



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

---

Volume 1

Number 32

4th. Session

34th. General Assembly

---

VERBATIM REPORT

MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1970

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House Met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker I wish to extend a very cordially welcome to some eighteen girls who are here in the galleries today from the Girls Home and Training School, Waterford Bridge Road under the direction of Miss Kenny, the Superintendent, and Mrs. Windsor the Supervisor. And to thirteen young United States citizens from the school at the Argentia Airforce Base under the direction of one of the most brilliant of the younger generation of Newfoundlander's we have got in our Province today Mr. Rex Murphy. Recently a distinguished student at the University. A Rhode Scholar, indeed I said a distinguished scholar at the University. And now putting some of his theoretically background and training to the practical test, that I hope that these young americans citizens who will provide that it is a good test.

These two groups are visiting our Chamber today to see what we look like, and to see what we sound like. And to get some idea at any rate how the laws are made for this Canadian Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. The difference between this House and the House with which they would be more familiar, the House of Representatives, and the Senate of the United States is this, that in this House you have not only the elected representatives of the people, the equivalent of Congressmen and Senators, not only have you got here on both side of this House, the elected representatives of the people, but the Government as well. In the United States the Government do not sit in the Congress, the House of Representatives, or the Senate. Under the British system they do. Indeed, you cannot see the Government, if you do not have seats in this House. The Government in this House, is made up of members of the House like all other members. And so long as a majority of the members of this House, taking the whole House, regardless of the side they sit on, so long as the Government have the continuing support of a majority of the members of the House, they continue in office. If they make a motion that the House do now adjourn, and the House rejects that motion, the Government have no choice, but to resign.

I as the Leader of the Government would go down to Government House and I would call on the representative of the Monarch and I would say, Your Honour, I have to announce with great regret that my administration of Your Government, and it is the Governor's or the Queen's Government, it is not mind I am only head of the administration of the Queen's Government. And the Queen

MR. SMALLWOOD: in Newfoundland is represented by the Governor, he is the personal representative of the Queen. I would say, Your Honour with great regret I have to announce that my administration of Your Honour's Government or the Queen's Government has been defeated in the House. And so I must tender you my resignation.

And when I do so, this means the automatic resignation of the whole of the Government, not just mind, but the resignation of the Government, so that at every point in the procedure of this House the Government are at the mercy, completely and absolutely at the mercy of the majority of the elected members. They can defeat the Government at any time, they feel like it. On any motion that comes before the House, if it is moved by the Government, as the Government motion, it must be carried or the Government must resign.

So always, therefore, the Government's life is at stake in this House. The moment the House says, "no" to the Government, the Government has no choice, but to resign and that is done by the Premier going to the Queen in England, or the Queen's representative here, and saying Your Majesty in England, or Your Honour here, I must tender you my resignation as Premier, and the resignation of my administration of Your Government. This is the great difference, between this House and the House of Representatives or the Senate of the United States.

There is another great difference, and this is one that worries the Opposition greatly and my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition who will speak, when I finish. At least if he does not, I will be surprized. He always does, he always agrees with me. I will be greatly surprised, if he does not. The other great difference is this, that the Government of the United States is elected on a certain date, for a certain term, and that term is no longer and no shorter than the date. It is a sixth term, the President is elected, and he brings his Cabinet in, and that Government are there for a sixth term no matter what happens. No matter how often they might be defeated in the Senate or in the House of Representatives, the Government remains throughout the entire period of their term. Not so in the British system. The moment the Government are defeated, they must resign. Defeated in this House here. On any motion, if it is a Government motion. Now there is this difference also, that having been defeated, I can go to the Governor and say, Your Honour with great regret I have to tell Your Honour, that my administration has been defeated, and so I must tender you my resignation, but before doing so, Your Honour, I must first advice you to dissolve the House. Dissolve it. Issue Your Proclamation, and dissolve the General Assembly. And issue Your Proclamation for the holding

of a general election.

So having been defeated in the House, I can go to the Governor and ask him to call a general election, and the House may be only a year old, or two or three years old. At the end of five years it has got to be dissolved whether or not who likes it. But within the five years, at any time the Premier advises the Governor to dissolve the House, the Governor has no choice. It is not always like that, but it is like that now.

So these young Americans will see what a basic and fundamental difference there is between the two types of government, American and British. We are more sensitively responsive to the people representatives at any time they can vote us out. Any time they like, you cannot vote out an American Government, you can impeach a President, but that is only for commitment of some very serious violation of the constitution of the nation of the republic. But otherwise, once the President is elected and he brings his Cabinet in, then they are there for a duration, until the term is up. And another difference is that a Premier must get his Cabinet from among the members of the House. But a President of the United States can get his Cabinet from any part of the nation, but of course the Congressmen might, the Senate must approve.

I hope all these young ladies and gentlemen, Newfoundlanders and Americans temporary Newfoundlanders, Newfoundlanders for the time being, I hope they will all enjoy their stay here, and see how laws are made. If they will stay along enough they will see it, so far we have not passed any in this present session. But do not be discouraged. We have passed one law, and we are well underway to passing several others. But, we have done other things, we have talked, and that is the meaning of the House of Assembly, it is a talk shop, What is the meaning of Parliament? What is the actual meaning of Parliament? It is to "Parle" it is to talk. Is it not? Parle-vous français, to speak French. But we are here parling all the time. It is a Parliament, we are here to talk. And we are here to talk about the business of the Province. The faith of our people and the destiny of our people and the condition of our people and what ought to be done for the benefit of our people. We are a talk shop, we are a Parliament, a parle, a crowd who are here parling, and God knows we have done an awful lot of that in the present session. Of course, I have not, I have only spoken a few words, but to the other members you cannot quiten them, they go on and on endlessly making

April 13th. 1970

Tape 415

PK - 4

speeches, now the Leader of the Opposition will be given a glorious opportunity to express what is in my way of welcome to these fine young people.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, this session has been full of surprises for the Premier so we cannot deprive him of one more surprise today insofar as I am filling in for the Leader of the Opposition in welcoming the students from the Girls' Home and Training School and from the Air Force Base at Argentia. In the case of the Girls' Home and Training School, during the period that I was the Minister of Welfare, I visited that institution as well as all other institutions which came under me, on a number of occasions. Well the Premier has been quick to say that the students from these institutions should learn something here today. I would hasten to assure the House that in my experience in visiting them, there is one thing which they will not learn here today and that is good manners, because I was never so surprised in my life on visiting the Girls' Home to find how well they conducted themselves, how well the place was run and how admirably they displayed their talents and so on in the little concerts and entertainments which they gave in that particular institution. I think it is a great credit to Miss Kenny and Mrs. Winsor, the supervisors who from personal experience, I know, have done an excellent job with that particular institution.

In welcoming the Argentia Air Force Base students, I should say that the long and detailed instruction which they had in parliamentary procedure was interesting to them no doubt but rather wearisome to us, because during this session of the House, we have rather a surfeit of parliamentary instruction, all of which incidentally was not needed but which was listened to attentively.

The indication was that the Government can be defeated at any time in this House by a majority of members. While it may raise hopes eternally in the breast, we are not expecting that to happen and I am sure that the students here this afternoon are not expecting it to happen. We will prefer, of course, to do it in a much more normal manner and the parliamentary way; insofar, as when we go to the electorate that is bound to happen the next time around. If these students from the Air Base are here in a few months time, they will probably be able to say that they were the first students in Newfoundland from another country to witness the defeat of a sitting Government. I have much pleasure in welcoming these two groups and hope that they will enjoy their visit.

HON. STEPHEN A. NEARY (Minister of Public Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I want to join with the hon. the Premier and the representative of the Opposition in welcoming these girls from the Girls' Home and Training School. My hon. friend who just took his seat mentioned the many occasions that he visited the Girls' Training Home, but I want to inform him, Mr. Speaker, that on no occasion did he invite the young ladies to come up to the House. I think I have been at the Girls' Training Home now on eleven different occasions over the past ten or eleven months, Mr. Speaker, and on two of these rather enjoyable occasions, I was privileged to attend a concert and school graduation that the hon. member just referred to, under the supervision of the girls' teacher and Miss Kenny.

It is to say the least, Mr. Speaker, very encouraging for me to know that these fine girls are taking full advantage of the education and training programs open to them; especially in such a practical as to come and see the lawmakers at work. Before I take my seat, Mr. Speaker, I also would like to welcome the students from the United States Naval Station at Argentia who are here with Mr. Murphy. This is not the first time that these students sat in this House of Assembly, Mr. Speaker. As a matter of fact, the last time they visited here, they sat right here on the floor of the House and cross-examined, yours truly, for two hours. I must say that I am glad to see them back again, but this time sitting in the galleries.

MR. JOHN CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words of welcome to these two groups on behalf of the Independent Liberal group. Mr. Speaker, it boggles the imagination to contemplate what information our guests might have gotten from the hon. Minister of Welfare after a two and half hour cross-examination, whenever that took place. I regret that we could not have been here to hear the results. I do not doubt that I would have learned something. We are very delighted to see that the girls from the Girls' Training School are visiting the House, Mr. Speaker. We only have one word of caution. We hope that the minister, on his frequent visits to that school is chaperoned and I am sure that he is. As far as the group from the Argentia Naval Base is concerned, we welcome them also and Mr. Murphy, Rhodes Scholar for Newfoundland last year or the year before.

The hon. the Premier gave us a learned discourse, Mr. Speaker, on the difference between our system and that in the United States and one major difference is the separation of powers in the United States. The powers of the executive, the legislative branches are separated. I think the one great weakness of our system, Mr. Speaker, they will notice is that the power of the Executive and the Legislative branches are not separated. We do not have any separation of powers and this often leads, Mr. Speaker, visitors might note to too much power being in the hands of too few people and that is one advantage of the United States system.

The hon. Premier also mentioned that in our system the one difference is that the Government may fall, if it loses a majority in the House of Assembly. If they had been here last Thursday, they would have seen that possibility occur, when the Government was caught with just nine members on its side of the House. If the Opposition had had all ten of their members present, Mr. Speaker, we might have witnessed the downfall of a Government on that particular day. Unfortunately that was not the case, but we can always live in hopes unless these rule-changes are passed. So, Mr. Speaker, we are quite pleased to see both these groups here. We congratulate them on their interest and hope that they will enjoy this afternoon's session.

HON. F. W. ROWE (Minister of Education): Mr. Speaker, I do not normally rise, because every day, I think, we do have visits from groups of our students and the formal welcome is extended on behalf of the Government, on this side of the House by the hon. the Premier. However, as this is probably the last time, I will have a chance to do it here; insofar as the visitors here from Argentina are concerned. I said, "insofar as our visitors from Argentina..." My hon. friend should have waited for the sentence to be finished. This is one of their troubles, Mr. Speaker. They are always too precipitant. They do not wait long enough. I would like to add my voice to the others in welcoming them here. Last year I had the pleasure and the honour of being invited out there, my wife and I were invited out to Argentina to the graduating ceremonies in the spring of the year and it was a most enjoyable visit. Following that in the fall, in fact, we were able to play host to the senior students from the Argentina Base here in St. John's. We took them around and showed them something of our culture and something of our history and background and I



was given to understand that they had a most enjoyable day here. I have a feeling, as a result of my contacts with that school at Argentina, that those many students there who have gone through that school will go back to their great country to be ambassadors of good-will for Newfoundland. They have been friends among us and we enjoyed having them here and we have a feeling, too, that they enjoyed being here.

I would like also to add a personal word of greeting to the girls here from another one of our educational institutions. I have double interest in that institution because the House will recall that it was back in the early days of this administration that that institution, in its present form, was set up. The girls in that institution have had an excellent, a marvelous record, and we congratulate them on their records of training and education and we are very happy to see them here and we wish them well.

HON. G.A. FRECKER (Min. of Prov. Affairs): Mr. Speaker, my third attempt to get on my feet. I am only the member for the district, however, since Argentia and the Naval Station do come within the geographic area that it is my honour to represent, I would not like this occasion to pass without extending to the young people from the naval school my heartiest welcome here. The Premier mentioned that this was almost a gabfest, I was going to say, but apparently we are each vying with one another for an opportunity to say something. I would say that the young people from the Girl's Home and Training School are also most welcome. We have heard the eulogies made with their regard and before sitting I should also like to extend a warm welcome to my old friend, the young Mr. Rex Murphy. Thank you!

MR. SPEAKER

#### PETITIONS

MR. R. BARBOUR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition from two communities in the district of Trinity North. I was asked by the hon. member for Trinity North who, I am happy to say, is making great progress on the road to recovery at the Grace General. The petition, Mr. Speaker, comes from two well known and very old communities, the communities of Old and New Bonaventure. The petition, Mr. Speaker, is signed by one hundred and thirty-one residents and the prayer of the petition and I quote, if I may, Sir; "We the residents of Old and New Bonaventure, district of Trinity North, do hereby make petition to have that section of the road between Trouty and the Old and New Bonaventure upgraded to secondary road standards approximately five miles from Trouty which is also nearby Trinity in Trinity North. We request that the Government which consider the possibility of having some of the blind turns, the curves straightened and the road in general widened to permit two cars to pass without having to have to back up a considerable distance at certain points in order to allow passage. Also, Sir, there is needed substantial railing along sections of the dangerous embankments.

Mr. Speaker, as I look at some of the names attached to this petition I see the names of great people such as the Millers, the McGraths, the Toopes, the Baileys and many, many others. Mr. Speaker, in the old days, in the good old days, the two communities referred to in the prayer of the petition consisted of fishermen who went to the Labrador in vessels and were very successful. Also from these two communities have come great people such as

MR. BARBOUR:

clergymen, school teachers, magistrates and men with trades of all kinds. Mr. Speaker, I cannot do the same justice to the petition that the hon. member for the district would do if he were here but humbly, Sir, humbly, with him I support the prayer of the petition and I ask without further delay that serious consideration be given to this petition. Sir, I ask that the petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that the petition be received and referred to the department to which it relates!

MR. A. J. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I could not let this opportunity pass without endorsing the prayer of petition and to remark on the very humble and eloquent manner in which this member presented the petition on behalf of the member who is in hospital. I think he is being very humble indeed to say that he could not do justice to it but, Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the prayer of this petition and congratulate the hon. member for the very splendid way in which he presented the petition and this is not even his own district. So we could figure out if it were his own district I think he would be most eloquent indeed but I did not think the occasion should pass without supporting the petition.

On motion, petition received.

NOTICE OF MOTIONS:

HON. L.R. CURTIS (Min. of Justice): I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a Bill, "An Act To Amend The Motor Carrier Act, 1961."

HON. W.J. KEOUGH (Min. of Labour): Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Bills, "An Act To Amend The Apprenticeship Act, 1962."

Also a Bill, "An Act to Amend the Annual Vacations With Pay Act, 1969."

MR HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, before answers to questions, I give notice I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce the following Resolution:

"That Mr. Speaker do appoint a Select Committee of this House to study and recommend to this House appropriate changes and revisions to Standing Orders, and that this Select Committee should be representative of all parties in this House."

QUESTIONS:

HON. J.R. SMALLWOOD (Premier): Mr. Speaker, in reply to question no. 241, on the Order Paper of April 6th., in the name of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, the member for St. John's Centre. The answer is that first after estimates were prepared a procedural change was made, that is a change from revenue refund to refunds out of expenditure. And second, that the introduction of the public service pensions Act which provided options for married females to opt out of the plan thereby creating a tremendous volume of requests for refunds.

In reply to question no. 323, on the Order Paper of April 9th. in the name of the same hon. gentleman the answer is Lee Wolfe Productions Ltd.

HON. S.A. NEARY (Minister of Welfare): Mr. Speaker, I have the answer to question no. 388, on today's Order Paper in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West. The answer to part one is that the estimated \$1,050,000. the bills are not received from suppliers. The answer to part two, \$924,611. bill not received from suppliers. That was as of March 31st. 1969, and the first answer was as at March 31st. 1970. We usually pay our bills Mr. Speaker, six months out of the year within 30 days, and the remainder of the year, 32, 33, 35 days.

Any delays in the past in the payments of accounts owed to merchants by our department will be eliminated with the introduction of the changeover of cheques instead of vouchers to applicants of short-term assistance.

The answer to question 389, also asked in the name of the hon. the member for St. John's West. The answer to part one is \$775,000. medical, \$27,000 non-medical for a total of \$802,000. Am I going to fast for the hon. gentleman? Non-medical \$27,000. total \$802,000. The answer to part two of question 389, is medical \$843,250. non-medical \$15,105. for a total of \$858,355. The answer to part three is "yes" Mr. Speaker a study is currently being made and I might say by the way of explanation that this is just one aspect of a complete review that is being made of the need for various items both large and small that go to make up the budget of the Department of Social Services and Rehabilitation with a view to spending our share of the tax dollars in the best interest of both the clients of the Department and the citizens of the Province generally.

HON. E.M. ROBERTS (Minister of Health): Mr. Speaker, today's Order Paper brought forth its usual quota of questions standing in the name of the hon. member for St. John's West who of course is rather a good fellow about this

sort of thing. I have the answers Sir, to three of the questions the hon. gentleman has asked. Question 403 Sir, on today's Order Paper of course, the answer is "yes," and the answer to the second part is "yes." With respect to question 409 Mr. Speaker, the answer to part one is "no," the answer to part two is 31st. July, 1969, and the answer to part three is as follows Sir, that the health services in the town of LaScie are within the area served by the hospital at Baie Verte which is operated in behalf of the Government, by the United Church Board of Home Missions.

The House will recall Mr. Speaker, that that arrangement was made several years ago. I am not sure just how long ago. The Government are the request of my friend and colleague the member for White Bay South who of course is also the Minister of Community and Social Development are reviewing the situation with respect to health services in the town of LaScie. I hope we can make improvements. The precise form of those improvements Mr. Speaker, and the date on which we can implement them is a matter we are not yet able to announce.

With respect to question 410 Sir, again on today's Order Paper, the information is as follows; on April 1st. 1970 there were employed by the H.J.Boyles Hospital located in Baie Verte five medical doctors, (one of whom I believe was part-time Sir, ) but there were five doctors, there were fifteen nurses, am I going to fast for the hon. gentleman? There was one trained X-ray technician, there was one trained laboratory technician, there twenty nurses aides and there were twenty-eight in the other staff categories.

With respect to part two of the hon. gentleman's question Mr. Speaker, there were thirty-two of those seventy people who have been employed since April 1st. 1969. Nineteen nurses have been employed since April 1st.1969 which in view of the fact only fifteen are employed, means a very high turn over. Five nurses aides out of twenty, and eight of the twenty-eight other.

HON. E.DAWE (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, in answer to question no. 392 on today's Order Paper, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. The answer to the first part of the question \$6,000,617. The answer to the second part of the question, the answer is nil because all these loans are for a period of two to five years and are covered by guarantees which are not yet expired. The answer to the third part of the question, is nil. The function of the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation is to repay loans

to chartered banks on behalf of the municipalities. Debentures for the amounts repaid are then issued to the corporation by the municipalities, and I might add that the Newfoundland Municipal Financing Corporation receives its funds from amounts allocated to it by the Department of Finance.

MR. CROSBIE: In connection with part two of the question is the hon. Minister going to table the rest of the information? When the loans were

the information but when the loans were incurred the mortgage loan and municipality date, the name of the bank involved, the interest rate,

MR. DAVE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I will take that under advisement and prepare that part of the question.

Question No. 393:, asked by the hon. member for St. John's West, on today's Order Paper. This covers the amount of \$572,959. 20. This represents an amount remaining on an advance of \$1,200,000 to the City of St. John's Housing Corporation by the city. The advance was made to the Corporation by the city for the acquisition and development of housing areas within the city. Provisions have been made to make annual payments to the city and this now represents the outstanding amount due on this amount, and final payment.

