

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD
10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.
FRIDAY, JUNE 26, 1981

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2819

NM - 1

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House that negotiations have been successfully completed with the Aluminum Company of Canada to extend the Special Fund for a two year period to assist dependents of deceased workers at the former fluorspar mine in St. Lawrence.

MR. NEARY: A good Liberal concept, boy. I negotiated that.

MR. DINN: The fund to which government and the company contribute 50 per cent each was set up in 1971 and was due to expire on 30th. of June this year. The amount involved is a maximum of \$120,000 annually. The fund was originally recommended by Alcan in its brief in 1969 to the royal commission investigating radiation, compensation and safety at the fluorspar mine.

MR. NEARY: Set up by a Liberal Government.

MR. DINN: The fund will continue to be administered by a registrar appointed by the Worker's Compensation Board.

In making this announcement I would also like to acknowledge the continued moral and financial responsibility shown by the Aluminum Company of Canada in supporting government's programme to assist workers and dependents who have suffered as a result of working in the St. Lawrence mines.

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

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2819

NM - 2

MR. THOMS:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:

What is wrong with your spokesman on labour?

MR. THOMS:

The spokesman on labour has been kind enough to let me reply to this particular one even though it is in his shadow because of course St. Lawrence is in the district of Grand Bank. And I must say I am very pleased to hear the minister's statement.

MR. NEARY:

They are just continuing a Liberal programme.

MR. THOMS:

And those in St. Lawrence who are dependent, even though the compensation is very low, it is very welcomed and there was a lot of concern whether or not the programme was going to be extended. And I am very pleased, on behalf of the people of St. Lawrence, to see that we now do have an extension of this programme. A programme, Mr. Speaker, which I understand was first implemented and negotiated by the Liberal Government of this Province and in particular by -

MR. NEARY:

By me, I did the negotiations.

MR. THOMS:

- the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS:

Having said that, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to hear the announcement from the Minister of Labour and Manpower.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Further statements?

The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, just a very brief statement this morning on fisheries but it is an important one to fishermen.

I am pleased to announce that the Fisheries Loan Board has adopted a new policy for financing, for the first time in our Province, of outboard motors for fishermen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

This decision, Mr. Speaker, was taken in response to representations from fishermen around the Province and more particularly from the Fishermen's Union and there are five guidelines outlined for the fishermen with regard to obtaining these loans. One, of course, is to qualify under current regulations. The outboard motor must be used in a vessel which has a commercial fishing vessel licence. The loan terms will be for a maximum period of three years based on the cost of these motors. The loans are to be insured.

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2820

ah-1

MR. MORGAN: Only one loan will be made to each individual fisherman within a three year period, the period to pay back the loan.

Mr. Speaker, I am sure that this new policy will be a benefit to fishermen not only along the Labrador coast but also around and throughout the coast of the Island portion of the Province.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.SPEAKER (Simms): The Leader of the Opposition has approximately one minute.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr.Speaker. We certainly welcome this addition. The Fisheries Loan Board has been in a mess for years. This kind of thing had been asked for fishermen for a long time. It has had political interference, it has had the worse kind of management by the government. They have now appointed a new board. They keep trying to blame things on the board and they have tried to pass their responsibilities now over to the banks. And, Mr. Speaker, I can tell you that the next major problem facing the loan board will be as the result of the government trying to back out of their guarantees and their subsidies and turning it all over to the banks.Now, Mr. Speaker, we should use this opportunity. If they really want to do something of benefit for the fishermen, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) should, instead of waiting for years and years like he has done with this, because this is long overdue, he should now take a look immediately at the policy of taking that away from the control of the banks immediately, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKR: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to respond to the statement made , Mr. Speaker. I want to assure the House and to assure all fishermen that the Newfoundland government is not going to be withdrawing

MR. MORGAN: any subsidies from the fishermen through the loan board. The only withdrawal of subsidies is in the case of the federal government who has now reduced the subsidies of boats from thirty-five per cent down to twenty-five per cent. We intend to maintain our subsidies, to maintain our assistance and to work with the fishermen and the Fishermen's Union of our Porvince.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.STIRLING: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A point of order has been raised by the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: I did not ask any questions, Mr. Speaker, and it appears that ministers -

MR.MORGAN: You made untrue statements.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

A point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. The minister, on the nod from the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), seems to have now agreed to a change in procedure. The occasional time that a minister got up has now been changed to the time that a minister gets up every time. We did not ask any questions, we made some suggestions. But it seems a new procedure now that ministers will have two cracks at a Ministerial Statement and we do not have the opportunity to respond.

MR. MARSHALL: To the point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of order. The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I just want to say it is Friday and the weekend is coming

MR. MARSHALL: and I do not know why the hon. member wishes to attack me on it, and nods, but the fact of the matter is that I had thought the hon. gentleman asked a rhetorical question that he did not express as sometimes he says things that he is not really expressing.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): To the point of order, there is no point of order.

I would like to ask hon. members to join me in welcoming this morning to the Speaker's gallery, the Secretary of the Vermont Agency of Environment, Secretary Brendan Whittaker, and his wife, Dorothy, who are seated in the Speaker's gallery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

Further statements?

The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening one of the 4-engine DC-4 spray planes was called out to treat Block 217. While on route to this area, the spray plane developed trouble in engine one. Smoke and flames were detected, necessitating action by the flight crew. To prevent loss of altitude and a possible crash, the plane was forced to jettison its load of 2,600 U.S. gallons of matacil spray mix. The area in which this occurred is thirty-five miles West of Gander in the vicinity of Sunday Lake.

Mr. Speaker, I have a map that I can either table and show, or I can show you now exactly where that area is in Gander. Spray Block 217, Mr. Speaker, is down here near Nillertown and Sunday Lake is over here near spray block 211 - Sunday Lake, where the spray was actually

MR. POWER: jettisoned. We can table the map and we will have copies of a smaller map for all members later on.

The time was approximately 8:00 P.M. The aircraft immediately returned to Gander and landed safely. Upon landing and arrival at a loading area, it was noted that some residual insecticide was still leaking from the aircraft. The standard procedures were immediately followed to contain this material, decontaminate it and clean the area. Because of the approach of darkness, no evaluation of the dump site was possible. All environmental agencies and the Canadian Coast Guard were notified according to the contingency plans and given pertinent information as is standard procedure in these matters. Plans were made to do a reconnaissance of the area in the morning to evaluate the dump site and carry out the necessary clean up procedures.

This morning, Mr. Speaker, officials from this department and the Department of Environment have gone out to evaluate the conditions in the affected area. Any other measures will depend on field observations and recommendations of this evaluation from the team of officials. When the evaluation is complete, further information will be made available, and I believe the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) also has a statement to make on this matter this morning.

In the meantime, Block 208 near Glenwood was treated with insecticide this morning, bringing the total area treated so far to 360,000 acres.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Leader of the Opposition has about one minute.

MR. STIRLING: I thought it was going to be followed up but we are doing them in two separate statements.

Do you want to do both of them together?

MR. ANDREWS: Yes.

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, further to the statement just delivered by my colleague, the hon. Charles Power, the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, I would like to confirm to the members of this hon. House that an environmental official from my department has accompanied the forestry crews to the area of last night's spill to assess the possibility of environmental damage and to ensure that any remaining pesticide residues are immediately cleaned up in accordance with the procedures established under the contingency plan for such an event.

In addition, samples of vegetation, soil and water will be taken for analysis. The only anticipated impact will be a localized effect on insect populations in the immediate area. However, my department will continue surveillance and to monitor the situation carefully on a continuing basis.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has about two minutes.

MR. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker. When we discussed the contingency plan it was obvious that there is no contingency plan for this kind of situation. The contingency plan simply says that if it is necessary to dump, no action can be taken, and there is no contingency plan. And, Mr. Speaker, this is being treated very lightly by the two ministers. It gives the impression that it is just a routine thing and the plane came back and they cleaned up the leaking residue. The truth of the

MR. STIRLING: matter, Mr. Speaker, is that there have been incidents like this in New Brunswick. I brought it to the attention of one of the ministers and I was told it was a different type of aircraft and this was not likely to happen. The truth of the matter is that this aircraft dumped its entire load in a very confined area. There are a number of questions that require a lot more of an explanation by the ministers. We have had ten page, twenty minute Ministerial Statements in this House on garbage, and now we have a serious problem and we get a one minute Ministerial Statement, which is not debatable, and we cannot ask questions.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not good enough. We have had a serious potential problem in the area. Was there anybody in the area? I would like to have some answers to ~~these~~ questions and I would ask the minister now to use the procedure that was improperly used by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan); was there anybody in the area who had this material dumped on? What kind of immediate steps were taken last night to keep people out of the area? Has it been blocked off, roped off? Is it now under absolute control?

MR. LUSH: Do they know exactly where it is?

MR. STIRLING: Have they been able to set out the boundaries?

any of this stuff still floating? Is it related to a water supply area?

MR. STIRLING: Was there anybody in the area? Are the children going hunting, fishing in that area today, the young people, do they know what has happened? Has there been any kind of a warning put out in Gander for people that were in that area?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!
The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, some of the questions brought up by the Leader of the Opposition are the things that are being evaluated this morning. Obviously as it relates to the length of the Ministerial Statement, just because we give a one page statement, Mr. Speaker, does not in any way mean that we take things lightly. It means that this morning at seven o'clock at the earliest point we had helicopters and people in the area. An evaluation is being done, Mr. Speaker. The spray; as it relates to our contingency plan, when the load had to be jettisoned, the aircraft went to an isolated area; most of the spray, as we can find out from last night, was dumped in a marsh, a boggy area. There are no people in the area. The closest camp, two miles from that is an Abitibi Price camp where no people were working. The camp people at Abitibi were immediately notified not to send any people into the area and our environmental officials and our departmental officials, along with probably some Canadian Environment people, are in there this morning doing an evaluation and an assessment and the answers to those questions will be done as soon as we get them, possibly before the House closes today.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of the Environment has an answer.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, to revert back to the procedure that has become common this morning, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition said that we did not have a contingency plan. I have already tabled one in the House but for his information I will table another copy.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, by leave.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Is there leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I challenge the Minister to look into that contingency plan that he said was tabled and read to this House the part of the contingency plan that deals with the dumping of a load exactly in this kind of situation. Read out of the contingency plan, what it says.

MR. ANDREWS: I do not have my copy here. I tabled it.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Forestry (C. Power) indicate to the House what actual steps were taken last night when this load of matacil, in a concentrated form was now dumped on a small area, what steps were taken last night specifically to protect people and to keep people out of that area today?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Forests Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, it is important to understand the procedure being used by aircraft personnel when jettisoning a load of spray in that form, not through the nozzles of the spray but through actually jettisoning through, I think, two or three inch hoses or pieces of tubing that the spray is jettisoned from. The aircraft personnel did everything they

June 26, 1981

Tape NO. 2823

EL - 3

MR. POWER: possibly could to make sure that the spraying was done mostly around an area of a fairly large bog in that area. It is away from water supplies. it was away from people, because obviously all information about the

MR. C. POWER: blocks that were to be sprayed at any given time in that area - where the spray was dumped is very close to another block, as I can show you on the map which was slated for spraying also at the same given time. so, therefore, Mr. Speaker, there should be no people in the area. Abitibi-Price people were not there doing any cutting although they have a camp in that given area where the spray was dumped.

Again, Mr. Speaker, some of the questions that caused the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) concern also caused the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) and myself great concern. Unfortunately, we cannot give the answers until the evaluation comes back from the team of officials that is out there today. Again, all I can say is that yesterday evening we notified the company which has an operation in the area, this morning we are in the area; I am sure, that any persons, for instance, trying to get into that area by permit would not get permission from our officials or the Department of Environment.

It is also, Mr. Speaker, important to note that when an aircraft travelling at several hundred miles an hour jettisons a load of 2,600 gallons out through two three inch pieces of pipe that that is going to cover a fairly decent area, many square miles. It is not going to go out in one very small area. Hence the effect on the environment will probably be diluted because of the fact of the spray going over a larger area.

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

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, that is the very point that we tried to bring up in this House. My colleague, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), who is our spokesman on forestry and is in his district this morning, he brought up that very point before the matacil spraying started to say that the contingency plan was not adequate, there was not a selected dump site in advance, it was not protected, it was not set out in advance. All of these things could be anticipated.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is making a speech. This is the Question Period. He should ask questions.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the purpose of Question Period is clear.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. L. STIRLING: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the purpose of Question Period is to try to get information. The purpose of trying to find out what the government is doing is to - we warned them in advance and now it is obvious, Mr. Speaker, that there was no contingency plan. It is a disgrace to this House that this morning we are getting from the minister preliminary -

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Name him! Name him!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

The hon. Leader of the Opposition
(Mr. Stirling) now is debating and should ask a question.

I would ask him to do so. He has a supplementary?
I will allow some preamble.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter and if the government had done its homework we would not be talking about the niceties this morning about how you are asking a question. It is a preliminary comment.

The question I have, Mr. Speaker, is why was there no contingency plan in force so that this morning we could have in detail that in accordance with the contingency plan the pilot - because they knew there were going to be problems - went to a dump area, it was screened off, people were not allowed in the area, it was pre-selected; the number of people that they have on duty, the kind of - all of the information, Mr. Speaker, should have been listed down because there was no contingency plan. And the question I have to ask him is specifically why it is that we have not got a full report this morning? You do not know who was in the area! You do not know what the effect is! So why is it that we do not have a full report this morning instead of this kind of - no information, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Forest Resources
and Lands.

MR. C. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I can understand the members opposite not understanding the contingency plan because many times they do not take time to read it. I cannot understand the Leader of the Opposition not understanding that in rural Newfoundland, in wilderness New-

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2824

DW - 4

MR. C. POWER: Newfoundland that you are going to have a report done at ten o'clock in the morning when the first persons to get in there was seven o'clock - it is 300 miles from us and I am supposed to have a report in the House of Assembly. Now, Mr. Speaker, that shows a total lack of understanding on the forests of Newfoundland, it shows a total lack of understanding of how procedures are to be carried out.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, that is totally and absolutely impractical. There is a contingency plan.

MR. STIRLING: Read it.

