

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
THURSDAY, MAY 1, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

With respect to the point of order that was raised yesterday in relation to the presentation of reports by Standing and Special Committees, the practice in this House has been that the presentation of such reports has been something done with very little comment. In doing some research on the matter, however, I find that indeed there have been occasions where a report has been presented and the member presenting the report has made brief comments, usually referring to the composition of the committee, thanking committee members, the form of the report, and in the case of the Estimates committees, the headings considered and the amount of time spent in committee meetings. There are, however, no precedents for any more elaborate remarks being made at the time of the presentation unless leave had been granted by the House.

I would rule, therefore, that at the time of the presentation of reports by Standing and Special Committees, comments other than those of the narrow type that I just described are out of order at the time of presentation. And further, no comments or responses are made following presentations of such reports unless leave, of course, has been granted by the House.

I would like to welcome to the galleries today, on behalf of all hon. members, twenty-one students from Island View Academy of Little Bay Islands from the district of Green Bay accompanied by their principal, Mr. Wheaton, and their driver, Mr. Roberts. We hope they enjoy their visit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with the requirements of section 51 of the Financial Administration Act, I am required to table details of guaranteed loans paid in part and whole since the last sitting of the House. I would like to table this and I believe there are copies available.

Also, Mr. Speaker, whilst I am on my feet I would like to table copies of special warrants that were signed on March 31st. and require to be tabled.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). Is he in a position now, or when will he be in a position to reveal the programme for the coming construction and hopefully upgrading and other aspects of the road work that are likely to be done during the coming year?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, that information should be available, I would say, by the middle of next week.

MR. D. JAMIESON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Could I ask the hon. minister if it is the intention to indicate, in a sense, in one statement or one release what the total work is that is going to be done other than presumably the normal kind of maintenance, is that the plan?

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

MR. BRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think the precedent was set last year when we tabled a list of projects and I assume that we will follow suit this year. We can do it the same way.

MR. JAMIESON: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: Perhaps the minister is in a position now to indicate, with regard to the remaining portion of the existing agreement on the Trans-Canada Highway, what sections or what work will be done with the funds that are already in place? What sections of the highway? Could the minister tell us that now?

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

MR. BRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, maybe not in complete detail. I would have to have it here but just from memory it is mostly paving, I think, on the section between here and Clarendville. It starts around Chance Cove there and then goes through almost to Northwest Brook. There is some more paving to be done in that area. And then in the Glovertown-Gambo area, I think, the major job there would be the overpass and then the largest portion of the funds, I understand, are to be spent on the West Coast, over in the Crabbs River area. I think a lot of that is paving, probably some reconstruction but again mostly paving.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the Premier. Two or three days ago in the House with regard to the questions on DREE and road construction for the coming year, the Premier expressed his concern that he was a little bit upset by the arrangement on the Trans-Canada, the fifty-fifty relationship, and said in the future he would negotiate to have this changed. Could the Premier inform this House what arrangement we would like? Is it fifty-fifty, seventy-five-twenty-five, eighty-twenty, ninety-ten? Which would the Premier like to have?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I am waiting to hear now back from the DREE minister and I have been calling his office the last week or so and we understand from some of his people-it is really difficult to get in touch with somebody who knows what is going on in his office-but we understand there is a letter on the way down to me about the present DREE agreements. I do not know if it is positive, negative or neutral. Number two, we have always taken the position, I have always taken the position that the Trans-Canada Highway reconstruction should be the same as the construction, and that is a ninety-ten agreement. And that is where we will be requesting funds, on that basis. I think if anybody looks at the Trans-Canada Highway in other provinces and so on we have a long way to go to even get to the national standard, as we have on just about everything else, and until we do we think that a ninety-ten is thereby justifiable.

MR. HISCOCK:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary. The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:

With regard to rural areas of this Province and municipalities particularly not having very much taxation or income base, there are arrangements now with the provincial government that if we want to have road construction it is a sixty-forty relationship.

MR. HISCOCK: Does the Premier, or this administration, have any plans in the future of changing this to a ninety/ten, or to a seventy-five/twenty-five?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: No, Mr. Speaker, we do not. We have in the last year changed the arrangement as it relates to fire fighting from fifty/fifty municipal/provincial sharing to I think seventy-five/twenty-five now, if I am not mistaken. But we do not have any plans in the immediate future to change this sixty/forty relationship, sixty per cent by the Province and forty per cent by the municipalities.

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

MR. JAMIESON: I had not intended, and if the hon. the Premier does not have the information at his fingertips I will understand, but his reference a moment ago to DREE and the Trans-Canada; my recollection is that in fact the Trans Canada agreement -

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is not that.

MR. JAMIESON: No, it is not.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I was trying to relate it to the hon. member because the roads were not in the Coastal Labrador agreement.

MR. JAMIESON: That is correct because the agreement is between, I believe, the Department of Transport.

PREMIER PECKFORD: DOT.

MR. JAMIESON: Have negotiations, separate altogether from those relating to DREE, been going on with the Department of Transport with a view to continuation of and improvement in the Trans-Canada Highway agreement? While I am at it, and I hope to have an opportunity later to elaborate on this, has the Premier or the ministry given any thought to an idea that was tossed around some time ago with regarding to having the Trans-Canada Highway declared a federal highway?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

We have not actually made that kind of request but we have over the last six or seven months put another proposal to DOT as it relates to ongoing reconstruction on the Trans-Canada Highway and to consider a ninety/ten kind of an arrangement. We also, at the same time, asked to have the present agreement re-opened and changed in its cost sharing and that was refused. So we are looking at a new agreement and we have not, to this point in time, actually asked for it to be declared a federal highway in the sense of it then being 100 per cent taken over by the federal government as it relates to financing.

MR. JAMIESON:

A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

Once again probably these matters would be better in a to and fro exchange, but I will just mention it, I will use the Question Period to do it. By way of preamble, I would say that my view is that it is wiser, in fact, for Newfoundland to proceed alone with regard to negotiations; if the contract were to be re-opened it is one which I take it would also require re-opening with regard to the three Maritime Provinces because it was a package deal. So is it a case now, I assume from what the Premier has said, that we will be negotiating strictly on the Newfoundland issue and on the Newfoundland road?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Absolutely, Mr. Speaker, no question about it. The previous document as it related to the discussion on bilateral issues will have the same kind of title, if you will, and will include the Trans-Canada Highway to reflect the fact that there are certain things which are peculiar to this Province and by negotiating them jointly, not that we are against the business of being friendly and

May 1, 1980

Tape No. 1192

NM - 3

PREMIER PECKFORD: co-operative with our sister provinces,
but which tend to dilute then the legitimacy of our own claims, not
only as it relates to the Trans-Canada Highway but other things, so
that we will tend to do it from government to government rather than
the other way.

MR. JAMIESON: Good.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. It seems that everything comes in threes, including bad news. We had the Greenspond-Ship Cove bridge problem last week; yesterday in the minister's absence, I brought up the problem of the federal funding for the causeway, and now today I have received a call from the council that the ferry service has broken down and there has been no ferry service - the third problem for Greenspond. Is the minister aware of it and can he tell us what is being done to bring in a temporary ferry service?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, 'temporary' ferry service is not a very nice word with me today. I was advised just a few minutes ago, Mr. Speaker, that there are some problems with the ferry service at Greenspond and we have had troubles other than the ferry breaking down for the last three or four weeks, but it was just brought to my attention. I do not know why the ferry is down and I do not know what steps are being taken because, as I indicated, it just came to my attention about half an hour ago.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: As the minister certainly knows, and as the House knows, there was a problem this year in the negotiating of a contract on that ferry service and negotiations actually broke off to the point that the ferry operator withdrew the ferry. One of the main points of contention that the department would not agree with is the ferry operator indicated that he needed a back-up service. And he had a back-up service available because he was afraid of just this kind of thing, that there might be a breakdown in the main ferry for as long as a week, because it requires getting in parts and that sort of thing, and this has now happened. The ferry is down and the estimate is it is going to be down for a week. But the department would not agree at that time to paying for a back-up service.

MR. L. STIRLING: And it is the lack of the back-up service that apparently is causing the problem right now. Would the minister agree to finding a back-up service on a temporary basis or paying for that back-up service on a temporary basis until the main ferry can be repaired?

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

MR. C. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, I am afraid I cannot agree to pay for a back-up ferry. You see, Mr. Speaker, it would be quite simple to have a back-up ferry if there were only one such service in the whole Province. And one only has to go to the waterfront of the city and see a large ferry boat tied up for seven or eight months of the year to know why I have to say no. Now, we have something like twelve ferry systems in the Province, and if this government has to have a back-up ferry for every system then we are going to get into hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars which we cannot afford, and the only comfort I can offer

MR. C. BRETT: the hon. member is that if it appears that the service is going to be out for a long time, then we will have to give some thought to looking for another boat. I hope that this whole thing is genuine, because the gentleman who operates the ferry service there came to us and we proceeded to negotiate a new contract. And on each item on a shopping list he was given a reasonable increase, which amounted to X number of dollars, but the gentleman insisted on having another \$30,000 or \$40,000 over and above that and of course we could not agree to it. And he stormed out of the office and closed the ferry system but later decided to open it and settle for the original amount which was offered to him. The back-up ferry was one and, as I indicated, there is just no way and I think most people in this House, the press and the general public recognize that if we have got to get into a programme like that, then the budget we brought in a few days ago is not going to be worth very much.

MR. L. STIRLING: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A final supplementary, the hon.

member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I have no quarrel with the minister. As he knows I wrote him complimenting his officials on their willingness to negotiate a reasonable service. So I have no quarrel with the minister on his negotiations with a particular ferry operator. My question is on behalf of the residents of that island who are stranded, and they sometimes get caught in the middle of these negotiations. It would seem to me that the minister makes a very good point, that you could not have a back-up service for each ferry service, but with twelve ferry services in operation can you not at least have one back-up service which could rotate, because for sure at some point in the year one of these ferries is always in trouble? So is there now a back-up service of at least one ferry and where is it in use right now?

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

MR. C. BRETT:

An excellent question, Mr. Speaker. It gives me an opportunity to explain something even further. What is happening on Greenspond Island just goes to point out the inadequacies of the present ferry system in the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. C. BRETT:

We spent the last two or three weeks negotiating to have the Catherine, which is a ferry that operates in the Bell Island run during the Summer months, we just finished negotiations with the owner of that ferry to have it to go to Fogo because the present ferry there has to come on dock and the other boat that the gentleman has is inadequate and we had hoped to get, you know, the Catherine to go in to take over. And I think she was about to go today or tomorrow when we suddenly discovered that it is written in the contract with the Bell Island group that she can not move. So, this is a case of where we are paying the piper but we can not call the tune; and we do, in fact, have a stand-by ferry and she has been sitting there for months and she will sit there for another couple but I can not move her.

MR. C. BRETT: And the hon. gentleman is making a lot of sense. There is no reason in this world why we should not have one or two stand-by boats, and that is all that would be needed, and have them in St. John's or somewhere around the Province, anywhere where we could get at them fairly easily. And then if she is needed in Greenspond or Fogo or St. Brendan's or wherever, then we can take her and shoot her there and use her for the two or three weeks. But, as it stands now, although we have a stand-by ferry, I am not allowed to use it; the government is not allowed to use it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation (C. Brett) and Communications as well, and it too relates to ferry services. Just a brief preamble: A couple of days ago I asked the minister about the committee that he set up to look into ferry services within the Province and I would like to follow this question up with another to the minister asking what precisely was the purpose of setting up this committee? What were the terms of reference? What was the committee supposed to do?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Yes, I indicated in the last question, Mr. Speaker, I very quickly became cognizant of the fact that the ferry system that we have in the Province is most inadequate and the whole purpose of the committee was to look into ways and means of improving the system. And, that is what they have done.

