had some conversations with some of the people in the refinery area and they indeed told me that there had been some individuals go there and I think these were the same individuals, the individuals they were referring to were the vanguard, shall we say, of this team of experts.

So from that I think one can say that the first phase of the inspection has begun and I have no further information since that time nor would I expect any at this stage. I would expect that a report, and this would presumably be just an initial or interim report, would now take a matter of a number of weeks. And that report presumably in the first instance would go to Petro-Canada and they have undertaken in the letter of agreement with us that any such information will then be sent down to the co-ordinating committee which is set up between the Government of Newfoundland and Petro-Canada so that each side is fully informed as to the sequence of events.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

Very specifically, have Petro-Canada, in fact, informed the minister or any of his associates that the likelihood of their acquiring the facility or putting it back into operation is, in fact, about 30 per cent positive as opposed to 70 per cent presumably negative? Have they actually used those figures or have they given the impression that it is not a very likely prospect certainly given those percentages? Have they made that kind of a statement to the minister or to anyone with whom he is associated?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition and,

DR. J. COLLINS: I am sure, all members are aware that the President of Petro-Canada used that particular figure in an interview a couple of weeks ago and to get clarification on that, that was the reason why I contacted Mr. Hopper and where I got that information I just mentioned. And I asked him specifically whether this was a new assessment on his part, that is what I was interested in. Because I do not think a percentage figure means anything really. This is a very subjective thing in my view. But I was interested to know whether he had any reason to have made a new assessment from the time the representatives of Petro-Canada had reached the agreement with us, and he assured me that there was no new information that would cause him to make a new assessment. So presumably if he had been thinking of the figure of 30 per cent, and he himself readily admitted that he is not himself a technician and he had no new technical information available to him, he indicated to me that his assessment at the time he mentioned that figure was no different from his view of things when we reached our letter of agreement.

What I am trying to get across, Mr. Speaker, is that that 30 per cent does not mean a downgrading of their assessment of the situation. In Mr. Hopper's view that presumably was the type of figure we always had in mind.

Now the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) mentioned that I have made a statement being more optimistic than that, and all I can say is that that is my feeling on the matter. I am certainly no expert in this type of business but I have had, over the last nine months or so, a fair bit of contact of one sort or another and I would be, if I were asked, and it is a very subjective thing, I would say that I am much more optimistic than that and I think I did say recently I would give it better than a fifty/fifty chance.

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary.

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

MR. JAMIESON: If I could direct this supplementary to the Minister of Mines and Energy, some weeks ago I asked him whether or not the Come By Chance facility was capable of being utilized for the type of crude which we all hope is going to be found offshore, His answer was in the positive and in fact I believe, if my memory serves me right, he said that in fact there would be less modification required than for perhaps other types of crude from other places. Recently I read an interview with Mr. Cabot Martin in the Rounder, a rather comprehensive interview, an interesting one which I hope we can have a chance to discuss in more detail later, but he indicated in that response which he gave to one of the questions, that offshore crude from the Atlantic would have to be blended, I believe was his word, with other types of crude if it were to be utilized in Come By Chance. The question I have is, can the minister, without being technical, I do not expect him to have that at his fingertips, but it is a large percentage of what I would describe as non-Atlantic crude that would be necessary for this blend, or just what exactly is the situation? In other words, would we have to bring in a lot from other sources as well, say Mexico or somewhere else?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, first of all my reference to the fact that there may not have to be the same degree of modification to the refinery had to do with the fact that it was contemplated initially that there would be high sulphur crude refined and you need additional facilities there to avoid the environmental problems that result from the emission of sulphur into the atmosphere. If you have a sweet crude or a low sulphur crude, which is what appears to be present on the Grand Banks, at the Hibernia discovery in any event, then you do not have the same environmental problems and do not need the same environmental equipment at the refinery.

MR. BARRY: With respect to the refining of the Hibernia crude itself, it is my understanding, and again it is preliminary information that we have obtained, but we have had certain consultants, before Petrocan expressed its interest, we had some preliminary work done which indicated that the supply of Hibernia crude was relevant for the start-up of the Come By Chance refinery, and I think it shows the importance of offshore ownership in that we are able to direct offshore crude to Come By Chance and to thereby interest Petrocan in the possible reactivation of the refinery by showing that there can be an assured supply of crude. And it is our understanding that the crude from Hibernia can make the project viable. The actual technical details of the amount of another quality crude which may be necessary to get the optimum refining process, I will get the hon. member the details if he requires but the basis of it is that the crude from Hibernia directed to Come By Chance can make that a viable project, a viable working refinery.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier and it stems from the Ministerial Statement made by the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) today, Sir. Hon. members know that almost three months have gone by since the new government was elected up in Ottawa, so I would like to ask the Premier if contact has been made with the new government in connection with offshore ownership or management and if the contact has been made orally or in writing to the Government of Canada to have the offshore management, control or whatever you want to call it confirmed? Has any contact been made at all officially by the Premier or by his ministers either to the Prime Minister of Canada or to his ministers, either orally or in writing?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I thank the hon. member for his question. Number one, I had a fairly detailed meeting with our representative in the federal cabinet in Labrador City about a month ago or five weeks ago on this matter and of course Mr. Rompkey, the hon. the minister responsible for National Revenue, indicated some doubts

April 29,1980

Tape No. 1116

AH-2

PREMIER PECKFORD: as to his agreement with our position and indicated that there did not seem to be at that time, in his opinion - he would have to have more information - whether in fact

PREMIER PECKFORD: he, as the federal representative in the Cabinet, would be able to support it. So I went through all the pros on it, the advantages of it from our point of view and indicated to him that I intended to present to the Prime Minister and to the Government of Canada a package of federal-provincial concerns in a co-ordinated manner. That, as I indicated yesterday in the House and last week and a couple of weeks ago, is well underway and we will have that package ready by tomorrow and a few days after that present it to the federal government. It will contain the whole question of a transportation plan for the Province, will contain and reiterate our present position on offshore ownership, will reiterate our position on the whole question of the fishery and so on. Number one, verbal contact has been made to this point in time with Mr. Rompkey because I wanted him to know exactly how we intended to proceed. I have sent him a lot of information on it so that hopefully I can persuade him to our way of thinking so that he can support us in Cabinet, if in fact that kind of support is needed, and perhaps all the federal Cabinet will agree. Secondly, we are preparing a major document to be released relating to ongoing federal-provincial relations, which will include the whole question of the offshore.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. S. NEARY: I would like to advise the hon. gentleman that we, too, met with Mr. Rompkey and outlined our views on the offshore management or ownership or control or whatever you want to call it, but I would not consider that making the official presentation to the Government of Canada. The hon. gentleman said he was trying to persuade Mr. Rompkey.

MR. L. BARRY: Which letter (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has stooped to the lowest level of politics I have ever seen in this Province and in this House today.

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

The hon. member is -

MR. S. NEARY: I am not asking questions of the hon. gentleman, I am asking questions of the Premier. And I would like to ask why there has been such a delay? We met with Mr. Rompkey and we talked over this offshore thing but the hon. gentleman says he was trying to persuade Mr. Rompkey. Well, was the purpose of the meeting with Mr. Rompkey just to politic or was it to ask Mr. Rompkey to arrange a meeting with the Prime Minister and the Government of Canada? Now, let the Premier be straight about it and tell us, did he say to Mr. Rompkey, "Arrange a meeting with the Government of Canada so that we can officially make the views of this Province known concerning the offshore ownership question "?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I met with Mr. Rompkey because it was the first opportunity I had to meet with him both as Premier and the gentleman responsible for Inter-governmental Affairs in the government and the first opportunity to meet with our representative in the federal Cabinet to go over a whole range of issues with him, and to indicate the kind of approach that this government intended to take as it related to federal-provincial relations, which was one of, hopefully, coherence, not ad hoc every day, wiring Ottawa again about this, that and something else, but then to isolate a number of very critical areas. One was DREE. We are in grave danger of having the worst year ever in our history economically as it relates to the cash flow of DREE funds in this Province - our forestry industry, our transportation industry and so on - and we have been communicating on a daily basis on that one, and that one we have to move on.

MR. S. NEARY: That is your own fault (inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to proceed? On the questions of principle, on the questions of the Constitution, which are in a different area altogether, I reviewed with Mr. Rompkey the positions

PREMIER PECKFORD: that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador have taken and which they will continue to take, and then I went on to indicate to him that I would be back to him after our package was ready and sent off to Ottawa so that they would have time to read it. I do not intend to release something today, then ask for a meeting yesterday. I intend to release the document for the Opposition, for members of the public and then a week or two later to request to Mr. Rompkey a meeting with the Prime Minister to fully go over those matters of principle, which I should bother the Prime Minister about, and to very briefly touch on crisis issues which should be dealt with by his respective ministries like DREE. So I wanted to separate the more practical DREE programme orientated issue from the more principle constitutional issue which the First Ministers should get involved in. And that is our aim and objective and before this week is out we will be ready to do that. And I am seriously considering whether in fact, as I indicated to the House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to have before that document is presented to be able to put down on the bottom of that part of the document dealing with the offshore that the House of Assembly has just passed a resolution dealing with the whole offshore question so that all members of the House, not just the members on this side but the members on the opposite side also, would agree so that will be an additional argument in our favour in trying to ensure that the federal government recognizes those ownership and control rights.

So hopefully the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) and his colleagues on the opposite side will agree to that kind of resolution and supporting us so that will be that additional argument that perhaps, possibly we might need, especially in light of the fact that a number of members opposite expressed the view yesterday that the question of five Liberal MPs being re-elected shows that Newfoundlanders might not necessarily be in favour of the offshore.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

PREMIER PECKFORD: A number of members opposite yesterday did mention that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

PREMIER PECKFORD: They implied it in their statements, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I want them to come clean, too, Mr. Speaker, and therefore we will be asking this House to unanimously support the government on this offshore ownership issue so that it can be incorporated into the overall package that we intend to present to the federal government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. member for Port au Port

MR. S. NEARY: I might say for the benefit of the hon. the Premier, I have a resolution here in my hand dated Wednesday, March 5th, 1975 moved by the Opposition and unanimously supported by members on both sides of the House concerning the offshore ownership - five years ago.

AN HON. MEMBER: Five years ago!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms) Order, please!

MR. S. NEARY: But, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman was very evasive in answering my question and elected to play politics with it rather than come to grips with the question.

The question I put to the hon. gentleman, this is a matter of urgent public importance, this matter of getting the offshore ownership question settled, and it has taken three months now and all the hon. gentleman did was have an informal and casual meeting with Mr. Rompkey. Why has the government not taken the bull by the horns? And why has the Premier not, because this is such an important matter to this Province, picked up his phone, called the Prime Minister of Canada, arranged a meeting, sat down, talked it over and left his proposal in writing with the

April 29, 1980

Tape No. 1118

SD - 3

MR. S. NEARY: Prime Minister of Canada? Or would
he prefer to play a little politics with it for a little while longer?
Is that what the hon. gentleman is up to?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the meeting I had with Mr. Rompkey, the Minister in Ottawa representing us, was not a casual meeting, it was a very very important meeting which lasted for two or three hours, which dealt with very important issues dealing with the Province. Now, the hon. member for LaPoile (S. Neary) does not consider Coastal Labrador DREE agreement to be important. The hon. member for LaPoile does not consider the whole question of transportation-

MR S. NEARY: Do not play politics now. Be straight.

PREMIER PECKFORD: -- in the Province to be important.

MR. S. NEARY: People are beginning to see through you now.

MR SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The hon. member for LaPoile does not consider fisheries to be important. If the hon. the member does not think that the whole question of trying to see whether our Federal representative supports us on the offshore is important, well then, I am sorry and, you know, I am very sorry and I regret the fact that those kinds of comments would be made by the member for LaPoile.

I am sure he would like to support the fishery, he would like to support the whole question of transportation in the Province -

MR. S. NEARY: You are the government.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - and I am sure he would like to see just how his federal Cabinet Minister is going to behave in the critical negotiations and talks we will have with the Federal Government. As I have indicated before, we are ready by the end of this week to present to the Federal Government a detailed, coherent picture of ongoing Federal - Provincial relations in the Province into two really specific areas, categorizing them, one dealing with matters of principle and jurisdiction-

PREMIER PECKFORD: the fisheries, the whole question of the ownership of the offshore -

AN. HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

PREMIER PECKFORD: Obviously, absolutely. This government is totally open and will ensure that those kinds of matters continue to be -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh !

PREMIER PECKFORD: - we will table everything, Mr. Speaker. We will ensure that the opposition is kept totally informed on everything, given the opportunity to debate this, that and everything else.