MR. POWER: If the member wants to read page 8, it has been tabled, it has been tabled before, but unfortunately none of the members opposite took the time to read it.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is a supplementary one to the minister and I am really concerned about this matter and I would like to ask the minister to trace the course of events that led to the dumping of this matabil last night after the plane took off from Gander. The hon. gentleman in his initial statement said that one of the engines of the plane started smoking and the pilot saw flames from one of the engines. Is that correct? Well, now, how much time did they have? Was there panic? Did they have to dump the load as quickly as they could? Did they have time to look around for a bog area to dump their load or did they start to dump the load when they were coming back to Gander for an emergency landing and dumped it all the way back? Because if there was matabil falling from the plane all the way back, then it would fall into the water supply, Gander Lake, it would fall over communities - it had to pass over a number of communities. I believe this is the first question we have to determine: Exactly what was the situation? Was it a panic situation? Was it an emergency landing? Did the crew have time to go and look for a bog area or, after they took off and discovered the fire in the engine, did they have to then high-tail it back to Gander as fast as they could to get the plane down to put out the fire in the engine and on the way back kept dumping matabil all the way back? Because I understand from my usual reliable sources of information that there is a fair amount of

MR. NEARY: matacil on the airstrip in Gander last night and this morning. Just trace the course of events so we can see what happened.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Forests, Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, as I understand in talking with my officials in Gander yesterday and this morning, the course of events was this: We decided yesterday evening that weather conditions were proper to go out and spray block 217 which is, as I have shown on the map, a fairly significant ways from Gander and very close to Millertown. On the course of the route in getting from Gander to Millertown, engine one of the aircraft was noticed to be having some troubles with it, flames were noticed and a lot of smoke. The DC-4 kind of aircraft which we tendered for this project, the reason we went for a DC-4 aircraft is because in using a four engine aircraft your safety chances are much greater than using the single engine aircraft like the Avengers that they use in New Brunswick where if you get a problem with an engine then it is a panic, it is a crisis situation. The reason for having the four engine aircraft is to give the pilot time to be able to look for a dump site-and there are selected dump sites both near Stephenville and near Gander. In this case that dump site was not used,

MR. POWER:

not used because the aircraft wanted to return to Gander, obviously, with the problems that it had. They selected an area where there was a fairly large amount of bog close to a spray block that was supposed to be sprayed anyway. It is an area that is isolated and uninhabited, an area where there is no woods activity now taking place. Mr. Speaker, after the aircraft - and this in in the contingency plan, the reason for doing that is that, obviously, from a pilot safety point of view - and there are two human beings onboard, Mr. Speaker, who obviously had their own lives to protect along with the aircraft - they decided to jettison the load in that given area and then return to Gander for an emergency landing, and all the emergency landing procedures that normally take place at any airport were in effect in Gander when the aircraft came back. It landed safely. Some insecticide was still leaking. The member asked exactly how much of the insecticide did actually leak from the area of jettison to the area of Gander airport. I do not know, Mr. Speaker. That is why we have a team of officials out in that area today to get those answers for us. All I can say is that the procedure and what happened is exactly as I have told the member.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that that is the key question. The hon. gentleman says he does not know. Well, surely, Mr. Speaker, the crew of the aircraft know. When the hon. gentleman admitted that they could not get into the dump site - there was a dump site that the crew was aware of, I presume - they could not jettison their load of matacil on the dump site

MR. NEARY: because there was an emergency, it was a crisis situation, and in order for the crew of the aircraft to save their lives they had to have an emergency landing in Gander where emergency procedures were implemented. So they selected an area. Now, the hon. gentleman, in my opinion, is handling that part of the answer very lightly. The area, he says, was bog land and it was uninhabited and there was no wildlife there, no moose there. Is that what the hon. gentleman is saying?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: I did not say there was no wildlife there.

MR. NEARY: Well, alright, the hon. gentleman just brushed over that very lightly. The hon. gentleman really does not know if there were people there or not, he does not know how much wildlife was there, he does not know how much of that matacil was dumped in that particular area because the aircraft was moving probably fairly fast to get back to Gander airport as quickly as possible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
Is the hon. member asking a question now?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: It is a fairly lengthy preamble.

MR. NEARY: Well, I realize that.

MR. SPEAKER: There are other members who wish to ask questions.

MR. NEARY: But it certainly is a very heavy subject too, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I agree, but I would ask the hon. member to ask his supplementary question.

MR. NEARY: I am trying to find out if the hon.

MR. NEARY: gentleman can tell us for sure that there were no people in the area, that no people's lives are endangered as a result of the matabil falling from the plane on the way back to land at Gander airport? Did the matabil fall on anybody at the airport? Did it go into the Gander water supply? Did it fall over any other communities? Because that plane had to fly over a number of communities to get back on the ground in Gander. Now, these are the questions that the hon. gentleman should address himself to.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I just find it hard to believe that any member of this House can expect a person at ten o'clock this morning, several hundred miles from where an accident took place, to have all the answers to exactly how many sparrows were in the area, how many caterpillars were in the area, how many moose, how many rabbits, how many ducks might happen to be breeding in the given area.

Mr. Speaker, we have a team of officials out examining the area so that we can get all the information which we will gladly give to members either at the end of today's sitting if we have it, on Monday if we do have it. Again, Mr. Speaker, I just find it hard to believe that we are supposed to have all those answers this morning. All I know is that the crew followed the contingency plans as best they could and in protecting their lives they have to jettison a certain amount of aircraft. If someone wants to ask me how many sparrows are comparable to a human life I do not know.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary -

MR. NEARY: I yield.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, we have heard quoted, and the ministers have not quoted the section, well I am going to ask a question dealing with the specific section. And in court we expect a minister at ten o'clock in the morning to have the answers in a contingency that should have been anticipated.

MR. STIRLING: Should a pilot find it necessary to jettison a load there is little that can be done to decontaminate the area. That is all that is in the contingency plan, Mr. Speaker. No rules that the pilot is under the control of Forestry. No rules that it was under the control of Forestry. Mr. Speaker, it is a shocking admission of lack of management of this problem.

Now let us suppose the same problem occurs tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, and the question I have asked the minister, now that a problem has happened, and you do not know at this point the concentration of the pollutant, you do not know at this point if any people were in the area, and you do not know about the damage that has taken place, what have you been doing since eight o'clock? You should have been out there last night eight o'clock. You should have been there all night. You should have been able to report to this Chamber this morning that you had it under control.

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

MR. STIRLING: The question that I have to ask, will the minister please outline the type of control that they used last night over the pilots to tell them where they could jettison and what they did to make sure that there was warning to the people in that area? What specifically was done between last night and today? And since you are continuing this programme what plans do you now have in force so you are not in here tomorrow morning saying it is ten o'clock and I do not know what is going on.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Someone says in the background, What are they trying to prove by asking questions which we obviously do not have the answers for when our officials are trying to find out.

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2827

NM - 3

MR. POWER:

The obvious answer, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STIRLING:

You should have been prepared for

it -

MR. POWER: is that again, Mr. Speaker, it comes up in this House that that side of the House is against a protection programme, is against -

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker!

MR. POWER: - protecting the 20,000 Forest jobs, as the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has shown -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. POWER: And they will find every excuse they can, signing petitions or do anything else they can -

MR. MORGAN: What a disgrace. What a disgrace.

MR. NEARY: You should be ashamed of yourself.

MR. POWER: - to come in here and find that they do not want to protect the forest resources in this Province -

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. POWER: - which we as a government have decided to do because it is absolutely necessary.

MR. NEARY: Shameful.

MR. LUSH: What a disgrace.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, they would want to continue to read it. Obviously, we have tabled this twice - nobody has read it. The Leader of the Opposition reads the first part -

MR. STIRLING: I just read it through.

MR. POWER: - that nothing can be done. Well, let us read all of it. "Jettisoned aircraft load. Should a pilot find it necessary to jettison a load of insecticide, full or partial for safety purposes, there is little that can be done to decontaminate that area. In all cases, Mr. Speaker, a) a pilot will, if the situation permits, jettison load on flat surfaces as far from water as possible, establish location on map, and advise the operations manager. Done!

MR. STIRLING: He does not have to be told!

MR. POWER: Operations manager will advise the Coast Guard at 737-2083, Done, Mr. Speaker. Number 3, if jettisoned insecticide can be identified on the ground, the operations manager will commence cleanup and de-contamination measures will begin. Liquid that can be absorbed with the use of an absorbent compound or batts will be soaked up and put into sealable containers, i.e., steel barrels, and be disposed of by burying. Contaminated area will then be treated with caustic soda or farmers' lime depending on the type of ground, whether it is dry or wet." That, Mr. Speaker, is being done this morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: I am amazed that member on the other side would treat this matter so lightly. I am trying to trace, I am trying to get the minister to trace the flying pattern of that aircraft from the time she developed her trouble until she got on the ground, made an emergency landing in Gander. Would the hon. gentleman tell us how many communities did that aircraft fly over on the way back to Gander to make an emergency landing? How many communities? Can the hon. gentleman just trace the course of the aircraft? Or does the hon. gentleman know, or is he concerned? Because obviously the aircraft had to fly over communities where the matabil was dripping from the aircraft. Did it fly over the town of Gander, for instance and over to the Gander Lake, which is the water supply for Gander? Surely the hon. gentleman - that is fundamental, basic information - the hon. gentleman should be able to give the House that information.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, again, as the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) says, they do not know their geography very well. I have shown them the map, that it is an area, Sunday Lake, an area west of Gander. So far I can see on the map, a place called Frozen Ocean Pond, which is in the area; I do not think many people live there; Burnt Lake, I do not think too many people live there; Sunday Lake, Hayes Lake, Crow Lake, there do not seem to be any communities there and obviously if the member wants the map he can look and see exactly where it is to.

MR. NEARY: In other words, you do not know.

MR. POWER: I am saying there are no communities there.

MR. NEARY: Well, how do you know? Which course did the aircraft take when he was coming back for his emergency landing? Did he fly over Gander?

MR. SPEAKER: Any further questions?

MR. STIRLING: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Is the minister really telling us that he had to get help from his colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), to take a look at a map right now to try to guess at what the pilot did? You mean you do not know whether or not the pilot zigzagged, went through two or three sites?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Do you not know what kind -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. Leader should direct his question to the Chair and not 'you', direct to the Chair.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, maybe I would have a better chance of getting the Speaker to answer the question. Is the minister now admitting that at this stage he does not know specifically what route that the pilot took, what steps that he took, whether he went over a number of sites? Does he not know whether or not there was a lot of leakage going over the town of Gander? Does he not know what direction, which actual runway he came in on? Is the minister saying he does not know and that he actually had to look at the map to see what route he would have taken? Is that the kind of complete lack of information that the minister has this morning?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, it is really hard to believe that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) and the members opposite find it hard to sink into their heads the fact that this thing happened yesterday evening, the fact that flight plans -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. POWER: If you want us to get flight plans from the Department of Transport in Gander, we will gladly get the flight plans; we will gladly table them by the end of the day, or Monday morning or Monday afternoon, we will gladly table the flight plans.

MR. MORGAN: How can you control the flight plan? Do not be so foolish, boy.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, all I can say is -

MR. STIRLING: I know you cannot control it -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. POWER: - that we have done everything that is humanly possible and it is continuing to be done today to make sure that there is absolutely a minimal amount of damage to the environment and a minimal amount of danger that any persons in Newfoundland are placed in. What we have to realize, Mr. Speaker, is that we as a government has decided to do a protection programme, we have 20,000 in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, who make their living directly and indirectly from the forestry, we have to have a protection programme because we have lost 22 per cent or 23 per cent of our forest resource to the budworm, and it is either, in our case, do a programme where there are risks involved, Mr. Speaker - no one denies the fact that when you use machines, use aircraft, use chemical sprays there are not some risks involved - we as a government have responsibly sat down and decided that we have to have a protection programme. It is just unfortunate that members of the Opposition are not equally so responsible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, now the hon. gentleman is admitting that there is risk involved in this programme.

MR. POWER:

I always did.

MR. NEARY:

Now how much risk is involved?

Are these aircraft safe? Mr. Speaker, are they properly maintained? What year are the aircraft? Who owns the aircraft? Where do they come from? Are they properly maintained? Did the hon. gentleman's officials or the Department of the Environment try to get some information on this aircraft before it came down to Gander?

MR. NEARY: Can the hon. gentleman tell us about the condition of the aircraft?

MR. MORGAN: Anything that flies is controlled by the Feds, boy.

MR. NEARY: Just how hazardous is this operation? It is only now that we are beginning to find out that there is an unsafe element involved and they do not have a contingency plan. Can the hon. gentleman tell us about the condition of the aircraft?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Forests, Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: I will try and take a couple of minutes, Mr. Speaker, to say that when you live as a human being there are hazards in almost everything you do. If the Speaker gets up and leaves to walk out, he may trip and break a leg; if someone gets on an aircraft, there may be a crash.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. POWER: There may be a crash.

MR. STIRLING: How irresponsible can you be?

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I am not treating it lightly. I am trying to find how absolutely irresponsible and asinine some of the questions are that are being asked by the Opposition. Now, finally, after we have gone through a Royal Commission in this Province that almost none of the members opposite went to, after we had a Royal Commission Report that was presented that most of them acknowledged not reading, and now are trying to say - and I wonder why they have such hesitations about a spray programme. Mr. Speaker, it is only now they are beginning to realize that there are hazards involved with a spray programme. Now our government knew that all along. Every member on this side, every member who dealt with and read the Royal Commission Report knows there are hazards

MR. POWER: involved. Mr. Speaker,

I can only say that we as a government have done everything we possibly can to make sure that the dangers are minimal. Unfortunately the licensing of all aircraft, the licensing of all pilots falls under federal jurisdiction and I only hope and pray they do a better job with that than they do with most things.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to come back again to the - no wonder they brought in legislation barring people from getting injunctions against the government to stop this spray programme.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Let us get back to the time element again. Would the hon. gentleman now tell us the amount of time we are talking about? From the time the aircraft left the ground, they discovered the smoke and the flames coming from number one engine and then dumped the load, found a site to dump the load, how much time are we talking about? From the time the aircraft left, dumped the load, got back on the ground again, how much time are we talking about there?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Forests, Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, in answer to a previous question from the Leader of the Opposition, I have agreed to get the flight plan and table it.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I believe that the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews) received the first message last night while we were attending the dinner at the dining hall. Could the minister tell us what specific action he took from that point, which was about eight o'clock? The Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews) is the one responsible for this. The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) is the one that is interested in killing the insects. The Minister of the Environment is suppose to protect us and the environment. Can he tell us step by step what information he took- what steps he took to get this under control, because we still do not have any specific information as to when it happened, how long it took for that aircraft to get back, how much of that has been dumped in various places and how big the area is, what kind of control and what contingency plans were in effect before and under whose control?

MR. L. STIRLING: Was this all decided by the pilot or did the operations manager have some control over it?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious to me that the decision to abort the flight was the pilot's decision. I was not on board at the time. I was notified at approximately eleven o'clock last night of incident. The hon. Leader of the Opposition was sitting next to me or just behind in the dining hall. I instructed my people through my deputy minister, who informed me - it took him some time to track me down and that was three hours after the incident. It was dark at the time - the first steps were to clean up what drippings there was around the aeroplane as it landed. That work was in progress at that time with the contingency plan, Mr. Speaker. I also instructed my people to get to the area as soon as possible this morning. My understanding is that they left at seven o'clock this morning.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Now could the hon. Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) tell us how much drippings are we talking about around the airport? Was it a large amount? Was it after the aircraft stopped, parked on the tarmac, that the drippings were discovered or was she dripping this matacil all the way into an emergency landing? Could the hon. gentleman tell the House that? And while the hon. gentleman is on his feet, could he also tell us how they cleaned it up? How do you clean up matacil? What do you do to try to neutralize it?

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2831

DW - 2.

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

MR. ANDREWS: I will turn to the contingency plan for the second reading of the day, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: No, I want to know what you did last night.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, it can be absorbed with absorbing compounds or batts. One of the better ways of absorbing - neutralizing is what we are talking about - this chemical is with a caustic soda and caustic soda would probably have been used last night -

MR. S. NEARY: What did they use last night?
I want to find out about, last night!

MR. LUSH: Did they use caustic soda last night?

MR. ANDREWS: I do not know if they used caustic soda last night or if they used batts.

MR. S. NEARY: You do not know! Well, that is the trouble, you do not know!

MR. ANDREWS: If it was in sufficient quantities to sop up they would have used batts and put it in sealable containers. That is the procedure.

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

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. L. STIRLING: I yield, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: The hon. gentleman soaked up more than they did in Gander last night.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please!
The hon. Leader of the Opposition yields to the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, is the hon. gentleman admitting that he does not the process, the procedure used in the clean up, that in actual fact he does not know how much drippings were - if it was all the way down the runway on the way in while the plane was landing, making an emergency landing or just on the tarmac where they parked the plane? The hon. gentleman, why does he not admit it and just say that he does not know? Is that the situation?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the spill, to my information - or the drippings, I would not call it a spill - I would presume it was where maybe the cocks or the valves were not slightly -

MR. S. NEARY: You presume but you do not know!