MR. T. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it looks like, by the answers that the minister gave the hon. member from Bonavista North (L. Stirling), that the committee seems to have recommended very little in terms of improving because certainly this would have been a most valuable

MR. T. LUSH: recommendation to have a back up service.
So, can the minister indicate to the House what recommendations came from the committee? What specific recommendations came from this committee in terms of improving ferry services throughout the Province?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I had never said that I had received the committee's report up until this moment. I think I might have told the hon. member in the corridor but I never said it publicly. But, in fact, I have received the report of the committee. It was handed to me two or three days ago on my way to the House and I just had time to take a very brief glance at the report. I will peruse the report now and then I will bring it to Cabinet and I do not think it would be proper for me to indicate exactly what the committee recommended until such time as the Cabinet has had an opportunity to look at it. And I hope the Cabinet can do that within the next couple of weeks.

MR. T. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: I wonder if the minister, on the basis of having received the report, and I realize his position of not wanting to give too much information without first of all, of course, presenting it to Cabinet, but can the minister indicate to the House now whether or not there will be any extra monies allocated for improvement of ferry services, specifically for the purchase of new ferries? I ask the question because

MR. T. LUSH: it relates specifically to St. Brendan's where we have a tremendously inadequate ferry service, as the minister knows, not from the point of view of the operators but from the point of view of the inadequacy of the boat to do that particular run. So can the minister indicate whether or not there will be extra funds this year allocated for the purpose of purchasing of new ferries?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, under the existing system the answer is no, there will not be.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not for St. Brendan's?

MR. C. BRETT: Not for any ferry with the exception of the new one, the Ramea - Burgeo one which is a new system that will be hopefully going into place this year. But under the existing programme there will be no money for new boats. Of course, we will be negotiating new contracts with the various companies, but there will be no money for new boats. Again, that question can be better answered after the Cabinet has seen the report of the Committees.

MR. T. LUSH: May I ask one further supplementary?

MR. J. HODDER: Go ahead.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated one final supplementary.
Do you wish to yield?

MR. J. HODDER: Yes. Am I going to get a chance to go on afterwards?

MR. SPEAKER: It depends on the time.
The hon. the member for Terra Nova, a final supplementary.

MR. T. LUSH: A final supplementary re the Committee's report: Would the minister indicate whether or not he intends tabling the report of that Committee?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I see no reason why we could not table the report after the Cabinet has dealt with it.

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

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Education. I was just wondering if the Property Committee, the committee that was set up to look at school facilities and to come up with a cost of what Grade XII would cost to implement in the Province, has the minister got a report from that Property Committee?

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

MS L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I personally have not received a report from the committee planning the reorganization of high schools, but I understand that the sub-committee which was handling that specific task of cost estimates and facilities requirements recently did submit a report to the main steering committee and I would expect that it will reach me quite soon. I did get a preliminary report from that sub-committee through the steering committee in December of 1979 but they have done work since then and made some refinements in their estimates.

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

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

MR. J. HODDER: Could the minister tell the House, since she has had some knowledge, how much the Property Committee said the implementation of Grade XII would cost?

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

MS L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot quote specific figures off the top of my head, so I will take that as notice and provide more specific, accurate figures within the next few days.

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

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

MR. J. HODDER: Well, I can tell the minister, I understand from the committee that it is close to \$40 million. This figure is, again, a rough figure, because I think there were six school boards that were not covered, so it is an approximate figure of \$40 million. Will this figure affect the

MR. J. HODDER: government's decision to bring in Grade XII on the time schedule which they have already decided upon? Will this figure have any effect on that decision?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), I think, has incorrect information. The only figure or estimates which are relevant for the preparation for introducing Grade XII, which is now slated to be taught for the first time in the school year 1983/84, are those facilities required for that extra year of senior high school. There may be other facilities required for high schools for the grades which are now taught, but those have to be separated in preparing for the addition of Grade XII.

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

MR. D. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett), getting back on land this time. I think the minister will agree with me that the road conditions around this Province are in a deplorable condition, the worst I have seen in years, I would imagine, and I see in the Budget here that there is a decrease of \$10 million in reconstruction of existing highways and bridges. How can the government justify a cutback of \$10 million when we look at the condition of the roads as they are today?

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

MR. C. BRETT: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with the hon. member that road conditions in this Province are worse than they have ever been. As a matter of fact, quite the contrary, Mr. Speaker; I think road conditions in this Province are better than they have ever been!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. C. BRETT: Last year

this government spent something like \$90 million, with the help of the Federal Government, of course, and I would like to think that \$90 million should make - the end result should be that road conditions are much, much better than they ever were. So first of all, I do not agree with that statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. C. BRETT: How I can justify the cut of \$10 million; well, maybe I should tell the hon. member that if we had gotten the agreement from Ottawa that we were looking for we would have had that extra \$10 million, because we are spending \$17 million on the Trans-Canada Highway this year, and, of that, \$15 million has to come from provincial funds. So had we got the agreement that we were looking for we would have had not a \$15 million provincial programme this year but a \$30 million programme.

MR. D. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. D. HANCOCK: It is obvious to me, Mr. Speaker, that the minister spends too much time up there in the plane. He should be on the roads more often and he would know what the road conditions are like.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. D. HANCOCK: Going down just in my district alone, the pavement there, most of it, is election pavement but we thank God that we have it. We should have more elections we may get more pavement. But, Sir, going down there, there are that many holes in the pavement now, in the night time driving down, I am expecting to see seals coming up through the holes that are in the pavement. You do not know if you are on ice when it is foggy or if you are on pavement, that is how many holes there are in the pavement.

May 1, 1980

Tape No. 1197

DW - 3

MR. D. HANCOCK: What conditions does your department weigh in respect to where and what road conditions get priority in this Province? Do school runs with buses, where school children are being transported back over road conditions that are deplorable and basically over a large section of dirt road, would they get priority over a section where there no school children being transported back and forth?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member mentions pavement with holes in it. He should have been with me yesterday, and I was in an airplane, but I would like to tell the hon. gentleman that I have travelled over every inch of gravel road in this Province since I have been the minister.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: Every inch.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BRETT: I drove over them, not flew over them.

And if the hon. member had been with me yesterday

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BRETT: - and if he had said to the people that I met with, two groups of people, as a matter of fact, if he had told them that he had pavement with holes in it and that he was upset, then I do not know what they would have done to him, because they do not have any pavement at all, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HISCOCK: (Inaudible) Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member has a point of order to raise?

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Do I have the floor, Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to establish priorities in the Province when we have 2,000 miles of unpaved roads, and as somebody said yesterday, "Why are we last?" I said, "Well, I do not think that you are last anymore than the other people who have to travel over and live near the 2,000 miles of unpaved road." It is very difficult to establish

MR. BRETT: priorities, but we do and we take into consideration, yes, where there are fish plants, and this sort of thing.

It is a difficult job but we do establish priorities.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the hon. the Premier, Sir. In view of the fact that the government have torn down the Union Jack and trampled it in the mud, and substituted it with a rag that is unacceptable to the people of this Province, would the hon. gentleman indicate whether or not the government is going to proceed to shove this flag down the throats of Newfoundlanders? Will they withdraw it, destroy it, and try to get a proper design that is acceptable to the people of this Province?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that the way the question is phrased, I do not intend to answer it. I will answer the question posed by the Leader of the Opposition yesterday in the appropriate manner, under the Answers To Questions For Which Notice Has Been Given.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Obviously the hon. gentleman is backing away from making his people toe the party line. But what I want to ask the hon. gentleman, is because this flag, this so-called flag is so offensive and unacceptable to the people of this Province, will the hon. gentleman consider taking it and putting it down in Robin Hood Bay and try to get something that is acceptable to every Newfoundlander?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not intend to answer questions of that sort, Mr. Speaker.

May 1, 1980

Tape No. 1198

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has
managed to cause one of the biggest furors in Newfoundland from coast
to coast than anybody else, I suppose, in the history of Newfoundland.
The hon. gentleman has given notice -

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

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is the Question Period
and I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne, page 129. "A question oral
or written must not be ironical, rhetorical, offensive, or contain
epithet, innuendo, satire, or ridicule." There is also another authority
that you cannot ask a question repeating -

MR. MARSHALL:

substance a question already answered. The hon. gentleman, as is his wont, wants to seem to monopolize every section of the proceedings of this House and this is exactly what he is doing. He is out of order. He has asked the question, the question in my mind is out of order in the first instance, but to repeat it, he has already gotten an answer. If he does not like the answer that is for his -

MR. BARRY:

He has broken every rule in the book.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

With respect to the point of order, I believe there is a legitimate point of order in this particular matter and I will ask the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to rephrase his question. He has time for one quick supplementary.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he has received any representations in the last twenty-four hours from individuals and groups of individuals in this Province protesting this monstrosity that was brought in on the floor of the House on Tuesday? If so, will the hon. gentleman be taking action on these protests and these complaints and these representations to try to give these people some input into the kind of provincial flag that they would like to have and not have the government shove this one down their throats?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, until the hon. member got to the last part of his question I think it was a legitimate one but the last three or four words surely were not and were again I think made to stimulate debate and were not in the best interests of this House or this Province. Suffice it to say right now that I have had representations supporting the flag and I have had representations not supporting the flag. I have two that were just handed to me a few moments ago, very, very ecstatic in their praise of the flag, so therefore I have been getting a mixed reaction and I will outline in the Answers To Questions For Which Notice Has Been Given how we intend to proceed.

May 1, 1980

Tape No. 1199

AH-2

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer two groups of questions, one in relation to a number of questions that were asked in different forms by members of the House, especially the Leader of the Opposition, over the last number of days and I think it is very, very important. It has something to do with the Private Member's motion yesterday. I have written the Government House Leader and written the Opposition House Leader and I have provided a copy to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), and the letter goes to both House Leaders and a copy to the Minister of Mines and Energy; 'Dear Colleagues; As I stated in the House recently the government will be most happy to brief all members of the House on offshore oil and gas matters. It is proposed that these briefings take place in camera after the estimate committees have completed their work, after May 6th. I feel that in camera briefings will allow government officials to give members of the House information which it might not be in the public interest to make public at this time, as well as to answer the questions of any member of the House in a frank and open manner. It is proposed a panel of officials under the Chairmanship of the Hon. Leo Barry, Minister of Mines and Energy, make three separate presentations to the members of the House. I have attached hereto a proposed agenda for the three sessions. If my proposal meets with the approval of both sides of the House, I would very much appreciate you jointly contacting the Minister of Mines and Energy with regard to the specific dates on which the three sessions can go forward.'

PREMIER PECKFORD:

And I have tried to provide a proposed agenda. Session One, Introduction to petroleum geology; b. Description of the geology and petroleum potential of the Province's offshore areas generally. Two, Introduction to offshore petroleum technology, description of the specific technology needed to develop the Province's offshore areas. Three, Introduction to petroleum economics, description of the general economic impact of the development of the Province's potential petroleum resources. Four, Discussion of the general relationships between the Province's fishing industry and the exploitation of its offshore petroleum resources. Five, Discussion of the environmental, social and economic impacts of the development of the Province's offshore potential generally.