Question No. 394 on today's Order Paper asked by the hon. member for St. John's West. The answer

- (1) Mr. Peter Murphy; Mr. John Murphy; Mr. Wilson Murphy; Mr. Albert Sinyard; Mr. Gerald Murphy; and Mr. Peter Murphy is President of the Community Council.
- (2) November 15; 1969.
- (3) Parker's Cove received the following grants, Revenue grants, \$2565. Emergency Assistance grants, \$5500. Capital road grants \$2212. making a total of \$10, 277. The Community Council of Parker's Cove have borrowed a total of \$13,000 and the loan was not guaranteed by the Government.
- (4) \$12,000. The water system is not operating properly in all the areas because of not sufficient water pressure, however an engineer from my department has visited the settlement and investigated the difficulties being experienced with the water supply and recommendations to correct this difficulty are now under consideration by my department.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, can he advise the House any meetings of the community council of Parker's Cove have been held since November 16, 1969?

MR. DAVE: Any meeting at Parker's Cove ?

MR. HICKMAN: Any meetings of the council, council meetings?

MR. DAVE: Not to my knowledge but I will take it under advisement. I have not been advised if they had a meeting or not.

MR. CROSBIE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker? There are no loans made by

the government to the council?

MR. DAUL: They did borrow \$13,000 but this was negotiated by the council themselves, without a government guarantee.

MR. CROSSIE: The Government itself has not loaned them any money.

MR. DAVE: No.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

HON. A. MALONEY (Min. of Fisheries): Before the Orders of the Day Mr. Speaker,

I would like to give the answer to Question No. 397 on today's Order Paper asked by the hon. the member for St. John's West.

(1) \$21,636.28

(2) No.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. A. MURPHY (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, at this moment I would like to direct a question to the Hon. the Premier with reference to a rumour that a writ has been issued today for a by-election in St. John's East.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Have not heard anything about it.

MR. MURPHY: Thank you.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

Second Reading of a Bill. "An Act Respecting The Marketing Of Salt Fish,"

MR. MALONEY: Mr. Speaker, a few weeks ago the Parliament of Canada enacted legislation creating a corporation for the purposes of trading and marketing salt codfish inter-provincially and in the export trade. The provisions of this Bill which I have the pleasure of introducing are complementary to the federal Bill and are made necessary to enable the corporation to conduct its business in this Province.

The passage of this legislation Sir, by the Parliament of Canada, is in my opinion and in the opinion of the Government is that long last a recognition of the importance of the salt fish industry in the economy of the Province and in the economy of the Nation. Many times Mr. Speaker, over the past twenty-one years, this Government have stated firmly, clearly their position in respect of the principles embodied in this Bill and never more clearly than in the great fishery conference called by the Premier in 1963. That conference Sir, as you know was made up of the fish trades of the Province The fishermen, representatives of the Government of Canada and the Government of Newfoundland and resulted in the appointment of a commission which was to



look into and make recommendations to the Government on the fisheries of Newfoundland and Labrador. That conference and that commission which resulted therefrom Sir, came forward with a number of proposals the main one of which was that the Government of Newfoundland which spurred a movement to have the Federal Government introduce legislation for the marketing of salt fish. I might say in passing Sir, and I was reminded of this in doing some research to the introduction of this Bill that in the same conference and recommended by the same commission were some other important facets of our fishing economy some important recommendations. (1) the twelve mile limit which we have heard a good deal in the past several days. (2) the training, the need for training of fishermen and we have today operating in Newfoundland the finest fisheries college, certainly in North America and perhaps one of the finest in the world.

That commission advocated as well, an increased effort on the part of the Federal Government for the development of new resources in the Province. And I believe Sir, as a direct

MR. MALONEY: the direct consequence of that conference and the commission finding we can look at the development of the herring fishery, the queen crab fishery, the shrimp fishery and expansion of our frozen ground fish industry, and the development of course of the herring reduction industry as the Premier has mentioned.

That commission also brought attention to a very serious situation in the Province, and that was the need for an acceptable supply of water to the main fish plants of Newfoundland, and Sir, I think, as of this moment, plans, quite a number, the majority in fact have been fitted with water supplies, a program of the Atlantic Development Board, and others are on the drawing boards, and perhaps within a years' time all the major fish plants will have been fitted. The Province also took quite a role in that program.

That commission recommended as well, Sir, a number of community stages around the Province, so that fish could be handled in a manner more in keeping with the times and in keeping with the demands of the market. I just mentioned the very important development Sir, that resulted from that conference, but the main one, and the one with which we are concerned today is of course the marketing of salt fish.

Now in speaking earlier in this hon. House, Sir, I remarked that this legislation would bring to the salt fish industry of the Province a degree a measure of stability, that that industry has not had in its long, long history. I can refer hon. members to a number of difficulties that the salt fish industry faced in the past twenty years. The hon. the Premier will be very familiar with them because I recall reading not so long ago, when in an address he made to the House, I believe, it was in 1950 or 1951, having to do with the sterling crisis which pretty well knocked out the salt fish industry of Newfoundland. There have been other periods of trouble for the industry since that time. Perhaps, the most recent was in 1967 and in 1968, and with this I would say all members of this hon. House are all very familiar. This great crisis in the salt fish industry arose from two main causes, one was the devaluation of sterling, and the consequent devaluation of the currencies of other countries which were interested in salt fish. And another serious set back that hit us at the same time, was a sad quality situation in our main market.

So on several occasions in the past twenty-one years, Sir, we have had to go literally hat in hand, to the Federal Government to seek relief for those who were involved in all phases of this industry. So when I emphasize, therefore,

MR. MALONEY: that this new legislation will bring stability to the industry, I would like to refer to the House, to some of the problems of the frozen fish industry, which have some parallels in the salt fish industry.

The House will recall about two years ago, the House was sitting at that time, that the frozen fish industry of the Province was in a very, very precarious position. In fact the frozen fish industry of Canada and perhaps, I could go on to say, the ground fish industry of the world, as we know it, was in a very, very serious position. In fact Sir, insofar as Newfoundland was concerned, I can say that it was touch and go, for quite some time, as to whether the major operating plants in this Province would continue to operate.

Hon. members of the House will recall that, hon. members on the other side of the House who were in the Government at that time will understand what I mean when I will say this. And, Sir, I am happy to be able to say now something of course that is well known to all hon. members, and that is that frozen fish industry has come back quite dramatically, the improvement is nothing short of remarkable. It shows the characteristic of the fishing industry, that perhaps it makes it unlike that of any other primary industry. It does have a remarkable capability of coming back very quickly. I would not have said, two years ago, that the frozen fish industry would be back on the footing that it is today.

But, Sir, this can be attributed to having placed behind it the support of the national Government. I think, that single fact more than any other fact, is accountable for the quite remarkable recovery for the frozen fish industry today. The fact that, the national Government for the first time, placed itself squarely and firmly behind the frozen fish industry.

Briefly, what the Federal Government did at that time was to say to the producers in Newfoundland the market in the United States appears to be able to buy all the fish that it can handle at twenty cents a pound, this is a price that will not permit you to operate profitably, we will therefore, enter the market as a buyer, and you have no reason to sell in the American market under twenty-four cents a pound.

Briefly, what the Government of Canada did Sir, was to say to the fish producers in Newfoundland, we will buy your fish, and pay you twenty-four cents a pound, if the price remains below that, we will continue to buy it, we will put the resources of the Government of Canada behind you. If on the other hand, the price improves, then the seller or the producer will have an

opportunity of buying back from the Government of Canada his fish and placing it on the market at a higher price.

But, Sir, I can repeat that the recovery since that time has been quite dramatic, was brought about largely at the measure as a result of that support.

Mr. Speaker, this Government believe that the Newfoundland Salt Fish Industry can be made more efficient, it can be updated, and become a stronger contributor to the incomes of our fishermen. The world demand for salt fish continues very strong. And we have long held to the belief Sir, that steps must be taken to place this industry in a better position to capture a reasonable share of the world's market. And on that Sir, it might well be of interest to the House to know that the market for salt codfish as remained roughly unchanged for decades. It is still around 250,000 metric tons a year. However, the world trade, as distinct from the market, the trade in fish, has dropped. And it has dropped because of course countries such as Spain and Portugal, that twenty years ago, bought in the trade of the world all that they needed for their own consumption, they are now producing a large quantity what they themselves consume. So

so the world trade in salt fish has gone down. Trade in the sense of trade, as between countries, but the market, the consumption of salt fish has remained unchanged.

Now in Newfoundland, at the moment, where eighty-five per cent of Canada's salt fish originates, production has been shifting steadily from salt fish to frozen fish. Forty years ago, we were exporting around 80,000 tons of salt fish a year. In 1968-69, perhaps even less, we were exporting around 20,000 tons.

MR. SMALLWOOD: About one-quarter.

MR. MALONEY: About one-quarter. There has been, Mr. Speaker, a gradual transition from curing by salt to the frozen fish industry and this is quite understandable because the frozen fish industry is relatively new in the Province, being not more than thirty years old and it has grown quite dramatically and with the advent of roads and ease of disposition, fish has tended to move into freezing as distinct from salting.

But, Sir, I think we have to remember in looking at the Province the major developments in frozen fish have tended to take place south of Cape Bonavista and a line drawn from Cape Bonavista to Port aux Basques. This is where the great development is taking place in the frozen fish industry and there is good, sound logic in that. North of Cape Bonavista, we have a development in frozen fish; in Twillingate, LaScie, Englee and in St. Anthony and perhaps one or two smaller seasonal operations. But they are seasonal for geographic reasons and, therefore, the development and the rapid growth has tended to take place in that part of the Province where all year round, operations are possible.

But, Sir, to carry that just a step further. The production of salt fish has consequently tended to move north. Not too many years ago, perhaps not more than ten, fifteen years ago, one of the major producing areas for salt fish in Newfoundland was in Placentia Bay. I believe, we have in the visitors' gallery today a man who spent pretty well all of his life time in the salt fish industry of the Province and who was a member also of the commission set up by this Government in 1963. I refer to Mr. Jim McCarthy, formerly of Red Island, Placentia Bay. Placentia Bay, not more than fifteen years ago produced more fish, salt fish, than perhaps any other bay in the Province

of Newfoundland. Well that is up to fifteen years ago. Quite a dramatic change has taken place there, because the great number of communities, of course, have been resettled and there has been quite a remarkable development in the frozen fish industry. So it has, Sir, tended to move north. The salt fish industry has tended to concentrate rather heavily say from Cape Bonavista - well perhaps farther south than that, Conception Bay, Trinity Bay, but rather heavily in the Northern Peninsula, in the White Bay and in the Straits' area, in southern Labrador, in the central Labrador coast and in northern Newfoundland.

The production has been running about 500,000 quintals a year and perhaps sixty per cent of this is north of Cape Freels. So this is brought about largely by the emphasis on frozen fish in the southern part of Newfoundland, where year round operations are possible.

I believe, Sir, that for many years to come in the settlements, in the towns and villages, fishing villages of the north, there will continue to be a salt fish industry and the introduction of this legislation, the passage of this legislation will, I hope, Sir, tend to improve the income of the fishermen who make their living in it and who will continue to make their living in it. The short-term objective of this legislation, Sir, as stated by the minister in the House at Ottawa is to improve and stabilize the returns to fishermen and to do this by maximizing, by getting the most in the market. This is in the short run and in the long run to get better returns by improving the quality of the product, and to gain, regain a place in the higher price markets of the world. Now it has been asked, I think, perhaps if not in this session of the House; it has been asked publicly that how can a corporation achieve better results than the traditional trade in the Province? That is a good question.

To this, Sir, I would say that with the credit of the people of Canada behind this industry, the corporation will have the opportunity to finance the collection, storing, marketing of fish, as it never has been financed before. This is not to detract from the traditional salt fish trade of the Province. All hon. members will know and some hon. members have been involved personally in the salt fish industry of the Province. They know the limited resources that the trade have to carry out this business

and as someone put it to me on one occasion, said that the salt fish merchants of Newfoundland down through the years, almost without exception, were broke at least once a year. What he meant I think was to say that they were over-extended, at least, once a year, and I think he meant that great amounts of credit had to be distributed, given out so the merchant in turn had to get all the credit that he could get from St. John's and from other suppliers and there is no question about it; it is beyond denial that the merchants of Newfoundland who have done a great job with the resources at their command were over-extended. Their credit was well over-extended in almost all cases, at least once a year. So as I say with the credit of the people of Canada behind this corporation, they will have an opportunity to finance with greater ease the collection, storing and marketing of fish.

The corporation will be in a position to hold fish of the market, for the same reason. Very often in the past, as hon. members will know, a fish merchant was obliged for the sheer force of limitation of credit to dispose of his fish he could not hold for the most advantageous market. He had to ship because either his suppliers or his bank, somebody was pushing it pretty hard, therefore, he could not enter the market at the most advantageous time.

The corporation is also enabled in the legislation to set the initial prices and these can be set, I believe, in such a way as to demand quality. They can offer premium for quality, premium prices. These things our fishermen are beginning to understand. These things will not happen overnight, Sir, but a start will be made with the institution of this corporation. There are other ways I

other ways I believe in which the corporation can improve the market returns, which I think hon. members will understand and certainly the fishermen will understand and that is, traditionally a fisherman who salts his catch will hold it until such time as he can get the best possible price. Fishermen have very often had fish cured to the right degree of cure and dried and was not satisfied with the price offered and made his own decision to hold on for another two or three weeks and I will wait for another buyer. And the result of that has been that, good quality fish has been very often held by the fishermen for weeks and for months in premises that were not suited to the holding of cured fish and by the time he closed the deal the quality had deteriorated.

Now, with the prices announced in advance by the corporation there would be no reason for the fishermen to hold his fish. In fact, there will be every reason to dispose of his fish once the fish is brought to a degree of cure and dried that that particular price demands. So for that reason fish can move out of the hands of fishermen and into stores where temperatures controlled and consequently there will be there a better opportunity of maintaining the quality.

There are efficiencies, no doubt, Sir, to be brought into the way in which fish is shipped to the market, in which it is collected from the fishermen and these are within the competence of the corporation, I suggest, to bring about.

There will be a new situation arise from this corporation and that is that the fishermen will, for the first time, have an idea in the spring of the year what price that they may expect for their catch. Up to the present time they have usually very little idea about what they will receive, except for a short period during the war when the fish was bought, I think, by the Combined Foods Board, certainly under their direction, and the prices were set. So this business of not knowing in the spring of the year what they will get for their fish, until the fall of the year, is, in my opinion, the reverse of what the situation should be.

The fishermen have been guided by rumor, in many cases, or by instinct, in the qualities of fish that he must try to produce. But under this legislation and under the corporation, the fishermen will know in advance before they commence fishing what they may expect to get for different grades of fish. These, of course, will be related, as they should be, to market



returns. Most hon. members will know that up to a year or so ago the high proportion of salt fish bought in Newfoundland from fishermen was bought on a tal qual basis. There was no specification of grade. The fishermen who produced top quality fish received no more for his fish than the fishermen who took very little care. So we can easily imagine the effect this had upon the quality if there was no incentive to produce a better quality of fish.

All our markets now, Sir, require a better grade of fish and all our markets are in a better position to pay prices for better quality fish. I think this is something that we should remember. And there is a reluctance Sir, in the market to accept the poor grades of fish even at reduced prices, because other food commodities are entering our traditional markets, the poultry producers are entering the Caribbean market and they are doing a bang up job and it behoves us if we are to continue to sell in the market, to think in a like manner.

Mr. Speaker, there are perhaps many other things that I could say about this Bill I look forward, I look upon it as a very very positive step. I look forward to it as an instrument to improve the incomes of our salt fishermen and when I recall that in 1963, at the fisheries conference, that this was one of the main recommendations to arise out of that great conference. It is unfortunate that it took so long, but we have it today, the Government of Canada and several other provinces are introducing legislation as I have the honour to do in this House today and I know that it will do much for the fishermen of the Province. Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in moving second reading of this Bill.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker to anyone that has had any connection whatsoever in the salt fish trade of this Province I think that this Bill comes as a great breaking of daylight, sunshine you might say, to an industry that has been plagued with all the troubles and tribulations known to mankind from the day of its commencement. As the hon. minister just mentioned I do not think there is any phase of business in Newfoundland that has been more subject to ups and downs over the year. In passing Mr. Speaker, I might say that I for one sincerely hope that the current rumours which are going about as who will be in charge of that board are proved to be actual fact. I know of no person better qualified or better suited to fill this job than the person who has been named. I shall not name him now of course, but ye all know who he is. It is

not often that we have an opportunity on this side of the House to pass a complement to a minister on the other side, but I have no hesitation in doing so on this particular instance. He knows the fish business inside out and upside down, has lived with it all his life, and quite apart from that he is an individual who has been trained in business, well experienced in the field, and I think has every qualification which it is possible to desire for this particular position.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in saying that I also offer to the people who take up this job my sincere sympathy because there is nothing of a more complicated and diverse nature than the salt codfish business. The quality of the produce which is the all essential ingredient to a successful marketing operation. It is something which takes all witted man to control properly. Salt fish as everybody knows is a very perishable article. Not only is it a perishable article but the market demands for the different qualities and grades and sizes are quite beyond the conception of the ordinary person who has had no experience in the business. We can go right from the point where salt codfish years ago was produced on the Labrador coast and known as Labrador slop, a detestible name, but what it meant to say was uncured fish. In other words bringing wet fish which came back from the Labrador coast in the holds of the schooners and then it is partly dried and shipped off to market.

This is one type of fish it went all the way up from that to the very hardest cured fish which at one time went to the Brazil markets where the moisture content was taken down to almost nil, and that fish was like a piece of board and had to be soaked for days before it could be eaten but it was of consistency and quality that could stand up under the most difficult and tropical conditions.

Now Mr. Speaker, I have been in most of the fish markets in the world one time and another selling this product, and I know the many many problems which can arise in giving our customers something really worthwhile eating or really fit to eat. Because from the time this fish is caught by the fishermen the time that finally gets on somebody's plate in Porto Rico, Jamaica, Brazil, Portugal, Spain, Greece or where have you, it can go through all varieties of climate, all varieties and difficulties and transportation but chief and mainly it can go through all the tribulations of trying to be prepared in a proper sanitary manner. Now no market

MR. EARLE: no matter how efficient it may be or how good it may be, will be successful combined with its marketing operation it does exert a tremendous control over the quality of the product which is being produced. The hon. minister said, the world consumption of salt fish has been fairly static over the years, that is correct. Unfortunately, he also says, a great<sup>part</sup> of the sales have been taken by our competitors, because they are catching their own fish. But, Newfoundland can still retain a large share of that market, at very good prices and at very good returns to the fishermen. If Newfoundland can produce an article which can be freely sold in these markets and as the minister has also said, markets are resisting poor quality. In all of the fish markets of the world today, we demand this for quality food. People all over the world are becoming modern. They are not prepared to accept something which is just slapped to them in any sort of condition, and consequently they are demanding a quality article particularly in a food product. And as I say no marketing organization that maybe created or devised by man can be truly successful unless it has a good product to market. And this is the first and essential step in which this organization must exert great control.