MR. POWER: This is being investigated.

MR. ANDREWS: - were not properly closed. My information last night and this morning was that it was a small amount, whatever a small amount is, in numbers of gallons.

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

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, it is very obvious that - they said that they had to track the minister down and they got him at 11:00 last night. Now, between 8:00 P.M. and 11:00 P.M., would the minister tell us specifically what action was taken, not what should have been taken according to a piece of paper that said, 'Now, this is what might have happened'? What action specifically was taken by the minister?

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

MR. ANDREWS: The action taken by me, Mr. Speaker, was after the fact, because I informed my personnel to have the contaminant cleaned up. They said that was in progress, if not completed - this was the telephone call I received from St. John's - and it was done.

MR. STIRLING: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STIRLING: Is the minister now telling us that the purpose in getting in touch with the minister was just to inform him that a problem had occurred and that action was being taken? Now, if I were there, if I were the minister, if there were anybody on this side with the minister, we would have the answers this morning. We would be here with answers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. STIRLING: It is obvious from the fact that - a small piece of information: it seems that I have to give some information to the minister in order to get some. If there were no damage to the tanks - as such, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: - if there were no damage to the tanks and they found when the aircraft got back in Gander

MR. STIRLING: it was still spraying, it was still jettisoning matacil, can the minister categorically say that the jettison took place in a specific area the plane circled, or in fact, from the information he has given us this morning which indicates that there was spillage on the runway, that there was a continuous jettison from whenever the plane took off until in fact it was still jettisoning matacil when it landed on the runway? Can the minister categorically deny that there was no jettisoning all over that route?

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

MR. ANDREWS: No, Mr. Speaker, I cannot.

MR. SPEAKER: The time for Oral Questions has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to a question raised by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) yesterday with regard to the use of rented cars by my staff. I want to confirm the answer that I gave him, which is that to the largest extent rented cars are not used by my field staff, and, in support of that, I would like to give the following information:

I have had a check made of my various regions, five regions in the Province, and the figures are as follows.

MR. NEARY: Could you speak up?

MR. MORGAN: We cannot hear you, 'Tom'.

MR. HICKEY: I cannot speak any louder.

It is not a matter of my not speaking louder, it is a matter of the people over there maybe not shutting up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, in the Eastern region, fifty-three of my staff use their private cars, one temporary employee uses a taxi, and no rented cars are used. In the Western region, sixty-four staff use their private cars, thirteen use taxis and four social assistance workers use rented cars - and I will explain the reason for that. In the Central region, thirty-three members of my staff use their own private cars, sixteen use taxis and four use rented cars.

MR. HICKEY: In Labrador, thirteen use their own private cars, six use taxis, none use rented cars. In the situations where rented cars are used, Mr. Speaker, they are used because it is cheaper than using taxis. Under the Wage and Working Agreement covering my employees in the field, there is no requirement that they use their own private vehicle. In other words, they have an option of using taxis or private vehicles.

MR. NEARY: I do not care what you say, they are getting away with something.

MR. HICKEY: The incident as indicated by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I wish to comment on. I have checked the information that he provided and I can confirm that on Monday, June 15th., a car was rented from Beothic Rent-A-Car in Lewisporte by the district office of the Department of Social Services. The car was used by the social worker during that day to perform a number of home visits in the course of his duties. Later that evening, the social worker used the car to travel to another part of the community on personal business. On returning, he had an accident. Realizing that he really should not have been using the rent-a-car for his own personal use, he went to the rent-a-car agency and had the original contract cancelled and another contract prepared renting the car to himself personally and he paid the bill.

MR. NEARY: I see.

MR. HICKEY: That is based on the information.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, can I continue? If the hon. gentleman has a question he can ask me afterwards.

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

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

On motion, that the House resolve itself into
Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please!

Bill No. 86. Shall the resolution
carry?

MR. NEARY:

No, not yet, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, yesterday hon.

members of the House will recall that I made some statements
concerning the collection of this tax,

MR. NEARY: the revenue from the gasoline tax, which is the highest in Canada. We have the highest provincial gasoline tax in the whole of North America. There is not a state in the United States, I do not think, that charges 22 per cent of a gasoline tax. Twenty-two per cent is what the Province, this provincial government, collects, twenty-two cents for every dollar. When consumers go up to the gas pump and they buy gasoline, twenty-two cents out of every dollar they buy goes into the Treasury of this Province. That is three times more than the federal government collects, and the federal government subsidizes gasoline in this Province. And yesterday I was tracing the usage of this money, the expenditure, what the money was to be used for. The money, I said, was to be used for providing the Premier with a \$300,000 or \$400,000 house, free of charge, rent free - the only Province in Canada who gives the Premier a rent free house. That does not seem to have sunk in to members' heads yet. The only Province in Canada, the poorest Province of Canada, the highest taxes, the highest gasoline tax, the highest sales tax, the highest income tax, the highest taxes in Canada, record unemployment, the highest cost of living, and what do we do here? 22 per cent gasoline tax charged up to the consumers to pay for a \$300,000 or \$400,000 home for the Premier, and the private dining room and all the other fringe benefits.

Well, yesterday, Mr. Chairman, you will recall that hon. gentlemen on the government benches challenged this statement and said that previously Mr. Smallwood was given a house. And I heard the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) at that game - yesterday it was the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) who said, 'What about Smallwood's house', and I said, 'Yes, what about it?'

MR. NEARY: 'Well, the taxpayers gave him a house', they said.

MR. CARTER: Tell us all about the Roaches Line.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I can and that is precisely what I am going to do if the hon. gentleman would only just exercise a little patience.

MR. HANCOCK: Can you get a D8 into the House, Mr. Chairman?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am going to say something and I am going to table a document that has never been tabled in this House before.

MR. HANCOCK: You should not say it yet.

MR. NEARY: But before I table the document there is a story that has to be told.

MR. CARTER: A fine story.

MR. NEARY: A fine story it is. And, Mr. Chairman, there was a house built on Roaches Line by Mr. Smallwood, Who built it? If the hon. gentleman wants to, he can go down in the registry office, the same as I did at 9:00 a.m. this morning, and he will find that there was a mortgage, Mr. Smallwood took out a mortgage that built that house. There was a mortgage on that house. He built the house the same as every other Newfoundlanders who would build it, out of a mortgage - mortgage money.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HANCOCK: That is what he got for twenty-three years.

MR. NEARY: And that can be confirmed by just going down to the registry office and looking up the volumes down there.

MR. HANCOCK: The most honest Premier this Province has ever seen.

MR. YOUNG: What are you talking about?

MR. NEARY: We are talking about Mr. Smallwood's house now and I am not going to be distracted by anything else.

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2834

SD - 3

MR. NEARY: We are talking about Mr. Smallwood's house, not who paid for anything else. The Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) is over there interrupting everytime we get up to talk about the Premier's \$300,000 or \$400,000 house. Yesterday he said, 'What about Mr. Smallwood's house?' Well, I

MR. NEARY:

am dealing with it now. Now, the house was built, Mr. Chairman. Now, when the house was built out of Mr. Smallwood's own pocket, out of a mortgage that he floated with a trust company in this city-that can be confirmed in the Registry Office-then what did he do with the house? Did he then keep the house for himself? No, Mr. Chairman, here is what he did. In 1963, Volume 831, page 307, Mr. Smallwood conveyed to the Province of Newfoundland, to the people of this Province, his house. "Know all men by these presents, that I, the hon. Joseph Roberts Smallwood, of Roaches Line in the electoral district of Port de Grave, Newfoundland, Premier of Newfoundland, have granted and conveyed and do by these presents, grant and convey to the Government of Newfoundland"-and then it goes on to describe the land - together with all buildings and erections there - on and the appurtenance thereon to hold the same until the Government of Newfoundland for use as a country residence for future premiers of Newfoundland.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY:

'And failing such use -

MR. HANCOCK:

You will have that in a couple of years.

MR. NEARY:

- 'failing such use by a future premier at any time for such use, by the then Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Newfoundland, reserving however to me, the said hon. Joseph Roberts Smallwood and to my wife surviving me, the exclusive right to occupy and use the said land and premises for the remainder of our respective lives, free of any rental but subject to the conditions that we shall be responsible for the repair and maintenance of the said premises during the period of such occupancy.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that house was conveyed to the people of this Province for the large sum of one dollar, one dollar. And you know, Mr. Chairman, the one dollar was never paid.

MR. CARTER: Is that still in effect?

MR. NEARY: That is still in effect, and I am coming to that, by the way. I am coming to it. That is still in effect. Mr. Smallwood does not own a house in this Province, does not own a home. He does not have a home. The man who was premier of this Province for twenty-three years does not have a home. He owned one, he gave it to the people of this Province, sold it to them for one dollar.

MR. CARTER: He has got what he deserves.

MR. NEARY: No. But, Mr. Chairman, when Mr.

Moore -

MR. HANCOCK: Boy, you are a disgrace to the House, honest to God.

MR. NEARY: When Mr. Moore was Premier of this Province, one -

MR. HANCOCK: A disgrace to the House. We should get a D-8 and run over you.

MR. NEARY: - one of the last decisions he made, in one of his last Cabinet meetings, he decided, Mr. Moore, a decision of the Cabinet was taken and Mr. Moore decided to sell Mr. Smallwood back his house for the same dollar, for the same price he had sold it to the Newfoundland Government for.

MR. CARTER: Thereby hangs a tale.

MR. NEARY: Yes, thereby hangs a tale.

MR. NEARY:

But lo and behold, Mr. Speaker, what Mr. Moores thought was fair and just, that the former Premier of this Province should own his own home, the present Premier cancelled the Order-in-Council.

MR. HANCOCK: Oh, come on, that is not -

MR. NEARY: The present Premier when he took over cancelled the decision of Cabinet -

MR. HANCOCK: Now, how about that, boys? How about that?

MR. STIRLING: Now deny it! Deny it!

MR. NEARY: - cancelled it, and denied

Mr. Smallwood the right to own his own home.

MR. HANCOCK: Get up on a point of order now!

AN HON. MEMBER: Your time is up.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not a half hour already.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): No, the hon. member spoke, when he adjourned the debate, he spoke for eighteen minutes yesterday. He would have twelve today.

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Chairman, the present Premier cancelled the deal. So the people of this Province own a house that the - and, you know, Mr. Chairman, I am amazed. Not only do I have to educate, sometimes, people on the other side of the House who make these snide remarks, who use these smear tactics, who use these low snake-in-the grass attacks on the former Premier of this Province, not only do I have to educate that hon. crowd over there, but these things have to be said sometimes to educate some of my own colleagues who think that everything that is said over there is gospel when in actual fact -

MR. HANCOCK: That deed is registered.

MR. NEARY: That deed is registered in the Registry Office. I went there this morning at 9:00 A.M.,

MR. NEARY: did my search, have copies, and I am asking the Page to come down so I can distribute some of these copies to the press. I am going to table the deed, Mr. Speaker. But I think it should be distributed to the press.

I hope that nobody ever again in this House or in the media will ever make the untrue statement, the incorrect statement, will ever add to the big lie that Mr. Smallwood was given a house by the people of this Province. As a matter of fact, the opposite is true. He built the house - got a mortgage the same as every other Newfoundlander did - built the house and then sold it to the Newfoundland Government, gave it to the people of this Province for the large sum of one dollar. And, Mr. Chairman, the present Premier cancelled the deal that Mr. Moores had passed in Cabinet.

Well, now, the gentleman who cancelled that, what was he the beneficiary of? He was the beneficiary of a \$300,000 or \$400,000 house paid for by the taxpayers of this Province rent free - free lights, free telephone, free rent, free motor car. That very same gentleman who thought that it was scandalous, a disgrace, for the former Premier of this Province to own his own home, that it be sold back to him for the same price he sold it for, that very same gentleman was the benefactor of these huge gifts from the taxpayers of this Province who are now asked to cough up 22 per cent tax on gasoline to help pay for it, a \$300,000 or \$400,000 luxurious house, Mount Scio House up in the Pippy Park. Security - now they are talking about putting a chain link fence around it with gates that are electrified, bodyguards all over the place. Mr. Chairman, what a - I cannot find an adjective

MR. NEARY:

an adjective to describe it, What a disgrace; What an utter disgrace; in Newfoundland bodyguards going everywhere. The Premier cannot go out of the building unless he got a bodyguard tight to his shoulder. The bodyguard leaps in the car and he jumps in the back seat and they take - you should watch it. I have seen it on my way out of the building. What a performance. You would not see it in a James Bond movie, the kind of antics that this crowd are carrying on. The hon. gentleman is obviously paranoid. But, Mr. Speaker, before my time runs out this particular session, I want to lay this on the table of the House. And I dare any member of this House, on the government side, to be the first now to stand up and say - stand up, I dare them now to ever again stand up and say that Mr. Smallwood was given a house by the taxpayers of this Province, by the people of this Province, rent free and free light.

MR. CARTER: Sit down (inaudible).

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you going (inaudible) him over there?

MR. NEARY: No, I will answer that when I come

back, do not worry, because that is completely untrue.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, I do not know as much about the former, former Premier's present house as I do about his future house. I do know it contains a very large furnace and some gentleman dressed in red who stoke it continuously in anxious anticipation for their new guest. And I can assure you that he will live there a long time in great discomfort. So what the hon. gentleman is saying is absolute rubbish and I wonder, I really wonder at gentlemen opposite, that they should ever have a good word to say about that former, former Premier,

Mr. CARTER: especially the gentleman from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), because if it were not for that hon. gentleman, he, today would be Premier. And anyone who does not believe that merely has to look at the election results in 1975. So I will be very interested if the hon. member for The Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) has the gall to get up and say a good word about his predecessor in the party. He knows very well that he owes him nothing, absolutely nothing. Now, there are two or three reasons why I believe this to be true. In the first place, a careful analysis of the 1975 election results will show you that the Liberal Reform candidates were placed in areas where they could split the vote.

MR. HANCOCK: Tell us about your crowd putting twenty-two cents on gasoline.

MR. CARTER: And were it not for the Liberal Reform Party that ran, the Liberal Party, it appears, would have come very close to forming the government, if not actually forming the government. Also, it is a fact - Hansard will back me up - that after the former, former Premier became a member in this House once again, in 1975 as leader of the Liberal Reform group, no cross word, no angry comment, no criticism whatsoever was made of the then Premier Moores. There was nothing but sweetness, harmony and light and praise for the former Premier by the former, former Premier. That is a fact and Hansard will bear me out.

The second fact that I have personal knowledge of is that when I wisely would not allow the television cameras to come in and record the nonsensical charade of the former, former Premier resigning, a very vigorous representation was made to me from former

MR. CARTER: Premier Moores to relent. Now, all of these lead me to believe absolutely that former Premier Smallwood knifed his colleagues, knifed them deeply, in the back, in the front, in the throat, in the side, everywhere he could push the knife he did and not only pushed the knife, but turned it and rubbed their noses in the dirt. And it is extraordinary to me, it is absolutely extraordinary to me that hon. members opposite can get up and say a decent word about him. Because if it were not for that - I have to say hon. gentleman, those gentleman opposite would now, very possibly, be the government of Newfoundland. God help us! So perhaps we ought to give the former, former Premier some praise, that he inadvertently did something for the Tory Party that he certainly was not willing to do for the Liberal Party.