Briefing Session Two; one, Description of the oil and gas potential of the Hibernia structure. Two, Description of the technological options open for the exploration of Hibernia. Three, Description of the economics of the petroleum resources of Hibernia. Four, Description of the relationships between the Province's fishing industry and the exploration of Hibernia. Five, Description of the potential environmental, social and economic impacts of the development of Hibernia. Six, Discussion of the likely timetable for the development of Hibernia. Seven, Description of the specific regulatory requirements regarding the examination and approval of any proposed development plan for Hibernia.

Briefing Session Three; one, Discussion of the Province's overall social and economic objectives and the importance of controlling the rate and type of development. Two, Discussion of the links between "ownership" and "control" and an assessment of the Province's offshore legal case. Three, Description of political negotiations with the Federal Government of Canada to date and the significance of the agreements signed by the previous Clark administration. Four, Description of proposed future course of action regarding negotiations with Ottawa and/or a reference to the Supreme Court of Canada. Five, Description of the basic philosophy and most important provisions of the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Regulations, 1977

PREMIER PECKFORD: as they now exist. Six, Discussion of the possible need for further legislative action and regulations. Note, it is proposed that each briefing take the form of a two hour session comprising one hour of formal presentations by officials of government and then a hour for members to reply and then, after that process is through, to decide in consultation with the Opposition how we should proceed from there.

So, I look towards both the House Leader on this side and on the opposite side getting together to see how we can set up a regime after caucuses on both sides have been held to determine the right schedule to be put into effect.

Secondly, I want to report to this hon. House that after having a meeting with Cabinet and a meeting of caucus, the position of the government as it relates to the flag is this: one, the government and myself initiated with the co-operation of the Opposition to have a Select Committee established and to report to this hon. House. A lot of people feel strongly about it in the Province, as has been witnessed by members opposite and members on this side, and it is the considered opinion of this side of the House that we are prepared, obviously, to have a free vote on this matter.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

What a coward! What a coward!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Any further questions.

MR. NEARY:

The coward of the country!

MR. W. MARSHALL:

Disappointed now, are you?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. T. BENNETT:

Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition from the Community Council of Rocky Harbour.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms)

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. W. MAPSHALL:

I again refer to the previous point of order. Is the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary) to be able to monopolize this House, The hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. T. Bennett) is up to give a petition and, as when everyone gets on their feet in this House from time to time, as is his habit he is interrupting so that other members can not hear and he is out of order.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER:

With respect to the point of order, I would like to point out, if I may, at this time, it is my opinion that in the last number of day, in fact, there have been an unusual number of interruptions from both sides of the House perhaps and to point out, in order to avoid any confusion that might exist in anybody's mind, the right to be heard in silence is one specific right that every member has in this hon. House. And I would ask all members to consider that. It is my position to point out these various rules. I think the hon. members should certainly themselves adhere to these particular rules.

The hon. member for St. Barbe.

MR. T. BENNETT:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to present a petition from the Community Council of Rocky Harbour and it concerns the relocation of the park boundaries of the Gros Morne National Park. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that down through the years since the introduction of the Gros Morne National Park, in the Bonne Bay area there has been a certain amount of discontent. And I understand the residents of Rocky Harbour especially at this time are asking that the

MR. T. BENNETT: boundaries as they exist be re-arranged to give the people of that community more freedom than they presently experience. The prayer of the petition is as follows: "From the community council of Rocky Harbour, a petition by the Rocky Harbour Community Council to extend the present boundaries of Gros Morne National Park according to the following description: Beginning at the South end of Rocky Harbour Pond and running in a straight line to Deer Arm Bridge, then following Deer Arm River to the West end of Deer Arm Pond, then following the West shoreline to Deer Arm Pond to Half Moon Pond Brook, then in a straight line to the West end of Bakers Brook Pond, then following Bakers Brook to the seashore."

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition that has been signed by more than four hundred residents of the area and I would like to have the petition placed upon the Table of the House of Assembly and directed to the authority to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support the petition so ably presented by my hon. colleague on behalf of some four hundred residents of Rocky Harbour. Of course, having a National Park in my own district, I can sympathize with the concerns and the wishes of the people who signed the petition. The people want it extended, they want the boundaries changed to give them more freedom, I expect. This is one of the things, Mr. Speaker, with respect to National Parks. that many time the boundaries sort of inconvenience certain communities. I can think of in my own district in particular, Charlottetown, which is completely hemmed in by the Terra Nova National Park and, of course, if we are going to - we all realize that we are going to have a National Park, that there have obviously got to be some restrictions and some inconveniences with respect to allocations of land. But, I do believe in some cases that the bureaucracy acted a little callous in terms of what areas were included

MR. T. LUSH: and the kinds of constraints and restrictions that were placed upon certain people living in communities that were established long before the parks came there.

And, of course, one would not care so much if, as a result of these restrictions and inconveniences that were imposed on people by boundaries, that they would have got some compensation in terms of the provision of extra services, this sort of thing, in the terms of water and sewer, in terms of paved roads in their area, but, unfortunately such was not always the case.

And, again I refer to Charlottetown which is completely hemmed into the - around the boundaries or within the boundaries of the Terra Nova National Park and a community without any water and sewer, which is a tremendous inconvenience and almost an indictment in this day and age.

So, Mr. Speaker, I wholeheartedly support this petition, though, of course, it is a federal matter, I am sure that the minister concerned will take the appropriate action with his federal counterpart and bring the wishes and the desires they have expressed in this petition to the appropriate officials at the federal level.

OOO

MR. S. NEARY: On a point of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of privilege, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the government, I believe the Premier, it was, a few days ago gave notice of a Bill to confirm in law the acceptance of a flag that was brought into this House on Tuesday. Now, Mr. Speaker, to show the contempt and the arrogance of these hon. gentlemen, that flag is now hanging in the lobby of Confederation Building. It is hanging there as if it was an official flag, and I would submit

MR. S. NEARY: to Your Honour that that is contrary to the rules of this House. That flag has not been accepted as the official flag of this Province and I would submit it is a breach of privilege of this House, Your Honour. And I raise it as a very serious matter. The government are

MR. NEARY: flying the flag as if it was the official flag of the Province. They have put it on display - they can argue what they wish - but the flag is down in the lobby of Confederation Building, down beside the Canadian Legion flags, flags of the Canadian Legion that represent veterans who went overseas and fought under the Union Jack.

So I ask Your Honour to give us a ruling on whether or not that is a breach of privilege of this House. In my opinion it is. The government is doing something that they have not had yet accepted on the floor of this House. So I ask Your Honour if you would give a ruling in favour of a breach of privilege and punish the people -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: - punish those who gave instructions to have that flag put in the lobby of Confederation Building.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that is not a point of privilege, it is a point of politics, that is what that is, that the hon. member is drawing up now. I refer Your Honour to Beauchesne again. If the hon. gentleman in this House wishes to get up on a point of privilege or a point of order it should be ingrained I suggest in the parliamentary rules.

Paragraph 16 - "Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by Members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions and which exceed those possessed by other bodies and individuals. Thus, privilege, though part of the law of the land, is to a certain extent an exception to the ordinary law.

MR. MARSHALL: "The distinctive mark of a privilege is its ancillary character. The privileges of Parliament are rights which are 'absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers.' They are enjoyed," and I emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, "by individual Members, because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the services of its members; and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity."

Now, Mr. Speaker, the type of privilege as raised by the hon. gentleman as he has from time to time, and in this case, is in itself an infringement of the privileges of this House because it abuses the normal proceedings that are set down in our Standing Orders and under the authorities from time to time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And this type of interference with the rules of the House and the way in which it is set down, Mr. Speaker, I say is an abysmal and a continuous and an irritating infringement of the sum total of the privileges of this House. What the hon. member has raised is not a matter of privilege of this House. There has been a bill brought before this House, a design of the flag is being shown for the purpose of information of the general public.

Now that is the answer to it, But there is a further and there is a deeper concern of this House, and that is the type of conduct by the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) from time to time who seems to want to take the floor of this House for his own political purposes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please! In addition to the citations referred to by the hon. President of the Council, here is another one, Paragraph 17, which I would like to point out to hon. members, "A question of privilege ought rarely to come up in Parliament."

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): And that of course if followed by a motion giving the House power to impose a reparation or apply a remedy.

In this particular case I would rule that there is not a prima facie case established; therefore, no point of privilege.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Order 11, Bill No. 12.

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: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill presented by the hon. Minister of Tourism (Mr. Dawe). I think this is my first opportunity to congratulate the minister on his appointment as Minister of Tourism and if this is an indication of what to expect from that minister, I am not going to say that he will have my 100 per cent support.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will do a lot for the Province of Newfoundland and also the section that we call Labrador. In speaking on this bill on Tuesday, the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) brought up a couple of very fine points that I want to go a little further on. The minister said that there are going to be probably two areas in Labrador

MR. G. WARREN: that probably will be reserved as wildlife areas. Now, you must remember that in Labrador the 112,000 miles is pretty well as big as the three Maritime Provinces together. And at the present time, in this area we have a very low staff of tourism officials, wildlife officers and so on. We do have a staff there probably that is sufficient to look after the wildlife at the present time. I am not condemning the staff there, but we do have a small staff, and if we are going to set up two large areas in Labrador that are going to be for educational and cultural benefit, for example, I think the minister should see fit that he will have adequate staff in the areas to make sure that they are well protected.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I was reading in the paper a few days ago, a big caribou herd is irreplaceable as a food source for Labradorians. There are roughly, I think, as this paper said, 150,000 caribou in this area. Now, if we are not careful, and we open up this large wildlife area - and the minister will have the authority under this act to let the traditional hunting continue. But let us look over the past two years: There was more than the traditional hunting going on there. There is a lot of fly-by-night hunting, a lot of people chartering aircraft and going in and pitching right down in the middle of the herd, using their 303 rifles and shooting the caribou, and off they go. And it is not for the sake of taking the caribou out of there but just the antlers.

I notice that the minister did say in this release that he is concerned about the Quebec attitude towards this herd, because this herd does fluctuate between both provinces, and he is afraid that probably it will diminish because of the Quebec people over-hunting. Again, I warn the minister, he should definitely be concerned about the over-hunting by non-Labradorians.

Mr. Speaker, the minister said that this bill, to quote from the paper, 'will go a long way towards putting Newfoundland among the leaders in North America.' However, I do caution him that it also will probably leave our countryside, our tourists - if they are not watched, as I said about the protection officers, where the Minister of the Environment

MR. G. WARREN: will have concern, if we are not careful we will have the same thing as is happening in places in the Province today where parts of the old Cabot Highway are closed down and there are no wildlife protection officers in this area at all, there are no environment officers looking at this area of the Province and we see sections of the land which are completely littered. So we have to be very careful in bringing in legislation in allowing such an extraordinary part of our Province to be allotted for a wildlife area and reserve.