The very type of the fish products which were exported from this country in the past in themselves left a lot to be desired. Just to give you a slight idea of some of the complications of the trade. To begin with in size, it went all the way from extra large to large, to medium, to large small, small to tom trout. This was in about, I suppose as twenty or thirty different grades of fish. And each of these grades of fish had to be prepared for specific markets. For instance, New York Markets like the fairly soft uncured fish, for that particular trade. Whereas the Italian market likes a thin hard dried fish. The Spanish market likes a thick, hard dried fish. Portugal is rather inclined to take fish with more salt, and not quite so hard dried. Greece was a great market at one time for our Labrador fish which was sent there, the semi-wet fish. All of these complications enter into this problem of marketing good fish. And I used to think, when I visited the market years ago that to have to face up to a customer, and say you were selling him thirds, it was almost an admission of defeat before you entered into this premises. The very title of thirds, said it was a third grade fish. Whereas what you were trying to sell them was a food product. And it was not very good sales propaganda, to go out and offer somebody something called thirds, when you

MR. EARLE: are trying to sell him something for his dinner table.

in  
And I think we got off/the fish business over the years to a self-depreciation, a rather bigotry attitude on our own part to the product itself, we never built up a good reputation for it, because I think, over history it has been such a difficult business, that the trade itself felt that if there was something, if they could do something else they would be glad to do it, instead of sell fish, because certainly there were no real money in it. Over the years there was no consistent profit, and those who had any sense when they made a good profit in some years, they got out of it as fast as they could, and took their money and put it into something else. And that happened throughout the history of Newfoundland time after time, the unfortunate ones where those who hung on and hung on, and did not get out of that business because eventually they were knocked off one by one, and today you cannot see any of the great names that years ago were in the fish business. There are none of them left. Virtually none of them at all, because if they had kept on after that fate assured they were going out of that business, they were going to be forced out of it. Now coupled with this at the time of Confederation this whole process which we are talking about, today which is culminated in this Salt Fish Marketing Act goes back a lot further than 1963 or 1964. Because from the day we entered into Confederation, there were groups of trade people and fishermen going to Ottawa on various and many occasions trying with the help of various government officials in Ottawa to work out some of the solutions of the salt fish business. And there are all sorts of schemes proposed and talked about and discussed in these meetings, from marketing organizations through the catchers organization, control people, and inspection and what have you, all the way down the line of the production of fish, but never for some reason unknown to myself at the time, could we all seem to get our heads together. There was I think first of all, a great suspicion on the part of people in the mainland, who knew nothing about salt fish, particularly government officials. A great suspicion that this was a dying industry, that there was no future. The product itself was something which they could not quite get to their heads why anybody wanted to eat it. And it was something that was probably best, if it just took the natural course and disappeared. It was never recognized, I do not think in officials service as being an important industry, yet to Newfoundland throughout the years it was a very, very essential

MR. EARLE: part of our livelihood. But, that could not somehow or other be gotten across. Then on top of that apart from the internal competition in Newfoundland there was also the competition from mainland suppliers and this Mr. Speaker was even worse, and even more difficult for Newfoundland to handle, than was their own internal competition. Because although in 1949 when it became part of Canada, it was many, many years after that before the salt fish business was really part of Canada. All we did, we were thrown into laps of a greater and larger and more violent competitive situation. From those on the mainland who were handling this product, and many of those who were buying their supplies from our own fishermen, and what was happening that they came to Newfoundland and bought their supplies entered into the market and fought us tooth and nail. This situation was extremely unhealthy and I recall on one occasion, when I was Chairman of NAFEL, that is the much abused organization we have heard of over the years, when I was Chairman of NAFEL, I was in Ottawa on a delegation, discussing the problems to which today we hope we have found a solution. I remember the late C. D. Howe ; who at that time was Minister of Trade, saying to us as he left his office, if you can get the co-operation of the Maritimers, by that he meant at that time particularly Nova Scotia, we will have a marketing organization that will handle the sales of all Newfoundland salt fish. We came back and decided for months to get this co-operation, but it never came through. And I think, with all respect to the late Mr. Howe, he knew that it could not come true. Because here again, this was a strong suspicion and a truthful suspicion, I might say at the time, that this was only a merchants organization, and not a fishermen's organization.

But inspite of all that has been said about that, there were months and months, and years and years, of meeting among the trade here, which I sat in on hundreds of meetings, in which the discussions took place night after night and day after day, as to why the fishermen themselves could not be part and parcel of this, as a matter of fact, at one time I remember quite clearly that we had met as a trade and had agreed that we would try to call such a joint meeting and

MR. EARLE: And I then rang up a Minister of Government at that time and suggested to him that under Government sponsorship such a meeting be held. He was very enthusiastic. Incidentally that Minister is no longer a Minister of Government he is gone somewhere else. But at that time he was very enthusiastic that such a meeting be held and this was long before the 1960's. I went home to my lunch thinking that at last we had accomplished something, that we were going as a trade to cooperate with the Government and with the fishermen. At lunch time that day I got a call from that Minister and virtually what he said was forget it.

For political purposes the Government were not prepared to cooperate, and they did not want to see harmonious working between the fishermen, the trade and Government, This defeated it on that particular instance, and that particular time.

The NAFEL organization, I would like to have something to say about this in passing because I feel very strongly that over the years the people who were closely associated with the salt fish, the marketing of salt fish are those who are most experienced and can give the best advice to this organization, this new marketing organization. I hope most sincerely that the advice of these gentlemen is sought, and that they are asked to cooperate because, the marketing of salt fish is not something that a trade Commissioner say, resident in Jamaica or Puerto Rico or somewhere can just ring up a few friends and say "look boys, how about buying some salt fish." It just does not work that way, and I hope that the new marketing organization depends on something more, something far more efficient than just a trade commission or something of that sort in the markets. It will have to be done by experienced people who have dealt with these people over the years.

Newfoundland is not alone in the marketing of fish. This is obvious. They are suppliers in many, many other countries and they are aware and have been trained over the years, and they are experienced in the fish business to all the tricks of the trade. Now believe me there is nothing in the marketing of wheat in Canada, or any other product, butter, cheese, eggs or what have you that needs so much experience and so much knowledge as does the proper marketing of salt fish. Because, you are dealing with people of many nationalities, many different characteristics, and many different ways of doing business. I hope, sincerely hope, that the experienced men who have worked in this either in NAFEL or otherwise will be consulted and their experience used to the benefit of this organization.

The great criticism, it was always a great political criticism of NAFEL was the \$10,000 membership fee. This was always said to be something that barred the ordinary fisherman from getting into NAFEL, and it was laughed at and criticized to the point that this was a wealthy man's organization and that the fishermen did not stand a chance. Because, here were the almighty people of money controlling things to the detriment of the fishermen.

Now the true story behind that was this, that NAFEL when it was set up and started had no capital. It had members, some with money and a lot without any money, but it did want to form an organization. In order to have an organization that could function properly it needed capital. It asked all members to contribute \$10,000. as a membership fee. At that time I think there was something like thirty-five members joined and the total capital of the company was \$350,000. On today's standards that is not a very, very large capital amount.

One thing which I do not think either the fishermen or a lot of people who criticized NAFEL realized, what effect that had, because up to that point people would ship fish to the markets and they would wait months and months and months, and sometimes as long as one year to get paid for it. They waited for their money and they kept their creditors waiting and as the Minister just said, they were literally broke for a long, long time. When NAFEL set up this fund and held back certain amounts of the proceeds, it meant that those who shipped fish got paid just about the next day. Things were organized very well indeed, and the money came to the people who shipped fish immediately it was shipped. Although NAFEL itself may not have been paid for many, many months after that.

This meant that the money, the proceeds from the fish, went into the hands of the merchant, they were able to pay their own fishermen, and the fishermen themselves benefited because they did not have to wait. I could never understand why this membership fee was always criticized, and held up as being something scandalous. It provided the working capital for an efficient company. Now also there was a further safeguard in that and I saw it happen on one or two occasions. Groups of small merchants or people who were literally very close to fishermen, could themselves band together in a group and selecting one of them, perhaps a more prominent member as a person

to represent them, they could band together and get into NAFEL by putting up this money. There was no real barrier to it, there could be ten or twenty get together if they wanted to and come on in as a member. Nobody in my time in NAFEL, no official or officer of NAFEL, or any of the staff ever disagreed with such a procedure.

This thing was thrown completely out of context at the time. It was not just a bunch of money grabbers and people who had all the funds in the world trying to keep the others underfoot.

Mr. Speaker: I could go on for length having known the fish business from the time that the square-sterned Danish hardwood vessels came out with salt and *Spices* in the spring and waited all summer in our harbours to pick up the fish and take it back to market. I remember these days very clearly indeed. Right up to the time on one occasion my last experience in the fish business was that I exported in one single vessel from one port more fish in two days than was caught in that particular area which was a large fish producing area, I exported more on those two days in that one vessel than was caught for the whole season of 1968-69 in that area.

That is a pretty clear indication of how the fishery has shrunk. And how the salt fishery has diminished over the years. At that time Mr. Speaker, there were 200, 300, 400 men employed. Not at big salaries, but at comparable salaries in those days. Everything was comparable. Now we hear of great industries coming to Newfoundland at a cost of \$150 million which may employ 300 or 400 men. In those days, men without approaching Government for a cent, men who had everything at risk, and their day to day bread and butter was out on credit, employed 300 and 400 men and sometimes many more and managed to keep the settlements going. How was that done? It was done on this product called salt codfish, which I think is a product that has had more abuse, more said about it, and more said about the people who handled it than anything else in the history of Newfoundland.

I hope that this salt codfish marketing organization will result in the complete elimination of this downgrading or degrading of our own industry and will bring it up on a level so that, not only those who handle the fish, the exporters and so on, and those who handle it from the fishermen



but the fishermen themselves, can take pride in the fact, that at last they are part of a worthwhile, viable and very necessary industry.

MR. DAWE: I just want to refer a few words to this Bill in passing. My particular district has been very active in the fishing industry and I can say to the minister that the people of, particularly in Port de Grave are eagerly looking forward to the new functions of the Codfish Marketing Board, and they are particularly pleased by the emphasis that are going to be made on the quality of fish to be produced.

The people of Port de Grave have been down through the years, producing a very high quality fish and I am sure that they will be further encouraged to know that emphasis are going to be made in this regard. I would like to associate myself as well with the support of this Bill, knowing full well that the fishermen will be pleased to know that it is the intention of the Board to try as far as possible to indicate prices to be paid in advance of the fishing season. They have been looking forward to this for many years, and they look back to the days of Commission when they knew in advance just what they would receive for their fish.

I am sure the passage of this Bill and the setting of this Fish Marketing Board will further renew the confidence of the fishermen of Port de Grave with this ancient and local industry. They wish to.....

MR. DAWE:

wish to assure the minister, we wish to assure those who will be associated with this Fish Marketing Board that they will be most happy to work with them and co-operate with them fully to make sure that it will be the success that we all intend it to be. They have been very progressive at Port de Grave in adopting new methods in the inshore fishery. I think they were one of the first to adopt the long liner type boats, they are now adopting their own freezing facilities there to provide their own bait and a local fisherman of Port de Grave is investigating, at his own expense, the possibility of drying his own fish and this will add to his income.

So, Mr. Speaker, in these few remarks I wish to associate myself on behalf of the fishermen of Port de Grave my support for this Bill. Thank you!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words on this Salt Fish Marketing Act. Although I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, there are any fishermen in the district I represent at the moment, or at least not more than three or four, I am not speaking indeed with reference to my district, but anyone interested in Newfoundland must be interested in the fishery. Any politician, of course, must be interested in the fishery because, as it has been pointed out in this House earlier in the session, there are, I think, someone said, twenty-eight or thirty districts that are still intimately connected with the fishery in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker. This is a matter that I do not imagine the Government forgets. And I assume that anyone else who is interested in politics would not forget it either.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as this Bill is concerned it is welcomed by everyone, I think, in Newfoundland (at least I have not heard more than one dissenter, I think I have heard one dissenter) as being a great step forward. Well, Mr. Speaker, this legislation and the Salt Fish Marketing Board itself, of course, are as yet unproven. The Parliament of Canada and this House today are being asked to provide the machinery to set up the Salt Fish Marketing Corporation. The Parliament of Canada deals with matters of the export trade or in the provincial trade. This House deals with matters of intra-provincial trade in goods, I-N-T-R-A, Mr. Speaker, you know the word.

The Hon. Minister of Health has much to teach me, Mr. Speaker, and I am always an apt and willing pupil, at least willing anyway. We have much to learn on this side, Mr. Speaker, but we are not ashamed to admit it. There

MR. CROSSIE:

are certain members on the other side who have learned a lot this session, Mr. Speaker, but they have not admitted it yet. They are even starting to learn the rules over there, that fourteen is a quorum for example and that if fourteen are not in the Chambers she adjourns until 3:00 P.M. the next afternoon. They have learned that so well, Mr. Speaker, that they are going to amend the rules now if they can.

Now to get back to the point about this Bill, Mr. Speaker, this is creating a board. The Parliament of Canada is giving it certain powers. This Legislature is going to give it certain powers, matters within our provincial jurisdiction. But, Mr. Speaker, this only creates a Board. Whether or not this step forward is to be successful or not is going to depend upon the president or the managing agent of this Board and the directors and their staff. There is always a possibility of dismal failure if they are not on their toes, Mr. Speaker, and if they do not start immediately by taking the right approach. And one of the right approaches that those gentlemen are going to have to take is that this corporation is not to have anything whatsoever to do, Mr. Speaker, with politics, that it is not to be influenced in its decisions or actions at all by political consideration. That is the first decision they are going to have to make and I personally, Mr. Speaker, have no objection whatsoever to the Board being headed by a former politician as long as that politician remembers he is a former one and operates the Salt Fish Corporation in that way. I think that the Hon. Minister of Fisheries of Canada said that he saw no reason why politicians or retired politicians should not be on the Board and I agree with him. There are in politics able people. Just because one goes in politics, Mr. Speaker, does not mean to say that you are some kind of a low worm that could not exist if you were not in politics.

There are able men in politics in this Province as there are in every Province and I would say some very able men on both sides of this House, some misguided, others seeing things clearly and I will not even specify, Mr. Speaker, who is who but there are able men and the gentleman who has been mentioned as a possibility to be appointed president of this Board is one that I personally have a great deal of respect for and I feel that he is the kind of man who can do an excellent job with this Salt Marketing Corporation. But that gentleman or whoever the appointee is, Mr. Speaker, is going to have to remember

MR. CROSBIE:

That first of all he, and principally he, is going to have to get the confidence of the fishermen of Newfoundland. That is the first thing that he and the Board are going to have to do, is to get their confidence, show them that this is for real, show them that this Board is to be operated for their benefit, show them that political considerations have nothing to do with any decisions the Board makes. The right atmosphere has first to be established, Mr. Speaker, and I do not doubt that the gentleman that has been mentioned will do that and he will certainly have our support as long as he does, wherever that is required.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this Board is going to control what happens to the salt fish production of this Province, whether it is for sale, for export, to the Mainland or even if it is consumed within Newfoundland under the Bill that is now before the House. They are going to control it, they are going to have a tremendous amount of work to do once they are appointed because it is now almost the middle of April and they are not appointed yet. When the directors, the chairman, and the president are appointed they have to get staff, they have to decide who to hire, they have to put people out in the markets. Perhaps somebody is doing that now, some agency of the Government is already doing that, we hope so. They have to tell the fishermen what the price, what the starting price for fish is going to be for this year, give them a pretty quick indication of that. The season is getting well along. There are other problems I understand as to where fishermen are going to get their supplies, or how they get credit for supplies. I do not remember the hon. minister touching on that when he introduced the Bill but when he closes the debate I wonder if he would say a few words on how that is going to be handled this season, if he knows? The ordinary fisherman, how does he get credit this year for his fishery supplies, salt and the rest of it. All of these things are going to have to be done by the Board immediately and, Mr. Speaker, I do not have any expert knowledge in the fishery, never been engaged in the fish business although my family were and I can remember thirty odd years ago just before World War II being down in our premises on Water Street, at the time when we were Water

MR. CROSBIE:

Street merchants but not the retail kind of merchants, Mr. Speaker, the kind of merchants that did something to build up Newfoundland, that took chances that was not engaged in just buying and selling dry goods, being down and seeing thousands of quintals of fish in our warehouses being culled and graded and so on for sale for export.

But my family, Mr. Speaker, after World War II were never engaged in that business, or shortly thereafter anyway went out of the salt fish business, in the early fifties, so I am no expert at it. Mr. Speaker, my first real experience with it was when a Spanish fish buyer came to Newfoundland in 1965 looking to buy good quality salt fish here in Newfoundland. This was a small fish importer in Spain, Mr. Speaker, who was so desperate to get a decent quality of salt fish that he came to Newfoundland not speaking a word of English to try and buy salt fish. He happened to fall into the hands of a scoundrel, that is how I came to know him. I will explain that in a moment.

He fell into the hands of a scoundrel, Mr. Speaker, who attempted to take him to the cleaners; this particular individual speaking Spanish and supposed to be an Honourary Consul of Spain here in Newfoundland.

That is how I met the gentleman. He came to me for legal advice. He was afterwards vindicated. He was arrested under our laws as an absconding debtor, unjustly and untruly. He was put under arrest as he was to leave Newfoundland to go to Spain, as an absconding debtor, alleged to owe the Honourary Vice-Council of Spain some thirty odd thousand dollars.

We later took the matter to court and the client I speak of was completely vindicated and justified, Mr. Speaker. But the amazing thing about

anything about this. What struck me is amazing. Here was Newfoundland, supposed to have salt fish to sell, and here was a merchant coming to Newfoundland from Spain who could not speak a word of English, because he was so desperate to get a decent quality of salt fish for his business. That struck me as extremely peculiar. In any event, Mr. Speaker, because of the association I had with them, I tried to help them in that endeavour for two or three years, while he was buying fish here in Newfoundland, and my experience with that gentleman convinced me that the system under which we were operating and still are until this legislation becomes in effect was absolutely hopeless. The gentleman's name was Perez - he could not buy, Mr. Speaker, a quintal of decent quality light, salted, dried fish for Spain just about no matter what price he offered for it. It did not matter what price he offered for that kind of fish, he could not get it. Why not? Because the fishermen who had the good quality fish would say to him, "will you take the rest of my fish?" He would have a lot of other fish, which would not be the same high quality - Spanish cure. Because as the minister mentioned, we have the system of the "tal. qual." The fisherman would sell all his fish no matter how poor or how good it was, at the same price, and if they sold their good quality fish to Perez at a terrific price, the other merchants would not take the rest of their fish. He had a hard job to buy it and he had a tremendous number of difficulties. He was also in competition with NAFEL or with the agents that NAFEL had in Spain who did all they could to do him in, because he was over here raising the prices. That was my limited experience with the salt fish business, Mr. Speaker and that experience was enough to show that we would have no salt fish business left in Newfoundland in a few years time, if something was not done to change it and that is what this board is supposed to be setting out to do.

As the minister mentioned, you must establish a system of paying a much better price for the higher quality fish to encourage the fishermen to produce the higher quality fish. Then you have to help show them how to produce the higher quality fish. But you must give them enough incentive to make it worth his while or his families while to produce that quality of fish. Another experience, Mr. Speaker, that showed me how far back in the dark ages we were, I mentioned in this House, earlier this session, was an

experience in Labrador South where the fishermen of L'Anse au Loup, I think it was or it might have been L'Anse au Eclair, told me last summer and this was in August that they did not know what price they were going to be paid for their fish then; that they would not know until October; that they did not know what price they were paying for twine; they did not know what price they were paying for salt, they did not know what price they were paying for groceries down in Labrador South in August and that they would not know what those prices were until October or November, when the local merchant or whoever they dealt with would settle up with them. I mean I had heard of that certainly as being the system in Newfoundland fifty or hundred years ago, but I had not realized, Mr. Speaker, that it still remains true in certain parts of the Province. They were completely at the mercy of the people who were buying their salt fish and did not even know what prices they were being charged for the goods they were getting from them on credit during the season. Well you only need to state that, Mr. Speaker, to have proved immediately the need for a public salt fish development corporation that will change all this. We hope that that is what the corporation is going to do.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the corporation has to get the confidence of the fishermen as I have said, and I believe that the corporation has to treat fairly those who are left in the salt fish business, when it commences. It has to decide whose premises they are going to use in the future and whose premises they are not going to use. I have seen this question raised and I wonder, if the minister would deal with it. What will be the situation if there are certain premises now used in the salt fish industry or business that the board does not want to use, does not want to rent the premises and it does not want to use the people involved as their agents or in connection with any business of the board? If there are any such premises or facilities like that, what will happen to them, will there be any compensation paid the owners, if they had been actively used in the salt fish business up to the time the board takes over and so on? If the minister could give us some information on that, I would appreciate it.