Now, as to his lovely house, as to that pile of garbage set on something

MR. J. CARTER: like 4,000 acres of Crown land, something that no other Newfoundlander can get, had not been able to get in the past and is not able to get in the present.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who built the house?

MR. CARTER: Situated on 4,000 acres of prime agricultural land, the very best, topsoil down to your arm-pits, situated on that is a very, very expensive house, far beyond the means - unless the hon. Premier was a very, very good manager, there was no way that that house was built by his own resources. There were a great many gifts given to him by craven hangers on. Look at the driveway itself. It must have cost many thousands of dollars to pave that. Look at those expensive pillars from the post office. Where did he get those? Did he pay for them or were they put out on tender? Nonsense. He was given them. Gifts. Gifts. Gifts.

MR. NEARY: Who owns it now? Who owns it all?
Who owns it now?

MR. CARTER: It does not matter who owns it.

MR. NEARY: Who owned it since 1963?

MR. CARTER: It is a well known fact that no premier is softheaded enough to want to go out in the sticks and live there. He will live there as long as he wants to, and his heirs can live there, because no premier in Newfoundland will be softheaded enough to want to go out and live in such a mausoleum as -

MR. HANCOCK: Your Premier was soft enough to (inaudible) it away.

MR. CARTER: The whole place lacks in taste. It is just a hodgepodge of conflicting architectural styles, set in amongst a nest of flies and mosquitoes. Anyone who would be foolish enough even to go out there and visit would want his head examined. So let the fellow live in his manure pile, him and his heirs forever, as far as I am concerned.

MR. CARTER: But I am very, very surprised that the gentlemen across the way are softheaded enough to fall for that kind of nonsense.

While I have the opportunity to speak about the matter under discussion, I would like to - it has been suggested that we are trying to close the House in a hurry. Well, I would like to make my own position quite clear. Some of us have to work for a living and, those of us who do, find the three hours per day of rest and repose that we can have in here, a very welcome respite from the work-a-day world. So as far as I am concerned, I am quite prepared to sit here all Summer.

Our Leader has very wisely made it absolutely clear that he is not going to go into extended sittings. We are not going to sit morning, noon and night like we used to before. We will sit merely three hours a day. And, in fact, in this coming week we are only going to be sitting for four sessions. There is a holiday on Monday, I understand, and the House will be closed until Tuesday. So merely four sittings a week is nothing.

MR. STIRLING: Then there is Regatta Day.

MR. BARRETT: That will be another day.

MR. CARTER: In my view, I think the House should sit permanently because where else could you have such free entertainment? Where else could the public of Newfoundland see Joey lovers? They are a rare breed. They can come in and see avowed Joey lovers.

MR. STIRLING: They are sitting up there now.

MR. CARTER: You would have to go to a zoo to see so many congregated.

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2838

NM - 3

MR. CARTER:

I think the Speaker, or his officers, should charge admission to the public. I am sure they would do very well. And it would perhaps defray some of the costs of taxes that we have to pay. I am sure people would be very glad to see such freaks sitting in their seats.

MR. J. CARTER: Anyway as far as I am concerned, I would be very happy to sit here all Summer if necessary. As I say, it is a very welcome respite from physical labour. The seats are comfortable, the backs are padded. I find sometimes, that I can even get forty winks or thirty winks and it is very welcome. So I am quite prepared to sit here as long as it is necessary.

MR. D. HANCOCK: You are going to have to, because you have no choice.

MR. J. CARTER: In the meantime, criticism is made against this government for raising the taxes as high as they have to be. Well, of course, it is no secret why the taxes are as high as they are, the scorched-earth policy that we inherited from the former Liberal government has left us with very little discretion, very little room to manoeuvre. And I still say that if Newfoundland had not been mis-administered for twenty-three years, we could have perhaps done something. But the moment we got into power we were faced with a \$200 million deficit on behalf of the Stephenville Linerboard mill. We had several choices, we could have torpedoed the project - perhaps that would have been the best thing to do and let John Doyle pick up the pieces.

MR. S. NEARY: That is what you did.

MR. J. CARTER: No, we did not. We tried to make it stagger on until it was shown to be absolutely unworkable. So very rapidly we found the public debt to be over \$1 billion. It was quite beyond our control. Now inflation has taken its toll and we have been left with a current account problem that leaves us very little room to manoeuvre. So I think hon. gentlemen are being very unfair in criticizing us for the few cents we are trying to take in. I do not like taxes. I do not suppose anybody does. But I do have one suggestion that might have some merit and that is if avowed Liberals were to pay double the taxes, perhaps we would take in a

MR. J. CARTER: little more income. I think that, in justice, an avowed long-term Liberal should agree voluntarily to pay double sales tax, double income tax and double every other tax. I think it is the only fair way to do it. After all, they are the cause of most of the trouble, so there.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!
The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. J. MORGAN: Oh, you have not been here for a while.

MR. E. ROBERTS: No, I have not been here for a while, Mr. Chairman, and I must say seeing the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) again I do not regret that I have not been here for a day or two. Seeing the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Chairman, is like thinking one is having a bad dream and waking up and realizing it is not a bad dream at all.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Chairman, let me, first of all, deal on the merits with what the hon. gentleman for Mount Scio (Mr. Barry) said and that will not take - I am sorry, St. John's North (Mr. Carter). Again I have done a disservice to the member for Mount Scio. It will not take me very long on the merits with what the hon. gentleman for St. John's North said. First of all, I would thank him for his testimony but I would remind him of the old saying, 'that while the light holds out to burn the vilest sinner may return'. And there are many of us who believe that the Liberals would have formed the administration in 1975 if Mr. Smallwood had done what many of us believe he ought to have done. We will never know that. All I can say is that it is a great pity, because the Province would have had a considerably better government

MR. E. ROBERTS: than, in fact, it did end up with. But that is neither here nor there. That is history and I am more concerned about the future. On the history though, you know, I think it is worth recording. As my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has said Mr. Smallwood did give his house to the Province, the deed has been down there for nigh on twenty years if anybody wants to go look it up. And as far as I have ever been able to determine, it is a valid bequest - not a valid bequest, a valid gift to the Province and the house remains in Mr. Smallwood's custody or possession for his lifetime and that of his wife if she should survive him. Both Mr. and Mrs. Smallwood are very much alive and very much with us. After that, as I understand it, the title remains where it now is, with the Province. The right to possession also comes back to the

MR. ROBERTS:

Province and, as I understand it, if it is not lived in by the Premier then it is to be used as a -

MR. NEARY: Summer residence.

MR. ROBERTS: - Summer residence. In the meantime, Mr. Smallwood maintains it and repairs it and insures it and keeps it up, not an ungenerous gift, My friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) would be well advised to remember the old adage, 'Not to look a gift horse in the mouth', He persists in looking in the other end of a horse. And seeing where he sits and who he must look at immediately in front of him, he looks at the other ends of horses. But there is a saying that, you know, 'One should not look a gift horse in the mouth'. And Mr. Smallwood, by giving this House to the Province - and let it be recorded - has done considerably more for the Province than either of his two successors to date. Mr. Moores set a number of precedents, and the present Premier is carrying them on and embellishing them, and I would wager we are probably up to \$250,000 a year in the all-in cost for Mount Scio house now, not only a very expensive accommodation for a person who is well paid, the highest paid elected official in this Province and one of the highest paid people on the Public Treasury of this Province, not only are we providing him with expensive accommodation but we are the only Province in Canada to provide a Premier with any kind of accommodation at all.

And that is a commentary on, you know, the values of a government in what is, they keep telling us and keep telling us accurately, the poorest Province in Canada at least in economic terms. You know, here we are, we are the poorest Province in Canada in terms of per capita income, we are the most heavily taxed and yet we can find about \$250,000 a year, by my estimate, to provide an accommodation for a Premier who is paid - what? - \$60,000 or \$70,000 a year. I do not

MR. ROBERTS: know what the Premier's salary is but it is of that order. It is a very handsome salary. And I simply say that that is a commentary upon the moral values of the Premier. He is not here this morning, he is off with the governors and the other premiers and that is well and good, that is fair enough, but I hope somebody draws those words to his attention because I say it is a very telling commentary. And the other gentlemen opposite, who are so busily currying favour with the Premier as is their wont, would be well advised to draw those words to him. They may not please him but I will tell you that they are a very telling commentary on the moral qualities, the moral values, the moral absolutes of the Premier who not only permits it but has embellished it and encouraged it. And that has been the case. We are paying for five security guards - I think it is five security guards - housekeepers -

MR. NEARY: That does not include the bodyguards.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the bodyguards are a separate issue altogether, I am just talking mainly about the people who cut the grass - I mean, we are supporting an estate, a wealthy man's estate. In fact, I doubt if there is an estate in Newfoundland that could equal it. Perhaps my friend from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) could confirm, there is not an estate in Newfoundland, not a residence in Newfoundland the equal of Mount Scio House, not even Government House itself.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Where? Mount Scio House? Tell me one that is better. Bowaters could not afford Strawberry Hill, they have it for sale.

MR. CARTER: Go in and look around Murray's Pond.

MR. ROBERTS: Murray's Pond? I go in and look around Murray's Pond, I am one of the people who belongs to the club there. There is another across Murray's Pond. I could name, but I will not, I could name each individual house there. It

MR. ROBERTS: could be the hon. gentleman from St. John's North (Mr. Carter) - there is not a house there that compares to Mount Scio House nor is there a house there that has groundsmen supplied by the public chest and security supplied by the public chest. And I do not mean police security I mean the kind of security, the watchmen employed by my friend the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young). What are there - he is sitting next to the member from St. John's there - five, six, seven men full-time, simply to be a night

MR. ROBERTS: watchman? Not security. And my friend from LaPoile (S. Neary) tells me we are talking of a chain link fence - are we? I do not know if that is to keep the Premier in or to keep the people out.

MR. NEARY: Yes. And gates that are electrified.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I mean it is just absurd. It is hard to believe that in a Province we have a Premier who has lost touch with reality, and has so lost touch with the concerns and the needs of people in this Province that he tolerates it. You could see it if it were forced upon him. You could see it if a gun had been held to his head and he had a choice between being shot or living up there.

MR. CARTER: What was he to do with it?

MR. ROBERTS: What was he to do? Let him sell it. I will tell you what should be done with it, let him put it on the block.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: And let the Premier do what every other Premier in Canada does, find his own accommodations.

MR. NEARY: Turn it into a home for battered children.

MR. ROBERTS: I heard the Premier in one of his voiceless - I am sorry, breathless voice clips on the radio a year or two past, after he became Premier saying, 'the reason I go for Mount Scio house, the reason I live there is I cannot afford to find a house in St. John's'. And here is a man making \$60,000 or \$70,000 a year. Well, what does that say for everybody else, the 99.99 per cent of the people of St. John's who do not look to that kind of income and who cannot expect to get it? I do not want to go on about - I will simply say it is a telling commentary upon the moral qualities of the Premier of this Province, that he would not only tolerate it but he would embellish it and encourage it.

MR. ROBERTS: What about the silver there?
What is it \$20,000 or \$30,000 worth of silverware.

MR. NEARY: Paintings.

MR. CARTER: Tell us about -

MR. ROBERTS: Tell me about -

MR. CARTER: - how it was built (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: How it was built - I know a little about how it was built.

MR. CARTER: Tell us about that.

MR. ROBERTS: Dr. Kavanaugh sold it under expropriation - it was expropriated, in fact, and there was either an agreed upon compensation or the procedures under the Expropriation Act were used. The house was then torn down.

MR. CARTER: Why?

MR. ROBERTS: Because it was not adequate. And I could table, or the hon. gentleman can get from the Public Works files the reports of the engineers.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I did not tear it down. I was in the Cabinet that tore it down.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman asked me, let him take the answer. It was a condition of the employment of Lord Taylor, the President of the university. Now, whether it was a wise condition or no, I do not know. It was a condition of employment. The new house was built but how does that justify the Premier living in it, refurnishing it and remodelling it for \$120,000, which is the figure that was tabled here in this House a year or so past, including silverware? My Lord, there is nothing in Government House to match that, where we have a hundred and fifty years of history. And we have the furniture in Government House, some of it, thanks to the present governor and his good lady, they have rescued it and refurnished it, refurbished the place. It is in splendid shape. The Paddons are going in now and will carry on that tradition. Some of it is the original furniture, still at Government House.

MR. CARTER: The original furniture.

MR. NEARY: No, Moores tore up the furniture.

MR. ROBERTS: No, at Government House.

MR. NEARY: Oh, Government House.

MR. ROBERTS: But nothing at Government House with one hundred and fifty years of tradition, to match at Mount Scio house. So, I say simply to my friend from St. John's North (J. Carter) it is a telling commentary indeed upon the moral qualities, upon the judgement, upon the values of the Premier of this Province, because the Premier has not only tolerated this, he has encouraged it.

MR. CARTER: A bit of lawn.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry.

MR. CARTER: A bit of lawn is all he has.

MR. ROBERTS: A bit of lawn and \$120,000 in re-furnishings in a house that had thousands more spent on it in the two or three years before that. And the silver and the crockeryware - what is there? - acres of lawn up there. Security guards.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: You know, Mr. Chairman, now they are going to blame Mr. Moores, the former Premier. They can blame Mr. Moores, he started it. Mr. Moores, I believe, at least paid some rent. He did not come close to the economic rent.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Exactly.

MR. ROBERTS: But he paid some rent. He paid some rent.

MR. NEARY: \$650 a month.

MR. ROBERTS: So, there we are. And hon. members opposite can think about that as they - the lady who represents Gander (H. Newhook) and cannot find a few thousand dollars so people can have water fit to drink, cannot find it in her capacity as Minister of Municipal Affairs, can only find it

MR. ROBERTS: for Tory districts, the lady from Gander (Mrs. Newhook) can mull on that as people come to see her and she says, 'We cannot find \$10,000 for some sewerage -

MR. MORGAN: I never thought Gambo was in a Tory district. Gambo?

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. member from Bonavista South would do well to take the advice given many years ago by a fisherman, that you learn more -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) Deer Lake (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman from Bonavista South should keep his ears open and his mouth shut and then he might learn something. I distinctly said Gander. And the hon. lady who represents Gander in this House cannot find a few thousand dollars for the people there in Griquet who have been told by the Department of Health officials that they are drinking sewerage. She cannot find a few thousand dollars for a survey, and yet, the government of which she is such an adornment and which she supports so slavishly, that government can find about \$250,000 a year to put into a residence for one man and his family, a wife and two children, I believe, and can provide him with servants.

MR. NEARY: That is right, maids, chambermaids.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, housekeepers. And, you know, I say that to the lady from Gander who is a decent, honourable Newfoundlander. I do not know how she squares that. She probably squares it by not thinking about it.

MR. ROBERTS: And I do not mind the gentleman from Bonavista South, he does not know any better, but the gentleman from St. John's North just does not want to think about that.

MR. NEARY: Just look at the pity on his face.

MR. ROBERTS: Anyway, Mr. Chairman, I want to come to an even more serious thing. We are talking about a financing bill, we are talking about some money for the government. I want to talk about what came out in Question Period this morning, this tale of non-feasance amounting almost to mal-feasance on this spray programme.

Now, let us look at what happened. The government have taken a decision to implement a spray programme. They have taken it, in my view, about three years too late. They took it only after they were forced to take it. They avoided and evaded it every way they could. It was a classic case of a Royal Commission being used as a shield for a group of cowards. The Royal Commission are not the cowards, the government that appointed them were cowardly, trying to shelter behind it. No new data came out - I read the Commission report - no new data, nothing new except the government said, 'Well, now maybe we have a shield we can hide behind.'