Mr. Speaker, in Labrador we have, I believe, one of the oldest buildings in the Province, and that is one of the old Moravian mission houses there in Hopedale. I think it is well over 200 years old. It is an historical building. The Minister of Tourism (Mr. R. Dawe) should take note that not only should we be concerned with the big wildlife areas of the Province, we should be concerned with those historical artifacts. I think the minister said that in 1975, a committee was struck to begin the work of preparing this legislation.

MR. G. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, from 1975 to 1980, that is five years for that committee to bring in this legislation. It did take a long time. However, I want to remind the minister that actually it started a long time before that, it started back in 1972 - 1973. In fact, it was reported in the Royal Commission on Labrador in 1974 and in that Royal Commission the commission recommends "that in the interest of preservation of historical materials and sites of provincial and national importance, and in the interest of expanding the tourist industry, the Province take immediate steps." That was in 1974, it was recommended that the Province would take immediate steps to designate areas and sites of historical significance. Now, that was in 1974.

So, Mr. Speaker, to the minister, this was six years ago and now I can see that the minister is bringing in this worthwhile bill. And in between that time and now there have been many very valuable artifacts taken out of Labrador and are not in the museums but in people's homes down in the Eastern United States, up in different parts of the mainland and probably in part of Newfoundland. I think the minister should take steps to try to get those artifacts back into Labrador and back to this Island of Newfoundland and Labrador and let them be shown as part of our past heritage.

Mr. Speaker, on page 823 of the Royal Commission again I would like to read this recommendation from the Royal Commission. It says, "The Commission recommends that in the interest of preserving the environment of Labrador and the wise and controlled use for recreational purposes of its fish, its game and other land and water resources, the Province should give immediate priority to the destination of the wilderness area". Now, again, that is six years ago and now we can

MR. G. WARREN: see this coming into being today. It was a long time coming but I hope that it will be for the benefit of all, game preserves, bird sanctuaries and provincial park areas in Labrador.

Now, provincial park areas in Labrador. Mr. Speaker, the third previous minister, the minister who is presently the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), when he was Minister of Tourism, and the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power) when he was Minister of Tourism—I can remember those two in particular made statements that there would be a provincial park within the Lake Melville area. Now at the present time we have a provincial park in Western Labrador in the Menihek district and we have a small provincial park down in the Pinware/Red Bay area. However, the transportation nucleus of tourists that go in and out of Labrador go into Lake Melville and there are no camping facilities whatsoever. And this was recommended six years ago along with the other two reserves that are in this bill, and those two recommendations were made and this government and the past government for the past seven years have not seen it necessary to have a provincial park in the Lake Melville area. It is an essential request; it is a request that does probably coincide to a great degree to the future of Lake Melville. We have now a ferry that operates from Lewisporte to Goose Bay for three or four months of the year that could accommodate many, many tourists, and with the economy in the Lake Melville area today at its lowest ebb, I believe that the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Dawe) should see fit to take immediate steps also to see that a provincial park is established in that area.

MR. G. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, Tuesday in the debate the hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) mentioned about the use of the land. Mr. Speaker, in committee reports when we had the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) on the committee, I suggested to the minister then that she should consider in a school curriculum that consideration should be given to native students that we can go back before Confederation, we can go back before probably schooling was brought into being along the Northern Labrador coast - we know that the students spent most of their time living the traditional way of life, living on the land. So I recommended to the Minister of Education and to the committee, and I recommend to the hon. Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) now, that all Cabinet ministers should support the Minister of Education in this very worthwhile proposition. And I believe the Minister of Tourism in consideration of this bill will be well advised to consider it also,

MR. WARREN: that the school curriculum at the end of the school year - it probably lasts two or three weeks of the school year - should be set aside for the teachers and the students, not necessarily the students alone, to go out into the wilderness, to go out into the fresh, clear Labrador air for the last two or three weeks of the school year and learn. And not only are the students learning more about their traditional lifestyle, but the teachers who are there are obliged to be part of that school, are also learning about the way of life of those children. So that is a proposition to Madam Minister, and I am sure the Premier would gladly agree with I am saying as would the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Dawe).

I hope all members of Cabinet will support the minister when she brings this proposition to Cabinet, which I hope is not in the too distant future.

Education, Mr. Speaker, is a must for all students, but, also, their way of life should not be sacrificed. We should not use them by having the native students learn about the white man's way of living unless we, as teachers, learn something about their way of life also. So, actually, it is a two way street and both of them should go in the same direction.

Mr, Speaker, in opening up the wilderness we are actually forming, to a certain degree, a potential for tourists and a potential for the country to be probably partially destroyed by campers cutting down trees half way to the ground, garbage cans being thrown around and everything else.

I know that the report of the Powell Commission on Kitts-Michelin uranium development is to be released within the next two or

MR. WARREN: three weeks, as I understand from the news release this morning. So I want to, also, draw to the attention of the minister that if this project does go ahead - and also to the Minister of Tourism - where we are one hundred and twenty miles or so from Goose Bay, and we are intending to open up a road from North West River to that area, and we are going into virgin territory, a great concern of mine is what will happen to this land? Will it be developed or just left open for hunters and tourists and anyone at all to go there? What will happen to the countryside? Will it be destroyed or will this area be tied into the minister's bill?

Mr. Speaker, there are other things to be taken into consideration when this bill is brought into being, when it becomes law. Here we are opening up potential areas - I may be speaking on Labrador in particular, but I am speaking about Newfoundland in general - areas for tourists. We have to make sure that there are accommodations available. We have to make sure that people will get into hotels and motels or the camping business to accommodate tourists who will flock into those areas. You know, there is more to it than just making the bill law, we have to make sure that we have the onshore facilities to accommodate the tourists who are going to want to avail of them. Because I am sure, if an area is opened up, people can be allowed in to take pictures of the wildlife and maybe do some good films for TV or for things like this. We need accommodations and transportation as well as the bill itself.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Lewisporte (Mr. White) in supporting the bill said that we should be really concerned about the

MR. WARREN: environment. He mentioned different things about the Newfoundland Light and Power and their spray programme along the Trans-Canada Highway and this sort of thing. These are some of the concerns that I hope are sinking into the minister's head. I know he has a fairly nice bushy head over there, but I am sure he can take in the concerns as expressed by members on this side of the House.

I hope that the minister does not use his powers too forcefully

MR. G. WARREN: in putting demands on those areas. The minister has the authority but he should treat it as a bill that is to the good of Newfoundlanders, in particular the people in the area of the Province that is concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I did have something else here on my paper. You are planning to have eleven representatives on your advisory council. Now, six of those will be selected from the general public. I have too much confidence in the minister to think he will pick favourites in such a bill as this. I am sure he is not going to do so. If I can be of any assistance to the minister in recommendations especially to parts of Labrador that I am quite familiar with along with the other three members in Labrador, I would suggest to him that he pay very careful attention to whom he selects on his advisory council and make sure that it is a cross section of the general public.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to throw out the suggestion that the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) threw open, that if you really want to see virgin territory of this Province, if you really want to see the outdoors at its fullest, the highest mountains, the nice blue running water, the snow-capped hills, I suggest that the minister and other officials from the government, and also on this side of the House, come up into the Torngat Mountains. The Torngat Mountains are unique to me, being the first member elected from that district which is called after the Torngat Mountains. It is one of the highest mountain tops in Eastern Canada, and I think it would be worthwhile for you to come up there. Contrary to what the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett) said about all the roads in Newfoundland, you cannot drive there, you have to fly or get a boat or something like that, but come up and see the beautiful country and look at what country this bill could put in danger if we are not careful.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the forest like in that area?

MR. WARREN:

In the Torngat Mountains

North of Nain there are very little forests at all. It is all mountains, hills and valleys.

There are some trees up at the head of Nain Bay, which is about thirty-five miles Northwest of Nain, but after you get past that the trees are very, very scattered. As you know there last year when there were three hunters perished in a blizzard, it was because they could not find any trees for security. Once you get up past the Torngat Mountains, up around Hebron Fiord, there are no trees whatsoever. You are almost out of the tree line completely.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion I would like to say again I am in favour of this bill. I support the bill 100 per cent but I would like again to say to the minister, be very cautious and make sure that we have the staff and the facilities to accomodate this bill. I was just going to clue up but I did not know there was one more little note here. This past two weeks we saw a project on the go in Northern Labrador with respect to the caribou herd where there was somewhere like 159 to 170 caribou killed. Now I agree that scientists need to update their data, I agree with that wholeheartedly, but although I have been given explanations as to why, I am concerned why they had to kill 170 caribou for samples. They could have probably got as many samples from thirty or forty caribou without going and killing 170. That is my concern. It is a concern that has been expressed by residents in my district and furthermore, as I understand from the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Dawe), the meat was distributed to the needy families which everyone is thankful for.

MR. G. WARREN:

However, another concern in this whole scientific survey was - now, I understand that there is a regulation in this government in this Province of Newfoundland saying that you cannot - I cannot quote it piece by piece - but saying that you cannot hunt or shoot or use a gun from a moving vehicle, whether it is a boat, a car, a train, a helicopter or what. You are not allowed to use it while you are in motion. Now, I want to make this point because it has been thrown open to me. I spoke to the minister yesterday, and though he gave me a very logical answer, I would like for him to explain it to the House, too. In this survey there were some twenty-odd caribou killed from the window of a helicopter. Now if the helicopter was moving low over the caribou, the biologists or scientists or the hunters, whatever the case may be, were killing the caribou from the helicopter.

Now, this had two drastic effects.

This not only scared the living daylights out of the caribou and drove them, you know, real - I will not use the word. I think it is unparliamentary to use the word in the House. But really drove them right fast, okay. Now, not only did it do that, but it also, by driving the caribou fast like this and by stirring up the caribou, we call it, I have learned from the people in Nain, from the people who have been eating caribou most of their lives as their main food, they have been telling me that once a caribou is driven, once an animal is forced to retreat because of noise and action, that the caribou meat is not as tasty, it is stringy and so on. It loses a little bit of its nourishment, which is natural, so this is a concern that some of the older residents have expressed to me and the minister did give me a fair answer and I am sure he is going to give the answer to the House when he clues up his debate.

MR. G. WARREN: But, I suggest to the minister that if there is another program like this on any other part of the Province, that definitely caution should be taken in shooting the wildlife, shooting the wild animals by means of a motor vehicle, in this respect a helicopter, which is very very noisy and, you know, it does disturb the herds.

So, with these few remarks, I will go on record in full support of the Bill and I assure the hon. minister that any assistance I can give him pertaining to that part of the Province, I will be only too glad to give to him.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MS. H. Newhook: Mr. Speaker, it is with pleasure and with appreciation that I do support this Bill No. 12, introduced by the hon. Minister of Tourism (R.Dawe). I think it has been a long time in the making and I am very happy now that it is before this hon. House for our consideration and for our approval.

Now, some of our members have expressed concern that this legislation is restrictive and will seriously affect our freedom to enjoy our natural beauty, our recreational activities and our skill to live off the land of our Province.

I wish to point out though that if we can be farsighted enough to look ahead into the future, to look way, way down the road to future generations, we must see that this Bill is really preserving and protecting the very freedoms which some of us say that it has taken away. Our Province, especially this Island part of our Province, is very small and it is just beginning really to become industrialized. Our people have a freedom, a lifestyle, a natural sports habitat which is envied by all those in other countries who have heard about Newfoundland and Labrador.