I think the board has to treat those people who are left in the business, at the time the board starts, fairly in connection with their premises, or any use that the board may have with them or for them. That

being done, Mr. Speaker, that being done, then the board has been set up for the benefit of the fishermen of Newfoundland. I am forgetting other provinces, because we are concerned with the fishermen of Newfoundland. The board is going to have to remember that any unnecessary expenses or any unnecessary operating costs are going to reduce the income that the board has left at the end of the season, which I understand, are supposed to pay over to the fishermen as a supplement to the price that they announced at the beginning of the season. In other words, as I understand it, Mr. Speaker, the board sets a price at the start of the season. If the board sells the fish for a better price, the market is overseas and the board anticipated or its income is greater at the end of the season, the net profit the board does not require is to be paid to the fishermen as an increase in price at the end of the season. That being so, the fishermen of Newfoundland will be quite justified in not forgiving the salt cod fish development corporation, if it wastes one red cent; if it has one person on the payroll more than it should have; if it has one agent more than it should have; if it rents more premises than it should rent particularly for any wrong reasons, the fishermen of Newfoundland will be quite justified in taking that out on the salt fish development corporation, because, Mr. Speaker, it will be their money that the board would be wasting, if it does that.

The minister says that the purpose of this board is to improve the fishermen's income and his lot in life, and we all hope that this will be done. By the way, Mr. Speaker, I forgot, when I started, though I do not think I have been critical in any event to congratulate the Government on this step forward, and I think it is only fair to agree that the Government have been pressing this matter, as the minister mentioned since 1963, our Government and the present passage by the Federal parliament of this legislation, the Government can take credit for that. I am sure the Government had the pressure on for that to happen. I think we should also make note, Mr. Speaker, of the present Federal Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Jack Davis who as far as I can see is the first Federal Minister of Fisheries we ever had who has got very much on the ball or who ever did very much for Newfoundland or whoever concerned himself very much about Newfoundland, and he is certainly to be congratulated. In the seal fishery, he is dealing with an aroused, hysterical, world public opinion and the pressure on the minister is



terrific, the pressure on the Canadian Government is terrific, and I would say that Mr. Davis is standing up to tremendous pressure now just to prevent the whole thing being abolished one hundred per cent. So even, if he makes the odd slip with respect to the seal fishery, he can hardly be blamed, Mr. Speaker, I would say. Because there is nothing that can arouse the public more than the sight of some poor little animal getting banged on the head. We all remember, President Johnson, our former President Johnson, holding his Beagles up by the ears. Well I would say, Mr. Speaker, that is the real reason why he did not run again in 1968. It was not the Viet Nam War at all. He knew that when the dog lovers saw him holding his Beagles up by the ears, he had it. The same thing would apply to anyone of us, Mr. Speaker, who tried to run on the Mainland, if a picture was ever taken of us out hitting a seal pup on the head. We would not have a hope. Now, Newfoundland, I think, would still survive.

MR. MURPHY: None of the members on the other side would be cruel to each other.

MR. GROSBIE: I see some signs that there is a little chagrin occasionally on the other side of the House. I have not seen any waves yet. The hon. member will be relieved to know that I have not seen any waves going up and down in the air, but I have seen a few other things that sometimes can amuse one. But to get back to the subject of the Bill, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Speaker, I am sorry. I keep calling the hon. gentleman, Mr. Chairman. I also think that we should mention the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen, Mr. Speaker, who have a very active interest in this piece of legislation and Mr. Pat Antle

MR. CROSSBIE: Pat Antle who I understand has co-operated all along the way. He may be an obstacle in certain ways, but generally speaking apart from the personnel of a Director, the corporation, I understand the Federation of Fishermen has supported this legislation, Federally all the way. And I do not doubt, Mr. Speaker, that the federation will continue to as long as political influences are kept out of the new salt fish development corporation.

Well, whoever takes over this corporation then Mr. Speaker has a great job to do for Newfoundland, a lot will be expected of him, a lot of people will be watching him, the industry that was the main stay of this Province for some 400 years, will be in his hands. Which also brings me to something, which I will be interested to have the minister's comment on, and that is how this salt fish marketing corporation is going to relate to our fresh frozen fish industry. Now I know it has no control over it, the Bill says, salt fish. But they are going to be in competition, as I see it, fine fish, the fresh frozen fish industry is going to want our fishermen to sell their fish fresh to the fish plants. And the salt fish marketing corporation, of course I do not know whether it will want to or not, I would assume it would want the fishermen to salt their fish, particularly good quality salted fish. And hopefully one of course would be competing against the other, and it may have a good effect on prices that way.

I wonder would the minister comment as to whether the board will have to consider when it sets its prices at the start of the season, what the prices paid for fresh fish are? Because if the salt fish corporation sets them very much lower, of course they will get a lot less fish.

And Mr. Speaker, while on the subject of fresh frozen fish industry, the minister mentioned the great improvement that has come in the last two years, as a result of measures taken by the Government of Canada, and the Government of Newfoundland, and I remember very well when that crisis started in 1967, and the minister, Mr. Speaker, was very cool, and did not get flustered, and his approach to it, and should be congratulated for his efforts in that crisis, from 1967 to 1969. But, Mr. Speaker, I wonder, or what I suggest the Government should consider is some kind of a marketing arrangement for Newfoundland for fresh frozen fish also, I would not hesitate to do it, if the studies indicated to me, this is the best thing to do, but I was not thinking of nationalization at the moment, Mr. Speaker, I was thinking of this, that the Government, I will be interested in what the Minister of Health is thinking about, when he cares to disclose it, Mr. Speaker, on all subjects.

I realize, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Newfoundland cannot control the inter-provincial or the international export of our fresh frozen fish. But, the facts are that the Government of Newfoundland finances most of the fresh frozen fish companies, <sup>with</sup> three or four exceptions. Giving them loans or has guaranteed loans for them. And I wonder, Mr. Speaker, why we do not have some kind of a marketing organization, I am particularly interested in Newfoundland, in the marketing of fresh frozen fish? And if our Government took a firm stand on it, I cannot see any but the three companies with whom we have no financial connection at all, being able to object too much to it. It seems to me, that it would be much more sensible to have one association of The Newfoundland Fish Processors marketing all our fresh frozen fish up in the United States and elsewhere, the same as they have in Denmark, or Iceland, or Norway, in several of those countries, they had I think, two marketing associations, in one or two others they just have the one marketing association. And I think that we would be much better off in Newfoundland, if Newfoundland companies, when the crisis did come, we are not up cutting the prices on one another in the United States or elsewhere. But that is by the way. But I would like for the minister to say something on this subject of the relationship between this corporation and the fresh fish business, the competitive aspect when he replies, I would appreciate it Mr. Speaker.

In looking at the Bill, itself we are only on second reading, there are one or two questions that come to mind looking through it. I notice, Mr. Speaker, the Lieutenant Governor in Council has the right to recommend the names of persons for appointment as Director to serve on the Board of Directors of the Federal Salt Fish Marketing Corporation. I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, and perhaps the Government has already done this, that they not fail to recommend fishermen themselves. But, we have quite a few able fishermen enacted in the Federation of Fishermen or otherwise who are good speakers and knowledgeable that could be appointed to that corporation. And that that they should be represented on it, and no doubt the Government will have as much in mind when they recommend the names of persons under section 53.

There is a question that comes in mind with connection of the detention of fish under section 9, which we will deal with when we go into committee, but if an inspector seizes and retains cured fish, that he is given power to do under that section, if the person he seizes it from, is found to be innocent Mr. Speaker, but his fish has deteriorated or something has happened to it

Mr. Grosbie; while the Board has the fish, I wonder whether he is to be compensated in that event? It is something that should be considered.

There is an objectionable section, I think, Mr. Speaker, Section 18(c). Of course that will come before committee of the House. But the principle of it is objectionable. Under Section 18, which deals with regulations, the Lieutenant Governor in Council, Mr. Speaker, can exempt from the application of all or any of the provisions of this Act, either conditionally or unconditionally, and either in general terms or for a specified period any part of the Province, any transaction, person or class of transactions or persons, or any class of cured fish or any by-product of fish curing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that seems to be very broad, in other words we can pass this legislation, the Lieutenant Governor can completely gut the legislation by exempting generally all these matters from the operation of the Act. I think that the hon. Minister should explain why, such a tremendous delegation of power is necessary. And Section 23, Mr. Speaker, about conflict between the provisions of this Act, and other Acts, raises a question as to what do the drafters have in mind, is there some possibility that this Act is conflicting with other Provincial Legislation, because Section 23, I believe is unusual. So the minister might deal with those when he replies, or when the legislation goes through committee. But, to sum up, Mr. Chairman, we are certainly going to support this Legislation, we congratulate the Government for the steps they have taken to push this matter. And we are delighted to see that it is now going into effect, we regarded to the first step, a tremendous amount is going to depend upon the President and his Directors and the management of the new corporation. The eyes of the fishermen of Newfoundland will be on them in their task, whether this is successful or not, depends on them. They must establish the right atmosphere immediately. So that they are trusted by the fishermen, and the trade. Politics must not enter into it, they need an able President and staff. The man who has been mentioned, Mr. Speaker, as the possible President is acceptable to us, who know him, and who had the experience of working with him. If he gets that appointment we certainly wish him well, and if he does not get it then, we wish well who ever does get it.

so to sum up then, Mr. Speaker, alot of expectatien has been aroused and rightly so by the legislation. It is going to be up to these people, when they are appointed to realize it and we hope that they do.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, for twenty-six of our forty-one House of Assembly districts, this is one of the most important pieces of legislation ever to come before the House of Assembly in its long history; not the most important, but one of the most important pieces of legislation, twenty-six of the forty-one districts. These twenty-six are Labrador North and Labrador South, White Bay North and White Bay South, Green Bay, Twillingate, Fogo, Bonavista North and Bonavista South, Trinity North and Trinity South, Bay de Verde, Port-de-Grave, St. John's East, Ferryland, St. Mary's, Placentia East, Placentia West, Burin, Fortune Bay, Hermitage, Burgeo-LaPoile, Port au Port, Humber West, St. Barbe South and St. Barbe North, twenty-six.

But, Sir, if this legislation is terribly important to these twenty-six districts, it is important also, but not nearly so much directly, in a direct way to nine other districts; namely, Lewisporte, Harbour Grace, Carbonear, Hr. Main, St. John's North, St. John's South, St. John's East (Extern), St. Georges or Bell Island, then St. Georges. Now I am not absolutely certain, not being completely clear in my own mind as to the nature of the boundary separating the districts of St. John's East and St. John's East (Extern), as to which of these two has more fishing in it. I know that St. John's East (Extern) has some, Flatrock and so on, Loggy Bay, Outer Cove, Middle Cove, Torbay and down as far as Flatrock that is all in St. John's East (Extern). Not that there is a lot of fishing done in it now, but there is some. Bauline is in St. John's North; Fouch Cove and Bauline, St. Phillips, Broad Cove, these are in St. John's North. There is a little fishing done in Harbour Grace and a little fishing done in St. John's East (Extern). Very little done in Bell Island. Very little done in St. Georges. Very little done in Carbonear. Very little done in Hr. Main. Very little done in St. John's South or St. John's North and very little done in Lewisporte. It is rather extraordinary that in our Province today, there are nine different constituencies represented in this House where very little salt cod fishing is done anymore, on this Island of Newfoundland. It is quite extraordinary. But, Sir, if that is extraordinary

that there are nine where very little fishing is done, it is even more remarkable that there are six districts where none is done; namely Labrador West, Grand Falls, Gander, St. John's West, St. John's Centre and Humber East, six districts of our forty-one where salt cod fish is just not done, not carried on. That makes fifteen districts where either none is done or very little. Then again, I think, it is a very good indication of the sociological revolution that has occurred and continues to occur in this Province; nevertheless, Sir, there are twenty-six districts left in Newfoundland where fishing is of the utmost importance and for whom and to whom this legislation today is one of the most important pieces of lawmaking ever to come before this Chamber.

I am immensely proud of it and I take immense personal satisfaction out of it. I seem somehow in my life, in my public life to begin too early sometimes or what appears to be too early to get some reform brought about, or some important accomplishment or some vital development. It took eleven or twelve years to get Churchill Falls going. That is a long time. That is a long time in any man's life. It took how many years to get a third paper mill going, almost as many. It took how many years to get an oil refinery going, years and years and years. It has taken a good many years to reach today, to come to now, to come to this affair this afternoon where our Minister of Fisheries introduces legislation for what purpose? For the purpose of setting up a salt cod fish corporation, no. For the purpose of setting up a salt cod fish marketing board, no, because these are being set up by legislation of the Parliament of Canada. This legislation today is to complete the legislation of the Parliament of Canada, because without this legislation, the legislation of the Parliament of Canada would be wasted words, just a scrap of paper. The fact of the matter is that Fisheries under the constitution of Canada are under two jurisdictions, under the jurisdiction of the Parliament of Canada. The House of Commons and the Senate may make laws concerning the Fisheries of Canada and the legislatures of the provinces

may make laws with respect to the Fisheries. So it is a divided jurisdiction, both have authority, both can make laws, but they cannot both make the same laws. They cannot both make laws in the same way dealing with exactly the same matters.

In the constitution of Canada, fish in the water is entirely a Federal responsibility, Federal jurisdiction. "Fish qua Fish" is the term. Fish as fish, in the water is entirely authority, a Federal responsibility because, of course, Federal jurisdiction. That is why it is, that it is the Parliament of Canada that can pass laws to give the Government of Canada, the Canadian Minister of Fisheries the right to say where you may wish in the water? How you may fish? When you may fish? What kind of gear you may use? What size mesh it shall be and so on and so on, because fish as fish is a Federal matter, coming under the laws of the Parliament of Canada and carried out by the Government of Canada. Once that fish comes ashore, once it comes into dry land, it ceases to be the responsibility of the Parliament or the Government of Canada. It then comes under this House, if it is this Province. This House has the right to pass laws covering fish once the fish comes ashore, once it comes on dry land, because then it becomes property and property and <sup>in</sup> civil rights are Provincial jurisdiction .

Once that fish is packed and exported to another Province, it then enters inter-provincial trade; it comes under the Parliament of Canada again. Once it is exported out of Canada altogether and goes into foreign markets, again as foreign trade, it comes under the Parliament of Canada. So you see the history of the fish. In the water, it comes under the laws of Canada. On the dry land it comes under the laws of the House of Assembly and when it is exported out of the Province, it comes once again under the laws of Canada. So when the Parliament of Canada passes a law to set up a salt cod fish corporation, as they have done, and a law to set up a salt cod fish marketing board, as they have done, when they have done that, they have only gone so far. If they stop there or no one else moves, if that is all that is done, it is not worth

the paper that it is written on. That is why we must pass this legislation here today; to give the Minister of Fisheries of this Government, of the Government of Newfoundland this House is asked to give our Minister of Fisheries, Newfoundland's Minister of Fisheries authority to do certain things and what are these things? These things are in the first place to appoint that Federal board, that Federal salt cod fish corporation as the agent of the Newfoundland Government; to appoint the salt cod fish marketing board, the marketing board of the Newfoundland Government, although it is a Federal board.

Now this often happens, for example, Mr. Speaker, I will give you a good example. We



we have a fishermen's Loan Board of this Government, this Government set it up. This Government appointed it, under laws that this House of Assembly passed. And this Fishermen's Loan Board lends money to fishermen to buy boats and gear and engines and so on, and so on. The Government of Canada decided in their wisdom to get authority from the Parliament of Canada and they did get it, to lend money to fishermen for boats and engines and gear. But instead of the Government of Canada setting up a board to lend money to the fishermen in Newfoundland they appointed the Newfoundland Loan Board, Fisheries Loan Board, as their board, so the money that the Government of Canada lends to Newfoundland fishermen is lent to them through the Newfoundland board, appointed by the Newfoundland Government under authority of a law passed by this House.

Now in the same way exactly, under a law passed by the Parliament of Canada, the Government of Canada is setting up a marketing board for salt cod. And the Newfoundland Government, if this law passes this House, as I imagine it will the Newfoundland Government will then have authority to appoint the federal board to represent Newfoundland in the marketing of salt cod. That is what this Bill is all about today. You may say well if that is so, what about the Act already on our statute books, passed in Newfoundland, passed in this House some six years, was it six years ago 1964, 1963 or 1964, in anticipation of this very legislation that has just passed the Parliament of Canada, giving the Government of Canada the right to set up this marketing board. In anticipation of this very legislation that has just passed the Parliament of Canada, giving the Government of Canada the right to set up this marketing board.

In anticipation of that, that only came a few weeks ago. In anticipation six years before that was done this House was asked by this Government to pass a law along the same lines exactly as this very Bill that is before the House today. Well if that, if that were done, and it was done alright, and if it passed and became law, and it certainly did, it is on the statute books today. Why then is the Government asking the House to pass this Bill into law, because Sir, this Bill is really only an amplification of the statute that we passed some six years ago. The statute we passed some six years ago had to be passed

in anticipation of the federal Act which had not been passed six years ago, was not passed six weeks ago, it was only passed about six days ago. So we could not frame our Bill, our Law six years ago, to fit perfectly into the Canadian law which have just been passed. So the purpose of this present Bill is to improve on the law we passed six years ago and make it fit more precisely, to meet the changed situation.

Now one thing I like enormously about it, is the fact that the greatest injustice, and perhaps injustice is the wrong word because injustice presupposes that the one who is treated unjustly is treated by someone unjustly that the one who meets out the treatment to someone is deliberately being unjust. And this may be this is not a matter of justice at all it is just a matter of perhaps of misfortune. But the misfortune in our fishing industry has always been this: That a poor angishore came along to a merchant, a supply merchant in the spring of the year. A long winter has passed, the snow's are going, the ice is melting, the ice is coming out a bit more, it has been a long and miserable winter. Now this has gone on for hundreds of years. And the poor angishore comes along to the local merchant, to whom, to this local fisherman this merchant is almost God. He gives jobs, he gives supplies, therefore he gives life, he is almost the life-giver. And that merchant may himself be insolvent. He may be as broke as ever anyone was, he may be hanging on by his bare finger-nails. But the poor angishore of a fisherman comes to him and asks to be outfitted. Now if he is not outfitted on credit he perishes. He and his family go hungry. The only hope he has had on this earth has been to get some merchant to outfit him on credit. And do you think he would be so stupid, do you think that that fisherman would be so ignorant, so lacking in information as to ask that merchant whom he has now approached in fear and trembling, looking for an outfit to be grubstaked, to be outfitted for the season so they could catch a bit of fish. To ask him about the price of fish, well never was there so innocent a fisherman as that, in the spring of the year, to go raising such an awkward and embarrassing question as that. What price he is going to get for the fish

he may catch. God in Heaven what he wants is a bit of grub to eat and a bit of salt, and a bit of gasoline when the engines came, and a pair of rubber boots, and may be a suit of oilskins, and a bit of food to put in his home so he can get fishing.

Now he gets fishing, he brings the fish home, he makes it, his wife used to help him make it, his children used to help in years gone by, down through the centuries. And when it came up in the fall of the year, settling up time, there have been songs written about it, squaring up time, when he came up in the end of the year and the fishery was over and he delivered the last cod's tail, (what he had not sneaked out in the dark to some ----) Except for what he had shipped to those, in the fall of the year he shipped the last fish he had to the merchant and then settling up time came. Then for the first time, for the first time, he probably learned the price that he was to get for the fish that was the result of a summer's and fall's labour.