MR. CARTER: What about the Indian Bay fire?

MR. ROBERTS: What about the Indian Bay fire in 1961? What does that have to do with it?

MR. CARTER: The biggest forest fire ever in Newfoundland.

MR. ROBERTS: Sure. And it was fought magnificently by the late Ed Ralph, by Dr. Stuart Peters, the late Bill Keough was minister at that time, and I will tell you, Newfoundland has never been better served than by that minister and by his officials at that time, and by the hundreds of men who fought that fire.

MR. CARTER: (Inaudible) Mr. Diefenbaker to give federal assistance to them.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Diefenbaker finally sent federal assistance to them, by devil, and sent us a bill for it which we never paid, nor would we, nor should we.

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Chairman, we have this situation where the government started a spray programme. The Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) who is turning out to be a weak and vacillating and irresolute minister - his ministerial duties are being attended to by inattention and by absence and by happenstance - the Minister of Environment tables a - that is probably not parliamentary so I will not say it - a half-baked contingency plan and the inevitable happens. Last evening, we do not know when, 7:00 P.M. or 8:00 P.M., late in the day, an aircraft got into trouble. Now, that is an entirely foreseeable event. The men flying the aircraft, quite properly ought to be concerned about their own lives and nobody would fault them for that. The men flying the aircraft decided obviously - I say obviously because no minister has given us any information; they do not know any information, they are off at lavish dinners, slopping up the food and the liquor, that is what they are doing. As opposed to trying to find out what is happening, they are off at lavish dinners.

MR. CARTER: Envy will get you nowhere.

MR. ROBERTS: Envy will get me nowhere. I say to my friend from St. John's North, the last thing I need is another lavish dinner.

MR. NEARY: Or liquor or booze.

MR. ROBERTS: I need none of that. I take very little of it.

But now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. ROBERTS: But now, Mr. Chairman, the ministers - here comes the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) lolling into the House - lolly gagging - let him come in and hear this. Because what he is about to hear is more relevant than anything he has told us this morning. We have an entirely foreseeable event, an aircraft gets into trouble. The pilot decides he must jettison his load, 2,600 imperial gallons as I recall it -

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: - US gallons, smaller than imperial, 2,600 US gallons of matacil solution, dangerous, potent. I do not know how dangerous or how potent, but very dangerous and very potent. We do not know really where that load was jettisoned or under what conditions? We do not know whether - it was not jettisoned according to the contingency plan, it was jettisoned obviously in an effort by the crew to head off what appeared to them, and I have no doubt appeared to them genuinely, to be a threat to their lines. So they dumped it overboard the first chance they got as far as we can tell, just let her go. And I do not blame those men. I do not blame them at all. They are not being hired or being paid to risk their necks unduly or to take that kind of hazard. And that aircraft then hightails it back to Gander. No minister over there knows where that aircraft came from or what line of flight it followed. We do know, it was brought out by a gentleman over here, that it dripped matacil, dripped or leaked or poured matacil all the way back to Gander. Did it cross Gander Lake? It almost certainly had to cross Gander Lake. If it did not cross Gander Lake it crossed Gander River. It probably crossed the town of Glenwood and may well have crossed the town of Gander. Because if that aircraft, Mr. Chairman, was in a state where the crew said, "We have got to jettison this stuff," rather than take it back to Gander - remember they can

MR. ROBERTS: land with that fuel in it, or that solution in it. Obviously that is what you do if your aircraft - if you have to abort your flight you take her back to your base with the matabil aboard.

But no, the situation was more serious than that, more urgent than that. They had to dump it. They had to get rid of that weight. I do not know what it weighs? 2,600 US gallons of water would be worth - it would be 2,600 pounds weight, a lot of weight. Matabil, I assume, is at least as heavy as water. So they had to jettison it. Obviously an emergency situation. And then they went straight for Gander. They went straight for that airstrip at Gander. And I say to the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews) that he is negligent in not having made the least effort. He was out at a party last night and his officials finally tracked him down. I do not blame him - it was a government dinner, I do not blame him for going to it.

MR. ANDREWS: No, (inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Good for him. And so he should have been. And, in fact, if rights were rights he would be there as chairman but because of the Premier. And I say to the minister that he was there not doing anything except being part of the applauding clap. That was his job. Part of the mob that applauded slavishly.

MR. NEARY: - a slave.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) is a slave. The hon. gentleman from Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir applauded slavishly and lavishly.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that aircraft went straight for Gander. And we ask the minister -

MR. E. ROBERTS: he has not been able to tell us, but we have asked him repeatedly where it went, what it crossed? And we have also asked how much matacil flowed out of it when it aborted and dumped its 2,600 gallons of solution.

MR. S. NEARY: The Gander town council are having an emergency meeting about it.

MR. E. ROBERTS: Well, my friend for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has just told me that the town council at Gander are having an emergency meeting about this -

MR. S. NEARY: Right at this moment.

MR. E. ROBERTS: - right at this moment. Because that aircraft I would say, in the absence of any further information from the minister, dripped matacil for every inch it crossed, every inch it traversed from the point where it dumped its load right back to the town of Gander, over the town of Gander and into the airport. The airport at Gander is on the Eastern side and that spill was on the Western side of the community of Gander. The area where it was dumped was to the left, West of Gander, the Western end of Gander Lake.

So I say to the minister that he and his colleague, the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) - whatever his long title is - are negligent in the extreme. They have made no effort to find out. I am not saying they should have been out there mopping it up but they damn well have a duty to make sure somebody is, and they have a duty to make sure officials do what they are told to do. That is what ministers are about. That is why we have ministers. That is what Crichel Downs, that doctrine is all about. That a minister answers for everything his official does.

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2844

DW - 2

MR. E. ROBERTS:

The Minister of Environment (Mr. Dawe) does not even know whether caustic soda was used to neutralize that or whether bats were used. And I will say, furthermore, he does not care, he just does not care!

MR. ANDREWS:

Do not be so cynical.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

I am not being cynical. I am responding to a minister who stood in this House and mocked and joked and laughed. And I say to him, on the evidence before us today, he does not care! He has made no effort! He does not give a hoot or a holler! He does not know whether it was caustic soda or batts or straw or sand! He does not know how much matacil was dumped, where it was dumped or on whom it was dumped! And he could not care less! All he talks - he gets up and he says, 'I now read the contingency plan for the second time! I think those were his exact words to which I would add, I hope he understands it for the first time. There is no contingency plan. And now we know why the government - we did not oppose the matacil, we did not oppose the spray programme, we opposed the government's efforts to block injunctions. And now we have a legal situation in this Province where the Gander town council, thanks to the votes of the Mayor for Gander - not the Mayor, the member for Gander and her colleagues -

MR. S. NEARY:

The former Mayor.

MR. E. ROBERTS:

The former Mayor of Gander - cannot go to court and cannot get an injunction to restrain this. They can only go after the damage is done. Oh, sure, when the damage is done then they can go in and take action. Then the writs can fly. But if the town council of Gander comes to the conclusion that the spray programme is still inherently dangerous there is not a thing can be done! And the member for

MR. E. ROBERTS: Gander (Mrs. Newhook) did her part in that. She voted for that legislation, she is part of the Cabinet, she is still in the Cabinet, she supports it!

MR. HOUSE: And will be.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I hope she will be too. She has done more for the Cabinet than most of the members including the Minister of Health (Mr. House). She adds considerably to the stature of that Cabinet. I would simply say to the Minister of Health that if he left the Cabinet and moved to Hebron, he would thereby raise the intellectual level of both communities.

MR. W. HOUSE: (Inaudible) miss you out of the House again.

MR. E. ROBERTS: No, I do not care if he misses me or not. I would simply say that if he moves from here to Hebron where nobody is living, he will raise the intellectual level of both communities significantly.

MR. W. HOUSE: At least I know where Hebron is (inaudible).

MR. E. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the nurses will take care of the hon. Minister of Health in due course and in the proper way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. ROBERTS: Now, does anybody else want to put his half-witted effort in? Does the minister want to try again? No! Well, then, let the minister be quiet.

MR. HOUSE: (Inaudible) half-wit.

MR. E. ROBERTS: I am sorry.

MR. BENNETT: (Inaudible).

MR. E. ROBERTS: The member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter) - I am sorry, St. John's West (Mr. Barrett), part of the gas house gang -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2844

DW - 4

MR. E. ROBERTS:

- the gas house gang, erupts himself
again and makes a spectacle of himself here in the Chamber.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me come
back to say that one of the many

MR. ROBERTS: things that the minister have not dealt with in this matabil issue is whenever those aircraft have been checked out, what kind of fault caused the pilots of that aircraft to get to the point where they had to take emergency action, obviously justified only, and I am quite prepared to believe that it was justified, justified only in their belief that their lives were in eminent threat, in eminent danger. Now, is that aircraft going back in the air today? What is wrong with it? What caused this kind of failure? One of the four engines smoked, I think that is all we are told. The ministers are so uncaring, so unable, so negligent that they have not even told us if they have made any efforts. I will bet they have made no checks on that. I will bet there are no mechanics that the ministers know of.

You know, here we are with a spray programme, a necessary programme, and I am not the least bit annoyed at the canards being spread by gentlemen opposite that we are against it. That is just the mark of desperate men and intellectually dishonest men. I do not pay any heed to that.

MR. CARTER: Why are you against it?

MR. ROBERTS: I just said it. It is the mark of intellectually dishonest men to say we are against it and my friend from St. John's North (J.Carter) just confirmed that.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let me come back again to say we have a spray programme. We have a situation where no person may use the courts of the land. The courts of the land have been closed to the citizens of this land by the fait of this government and we now have the situation where we have had an accident. Fortunately, as far as we presently know, no grave harm done, as far as we know. We do not know what - that aircraft must have flown over Gander Lake -

MR. NEARY: It did. It did.

MR. ROBERTS: which is the water supply for the town of Gander and, I believe, for Community of Glenwood.

MR. NEARY: They think a lot of this stuff went into Gander Lake. That is why they are having an emergency meeting.

MR. ROBERTS: And that substance was not all dumped. If the situation was that serious, then it had to be dumped immediately and that weight had to be got out of that aircraft then they went straight for that airport, straight right across Gander Lake, conceivably across the town of Gander. It is pretty hard to get to Gander Airport in anything from about 180 degrees on the compass to about 320 degrees on the compass without going directly across the town of Gander, just about impossible. And so, I will say to the minister that he has to tell us whether that aircraft crossed the town of Gander or not. And if it did cross the town of Gander, was it leaking and dripping and drooling matacil solution behind it as it went? And if so, what happens from there? You know, it is just not good enough, Sir. I have no quarrel with the Minister of the Environment (H. Andrews). He got himself elected to the House, got himself in the Cabinet. Those methods speak for themselves. I do not need to say anything about them. Let him now deal with his office, that is all that worries me. I could not care less about the minister. I have no quarrel with him and I have no brief for him. He is the minister now. Somebody else will be the minister next year, somebody else the year after, it does not matter a hoot.

You know, all these hon. gentleman over here, the hon. this and the hon. that, sure, they are hon. now. They are ministers and they have all the prerogatives of office and all the perks of office and in due course they will all be out. Nothing is more sure and certain than that. The

MR. ROBERTS: only question is for the good of the Province, will they be out quickly enough? And the answer is no, not quickly enough. But that is neither here nor there.

But the Minister of the Environment (H. Andrews) - really you know, I have said some harsh things about him this morning and I intended to because I think his performance in Question Period was abysmal. I think he came through as a man who had no idea what had happened. I do not say he should have gone to Gander and taken a sponge in hand, but he should have been up at seven or eight o'clock this morning and made some efforts to find out. And if he was up and if he did make the effort, then he should have a few words with the officials who gave him so little information. He does not know what happened. He does not know what happened. And neither does the Minister of Forestry (C. Power). But I am not concerned about the Forestry Minister, his job is to dump it.

MR. ANDREWS:

I was up at six o'clock.

MR. NEARY:

He was not even home then.

MR. ROBERTS:

I do not care what time he was up. I could not care if he was up, down, in or out. I do not care about when the minister got up. I care about what he does as minister. I do not care when he got up. I do not care where he slept. I do not care about anything, except what he does as minister and I will say as minister, what he has done in this House today is cause us grave disquietude. He does not know what happened. He does not know where that aircraft went. He does not know what came out of that aircraft in the form of matacil. He has made no effort. He has made no effort to find out or no satisfactory effort. And, Sir, he owes this Committee in this House and the people in this Province an explanation. Instead all we get is his third-class sarcasm, an

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2845

EL - 4

MR. ROBERTS: unsuccessful CBC type. Third-class sarcasm, and I have seen lots of third-class sarcasm. And some day the hon. member may even rise to the level of the gentleman from St. John's North (J. Carter) and come to second-class sarcasm.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Some day. But let the gentleman from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (H. Andrews), as long as he is the minister, whether it is a day or a week or a month or

MR. ROBERTS:

a year or forever, as long as he may live, let him do his job properly. The members are concerned about this matacil situation, deeply concerned, and I think the minister owes us better. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is all in order because we are talking about money for this government and the way they spend it. So, now, one of my colleagues may have a few more words to say because I am about out of time and then we will have some more to say depending on what, if any, answers we get from the other side.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Before I recognize the hon. the President of the Council I would like to welcome on behalf of all hon. members four student ladies from Quebec who are here attending English Summer school. Please welcome Dianne Venette, Louise Symard, Lucy Borjeau and Ann Sankmarse.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am just going to have a few words, particularly in relation to what the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) - with respect to his speech. He mentioned that he was a bit harsh and I think he was a bit harsh all the way through his speech today. The first part with respect to - he dwelt on the present Premier's Mount Scio House. I think, really, that it is indicative, that the hon. member, I think, was probably burnt a bit because of comments made by the Premier with respect to the hon. -

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) well done.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, certain comments that the Premier made with respect to the hon. gentleman not being in the House type of thing, and I think he was hitting back

MR. ROBERTS: and that. But just let me say this, as far as the Premier and this government is concerned what is done by the Premier, what is done by any minister and what is done by any member of the government is done up front, the people of the Province know it. You are debating an issue that has already been debated ad nauseam by everybody -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) the Minister of Fisheries (inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Alright, that is fine. I know I am speaking to cynics and I know my remarks will be greeted accordingly, but I am just making that statement and that is the statement and I will just leave it at that.

With respect to the statement that the hon. member made concerning the unfortunate occurrence, the unavoidable occurrence that occurred last night and with which the hon. members consumed Question Period and that, they can have their own impressions, Mr. Chairman, and I say this, that this was an unfortunate and unavoidable situation. The situation has been dealt with in the most expeditious manner possible by the two ministers concerned. They have shown, Mr. Chairman, that they have given all of the information -

MR. STIRLING: Why do you not let the minister defend himself?

MR. MARSHALL: - concerned. They have shown that they have been on top of the situation and they will continue on top of the situation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: What a bluff.

MR. MARSHALL: I find it, Mr. Chairman - what a bluff says the hon. gentleman. All I can say is it takes one to know one and the hon. gentleman is not even capable

MR. MARSHALL: of being a bluff.

MR. STIRLING: You certainly are.