May 1, 1980

Tape No. 1207

EL - 3

MS. H. NEWHOOK:

I am sure we all realize that our woodlands and wilderness areas in this forty-odd thousand square miles or so of Island land are diminishing each year. The many access roads we continue to build are cutting into our uninhabited areas. Even the wide open regions of Labrador need protected areas, which we are hearing so much about these days

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: from our Indian and the Inuit people of that part of our Province. They are saying to us that our footsteps are everywhere, all over this Island, all over this land, and it is absolutely essential, I feel, that we ensure that areas are preserved, that they are set aside so that they may continue to leave their imprints there.

While this piece of legislation provides areas for the preservation of all kinds of life, of organisms, fauna, flora, aquatic, rare and endangered species, common species, present ecology and geological formations, it also preserves and protects areas for us to fish, to hunt, to trap, areas in which to travel and to appreciate nature. This act protects the environment, and I have a short note on my department's involvement in it.

Bill No. 12 to establish this act was drafted for the Department of Tourism and Recreation by the Wild Lands Committee, which was appointed by Cabinet several years ago for this purpose. Through the membership of our environmental biologists on that committee, we have participated in the preparation of this bill and our staff have reviewed several drafts leading up to the production of the final document. We are therefore familiar with the intent and the provisions of this bill and we are strongly in favour of its approval by this hon. House of Assembly.

The establishment of reserves for the reasons outlined in the bill will offer these areas special protection from undesirable human activities, and so will supplement the existing environmental protection legislation administered by my department and other departments of government.

Now, this will certainly prove beneficial in maintaining the environment within these areas, and with respect to our particular mandate to protect the air, the water, the soil and other resources. We are not aware of any way in which the provisions of this Bill No. 12 will cause any adverse impact on these resources. In fact, Clause 5 (c) and (d) set aside areas to provide standards against which the effects of development in other areas may be measured, and areas to provide an opportunity for study of the recovery of eco-systems

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: from the effects of modification by
man. Mr. Speaker, this provision is of particular interest to our
Department of Environment.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may just bring
in a personal note, I would like to say that my dad, in his younger years,
spent all of his free time travelling in the woods - or in the country;
we called it 'in the woods' in those days - fishing and hunting for pleasure,
and sometimes he would take me with him. And I would tag along behind him
in those narrow paths, climbing over windfalls and gasping against the big
boulders, and I think I would burst a blood vessel before I would have

MRS. NEWHOOK:

admitted that I was tired. And he would say to me, "Are you tired?" "Oh, no! Oh, no!" And I was scared to admit that I was tired for fear he would not take me again.

Now my dad is eighty-eight years old, and his knees are not quite as steady as they used to be. As a matter of fact, I think the doctors have told him that one of his knee caps is worn out. He cannot really understand why one knee cap wore out and the other one did not. But anyway now when he goes out fishing, and when he goes out roaming the countryside looking for berries and all these sorts of things which he does in the Summertime, and sometimes in the Winter, we are quite concerned and we say to him, "Now, do not go too far and be sure you tell someone in which direction you are going." Well, you know, I think it was only early this Winter that I was in Gander and we were downtown so I said to him, I said, "Dad, how come when I am with you and we are downtown together and you are walking you hold my arm and I have to help you, you know, or guide you up over a step or down a step and when you go out in the woods you are on your own and you manage okay?" So he said to me, "Oh, oh," he said, "but that is different." He said, "Out there there is a whole new world and," he said, "when I am out in the country," he says, "all my cares, my worries and my concerns just fall away and," he says, "I feel free like the creatures of the country."

Mr. Speaker, you know I think that this is the kind of atmosphere, the kind of escape that we have to preserve to enjoy in our free time, in our holiday time, and of course the free time that we get these days is increasing every year. And I would like to advise the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) that our department does have an environmental kit which is used in the schools. Now it does not apply, I think, particularly to Labrador, but it is a kit

MRS. NEWHOOK: that we put together in co-operation with the Maritime Provinces and we do change it every year and it is used in the schools. And I think we will be expanding on this kind of an educational programme and I have been talking with my colleague, the hon. Minister of Education (Ms Verge) and we will be talking about consumerism and environmental concerns and hopefully will come up with some more programmes.

I would also like to advise the hon. member that I am quite sure that between the Department of the Environment and the Department of Tourism that we will have the facilities to administer this act.

Now, Mr. Speaker, my remarks are brief- I have a bit of a sore throat today. It is kind of difficult to speak-but I do very sincerely support this bill. I am sure all members of this House will support it and that other members will probably expand on the virtues contained in this piece of legislation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. member for Eagle River.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I also would like to support this bill and I thank the minister for giving us the assurance in this House that at least our own departments will have sufficient staff in order to police or look after this bill.

MR. E. HISCOCK: We, of course, have great areas in the Province, the mainland part of the Province as well as Labrador, and there is a need for this bill, a very, very strong need, particularly with regard to the Avalon Peninsula now with regard to cabins and parks, gravel pits for trailers in the Summer. Our ecological system in the Avalon in some ways is being taxed and I commend the government on its wisdom of bringing in an act like this so that we could have certain areas set aside.

I am also concerned from another point of view that basically it is wilderness areas. I do not particularly agree with some of the provisions here in the wilderness area and I will bring them up later. But I am concerned from the point of view that here we are in our provincial parks and now we are thinking of taking our provincial parks and turning them over to the private sector. In that way it is defeating, almost, the purpose of this bill, because you will have a lot of tourists coming in saying, 'Okay, we should have showers in the provincial parks, we should have restaurants in the provincial parks, we should have beer outlets in the provincial parks, we should have X number of things.' You can get those in the private parks that are owned by private citizens, but in the provincial parks themselves in keeping areas set aside with basically minimum of entrenchment upon the system, I think there are a lot of people who do appreciate our provincial parks.

I remember listening to the C.B.C. at one time. I forget the commentator now, but he ended up saying about our parks what park people perceive and how they perceive the park, and basically, one, they do not want to have any mosquitoes or flies in the park, two, they do not want to particularly go camping because of dampness, three, they want to have showers and other facilities and, four, they want to see wildlife. The commentator at that time suggested that basically we get a stuffed moose and put it over in the corner, spray the park daily so that we do not get any mosquitoes and flies, and basically give the tourists or the people what they want.

I feel the danger of turning around and giving the provincial parks over to the private sector, this is what I feel

MR. E. HISCOCK:

may happen to our provincial parks.

But now, the government has brought in this bill to set aside natural areas in the Province for the benefit, education and enjoyment of present and future generations in this Province.

I am concerned that basically with the wilderness area in the interior of Newfoundland, it was changed by an Order in Council. I also feel that this bill does not have enough power and that the minister, really, has too much power in this bill, that once an area is set aside, it should be set aside for perpetuity. And I feel that the minister has the right to change it in the future. And as we go on and progress on in history, there may be a danger of pressure being put on us to change it. We have the example now of improving transportation across St. John's and some areas of the graveyard may have to be taken. It opens up the question of when you have a park and progress comes in the future that there will be certain pressures put upon us to re-zone that area. So I am concerned about that.

Another thing I would particularly like to see - and I compliment the wisdom of Mr. C. A. Pippy

MR. HISCOCK:

in allocating money so that we could buy land here in the centre of St. John's and set aside the wilderness area in C.A.Pippy Park where in the future it will be proven, and it is now, one of the best examples of botanical gardens, probably, in Canada, particularly in the future as it grows more and more, and more emphasis is put on it and more people begin to appreciate it. We take children from the high school and go out and use the park quite regularly. So it is in that regard that I would like to encourage the government to move in that direction also, that we have the C.A.Pippy Park and that, basically, certain other areas near the centre of municipalities should also be set aside. I am talking about Corner Brook, I am talking about Gander, I am talking about all our major cities or towns or villages, that a core group itself should be set aside in each area, and I think again of the future, fifty years, sixty years down the line.

We have the Navy Park in Halifax, of course, which was set aside over one hundred years ago and now Halifax realizes the beauty and the benefit of it.

Mount Royal in Montreal, in Halifax, again, we have the Citadel, in Quebec City we have the Citadel, the Plains of Abraham and Le Bose de Cologne, another area that is set aside.

New York itself was built around the park in the city, Central Park. And in Edinburgh we have the centre of the town, again, basically built around a park. This was done when people had foresight, who realized that their province or their town would grow, housing, industry and other pressures would be put upon their town or community in the future, and they

MR. HISCOCK: had the wisdom to turn around and set aside areas not 200 miles from the city but in the city itself - Vancouver with Stanley Park. And as I have said, I compliment, again, the wisdom and foresight that Mr. C.A.Pippy had and I again encourage the government here to have a look at this, and the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Dawe), and in this way I would like to make the suggestion, particularly with regard to St. John's, that another area be set aside and that is from Portugal Cove all along the coastline into Topsail Beach and St. Phillips area, going on to Chamberlains, Manuels and on up to the Yacht Club in Long Pond. I think that area should be set aside as an area of park wilderness so that we could have cross-country skiing, we could have hiking and, basically, we would have something, again, in reach of the city. Because now in the Summer when you want to go out and get near the seashore the congestion of traffic that you have at Topsail Beach is unbelievable and yet here in St. John's itself there are so many people, again, who have an affinity with the sea that we basically want to be near it. And what do we have? We either go out to Outer Cover or we go out to Logy Bay or some other area.

So, again, the point I want to reinforce to this government is that I think that the government itself should facilitate more areas not only in reserves and ecological reserves, but areas of parks near the urban areas and not only in the urban areas but even in smaller ones so that people themselves can take advantage of them. All too often I have seen in this Province that one government turns around and gives money to set aside a park, or to set aside a playground, or a recreation area in a town or a community and then with progress coming on that area being taken and a school

MR. HISCOCK: being built on it, or a stadium being built on it, or the land being sold for commercial development. And I do not think that, again, should necessarily take place. Again I encourage the government to get into this area.

With regard to the reserves and ecological reserves areas, I think we need to get into an education programme about it and get out students and our people realizing the various forms of wildlife and various forms of plant life and, again, even fish life itself. But I am concerned from the point of view that in this act we are setting these areas aside and we are saying no cutting of trees, or no logging, no mining, no agriculture, no claiming, no prospecting or no staking in these areas. Well, I am not so sure really about this. I agree we should not have mining in a wilderness area. I agree with not constructing

MR. E. HISCOCK:

cabins and other things in the area itself. But I am concerned from the point of view of logging and even hunting. We had the member for St. Barbe (Mr. Bennett) today present a petition from Rocky Harbour asking this government and the federal government to declare certain areas of their town outside the jurisdiction of the federal park, Gros Morne. I also feel that if we declare certain larger areas, and our people have had the right to go and hunt and fish into these areas and log and cut firewood, that if these rights are taken away I think that we are infringing upon the lifestyle of our own people. But also I realize there is a conflict because we need to do this. So I think what you need is correct management. I am not saying that we should have people going in and creating great logging industries or sawmills into these areas, not at all, but I am saying that the local people of these communities should have the right to go and cut firewood into that area and they should have the right to go and cut probably some logs with, as the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) said proper management under the direction of the Environmental people, under the direction of the Department of Tourism or Forestry because we need to manage our forests. Here we have the spruce budworm and what has been said about it? We have to cut out the dead wood in order to give younger trees a chance to grow. If there is no logging or cutting of trees then basically we are only perpetuating the idea that if there is a disease in that wilderness area then it will continue. So I see a weakness in that area. We need proper management, we do not need categorical statements saying, 'No, you cannot do this and you cannot hunt.'