The hon. member for LaPoile(S.Neary) only a number of weeks ago was praising the administration for its openness and so on, and I hope the hon. member for LaPoile will continue to do that because we intend to be totally open and that document will be available. So we will do it in a coherent, unified approach and hopefully we will have at that time, in the next six or seven days, the full, absolute, unqualified support of the Opposition in our attempts to make this province a little bit better than it is right now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transportation and Communication (C. Brett). And I wonder if the minister would indicate what the situation is with regard to his proposals to Ottawa insofar as DREE subsidiary agreements or what have you are concerned? We understand that the Cabinet and the minister are in the process of preparing proposals for Ottawa for funding for various highroad construction projects in the

April 29, 1980

Tape No. 1119

EL - 3

MR. G. FLIGHT: Province, and I am wondering if the minister would tell the House whether or not the Buchans-Burgeo, South-west Brook and specifically the Buchans-Burgeo part of that road is listed on the shopping list, and if it is listed, in what priority it retains on the shopping list?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that there is a fair backlog of requests in Ottawa with respect to agreements and there was a shopping list set up some time ago but that particular road was not on that list. Now that does not mean that it will not be forwarded, that, you know, it could possibly be sent forward at a later date. But it was not on the last list that went up. But the Province has not changed its mind. We are still interested in that route from Buchans to Southwest Brook, there is no change in that, and we are pursuing the matter and I have no doubt that in time that will be put forward to Ottawa.

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

MR. FLIGHT: I wonder if the minister would be a little more definitive. He says it was not on the last shopping list, Will it be on the next one, the list that the Premier just referred to with regard to construction projects and what have you in the Province? Would the minister indicate whether a request for funding for the Buchans-Burgeo Road will be on the next shopping list that we understand is going to be presented to Ottawa in June? And if the answer is affirmative, then this question will not be necessary, but in the event it is not affirmative, if the minister cannot indicate to the House whether it will be there or not, then would he tell the House why, given the performance this past five years, and given the situation in Buchans, and given the case that has been made over the years for that road? If the answer is not affirmative, if it is not going to be on the next shopping list would the minister indicate why it will not be there?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, the Province has

MR. BRETT: not changes its mind. We are still interested in that route. I think I should explain that at this particular moment in time we are not interested in that route as the second Trans-Canada Highway. Our present highway in the Province is only - only about one-tenth of it has been upgraded to the extent that it should be and many hundreds of millions of dollars will have to be spent on the existing TCH before it is brought up to equal standard. So we are not interested in the road from that point of view of a second Trans-Canada Highway, but we are extremely interested in that section of road as it relates to resource development, And in time we hope to see the Tulk's mine deposit developed and I would suggest to the hon. member that in conjunction with that then that road would probably go ahead and I have no doubt that DREE will be asked to participate in the building of that road.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

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

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister would tell the House - we already have an investment in that road; there are eight miles of road constructed by this Province to the tune of \$1 million. Now since the minister had indicated that it has not been on a shopping list up until this point in time, I would not hold out too much hope, based on what the minister has said, for it to be on the next shopping list, the one that is going in in June, so that is a year or two probably before we have a chance to have it on the shopping list. What precautions are the minister or the Department of Highways going to take to protect the eight miles of road already there, built completely at the Province's expense, at a cost of around \$1 million in an area that is prone to flooding, washing out? Will the minister indicate to the House whether or not the Department of Highways is prepared to maintain that road in a reasonable condition so that it will not be totally washed out when and if we ever get to extending

MR. FLIGHT: the road on to the West Coast? What responsibility has the department taken with that road? Furthermore, are the people of the Province entitled to have the road leading into that ten miles of road that we built up there fifty miles away from nowhere, are the people of the Province entitled to get to that road and therefore will the Province undertake to maintain the thirty or forty miles of woods access roads that get us into that strip of road that has been in there and now apparently is going to be forgotten? What is the department's position with regard to that eight miles of road already existing in there at a cost of \$1 million to the Province?

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

MR. BRETT: I understand, Mr. Speaker, that I am going to have to bring my secretary into the House to take notes because that question is very, very cumbersome. The fact that the government went out and spent \$1 million to build eight miles of road indicates that we do down the road at some future date intend to extend it on to connect up with the Burgeo road. I do not think we have any responsibility to keep the thirty miles of woods road open because I see no reason why any Newfoundlander would want to travel over thirty miles of road to travel a further eight miles to not go anywhere. So not only do we not have any responsibility but I do not see why anybody would want us to do such a foolish thing.

We have not taken any precaution. I do not know what we could do to insure that there are no wash-outs, that it does not rain, that it does not snow or that it does not freeze. It is not very much we can do about that. We recognize that the longer the road is there the more that it will deteriorate, and we have discussed that because it is of some concern to us, but I do not think that it will deteriorate to the extent that we will not be able to rebuild and carry on. Obviously there will be some and it will have to be rebuilt again but there is very little we can do about it now.

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

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just before the weekend I brought to the attention of the House a very dangerous condition involving the bridge between Greenspond and Ship Island. I now understand that as a result of the work done by the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor) together with the Minister of Highways (Mr. Brett) that they now have some good news. I would like to ask the minister if he would like to report to the House on the good news - the Minister of Municipal Affairs (Mr. Windsor).

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

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his question. First of all, I think I was out of the House last week when the question was first brought to the attention of the House and my colleague the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) advised the House at that time that it was not under the responsibility of his department, which is quite correct. As I understand, the original structure was constructed probably by federal authorities as part of the breakwater construction there. Nevertheless, with the co-operation of my colleague, officials from his department are now in Deer Lake and preparing a bailey-bridge type structure for transportation to Green's Pond. This will be put in place within the next week or two in Green's Pond with the co-operation of the two departments, the Department of Municipal and Housing and the Department of Communications and Communications. I am further advised by the federal authorities that they have some funding allocated for reconstruction and upgrading of the breakwater so hopefully this will alleviate the problem for the people on Ship Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). Sometime ago I was enquiring from the minister with respect to what monies would be made available for ferries throughout this Province. The minister indicated that there would be no decision made in that respect until the report of a committee

MR. C. BRETT: people from Intergovernmental Affairs, Municipal Affairs and Housing -

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is an in-House committee.

MR. C. BRETT: Yes, it was an in-House committee. That is three departments that were represented and I am not sure who the other ones were.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired. I am sure hon. members would like to join me today in welcoming to the gallery members of the town council in Pasadena, Mr. Bill Pardy, the Mayor, Mr. Max Rice, the Deputy Mayor, and Mr. John Harries, the town manager.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I may have the attention of the House and the support of all members right now - I forgot to do it at the beginning when the House opened first. I understand that one of the members of the House, the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow), that his mother passed away this morning or last night at the ripe old age of ninety-seven and a half, and I think that I would be remiss in my duties if I did not ask all members of the House to join with me in passing along to the hon. member for Bay of Islands our condolences and to see, Mr. Speaker, through you that the appropriate condolences are sent out in telegram or whatever form to give concrete evidence of that fact.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, it would be quite inappropriate to say it is a pleasure, of course, to second this motion, but I certainly do join wholeheartedly as do my colleagues. I suppose when one reaches the age of ninety-seven, on an occasion like this it is more a question of giving thanks for a long and

MR. D. JAMIESON: productive life than one of regret at the person's passing. But nevertheless I am sure that somebody as dynamic as that must have made quite a contribution, not the least of it being her son who I think is one of the most affectionately regarded members of this House on both sides. I am pleased to join in this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Those in favour 'Aye', contrary 'Nay', carried.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman from Mount Scio as the Chairman of the Committee presents the report, I simply want to say that my understanding is that both sides have agreed -

AN HON. MEMBER: St. John's North.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I am sorry, St. John's North. I keep thinking of him in connection with Mount Scio in a very savoury sense indeed, and I hasten to say.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I simply want to say my understanding is that we are going to vary the normal procedure. Normally the member would simply stand and say, 'I present the report' and that would be it. I understand that he is to make a statement and that my colleague, the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), who was, I believe, the Vice-Chairman of the Committee, is to make a similar statement. We on our side, Sir, certainly consent readily and happily to this arrangement.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to members of the House that although we agree, I would like to point out to the House that this is the very same gentleman that we are now giving leave to make a statement who turned down a request to allow the last speech of Mr. Smallwood to be televised in this House when he resigned. So I just want to make that point to show that we are not as narrow-minded as the hon. gentleman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

I understand that leave has been granted both to the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) as well as the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). I would like to make that quite clear.

The hon. member for St.

John's North.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank all members of the House. I have the honour to submit herewith the report of the Select Committee to enquire into and to hear evidence on all matters relating to the adoption of a flag for the Province and to recommend this special design therefor.

Mr. Speaker, since 1932 the official flag of Newfoundland has been the Union Jack. We will always be proud to fly it because of our close ties with Great Britain and as a member of the Commonwealth.

However, many have long felt that we should have our own distinctive provincial flag, a symbol of our own individuality, one which represents our unique identity as well as the traditions reflected in the Union Jack. Accordingly, in November 1979 the provincial government brought into being a select committee of the Legislature to hold public hearings to receive design

April 29, 1980

Tape No. 1122

DW - 4

MR. J. CARTER: proposals and to submit a design for a provincial flag not later than April 30th. of this year. . .

The Committee consisted of the members for St. John's North (Mr. Carter), Kilbride (Mr. Aylward), Menihok (Mr. Walsh), Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart), Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms), Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), and Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock).

MR. J. CARTER:

Public meetings were held in the following communities: St. John's, Labrador City, Happy Valley, Nain, Makkovik, Davis Inlet, Hopedale, St. Anthony, Harbour Breton, Burgeo, Port aux Basques, Gander, Twillingate, Fogo, Greenspond, Valleyfield, Grand Falls, Stephenville, Corner Brook, Marystown, Grand Bank, Placentia, Clarenville, Bonavista, Harbour Grace, Bell Island, and, once again, in St. John's. From its first meeting, the Committee had agreed that any provincial flag should fulfil the following conditions; it must be simple, attractive, distinctive, mirror our important traditions and be widely acceptable. The Committee also agreed to refrain from promoting specific designs until all the public hearings were over. As the hearings progressed, two concerns were expressed over and over again - Labrador must be represented in the design, and although there was a profound affection and respect for the Union Jack and all it represents, our flag should be unique. Another generally expressed concern was that the new flag should not be a compromise between divergent designs. The Committee was exceedingly fortunate in having the help of the internationally acclaimed Newfoundland artist, Christopher Pratt. He had offered to help in any way possible, free of charge, and in late March a prolonged meeting of the Committee was held with him. The Committee's general impression of the public reaction and its preferences and concerns were discussed in detail with him. It was decided at this meeting that the new flag should be geometric in design. All public design proposals were shown to him and he agreed to study these in detail and make some designs under certain conditions and these were, one, that he be paid only for the art materials used; two, that the Committee would be under no obligation to accept all or any of his designs; and three, that if any one of his designs were to be chosen that it would not be altered. This was agreeable to the Committee, who appreciated his offer, and a further meeting was scheduled for the middle of April. In the meantime, further proposals were forwarded to Mr. Pratt as they were received. On Thursday, the 17th of April, the Committee went to Mr. Pratt's studio in Salmonier where a large number of designs had been prepared. The Committee unanimously chose the design which is presented here today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. CARTER:

In this flag, Mr. Speaker, the primary colours of red, yellow and blue are used against a background of white, which allows the design to stand out clearly. White is also representative of snow and ice, blue represents the sea, red, our common humanity, and gold, our confidence in ourselves. The blue section most reminiscent of the Union Jack represents our Commonwealth heritage, which has so decisively shaped our present. The red and gold section, longer than the other, represents our future. The two triangles outlined in red portray the mainland and island parts of our Province reaching forward together. A golden arrow points the way to what we believe will be a bright future. But the design of the flag encompasses much more symbolism than this. For example, the Christian Cross, Beothuck and Naskaupi ornamentation, the outline of the Maple Leaf in the center of the flag, a triumphant figure and our place in the space age. Also, Mr. Speaker, hung as a banner, the arrow assumes the aspect of a sword which recalls the sacrifice made by so many of our veterans. The design looks simple and it is, both simple and profound. In the words of David Silcox, "It is the mark of great artists

MR. CARTER: to make their work look easy, simple and artless. They dismantle the scaffolding of complex techniques, erased the false starts and preliminary groupings. Such artists bequeath us an image and an object so inherently logical, balanced and inevitable that it seems to have a life of its own, an interior energy that never wanes. Such an artist, Mr. Speaker, is Christopher Pratt."

In bringing you this design, the committee has listened attentively to all submissions and carefully considered every concern and then, having given you its industry, has exercised its judgement.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for allowing me to speak on this occasion, giving leave to speak on this occasion. I wish to endorse the words of the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) when he introduced the flag. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the new flag of Newfoundland and Labrador will not please everyone at first glance, but I am quite confident that once the flag is accepted by this House then we will be as proud of this flag in the future as we are now proud of the flag of Canada.

It is also a great satisfaction to me that we will be able to fly the Union Jack beside our Provincial Flag, and I assume, Mr. Speaker, that the Union Jack will continue to fly on our provincial buildings as the flag of the Commonwealth.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the great Newfoundland artist, Mr. Chris Pratt, who undertook to represent the ideas of this Committee into the flag you see before you. The flag took him many hours to produce and it could not have been done by a more talented Newfoundlander.