That went on for centuries, that is going on now, It went on last year, to some extent. But during the war when the combined Food Boards of the United States Government and the Canadian Government and the Newfoundland Government got together and more or less, commandeered all the food of North America and set prices on the different kinds of food, sugar and wheat and fish and what-have-you. Then for the first time, in almost 500 years of our history for the first time, a fisherman before he produced any fish, before he took a fish out of the water knew what he was going to get for that fish when he got it and cured it and delivered it to the merchant. It happened for a period of, I think, may be three years, there is an old-time fisherman sitting in the stranger's gallery and if he will nod, was it three years, was it two years, how many years did it last, where the fishermen were told in the spring what they were going to get? Three years? Three years? For three years in nearly 500 years it took a World War to do it. The fisherman were told what they were going to get. That is a savage situation, I said, I started out by saying a great injustice, but injustice presupposes that the merchants were deliberately withholding the information. They had it and would not give it. I do not think that was it. I do not think they had it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not think the merchants knew. Even after the merchants got organized in the NAFEL, which in its way was the greatest thing that ever happened in our history up to that time, to stabilize the marketing of fish. Even NAFEL would not know what they were going to realize on the fish in the markets, until well up late in the year, sometimes not until the following year. So knowing themselves even under the NAFEL system, they could not very well inform the fishermen. And before the NAFEL system, before that came in, the merchants had no more notion than the man in the moon, of what prices they were going to realize in the markets shipping the fish over to Oporto and Lisbon and Malaga and Alicante, and all over the Mediterranean to Italy to Greece to Malta, and down in the Caribbean and to Brazil, shipping it off on consignment. On consignment. Shipping it off no price, shipping it off to a broker, hoping the broker would get the best possible price for it. The semi-perishable article of food arriving in warm climates along the Mediterranean Coast. I have been up and down that coast, I know what the climate is like. I know a little about salt cod, and I know what had to happen. If a schooner load of fish two or three or four thousand quintals of fish were loaded in some Newfoundland ourport in Carbonear and shipped off to the Mediterranean unsold, consigned to a broker, calling in to Gibraltar on the way along and getting the latest orders from the owners of the fish back in Newfoundland. And telling them what seaport to go to. And going in that seaport and unloading that fish, consigned, unsold, consigned to a fish broker in that market, and then wondering what the claims were going to be because never was a cargo of fish shipped over there without claims being made against it for bad quality, whether the quality was good or bad, the claims were made in any case and what could you do when the fish was over there, when it was unloaded, when it was a semi-perishable article and when it was in a hot climate. And when they buyer made claims against the fish, the quality of it, what could you do except settle and get the best you could.

So perhaps the merchants are not to be blamed, but Sir whether they are or not, the fact is this, that this is one of the great reforms, because

the general manager, the president and general manager of the salt codfish marketing board, will come out with a price for each grade early in the season before the fish is caught at all. Now when he names that price and the fishermen deliver that fish they get that price. They may get more later on after the fish is sold and they realize on it, and the settling up is done in the markets, and if more money comes back that money goes to the fishermen. And so what the fishermen get in the first place when he delivers his fish to the board, before he delivers it he knows what he is going to get. There is a price declared and that is a public price, and everybody knows what it is and he receives that money, that is only a downpayment. And then if the market is all right and they do well in the market, then an additional payment will be made.

Well Mr. Speaker, this is nothing new about that, except for salt cod. This is the way wheat is done. This is exactly what happens to the wheat board, and this is why some of us in Newfoundland have ground our teeth in rage, and with a sense of burning injustice, to see why our fishermen were kept in ignorance, and maybe a necessary ignorance of what they were going to get for fish to see the wheat farmers of our same country. This country of ours Canada, to see the wheat farmers knowing exactly what they were going to get for their wheat. A certain downpayment so much a bushel, and then later on a second payment and maybe finally a third and final payment for their wheat. While all that same time our fishermen here were in complete ignorance, kept like little children to be seen and not heard. Do not raise rude and awkward and embarrassing questions about what price you are going to get for your fish. A very good reason because probably the merchants themselves did not know it. They were engaged mostly in a cut-throat competition where it was dog eat dog, and God take the hinder most.

Well that is the great reform. Apart from the matter of introducing into our salt fish industry modern merchandizing. They are not going to sell the fish, they are going to merchandize the fish. And anyone who knows

anything will tell you that there is a world of difference between getting out and peddling a thing, faring a thing and merchandizing it. Merchandizing connotes orderly marketing, orderly shipping, proper packaging, proper business-like modern merchandizing techniques. This is what the salt codfish board will be doing, and the fishermen will find it to be a great blessing.

There is some reference in the debate to the exceptions, the exemptions that the minister is authorized to authorize the board, to exempt certain types of fish from the working of this marketing scheme. Today Mr. Speaker, I was visited by three business men engaged in the business of packing and exporting salt codfish. And they have worked up a new trade. They cut the salt cod in steaks, I suppose you would call it. And I believe they are boned, very attractive looking and they are put in cellophane packages. They they are stapled together, and an attractive label is put on. On the one side in English, and on the reverse. They package it here and the label goes on like this. On this side it is in English, and on that side it is in Spanish, because that is where he ships it, the fish to Spanish-speaking country which is in the Caribbean. Bilingual codfish. Now that fish is a specialty. This merchant firm have shown enterprisa, initiative in getting up a nice article. It is on the Southern Shore.

The question is, would it be good or not for the marketing of that particular kind of fish, put up in that particular way, in that particular package, with that particular label on it. Would it be good or not for that fish to be marketed by the board? Or would it be better for those who put it up to be left to their own devices. I may say that the people who are doing it are not sure, which is the better thing to do, they are not sure. But that can be settled. It can be settled by discussion, by trial and error. They can try it, see if it works. Or they can try marketing it this year themselves as they did last year without the board. They may come to the board asking the board to come to their rescue. Leave it, leave the Act so that it may be exempted and put it on trial and error and see how it works. Now that is not only salt cod, but I understand and the minister

in closing the debate tonight may be able to tell us. Is it not true that other provinces, say for example the province of Quebec, is asking also to be allowed to exempt from the operation of the Act of the salt codfish marketing board, certain types of fish that they are putting up.

For example, I remember seeing in Quebec, down on the Gaspé Coast in the fishing sections, salt cod cut in steaks and put in little wooden boxes. A wooden box about ten inches or twelve inches long, one pound of salt cod say in a box, a little thin, thin board, the board is quite thin, about a foot long and about four inches wide, and about three inches deep. And the whole top of it slides, is one piece, and you can slide it. It slides in through two slots. That is put up

MR. SMALLWOOD: and they worked up a specially market for it in the United States. And they are happy with that market. You see the same fish in the supermarkets in Toronto. Now where someone either in Quebec or in Newfoundland or Nova Scotia, has worked up a specialized market for salt cod put up in a special kind of way, not the normal usual big quantities in hundred of thousands of quintals, but small quantities, half a million pounds even a million pounds. The Act should be so worded, as to give the Board the discretion as to whether they will insist on bringing those specializes into their operation. Or have the right to exempt it, and to accept it. Now just as the Board should have the right to accept and exempt certain packs of salt cod, so similarly there could very well be a reason, we do not see it at the moment, but there could be a reason for exempting a whole area, a bay, or a part of the bay for some reason, I do not know what the reason would be, I cannot imagine a good reason, yet, a good reason might come, notwithstanding the fact, that I cannot imagine it, or that any member of this House cannot imagine a good reason, there might nevertheless be a good reason to exempt a geographical section from the operation of the Act. And so the Board is given that right.

But, Sir, these rights given to the Board in this law, that passes into Law, these rights will be exercised by the Board in the right of the overall purpose of the Board. What is the overall purpose of the Board? The overall purpose of this Salt Codfish Marketing Board is to get greater returns for the primary producers. You do not have to be anti-merchants, You do not have to be a communist, you do not have to be a socialist, you do not have to be arrested, you just have to be an ordinary human being, to understand that the fishing industry does not exist. It was not put in the ocean by the Almighty for the sake of a few merchants. You got to be a communist to have that point of view. Primarily, basically, fundamentally the fishing industry exists for the men and the women who work in it. Now if you have merchants who make a contribution to it, God Bless them, if they



make a contribution. If they are not just filling their own pockets, if they are not lining their own pockets, and making their own families rich. If they are not doing just that, then God Bless them, if they are helping to develop the fishery and enabling fishermen to make a decent living, then God Bless them. They are doing a good thing. But the fishing industry exists primarily for the men and women engaged in it, including the merchants. And always the Board must function to fulfill its great basic purpose, the very thing that brought it into life, that gave it life, the thing that caused the Parliament of Canada, the House of Commons, the Senate to pass that law, and the thing is causing us here today to pass this into law.

Why is that great basic purpose? To help the fishermen, and God knows, down through the centuries the fishermen have had a rough time of it. This is not always the result of deliberate injustice, because I know merchants who had a rough time of it too. And the absolutely astounding thing is, I heard Sir William Coaker once in this House reel of the names (names now forgotten) the Dudors, the great names of Water Street, and the great names outside of St. John's, the great merchants class of Newfoundland I heard him reel of dozens of names, where are they now? Where are the snobs of yesterday? They all went broke, they all went insolvent, they were all washed down the drain. Yet, in their day, these were vast empires, industrial commercial empires. The Dudors at one time had more vessels in number than any other firm in the world. Not more tonnage, but if you were to count up all the vessels and schooners and boats that the Dudors had in Newfoundland, it came to a larger number than another shipping firm in the world, shipping or fishing firm, that Dudor Firm were a great commercial firm.

Mr. Speaker, there might be hon. members of this House who remember where the Dudor Building was. You know where the General Post Office is now, right straight across the street was this little narrow building, it could not have been more than twenty-five feet wide, and it was three stories, the third it went up in front, straight up and then it bent like a church and came up almost like a steeple, and the whole front of the building was concrete,

something like plastered concrete. The main floor was the office, the front office, and in behind it another office, it was only room for two offices. The floor above had three smaller offices, and then there was an attic, I know it well, because I worked in it for a couple of years, when I was part of that while I was doing the Book of Newfoundland, that was the office of Crosbie and Company. They inherited the office, and that is where Sir John Crosbie had his office, and that is where Chesley A. Crosbie had his office, and that is where I may say, I had my office, by courtesy of, I did not have any right to it, but Mr. Chesley Crosbie was backing me on the Book of Newfoundland, Volumes I and II, and he gave me the second floor, I had the whole second floor to myself up there. That was the Dudor Building. That was the headquarters, the head office of the greatest shipping empire in the world at that time, now that sounds ridiculous, because of course, remember it was before the days of the great steam ship, before the days of the great ocean liners, and I am not talking about tonnage, I am talking about numbers of vessels. Well, Sir that empire died, it disappeared. What was the name of the great firm, Slade's of Fogo, Slade's of Trinity, Slade's of Carbonear, the great Slade Firm died, gone name almost forgotten, except by a few of us who are deeply interested in Newfoundland History. And also I heard Coaker, reel of the names of those merchant firms that flourished and made millions and then lost every nickle and dies in proverty, so to speaker. A few of them were smart and cute and got out of Newfoundland before the collaspe, and went over to live in England, and took their fortunates with them, and did not stay all enough to lose them. But those who stayed went bankrupt.

MR. HODDER: The Manuals.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, the Manual's would be recent, fairly recent.

MR. HODDER: The Manuals owned twenty-one Labrador schooners.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twenty- one Labrador schooners, my grandfather owned four or five in Greenspond. And he was only a little fellow. They all disappeared

1905

MR. SMALLWOOD:

they all went broke, that is the kind of industry we have had in Newfoundland this salt codfishery, but Sir, I would have you remember this that when the merchants went broke, and he lost a hundred thousand, two hundred, a quarter of a million, half a million dollars, and later on when the figures got big enough, three quarters of a million, or \$3 million, what did Sam Harris lose in Grand Bank? Three million, \$4 million, \$1 million down the drain. You got in the later times, you are up in the bigger money.

Sir, when those merchants lost all that money, they always managed somehow or other to survive. They had enough food, and they had nice homes, and they had clothes, but the fishermen even while the firms flourished, and when the firms went broke, it made precious little difference to the fishermen in main, they suffered all the time and lived on a miserable, a miserable, they and their wives and children lived on a most miserable standard of living for long centuries.

May we all unite in this hope here today, may we unite in the hope that this legislation, supplementing as it is intended to do, the Legislation of the Parliament of Canada, to set up this Marketing Board, may we all unite no matter how we have disagreed on other things, may we unite in this, that at last after the centuries, the fishermen are going to emerge out of the darkness, out of the shadows into a little brighter day, than they have ever known in the past.

MR. SPEAKER: It is now 6:00 o'clock I do leave the Chair until 8:00 P.M.



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR**

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

---

**Volume 1**

**Number 33**

**4th. Session**

**34th. General Assembly**

---

# **VERBATIM REPORT**

**MONDAY, APRIL 13, 1970**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE**

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair:

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Speaker, before the debate resumes may I express a word of warm welcome to some fifteen members of the 1st. St. Bon's Scout Troup. They are in charge of Nick Murphy and Gary Healey and I just want to express a word of warm welcome to them here in the House of Assembly. I hope they enjoy their visit and come back to see us again.

MR. A.J.MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join with the hon. the Premier in having the Boy Scouts here tonight, the 1st. St. Bon's Scout Troup. I notice they have a Murphy in charge of them which is a very good augury indeed for a successful scout troupe. I am familiar with the group myself, and I certainly hope they will enjoy what is happening here this evening.

The weather is not too good outside, but inside I think it will be a little warmer.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to keep the House very long. I want to add my support to the Bill that is presently under debate, an Act respecting the marketing of salt fish. The purpose of the Act was very ably outlined in the principle, by the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. It is really an enabling piece of legislation to work in conjunction with the creation of the Salt Fish Marketing Board which is proposed by the Government of Canada and the Parliament of Canada.

The Bill I presume, and I would very much appreciate if the hon. the Minister of Fisheries in closing this debate would give an indication as to whether the purpose of this Act is to give a complete monopoly to the Salt Codfish Marketing Board insofar as the purchase and subsequent sales of salt cod in Newfoundland is concerned, and other species of fish which may be purchased and marketed by the Board.

Section, 6 (2) of the Act indicates that the intention may not be to create a complete monopoly, and the provisions later on in the Act for the exemption of certain areas of the Province from the scope of the Act, would indicate to me, but it is still only an indication that this is not the

intention. I do believe that some people in the Province fear, or are under the, with the understanding rather, that this will mean the end of the salt codfish trading as we know it in this Province, and the purchasing of all salt cod by this one agency.

Whether that is good or bad I do not know, but I presume that if at the beginning of the fishing season a minimum price for salt cod is announced that anyone who wishes to stay in the business other than this corporation will have to set at his, or hers, or its minimum price something that will equal at least that offered by the corporation. It might be a very good idea if some of the trading companies that have been in the salt cod business for a long time, and who had certain markets such as the one referred to today by the hon. the Premier in the Caribbean. I heard something about it, I think that the operator of that plant deserves a great deal of credit. He not only has come up with a product that appeals to the people in that particular island, or on that particular island in the south, but I am told that he has taken on himself the idea of paying the cost, or sharing the cost of advertising with supermarkets in that area and it has become a product which has received wide acceptance. Obviously it is not the type of product that is going to take the attention or much of the time of this corporation.

We should allow, and take advantage of any initiative that those who are skilled in the salt codfish business are prepared to show. Now I believe that the implication from this Act is, that whilst it is expected that a lot of the produce of the fishermen will go through this corporation, that any other person in Newfoundland if he is prepared to pay the price and to meet the same conditions, and rely on the inspection that is provided from this Act, will still be able to stay in business and compete in the markets, Otherwise, if we do not do that we are going to find ourselves maybe, in a rather awkward spot if we are competing with Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island producers on the east coast of Canada.

I would like too for the hon. minister to tell the House in closing where the Salt Codfish Marketing Act that was passed in 1964, and the Salt Codfish Marketing Board Act, that was passed at the same time, where that fits

in the scheme of things now that we have had, if and when this piece of legislation becomes law. Both these Bills or Acts Mr. Speaker, are subject to proclamation and as I read the second Act, it attempts or indicates that it would be creating a complete monopoly which appears to be somewhat contradictory to the present Act which we are now debating. Again I am sure that the minister can, and will in closing give us an indication as to whether this new piece of legislation will by implication repeal the other Acts, or whether it is the intention of the hon. minister to recommend that these Acts be proclaimed if they have not been proclaimed already.

Mr. Speaker: There was during the debate a great deal of discussion, or some discussion by the hon. minister as to how this piece of legislation will fit insofar as the frozen fish industry is concerned. We do have now, a frozen fish industry, a pretty viable operation. It would be folly and wrong for us to believe that the passing of this piece of legislation will end all the troubles insofar as the fishery is concerned. It is a step in the right direction. The frozen fish trades, and the frozen fish industry, and the deep sea fishermen are today enjoying I believe unprecedented prosperity. At the same time, if they are going to maintain that prosperity, and if the plants and the plant workers are going to get the type of employment, and the continuity of employment that that industry must provide, if it is going to keep its work force, and at the same time compete with other industries in this Province, then it is obvious that the productivity of these plants, and the draggers must be increased.

One of the ways to do that as I said earlier in this House, is to increase the number of modern draggers operating out of this port. The projection has been made Mr. Speaker, that twenty-seven new stern draggers will be, a minimum of twenty-seven new stern draggers will be required in the Province of Newfoundland within the next five years. Now that is a fair hunk of money. Draggers now are running somewhere in the vicinity of \$1 million to \$1.5 million in cost. The Government of Canada in its wisdom or otherwise, and I think otherwise, has seen fit to reduce the bounty on stern draggers or draggers generally to thirty-five per cent. We have in the district of

Placentia West, and my hon. friend's town of Marystown a good fish plant, or a good ship building plant rather. A plant that is capable, or was designed to be capable to produce one dragger a month. Now I think that that projection was quite unrealistic. Whether it is one dragger a month, or whether it is two draggers a year, or three or four, the simple fact is that that shipyard in Marystown with proper design, if it is prepared to keep abreast of the Dutch, and in particular the Dutch in the design of draggers and to a lesser degree those in the United Kingdom. If they are prepared to keep abreast of the ship building yards in Halifax, and Pictou and Fort Weller, Ontario and across the river from Quebec City.

If they are prepared to do that, and to change the design to meet the needs and demands of our deep sea fishermen, then there is no reason in the world why that ship plant in Marystown cannot get once again get back into the competitive business of building draggers.

Mr. Speaker: They will not do it, there is no way that they will do it unless there is some change in the present scheme of financing the acquisition of these draggers. Thirty-five per cent bounty by the Government of Canada is just not sufficient.

Now Mr. Speaker: We have had in answer to questions tabled in this House an indication of the losses that have been suffered in the past two years by the shipyard at Marystown. I believe Mr. Speaker, that these losses could be converted into profits. I believe that if Government will accept the principle that that shipyard cannot and must not be allowed to close, and if it will accept the principle that the shipyard has to not only increase the workload in that plant, but to maintain its work force and this is becoming vitally important Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend knows in the town of Marystown at this time. That



many skilled shipwrights, many of whom are trained at the expense of the Province in the vocational school at Burin and started on their apprenticeship in that yard, and who have since been compelled to leave or to hang around hoping that another job will come. Many of these men are moving away from Marystown and unless there can be some assurance and even two draggers a year would be sufficient assurance to retain the skilled men who were starting to be developed in Marystown. This, Mr. Speaker, can be done, if instead of accepting the principle of simply subsidizing the shipyard, that that same money was used to increase the bounty, to have the Government of Newfoundland increase the Federal Government Bounty to bring it up to say fifty to fifty-five per cent. Then you bring the draggers within the reach of the average fish plant in Newfoundland, and I know I am repeating myself, Mr. Speaker, but I think it has to be repeated time and time again. That at the present time, we have in this Province a demand and a need for a substantial number of new draggers. The logical place to have these draggers built is in Marystown, but if Marystown is not going to be competitive, if Marystown is going to be allowed to simply become a marine haul out, then this business either will not come to fruition at all or it will go elsewhere. If we are prepared and if the Government are prepared at this time to give an assurance of continuity of work in the shipyard at Marystown, we will solve two problems. We will provide employment in that shipyard and we will provide increased employment in the fish plant; particularly south of the area mentioned by my hon. friend the Minister of Fisheries.