MR. MARSHALL: That is the situation, Mr. Chairman, and it is rather regrettable, out of an unfortunate occurrence which the government has responded to in as expeditious and effective and efficient a manner as possible and is now responding to it, that the hon. gentlemen there opposite are trying to make a small little political point out of an incident which occurred. And that is exactly what they are doing, Mr. Chairman. They are outraged, they are making all sorts of comments, they are not satisfied with this, they are not satisfied with that, they are not satisfied with the other things. The hon. the Minister for the Environment (Mr. Andrews) was working on this last night, the hon. the Minister of Forests, Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) was working on this last night. He has a map there, he has pinpointed the thing, he has given this House as much information as is available. He has also shown that actions were taken and that expeditious actions were taken, Mr. Chairman, in this matter. It is in good hands and we are doing the best we possibly can with, as I say, an unfortunate and unavoidable situation, one that occurred as a result of a programme which had to be implemented in order to safeguard the forests of this Province. And the hon. gentlemen seem to be absolutely delighted if something unfortunate happens. They seem to dwell on unfortunate matters, Mr. Chairman. Their hearts leap up when they hear of something that is unfortunate. They would love, for instance, Mr. Chairman, I am sure, to see such things as the cases

MR. MARSHALL:

that are before the court on recall of power from the Province of Quebec to fail, they would exult in that. They would love, Mr. Chairman, to see, and as a matter of fact they are working actively, to deprive us of our rights to our resources on the offshore. If that happens they will be exulting in it, they will be delighted. And they have shown, Mr. Chairman, this morning how small-minded they are and why the people of Newfoundland cannot look upon any member of them as an appropriate alternative in government. And not even as you look at them, and you see so many of their leaders speaking from time to time, none of those personages will ever occupy the ministry benches let alone any of them ever being a First Minister. Small-minded men, Mr. Chairman, make small-minded statements, we see it day by day but never in my life have I seen a more vivid instance of it than today both in the Question Period and in the speeches that have been made. To insinuate in this House that not only the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews) and the Minister of Forest Resources and Land (Mr. Power) but any minister, any member of this House, is not concerned and shows no concern, Mr. Chairman, is about the basest thing that anyone could do. Not just the Minister of the Environment or the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands, every minister in this House, every member in this House, as well as the hon. gentlemen there opposite, I would assume, and I know that they are, would be concerned about this. So I say to them stop trying to make their negative little political points over an incident which was an unfortunate incident, but one which so evidently the hon. ministers are grappling with and are doing the best they possibly can in the circumstances.

Now, I know the hon. member will get up and he will rant and rave and he will say, 'This is not so', but he can rant and he can rave until the cows come home, the

MR. MARSHALL: fact of the matter is, the government is doing the best they possibly can -

MR. CARTER: Hear, hear.

MR. MARSHALL: - they will continue to do it, and the efforts to date of the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) and the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) have been exemplary, Mr. Chairman, in this and I know they will continue to be during the period, until the effects of this have been fully assessed and until we have mitigated or lessened any possible damage that may have occurred.

The Minister of Forestry knew exactly what happened, he knew where the matabac had to be jettisoned, he knew the place where the plane was, the time, what is being done, what is in the process of being done now, that there are people deployed to the area and I do not know what more the hon. gentlemen there opposite wish. I know what the hon. gentlemen there opposite wish, disaster, disaster everywhere, Mr. Chairman, because it takes, as he says, and I say to him, it takes a bluff to know a bluff, it takes a disaster to know a disaster and the hon. gentlemen there opposite both jointly and separately are living disasters.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, we have a very serious problem and we have just heard standard political speech number three from the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall).

MR. ROBERTS: The great defender.

MR. STIRLING: Anytime that a minister gets in trouble, you hear the standard, same speech from the President of the Council, 'Oh, they are only making political points'. He is the master of deception, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. STIRLING: You cannot bring out a point of order except -

MR. MARSHALL: To accuse somebody of being the master of deception is to accuse someone of deceit and I must ask that the hon. gentleman be asked to withdraw that. It is in Beauchesne, page 106, it is out of order, it is ruled unparliamentary and I hardly need to quote an authority on this - 106 - to say that someone has deceived or deliberately deceived or intentionally deceived. And when the hon. gentleman calls someone the master of deceit, the hon. gentleman then is uttering an unparliamentary expression. I ask that the hon. gentleman withdraw it. It is not, Mr. Chairman - it is unparliamentary. And if the hon. gentleman wishes to make his points he can make them negatively but he cannot make them by inpugning the integrity of people in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2848

NM - 1

MR. NEARY:

Do not be so foolish, boy.

MR. HODDER:

To that point of order,

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

To the point of order.

MR. HODDER:

Beauchesne, page 110, "Since 1958, it has been ruled parliamentary to use the following expressions: "and deceive is one of the words that is listed there. And I would contend, Mr. Chairman, that the term 'master of deception' would come within that particular listing because, Mr. Chairman, deceive - there is no listing for 'master of deception' in there but it has been ruled parliamentary since 1958 that deceive is parliamentary.

MR. MARSHALL:

No, no Mr. Chairman. I have quoted Mr. Chairman, where it is unparliamentary to say it. The distinction is this, Mr. Chairman, if the hon. gentleman wishes to see it.

MR. HODDER:

And I quoted where it is parliamentary.

MR. MARSHALL:

Now, if the hon. gentleman wishes to see it the distinction is this, somebody attempts innocently to deceive the House without having any ulterior motives one way or the other, but when you say somebody deliberately deceives the House, what you are doing you are imputing motives to him. You are imputing intentions to him, Mr. Chairman, when somebody says somebody is a master of deception. He talks about one, two or three or four political speeches, sure they are consistent, Mr. Chairman, because they are common sense against the negative waves that come across from this Opposition

Now, Mr. Chairman, this is the House of Assembly, and this is the Legislature of this Province and there is no member of this House allowed to impugn the integrity of somebody. And using the words 'master of deceit' does it and I am surprised that the hon. member, who obviously lets his tongue run away with him from time to time, has not been up on his feet by now withdrawing it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please! With respect to the point of order raised by the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), I rule that there is a point of order and I would ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) to withdraw.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, I accept the fact that the Chairman has to maintain what he considers order. I accept that in this House the fact is not a sufficient reason and I do do whatever Your Honour wishes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Leader has to withdraw.

MR. STIRLING: I withdraw whatever it is that you wish me to withdraw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, you have asked him to withdraw -

AN HON. MEMBER: Shut up maw mouth.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: It is not, Mr. Chairman - it is not, Your Honour, whatever Your Honour says that he has to withdraw. Your Honour represents in this House the person who is in charge of enforcing parliamentary rules. I have risen on a point of order that the hon. member has accused me of being a 'master of deceit'. And, Mr. Chairman, it is not sufficient for the hon. gentleman to say, "Oh, I withdraw whatever Your Honour says." As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, that smacks of contempt. What, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman must do is withdraw the words referring to me as 'master of deceit.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please!

In order to dispense with this matter I would simply ask the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) to make an unequivocal withdrawal.

MR. STIRLING: I make a withdrawal, Mr. Chairman.
Whatever it is that you want me to withdraw I withdraw.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): The hon. Leader of the Opposition
withdraws.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, I take always
direction from you. If you want to look at the tone in which
something was said, look at the tone of the last remarks by the
President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL: He is challenging Your Honour's
ruling. He is challenging the Chairman's ruling.

MR. STIRLING: You have already accepted the
ruling that is over.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognized the hon. Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, the President of the
Council believes that he has to dictate to you but we have
complete confidence in your ability to control this House,
Mr. Chairman.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let us just
say that the President of the Council is a master. Let us
say that the President of the Council is a master at his
trade. The President of the Council is well known as a
lawyer. As a matter of fact, one of the reasons that we
cannot get him to have evening sessions, one of the reasons we
cannot get morning sessions is the minister is practicing his
trade. And he is an absolute master at his trade. He is an
absolute master of sticking within the technicalities of the
law, the technicalities of the rules of the House. And he is
a master at going on with the kinds of comments he did this
morning to provoke people into calling him something that he
knows is outside the rules and he is an absolute master.

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2848

NM - 4

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, let there be no doubt that he is recognized as the absolute master of his trade and he does it very well. And let me just say, Mr. Chairman, I hope he does not object to me calling him a master at what he is doing. Now, would he like for me to withdraw the fact that he is

MR. STIRLING: a master of presenting a whole series of material to give you an impression, and if you call it what it is that he has done, then he gets very upset and uses the rules? And he is a master at using the rules of this House. In this case though, take him at his word. Let us say that he now, in defence of the two ministers, said, 'They know what is happening, they are completely on top of it.' If you check Hansard, Mr. Chairman, you will see that he said, 'They know the approach that the plane took, they know where they dumped the matacil, they know exactly what happened and they are in complete control.' Now, I accept the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) at his word, the master that he is. He is an absolute master.

MR. CARTER: Of what?

MR. STIRLING: You will have to use your own judgement. Everybody here knows what he is the master of and he is the master of a number of things, some of which you can say in this House - like he is a Master of Law, I presume you can say that. But there are some things that he is a master of that you cannot say in the House and therefore I will not say in the House. But he knows that he is a master of a number of things. I accept though, that he has said here this morning that the two ministers were on top of it, and I accept that he was not misleading the House, because he could not mislead the House when he knows the rules. So he was not misleading the House when he came to the defence of the ministers to say they knew what they were doing, they know exactly what the situation is. And I cannot say that the ministers have misled the House, all I can say is that they did not give us the information. The President of the Council is not misleading the House when he says that the facts that he gave are different from the facts that the ministers gave.

MR. STIRLING: And we just have to accept the fact that in certain situations a minister can say one thing and another minister can say something entirely different but they are not lies and they are not misleading, they are not deceitful. We are establishing a pretty good record here, Mr. Chairman. Just about anything that is accepted in Beaufort is not acceptable now in certain cases in the House.

Let us look at this situation.

The truth of the matter is that this is a further indication - and I believe, Mr. Chairman, looking for direction, that you are allowed to say that the government deceives, as long as you do not talk about a specific individual. You can say that the government is deceiving the people or that the P.C. Party is deceiving the people, but you cannot say that individuals are deceiving the people.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, as part of the overall management of this Province, the government has amongst its membership certain masters, certain absolute masters at taking the political propaganda and putting the propaganda out. I assume 'propaganda' is acceptable in this House because we saw it on the Premier's own letterhead - not on P.C. Party letterhead - on the day before the election.

But let us get back to this situation.

The two ministers have told us in this House that they do not have any information on the Gander Lake incident. Now, we told them, Mr. Chairman, through my colleague, who is our spokesman, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) - and I am going to do this afternoon what those ministers should have done, and that is I am going to Gander. I have contacted the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) and told him I am going to Gander. I want to know what exactly

MR. STIRLING: is going on. The people in Gander cannot find out what is going on. Well, I am going to find out for them and I am going to Gander.

MR. MORGAN: You do not mind going on the government aircraft.

MR. STIRLING: I am going, as my right -

MR. CARTER: As an investigator.

MR. STIRLING: - my right to go on behalf of the people, to Gander and to go with the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power). The Minister of Forestry has agreed that I can go out and accompany him and find out what is going on and report to the House.

MR. CARTER: Have mouth will travel.

MR. STIRLING: If having mouth will travel was a criteria, the member for St. John's North would be on a round-the-world trip day in, day out for the rest of his career, if that was the only qualification.

Mr. Chairman, I have no doubt that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) would have been prepared here this morning that he is ashamed of his colleagues

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2850

EL - 1

MR. STIRLING:

as he was ashamed once before when he said to the Minister of the Environment (H. Andrews), 'the damage is already done'. And what we have here are two ministers, two newly appointed ministers who are so taken up with the thrill and the power and the glory of being a minister that they have forgotten that they have to do their job. And what was their job? First, to anticipate that there would have been a problem and to have a very specific programme set out as to what would happen in these kinds of contingencies. No question about it, Mr. Chairman. That is what would have happened. They should have had this done, as my colleague had suggested to them, in advance. They should have known in advance and anticipated and set it out. They should have had a committee set up with people from the area who could monitor the experts, to see that the experts have actually done it.

And then this morning we could have had some information presented to us, Mr. Chairman, we could have had the information presented us so that the ministers would give us and give assurances to the people in Gander that they, in fact, were in touch and in control. And if you check Hansard, you will find that the Minister of the Environment, the man responsible for it says, 'I do not know'. He does not know what approach was taken. He does not know how much was dumped. He does not know where it was dumped. He does not know what route it took in over Gander. And, in fact, whether or not there was a dumping of the matacil all the way.

Now, I am concerned about the future, Mr. Chairman. What are we going to do for the balance of this period? Are we now going to be in a panic situation saying we have to get all of this out? Did I hear this morning that they are now going to try to increase the strength of the matacil?

MR. STIRLING: Are they now in a situation where, to protect their own pride, to protect their own egos, that they now have to admit that they did not have a proper plan from the beginning, that they could not in Newfoundland weather conditions possibly do the matacil programme that they had set out, that they had no leeway built into the plan and that you now have what will be a wasted matacil programme? All of the dangers, all of the threats and of no use to the forestry. Now they are talking in a panic situation about increasing the strength of the matacil, now going back.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no question that this is a further indication of what people are having as a suspicion all over this Province and that is that this government does not know how to govern. This government does not know how to manage. We have a situation with the Minister of Health (W. House) dealing with the hospitals. He did not table in this House a report of the shortages. He will not table a report of what the shortages are in the hospitals.

And, Mr. Chairman, we are going to have to have another crisis situation where we come in here in the morning and say, 'Look this situation occurred in this, that or the other hospital'. You have a situation up in Labrador City where the mayor was on the radio this morning saying the government just does not care about the medical shortage up there. So, you have in Health a government that is not on top of it, not in charge. You have a situation in Fisheries where the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) has become the unofficial Tory spokesman, Federal spokesman for fisheries. He has not made a single effort in provincial fisheries in the last year, not a single statement.

MR. HOUSE:

(inaudible).

(Inaudible) the Department of Health,

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, a point of order.

MR. STIRLING:

If we had a management -

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please! Order, please!

A point of order raised by the hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN:

The hon. Leader is obviously browbeaten. He is so carried away with trying to keep his colleague, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) from overshadowing him these days, as leader of the party over there, he is not taking time to read the statements made on fisheries in this House the last two or three weeks, major statements of provincial policy, on changes of provincial policy effecting all the fishermen of our Province to the fishermen's benefit. So what he is saying now is totally untrue and is misleading the House. But it is obvious, again, he is so taken up with trying to keep his colleague from overshadowing him and doing his job as leader -

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! I would ask the hon. Minister of Fisheries to withdraw the remarks that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) is deceiving the House, or misleading the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not deliberately. Not deliberately.

MR. MORGAN:

Well, Mr. Chairman, I will withdraw the word misleading but I will say that what he is saying is totally untrue.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

That is not a point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has about ten minutes to conclude his remarks.

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2851

NM - 2

MR. STIRLING:
very much.

Yes, Mr. Chairman. Thank you,

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Chairman, there is no question -
Totally untrue.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Chairman, there is no question
that in the whole area of management -

MR. NEARY:

That crowd out there are gunning
for you, boy.

MR. STIRLING:

Mr. Chairman, in the whole area
of management -

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

A point of order has been raised.

MR. MORGAN:

The point of order is that
it is against the law - or against the rules of the House to
lie to the House. It is against the rules to mislead the House,
especially if it is intentionally misleading information. And
the hon. gentleman a few minutes ago, five or six minutes ago
in his debate, said that the two ministers responsible, the
Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power), and the
Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews), were going to go with
him to Gander. That is a totally untrue statement. The fact is
my colleagues are going to Gander, sure they are, but they are
not going with the hon. gentleman. They are going out to
Gander on their own business to deal with a problem that came
to light this morning and last night.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

Once again I have to say that that is not a point of order and
the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) was imputing
motives when he referred to the hon. Leader of the Opposition
(Mr. Stirling) as being a liar, or telling lies, and once
again I have to ask the hon. minister to withdraw those remarks.
It is totally unparliamentary and I cannot accept them. Withdraw,
an unequivocal withdrawal.