MR. HODDER: The flag represents our heritage and it is based on the Inuit, Beothuck artifacts. Perhaps this will remind us that they used the land better than we do at present. Also, as was pointed out by my friend from St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), the upper triangle outlined in red is to represent Labrador, as the lower part represents Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, the Flag Committee members were unanimous in their selection of a flag. It will stand well with the flags of the other Provinces of Canada and I believe as well that it can stand with the national flags of the world as it recognizes that we were once an independent nation. But most of all, Mr. Speaker, it is rooted in our past but it looks forward to a brighter future for Newfoundland and Labrador.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Further reports?

NOTICES OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. WINDSOR: I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The City Of St. John's Loan Act, 1975-76," and the "City of St. John's Loan Act 1978".

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to lay on the table of the House, in my responsibilities as the member for Bellevue, a petition signed by a very large number of residents of that community, I will not read the entire prayer of the petition but essentially it is to express their opposition to the construction and operation of a mink farm in Blaketown. The residents who have signed this petition indicate that they have had experience in the past with this kind of facility located in a comparatively small community, in a compact area, and they point out that they had a most unfortunate experience with it with regard to

MR. D. JAMIESON: not only odors but the pollution which resulted from the previous operations of this kind in that area and they are asking that this particular project be located somewhere where it will not indeed cause what they regard as very serious undermining of the general ecological nature or the environmental area of the community. I am pleased to lay this on the Table of the House.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

Motion, second reading of a bill,
"An Act To Provide For Natural Areas In The Province To Be Set Aside For The Benefit, Education And Enjoyment Of Present And Future Generations In The Province". (Bill No. 12).

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. R. DAWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is indeed a pleasure for me today to rise and introduce Bill No. 12, "An Act To Provide For Natural Areas In The Province To Be Set Aside For The Benefit, Education And Enjoyment Of Present And Future Generations In The Province".

I think that everyone realizes that we are faced today, we will be faced with in the future, added pressures as they relate to economic development in our Province. There are pressures of making a decision between advancing as quickly as possible or taking the time to stop and have a look and see just what is happening to our environment, to our way of life, and to the enjoyment of that way of life by future generations.

This Act will establish essentially two types of reserves in the Province, the first one being a wilderness reserve which is essentially a large land mass that will be set aside for the normal play of activities and natural things that go on within that area, will be able to go ahead without too much influence from man, without too much persuasion from him to change the things that are already

MR. R. DAWE: there, and the normal activities that go on with regard to the wildlife and the various topography situations that are existing in that particular area.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. R. DAWE: In this kind of a reserve man will essentially be a visitor. He will be an individual who comes and as a visitor hopefully will respect his host, which will be the area itself and the wildlife that habitate that area.

Essentially there will be very few of these wilderness reserves. There is presently a reserve established in the Avalon area and I think this is probably our prime example of the type of wilderness area we are speaking of.

It is anticipated that there may be one additional wilderness reserve on the Island part of the Province and possibly two others in the Labrador section of our Province.

The second type of reserve that this bill will establish is an ecological reserve and this reserve will be of much smaller dimensions. Again, it is expected from research that has been done that these reserves will average somewhere less than 1,000 acres. And they will be reserves set aside to protect a specific natural phenonenon; an example may be the bird sanctuary at Cape St. Mary's or an area of the Province that may be set aside to protect one of our natural red pine stands that are perhaps in danger of being taken over by some development or project.

One of the things that this bill addresses itself to is the establishment of these reserves with the intention of making them have a certain amount of longevity, hopefully continued longevity. The problem that we had with legislation in the past has been that

MR. R. DAWE:

it has not been strong enough.

Really, the removal of a wilderness area or the establishment of a wilderness area was the responsibility and still is the responsibility of the minister who is assigned for that particular area of concern, and the various outside forces or internal forces that may be applied have not always been taken into consideration in the light of development, sometimes in the name of expediency.

This new Act, on the other hand, will make the process of establishing the reserves a lengthy and detailed one that will involve an advisory committee, it will involve the public at large, it will involve various government departments who may have an interest. It will involve a number of agencies and groups that may be interested in the particular area that the reserve is dealing with. The process of public hearings will be adhered to. And in total, every aspect of the setting up of the reserve will be investigated, both from the economics involved in it and for the future benefits that that reserve will hold for our next generation and generations down the road.

I think it is imperative that this legislation be passed as quickly as possible. We are in the throws now of tremendous economic development within the Province. Over the next ten to twenty years, economic forces that are playing upon us will literally change the face of our land and our landscape. Now is the time to select areas which are most special, areas that we want to preserve in their natural conditions for future generations.

The wilderness reserves area will preserve spectacular landscapes as well as individual species of wildlife that require large ranges for their survival and, I guess, most specifically I speak of the caribou and the tremendous success story that has been told and will continue to be told as it relates to the Avalon Caribou herd, which in 1963 totalled approximately 400 animals, but a

MR. R. DAWE: census done in 1979 indicate that that has now risen to 3000 animals and I think that this is in no small way attributable to Mr. Mike Nolan, who has really over the years taken upon himself to look after that particular resource in that area along with other officials of the wildlife division.

Ecological reserves, as I mentioned before, preserve valuable, natural phenonema, and I referred specifically to the bird colony in Cape St. Marys and to a number of existing red pine stands that are around the Province. We are very lucky in this province, I suppose, to have a number of sites that have already been designated and have reached not only national but international significance. And a number of our bird colonies fall into that category. The murr colony on the Funks and the petrel colony of Gull Island and the puffins of Great Island represent the largest colonies of their kind in their individual species. The razorbill colony of murr just off the Coast of Labrador is the largest in the world as well. Cape St. Marys with their gannet population is the second largest gannet population in North America.

One of the things that I have always noticed, and I guess everyone else has, in travelling the Trans-Canada is that in its haste to be built, the-Trans Canada and the communications system that went with it was probably one of the greatest criminals, one of the greatest visible criminals that we have had in not preserving various forms of natural phenonema along its route. And one that comes to mind, more particularly those who have travelled through what is known as the Birchy Narrows area and witnessed the number of trailers that are parked in what is now a gravel pit on the side of the road, that once was probably the only true stand of native pine anywhere along the Trans-Canada Highway. Because the gravel conditions and so on were just

April 29, 1980

Tape No. 1126

EL,-3

MR R. DAWE: right for the construction of the road,
that particular pine stand was just plowed under, and I think it is
much to our shame that

MR. R. DAWE:

we have to witness that each time we drive by that particular area.

In 1969, I had occasion to travel to Baie Verte to take up a teaching position in that community. Just on the Trans-Canada side of what is Flat Water Pond Provincial Park where the river flows into Flat Water Pond, there was a beautiful stream. That stream had a lovely sandy bottom, it had various little pools for swimming, it had an abundance of natural or fresh water clams or mussels - I am not sure what the right term is - that abounded from one end of it to the other. It was a place which most people in the area frequented from time to time on a leisurely afternoon.

In 1970, when the highroad from the Trans-Canada to Baie Verte, the remaining thirty miles, was paved, it was discovered that this sandy bottom represented a type of soil that did not need to go through a crusher. It was exactly what the construction company needed in order to be able to put down the preliminary surface just before the asphalt went on. Needless to say, right now that again is a gravel pit and a hole full of little pools here and there, utterly destroyed. It may not be significant on a broader provincial plane, but I am sure it is of concern at this point in time for the residents in Baie Verte and for the Baie Verte Peninsula who look at that. And there is just no way that that will ever be returned to its normal state again.

In Codroy Valley, where I am now residing, just before I got there the Area Development Association, being prodded on by a lot of local opinion, decided that they would take an issue upon themselves and try to do something about it. It related to the hunting pressures on the Canada geese that frequented the Grand Codroy River from where the river widens to start forming an estuary to where it enters the sea. The Canada geese and black ducks frequent that area in the Spring when the ice breaks up. They go back in the ponds in the area to nest in the Summer and return again in late August, when the young start to fly, to feed and get fat just before they go South. The hunting pressure was such that it was very noticeable that the population of both the Canada geese and the black ducks were reducing.

MR. R. DAWE: Through representation made by this local group, their own initiative, contact was made with the necessary officials and various avenues of both provincial and federal jurisdiction and the area was set aside as a reserve, as a non-hunting area, and each year it is very, very noticeable the increase in the number of birds that are coming to the river that are now beginning - at least the black ducks are - beginning to breed and to have their young on the banks of that river. And it is really a tribute to the people in that area that they have taken that under consideration. Unfortunately, this has not always been the case in other areas. Sometimes the realization of what is happening does not hit until after it has happened and that things are gone forever.

In 1975, a Committee was struck to begin the tedious work of preparing the legislation that is coming before this House today. There has been some considerable work. In the case of a number of members of the Committee, it has been five years of continuous contact from one time to another working on this particular project. Various forms of legislation, not only across Canada, but in the United States, were studied, as they relate to conservation and to acts that would encompass wilderness areas. It was brought to the point that most of the legislation in the United States was not necessarily relevant to our particular situation, so a review of the existing Canadian legislation was the basis for our present legislation today. There are five other provinces within the Dominion of Canada that have similar legislation, and it is recognized now, especially by New Brunswick, who have indicated that they will be using this particular bill as a model for their proposed legislation in the very near future, that the Committee has

MR. DAWE: taken the best parts of all the legislation they reviewed, incorporated it to meet some of the specific needs in this Province, have developed what I think is an excellent bill.

The Committee was made up of a number of areas of interest. It was made up of staff from the Department of Tourism, Recreation and Culture, the Wildlife staff, the Park staff. The Department of Mines and Energy had a representative, the Department of Lands and Forests, Consumer Affairs and Environment, a representative from the Memorial University Biology Department, input from the Canadian Wildlife Service, the Canadian Forestry Service, and the federal Department of Fisheries.

The passage of this bill, Mr. Speaker, will place Newfoundland among the leaders in North America in the area of nature conservation, and I think that we can all be very, very proud of this fact.

One of the areas, I suppose, that we have to address ourselves to at this particular time is the process it has to go through, that will have to occur in order to establish a reserve, whether it be a wilderness reserve or an ecological reserve.

This bill will allow for the establishment or the creation of an advisory board, an advisory council. This council will have a maximum of eleven individuals. Six of the eleven, which makes them in the majority, will be people outside of government service, outside of government agencies or control, and it is anticipated that one of the six will, in fact, be the chairman of that particular advisory council. This advisory council will be given the responsibility of identifying and describing areas that they see as potential reserves.

MR. DAWE: The necessary research will be done by that advisory board and with a detailed description they will go to the various government agencies - in the form of a report - to the various government agencies, government departments, individual groups that may be concerned, and ask them to respond to what they have put in their report. After this report, the results come back from the people whom they have asked to respond. If there is nothing in the reports or the responses that come back that would indicate that they should change their minds as it relates to a reserve, they will then make a submission to Cabinet, through the minister responsible, asking that a provisional reserve be established. After having looked at the necessary documentation, Cabinet can then establish a provisional reserve in that particular area.

Within a year of the establishment of a provisional reserve, it will be the responsibility of Cabinet to indicate to the public through newspapers, through the various medias, and to the various departments, a complete description of the reserve that will include boundary descriptions of the actual land masses involved.

A management plan, which is very important, each individual reserve will have its own management plan which will make each and every one of them an individual reserve; an indication to the public that details of the reserve are available upon request, and a statement indicating that if an individual or a group wish to make representation at a public hearing, they must do so within thirty days of the notice. At that point in time the date of the public hearing will be set, and that each individual or group within the Province who wishes to

MR. DAWE: make representation to the advisory council as it relates to the reserve, will be given the opportunity to do so. When the results come back, a report from the advisory council comes back to Cabinet, it will then be Cabinet's decision; the Lieutenant-Governor in Council will make a decision, either to discontinue the reserve based on the report, or to in fact establish a reserve. The next stage I think in this whole process is probably where this legislation has some meaning, significant meaning, to the longevity that I spoke of earlier as it relates to wilderness reserves.

Once a reserve is established, in order for that reserve to be disbanded or disallowed, or discontinued, the exact same process that was required in order for the reserve to be established must take place, so that each and every individual who wishes to make representation, whether it is the government, or government agencies or individuals or private groups, or rod and gun clubs, or biology students, or the university or anyone. In order for that reserve to be discontinued the exact same process that went through for its establishment must take place. And I think think this is where this legislation differs from any previous legislation. It certainly differs from any previous legislation that we have within our Province, where it is very, very easy now for the minister responsible to decide to disallow or discontinue a particular wilderness area.

There has been some concern expressed by people to me knowing that this piece of legislation was coming forward and it related specifically to what would be classified as traditional rights, hunting, fishing, trapping, as they relate to the individual reserves. As is the case presently with the Avalon Wilderness area, there should in fact be no hunting or fishing restrictions insofar as they relate to the normal, what would be classified as the normal management of the wildlife in that particular reserve, or in that particular area. There is really no reason why the hunting and fishing rights cannot continue in that particular instance.