The original work force, I believe, or the peak of the work force in Marystown went to 390 in that shipyard. It is now down ranging from fifty to one hundred. This, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely tragic. It is tragic because many people have committed their life savings to building a new home or homes in Marystown. It is tragic because we see a good plant going to waste and it is equally tragic because when we see the skills of

of Newfoundlanders not being used or whether they have been obliged to leave Marystown and move to say Churchill Falls or move to Mainland Canada to use their talents in other areas. So, Mr. Speaker, whilst everyone should be encouraged by the increase in the earning power of those who are employed with deep sea fishery in the frozen fish industry at this time, this is no time for complacency. This is not a time to sit back and say, well we have got the frozen fish industry taken care of, all we have to do now is do something to help the salt cod fishermen and we are home free. Nothing could be further from the truth, Mr. Speaker. The fact is that unless we can control the fish docks of our coast and unless we can provide additional ships, additional druggers, within two or three years the successor to my hon. friend the Minister of Fisheries, will have another problem, another crisis in the frozen fish industry.

It would be equally wrong, Mr. Speaker, to convey the impression to our salt cod fishermen in Newfoundland that the day that this Bill becomes law, their worries will be over. As I understand it, this piece of legislation enables the Government of Canada to set a floor price for salt cod at the beginning of the season. It enables the Government of Canada to use its good offices to develop markets or to maintain markets for salt cod that is produced in Canada but primarily in Eastern Canada. It also provides and will provide a great inducement for better quality fish. It will make it attractive for a fisherman to produce a higher  
of  
quality fish.

But one thing, Mr. Speaker, that it does not do and there has been no indication that it is intended to do this. It does not provide our salt cod fishermen with an assurance that in the event of a catch failure that he will be in any different position than he was last fall.

Mr. Speaker, there is where I think that the Government of Canada has not shown the same understanding, has not shown the same affection for East coast fishermen in Newfoundland that it has shown for other primary producers in this nation. If there is a crop failure in the province of

Saskatchewan, the farmer can look to Ottawa for some reimbursement, but if the Labrador fishermen gambles his earnings, gambles his money, gambles his boat and his equipment and goes to Labrador and finds that through no fault of his own, he draws a blank. When he comes back, he is met with a rather ludicrous statement from the Federal Minister of Fisheries that he can always go on Social Assistance.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the way to treat the primary producer in this Province. This is not the way to treat the Labrador fisherman of Newfoundland. This is not the way to convince our fishermen that there is great affection and great understanding for their needs.

Mr. Speaker, I said this before that I believe that regardless of where jurisdiction lies - it does not make any difference whether we are talking about fish as fish which falls within the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada, that when any segment of our population is faced with a Provincial disaster and make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, last year's Labrador Fishery and the year before was a Provincial disaster; that the Government of Newfoundland cannot shrug its shoulders and say, Fisheries is Federal. That is when the Government of Newfoundland has got to show its metal. That is when the Government of Newfoundland, regardless of party politics, regardless of whether there is one vote in it, has got to go to the seats of the mighty in Ottawa and say Canadian people are in dire need - Canadian people have suffered a tragedy. Newfoundland fishermen who are just as much Canadians as the wheat farmers in Saskatchewan. These fishermen, through no fault of their own have suffered tremendous loss, and we want you to do something to subsidize, to make unconditional grants to eliminate and eradicate that loss that they have suffered, through no fault of their own.

This Bill will not do that, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is not designed to do that, Mr. Speaker. This Bill is designed to assure a decent income for fishermen, salt cod fishermen who produce the fish and the fish of good quality. But, Mr. Speaker, we still have not faced up to the other problem. The real problem, the catch failure insurance scheme

that we must have. Now some of the experts in the Department of Fisheries in Ottawa and the Provincial Department of Fisheries will say that this involves a very heavy premium and many of our inshore fishermen and many of our Labrador fishermen, at the beginning of the voyage just cannot find the kind of money to pay that premium.

Well I can think of far less worthy schemes that have been subsidized by the Government of this Province than that. If we have to guarantee that the catch failure insurance premium would be paid, if we could ever persuade the Government of Canada, and they will not be persuaded, Mr. Speaker, simply by writing them a letter. They will not be persuaded by one or two speeches in the House of Commons every second or third year, when this crisis arise. They will only be persuaded, if the Government of Newfoundland uses its influence and makes its demands unequivocally and say on this, we do not compromise. All we ask is that this just society spread its benevolent wings as far East as Newfoundland.. We are still waiting to see them.

That, Mr. Speaker, will then give to our salt cod fishermen, our inshore fishermen the kind of assurance, the kind of confidence that I believe they are entitled to receive. Time is beginning to run out, insofar as this season is concerned, Mr. Speaker. Many of our inshore fishermen in particular our inshore fishermen are gambling the success of this year's voyage on the implementation of this program.

Mr. Speaker, some of our inshore fishermen already have their traps in the water and their gear in the water, and they have gone into this voyage with a great deal of skepticism. As of last week

MR. HICKMAN:

Mr. Speaker, in one of the larger inshore fishing areas in Newfoundland, which is South of my hon. friend's line, in the town of Lawn which is strictly an inshore fishing area. That fishery has now commenced and whereas in January and February of this year and even when this hon. House opened these inshore fishermen felt that by the time they started the voyage they would know what they were going to be paid this year for their fish. They would know whether they would this year for the first time in a long, long time have an option, the option to sell to the frozen fish plants at Fortune, Grand Bank, Burin and Marystown or whether it would be in their best interest to once again use the facility at Lawn to produce salt cod because they had hoped that by this time the floor price for their fish would be announced. But as of today the corporation has not been set up, as of today its officers have not been named and that, Mr. Speaker, will be the simplest thing in the world. That can be done by a stroke of the pen in Ottawa.

But after that has been done, then there is the acquisition of staff who know what they are doing, not just someone who comes in and says that I have been working in a particular branch of Government or I have been working somewhere else for ten years and I have a degree in a particular field, but people who understand grading, men who can go out and inspect fish. How many fish inspectors do we have in Newfoundland today, Mr. Speaker, who are not already working in frozen fish plants in Newfoundland in that same capacity because they cannot be taken out of these plants and put on salt cod, how many do we have? There is no point in taking a man and sticking a uniform on him and saying you are now a fish inspector, I give you a copy of this act and all the regulations, you have the right of entry into the premises of anyone in Newfoundland and you can inspect fish and you must assure that they have good quality. There is not much point in sending that man in if he does not know a tomcod from large maderia or whatever the market is demanding.

My concern, Mr. Speaker, is that unless we get moving on this, unless the machinery starts working to get this thing going now in the month of April that

MR. HICKMAN:

the impression will be conveyed to our fishermen that once again they are being led down the garden path and this cannot happen. Our fishermen have been fooled too often, they have had to bear the brunt of political manoeuvrings for generations in this Province and surely goodness this is the last clear chance that we have to put the salt cod fishery on a sound footing. This is the last clear chance we have to make it worth a fisherman's while to go in his boat and if we muff it this time, if we lose the confidence of the fishermen this time by May, June and July coming, what would happen say the first of June if there still had not been an announcement as to floor price? What would happen if on the first of August some fellow, and I do not say this disparagingly and I do not want to offend the hon. members from St. John's, but some fellow comes off New Gower Street in St. John's in a uniform and finds himself down at Port au Choix as a fish inspector and he does not know the difference between a tomcod and that sculpin that the hon. Minister of Mines put in that pamphlet that he circulated in connection with Bonne Bay? Do you think that that is going to restore the confidence of the fishermen? Because, Mr. Speaker, do not forget -

MR ROWE (W.N.) A silica sculpin.

MR HICKMAN: It will confirm one thing, that that sculpin obviously is not a west coast sculpin. But, Mr. Speaker, schemes have been tried before. I can remember as a small boy when the Commission of Government sent around this Island inspectors-from-tidewaiters done up in uniforms-to suddenly take a hold of this problem and cure it once and for all. But, to our regret, it was found that many of the people who were inspecting the fish did not know as much about it as the fishermen.

Now we can find inspectors, we can find men surely in Newfoundland who have the capabilities to become inspectors but all of this is going to take a bit of training. What happens to the inshore fishermen who now has his gear in the water and what would happen to the inshore fishermen who are going to start the voyage within the next month or six weeks? We are not

MR. HICKMAN:

talking about something that is supposed to happen in 1971, Mr. Speaker, We are talking about a program that has to be implemented in 1970 and in April of 1970 and many fishermen are becoming a little bit apprehensive, they are beginning to adopt a wait and see attitude, some of them. I have a very close friend who is very active in the Federation of Fishermen and he lives in my district. When I was talking to him the week before last, with a great deal of enthusiasm over this new scheme, his attitude was, well you know I have been an inshore fisherman for fifty years and he said, "my son, I have heard a lot of promises, and I have heard about a lot of things that have been going on in the Legislature. I can remember right back before Commission of Government and every two or three years it is the same thing; we have found the cure for all the ills of the fishermen." Now, he said, "I hope that this is it but he said, you will not think that I am being unreasonable if I adopt the attitude that I want to wait and see if this is going to work."

Now with every day that passes without an announcement of the appointment of the president of this organization, every day that passes without naming the Board and every day that passes without activity in finding the personnel to work for that corporation and every day that passes without an announcement of the floor price surely will only increase the apprehension of fishermen. And, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will not work without the absolute unqualified confidence and support of the fishermen of Newfoundland. It just will not work without it and the first job that my hon. friend will have to do when he becomes president of this corporation is to convince the fishermen of Newfoundland that this corporation, that this Federal Legislation, that this Federal Board is something in which they can place their confidence and that if they produce quality fish they will be able to earn a decent living which is something that they have not been able to do with any degree of regularity in the past.

Mr. Speaker, one other little problem that I would certainly like to hear

MR. HICKMAN:

From the hon. minister in closing is when this Act becomes law and when the corporation is created this month, because if you create it in May do not waste your time trying to tell the fishermen in Newfoundland that it is going to work in 1970, but when it all starts operating in April and let us assume that the corporation starts buying fish in April or May, in certain areas of the Province it may not experience too much difficulty in warehousing and handling this fish, but what are the plans of the Government of Canada in certain areas like the area of the district that I represent which is not really an inshore fishing area but where we have pockets of inshore fishermen with not too much warehousing capacity, in fact very little of any because they have been selling a great deal of their products to the frozen fish plant right off the knife. Again one of the problems, I believe, that has to be overcome if you are going to have quality in the fish is ready warehousing almost as soon as it comes out of the water and is salted.

MR. ROBERTS: How far is it from Burin to Grand Bank?

MR. HICKMAN: It is about forty-five miles by the present road, seven miles by the road for which tenders were called in 1966.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. gentleman was in the Government.

MR. HICKMAN: I was in the Government and it is not the fault of the Government in Newfoundland that that did not go ahead.

MR. ROBERTS: I am glad that that is on the records.

MR. HICKMAN: It is. It does point up though very clearly the need of absolute confidence on the part of the Government of Canada in the Government of this Province and the absolute necessity for a complete and frank liaison between any two Departments of Fisheries. And as my hon. friend, well anyway, to get back to the point, there is not sufficient storage on the Burin Peninsula to take care of the salt cod production from the Lawn area and again from Placentia West, in the, as my hon. friend knows, in Port Elizabeth around the banks of Port Elizabeth. Now what I would like to know, this is one of the questions that I would like to hear answered by the hon. the Minister of



April 13th, 1970

Tape 434

JM - 5

MR. HICKMAN:

Fisheries, what are the plans? Because if the people of Lawn start landing fish next week, which they will, are they going to be able to avail of the alleged benefits that come under this, that will flow from this Legislation? Because if they are going -

MR. HICKMAN: Because if they are going to, then the Hon. the Minister of Fisheries has to be able to tell us where the fish from Port Elizabeth in Placentia West, or some of the fish that will be caught in Hermitage, will be warehoused in the meantime. The same ~~problem~~ will not exist on Northeast coast where they have concentrated almost entirely on the salt cod fishery, and where you still have three to four weeks leeway in which to make plans. But Mr. Speaker, all of this points at one thing that we have lost as I see it, two very valuable months as far as 1970 is concerned in getting this program implemented. And if we are going to have the confidence in this program then we must have, on the part of the fishermen, we are not going to get it by further procrastination. We are not going to get it by cute little announcements from Ottawa and little innuendos and suggestions as to what may happen, or any great and glowing promises or comparisons with the past.

This will not make this thing work Mr. Speaker. What will make it work is if before this month comes to a close, a viable non-political corporation can say to the fishermen of Newfoundland, here is your floor price, here is what you will get for high quality fish and the different grades. Then you can make up your own minds as to what you are going to do with your fish. And this is why time is of the essence Mr. Speaker, and this is why I suggest that the fishermen of this Province are adopting or a wait-and-see attitude to see what is going to happen when this comes in.

Now Mr. Speaker, this may be the last opportunity that we will have to participate in a debate on a Bill that is introduced by the hon. the Minister of Fisheries. Last Fall and on many occasions before I said, and I have no hesitancy in repeating it, that I think that our Minister of Fisheries is the outstanding Provincial Minister of Fisheries in Canada today.

<sup>is</sup>  
And it with a great deal of regret when I hear that people make utterances that the political activities or the fact that a man is in public life should mitigate against him. There can only be one criteria in making an appointment of this magnitude. And that is would you have

appointed a particular person if he was not in public life? And if the answer is "yes" then that should not handicap him. Mr. Speaker, I am convinced that once this Corporation is set up, that particularly as it is a Federal institution, that it will be free from political interference. No matter who the president is, he will be in his legislative rights if receives a telephone call from any hon. member of this House. From the hon. the Premier to the most junior backbencher. And if he does not like particularly what is being said, he can hang up on him, because this House will have no jurisdiction over him. This House will have nothing to do with it. He will have all the protection and all the independence that Federal Civil Servants enjoy and I believe that all public servants anywhere in Canada are entitled to enjoy. So that I do not fear at all, that if it should come to fruition what so many of us expect, that my close friend on the opposite side of the House, will do anything but an excellent job, and that he working with Dr. Weeks, who has already been announced as an officer of that Corporation, will do a great deal to improve the rather unfortunate lack of liason that exists between St. John's and Ottawa.

Mr. Speaker, if you need an example of that. The Atlantic Development Board with all its grandiose concepts, will all its excellent ideas is proof positive what can happen when it starts to lose confidence in its particular area, or in a particular department, or in a particular government. Many of the plans that are slowly coming to fruition now have been on the drawing board for two or three years. This road that I speak of, this access road on the Southcoast, somehow or other lost the enthusiasm of the Atlantic Development Board. My hon. friend in introducing this Bill talked of the water systems that have been installed or assistance that has been given by the Atlantic Development Board to enable the establishment of the Fish Plants. But for the last year and a half, it has been like pulling teeth. Survey after survey, visit and my hon. friend, he suffered from this more than anyone in this House. And he knows the frustrations of a reluctant Ottawa when they want to be reluctant. They have allowed the quality of the

fish to be on the verge of deterioration while they try and make up their minds whether they can take another chance or not on this Province.

They have allowed the security of at least one municipality, the protection of one municipality to hang in the balance while they still talk. They can talk themselves blue in the face when they do not want to co-operate. But if they have confidence in their provincial counterpart, they can do it in a week. But if they have not Mr. Speaker, and we have seen a great deal of this of recent months and years with the Atlantic Development Board.

Now I believe that the hon. the Minister of Fisheries and Dr. Weeks and people with not only a knowledge of this industry, but people who are prepared to plan, it is a dreadful word, but the word plan Mr. Speaker, is still in the dictionary of some of us. But people who are prepared to plan and go to Ottawa and say to Ottawa, "here is the research that we have done, here is what our experts indicate to us must be done." That they will find that this Board, the Corporation will function. But if, Mr. Speaker, we should dare to take the other attitude, and that when requests come from Ottawa we say that is nonsense you do not know what you are talking about, we are going to do it our way, or it will not be done at all. It just will not be done.

And there is no province in Canada that should have learned its lesson by now as much as the Province of Newfoundland. It is very well to stand in this House and talk about the great benefits of Confederation, but what is equally relevant Mr. Speaker, is the many many benefits of Confederation that are passing us by, and are passing us by because we have not the wit to comply with some of the simple reasonable requests that emanate from Ottawa. And this Bill, this piece of legislation Mr. Speaker, can only work if there is absolute disclosure between the provincial Department of Fisheries and the Federal Department of Fisheries, and not if we stand in this House—can you imagine standing in this House saying Aha, we have taught that crowd in Ottawa what to do. It is all our idea, they have not a brain at all. We taught them, we showed them what to do, and now they are going to do it, it took us five years to hammer it into their heads. That is not the way to get this thing off on a good footing Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: There is only one way to get it going, and my hon. friend who has been talking about silica now for three years, until it is running out of his ears, should have learned by now, that is not the way you get national parks going, that is not the way you get Federal/Provincial Housing Developments going in Newfoundland, that will not be the way you will get a good grand fisheries scheme that is weighed in its concept, sound in its concept, and with the fishermen will work, if we have sense enough in this Province to work in conjunction with Ottawa, and not treat fishermen in Newfoundland as a political football. That has been the history in the past, this is the time to break it. I do not believe that because anything has been going on for ten years or fifteen years or twenty years, or a 138 years, that it is not necessary to change the concept, to change the philosophy, and to change the approach, and we desperately need in this Province a change of approach, Mr. Speaker. And I believe with that change of approach, then we will see that this legislation when it becomes law, this enabling legislation and that is all it is an enabling legislation, will pave the way for the Government of Canada to assure the fishermen of Newfoundland, if they catch their fish, and if they have the quality addition income, but Mr. Speaker, do not ever let any fishermen be misled into thinking if we have another disaster, like we had on Labrador, that this piece of legislation will happen, it will not.

Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to support this legislation. I would hope that there will be something more to support than just the enthusiastic ~~thumping~~ of desks in this House, when it becomes law. I would hope that we would see a great deal more than that. I would hope that we will see that the fishermen of this Province in April of 1970, see certain actions culminate which will give them confidence in this piece of legislation, confidence in those who are going to look after their well-being, and confidence that this will be once again a thriving growing industry. And if you cannot thrive a growing Newfoundland, then what else is going to thrive or grow here.

It does not make me very proud as a Newfoundland, to read this, that the

largest frozen fish plant in eastern Canada is in Lunenburg. It does not make me to proud as a Newfoundland to learn that a high percentage of the dragger fishermen out of Nova Scotia are Newfoundlanders. They are not Nova Scotians of choice, they have not left Newfoundland because they wanted to. They are not going up to Lunenburg in Febraury and staying there until November and leaving their families at home, because they like it. They are going there becuaese this Province has yet to recognize the great natural resources at our doorsteps. That we have advocated in favour of Nova Scotians. It does ~~not~~ make me very proud when I go through a fish plant in Halifax, and find that the majority of plant workers are from the southcoast of Newfoundland, and there is hardly one there, that is not yearning to go back to Burgeo or Ramea or Marystown, or Burin or Fortune or Grand Bank. But, he cannot go back, because there is not a continuity of employment that he can find up there. And there is not a continuity of employment because we have not got a large number of draggers, that we need. There is not a continuity of employment in the Salt Cod Fish Industry, because we have not used the same care, we have not exploited it to the same degree as our friends in Nova Scotia have done.

This is why I say, this Bill is the last clear chance to save the Salt Cod Fish Industry of Newfoundland. And we cannot muff this one. I am very happy to suuport this legislation, Mr. Speaker.