MR. E. HISCOCK: But with regard to hunting that is another area. I think with proper management of people going in - the Premier refers all the time, you know, to wanting to go into the woods and snare a rabbit and cut his thumb. Well, if we are going to get into our wilderness areas and reserves and they are relatively close to population centres I think again we have the question to ask ourselves, you know, are we not whipping our own backs? Or what are we doing in that regard if we are just setting it aside as a wilderness area? I think it has to be used and I do not think we have to have over-hunting of rabbits or small game and things, but I still think we need proper management in that area.

Another one that I want to point out, and I will go to my own district, and that is with regard to a provincial park. We have only one provincial park in our district and really it is only a campsite. When you come across the ferry on the Strait of Belle Isle and go down to Pinware Provincial Park, basically there is a parking lot there and you have to park your vehicles in one central parking lot and then take all your camping equipment and your camp and go on over to wherever you want to camp. I think that we should, again, have accessibility to camping areas, you should be able to drive into a campsite and have your own vehicles in that area.

Also, I am concerned and I will support my friend, the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) on the need of a provincial park in the Lake Melville district. It is something that is needed. It has been suggested that we have two federal parks down in Labrador but because of land-claim issues and things the people have said, 'We will not get into granting of federal parks until these

May 1, 1980

Tape No. 1212

DW - 3

MR. E. HISCOCK: land claims are straightened out.
And I, of course, support that position.

But I do think that we can get two provincial parks in that area and give the people in that area a benefit and also encourage tourists to come. I regret that the Minister of Tourism (Mr. Dawe) is not here at the time because -

MR. E. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) of this bill.

MR. E. HISCOCK: I want to bring up the point about the herd in Northern Labrador. We talk about ecology and systems and reserves; Some of the biologists say that the reason why that caribou herd of 150,000 is up North is

MR. HISCOCK: because when we built the Upper Churchill, basically, it cut across migrant patterns, and that when they came to return certain areas were flooded and certain areas were built, so they continue to go on North and not come down.

So, as a result, I have now, in my district, a problem. Our people were always used to hunting caribou, and now there is no caribou to hunt because they are not built up enough. With this experimentation of killing 150 and doing research and then giving it to the needy people and then each year marketing - not marketing, but marketing in a way - of so many each year and studying the predators and control and that, I would like to ask the Minister of Tourism, in conjunction with the federal government, if we could not do something as was done in Brunette Island, bringing buffalo in, that if the minister could not take 2,000 or 3,000 or 4,000 caribou from the North and move them down to the South, thereby accelerating the chance of allowing that area to go back to the traditional lifestyle of hunting for the caribou instead of waiting? Because the herds that are up North - there is supposed to be a migrant pattern for every fifty years, that the caribou eat the moss and then, once the moss is gone, they move on and this takes place and is reconstructed over a period of fifty years.

Another area that I want to point out to the minister, and I will be asking the government's official stand on this, and this is with regard to the archaeological site of the ship that was found, the Basque ship, down in Red Bay. Basically, what has happened is that they found a 15th century Basque whaling ship, and now it has been taken out and reconstructed with Parks Canada and with the provincial government. I want to see this government make sure that there is an official stand taken on it, and that some type of interpretation centre is built in Red Bay and that not all of the artifacts are taken out and sent off to Ottawa. I realize this is an international find, and the international community is quite pleased about it. When I was in New York not long ago I went to see

MR. HISCOCK: the Chinese Bronze Age at the Metropolitan Museum there. I know that in some day New Yorkers will be able to go in and look at the Basque ship that was found down in Red Bay. I am sure it will go to London, I am sure it will go to Paris, I am sure it will go to other international cities. But, still, from the point of view of economy and from the point of view of the local people themselves, I do think that we should have an interpretation centre. This has happened to us once before and it will not be tolerated, that what has happened in L'Anse-Amour the provincial government with the university found the remains of an Indian there, Naskaupi Indian, over 5,000 years old and it is now in the Museum of Man in Ottawa. A replica is down in the museum on Duckworth Street, and what is in L'Anse-Amour where they found it? A mound where it was, they left a mound there, and a plaque. If they would turn around and do a replica, a copy, as they have here on Duckworth Street and put an extension on the museum down in L'Anse-au-Loup - but again, it is not the original. Because of the value of the original I realize that probably for security, for fire prevention and to avoid decay and things, maybe the best place for it is in the Museum of Man. But I still feel we should have some replica. In the future, with regard to the Basque ship there, again, maybe from the point of view of preservation and that, we may not be able to have all the artifacts of it but at least I feel we should have a major interpretation centre as there is, by the way, in L'Anse-au-Meadow with the Vikings. A lot of that is in Ottawa, but they did permit one to be built in L'Anse-au-Meadow itself. So, I would like to see the government take a position on this and support me and the residents of my district in trying to get an interpretation centre into that area.

So, I support the bill, but from the point of view of the environment and the environmental impact, from the point of view of management of resources and not permitting cutting of trees and not permitting certain types of hunting, I think

MR. E. HISCOCK: we have to be very, very careful that we do not bring in areas that are set aside and the majority of our people do not have access to them. We have to be extremely careful of that, because what has happened in Quebec, for example - Quebec being a larger province in population, many of the lakes became private lakes, like Murray's Pond here in St. John's. Many areas of the coastline and many other private hunting lodges were set aside and very rich people had these. The provincial government saw, in its wisdom, to revoke those licences and allow those areas to be opened up to the general public. And it is that area that I feel now - that we have these areas open to the public now. I see us going in the other direction, that we are setting aside these reserves and we are putting so many restrictions on them that basically we are not allowing our own people to have access to a way of life and to a way of culture. So in that way I support the bill and I hope the minister will look at it from the point of view that I do think he, the minister, has too much authority and that basically we will work on some areas in this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

The hon. the Minister of Labour and

Manpower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. J. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on the bill and start out by number one, complimenting the minister who introduced this bill. It is one that has been a long time coming, as other speakers have said. I want to compliment some of the other speakers who spoke on the bill and the interest they have shown in this type of legislation, the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. G. Warren) and the hon. the member for Eagle River (Mr. E. Hiscock) who spoke well about some of the problems they have up in their area and the needs of their area and the need for parks, for example, particularly around the Lake Melville area. I remember travelling up there with the Resource Policy Committee of Cabinet about a year and a half or two years ago and was awed by the country that I flew over in the helicopter and in Labrador Airways aircraft.

MR. J. DINN:

I remember flying over Torngat and flying over Churchill, the reservoirs, and going up to Nain. Whoever named the country or indicated that the country was the land God gave to Cain, I think it was very appropriate in some ways. The fact of the matter is that this is one of many things that need to be done in Newfoundland and Labrador. It is one of these things that men of vision in the past have done and one of the things that we need done here in this Province so that we can protect some of the very important things that we have.

The minister will probably, when he closes the debate, thank most hon. members for the support that they have shown for this piece of legislation. I was particularly struck by the speech made by the hon. the member for Lewisporte (Mr. F. White) who, whilst he supported the bill, outlined some of the other problems that we have in the Province with respect to, sometimes, the thoughtless people who throw garbage about our highways and in our wooded areas.

MR. J. DINN:

The hon. the member for LaPoile (S. Neary) disturbed me a little bit, as is his wont, I guess. He supported the Bill at the end. I think that is important. It appears to me as though we will have unanimous support for the Bill in the House and something should be said for that also. It means that we can get together as Newfoundlanders and Labradorians and think about what needs to be done in our Province and what needs to be preserved and agree on ways of doing it and supporting one another to protect the environment, as we have done in the Environmental Assessment Act to protect wilderness areas, because it is not just us, it is our kids and our children's children who will look back years from now and thank us, in a way, if we do the job - we have the legislation that is capable of doing it - we do the job that is outlined in this piece of legislation. I think, all members of the House will be justly proud years down the road when, hopefully, they will be able to look at different areas in the Province that have been preserved, that we can get in there and have a look at the way it should be. I suppose, because we may be in for some turbulent times, and we may get carried away with developments, whether it is offshore oil and gas or hydro developments, we need to stop every once in awhile and read through a piece of legislation of this type and it kind of brings us back to our roots, it kind of makes us aware that really, no matter what we do as human beings, that there is a creator, someone who is capable of doing something just a little better than anything that we will ever be able to do.

We have in the Bill the capability of establishing an advisory council who will report to the minister on a yearly basis, who will suggest to the minister different areas in the Province that should be set aside, examine areas so that hopefully we can make sure in the future we will have, we will save a little piece of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador for future generations.

MR. J. DINN: Now, Mr. Speaker, it could be , it may very well be, having read through the bill, having gone through the different clauses, that maybe I should just sit in my seat and wait for the time and vote for it and that is that. I think it is important that all members stand in the House and say their little pieces. Because the legislative draftsman got together and put it together, put together what the minister wanted as a carry-out of a policy of the government. If we do not think about what we are doing, if we do not have, and I do not very often say this, but if we do not have people like the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who will get up and criticize, then you do not really, sometimes, know if what you are doing is one hundred per cent correct. We have to have criticism. I think that a criticism should be a well-thought-out and justified criticism. I think we should go through this bill clause by clause to make sure of what we are doing and that goes for just about any piece of legislation we bring in.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you going to say a few words ?

MR. J. DINN: Because there is that capability within ourselves, I suppose, to maybe sometimes be over protective or maybe sometimes to do things that down the road we may regret. This is not that type of a piece of legislation. It is one that has been around for some time, it is one that I have read very carefully. In my opinion, it is a good piece of legislation. I think that when one reads a piece of legislation he has to read it from the point of view of

MR. DINN: trying to pick the holes in it, being the devil's advocate, if you will, to tear it apart in your mind. I have gone through it and I cannot see anything, there may be. Hon. members opposite, I would hope, if they can see something in there, bring it out, because I think it is important. I do not think that any piece of legislation is something that is to be bronzed or cannot be changed, but this is one piece of legislation that I feel has the capability of doing what we want to do. Oftentimes I think we, as government members or as Opposition members when they think about legislation or when they want to bring in some changes too that will affect the Province, sometimes rush in and do not really think about what they are doing. I think they sometimes get dogmatic. I remember myself, when I came into the House of Assembly, I had a kind of a dogmatic approach to how things should be done and that I was right and -

MR. STAGG: Idealistic.

MR. DINN: - and probably a little bit idealistic, yes. The fact of the matter is that other people have things to say, have ideas that should be expressed. I know I have heard sometimes in a common room a comment made about a piece of legislation or a policy, and I think it is important that when that happens that members make it a point to stand up in the House and make a point of it, so that if it needs changing it can be changed, so that we do not tie ourselves down, so that we do not impede progress, so that we do not impede our way of life. I think we have a fairly good way of life in this Province. I know people will appreciate the way of life we have in this Province if they spend some time away from it. And I have spent some ten years on the mainland and I spent a lot of time travelling throughout, especially, the countries bordering on the North Atlantic, Africa and Europe and Iceland, as far North as Iceland, and England, Scotland, Ireland.

AN HON. MEMBER: You were glad to get back though.