MR. DAWE: The ecological reserves may in fact be a little different for specific items. The opportunity is there in this legislation to make exceptions to certain basic rules of not allowing activities to occur within the reserve. For instance, if an ecological reserve was established to protect a red pine stand, one would think there would be no reason why you could not allow hunting, fishing, and, for that matter, a certain amount of trapping and other activities to go on as long as the prime reason, which was the preservation of the red pine stand, was not in jeopardy. So that this area would not then in fact take away any traditional rights that may have gone on in that area, wood cutting, and general abuse of the red pines would in fact not be allowed in that area.

By the same token, if an area was set aside to preserve what is considered probably one of our endangered species, the pine martin for instance, then certain forms of trapping, if not all trapping in that particular ecological reserve would have to cease. But other normal woods operations, fishing, and so on may be able to continue. Each and every, and I want to emphasize that again, each and every particular reserve will have its own management plan and this management plan will be part of the legislation and part of the regulations that set up that particular reserve.

In certain instances there may be an overlap or there may be some involvement with what are either economic or traditional rights or legal rights to a particular piece of land that may in fact be designated as a reserve. And again there is provision made within the legislation to allow for these activities to continue, provided again they do not interfere with the purpose in which the reserve was established.

It might also be worthy to point out that the total - and there has been a lot of research and so on done into this over the past five years and in fact a number of areas have been identified within the Province as potential reserve areas.

April 29, 1980

Tape No. 1129

NM - 3

MR. DAWE: A number of years ago an international biological programme which drew from the information and expertise of biologists all over the world to try and identify within the world, all over the world, various areas that were of significant importance either to preserve or identify, and it was noted that

MR. DAWE: in Newfoundland alone there were some eighty such sites or items identified by that particular group. They were funded internationally, and unfortunately I understand that that funding has now stopped and there is no further cataloguing of these areas taking place. But the committee that designed this particular legislation - helped design this particular legislation have identified several areas around the Province that are potential reserves, some of the work has already been done. Based on this, and the information that we have available, it seems that no more than five per cent of our total land mass, excluding our Provincial and National parks, would ever come under the ambit of a reserve, so the amount of reserve area that we are speaking of is very minimal when you look at the total land mass of the Province. As populations grow, as we as Newfoundlanders increase in population, as we entice people from other areas to come into our Province to help us grow and move on to the future, the need to reserve special areas becomes even more pressing. Each day they become more pressing, and I think it has been established that the only way to really preserve and protect either biological or zoological species within the world is to establish a reserve. I think this has been found in various countries around the world. It is important that we at this particular time in our history have a look at some of the things that have happened, the damaging things that have happened, not only within our own Province but within other provinces and other countries. And now is the time to set aside these particular areas, to preserve them, to protect them, to make sure that our children, grandchildren and future generations have an opportunity to enjoy and to participate in what is, in a lot of our cases, at least as much of our heritage; The land, the animals on the land have formed our heritage in a number of cases almost as significantly as the sea has done, and it is important that we preserve and protect this aspect of our heritage.

A number of years ago there was a wildlife park established in the Salmonier area and if hon. members have not had the opportunity to visit that particular park I would suggest they do so.

MR. LUSH:

The director of the park only a few short months ago attended a conference in British Columbia and it was recognized at that particular conference that that park, the concept of the park, is one of the best in Canada, and I think we can be proud of that as well.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I think that this legislation will be not only of provincial and national significance, but will be of international significance. It is a reasonable, very reasonable, yet a very, very progressive piece of legislation that will place Newfoundland as a recognized leader in the world conservation movement. I look forward to the debate that will follow. I look forward to the support of colleagues on both sides of the House and I think they will agree that this legislation is needed, it is overdue and it is the kind of legislation that we as Newfoundlanders can all be proud of and look forward to enjoying in the years to come.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to congratulate the minister on bringing in this piece of legislation. And let me say first that if the government were on the ball and doing their job there would be ten more pieces of legislation brought into this House to protect the environment and the ecology of this Province because I think that if there is anything, any one area that we are slack on in Newfoundland, then that is the total mess that our environment is in and it is one of the major concerns that I have with respect to the way things are done in this Province and the mentality of some people in this Province who have the feeling that you can fling anything out the window or

MR. LUSH: A million, and keep the rest (inaudible).

MR. WHITE: Well, put up \$1 million and then enforce it on somebody. But it is a major concern, Mr. Speaker, and something that we should address ourselves to.

Another situation is what has been let go on in this Province over the past few years, not the past few years but the past thirty, forty, fifty, one hundred years, and that is contractors allowed to build stretches of road and then leave huge gaps and gravel pits by the side of the road. The latest bit of road that was constructed, they did do some seeding and that looks very nice now and that programme should be continued throughout this Province because tourists -

PREMIER PECKFORD: And it does not cost very much.

MR. WHITE: No, it does not cost nearly as much as people think it would cost. And it is something that should be followed up on and carried through.

Two of the concerns I had about this bill, aside from other environmental concerns that I have, is that I am afraid that the freedoms of Newfoundlanders are being threatened more and more all the time, and I hope that this bill does not erode the freedoms of Newfoundlanders any more than they have been eroded over the last few years.

A few years ago the government made an attempt, for example, to cut out the construction of all cabins in the forest around this Province. The reason behind doing that was a good reason, that they did not want people wantonly destroying wildlife in the Wintertime, or anything like that. But, I think, once again they went too far too quickly in

MR. WHITE: stopping people from being able to use the woods and so on in the Wintertime to get enjoyment from that. And I hope that this bill does not, Mr. Speaker, erode any more freedoms of Newfoundlanders in that sense.

I also hope that the bill does not mean that there are going to be private resorts created for certain people who have the ability to get into remote areas of this Province. And I hope that the minister sees that certain individuals do not set up camp in some of those wilderness areas and use them for their own private resorts.

I have heard some awful stories over the years, Mr. Speaker, about what goes on in some of the remote sections, wilderness sections of Newfoundland, stories of caribou being killed and canned immediately, and whipped out of the woods all times of the year, those kinds of things that are hard to police but must be policed.

I think the minister should take a look at one particular section of the bill dealing with that, and that is where it says, 'That no additions or improvements should be made to existing cabins' and so on 'that lie within wilderness areas'. It might

MR. F. WHITE:

even become a regulation, Mr. Speaker, if there is a small area set aside for ecology reasons and so on, to maybe have some of those pleasure spots removed if we want to really protect the wilderness area that we are talking about.

But generally speaking, Mr. Speaker, this is a good piece of legislation and I would like to see more of it brought into this House. I would like to see the government really crack down on the wanton destruction of our environment in Newfoundland.

I raised a matter in this House last year concerning the Newfoundland Light and Power and Newfoundland Hydro spraying along the Trans-Canada Highway. I just do not understand how a government could permit that to happen. Here in the middle of the Summer - and we only have it for two or three months of the year - the trees grow up and it looks gorgeous and beautiful along the highway and then they permit some company to come along with spray and to kill it all and knock it down. There was one decision that this government made this year that I fully support and endorse and that was the decision not to spray in this Province. I am totally opposed to spraying and I do not think it should be done under any circumstances.

I was reading an article the other day, for example, that in one section of Europe in a large forest area that they got rid of the spruce budworm by importing a little bird called the jackal, which survives and lives on the spruce budworm, and yet, here we are spraying in some areas of Newfoundland and destroying the very thing that can destroy the spruce budworm. And I am told that in that particular area - and studies were done on it - that large numbers of people were hired to take birds into the forest areas and release them, and within a matter of a few years, the bird population increased and the spruce budworm situation totally and completely disappeared. I think that is something that we should definitely look at, Mr. Speaker. I am not being facetious in saying that and I am not suggesting that we all run out tomorrow and capture little birds and throw them in the woods, but I think it is something that we should look at, because I think there are natural ways of getting rid of the spruce budworm

MR. F. WHITE: without wanton spraying of this Province with chemicals. I cannot understand how people can agree to just fly over masses of natural life and disperse a spray that we do not know what it is going to kill or how it is going to kill it. It just boggles the mind, Mr. Speaker, how people can permit that to take place.

I was wondering when the minister was speaking if Brunette Island on the South Coast was being considered for one of the wilderness areas he talked about. He did mention some of the bird sanctuaries around the Province and I was delighted that he mentioned the Funk Islands, which I will talk about in a minute, but I was wondering whether or not Brunette Island still has buffalo on it, and if so, how many buffalo are on Brunette Island? I would like for the minister to look at that and let us know.

The Funk Islands are a group of islands off the Northeast Coast that again need to be protected, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if any member has had the opportunity to go out to the Funk Islands, but it is a fantastic site. There are thousands and thousands of birds of all kinds and species nesting on the Funk Islands and that, too, is becoming a problem now because with the large number of pleasure craft that exist

MR. F. WHITE: around the Northeast coast of Newfoundland more and more people are visiting the Funk Island and I am sorry to say that the eggs are being stolen, that birds are being killed and it is something very serious that we have to come to grips with and make sure it does not happen again, because there have been a number of species of birds on Funk Islands that have disappeared over the last century or so because they were destroyed.

I read one story about the great auk where foreign sailors would come over, land there, kill the great auk and build houses out of the birds and use the birds for fire materials and so on. So, I know that kind of thing does not exist today but we do not want to destroy any of our natural environment and we must try to protect it as much as possible.

I would also like to see the government, Mr. Speaker, and I meant to get in on the Environmental Assessment Bill, the other day, but I was not here when it finally passed through, and I was concerned about the oil disposal sites that the government has talked about throughout this province. There was one designed, or it was suggested that there would be one set aside in my area since Lewisporte has one of the three environmental protection units that were put in place by the Federal Government and the people in the area concerned, Browns Arm, got very upset because they were going to have an oil disposal site there. And I am wondering with the situation we have now, particularly with the large increase in fuel coming into Lewisporte, that supposing there were a major spill in that area, where would they actually dump this stuff? And I think the government should move ahead quickly to formulate their policy on this because essentially they have dropped this oil disposal program and nothing has been done on it to my knowledge in the past little while.

MR. F. WHITE:

I do hope, Mr. Speaker, that something is arrived at with respect to that soon so that we will know, particularly in our area.

This year, for example, the amount of fuel coming into Lewisporte to service Gander is the highest since the Second World War because of the increases in traffic at Gander International Airport. And it is a regular thing now to see a tanker coming up Notre Dame Bay and arriving in Lewisporte. And I would like to see the government put in place some on-land environmental protection system so we will know where this oil soaked material would be dumped should a spill occur, and it is not beyond the realm of possibility, particularly in Notre Dame Bay with all the small islands and so on that we have there.

There is another thing I am going to raise now, Mr. Speaker, that I know the Premier has shown some interest in and I hope he shows a great deal of interest in it in future, and that is the government's sign policy as it relates to the Trans-Canada Highway and other by-roads in Newfoundland. You might ask how does this apply to the present legislation that we are discussing here today. Well, it applies very significantly in the sense that the minister mentioned last night, at his estimates meeting, that a lot of people had complained that they do not know how to get to various areas of the Province and that they drive right across the Trans-Canada Highway and there are no signs telling them where to go. I think we are probably the only province in Canada and all the states in the United States; I am sure there is no other place with the kind of sign policy we have in this province. I think it is ludicrous not to permit private individuals, private companies and others to place signs along the Trans-Canada Highway to let tourists who come into this province know where to go. I think it is madness and absolutely ludicrous and I think the government should change that policy.

MR. F. WHITE:

I am not suggesting that we permit whoever wants to put up a sign go ahead and do it. I am not saying that. I am just suggesting that the sign policy should be changed so that a person who wishes to put up a sign can get conditional approval and then after a design is submitted to whichever department of government is concerned that he can get approval to put up a sign.

The way it is now, nobody, no one can put a sign on the Trans-Canada Highway and that, to me, is wrong and should be changed. I agree we should maintain some uniformity with respect to a sign policy, but I think that the government's present sign policy should be changed.

MR. F. WHITE: Now, Mr. Speaker, those are just a few comments on this bill. I applaud the minister for bringing it in and, as I say, I think the government should move even faster to bring in more legislation to protect our environment in this Province. And for us over here, Mr. Speaker, we will support this legislation and any other legislation of this nature the government wishes to bring in.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Baird) The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I want to take a few minutes this afternoon to support this piece of legislation also. I believe that this is one of the most important pieces of legislation that has been brought into this House for some time and certainly the minister and the administration are to be complimented for it.

I am delighted to see, also, that the official spokesman for the Opposition has supported this bill because I believe all of us can support the very fundamental principle that is so prevalent and that is really the basis of this piece of legislation, and that is that we have to ensure through legislation that there is a preservation of the natural beauty of this Province, that there is a preservation of the wilderness areas, that there is a preservation of the ecological areas that the minister and the bill refers to. I think it is important that we do that. It is equally criminal, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of the natural beauty, a lot of the ecological beauty of this Province has been over the past number of years destroyed. And that is not to be critical of anybody; hindsight is a great thing. But in our rush, Sir, to develop the Province, in our rush to push through roads, in our rush to industrialize and all that kind of thing that we have not been as conscious of the natural beauty and the natural resources of this Province as I

MR. T. RIDEOUT: believe we ought to have been. And I am therefore delighted that this piece of legislation will, for the first time, by law set up an advisory council to the minister to be able to advise the minister and the government of what areas natural, beautiful areas of this Province ought to be retained. .