MR. A. WORNELL: I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Burin, I think he made a very fluent speech, and I think he would be a good candidate Sir for the replacement of the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, who may retire soon. And I am sure when the hon. member for Burin becomes the Minister of Fisheries, I hope that he will lose no time in implementing all the proposals he has made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is a good Bill, "An Act Réspecting The Marketing Of Salt Fish." I am sure everyone in this hon. House must approve of it, and anyone who knows anything at all about the salt fish trade, will say that it is perhaps twenty years over due. Now we have heard references made

MR. WORNELE: to the good jobs done by NAFEL over the years. The hon. member for Fortune who had very close association with NAFEL over the years. He was one time the Chairman of it. He has told us of some of the good offices performed by that association.

And, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the good offices of NAFEL, the better part of NAFEL may or should be retained by this Marketing Board. Now the fishermen are the primary producers in Newfoundland. And to my mind Sir, they should of had better attention from the past governments, both Federally and Provincially. Now I realize that this Government brought in an Act in 1963, an Act which was virtually the forerunner of this present Federal Act. And whether the Opposition members wish to decry the efforts of the Government at that time or not, I do not know. But some elusion was cast a few minutes ago by the member for Burin, and I think it might have been an effort to belittle that Act. But, I feel Mr. Speaker; that the Federal Government have been dragging its heels for seven years. And I believe, that it is only true indefatigable efforts of our present Minister of Fisheries, that we now see this Federal Act coming into fruition.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I intend to limit my remarks to the principle to this Bill. I said that the hon. member for Burin made some very good points, I am sure that it was probably one of the fluent speeches that he has made in this House. And, I think, that he perhaps is well briefed on this subject, because he comes from a district which had actually grown and owes its prosperity to the saif cod fish trade.

And the hon. member mentioned catch failure, and that is something that I think this Government should give some attention to, I do not think that it is relevant to this particular Act. Because in one breath he mentioned this Act as an enabling measure, and yet in other moments, he goes on to try and include something which to my is a bit ultravies or irrelevant.

Now I also agree with him that time is of the utmost importance. I believe that both the trade and the fishermen, and by the trade I mean, the suppliers, the trade and the fishermen are very anxious, Mr. Speaker, that this

Act come into effect. And I think the sooner, that the Federal Government or the Federal Minister of Fisheries appoints a Chairman, and that Chairman proceeds to get the Board constituted the better for this Salt Cod Fish Marketing Act.

Now my hon. friend the member for Fortune and also the member for Burin, I think said something about having knowledgeable officials, and employees used in dealing with the fishermen. That Sir, I think, is very important thing, most important. I find Sir that a lot of young people today leaving University with all their good points, they lack one very basic essential, that is that they have never caught a cod fish. They have never seen a cod fish salted, and perhaps they would not know a cod fish from a ling or a haddock.

I remember in my young days it was part of our summer vacation to go out on the fishing grounds with our uncles, and fathers, if our fathers were fishermen, and jig a few



MR. A. WORNELL: Fish. And I remember the first summer vacation I spent that way. I cut tails with my brother. My brother got terribly seasick I remember, he was older than I was, but he got terribly seasick. I used to like that, because I thought that he would tow the fish you see. Anyway I used to catch fish while he was very busy getting seasick. I used to jig fish and haul them up I remember we used to cut the tails.

The first summer I got something like sixty-seven cents as my share of the fish, after we made fish and sold it to the dealer in the fall. So I know something about jigging fish, hauling a cod-net, I have helped to haul a trawl, and helped to haul a codtrap. I feel that when I am speaking to a fisherman even though I have very hazy memories of these days, I know something about the hardships which the fisherman goes through.

Someone in the National Convention was credited with saying that the future of the fisheries lies in the past. I do not know whether he said lies in the past, or if he said that we should learn from the past. Anyway I feel that if there were any mistakes made in the past these mistakes should be corrected if at all possible, and that we should try and reclaim what ever markets are still available. What ever markets still remain for salt fish Newfoundland should get its share. Not only its fair share, but I would say the lion's share.

Now there are three good things about this Bill Mr. Speaker. The first one is that the fishermen will be assured of a floor price on his catch. The second, is that he will be assured of ready marketability of his catch. And the third one, I would point out is this, that there are inshore fishermen who are selling to the fresh fish plants. Sometimes the fresh fish plants have to close down through probably a breakdown in machinery, a strike, or through weakening markets. In such cases the inshore fisherman had to stay ashore, probably take in their gear. They could not sell their fresh fish. Now they will have the other alternative. They will be able to salt their fish and find a ready market for it. That is another good point.

Now Sir, I shall have other things to say when this Bill comes to

committee stage, but for the present I wish to give my support to this Bill and in so doing I wish to congratulate the Minister of Fisheries for his great work in bringing this Bill before the House.

MR. A. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, it give me great pleasure to rise at this time in support of the Bill presently under debate. If this Bill becomes law, it will at long last give the salt fish segment of the industry something very tangible, and great stability will prevail because of it. This administration ever since it has been in office has been advocating such legislation and more especially since 1963 when the fisheries conference was held.

Now that we are about to enjoy the privileges which this legislation will provide, I think we should take a very close look where necessary to make sure that our fishermen will fully embrace the full benefits of this Act. First of all we must be prepared to come up with good quality fish. I think this is going to be paramount. I think the terms of reference if I may call them as such are going to be laid down, so that is one stipulation that is going to have to be followed, that we here in Newfoundland or in any Provinces that are going to participate in the benefits of this legislation will have to produce good quality fish. In fact, as good as can possibly be made.

Now at the present time there is nothing to prevent a fisherman when he lands his catches of fish to split it and dress it, salt it in his stage. As everybody knows in this particular day and age that does not lead to making a good quality food product. There is some talk in connection with this new legislation that there are going to be certain plants around Newfoundland that will possibly become redundant. No doubt there are centres in Newfoundland where more than one plant exists, more than one salt plant exists, and the likelihood is that possibly one of those plants may become classed as redundant and they may have to close its doors.

I think in closely at this Bill, we should have a very broad concept of just what benefits this Province is going to derive from it. First of all in my opinion, we should maximize on the catching of fish. What I mean by that is that our fishermen who places his traps in the water, or places his

trawls in the water, his job should be the catching of fish. As everybody knows any fisherman who is fortunate enough to come up with fifteen or twenty tons of fish in one day, and that is not unusual in the heavy trap season he has a bit of a problem on his hands if he cannot find a market for his fish in a fresh state. If he has to salt that fish, it takes quite an effort. Now then, if facilities existed on shore where plants were fresh fish plants as such, which were turning the fresh fish into a frozen form were overtaxed, that fish could be taken and split and put under salt. This should be done by a shore crew located in plantations. It does not necessarily have to be the crew of the fisherman. As I said earlier his job should be the catching of fish, and the more fish he catches the more money he is going to make. That is obvious. In other words, the situation which exists at the moment and I think at this particular point in time we should take a very close look at it.

It applies insofar as the Unemployment Insurance Act applies in respect of our fishing industry. I do not know if every hon. member of this House is fully familiar with the way this Act works. I think perhaps you do, it has been around now ever since 1958, so possibly everyone is pretty conversive with it. But I will say this, that ever since its inception in 1958 the plants engaged in the buying of fresh fish for the inshore fishermen have come off second best. They have plenty of fish to handle in the heavy trapping season that is obvious. The fisherman has a lot of fish to offer so he goes to the nearest place where he can dispose of it. That happens to be to the fresh fish plants. Once these traps are taken from the water, it is not in the fisherman's best interest, and please remember this, it is not in the fisherman's best interest to sell his fish in a fresh state.

If he wants to qualify for Unemployment Insurance Benefits the coming winter he has to put some of his fish on salt. A fair quantity of fish possibly on the salt. He has to come up with fifteen or eighteen weeks contribution in order to qualify. Now I contend that that should not be so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman would allow me. He has to come up with eighteen weeks did the hon. gentleman say? Is his entitlement to unemployment insurance based on time or on value of fish?

MR. MOORES: Well Mr. Speaker, the fishermen and I will elaborate on this

just a little, a fisherman who elects to sell his fish fresh during a week if he is successful, and he could very well be in the month of July, in the heavy trapping season he can in one day qualify for the maximum stamp in that week. All he has to land is somewhere between \$200. and \$250. worth of fish and sell it fresh. He then qualifies for the maximum benefit. Now the balance of the fish which he sells during that week is not taken into consideration, there is no value placed on it from the stand point of insurance, no whatsoever.

Let us say that he enjoys four or five weeks of heavy fishing. He sells his fish in a fresh state and maximizes stamps. The minute that he can cope with this fish himself, and the splitting of fish it is in his best interest to salt it.

To answer the question of the hon. the Premier, when he completes his fishing season, or it could be during the fishing season, when he takes his salt fish to market. When the Unemployment Insurance stamps are affixed in the books of the fishermen the law states that the day on which you sell your fish that is the period. That is the deciding factor. The stamp was placed in the book for that particular week and you go back, you go back to the previous week, and the previous week, and the previous week and finally the fishermen has it figured out that he will salt, he has to come up with a certain tonnage of fish under salt in order to get the full quantity of stamps. In other words it is taken and divided all the way through. Any week the fisherman sells his fish fresh, the salt fish merchant, or as far as the Act is concerned the fisherman does not have to affix a stamp in that week. He just skips over that and keeps going back.

In other words the salt fish segment of the industry is in a very much stronger position than the counterpart in the fresh fish industry in respect of unemployment insurance. Now in my opinion .....

in my opinion it is not too difficult a problem to cope with this situation. Our fishermen, he has to, as I mentioned earlier, he has to consider the coming winter, and by doing that he decides to salt a certain quantity of his fish. It does not make any difference about the price of fish, the price of fresh fish, I saw it happen, last fall in operation.

It was not a question of the price of fish, the fact that if we sold the fish fresh he would not qualify for unemployment insurance. You cannot blame the fishermen. Now, if the fishermen decided to sell his fish, it does not make any difference how he sells his fish, let us catch the fish. Bring it to the shores, and which ever way the fish ends up whether it is a frozen form or solid form the benefits to the fishermen should be exactly the same. And that will give us a real opportunity to maximize on our fish and to get the strong economy with which our fish is distributed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Before the hon. gentleman sits down, what would he, what would have to be, what would ~~it~~ be necessary for the basis of payment to the fishermen be or what would have to be the basis of his contribution into the fund, because it is a fund to which he contributes before he can draw money out of it. He must have put money in, At the moment his payments into the fund are based in a certain way so that it would make no difference to the fishermen whether the fish ended up frozen or salted so that that would happen and he would still get the same benefit in unemployment insurance how would it have to be done what would have to be then the foundation or the basis of it?

MR. MOBRES: Mr. Speaker, I think that it should be treated on an actuarial basis, based on values, on values, not time, no not time, on values and by doing that then the fisherman is free to maximize on his catches of fish. For instance, I know of situations last summer on the Avalon Peninsula there was an exceptionally good inshore fishery good on the Avalon Peninsula it was not so good north as everybody knows. But there are fishermen who could only fish two traps, three traps at the most, he had two more in the stage that he could not use because there was no market, he could not dispose of his fish, if he put the other two traps in the water. The fish was so bountiful that three traps kept him going. But with all the workers we got

available and the shore installation surely the fishermen can put more traps in the water and let us maximize them and bring the fish to shore. That is why I say with this Act now that it is a real breakthrough and now that we have gottit let it make it work in the very best interest of the Province. Not looking so much through a pair of glasses as far as just a salt fish industry is concerned, but let us look upon the total concept of the industry. They are a few stumbling blocks in the way at the moment that just prevents us from doing that.

There is just one thing I would like to mention at this time with this legislation and I hope that even though this is put through by the federal government we will be able to introduce, from time to time into this House legislation in the best interest of the province to cope with a particular situation that might arise. And what I mean by that is that Newfoundland is the Province that is going to make, I think it is the greatest benefit under this Act. It is the best in Canada in that respect, it might be so because we have the fish. We have plenty of fish to offer. But by the same token I think that we should be free to make legislation without having to go to Ottawa. If it is in the best interest of the Province. I would think that we can do that. I think that that is the reason this Act is here today because we have to approve of it. But the same token, I think as well that we should be free to introduce other legislation, that will aid and abet what we are debating here tonight.

Then again I have been talking about the maximizing catches. For instance, there are splitting machines, possibly every hon. member knows, available, to be purchased from suppliers with such material, such equipment, these could be set up in strategic locations where we could maximize on the splitting of fish. I think that my own personal view on this, I hope I am not bias but I think that our future, the future of the Province of Newfoundland lies in the frozen segment of the industry. I mean you are selling the product to a more affluent society and one that is going to pay possibly a better price for his fish. And I am sure it will, do just that, but we should maximize the total capacity of the fresh fish plants to that extent, possibly I think that we

will see the full benefit of this in 1970 and I think in 1972 and 73 it is going to become very obvious, that the fresh fish segment of the industry is going to make a terrific contribution I think that, granted good quality salt fish will sell and command a good price and this is where we are going<sup>to</sup>/have to lay the greatest emphasis on quality as far as our salt fish is concerned. So I think we are going to have to balance out between good quality salt fish and good quality fresh fish.

I was very glad to hear reference made to the fact that any firm who has ideas as to how fish should be presented in the one pound or whatever state in a foreign market would be entertained I think that we should maintain that because it gives the Province an opportunity for young men who have ideas a to think and come forward with a way of handling our fish and selling our fish to market. The hon. Premier mentioned merchandising, merchandizing is the big factor and with good quality fish selling it would not be too great a problem.

Now there is one other point I would like to just touch on, in connection with maximizing on our inshore catches of fish. That is the movement of fish. The movement of the fish to a centre where it can be split or where it can be sold in a fresh state and frozen. This may be right off tangent but I have been thinking a lot about it recently when we heard a lot about hovercraft. You know, and I think that possibly there may be some assumption in giving some consideration to the moving of fish, from points farther north by means of hovercraft into the plants on the southern part of the Avalon Peninsula. I do not think it is too far fetched, possibly may be but I think that we should look into it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Let me send down to the hon. gentleman, I have just finished reading it, Japan, the Economic Journal, I get it every week. The current issue, Hovercraft now being built by the great Mitsui Shipbuilding Company in Tokyo. The hon. gentleman might read it.

MR. MOORES: You wish me to read it to the House.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes read it to the House.

MR. MOORES: The Mitsui Shipbuilding Company has begun work to design and build hovercraft to carry 150 persons. It hopes to complete the experimental model at the beginning of 1972. "The Hovercraft is to become the biggest ever made in Japan. It already has produced those for carrying fifty persons at a top speed of sixty-five knots. I think, Mr. Speaker, that this could become a real break through in maximizing the landings of fish on the Northeast Coast and moving them south. I know, for instance, an approach a short while ago by a co-operative to the north of us on Fogo Island. There are as you know 25 or 26 long liners based on Fogo Island and they are quite concerned over the fact that there is a lot of fish in the area and finding markets for. They are not too much concerned over this codfish because they figure that they can salt it and they can make a good dollar at it. But there is a lot of turbot



April 13, 1970

Tape #439

Page 1

MR. MOORES: And there are not too many plants in close proximity to Fogo, where these fishermen could offer their fish for sale. Twillingate, well Twillingate has a big area as well and a lot of fishermen to entertain, and Fogo is just too far away. But I think a boat like this that could move fish very rapidly and fairly large quantities. One other point I would like touch on again in connection with quality, and it seems that every time I stand in this hon. House and I talk about fish, I always - the word "quality" is uppermost in my mind. And I think everyone agrees just how important it is. It may be necessary for us to consider training our young people once again into the methods of salting and curing fish.

We have our Fisheries College. Now that we have this legislation about to become law, it could work hand in hand in glove, so to speak. And it would us an opportunity to train our people, train our young men to come up with making good quality fish. Mr. Speaker, before I sit down, I want to make reference to the Frozen Fish segment of the industry. The word was mentioned here earlier this afternoon that possibly some consideration should be given to a similar board as far as fresh fish is concerned. My personal opinion and I do not think that is necessary. We already have under legislation in Ottawa a price stability, and of course we had a very good example of that in 1969, when price stability was brought about by the Department of Fisheries in Ottawa upon recommendations from our government here.

In fact Ottawa before it took the step it consulted with its European counterpart to see if they would support it, but at that particular time, they did not go along with it. But Ottawa took the long shot and it certainly paid off, and it brought great stability in the world market so far as frozen fish is concerned. Iceland and Norway and Denmark, as I said earlier, did not feel like going along with us, but after two or three months in operation they began to realize that it was very important, and I am confident that the positive step which Ottawa took, resulted in the, at least a much firmer market for 1969.

Now Norway and Denmark, I know they export their fish through an association, but I do not think there is any government involved in it whatsoever as far as the movement of fish across this board is concerned. I do not think the United States Government would tolerate that. I think we

April 13, 1970

Tape #439

Page 2

would be confronted with a dumping duty. Iceland may be just a little different to a degree. Iceland of course depends wholly and solely on its fishery. There are about 190 to 1,000 people there, and I know they devalued their currency by at least fourteen percent when devaluation took place in 1968. Their main concern at the time was that twenty-eight cent price for cod blocks was returned to Iceland. It did not make any difference how it was accomplished. But the one method of doing it was to get themselves into the further processing of fish in the United States. But as far as fresh fish marketing board is concerned, I do not think that Ottawa at all would look very kindly toward a suggestion along these lines. And as I said earlier, we are moving our fish now into more affluent markets, and whatever chance Canada has to maximize it, these markets, it is going to be through a private enterprise.

It gives me much pleasure Mr. Speaker, to support this Bill. Before I sit down, if it should transpire that our present Minister of Fisheries is called upon to head up or become president of an association of salt fish marketing board rather, I wish him well. I am sure that their choice is a good one, and I hope that he will be very happy in his work. Thank you very much.

MR. CALLAHAN: Mr. Speaker, just a few words Sir in behalf of one of the twenty-six. It was stated here this afternoon and I think it is an accurate statement that there are twenty-six districts wherein the Fishery of this Province is essential and vital to the economy of those places, those districts. And another eight or nine in which it is pretty important, if not in fact, is essential as it is to the economies of the other twenty-six. One of the twenty-six is the district of Port-au-Port where at least half the population depend upon the fishery in its various forms, and the lobsters, and scallops particularly, but also on the codfishery for their principle source of a livelihood. And this legislation certainly is of concern in the Port-au-Port and St. George's Bay area. Indeed I cannot neglect to mention the fact that the Port-au-Port Fishermen's Co-operative is very

concerned as to the method of designation of agents of the Corporation, and I have represented this to my colleague the minister, and I hope that it will be possible to have that Co-operative designated. It is the only merchandizing operation in the area collecting from most if not all of the fishermen, and I think the Corporation will be well advised and indeed I believe it is its intention to take advantage of existing merchandizing structures and organizations to be designated as its agents.

I was interested Sir in the comment that the hon. member for Burin - I was listening very closely Mr. Speaker. He stated on more than one occasion during his remarks that this legislation represents the last clear chance for the salt fish industry in this Province. I would suggest rather to the House, as one of my colleagues remarked that indeed it is perhaps the first clear chance for the salt codfish industry. And the reasons for this Mr. Speaker, are rather obvious. One of them and perhaps the most important reason is that this legislation, and the matching Federal legislation, taken together with the action of the Government of Canada to which my hon. friend from Harbour Grace referred. The action taken last year in respect of price stability. These things taken together and now the package, at least in principle is complete, mean that for the first time in Canada the Fisheries have been recognized as a national industry. And I think that has not really been the case prior, certainly to last year.