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2851

NM - 3

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the statements of being a liar. Nobody has called the hon. gentleman a liar. So now on personal privilege I stand, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY:

Do not challenge the Speaker.

MR. MORGAN:

No, Mr. Chairman, on a point of

privilege.

Mr. Chairman, it is very serious in this House when members can stand and tell untruths to the House. The hon. gentleman a few minutes ago lied about two of my colleagues on this side of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT:

Withdraw and apologize.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, I am standing on

a point of privilege, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY:

Sit down. You are making a fool

of yourself.

MR. MORGAN:

No, Mr. Chairman. No, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please! Order, please!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Chairman, I am on a point

of privilege.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Yes, on a point of privilege.

Order, please!

MR. HODDER:

Sit down.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Once again the hon. Minister of

Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) in imputing motives to the

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

as not telling the truth. And you cannot rise on spurious points of order to interrupt another hon. member in the House when he is speaking because that is totally against the rules.

MR. STIRLING:

I totally disagree.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

If you do not agree, if you have a difference of opinion that is fine.

MR. MORGAN:

On my point of privilege, Mr. Chairman, and every member of this House has a right to stand on a point of privilege and he has the right to be heard. And, Mr. Chairman, it is a serious matter when the Leader of the Opposition stands and tells untruths about two members of the Cabinet on this side of the House who are not now in the House. The fact is the hon. Leader of the Opposition stood in this House and said, and Hansard will verify what I am saying, that he was taking the two ministers concerned to Gander. That is totally untrue, Mr. Chairman, it is totally untrue. And I am right in what I am saying. But the fact is, that my two colleagues are not here to defend themselves and I am defending my two colleagues.

The fact is, that the two ministers concerned are going to Gander. They are going on their own to deal with a problem involving the two respective departments. They are not going at the request of the member and the hon. gentleman, the Leader of the Opposition, is not going with them. And it is totally untrue for him to say so.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

That is not a point of privilege. I must inform the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) that is not a prima facie case, therefore, no breach of privilege. But one again I will ask the hon. Minister of Fisheries to stand in his place and withdraw the remarks where he imputed that the hon. Leader of the Opposition was telling lies to the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

You just cannot do it, you can have a difference of opinion.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Chairman, I do not want to call any member a liar, I withdraw that unequivocally but I will say again that the hon. gentleman -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: - told untrue things about my two colleagues on our side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

For the last time I will ask the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) for an unequivocal withdrawal, please.

MR. MORGAN: I withdraw, Mr. Chairman, and I again stand on a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition has -

MR. MORGRAN: A point of order, Mr. Chairman, on a point of order. Mr Chairman, I want to say again that the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Stirling) is not going to Gander with my two colleagues from this side of the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is not a point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has about six minutes to conclude.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, dealing with the facts-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. STIRLING: - and I think we have to clarify this, and I would ask the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) to come back in because the Minister of Fisheries has now said something that only the Minister of Forestry can clear up. Outside the NTV room I said, 'Charlie, I am going to Gander, I think you should go to Gander', he said, 'Yes, I am going'. And I said, 'Can I go along in your plane with you because I would like to see exactly what is going on', and he said, 'Yes'.

June 26, 1981

Tape No.2852

SD - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No way! No way!
MR. STIRLING: He said, 'Yes, you can come along'.
Now, he may have changed his mind when the Minister of Fisheries
(Mr. Morgan) used whatever muscle that he can. But the fact
of the matter is, that the Minister of Forest Resources and
Lands (Mr. Power), who may not have any control over it, invited
me to go along with him and he said, 'Yes, you can see it,
you can go with me. I would be glad to have you along'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. STIRLING:

Yes, by leave I would like for
the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands to straighten it
out.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

By leave the Leader of the Opposition
gives leave to the hon. Minister of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. POWER:

I am on the phone, I cannot get
the government aircraft, she is doing something else. I am
hoping to get a small Cessna which can only take two or three
persons in addition to the pilot. The minister is going,
I am going,

Mr. POWER:

I have been asked by the member for Gander (Mrs Newhook), who obviously have some concerns, can she go. We also want to bring the Deputy Minister's of the Environment and Forestry. And when I clarify it I will be glad to come back and say who can go and who cannot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible).

MR. POWER: No, you asked to be invited and

I said, yes, if we have the government aircraft. But we have not got it.

MR. MORGAN You know he is not going. No way is he going on the government aircraft after shouting propaanda the way he did this morning.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

The hon. Leader of the Opposition has about five minutes remaining.

MR. MARSHALL: He is as stunned as a bat so he can fly.

MR. NEARY: EPA goes into -

SOME HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Chairman, we have had a very interesting demonstration this morning about how close the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) can get to embarrassing a colleague, because the colleague did, in fact, say that I could accompany him if he could get the government aircraft. I recognize that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) - I do not know what hold he has, but when he contravened the Public Tendering Act and was found by both sides of this House to have contravened the Public Tendering Act, Mr. Chairman, when that was found he somehow found a way to have the Premier leave him there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: That was one thing. Now he managed to do that. Now this morning he also found -

MR. MARSHALL: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please! The hon. President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: The matter before this House is the resolution on the imposition of a gasoline tax. And the hon. gentleman opposite is not only being irrelevant, but he is deliberately attempting to insult the hon. gentleman to get the type of repartee that he likes in the House itself.

So the point of the matter is, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. member is not being relevant. The hon. Leader is not relevant period, but he is not being relevant in this debate.

MR. NEARY: To that point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: To the point of order. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. MORGAN: The other leader is up.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Your Honour knows that when we are debating money bills in this House that the debate is very wide-ranging, especially when you are talking about a tax bill. As a matter of fact, the debate on a tax bill in this House is so wide-ranging, it is as wide-ranging as the Throne Speech or the Budget Debate. Your Honour is aware of that. So, therefore, my hon. friend has no point of order.

MR. HANCOCK: What else is new?

MR. NEARY: What he is trying to do, he is trying to cool of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), obviously, is uncontrollable. They cannot control him. So the hon. gentleman gets up on a point of order which is not a point of order, hoping that he can get the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) attention, get him outside and tell him to cool it. Because the gentleman -

June 25, 1981

Tape No. 2853

ah-3

MR. MORGAN:

Cool it (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Chairman, you should see the look of agony and pity on member's faces, the pain on their faces -

MR. MORGAN:

You are getting your own. You are getting your own.

MR. HANCOCK:

You have no choice.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

- when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr Morgan) is up making a fool of himself, the pity on their faces.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

Order, please!

I have heard a submission from both sides and I can rule on this point of order. First of all, let me say that there has been wide-ranging debate on this bill and perhaps the Chair has been a little guilty of having a wide-ranging debate. But let me say that that has been the pattern that has been established. Relevancy is very difficult to define when you are on a bill that deals with money, therefore, I would have to rule no point of order. The hon. Leader of the Opposition has about two minutes to conclude.

MR. STIRLING:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

We have had introduced here this morning - and, Mr. Chairman, I know that you will welcome the visiting governors after I have my two minutes. But it is a pleasure to have them in the House, have a visit from the co-chairman. I am glad that they got here this morning. And, Mr. Chairman, if the House, on the other side, would like to get the spirit of what they should be doing, they should have attended the session yesterday where the governor had suggested that we have to work in a spirit of co-operation and we have to work together, that there are a great number of things we can do if we all work together. Mr. Chairman, that is the lesson that this

MR. STIRLING:

government has not learned. They seem to feel, and we are dealing with the overall management- they would be interested in knowing in the United States, I know, that a province has now put in a tax - the debate that we are having this morning is on the gasoline tax, which used to have to come to this House - one of the tax bills. If they wanted to increase the taxes they used to have to come here and fight for it. Now, they have changed it over, so, Mr. Chairman, not only do we have the highest retail sales tax in Canada, 11 per cent sales tax, but we now have a 22 per cent provincial sales tax on gasoline.

MR. YOUNG: It is still cheaper than it is in the States.

MR. NEARY: Twenty-two cents on (inaudible) no it is not cheaper than it is in the States.

MR. STIRLING: Yes. Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: No, thirty is right, it is cheaper than it is in the States. He is absolutely right.

And the reason that it is cheaper than it is in the States is instead of allowing it to flow to world prices the way that this government would like it to and double the cost in Newfoundland and then get their 22 per cent on the doubling - the reason that it is cheaper in Canada is that the federal government subsidizes gasoline in this Province, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I have to remind the hon. member that his time has expired.

It is with a great deal of pleasure that I welcome to the House today on behalf of all hon.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): members, Governor Joseph Brennan from the State of Maine and his entourage, the party with him.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: It is not easy to get recognized in this House.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise on a more positive note, really. I can understand the concern with the problems existing in the spray programme for the Province, and I can understand the concern of the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Forestry (Mr. Power) and the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews). I can understand the concern of the people of Gander, I can understand the concern of the Minister of Municipal Affairs, the member for the district of Gander (Mrs. Newhook). However, as I have said, I would like to take this opportunity to rise on a positive note, because there were two Ministerial Statements that were made in this House this morning which are of concern and of benefit to the people of the district of Grand Bank.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I said, I can understand the spray programme, but I would also like to point out - and maybe more of us should realize it - that I was elected to represent the people of the district of Grand Bank, and I feel, even though I may be interjecting in a very lively debate on what is happening in the spray programme, I also feel obligated to stand and to say a few words about these two Ministerial Statements which were made in the House this morning.

The first one I would like to comment on is the one made by the Minister of Labour and

MR. THOMS: Manpower (Mr. Dinn) and it affects a number of people in the town of St. Lawrence, in the district of Grand Bank. Most people in this House know of the history and the tragedy that happened at St. Lawrence. Most of the members of this House realize what suffering has gone on by those who worked in the mines from the St. Lawrence area, including the town of Lawn, and people who came from other parts of the district to work in the Alcan mines in St. Lawrence. Most people realize what happened when Alcan unceremoniously packed up in 1977, I believe it was, and left the town of St. Lawrence. But, Mr. Chairman, there have been many, many miners in the town of St. Lawrence who

MR. THOMS: have died agonizing deaths from the disease that was contracted while working in the mines at St. Lawrence. They left behind many, many dependents, widows and children. There are probably more widows in the town of St. Lawrence, there are more children in the town of St. Lawrence without fathers than any town anywhere else in Newfoundland, anywhere else in Newfoundland per capita.

But those who worked in the mines contacted, because of the dust problem in the mines, they contracted the disease and over a period of time they died of the disease. There are widows in the town of St. Lawrence who have been widows now for thirty years. One of the leading widows in the town, a Mrs. Bibbyana Tobin, who has worked so hard and so long and given so much of her time in connection with the problem existing in St. Lawrence, at this present time she has been a widow for about thirty years. And I do not know how many read Insight, I believe it was Insight, which was talking about people such as Mrs. Tobin, who cannot find employment and have to depend on government for assistance. But these are widows who have had a rough, long, hard climb to bring their children up on very little, on very little.

It may be difficult for members of this House to appreciate the fact that under this special fund that was set up at the instigation, I understand, of the previous, previous administration, the Liberal Government -

MR. NEARY: One hundred per cent correct.
I set it up.

MR. THOMS: - prior to their being turfed out of office in 1971, and led by my friend from LaPoile (S. Neary)

MR. CARTER: Rubbish!

MR. THOMS: - who was Minister at the time.

MR. NEARY: I was the man who set it up.

MR. THOMS: But the dependents of these deceased miners were receiving, they were receiving \$30 a month in compensation. They are now receiving, I understand, \$36

MR. THOMS: a month in compensation. To most, of us, Mr. Chairman, this may not seem like very much. \$36 a month, I suppose most of us here could spend without any real problems on a couple of drinks or a couple of cases of beer or this or that or whatever and really not miss it.

MR. NEARY: One hand.

MR. THOMS: On one hand, that is right. One hand of poker.

But, Mr. Chairman, to the widows in St. Lawrence who, through very difficult times, are trying to raise a family, to raise a family, really on the pittance that they receive through assistance, \$36 a month is a lot of money. It is a lot of money. This particular special fund that was set up back in 1971 co-shared by the government of this Province and the Aluminum Company of Canada, has now been extended for a two year period. And this is welcome news to the widows and the children of the St. Lawrence miners. And I could not let today go by without making a few comments on it.

What happened in St. Lawrence, Mr. Chairman, should not happen in any town in this Province. The Non-renewable Resources Committee of this House, of

MR. THOMS: which I am a member, is looking into the possibility of having companies who go in and extract the minerals, the resources from this Province, set up just such a special fund so that they will pay a half cent, one cent or two cents on every ton of iron ore, for example, that might come out of the ground so that when the non-renewable resource is exhausted and the companies move out, there are funds available to help the people at that point in time. And, Mr. Chairman, I do not want anybody to think that I am anti-company or anti-development or anti-anything, but I think the St. Lawrence experience shows us that a company will come in to this Province, will reap the benefits of the non-renewable resource and then, without very much qualm of conscience, will pack up and just move on, they got what they had come for. And I am very pleased to see that this is one of the terms of reference of the Non-renewable Resource Committee, to recommend to this government what action should be taken as far as this is concerned.

It is not a novel idea. Certainly the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was involved in this one back in 1971.

MR. NEARY: Right on, Sir.

MR. THOMS: I believe the member for LaPoile has made this suggestion in the House since I have been here about special funds -

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. THOMS: - for such situations. St. Lawrence is not the only case, of course, the mines on Bell Island closed up and there were no funds available at that time to offset the problems that arise when a one-industry town is left with no industry at all. In St. Lawrence, with the aid and assistance of the former Leader of this Party, the hon. Don Jamieson, there was a fish plant established and that has helped to offset - the intention was to offset the closedown of the Alcan mines.

MR. THOMS: And it is important, Mr. Chairman, that when a town loses its only industry and the unemployment rate jumps to an unacceptable level, that an alternate employment be found immediately for those people. Because there is always the tendency - I cannot explain it, I cannot understand it - but there is a tendency that once a person gets onto social assistance or able bodied relief, that they become comfortable in that position and they do not want to go to work. And there is that danger and the quicker we get people back to work, in situations such as the St. Lawrence situation, then the better it is for the people of that particular town.

So I am very pleased to see that this special fund has been extended for a two year period. I assume that there must be some plans to extend this special fund beyond that two year period, that negotiations will presumably start to have it more permanent in the

MR. THOMS: sense that, of course, all those - I mean, once a widow dies then sometimes this particular fund will come to an end. But all the widows in St. Lawrence are not going to die within the next two years, so that this special fund is going to have to - and it is not, Mr. Chairman, a big fund. The amount involved for this year and for the next two years of this programme, is \$120,000 annually. That is cost shared on a 50/50 basis by the Government of this Province and by Alcan. Now, if we had a requirement for a company to have such a special fund that could be kept invested, then, of course, there would not be any requirement for the government to be involved in funding the programme. But it is not a big amount of money, it is \$120,000 annually. Now, we budgeted in this House almost exactly that figure for the Norma and Gladys. This year there was \$115,000 budgeted for the Norma and Gladys to sail around the coast of this Province. And I do not know what happened to her, but in the Committee, Mr. Chairman, the question of the safety of the Norma and Gladys, the seaworthiness of the Norma and Gladys was questioned at that time, and I thought it was ironic when they had to tow her in to Clarendville, the Norma and Gladys having taken on water.