I am happy also that there is a process of public hearings built into the legislation. Who knows better, Mr. Speaker, than those people who are living in the areas that government might want to look at, who knows better what ought to be preserved and how it ought to be done? I think it would be very wrong to use the heavy hand of the law to walk in and say, "This is what we are going to do," without any recourse, without any provision for the people who live in those areas to have some input into what might develop as a result of it. So the method of public hearings that is built into the bill, built into the piece of legislation, gives a large substantial degree of participation, it protects the individual, it will protect the rights of those living in the area so that they will have an opportunity to be able to say, through the route of public hearings, not anything secret or sinister but through the route of public hearings, "This is how we would like to see this area protected, this is how we would like to see development proceed" if indeed there is room for development in those areas at all.

So, you know, it is a very important piece of legislation. And the principles of the legislation, Mr. Speaker, that are outlined in sections 4 and 5, you know, I do not think there is a person in the Province who could take objection to the wilderness area concept and to the ecological area concept that is outlined in section 4 and 5. You know, they are outlined in great detail and they are the principles really that this bill is all about.

The statement made by the minister that the wilderness reserve areas are areas where man should be a visitor, I believe, Mr. Speaker, that is a very important concept that is built into this piece of legislation. We have not always, as

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

Newfoundlanders, been conscious of that. I am one of those who like, on occasion, to go into the wooded areas of the Province, into the wilderness areas, and I believe that you can go as far into the wilderness as you like in this Province now and it is almost impossible to find a part of this Province that has been untouched, that has not been left clean because of the human visitor who has gone before. It is criminal really to go into a place that is not frequented very often and see the disposal that human beings leave behind. You know, people where they have cabins that they frequent

MR. T. RIDEOUT: in the Winter, to go back and walk through those areas in the Summer and see the pile up of garbage and that kind of thing. I believe we have to try to instill in some way or other into our people that if we continue to do this kind of thing, if we continue to practice that kind of thing, then the generations who are coming behind us will really have nothing but one large garbage dump to inherit. And I think that is criminal for those of us who practice it and we ought to do what we can to try to change that concept in this Province.

The ecological reserve concept also I find very interesting so that we can specifically design and specifically reserve for ecological reasons areas that have a natural phenomena occurring in them. I think, for example, in my own constituency up in Grey Islands where over the last dozen years or so caribou has been transferred to that island that they have come along so well. They have grown so well, the herd is developed so well that there has been a limited caribou hunt on the Grey Islands now for the last four or five years and that is due in large measure to the persistence and the commitment of Earl Pilgrim, who is the wildlife officer in that area. But Earl Pilgrim is not going to be in that area forever, he is not going to be the wildlife officer forever, he is not forever going to be tripping back and forth to the Grey Islands to make sure that that herd is protected and preserved. And with this legislation, it is the Grey Islands type of situation that can be declared an ecological reserve and hopefully preserved so that the residents in that Roddickton area will be able to partake and use that resource as a recreation and as supplement for food forever more into the future.

MR. T. RIDEOUT: It was certainly a great thing that was done. It is thriving and it is staying there but it is always going to have to be protected and you are not always going to have the kind of commitment that the wildlife officer in that area presently has.

Mr. Speaker, I also want to mention briefly the damage that has been done to certain areas of this Province by the numerous gravel pits that has been occupied for months at a time all over - certainly all along the Trans-Canada Highway and all along the major secondary roads in this Province. The minister made reference to Birchy Narrows. Well, I would say that starting now around the 24th. of May, or a week or so before the 24th. of May, up until October or November, in the Birchy Narrows area there will be more people living there than there are living in a lot of small communities in this Province. There are no sewerage disposal sites, there are no sanitation disposal stations there, and the human waste and the garbage and so on has just been piling up there now for the last number of years. And that is only one example of the many thousands of such sites distributed along the Trans-Canada Highway and along the major secondary roads. I believe that the time has come when the Department of Tourism and the government as a whole has to take some sort of firm stand against the destruction of our natural beauty and our natural heritage by that kind of thing. Now that does not mean to say that there has to be a total ban. I do not know what the answer is but certainly I believe it should be thrown out for public participation. Because I have heard many people who drive that section of the Trans-Canada Highway complain and complain very bitterly about what they see happening and is allowed to continue to happen.

MR. T. RIDEOUT:

The minister made reference also to the destruction of that beautiful area along the Baie Verte Highway. Just for simple efficiency, the company that was paving the road at the time-cost efficiency-did not go into the usual crushing and compacting, and spreading of rock to do the section before the road was paved, but because of costs, because they could make a quick buck, they were allowed to gouge out one of the most beautiful, natural phenomena that you could find anywhere in this Province located along highway 410 on the Baie Verte Peninsula. One of the few areas in the Province, I suppose, that I know of where you could harvest fresh-water mussels, one of the most beautiful, one of the most productive and abounding blueberry resource areas in the Province located in that same area, located also next to Flat Water Pond Provincial Park which is being utilized more and more every year and which, over the next few years, is going to have to be expanded. And if it were expanded, Mr. Speaker, the area that we are talking about would be a natural, it would certainly be included within the park expansion. And now, because of the lack of foresight, because we were not in tune with what was happening at that time, a great area, a great natural area has been destroyed and can never more be rebuilt. I am also very interested in the ecological resource management plan that is built into this particular piece of legislation that if an area is declared an ecological reserve then a management plan will be drawn up for that area. I do not know if it says specifically in the legislation or not, but I would hope that input into that plan that would come from the people who live in the area. I would hope that through the public hearing process the people would have a chance to say what this plan is made up of and what activity or not is allowed to go on in this particular area. Because there is a

MR. T. RIDEOUT: wealth of local knowledge, a wealth of local expertise that I think we can tap in this particular area and we ought to do so.

So, Mr. Speaker, I certainly am enthusiastic about the principles outlined in this piece of legislation. It is an excellent piece of legislation. The minister and the administration, I believe, are to be complimented for bringing it in and I certainly support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what a pathetic spectacle, to see an hon. member, Sir, being forced to toe the party line and not being allowed to speak his mind in this hon. House. That is the only reference I am going to make to that hon. gentleman, Sir. I am going to try to deal with this situation and put it in its proper perspective and not get up trying to weasel your way in with the minister and the administration.

Mr. Speaker, this particular bill could be a good piece of legislation, but I have grave doubts whether it is going to be or not, even though my colleague announced that we would support - I believe he did say we would support the bill, did he not? I was out discussing urgent public business at the time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: But I believe I caught him there with one ear saying that he was going to support the legislation. But he said we would support it with reservations. Well, if he said we will support it with reservations, he is our spokesman on this particular matter and I am afraid that I would have to go along with him, only probably I would be a little stronger in my reservations than the hon. gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that in this Province in recent years, we have become so militant and we have subjected our population to so many rules and regulations and a permit for this and a permit for that -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. S. NEARY: - that the next thing you know they will be forcing you to get a permit to go to the men's room.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Ray Simmons, a man that I admire and respect - and I do not know what his politics are - I have been following his comments in, I believe it is Outdoor Life - Is that the title of his -

AN HON. MEMBER: Outdoors.

MR. S. NEARY: - Outdoors - is right on, Mr. Speaker, when he says that pretty soon, if the government keeps bringing in rules and regulations and making this area out of bounds, that pond out of bounds, that river out of bounds, there will be no place for children to swim, there will be no place for hunters to hunt. The situation has gone too far, in my opinion. Windsor Lake down there, which is located right on the main highway - I have spent half my life driving back and forth to Bell Island and you had to pass by Windsor Lake - you are not allowed to fish in Windsor Lake, you are not allowed to swim in Windsor Lake, you are not allowed to skate on it. The people who live in this area on the Avalon Peninsula who would love to be able to toss a line into Windsor Lake - and I am told some of the prize trout come out of it on May 24th, regulations or no regulations, legally or illegally - they are not allowed to do it. Why are they not allowed to do it? Because it is the city water supply, we are told. Now, you can drive along the highway and you can break the bottom pan of your car in the potholes down there on that road and the oil can run out in Windsor Lake. You can put a hole in your gas tank and your gas can run out into Windsor Lake. You can drive along when the salt truck is going down there with salt and sand and that is flicked out into Windsor Lake. You can see bottles and cans flying out into Windsor Lake.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sometimes cars (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: Yes, that is right, many a car has gone out there and people have come to an untimely death going out into Windsor Lake. But you are not allowed to skate and you are not allowed to throw a line out into Windsor Lake, when all that is required, Mr. Speaker, to

April 29, 1980

Tape 1136

EC - 3

MR. S. NEARY:

give the people of this Province,
especially those on the Avalon Peninsula, access to that great natural
resource, all you need is a water treatment plant. The government say
no to that, the City Council say no to that - bar it from the people,

MR. NEARY:

keep the people away from it. The same way with Bay Bull Big Pond, you have the same thing. People used to do a little boating. I believe you can operate a boat on Gander Lake. As a matter of fact, I have been out on Gander Lake. I do not know if they have changed their tune on that in recent years, but several years ago I was out on Gander Lake with an outboard, and Gander Lake, I believe, is the supply of drinking water for the town of Gander, is it not? And can you not boat in Gander Lake? And do they have a water treatment plant in Gander? Well, there you go. Why do they not have it in St. John's? The argument, I presume, it is too expensive. That is the argument, I presume. Why is anything too expensive to give our people, the people of this Province a little fun, and a little play, and a little recreational facility on their off-time, on their leisure time? Is that asking too much? Or will we take the line of least resistance and argue that a water treatment plant is too expensive? Because that is what we are doing, Mr. Speaker. And that is what we are doing in this legislation; we are now carving out, the government is going to carve out large sections of Newfoundland that will only be accessible to the rich, to the wealthy. Why, this is the Frank Moores thinking, that is what this is. Obviously, it is one of the ideas that was copied from him, that he left behind. If he had his way the salmon rivers and the ponds and the fishing holes of this Province would only be accessible to those who can afford helicopters and planes on floats.

Mr. Speaker, there are too many 'no hunting, no fishing' and other restrictive signs going up in this Province.

MR. WHITE:

We need more no litterings.

MR. NEARY: That is right. If we had a few more 'No littering' signs we would be better off. And half the time these ideas are being pushed, as Ray Simmons says, by puppets who are on the public payroll. We are losing our personal freedom in this. . . Province, Mr. Speaker, and I hope all hon. members will have a go at this bill because it does restrict. Again it is a restrictive measure to cut down on the areas that are accessible to people in this Province who like the outdoors.

I did not hear the minister, when he got up, address himself to Sunday hunting in this Province. That is something that is going to have to be dealt with. The hon. gentleman has managed to evade that one so far. But people are clamouring for Sunday hunting. I do not know if I am for or against it. I am not the government. If I were the government I would take a decision. If I were the minister I would take a stand. So, therefore, I do not have to say whether I am for or against it at this moment. I would say that people who go out picking blueberries in the evenings and on weekends and on holidays do have a point, and the people who want to hunt on Sunday have a point. Fortunately I do not have to make the decision. If I had to make it I would make it.

When I was Minister of Social Services, for there and a half years, I made decisions, I will guarantee you that, I made decisions. Rightly or wrongly, I made decisions. And one of the biggest decisions I made was to change the demeaning voucher in this Province, that people had to go and collect from the Welfare and bring down to the stores to cash, to getting paid by cash.

What is the hon. gentleman looking at me now and holding in his hand and waving at me? Oh, is it not wonderful? Is it not wonderful?

MR. WHITE: Ask him about the Mahoney Report.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and ask him about - you know, today in this House -

MR. WHITE: Ask him about that. . .

MR. NEARY: - we heard the Premier say that he has not dealt with this government because he considered it to be - the new government up in Ottawa - a hangover from the previous government.

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

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): A point of order. The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: The member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has been irrelevant in his debate now for approximately two or three minutes. If he is finished, I would like to get on. Mr. Speaker, he is obviously being irrelevant.

MR. SPEAKER: No one speaking on that point of order?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have to admit that I was a bit carried away there. The hon. gentleman who is trying to get into the Cabinet carried me away there a little bit, and I apologize to Your Honour for being irrelevant because I am afraid I was at that particular moment.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) There really was a legitimate point of order under relevancy rule and since the hon. member has withdrawn, I will recognize him again. The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister will have to address himself to the matter of Sunday hunting in this Province sooner or later. Well, the sooner the better. The hon. gentleman has managed to procrastinate now for several months. He is getting himself on a sticky wicket and he is soon going to have to face up to his responsibilities and take a stand, take a decision. I have no respect or no admiration for a man who will be wishy-washy when he is placed in a position of trust, in a responsible position and not take a stand. You have one group in this Province saying there should be hunting on Sunday, and you have another group saying, no, Sunday is the only day we have to go pick berries and go out and walk down the trails and enjoy the country. The minister, only the minister, can decide and that minister should state his policy now while we are on this bill, state his policy and not procrastinate any longer. Procrastination is the thief of time, and it is about time now that the hon. gentleman told us where he stands on that particular matter. But, Mr. Speaker, as I cannot help but repeat myself, 'No Hunting' signs, 'No Fishing' signs and other restrictive signs are going up all over the Province every day. Every day a certain part of this Province is being restricted to the ordinary people and pretty soon we will have a flag, we might have a flag but it will be flying over a Province where you have to be careful where you walk, you might be in a restricted area. You might be in an area that is out of bounds. In these areas that the minister is talking about in this bill, you cannot go in on a skidoo, and what are people going to do? Are they going to go around with a map in their hands?