MR. DINN: I think the hon. member has a very good point. Wherever you go, whether it be on an RCAF station or a Canadian forces station, you always have a Newfoundland club, and it does not matter if there are only ten Newfoundlanders, the main theme of any conversation of a

MR. DINN: Friday TGIF night or a meeting that you might have for a Winter carnival is getting back to the 'Rock' and maybe some day coming back and settling back here. The reason for that is that, having gone throughout the North Atlantic and the countries bordering thereon, when you come back here you can see that we still have something that is just a little bit different. Hopefully, we will have our wilderness areas now, we will have those preserved. We will have environmental assessments so that we do not destroy the little that we do have here in the Province worth preserving.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please!

I apologize for interrupting the hon. member, but it is five o'clock and I can inform the House now that I have not received any notices of matters for debate at 5:30, when a motion to adjourn will be deemed to be before the House.

The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I have not heard during this debate anyone really getting carried away with themselves. I think most hon. members who spoke in this debate have given some thought to this very important piece of legislation. The minister, when he presented it, I was amazed at the background knowledge that he displayed. The Minister of the Environment (Mrs. Newhook), when she spoke, brought me back a few years. I am not what you would call a woodsman or a fisherman or -

MR. STAGG: A rustic.

MR. DINN:

-anything of that type. I do not partake of the killing of game or being out in the woods that much. My thing happens to be golf. But as a recreation -

MR. STAGG: You have killed a lot of golfs. You have killed a lot of golfs.

MR. DINN: I have killed a lot of golfs over the years. But the fact of the matter is that I still appreciate, I have been out there enough to be able to appreciate the wilderness, to be able to appreciate the fact that there are people who spend their time in there and that that is worth preserving, it is worth going through the time even in our turbulent times. I think of myself as Minister of Labour and Manpower in this Province where we have 15.7 per cent unemployment, and that is a Statistics Canada statistic, it is something that indicates the number of people looking for jobs, and it is a deplorable situation that we still have to take time, we still have to think about what we are doing, we still have to take time to bring in important pieces of legislation such as this so that for future generations, when and if the oil may come or when the fishery expands to where it should be, that is protected and managed properly. We also have to manage and protect natural areas of the Province so that people who enjoy that sort of thing can get out there and enjoy it.

The members have talked about a lot of things in the bill, a lot of concerns that they have and they have asked some questions that I am sure the minister when he closes the debate will answer. He has surprised me to this point in time, surprised me because it is only a year or two that I have known the hon. the minister and he surprised me with the knowledge that he displays not only here in the House of Assembly but as I talk to him in our travels throughout the Province, etc.

MR. LUSH: There have been many great speeches made (inaudible).

MR. DINN: The hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush)

MR. DINN:

gave a great speech in this House. He has given many, many great speeches. And I will continue if he can match - but I think we have something worth preserving here and I think that it is this kind of thing, it is the kind of thing that in the cut and thrust of debate, in going through estimates - and that is another thing that I compliment hon. members opposite on as well as all the members of the Committees who went out during my estimates - they spent six hours or more discussing \$6 million and I think it was covered very, very thoroughly and I compliment them on that. I think it is time, when we bring in a piece of legislation of this type, I think it is time for all of us who sit back in our places, to get up and speak and to reflect on where we are going here in Newfoundland. Because I think all members in this House realize, travelling throughout this Province of ours, that we do have something, something unique, something worth preserving. And it is this type of legislation that causes us to reflect, causes us to think about what we are doing and causes us to act as we have to this point in time, in the debate at least, to act in unison, to act as a bunch of very responsible human beings. And I, for one, would not want to let this debate go by without getting up and complimenting hon. members on both sides of the House for the remarks they have made with respect to the legislation and for the co-operation and unification that we have shown, that we are capable as Newfoundlanders of getting together every once in a while and doing the right thing. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, thank you. I would want to say a few words on this particular bill. I would again add my voice to the other members who congratulated the member for bringing in the bill. It is long overdue. But I cannot be as conciliatory as the member who just spoke, Mr. Speaker, because when one looks at, as he said in his last few words, that this bill is just coming in, when

May 1, 1980

Tape No. 1217

IB-3

MR. FLIGHT:

we look at the Environmental bill that came in two weeks ago we have to recognize the hypocrisy, the total and complete hypocrisy of this

MR. G. FLIGHT:

government, Mr. Speaker, in looking at our way of life, looking at protecting the environment they are now claiming so badly to want to protect. I would ask the House and the ministry in particular, does anybody remember the wilderness area that was set-up in this Province some years ago, a vast wilderness area set-up in this Province, set-up to protect the environment, the wildlife, to be guaranteed so that wildlife would stay undisturbed for future generations? I wonder, if when the minister stands up to close the bill he would tell the House exactly what happened. What he proposes to do with this legislation was done by a Minute of Council of the government of this Province and the area identified, and all maps coming out after indicated the wilderness area. So I wonder if the minister would take a few minutes and tell the people of this House of Assembly and the people of Newfoundland what was the reasoning? Why was that legislation rescinded? Why was the wilderness area as we knew it wiped out? One reason, Mr. Speaker, was because Newfoundland Hydro decided they wanted to have a hydro electrical development in there, what we will now know as the Upper Salmon. Now, Mr. Speaker, under this legislation an area in this Province is going to be designated as a wilderness area, as a wildlife resort, as anything, will the government determine first whether or not there is any hydro potential in that area? And if there is any hydro potential will that immediately, regardless of what other qualities it may possess, what attractions there would be to make it a wildlife area or a wilderness area, will that then be put aside and say, "No, irregardless of the beauties, irregardless of the abundance of wildlife, irregardless of the nature of this piece of country, there is potential hydro development in here so therefore we cannot declare this a wilderness area?" That is what happened to the wilderness area we had, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, people will remember -

MR. G. FLIGHT: I would like to see, I would like to hear the minister comment, if he would, when he stands up, as to where he sees now, and certainly having designed this legislation he must have put some thought into it, somebody must have considered well, where in Newfoundland is left? So obviously there must be some places in his mind, some parts of this Province that would fit the bill as described in this legislation. And I would like the minister to indicate what parts of the Province he sees as potential wildlife areas or wilderness areas and natural areas left. Can he designate an area in Newfoundland that is already owned by some company? The land that the paper mills, for instance, own in this Province by lease or by grant, can the Province designate that as a wilderness area? Because if they cannot there is nothing left. Any place in this Province where a family or a man would want to go and spend hours in the wilderness hunting, fishing, canoeing, anything he would want to do, is owned and controlled totally and absolutely by the paper companies, the major paper companies. So, will the minister have the authority to designate areas held by Bowaters, by Price and the other major companies as wilderness areas? Mr. Speaker, it would do the minister good to go into the Lloyds River area. If there is one area in this Province today where a group of men looking would say, 'Lets pick the best spot in this Island to have designated as a wilderness area', it would have been the Lloyds River Valley, and that is the area coming from Lloyds Lake down to Red Indian Lake, a distance of around twenty odd miles, the most beautiful country in Newfoundland today. No question about it. Anyone who had never seen it all they would have had to go was to have gone in and looked at it and say, "We are charged with the responsibility now of designating an area in Newfoundland that is teeming with wildlife, good fishing, steady flowing rivers that can be used for canoeing, beautiful forests, lush forests." It would have been the area that probably would have stood out above all others in this Province. Now, every one will remember, Mr. Speaker, and this is when I talk about the hypocrisy of this government, everyone will remember the Lloyds River Diversion debate, everyone will remember how they wanted to have a hydro electrical development on that

May 1, 1980

Tape 1218

MB - 3

MR. G. FLIGHT:

river, divert the river, and
enough people got involved to change their minds. It became a political
issue and they backed off the hydro electrical

MR. G. FLIGHT:

development. Well, at that point, that river and that valley was still in its natural beauty, nothing was disturbed. The paper companies had not gone in; not a tree was cut. But having been identified - having the Minister of Mines and Energy going out and looking at it, having other ministers concerned about it because of the controversy over the diversion - having proved to the government of this Province that the people in Central Newfoundland, anyway, wanted that area preserved in its natural state, what happened? They did not divert the river, but they allowed the paper company, who has the rights to the area, Price (Nfld.), to go in and cut in Lloyds River.

Well, Mr. Speaker, it is a criminal injustice to this Province. If they had gone in - I would ask the minister and any member of this House of Assembly interested in preserving what we call the beauty spots of this Province, to go into the Lloyds River Valley. It would turn your stomach. If they had gone in with airplanes and bombed the area - they went wild. They went into that area and they started to cut and throw the wood into Lloyds River so it would go down the system and they demolished that country. It is unbelievable. You have to see it to believe it. They ran wild. They went worse than they ever went in some of the other areas they cut in, and there is no way that that piece of real estate can ever be put back to the natural beauty that it was. And we talk about the hypocrisy. The logs could have been cut in there. Price could have cut the timber and it could have been delivered to the rivers, or they need not have cut it at all. They did not need it that badly. It was the type of area that this bill seeks now to protect. There is not much left, Mr. Speaker. The one wilderness area that was set aside was rescinded by this government because they felt we wanted the hydro power that was available there. The Lloyds River Valley from King George Lake to Victoria to Red Indian Lake has been demolished. That area is probably the richest in Newfoundland with pine, free standing pine, great big pine - it is famous for it. And they are there now. People should go in and look at it. Free standing pines - ten million board feet, it was estimated was in the stand, enough pine to justify

MR. G. FLIGHT: a sawmill operation employing ten or twelve people for ten years. The paper company that owns it said, 'No, we are not interested in having any private development going in here. We are not interested in having a private industry, a private company going in to log that pine and saw it, but we will look at a joint operation.' And as a result of their wanting to look at a joint operation, not one stick of that pine is cut yet, and what is going to happen is that beautiful pine is going to fall down, blow down, become wind shaken, be lost to the economy of the Province and add to the utter desolation and destitution that the company has wreaked on that valley. And then the minister stands up -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible).

MR. G. FLIGHT: What company? The Abitibi Price Company, Lloyds River Valley. The member will remember the great controversy over the Lloyds River diversion.

MR. F. STAGG: That was what got the hon. member elected in 1975.

MR. G. FLIGHT: It could be. I would not concede that, but nevertheless, that is beside the point. The fact is that once that controversy was over, the hydroelectric project did not go ahead, but having identified Lloyds River as probably one of the beauty spots of this Island, this government then allowed - with no supervision, with no conditions, nothing, allowed that company to go in there and wreck it. It is gone. Lloyds River Valley is gone. There is nothing left only dead trees, stumps, tractor roads, soil washing out into the river, the natural river banks washed away, and some dollars in the bank for the shareholders of the company. It was not necessary. The wood could have been cut.

MR. F. STAGG: It will never happen again.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Every stick of wood could have been cut. It should never have happened. That is the hypocrisy.

MR. F. STAGG: That was under the old regime.

MR. G. FLIGHT: I have asked the minister to stand up and identify in this Province the areas that he wants to designate as wilderness

MR. G. FLIGHT: or natural areas. And if he cannot designate these areas on land held by the major paper companies, then forget it, there is nothing else left anyway.

MR. F. STAGG: The Committee is going to do it.

MR. G. FLIGHT: The Committee. But having dreamed up the legislation, he must - you know, the legislation would not be necessary if he had to admit to himself there is nowhere left. But I am saying to this House and I am saying to the hon. the member for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg), that if we cannot designate these areas on lands now owned either outright by grant or leased by the paper companies, then there is nowhere left. The bit that was left was turned over a few months ago to support and to sustain the Linerboard - nothing wrong with that. But we are talking about the beauty spots.