But, Mr. Chairman, to get back to the St. Lawrence situation, it is a tragedy. But then, of course, Mr. Chairman, the South Coast of this Province, in particular, is used to tragedies. Time after time after time - we can all remember the Blue Wave and the Blue Mist. I can recall growing up on the Burin Peninsula of this Province when a fishing boat would be lost and all hands onboard that fishing boat lost. I can remember in Garnish and Lamaline when every blind in the community was drawn when a fishing boat was lost at sea, and when every person there had lost some relative, every person in the community

MR. THOMS: was touched. And Newfoundland history is full of this sort of thing, particularly, of course, on the South Coast of the Province. So they are used to tragedies, they are used to death by sea, particularly on the South Coast. But equally as tragic, Mr. Chairman, was the situation with respect to the St. Lawrence fluorspar mine, where a great number of men contracted disease from the dust. And there are still miners, who worked in the St. Lawrence mine, who are dying of the disease today. They are dying today and they have died over the years since the mine closed.

So this tragedy, the tragedy of widows who have been widows for a number of years, the tragedy of children having to grow up without the benefit of a father, is a legacy that Alcan left in St. Lawrence.

MR. THOMS:

Now, there has been some talk, Mr. Chairman, there has been some talk of the mines re-opening. If they have to re-open under the conditions that existed when the mines closed in 1977, then I, for one, will not support any company re-opening the mines unless I can be reasonably assured, reasonably guaranteed, unless the people in St. Lawrence and Lawn can be reasonably assured, reasonably guaranteed that the dust problem would be under control, that they would not end up ten or fifteen or twenty years later with the children of the miners suffering the same fate as their fathers.

So, Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to see that the negotiations have come to a fruitful conclusion in that the special fund for the dependents of the deceased workers of the fluorspar mine in St. Lawrence, has been extended for two years. It is welcome news to the people of St. Lawrence. And, as I said, I appreciate the importance of the spray programme. I realize that the spray programme is going to get to the media. But I hope that the media will assist. I have already given the news to them, and through them to the people of St. Lawrence, about the announcement this morning.

There was another announcement made this morning which is of importance to the people of Grand Bank, and particularly to the fishermen of Grand Bank, and that is the announcement by the Minister of Fisheries (J.Morgan) that the Fisheries Loan Board has adopted a policy of financing out-board motors for fishermen.

Mr. Chairman, I said it in the House, if I said it once I said it a dozen times, that the district of Grand Bank is a district that is one hundred per cent either directly or indirectly dependent on the fisheries. If the fisheries fail, then there are tough times in the district of Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS:

Mr. Chairman, I do not think there is anything so depressing as for me to drive into Fortune or into Grand Bank if one or both of the fish plants are on strike. It is a depressing situation, because the fishermen are not at work and in many, many cases in the district the wives of the fishermen are not at work. I have a number of women who actually fish, who actually go out in the boats and fish with their husbands. Most of them, of course, work in the fish plants. But there is nothing as depressing as to drive into Grand Bank or into Fortune or into St. Lawrence when the fish plants are down, or when there is a strike on.

Mr. Chairman, at one time-and I do not think there is anything nicer than the sound of the old Acadia engine, the old three horsepower Acadia as she pattered, putt-putt-putt into the harbour. You know, the sad thing about it is this, that since I was elected, June 1979, I have seen and heard one putt-putt during that period of time, and that was in Lawn at about six or seven o'clock in the evening when the skiff was coming in and the old motor was there going putt-putt-putt. And I think it is one of the sweetest sounds, one of the nicest sounds in this world.

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2859

ah-1

MR. THOMS: And I can remember, Mr. Chairman, the broken arms too from starting these things. When you take them, you know, the stick that went in the wheel, and you went like this and then bang-o the next minute you had a cast on your arm.

MR. NEARY: That is the land lovers. The real fishermen did not have casts on their arms.

MR. THOMS: But the real fishermen did not have casts on their arms because they did not use a stick he went like this and wiggled it that way, and she caught.

MR. NEARY: The sports fishermen had the casts.

MR. THOMS: But there was nothing, nothing, Mr. Chairman, I do not think, that really gave me a feeling of nostalgia as when I heard that the President of the Council would not know what I am talking about. The President of the Council has never been outside the overpass, he cannot appreciate the benefit and the advantages and the value of having been brought up in an outport in Newfoundland. He could not really appreciate the old three Acadia engine that was once used by the fishermen of this Province.

But, Mr. Chairman, maybe not unfortunately - unfortunately from a nostalgic point of view, the fishermen in my district, and I would assume in all the fishing districts in this Province now, use outboard motors. I think it is just about, practically one hundred per cent of the fishermen use outboard motors.

AN HON. MEMBER: Outport motors.

MR. THOMS: No, not outport motors, outboard motors. They are more convenient, they are faster but they are also expensive and, you know, they are not as reliable.

AN.HON.MEMBER: A man drowned in my district last week.

MR. THOMS: They are not as reliable as the old engine that they used to use. Ask Tom Hiscock in Garnish. When Tom went out the first day of the lobster season to put out his lobster traps and the outboard motor broke down,he was there from seven o'clock in the morning until five o'clock in the afternoon,until somebody finally went out to find out what the problem was. Outboard motors are not as reliable but they are more convenient , they are faster, they get the fishermen to the grounds a heck of a lot faster than the old three Acadia. And I am very pleased to see that the policy of the Loan Board has been changed so that financing for outboard motors,which is a part of their fishing apparatus now just as much as the trawl or the trap or whatever -

MR. PATTERSON: He is always thinking about the poor man. The greatest minister we ever had in the fishery.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Chairman, I have been trying to -

MR. NEARY: You just finished yourself from getting into the Cabinet. You are doomed.

MR. THOMS: I have been trying to keep my thirty minutes in speaking this morning -

MR.NEARY: You are better when you are nastier.

MR. THOMS: - on a very positive- I may be better when I am nastier -okay? - but these are two things that affect the district of Grand Bank and the people of Grand Bank deserve to have me stand here and give them thirty minutes on matters that affect them. Like I said, it may not be as important as the spray programme, it may not be as important as the possibility of dangers that come from whatever happened yesterday in the spray programme,

June 26, 1981

Tape No. 2859

ah-3

MR. THOMS: but believe you me, Mr. Chairman, that to the widows and to the children of the deceased miners in St. Lawrence, the announcement by the Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) this morning is more important than the spray programme. The announcement by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan)

MR. THOMS: that the fishermen in the district will now be able to finance the purchase of outboard motors, it is more important than the spray programme to the people in my district. And, Mr. Chairman, as I said, my first responsibility to this House, my first responsibility is to the people of Grand Bank and God help me, the first time that I do not realize that. That is when the people of Grand Bank will have every right to turf me out of office and turf me out of this House of Assembly.

I believe that all members have a responsibility to be concerned about the provincial issues and the national issues. We all have that responsibility. I am prepared to take my responsibility as far as discussing the Constitution of Canada is concerned.

But, Mr. Chairman, the Constitution of Canada is not as important to the widows and children of the deceased miners as this announcement this morning. The Constitution of Canada is not as important as the statement by the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan), where they now can get an outboard motor financed.

I hope that there can be more positive moves by this government, as far as my district is concerned. I sincerely hope that. I hope that when the Minister of Transportation (R. Dawe) - I was going to say I hope when the Minister of Transportation goes down and sees that section of the loop road between Lourdes Cove and Lawn, that he will see the need for funding. I hope that the Minister of Municipal Affairs (H. Newhook) will give Garnish its water and sewer they have applied for. I hope that the next time the roads programme come out for this Province, I hope that the next time the Municipal Grants Programme comes from the Minister of Municipal Affairs, that the district of Grand Bank will not be just a blank on these pages. I hope that I can get as much for the district as the member for Fortune - Hermitage (D. Stewart) got for his district.

MR. THOMS:

They deserve it.

Mr. Chairman, as I say, I hope there are more positive moves, such as the two that we had this morning to assist, not only just the - the Minister of Labour (J. Dinn), of course, assisted the people in St. Lawrence, but the other statement, by the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan), will assist all fishermen in Labrador and in other parts of Newfoundland and I am very pleased to see that these statements were made.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Chairman, I thought we might be able to ask the question, but the hon. gentlemen want to filibuster so we will put a little bit of sense into the debate.

I want to congratulate the member for Grand Bank (L. Thoms). I want to congratulate the member from Grand Bank. I thought I was - I was nonplussed really.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL:

It is the first time this year, it is the first time in many years, but particularly this year, that I heard a positive speech coming from the members there opposite. The hon. gentleman has shown that you can be in opposition and at the same time you can make a speech without tearing down everything, without being completely negative about everything

MR. MARSHALL: and without, you know, assailing people and situations and what have you. It was a positive one and I hope now the hon. gentleman will consider some of the statements that he has made in the past where, in order to toe the party line that he has had to toe with the members of his caucus, he has said that nothing is done for the people in Grand Bank. He said absolutely nothing is done for the people of Grand Bank. Today he is seeing the light.

MR. THOMS: No, you have seen the light and done something for them.

MR. MARSHALL: I do not want to embarrass the hon. gentleman at all, I will just say that once before the hon. gentleman

had seen the light because once before the hon. gentleman was a Tory. The hon. gentleman was working very hard in one election many, many years ago now, mind you, when the hon. gentleman and myself were working down in Wesleyville and Badger's Quay, in the Leader of the Opposition's district, then to defeat the Liberal. I think his efforts would be better directed if he worked in this day and age down in that particular district to defeat the present city member. But he has shown that he is a true Tory, Mr. Chairman, deep down. He shows he knows the true story and he is a true Tory, and every now and then, Mr. Chairman, when somebody, you know, goes - the very few times when they mistakenly stagger from the Tory Party to the Liberal Party, every now and then their true colours come through and I can only say that today the member for Grand Bank's (Mr. Thoms) true colours came through. He was positive, Mr. Chairman. I congratulate him. It is the first positive speech that has been made by the Opposition. I do not know what got into him - I know what got into him, he is a positive individual.

MR. MARSHALL: I wish the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) would stop frowning at me. I find it rather frightening and intimidating when I am trying to speak.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) the hon. member, I can only (inaudible).

MR. MARSHALL: I realize that, Mr. Chairman. Anyway, I will leave the hon. the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde. He and I get on very well.

Now, this is a bill that has been debated and debated over and over again. It is a tax bill to put a tax on gasoline. It has been debated ad nauseam. It was announced by the minister in his Budget Speech and this is a bill now to bring it into effect.

The hon. gentlemen decry the imposition of a tax. They are not the only ones who decry impositions of the tax. As far as we are concerned, each and every person on this side would prefer that we did not have to levy not only this tax but any other type of tax.

Now, on the one hand, the hon. gentlemen there opposite tell us that we cannot levy taxes, in other words, that we cannot get revenue, and then out of the other side of their mouths every day, they are up on their feet saying that we should spend money. Now, pray tell me, if they do not want us to levy this tax, where are they going to suggest that we get this extra money? Are we going to get it from raising the personal income tax? No, this side says no, we will not raise the personal income tax. Hon. gentlemen there opposite might wish to do it. We are not going to raise either, the retail sales tax. Hon. gentlemen may wish to do that, but we cannot do that, it is as high as it can be. And we just cannot raise taxes any more. The people of this Province are paying more taxes than they should have to bear and we

June 26, 1981

Tape 2861

EC - 3

MR. MARSHALL: are just squeezing every possible nickel that we can.

The actual answer to that question, Mr. Chairman, is quite obvious, and it comes up again and again and it has to be faced. Hon. gentlemen there opposite get up on this floor and indicate that the taxes should not be imposed, that we should reduce taxes and what have you. What they should be doing at the same time is indicating that they stand with us - and I say it again because it needs to be said again and again and again -

MR. MARSHALL: stand with us as Newfoundlanders demanding that we get the just rights to our offshore resources. If we get the just rights to our offshore resources, Mr. Chairman, then in due time we will be able to lower the taxes, at least to the Canadian average. Because this is the whole purpose, Mr. Chairman, of our getting the control to our offshore - the people of our Province will pay less for taxes. And from the point of view of the gasoline tax, which we have under consideration at the present time, the tax rate comparisons: with a 22 per cent tax rate in Newfoundland, there is a 22 per cent in PEI which equally labours - unfortunately PEI does not have the prospects that we have, or the prospects that we hope we have, if these prospects are not denied us by the hon. gentleman's friends in Ottawa and the collusion of the hon. gentleman with them.

New Brunswick pays 16 per cent, Ontario pays 20 per cent, Manitoba pays 20 per cent and Saskatchewan pays 20 per cent. I say again, the basis of the tax which this government is bringing in this year is on an ad valorem basis which is - the hon. gentlemen there opposite, perhaps, are more apt to call it an indexing because it relates to the average retail price, that is the tax itself. The percentage rate for gasoline, when this bill passes, will be 22 per cent of the average retail price less the tax itself.

Now, are we the only people in Canada who have an ad valorem or an index tax system? And I say again, no we are not, every other province of Canada has it with the exception of Alberta and Nova Scotia. Alberta does not charge any taxes at all. Alberta does not charge any taxes because Alberta has the resources. And that is an example of what we will do and what we will be able to do when we are able to get control of our own resources.

So, Mr. Chairman, you know, they can

MR. MARSHALL: filibuster all they want, they can get up and they can talk about all sorts of non-entities and what have you, as they have been doing from time to time, the fact of the matter is, the hon. gentlemen, Mr. Chairman, are filibustering and they are filibustering, Mr. Chairman, because there are so many fractions on the other side of the House that they cannot operate as a cohesive unit. There are two, three, four, five or six leaders on the other side of the House, none of them will go along with the general consensus because they cannot get a general consensus.

MR. MARSHALL: What we are seeing in this House, Mr. Chairman, is a deliberate delaying tactic, not against the government -

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Butt): A point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: I know Your Honour was paying very strict attention to what the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall) was saying and Your Honour also knows that you cannot attribute motives to any member, or group of individuals in this House. The hon. gentleman just said that the Opposition were deliberately delaying the House. That is completely false and untrue. It is typical of the kind of a statement that we have come to expect from the hon. gentleman. It is not a point of order - it is not a -

MR. DINN: It is true.

MR. NEARY: It is not true, Mr. Chairman and the hon. gentleman knows it is not true. It is the mismanagement of this House, the same as the Province is being mismanaged, poor planning in the House. A Government House Leader who will not deal with the House Leader on this side of the House. It is the buttoned-down mind, Mr. Chairman, the narrow-mindedness and the buttoned-down minds of the hon. gentlemen.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

That is not a point of order. I am going to have to ask the hon. member to take his seat. We will have to agree to stop the clock.

MR. NEARY: No, no, Mr. Chairman, no stopping the clock.

MR. MARSHALL: I move that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am -

MR. MARSHALL: There is no point of order. I have the right. I am on my feet and I have the right to move the Committee -

MR. NEARY: I am on a point of privilege. I am on a point of privilege.

MR. MARSHALL: Do not be a clown, boy. On motion, that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. BUTT: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred, and directs me to report some progress and asks leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of Committee reports that it has considered the matters to it referred, made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I ask the motion, I wonder if I might ask to have the clock stopped to pass along a fairly important communication, a brief one, from one of our citizens.

It is a letter addressed to me as Speaker of the House, "Would you please convey to the members of the House of Assembly my affection of their expression of sympathy on the passing of my son, Jeffrey. Such expressions do indeed seem to ease the sorrow of his untimely death." And it is signed by Mrs. Cynthia Hunt.

On motion, report received and adopted, Committee order to sit again on tomorrow.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Tuesday, at 3:00 P.M., and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, June 30, 1981 at 3:00 P.M.