MR. NEARY: The people down in my district are the best skidoosers in Newfoundland. They have often gone from Port aux Basques to Burgeo in their skidoos. Now, what do they do? Do they carry a map and they say, "Oh, we have to fly over this area" or "we have to go around this area" -

MR. LUSH: Avoid it.

MR. NEARY: "Avoid the area", and we do not know what the areas are, and they will not know what they are. The next thing you know they are sailing along on their skidoo enjoying life, going to their cabin, and by-and-by a helicopter swoops down and says, "I am sorry, boy, but you are in a reserved area here. This is set aside for the businessmen, for the well-to-do, for the rich in this Province, for the fellows who have the helicopters and the planes. You cannot come in here with your poor old skidoo. You are only an ordinary Newfoundlander. You are only an ordinary person." You are hauled into court, your skidoo is confiscated -

MR. WHITE: A \$1,000 fine.

MR. NEARY: - and a \$1,000 fine, and do not think it cannot happen, because all you have to do is look at the wildlife regulations in this Province. I remember one time I had a fellow from Bell Island who had never been in the country in his life. He decided that he would not be in style unless he went moose hunting. All his friends used to go moose hunting. Never had a gun in his life, never had a permit, a licence, in his life, and he went moose hunting, and he never got a moose. He had a mattress in the back of his van, and on the way back he said to the two young fellows who were with him, he said, "I am going to get in the back and have a nap. One of you fellows drive the van." And all of a sudden she stopped. There was a screech of brakes and she stopped, and one of the young fellows said, "Quick, there is a moose on the side of the road!" So he jumped out, grabbed his gun and let her have it. Where do you think he was, Mr. Speaker? In the Terra Nova National Park. He knew nothing about boundaries. He was hauled into court, hauled into court, his van was taken, his gun was

April 29, 1980

Tape No. 1138

GH-3

MR. NEARY: was taken, his ammunition was taken and he
was fined -

MR. STAGG: What about his mattress?

MR. NEARY: - yes, the mattress - and he was fined \$1,000.

MR. HODDER: The moral of the story is never go to sleep
in a van.

MR. NEARY: The moral of the story is that the poor fellow
was nearly forced on welfare because he ran a

MR. S. NEARY:

meat market on Bell Island and he needed his van to operate his store.

MR. N. DOYLE:

He was one of the richest men on

Bell Island.

MR. S. NEARY:

He was one of the richest men on

Bell Island. Well, if the hon. gentleman thinks he was the richest

men on Bell Island, I would not want to see one of the richest men on

Bell Island, he was a little lowly poor old butcher in Lance Cove

in case the hon. gentleman does not know about it.

MR. N. DOYLE:

Lance Cove.

MR. S. NEARY:

Lance Cove I am talking about. The

hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. N. Doyle) does not know

where that is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY:

They are still looking for the hon.

gentleman over there.

MR. G. WARREN:

He does not get there very often.

MR. S. NEARY:

And so, Mr. Speaker, the point that

I am making is do not think it can not happen.

MR. F. STAGG:

He is there every week.

MR. S. NEARY:

There every week, oh, yes, well I

will be over there the end of the week, invited over the end of the

week. I hope the hon. gentleman will join me over there so that people

can see what he looks like. They are wondering about the oil in the

mines and they are wondering about the ferries and they are wondering

about a few jobs this year. But anyway, I am getting lead astray

again, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is a good member.

MR. S. NEARY:

Yes, a good member alright. That is

why they are calling me all of the time and writing me and trying to

get me to solve their problems. You know, I am almost tempted - only

for I love LaPoile, I love the people in LaPoile district so much -

I would almost be tempted to come back and give the hon. gentleman -

MR. G. WARREN:

A run for his life.

MR. S. NEARY: - the root. I would almost be tempted.

If I was the hon. gentleman I would not dare me very much, do not dare me, do not tempt me

MR. G. WARREN: Right on, right on, you are talking 'Steve'.

MR. S. NEARY: Ah, it is sickening, Mr. Speaker, to hear the way my former constituents on Bell Island are being treated. I would almost be tempted.

MR. N. DOYLE: (Inaudible) LaPoile

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, is that so. The hon. gentleman does not realize that the Premier sent in the big guns to try to do that the last time.

MR. G. WARREN: Double barrelled.

MR. L. THOMS: Cabot Martin could not do it.

MR. S. NEARY: And it is not a matter of getting elected, the first time you get elected is easy but getting re-elected is the problem, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. STAGG: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. L. THOMS: Jumping Jack is back again.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): A point of order, the hon. member for Stephenville.

MR. F. STAGG: The point of order is obvious. The hon. gentleman got up and he criticized the bill that his colleague had supported wholeheartedly. When he ran out of criticisms he started getting into matters that are totally irrelevant. He is now talking about trying to skedaddle back from the West coast to the East, he must be in trouble in his own district. I think he should get on to the bill, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I would have to rule that there is a point of order and the hon. gentleman is being rather irrelevant and I would ask him to confine his remarks to the bill.

MR. S. NEARY: I have been elected six times in a row, Mr. Speaker, and that is more than I can say for the hon. member

MR. S. NEARY: for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) or the hon. member for Harbour Main - Bell Island (Mr. N. Doyle) and his big job will be getting re-elected -

MR. N. DOYLE: No problem.

MR. S. NEARY: - not getting elected the first time, that is easy.

But anyway, Mr. Speaker, I am very concerned about this loss of personal freedom. I believe it is only a matter of the government changing its policy, changing its philosophy and instead of taking the easy way out, the line of least resistance, and going out and declaring this a watershed and that a watershed, and now they are down in Portugal Cove declaring all the ponds down there a watershed, because the people of Portugal Cove need drinking water, when in actual fact all the people in Portugal Cove have drinking water at the present time. And the government has spent enough money putting artesian wells in Portugal Cove but now this pond because all the well-to-do have their cottages down by the lake-

MR. L. THOMS: That is the real reason for it.

MR. S. NEARY: That is the real reason, Mr. Speaker, they have their cottages down there and they do not want anybody to invade their privacy. They are down there in seclusion. I was down there once, I remember, I came across Miller's Pond, I was invited down to visit somebody who wanted to have a meeting and I was coming across Miller's Pond -

MR. F. STAGG: This is irrelevant.

MR. S. NEARY: This is relevant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: It is relevant.

MR. S. NEARY: I beg your pardon, it is relevant.

MR. F. STAGG: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Stephenville on a point of order.

MR. F. STAGG: Down in Portugal Cove going across Miller's Pond, I can not see that being relevant.

MR. HISCOCK: Well, you should listen.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, to the point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): To the point of order, the hon.
member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: The hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is
being very relevant. He is talking about the environment in this Province,
that is what this bill is all about and I suggest that -

MR. S. NEARY: This time I am right on.

MR. F. WHITE: - the member for Stephenville (Mr. F.
Stagg), Mr. Speaker, is just trying to interrupt the hon. gentleman
and throw him off track.

MR. WARREN: Which is typical.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order, I would rule
that there is no point of order at this particular time and I would
ask the hon. member for LaPoile to continue.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. L. THOMS: Shot down again.

MR. S. NEARY: I want to congratulate Your Honour
for being so familiar with the rules, I congratulate Your Honour for that.
Well I started to tell a story - I got sidetracked - but the point that
I am making here, Mr. Speaker, is this, I know all about Miller's Pond,
I came across there one evening, you would not know b t it was John
Cabot landing in the front of the boat me and a few of my cohorts and colleagues
but the point I am making, Mr. Speaker, is this that the well-to-do
and the wealthy and the land grabbers are buying up too much land
around where these resorts are. And they are barring our people from
access to ponds and lakes, traditional fishing holes. What is the
hon. gentleman grinning at over there?

MR. STAGG: I am amused by the hon. member (inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: Well, of course. But, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: I am very concerned about this and a lot of Newfoundlanders are concerned about it because, Mr. Speaker, what the government could do under this bill is deny the ordinary person the only little bit of pleasure that he has left in this world.

MR. WARREN: The outdoor life.

MR. NEARY: The outdoor life.

MR. WARREN: Right on! Right on!

MR. NEARY: There now, while you are almost on the brink of a third world war you have artificial insemination. You have it all now. They are taking away all the pleasures and the only thing we have left is the sun, and the moon, and the stars, and the rivers, and the ponds, and the lakes and now, under this bill, they are likely to take them away from us too.

MR. WARREN: It is shameful.

MR. NEARY: It is shameful. It is a very dangerous piece of legislation. It puts too much power in the hands of the minister. It gives very little opportunity for public hearing even though it is referred to in the bill, very little opportunity. People are so busy today trying to cope with the high cost of electricity and the high cost of living, unemployment, inflation, school taxes, high taxes, they are so busy with these things that they cannot afford to take the time to go out and employ a lawyer. And the government think because they put a little clause in there saying, 'There will be public hearings' - in this particular instance the public hearings are rather restricted, Mr. Speaker. It is hard enough and difficult enough for people to cope with the problems of ordinary day life without having to go out and fight for the right to go in the country and enjoy yourself. And that is what is happening here, Mr. Speaker. This crowd have managed now to haul down the

MR. NEARY: Union Jack and trample on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: They are going to have a flag flying over a country where you are not free. At least under the Union Jack you felt free. Whether you were or not, I suppose, is a matter for debate.

MR. WARREN: Maybe that is why they brought the bill in.

MR. NEARY: But under this one, with the big rocket in the centre of it - it will be flying over a Province that is not free.

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: No fishing! No hunting!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Is my time up?

MR. SPEAKER: No. Order, please!

The hon. gentleman has gone from the bill now to the flag, and I would ask him to confine his remarks to the bill.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, probably that is about the only way that I can get the message across, that there are far more important things in this Province to think about than to be bringing in restrictive legislation like this. We have an act on here - where is it? - "An Act To Amend The Embalmers And Funeral Directors Act".

MR. THOMS: I am waiting for that one.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman is waiting for that one. And we have all kinds of bills on here that I would consider to be non-essential, unimportant, at this particular point in our history, and we are forced to debate in this House matters like we are debating this afternoon. Well, as I told the hon. House before, anything

MR. NEARY: they bring in that is motherhood I am for it. Bring it in. Bring in a bill, bring in a resolution, if it is motherhood I am for it, I will vote for it for no other reason than political expediency; if that is what they want, if that is the way they are going to govern the Province, irresponsible, reckless, bringing in measures they think are going to satisfy their buddies and friends, the well-to-do and the rich who will be the only ones who will have access to these areas that they are talking about.

Very few school children will be able to get an education and that is why - one of the reasons they are stating here, "An Act To Provide For Natural Areas In The Province To Be Set Aside For The Benefit, Education And Enjoyment Of Present And Future Generations In This Province". Mr. Speaker, if we do not do the right things now with our outdoors, if we restrict it now, and I think we have gone far enough, I think it is time to call a halt to it, then I am afraid that the next generation in this Province will never forgive us for what we have done, Mr. Speaker. However, as my hon. friend says, we are going to support the bill. I guess he has good and justifiable reasons for saying it and I have enough confidence in my hon. friend, and enough faith in him, that

MR. NEARY:

if he says, "Support it" I will support it but I will support it with very, very grave reservations indeed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, it certainly gives me great pleasure to follow that voice crying in the wilderness on the other side. In discussing this Wilderness and Ecological Reserves Act obviously his comments show practically no preparation whatsoever and it is indicative of confusion that must reign on the other side of this House so far as a unanimous position on anything is concerned. The hon. member got up and criticized practically everything that his hon. colleague had supported and then in sitting down says, "Well, if it is good enough for him it is good enough for me". Is that the kind of research that the hon. member is renowned for, and I do not think it is, the hon. member has done some excellent research over the years, but certainly his debate on this matter was decidedly irrelevant and was basically a waste of time.