Mr. Speaker, there are lots of things that one could get on in this particular bill, but we are running out of time. I understand we are going to wind it up.

MR. G. FLIGHT: I will say some things on it when it gets to the committee stage. But this government, you know, do not appear to know what they are doing.

MR. HISCOCK: I told you.

MR. G. FLIGHT: This legislation is very close to the legislation that designates areas for Summer cottages. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have in this Province a situation where somebody from Grand Falls or Lewisport decides they want to build a Summer cottage and they go out into some area along a beach and the salt water, no wood there that will ever be cut, no value in a sense that obviously there will never be a shipping facility there, there will never be a sawmill or lumbering going on in the area, so they decide this is where they want to build their Summer cottage. They write a letter to Crown lands and Crown lands writes back and says, ' No, you cannot build there because that is not designated as a Summer cottage area. But we would suggest that there is indeed - we would suggest that you apply for a piece of land on Badger Lake because on Badger Lake there is an area there that has been designated as Summer cottage land. Now, it so happens that that particular Summer cottage area that they are asking that person to apply for is ninety miles removed from the town the man lives in. They are saying, ' No, this area is not designated as Summer cottage, drive one hundred miles and we will find a little block of land for you ! Utterly ridiculous, Mr. Speaker, it shows that the minister and the department responsible are not in tune at all with the needs of the people and the desires of the people. And, Mr. Speaker, the minister when he was speaking talked about how lucky he was to fly over Labrador, to fly over Central Newfoundland and to fly over this - that is the problem, that is the big problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Minister of Tourism ?

MR. FLIGHT: No, the hon. Minister of Labour - talking about how he flew over Labrador and he flew over Central Newfoundland and he saw all the beautiful beauty spots in the Province by flying over it. Well, Mr. Speaker, he should be so lucky, he should be so lucky. There are only twenty or thirty or forty people, probably, that in any given time gets the chance to fly over and see those beauty spot. The people we are supposed

MR. G. FLIGHT: to be preserving those beauty spots for have not got that luxury, they cannot jump a government airplane or helicopter and fly in and look they have to have access. And the Government of this Province, Mr. Speaker, have shown no desire at all to make the areas that they talk about, where we should be able to get away from it all and go and enjoy, accessible to the people of this Province. And another sore point that is happening in this Province, with regards to the areas that we want to get to, is the private roads controlled by government in some cases and the paper companies and mining companies in others. And, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundlanders drive up to these gates, controlled by the paper companies or by government, wanting to go fishing some morning - locked, they cannot get through. The ordinary man, you know, the ordinary guy on the street cannot get through. But he sits there for a little while and along comes somebody who looks like he is a lawyer or a doctor or a shareholder of the company; somebody comes out, opens her up and away he goes. And they say that is the system, that is the system we live under. Is the minister going to guarantee that kind of stuff, in this legislation, that he is talking about making these spots accessible to Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, and tell the various companies that control these roads that this is not yours to enjoy by divine right, this belongs to all the people of the Province? Take your gates off. If you are going to allow your boards of directors to go through to fish -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. G. FLIGHT:

- then you will allow the people who own

this stuff to go through and enjoy that particular property.

MR. HISCOCK:

The road construction in Labrador -

are they going to do the same thing that they did in the wilderness area, you know put out (inaudible)

MR. FLIGHT:

Where is (inaudible)

MR. STAGG:

The hon. member is mumbling again.

May 1, 1980

Tape No. 1120

RA - 3

AN HON. MEMBER:

pits in Labrador.

'Graham; road construction and gravel

MR. G. FLIGHT:

the minister when he -

Yes, that is right. Mr. Speaker, would

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

(inaudible)

MR. STAGG:

A few words on the (inaudible)

MR. G. FLIGHT:

question to the Minister of -

Let me ask this, let me ask this

MR. N. WINDSOR:

Is he talking about the wilderness:

AN HON. MEMBER:

Yes, between his ears.

MR. G. FLIGHT:

The minister need not talk about wilderness between the ears. I would rather have it between my ears than what the minister got between his, and if he wants proof of that he should go and talk to the councils and find out what they are saying about that particular minister.

The minister need not talk about

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. G. FLIGHT:

legislation -

Now, Mr. Speaker, in a few days the

MR. G. FLIGHT: the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment (Mrs. Newhook) brought in, the Environmental Bill which is a sister to this one in a sense, will come into this House for committee reading and, Mr. Speaker, the minister will then have to stand up and tell us whether or not the in that legislation the clause that exempts projects already undertaken, whether it is exempted from that legislation. Because if it is, Mr. Speaker, then it renders this bill here useless. Because the problem the Minister of Tourism, Recreation Culture (Mr. Dawe) would have then is that any area that he designates as a natural wilderness area the paper companies already operating, the mining companies already operating, they might have designs that he might not know about. And that is what I would like to hear the minister indicate when he stands up. He talked about the geese and he talked about the Codroy river and the geese and the goslings in the Codroy river.

AN HON. MEMBER: And the ganders too.

MR. G. FLIGHT: And beautiful, that is right, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, what is he going to do? That is a natural spot. The government did not do anything. He took credit as though the government designed that. You would think to listen to the minister that it was the Government of Newfoundland who put that waterway there and allowed the geese to land there. The minister has no - anything that is still good, left in this Province for mankind to enjoy, the government of this Province had nothing to do with it and anything the government of this Province, these last eight years, could have done to hurt it was done. Now we have seen this in the last eight years, Mr. Speaker. And now they come in with this ridiculous legislation. They will not move against the paper companies, they will not move

MR. G. FLIGHT: against the mining companies, they will not move against anybody who is desolating this Province, who is tearing up the natural environment. They bring in a little piece of legislation saying, 'We are going to designate a naturalist area, we are going to have an advisory committee tell us where.'

Well, Mr. Speaker, that advisory committee has not got as much to work with now as they would have had twenty years ago. Too many parts of our Province have been wiped out, destroyed. So I am interested in where these areas are and whether or not, Mr. Speaker, the minister will have access to all the property of Newfoundland or will he be restricted to what is considered Crown land under the agreements we have with the various mining companies and paper companies.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is about all I want to say on that particular bill.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture. If the hon. minister speaks now he will close the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. R. DAWE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I had hoped to answer most of the questions that have been raised from time to time throughout the debate and we will have to see how much time is remaining. I want to thank hon. members on both sides for their comments on this particular piece of legislation. I had one problem with it, in hearing some of the responses from a number of members opposite, in that they either did not read or sometimes misinterpreted the bill itself. I think, if I may, will read the title of the bill which is in fact the principles of that bill, "An Act To Provide For Natural Areas In The Province To Be Set Aside For The Benefit, Education And

May 1, 1980

Tape No. 1221

DW - 3

MR. R. DAWE:

Enjoyment Of Present And Future
Generations In The Province". When I introduced this bill
a couple of days ago, I made reference to some of the things
that had occurred and perhaps are continuing to occur in
our Province which is slowly but surely removing some of
the very important natural areas. And I indicated at that
time that a bill such as this one was long overdue and I
think there has been general agreement to that fact.

This bill in conjunction
with the Environmental Assessment Act

MR. DAWE:

will do more to protect the environment of this Province, to protect the rights of our citizens, to protect the availability of wilderness areas for our children and our children's children than anything else that has ever been done in this Legislature. The problem with legislation -

MR. FLIGHT: The wilderness (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. DAWE: The problem with legislation that is now presently in existence is that it makes the process of eliminating as well as setting up wilderness areas or reserves, a process that is in itself relatively easy, it makes the introduction easy and the removal easy. This particular piece of legislation will take away those inadequacies of legislation of the past. It provides for a very responsible and, hopefully, a very representative viewpoint of the people of this Province as it relates to the establishment of a reserve.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: It allows for the setting up of an Advisory Council who will be empowered to review possible sites as reserves, to accept submissions from individuals or groups within the Province who wish to establish a reserve or think that there is a particular area in their neck of the woods that is worthy of protection. It is significant enough that they would like their children to be able to experience some of the things that they have enjoyed in that particular spot over the years. This Committee will listen to any recommendations that are being made in respect to that area, they will develop a proposed management plan for that particular reserve and ask government, ask Cabinet, through the minister responsible, to have a look at the possibilities of setting up a reserve. Cabinet will take all the views and recommendations from the Advisory Council, will distribute the information to the various government agencies and departments involved. If there is no objection or it does not look like there is any real reason why this should not be set up as a reserve, a provisional reserve is established which will

MR. DAWE:

be in effect for approximately a year. During that year the necessary research will be carried out involving all aspects of the reserve as they affect the economics of a particular area of the Province in general, as it affects the benefits to the particular item which was hoped to be reserved.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. DAWE:

We are almost approaching the -

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Order, please!

It is five-thirty and a motion to adjourn is deemed to be before the House. Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is leave. Agreed.

The hon. Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture.

MR. DAWE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once a management plan has been established-and I think this is where hon. members have missed an important aspect of this legislation - a management plan will be established for each individual reserve whether it be a wilderness reserve or an ecological reserve. The management plan will be specific enough in that it will take into consideration every single aspect of life, both socially and economically, that may or may not affect that particular area. In the form of public hearings people will be given the opportunity to make submissions, suggestions, possible changes or additions to that management plan.

The minister carries these concerns to Cabinet and Cabinet ultimately makes a decision.

MR. R. DAWE: The only authority that the minister, as an individual, has in this particular piece of legislation is to provide for the regulations necessary to manage the reserve, to protect the reserve as it relates to the specific management plan. Any changes to the management plan, any alterations of boundaries of the reserve, all have to go through the same process that was necessary for the establishment of the reserve in the beginning. The authority is with the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and not with the minister. The only direct authority that the minister has is the enforcement of these regulations. There were some concerns expressed by a number of members as it related to the reduction of freedom of our citizens, more regulations sometimes considered by members opposite to be unnecessary regulations as they related to this particular legislation. Again, I would refer them back to the title of the bill itself. It preserves, it protects, it allows for the use of and not the abuse of particular areas of our Province which are deemed to be desirable of protection. And I think a number of members opposite missed that point completely. If you read through the act, ample provision is provided through the management plan for all and every traditional use of that particular area as it relates to why the area was set up in the beginning. Obviously, if you were to protect a red pine stand in the Province, cutting of that particular pine stand would be prohibited. That is the very purpose of setting up a reserve, if, in fact, it was for that purpose. Hunting, fishing, hiking, snowmobiling and any other activity that does not endanger the species of tree or animal that you wanted to protect, will still be permitted.

The member from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) expressed some concerns about enforcement as it relates to particular areas. And I think we all have some concerns in this area as it relates to wildlife protection and management wherever it may be. And these are concerns that we will have to address ourselves to and, in co-operation with the Department of Consumer Affairs and Environment, I am sure that we will be able to enforce these regulations adequately.

MR. STAGG:

Hear, hear!

MR. R. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, there are many other things that I could say about some of the responses that we have gotten from members on both sides of the House, however, I think the bill has been adequately debated. I am sure that once we get into debate in committee stage there will be more specific items which will come out and I look forward to the opportunity of answering any questions that may be brought forward that are specific to any items in the bill. I would like, at this time, to move second reading of Bill 12.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: On motion 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, read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow. (Bill No. 12)

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, May 2nd, at 10 A.M.