Mr. Speaker, what we are talking about here is something that has been enunciated by this government and, indeed, by the Progressive Conservative Party since we took over this government in 1972. We are talking about the quality of life for Newfoundlanders. We are talking about how our children and our children's children are going to live, in what kind of a Province they are going to live. We are talking about what links with our past we can look at and preserve, what links with our past we can preserve for our future so that we do not become a Province similiar to some of the provinces of Canada or some of the states of the United States that were once pristine wilderness and are now affected by acid rain, or they have tremendous pollution problems and that sort of thing. What we are hoping to do, in addition to the passing of this bill which will refer specific wilderness areas and ecological reserve areas, is to bring about an awareness in the public mind of this Province, in the public conscience of Newfoundlanders, an awareness of the wisdom of preserving our quality of life, the wisdom of being able to go out

MR. STAGG:

into the woods unobstructed by the iron horse, the snowmobile, as my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who is the champion of the snowmobilers. The snowmobile is in some ways an instrument of great destruction for our environment and it is certainly something that must be curtailed, it is something that is foreign to the wilderness. It is the iron horse that charges out and the natural habitats of the wilderness really have no protection against it. The curious snowmobiler out on the Port au Port Peninsula, I have been told is more responsible for the dissemination of the caribou herds there than the poacher.

MR. HODDER: Not so.

MR. STAGG: Not so? Well, the hon. member says, "Not so", he can engage in the debate. I have been told that the curious snowmobiler who sees an animal and who says, "Well, look there is a caribou, let us have a closer look at it", and the caribou is in a very fragile state at the time. They are animals whose psychological and physiological makeup is such that they require a quiet environment, they cannot stand too much chasing.

MR. HODDER: Who gave you this information? I am told the wildlife people (inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Well, the hon. member can speak in the debate. I have been talking to people who indicated that the snowmobiler -

MR. HODDER: What people! What people! (Inaudible) the minister is hardly (inaudible). You are full of hot air.

MR. STAGG: Well, the hon. member might think that I am full of hot air. I would also indicate to the hon. member that the snowmobile is something that is not an instrument which is in small supply on the Port au Port Peninsula. It is a relatively small geographical area and the people have been known to wander far and wide with their snowmobiles and the snowmobile has been known to chase animals when humans are aboard it. So if the hon. member wants to dispute that, okay. I suggest he should learn a little bit more about his district.

MR. HODDER: (Inaudible) does not concur with the information of the hon. member.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is interfering with my speech and I am - this is not a provocative speech I am making. I was suggesting maybe the hon. member might have a look at some of his constituents out there who may need a little bit of education, in a sense, to persuade them that maybe they should not chase the caribou, if indeed they do, or even go in and look at the caribou. I have been told that they do.

MR. HODDER: By whom? By whom?

MR. STAGG: Never mind by whom.

AN HON. MEMBER: Now that is it. He cannot tell you now.

MR. STAGG: I am not going to name my sources. Does the hon. member name all his sources?

MR. HODDER: Yes.

MR. STAGG: Yes, certainly.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that the snowmobile has to be kept under very strict control. It is an animal that is frightening to the moose and the caribou

MR. F. STAGG: and the other fauna that abound in our wilderness. So it is not something that can be taken lightly. The paper companies in Newfoundland for far too long - The paper companies are in Newfoundland since 1924, so whenever the paper companies came - the paper companies came to Corner Brook in 1924. I believe they came to Grand Falls before that - the paper companies have had a free reign as far as the interior of Newfoundland is concerned. It was only they who had the wherewithal and the paraphernalia with which to get into the wilderness areas. And the matters referred to by my colleague from Lewisporte, (Mr. White) indicating that some of the less than wholesome activities sometimes carried on by people in these hunting camps in the interior of our Province, I believe that is correct. I, myself, have visited a number of these camps and certainly the garbage that is seen strewn around and just generally looking at them, one is not proud of the people who preceded him in these camps. Hopefully, when the people who came after I left, I did not add to the confusion. But certainly it is something that we have to be very concerned about. And as I originally stated the paper companies who really had a free reign, it was their fiefdom, the wilderness areas of Newfoundland, they have a lot to answer for as far as the lack of real feeling for the ecology is concerned. So the moose and caribou herds of Newfoundland have to be very, very carefully maintained. They exist in a system which is very fragile. If it is disturbed significantly it is quite conceivable that they will not multiply in the numbers that they should. So it is a matter of considerable concern. And this is the principle behind this bill, this bill referred to as "The Wilderness And Ecological Reserves Act" to set up wilderness

MR. F. STAGG: areas. On the maps that are put out by the Department of Crown Lands at the present time there is a large wilderness area in the center of Newfoundland and a large wilderness area on the Avalon Peninsula. Presumably there may be other wilderness areas which may come about as a result of the committee that will be set up under this bill and the public hearings that will follow. If these are the only wilderness areas that are designated then, obviously, the regulations and prohibitions that are set out in this bill have to be strictly adhered to because we are in a position now where we have roads running throughout the interior of our Province; the Burgeo road for instance. The Burgeo road is a reality. People now travel from Burgeo to Southwest Brook and onto the Trans-Canada Highway. It is quite conceivable, if this piece of legislation were in place when the Burgeo road was conceived, and also the Environmental Assessment Act had been in place when the Burgeo road was conceived, that it may not have been built. The Burgeo road more properly might have gone along the South Coast from Port aux Basques down to Burgeo and open up the coast line there. It is quite conceivable that that might have been the case, however, the Burgeo road is now a fait accompli and from our point of view, in the Stephenville area, we are quite delighted with some of the positive aspects of it because it opens up a commercial and other contacts between our people and the people on the South Coast. But it is conceivable that a road of that type need not have been built.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Environmental Assessment Act an improvement in (inaudible)

MR. F. STAGG: Yes, the Environmental Assessment Act and the public hearings that are necessary there and the public hearings that will be necessary under this act quite conceivably would have resulted in a negative decision as far as that road is concerned. So we do have tremendous numbers of roads in this Province. We have woods roads all over the place. If you fly from the East Coast to the West Coast you will see hundreds of miles of woods roads, and these are accessible by the ubiquitous four wheel drive vehicles, by the snowmobilers - these roads make it easier for the snowmobilers to get around, and it is quite remarkable that we have any wild fauna in these woods at all.

The bottom line in all of this, Mr. Speaker, is that all of us in this Province over the next ten years, and certainly we, as legislators in this House, and we, as opinion makers in our own districts, must be very concerned that the public of this Province is made aware of the possibility that we may not have anything out in the wilderness in 1990 or the year 2000 unless we are determined as a people, unless we are determined as legislators, to make sure that the public is sympathetic towards the principles that are enunciated in this bill and in the Environmental Assessment Act and generally speaking, in the philosophy that was enunciated so well by the Minister of Tourism (Mr. R. Dawe) that was really buttressed and amplified by the member for Lewisporte (Mr. F. White), additionally by the member for Baie Verte - White Bay (Mr. T. Rideout). Unfortunately, the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) chose to divert somewhat from the theme of unanimity that had been established in previous debate. He may have had other reasons for that.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite proud to be associated with this bill and I am quite proud that the public of this Province will be assured that all possible means for assuring a pollution-free environment, so far as that is possible, will be maintained by this government. And I am encouraged by the support given by the official spokesman for the Opposition. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pride to stand along with my other colleagues and support this particular bill and to set straight the records insofar as comments were made by the last member who spoke. The last member criticized the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) by stating that there was dissension on this side, that we did not agree with this particular bill. That is so far from the truth, Mr. Speaker. So to set the record straight, what the hon. the member for LaPoile did say was that he agreed with the bill in the same fashion and the same manner as did our spokesman but did have some reservations, as our spokesman indicated and illustrated, some of the concerns, some of the reservations that he himself had with this particular bill. And the member for LaPoile, of course, elaborated on some of these reservations. That is quite in order, I am sure, to speak to a bill, and certainly, in doing that to express some concerns and some reservations without any suggestion, without any indication that we are not supporting the bill.

MR. S. NEARY:

Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. T. LUSH:

That is what the member for LaPoile did, Mr. Speaker, just elaborated upon, elucidated, made more exquisite, made more clear the real concerns, the real reservations that he had with this particular bill, as I am sure members on the government side have, as I am sure the Premier does. We have often in this House spoken about the necessity of preserving our environment and preserving our culture, but at the same time, trying to hold on to these freedoms that Newfoundlanders have known and had since we have lived in this beautiful Province. That is the concern, striking a balance between the control of the environment, if you will, controlling our wilderness area, reserving ecological areas, but yet maintaining that freedom to get out and to enjoy the wildlife and to enjoy nature that has been a part of our life. These are the concerns that we have been expressing here, and as I have said before, I am sure they are concerns of the Premier and his government,

April 29, 1980

Tape 1143

EC - 3

MR. T. LUSH:

that we want to maintain these

freedoms.

There has been in the past couple of years, certainly, a distinct erosion of the freedoms of Newfoundlanders by several bills that we can point to. And there is no question, there is some difficulty in trying to control

MR. LUSH: a certain area and trying to control a certain thing without having some negative effects, without somehow affecting certain freedoms, without putting in certain restrictions, and that is a real difficulty, a real difficulty. So, in pointing out these difficulties, the member from Lapoile made some excellent points I thought and pointed out some excellent concerns and I would hope that the government just would not dismiss them, just would not think they are a lot of hogwash. If they are concerned, as I am sure they are, they will make note of the concerns raised by members on this side and will continue to be raised, and that is the only point, Mr. Speaker, of speaking to this particular bill. Really, I wish government members would do that. The bill itself, it is just a motherhood thing. Again, one wonders why a bill like this was not presented, was not put before the House years ago. That is not meant to be a derogatory remark or a disparaging remark, it is in the last little while that we have really become concerned about that sort of thing, but the logic of it, the logic of it. The logic of it would suggest that this is the sort of thing that we should have had passed in Newfoundland years and years ago. So, what I would like to see is members raising their concern about putting restrictions on the freedom of the ordinary Newfoundlander and the ordinary Labradorian, not to restrict the free movement of people from engaging in the kind of recreational activity, the kind of sports activities that they have been used to all their lives. Again, we certainly, on this side of the House along with government members, see the necessity for certain controls, but, Mr. Speaker, one wonders, when we look at all the legislation that has been passed in this House over the past few years, whether or not we are going to regulate ourselves right of existence. We are going to regulate ourselves right out of existence, and I think we are going to be doing probably what was done in some Western Provinces. The necessity is going to be there to follow the same kind of precedents there by setting up some kind of a de-regulation department, really, and I think that is the concern, and not wanting to exaggerate the position but I believe that is the real concern of people on this side of the House

MR. LUSH: and I think, certainly, should be legitimate concerns of members on the government side to make sure that we keep a middle of the road, if you will, that we do not make regulations that are going to be so restrictive and so inhibited that we are going to destroy that quality of life that Newfoundlanders, that this Province has been known for. That is the real concern, Mr. Speaker, and I see nothing in this bill, nothing inherent in the bill, Mr. Speaker, that is going to do that. I do not see anything inherent in the bill but there is that danger, there is that danger once we start bringing in that kind of legislation because people get carried away with themselves. When you get people on committees who are environmentalists or who are concerned about ecology or who are concerned about the preservation of wilderness areas, they get carried away with themselves and they do not think about the enjoyment even though that is the very purpose of the bill, the very purpose of the bill to ensure the further education and enjoyment of people by the pursuit of these things listed in the bill. The point of the matter is we can make it so restrictive unknowingly and unwittingly, we can do that, and remove every vestige of freedom that people have. As I say, I do not say that in a derogatory sense or any disparaging sense, I just put it forward as a concern and would certainly hope that members opposite would take these concerns into consideration and, certainly, as the thing develops, as the advisory council comes into being, and as we get working with this particular bill, that we will have enough wisdom and enough sensitivity that we will not allow the kinds of things to happen that will restrict our particular lifestyle, as I believe certain legislation has been doing in this Province over the last three or four years, and as I say it again not, I do not think, knowingly, I do not think it is deliberate but possibly unwittingly. Again somebody already referred to the example in Crown lands where we came out and disallowed people from building cabins and what a furor that particular piece of legislation or regulation, whatever it was, the furor that that caused all over this Province and it is continuing to cause,

MR. LUSH:

so much so that I think the government is taking a look at it and a serious look because what we are talking about are the pleasures and the enjoyments of the ordinary people of this Province. But certainly we need to bring in certain controls, particularly in a Province where we have not been, where we have not regarded, really, the environment as much as we should have. There is no question about it, that we have been careless, and I suppose it is because we thought this almost unlimited. We can go out in the forest and we have got so much land, we have got so much beautiful land, so much forest, so many lakes, so many ponds that I suppose the tendency was to think that there was nothing we could do with this to destroy it, it was so vast that we could just have this forever more. But we found out how quickly we can destroy our wildlife, how quickly we can destroy our environment. So there has certainly got to be the necessity, if we are going to preserve it for future generations, to take, certainly, some steps whereby we can control these matters.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is no question on this side of the House about supporting this particular bill, none at all and we will continue to support bills of this nature, bills that we hope will bring benefits to Newfoundlanders. Now, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) again just mentioned, to put the record straight, not indicating that he was not in agreement with this particular bill but pointing out the importance of other matters that maybe we should be dealing with, the matters of employment and the matters of inflation and taxation and all of these sorts of very important matters to the people of this Province, and by so doing put this bill in its proper perspective. That is not to say that it is not a good bill. That is not to say that we on this side do not support the bill or subscribe to the clauses in the bill wholeheartedly and that we do, Mr. Speaker. But we are striking at a very important area. I notice, Mr. Speaker, that the people are listening very attentively, particularly my own colleagues but -

MR. F. ROWE:

I listen with my ears not my eyes.

MR. LUSH:

I thought I would notice because the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) was making motions. But just a point, Mr. Speaker, to further elaborate on a point made by our spokesman, the hon. member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) again talking about the certain tendency among Newfoundlanders to not respect the environment. Again I am wondering whether or not we are putting the right regulations into place. You know the City of St. John's is probably one of the messiest cities in Canada. It really is, one of the messiest cities in Canada, confetti, debris, all over the place. And, Mr. Speaker, this hon. member went through a great experience on Saturday, a tremendous experience. I had a few things in my backyard that had accumulated from some renovating that I had done earlier in the Winter and my wife was tormenting me to get it out of there. It was a little too much for a car so I go and rent a truck on Saturday morning. It was not something I wanted to do, I did it rather reluctantly with the high costs today. So I get up Saturday morning and go and rent myself a truck and load it up, take my time making sure that I have the place cleaned up very, very well. I leave to go to Robin Hood Bay, get there about one o'clock and find that the place was closed at twelve o'clock, closed. I called every other dump in the area of St. John's, every waste disposal area and found that they were all closed, because I want to save some money, I do not want to hold onto this truck until Monday morning, but lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, I could not find a waste disposal area or a dump where I could dispose of my garbage.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have the bill here as to what it cost me. I have the bill for what it cost to rent the truck to do this. What I was planning just for a half day's work, it cost me \$58.70. That is what it cost me, \$58.70 for a truck that I put about thirty kilometers on. You know, Mr. Speaker, this is ridiculous! And it was not done to save dollars, that is the strangest thing. If the area were closed, of course, you could understand it, they would do it to save dollars, but a guard was there. There was a guard or a commissionaire or whatever you call it there and a little house outside the gate just to tell me that I could not get inside. And I said, 'Somebody must have a key to let me in.' 'No, Sir, we are not allowed to let you in.' Now, is that not ridiculous? Saturday, a day when most people do their work and the waste disposal area is closed. Now, I do not know which department of government okays that sort of thing, who regulates it, whether it is the Department of Municipal Affairs or whatever, but here is something we should get into, to make sure that these regional dumps and waste disposal areas are open all day Saturday so people can get in there.

MR. F. ROWE: Right.

MR. L. THOMS: That is so they cannot (inaudible)

MR. T. LUSH: I know many people would not have done what I did, to bring back my truck, Budget Rent-a-Car parked by my door from Saturday afternoon until Monday morning waiting with the garbage out there. What a citizen, Mr. Speaker!

MR. L. BARRY: Did you notice a scattered bit dumped along the side of the road (inaudible).

MR. T. LUSH: Oh, yes. Well, I had some advice from friends, what they would do. They certainly would not have left it in that dump truck and paid \$58. But that is a matter to look at, Mr. Speaker. You know, we talk about keeping the place clean, and here we are on a Saturday when most working people have the day off - that is the day when they want to do their work - and you cannot get into a waste disposal area, not on the Avalon Peninsula anywhere and I have called all around.

MR. BAIRD: I can verify that.

MR. L. BARRY:

(Inaudible) have to cross (inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE:

You are right on with garbage, boy!

MR. T. LUSH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have been expressing some of the concerns. So these are some of the concerns that we should have if we are concerned about keeping our environment what it should be, without littering the place, it is to make it easy so that people have access to these places and can do their work on a Saturday without it costing them an exorbitant amount of money, and can go in there and dump their stuff, whatever it is they have in their trucks or in their yards or whatever, without costing them any extra money and costing the taxpayers any money. But, Mr. Speaker, that was a strange thing. That was certainly a strange incident. And, you know, I called a city councillor and he said, 'That is to save money, I guess.' And when I told him, of course, the guard was there, the guard was just there to tell me that I could not get in, well, he could not believe that at all. He says he is going to raise it and I hope I am going to hear about it. But this was the point, they were going to put the man there to save money and all he was there for was to tell me I could not come in - and a simple matter, just open the gate and tell me where I had to go - go in a mile or so and throw out my things and I would have done it and been in \$30 or \$35 that I could have spent on my family, Mr. Speaker, you know, bought shoes for my boys, coats and all this sort of thing.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Skates.

MR. T. LUSH:

A pair of skates.

Mr. Speaker, this is what we have been trying to do here, to point out some of our concerns in areas that we can work in to certainly make this Province a cleaner place and a better place in which to live. This is certainly the intent of this bill in terms of preserving our wilderness area and ecological areas, and in that, Mr. Speaker, we support the government. There is no question, in that we support the government, but we again want to raise the concern that by bringing in certain regulations we make a deliberate effort not to restrict

April 29, 1980

Tape 1146

EC - 3

MR. T. LUSH:

the freedoms of our people, not to
affect that quality of life, not to affect in a negative sense or not
to prevent our people from

MR. LUSH:

engaging in the activities that we have been known to engage in ever since we have been a Newfoundland and ever since we have been a Labrador. And with these few comments, Mr. Speaker, I shall certainly take my place. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I wish also to add my support for this piece of legislation. I would also want to caution the member who just took his seat if he does eventually get into that dump with the truckload of garbage or whatever the items are, just one word of advice; I have been in there, about three weeks ago, and the only thing you have to watch for after you get out of the dump is the clean-up job. I do not know if the hon. member is aware or not but there are about two million gulls circling overhead and they have an unusual habit of dropping certain items when people are in the vicinity. So there is a fairly extensive -

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible).

MR. GOUDIE: No, Mr. Speaker, but I would suggest to the hon. member if he wants to do that in the future, I would be more than happy to loan him my pickup truck. He will not have to pay for anything more than the gas.

Just to make a couple of points in support of this bill, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if hon. members will remember, are aware even, that last year and for the year prior to that Parks Canada and the Provincial Department of Tourism, as it was called then, now Tourism, Recreation and Culture, were consulting with quite a number of groups, particularly in Coastal Labrador, where a suggestion was made that perhaps there should be at least two national parks in Labrador, one in the Torngat Mountains area - the hon. member representing that district (Mr. Warren) is fully aware of it - and one in the Mealy Mountains area which is within the borderline, if you will, of my district, two of the more important and prominent mountain ranges of this Province, the Torngat range being the highest in Eastern Canada, highest East

MR. GOUDIE:

of the Rockies, as a matter of fact. But one of the very large concerns, or one of the great concerns expressed by both the Indians and the Inuit, when these discussions were taking place, was for the freedom that they might lose in terms of trapping, in pursuing a traditional way of life, of hunting for caribou, for partridge, porcupine or whatever the animals or birds are that they wish to hunt not strictly as a means of livelihood but as a - well, there are not all that many commodities that are low priced in terms of produce and meat and fish and so on in Northern Labrador through the stores that operate there, so people hunt and fish not only as a way of life but of sustaining a traditional lifestyle in keeping themselves alive in as cheap a manner as possible those days. So I would expect that when groups in Labrador, some groups, particularly the Indians and the Inuit, discover that this piece of legislation is being debated and eventually will be passed, I hope, by this House, they will be expressing that concern and perhaps the other two members, on the opposite side, for Labrador districts will be expressing the same sentiments, I do not know. But that fear will be there.

But I think if we look at section four, paragraph (a) which reads, "To provide for the continued existence of those areas as large wilderness areas to which people may come and in which they may hunt, fish, travel and otherwise experience and appreciate a natural environment". Of course that is subject to the approval of the minister as I interpret that act at least. So the provision is there, to allow this kind of thing. But I think the basic principle of preserving parts of this Province to preserve endangered species of plants, of animals, of birds, whatever is an excellent idea. I do not think any part of the Province has to suffer either in terms of traditional lifestyles or anything else because of this legislation.

I think as one example we in Labrador I guess, with a population of around 35,000 to 38,000 people in 112,000 square miles of land probably have some of the greatest expanses of natural country, wildlife and so on left in North America, not just Canada or just this Province but in most parts of North America I

MR. GOUDIE:

think. But just as an example Happy Valley-Goose Bay has existed since around 1942, I guess, when the first construction project began to build the bases there. And at that time hunting, fishing and everything else was taken for granted by the people who lived at North West River, at Mud Lake and at Traverspine River. However, these days-I am one of the people who likes to hunt and fish that part of our Province - those days if I want to get in a decent duck

MR. J. GOUDIE:

hunt or a goose hunt or a fishing trip I have to travel about two hundred miles outside of our area beyond Rigolet to a place called Pottles Bay, where I normally go to take advantage of that type of recreation which is offered by the environment itself. The place is fished out, it is hunted out. There are no partridges left, very few trout left, no salmon left to any extent at all. Of course, that is a problem all across the Province. But compared to what it was just a very few short years ago I think that illustrates the need for this kind of legislation and the need for certain areas of our Province to be set aside as wilderness reserves or a reserve in terms of the ecological sense and so on. I think it is a very important piece of legislation. I, again, like, I suppose, most hon. members of the House - I know the hon. the Premier, for instance, has a great deal of appreciation for the outdoors. I think during the Easter break the Premier was -

PREMIER PECKFORD: (inaudible) photographs back yet.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Oh, very good - out snaring rabbits I believe was what the gentleman said -

PREMIER PECKFORD: Rabbit season is closed.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Oh, Okay. Alright, I do not want to incriminate anyone here, enjoying the outdoors, I guess, is what I am trying to say.

AN HON. MEMBER: He hooked a few rabbits (inaudible)

MR. J. GOUDIE: He hooked a few? Well, that is alright, I guess you can fish with them as well.

MR. STIRLING: (inaudible) plastic (Inaudible)

MR. STAGG: (inaudible) came after Gerry Ford?

MR. J. GOUDIE: In any event, I guess the point I am trying to make is that perhaps all hon. members of this House of Assembly appreciate and take advantage of the outdoors whenever the opportunity arises. I know -

April 29, 1980

Tape No. 1148

RA - 2

MR. STIRLING: Take advantage of the wildlife as well (inaudible).

MR. J. GOUDIE: Take advantage of the wildlife as well.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) everybody in the House.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Okay, I know one of the greatest satisfactions I have had, Mr. Speaker - you talk about areas of the Province where other people have been, garbage is left behind, camping places are left and so on, and I know that there are people in the Province who are guilty, I guess, of littering the countryside and so on, but you will also find other people who are not guilty of littering and who have an appreciation for the natural areas of our Province - I know one of the greatest satisfactions I have had, especially travelling in boat late in the Fall, when you are on a goose hunt or a duck hunt, travelling in bad weather, stormy weather all day long, and you are in a small open boat, and you go ashore to a place where you know that people have camped before and the brush is there on the ground, the tent pickets are up, even the pickets for the stove, the three pickets to rest the stove on are there and it is just a matter of taking the tent and the stove out of the boat, setting it up, get the kettle on, stick a flummydum in the frying pan and let her go. What more could you ask for? You could not ask for anything better than that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Pollution free air.

MR. J. GOUDIE: Pollution free fresh air I think is the way Gordie Randell used to refer to it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. J. GOUDIE: A great life, Mr. Speaker, a great life. As a matter of fact, I think in supporting this bill I am going to serve notice on my colleague now, the hon. Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) perhaps she may not be in the portfolio when this will take place -

MR. YOUNG: You want her to go fishing with you?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. GOUDIE: I have two sons, Mr. Speaker, who, as a part of their educational process, are going to be out of school at least a month of the year when they get a couple of years older. I do not care whether they lose their Family Allowance or not, that is not the point, but they will be out of school for at least a month of the year so that they can be taken out, exposed to a traditional lifestyle. When I say traditional I mean traditional in the sense that they will be taught how to survive off the land, not just by me, I do not mean to suggest - yes, Mr. Speaker, you can come along as well if you wish. I am not that much of an expert but I have some relatives who are, one particular brother of mine who has been trapping since he was fourteen years of age. That will be a part of their lifestyle, their education process and I think, perhaps, that again might be something that government might want to address itself to somewhere down the road, setting up some kind of a - not college, that is not the right term, but an area of the Province, perhaps, with a facility constructed where, at least in the Summer months, interested children of any age, school age children, can go to observe and take part in some of the traditional ways of survival that the people of this Province have had in terms of the fishery, in terms of hunting, trapping and so on. I think it is an excellent piece of legislation. As I said, I think some of the groups in Labrador are going to express some reservations about it but I think that the minister and the staff in his department and government have tried to envisage some of these problems by allowing for hunting, and fishing and so on in some of these areas, with permission of the minister based on the advice of the Advisory Council. I think it is an excellent piece of legislation and I fully support it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I want to
speak in the debate on this bill but seeing that we
are approaching that wonderful hour I wish to move
the adjournment of the debate.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I move that
the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow,
Wednesday, April 30, at 3:00 p.m.

On motion, the House at
its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April
10, 1980, at 3:00 p.m.