The hon. the Premier said this afternoon, the divergence in treatment which the fishermen of Canada, and principally on the East Coast, and most especially in Newfoundland, the divergence of treatment between the fishing industry and the agriculture industry in Canada has been especially marked, and it is only now, as was mentioned this afternoon, that the creation of national marketing boards in respect to the fishing industries that there is even in principle parity between agriculture and the fishery. And far from the rather pessimistic or apprehensive outlook that my hon. friend from Burin expressed when he spoke. I think that after all the years, Mr. Speaker

April 13, 1970

Tape #439

Page 4

of trying to get some real control and real organization into the fishing industry, we should not feel that if does not all fall into place within the next two, or three or four weeks, that all is lost. And I do not agree

not agree that the fishermen of this Province consider that that is or will be, in fact, the case.

Mr. Speaker, mention was made of catch failure insurance and of the Labrador Fishery last year and while I anticipate, my colleague the minister will make reference to this, when he closes the debate. Let me say that the matter of catch failure insurance in agriculture to which again my hon. friend opposite referred is not as simple and cut and dried as he might suppose. It is only in the great preponderant crops, in the grain and wheat crops and in the great preponderant potato crop in the province of Nova Scotia or in the province of Prince Edward Island. In particular crops only, is there, in fact catch failure insurance. Even there, the cost to the farmers is extremely high. So when we had a failure in the potato crop in Newfoundland in the fall of last year due to early frost, not only was there not a method by which the farmers could readily be compensated, insurance was barred to them because the crop just was not big enough to enable them to afford to have insurance. In agriculture where it is possible to control the crop environment, it is every difficult and even more difficult obviously in the fishery, where catch failures may mean anything from storms to the absence of the fish itself. It is not an easy matter to resolve. I agree with my hon. friend that it would be highly desirable to resolve it. In the case of the Labrador fishery to which he referred, of course, and he referred to it several times but added the qualification, I think, on only one occasion. This Bill is not designed in any way, shape or form to deal with that very difficult and very thorny problem.

Mr. Speaker one of the advantages of a national approach to the fishing industry and to marketing, along the lines of this legislation, is that for the first time that fishery of this country will be more or less on a par, and I think my colleague the minister referred to some degree to this this afternoon. To some extent, at least, Sir, on a par with the fisheries of other nations who regard, as they must, their fisheries as national industries.

Very often we hear the question raised as to why foreign countries, whether it be the Northern Europeans or whether it be the Russians or the Poles or whoever, why they can come to our doorstep and do very well on a resource of which we ourselves seem to be exploiting rather badly? By badly, I mean, with a lack of success in comparison with those countries. One of the answers is that the countries to which reference generally is made, either depend upon the fishery as their national industry and as the main stay of their national economy or they require the food source so badly that it is possible for them to subsidize it extremely heavy in one way or another. This has not been for the obvious reason of its size and importance in the total economy of Canada; has not been the case with the fishery of Canada and particularly the fishery of the East coast.

As my friend from Harbour Grace again said a few minutes ago, it was possible, not possible, Sir, necessary, rightly necessary for example; for Iceland to devalue its currency to a very major degree in order to put fish in a position of advantage, a necessary position of advantage in order to save the national economy of Iceland. It would be a little far-fetched to consider that the fishing industry in Canada assumes that particular importance. It may to this Province. It may to one or two other provinces, but in the scheme of the national economy, it does not assume that importance, Sir, to the point that Canada could take action such as that or comparable to that in order to favour the fishing industry. This is one of the problems that we live with, as a Province, that depends so heavily on an industry, which in the rest of the country and with the other 19.5 million people, is not of all that account. Even with that, we have now come to the stage where the fisheries, essentially of this Province, have come to be recognized as a national industry. I think that is a very historic occurrence, a very historic recognition, and I think if we go back, and I remember very well the brief, the report that went essentially from the Fisheries' Conference here to the Government of Canada asking for a national fisheries program that would in fact, be comparable in the recognition it might receive to the agriculture

industry or the program for agriculture in Canada.

I think we now have come to that point, and I think the credit, very largely, goes to the hon. the Premier, to my colleague the Minister of Fisheries and to his predecessors over the past five or six years who have worked so hard to bring this about. If we are looking for significance, Mr. Speaker, in this legislation, if we are not looking for instant solutions to centuries old problems, if we are looking really for significance in the legislation, even aside from the purpose of it and aside from what it might achieve; in fact, the real significance, I think, is that it does recognize it along with the Federal legislation does recognize the national character of the fishing industry, which heretofore has been considered, in many respects, to be a fractional and perhaps only a regional industry with only regional significance.

Reference has been made, Sir, to the fresh or the frozen fish industry, and I think one could be pardoned or excused for believing or suspecting that what is now being done in respect of salt fish inevitably will be done in one form or another, certainly to the point of the control and co-ordination of merchandizing in the frozen fish industry. I think along with that and merchandizing was mentioned this afternoon, I think, one thing that must go with merchandizing is advertising and a good advertising program. I saw in the paper the other day where Bobby Orr of the Boston Bruins makes \$200,000 a year or will next year to play hockey. It might be a good idea, if we considered paying him another \$50,000 to sell our fish. This is the kind of - it might be a very good idea, Mr. Speaker. I would be impressed. I know my kids would be impressed and that is where the selling games start these days to see Orr, Hull or Howe or somebody sitting down with their families to a meal of Newfoundland fish, and it is

MR. CALLAHAN: Sir, it is the kind of think Mr. Speaker that will sell a product and its a kind of thing that I think we have to do, and the method is seen in respect of every other product. But our problem Sir, the Bill starts the title of the Bill, and it is interesting sometimes the title of the Bill can be rather catching and amusing and in this case, its an Act respecting the marketing of salt fish and I would say that is the first time in the history of Newfoundland Sir, that anybody has shown any form of respect for salt fish, or for the fishing industry. I think we have lived with it so long, we have had so many problems, it has been a continuous problem for four and a half centuries, that our people associate fish and hardtimes to the extent that we have not really had very much respect or appreciation for the resource that we have around our shores. And I think this is really one of the problems we have had in doing anything with the fishery.

In that event, Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased in behalf of my constitutents, who have a very sincere interest in this matter, and in my own behalf in supporting the princple of the Bill, and in again, extending my congratulations to my colleague the Minister of Fisheries, who has done so much to bring this matter to a head, and to bring about the creation of a Salt Fish Marketing Organization, and the recognition of our fishing industry as indeed a great national industry in Canada.

MR. HAROLD COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, certainly it gives us a lot of pleasure on this side of the House to support the Bill which is now up for debate, an enabling piece of legislation more or less in conjunction with the Act which was passed in Ottawa sometime ago concerning the marketing, mainly of course, marketing of our salt fish.

Sir, if we think back as far back as we can think ourselves, and then also go back further than that on the basis of words which have been passed down to us by our forefathers and words which have been written by the fishery, certainly one must come to conclusion that the problems with which the Salt Fish Industry has been faced over the years, up until now is still faced with, are not too different from those problems which were obtained shortly after our



MR. COLLINS: discovery and right up through to this present time. Certainly the inshore fishermen who have been required down through the years to catch and clean and salt, and eventually try and market their fish have been faced with tremendous problems, problems which they themselves, although they have put a lot of time and a lot of effort in it, problems which they themselves could not have solved, and then of course the records show, that they were not solved. Mainly, I suppose, because of the lack of foresight and initiative on the part of Government to recognize the problems and do something tangible and worthwhile for the fishermen.

Before we get into the ideas of catching and curing and marketing, I think it is worthwhile to mention the fact that last week, we are told that the Federal Government have now taken the position that they are to extend or at least recognize now the twelve mile limit, proclaim the twelve mile limit, certainly we hope that they will enforce the twelve mile limit, because if it is not enforced, it does not mean that much, the twelve mile limit now being proclaimed and is enforced, then I would say Sir that this will certainly be a great benefit to the fishermen mainly of course on the northeast coast of Newfoundland, and Labrador fishermen, and after all there is the area where we are most concerned with the salt fish development.

We all know the ravishes of draggers along our coast in recent years, and as I said if this twelve mile limit can be patrolled, effectively patrolled then possibly we can restore to our inshore fishermen a reasonable chance of once again obtaining a livelihood. I am not sure if this goes far enough because I have always been of the opinion that the twelve mile limit at this particular time is too little too late. The twelve mile limits had to be twelve years ago or twenty years ago, would certainly have been more effective. And I would suggest that today while the twelve mile limit is now a step in the right direction, we must also start to become interested and concerned and involved in trying to establish inshore fishery reserves. And only by establishing inshore fishery reserves can we ever hope to ensure that fishermen can once again have a successful days fishing.

MR. COLLINS:

Sir one of the advantages I would hope of this particular piece of legislation, this is the Federal legislation I am talking about now, would be that fishermen will be in a position in the spring of the year to know for sure what he can expect in return for his fish. What price he will be getting, and until that is done, certainly there are a lot of people in Newfoundland, a lot of good fishermen who might have gone fishing otherwise certainly will not be prepared to take the chance where everything is uncertain. Goodness knows the catching of the fish is uncertain enough, there is no one who knows for sure if the fish will come to our waters, and then to be faced with the added doubt, as to prices it makes it almost impossible for any sensible thinking man to even consider taking a chance to ever again to go fishing.

We have heard a lot of talk about this in the passed few days, of course it was to be expected I suppose of the Premier and his Government would try and take all of the credit for the setting up of this particular corporation by the Federal Government. We have been told that the Provincial Government have been working on this for years, because we have no way to really satisfy ourselves that that was the case. We do know that there has been a great fuss kicked up in Ottawa this passed year or year and a-half by our members up there. And I am inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that possibly the continual agitation by those people. I would say that possibly had a much greater effect in stirring the Federal Government on to setting up this Salt Fish Corporation, that anything which the Provincial Government has done, because if they done it, they certainly done it very quietly, and there is a lot of people on that side of the House are not noted for being quiet about things, when they do them.

Sir, insofar as the Marketing Board itself is concerned, I am sure if the Minister of Fisheries will agree with me, that possibly one of its main responsibilities, certainly if the Board is going to be effective and be successful and be worthwhile as a Board, one of its main responsibilities must be to provide the proper incentive, and possibility only mention incentives, we must first of all think of financial incentive to our fishermen. We all know

MR. COLLINS: that down through the years, through recent years many of our fishermen have been caught in the tight squeeze, and the inability on their part to raise loans, the greater number of our fish merchants have disappeared. People who outfitted the fishermen in April and May, and continued to feed his family in June and July and August and possibly September and possibly October, at least Mr. Speaker, until such time as the catch was caught, and the catch was cured, and the catch was shipped, and some monies recovered, the fish merchants were obliged to keep the fishermen equipped and keep his family feed all those months. Now with the disappearance of those fish merchants, and I do not calling them fish merchants, but for the want of a better term, that is what I will call them, but the disappearance of those people because of the poor markets, and lack of concern and lack of assistance by Government down through the years, the fishermen have been put in the position whereby they found it impossible to be able to raise adequate sums to keep his boat in repair, and to buy a new boat, and keep his cod traps in repair and knit new cod traps. And consequently Sir, that coupled with the difficulties in marketing etc. We founded that a great number of our fishermen, and I fear possibly are better fishermen are obliged to leave that profession and look for work in what they thought was going to be the Rhhr: of Newfoundland, everything was going to be industrialized and so on and so forth. We all remember years ago, when this Government more or less told fishermen to burn your boats, and burn your flakes, and burn your stages.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Sheer nonsense. Sheer nonsense.

MR. COLLINS: It might be sheer nonsense Mr. Speaker, but I do not think the fishermen feel that it was nonsense. Burn your stages, burn your flakes, burn everything you had, and there are two jobs in Come-by-Chance, and two jobs in Stephenville, and two jobs all over Newfoundland for them. And of course, Sir, we found out that today that those jobs are non-existent and we find now that people have to return to the fishery, other than that they have to go to Toronto.

MR. COLLINS: Sir, if this corporation is to be successful, then provision is certainly going to have to be made to provide financial assistance to our fishermen.

Probably Sir one of the next important functions of the Board, and I am sure again that the Minister of Fisheries will agree, so will the member from Harbour Grace who spoke a few minutes ago, they will agree with me that we must, and this is a must, Sir, we must ensure that are men who get up in the morning at two o'clock or three o'clock, and go down to the sea in ships, as it were, and catch fish and bring it on shore, those men must be relieved of the responsibility for curing the fish. I believe

MR. COLLINS: I believe that they should be considered as professional fish catchers, that is their function, that they are suitably equipped, certainly there are no better fishermen in the world than our Newfoundland fishermen. Certainly there are no better fishermen in Newfoundland than on the Northeast Coast catching fish which ultimately end up salted. And if they are going to be successful and be able to take advantage of the short season, and the good weather and so on and so forth. They are going to have to be working in circumstances which permit them to spend all of their waking hours, all of their time catching fish.

Now Sir, one of the big problems in the salt fish industry down through the years has been that fishermen have been preoccupied with catching a lot of fish, bringing it to shore and of course once coming to shore with it, found they had no place to salt it, they had no place to do it properly. Very often the result was that they came up with a poor product, and then for its weather which we are sometimes faced with in Newfoundland, the drying season, this adds insult to injury as it were and lessens the chances of providing a good quality, and consequently of course we have to sell to the cheaper markets, the West Indian markets and we have not been getting the returns for our fish, which otherwise we <sup>should</sup> have gotten. So I would say Sir, we should be thinking along the lines whereby the fishermen are thought of as professional fishermen. His duty is to catch fish, bring it to shore and that is where his responsibility ends, insofar as actual working in the fish goes. If that is to take place of course, we are going to need vastly more of, and vastly improved types of shore installations. And I can envisage a modern plant being set up possibly based on the concept of the community stage, which I believe was a step in the right direction. It happened to be introduced by another form of a government in Ottawa years ago. A very good idea. They were not always placed in the most convenient spots in the country. I did not hear of one on the Gaff Topsails, but I do not why we did not have one placed on the Gaff Topsails, or in Central Newfoundland. But I believe it is a good concept, and if that endeavour can

be continued and enlarged upon, and this is the thing, the type of facility which we need to enable fishermen to come up with a better product. I would also suggest Sir that certainly if we are going to produce much salt fish, a great amount of salt fish, we can not leave ourselves vulnerable to the doubtful weather conditions which we find in Newfoundland. Naturally sun-cured fish probably have a higher quality, but then in this technological age when we can improve a driers system, I am sure that we can come up with a drier which is capable of producing a product of a quality which is very comparable to the sun-cured product. And I would suggest Sir, that those who will be in authority in this Province would seriously consider the concept of providing a fish drier, adjacent to or part of the fishing stage, or the community stage, or whatever it might be. Only by having driers in those places can we insure that a good quality brought from the nets, a good quality taken from salt bulk, but eventually end up as a good quality to go to the market.

The hon. member for Harbour Grace mentioned the need for improved equipment, and one of the things he mentioned was the automatic splitter. Certainly this is a worthwhile piece of machinery. I have never seen it function myself. There are not too many in Newfoundland I understand, and I have not been fishing myself this last five or six years. I have missed the opportunity of having a look at that, but in conversation with Captain Max Burry, who I believe Sir, pioneered this particular, pioneered in Newfoundland as far as introducing it to Newfoundland, he tells me that it is a very good piece of equipment, and I believe that that piece of equipment which he used in Labrador is about now to be located at Fogo Island. And I can think of no better place for this to be installed, and certainly there is a need for more equipment of this sort, and no doubt that can be improved, if it indeed needs improvement. Certainly Fogo Island - if Newfoundland Sir, can be considered as a floating stage in the Atlantic, well then Fogo Island can certainly be considered as a floating stage yet in the North Atlantic. And I can think of no place on the Coast, on the Northeast Coast where fishermen

are so interested, where fishermen are so professional, and where fishermen are so deserving of some government assistance, and I would hope Sir, that this Corporation will mean to Fogo Island what wheat means to the Prairies, and what Expo meant to Montreal, so and on and so forth. I hope this will be the godsend which they have been waiting for for years. The Premier made a lot of promises down there a few years ago. I do not think he promised them a splitter or a salt fish corporation, however I am sure they will be willing to forego some of the promises which he indicated if we can get those things for them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman will allow me. I allowed him to say that and not contradict him of course. Then in my own hearing he said it and I did not contradict it so it must be true. I made no promises on Fogo Island, except I would try to get a mini FRED adopted for Fogo Island. A mini, a small, a miniature FRED, and FRED itself was abandoned, so there was no mini FRED. No false promise there, no broken promise.

MR. COLLINS: Sir, the people on Fogo Island need a maxi FRED now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I know that, but I am talking about broken promises.

MR. COLLINS: Well we can only report. I did not attend the Premier's meeting.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I did, I spoke at it.

MR. COLLINS: We can only report by the press report which came off Fogo Island, and talk with the people of Fogo Island. And I cannot say that the people of Fogo Island are noted for telling lies.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They are not telling lies, it is not the people of Fogo Island. The Minister of Fisheries was present he knows what lies I told. And there others present. Were there any lies? No promises.

MR. COLLINS: That is a change. No promises.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Change or no change, there was no promise made.

MR. COLLINS: There is a difference between promises and lies Mr. Speaker. Well Sir, to get back to the topic which we were discussing. Certainly all of us, all hon. members of this House will be looking forward to the introduction of this particular board, and hopefully that it will have the

April 13, 1970

Tape #442

Page 4

desired affect to make the fishermen's lot a better one. We are all suspecting I would suppose a lot of people are looking forward to the Minister of Fisheries becoming the man in charge of this particular board. Certainly he has a background in the Fisheries to be able to do a good job in this particular field. I believe he will have the interest of the fishermen of Newfoundland at heart, and I am sure that when he takes the job that he will be doing everything in his power to help improve their lot. I would hope that he will travel around Newfoundland as I have done, and see what the problems are, if he does not already know them. And Sir, in looking ahead and realizing that there is a good chance that the Minister of Fisheries is going to be the man to head up this board, then of course we must ask ourselves the question, who is to be his successor? I do not know if there is going to be a great Cabinet shuffle again. It would utilize the Ministers without Portfolio, and put them into this particular job. I do know Mr. Speaker, that there are some members on that side of the House who do not now hold a portfolio, will be looking toward this one. And I would also suspect Sir, that this might be the last chance to hold them on that side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: I wish the hon. member would stick to the debate.

MR. COLLINS: I say it does Mr. Speaker, because we are talking about the man who might be heading up the Bill, and we are also talking about the man who might become the next Minister of Fisheries. However Sir, I would hope that everybody will support this particular piece of legislation, and as I have said on possibly a couple of occasions that it will be the answer to the prayer of the Newfoundland fishermen.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, of all the subjects that I either know something about or alleged to know something about, salt fish is not one. I like to eat salt fish, and indeed at one point last Fall, my colleague the Minister of Fisheries was in Englee with me, and while there he turned his hand to culling board, because the firm of Reeves Limited in Englee is one of the few firms in Newfoundland Sir, that did not abandon the culling board. In the past few years



MR. ROBERTS:

years of the glory of tal.qual. My colleague turned his hand to the culling board with the aid of the Mayor of Englee, who is also an experienced fish culler, Mr. Baxter Gillard, and selected a quintal of salt fish. That is about the limit of my practical knowledge of salt fish itself, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, I have just listened to a far duller speech from the member for Gander than I even thought he was capable of. He goes on, Sir, not from height to height but from dullness to dullness. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman indeed has made it a dull night. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should perhaps tend to his own fish traps. Yes, my hon. friend said the hon. gentleman made a cod of it, that is not a bad phrase at all.

Mr. Speaker, while I might not know much about salt fish I do know a lot about what salt fish means to at least one part of this island that is my own district of White Bay North. I listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent plea of the member for the district of Burin when he talked about the plight of the Labrador fishermen. And indeed it is a plight, Sir, there is no doubt about that and nobody has attempted to deny it. I wish however, Sir, that thought had also been given to people who, as I have earlier pointed out to this House and as the hon. gentleman has consistently ignored, the people of all of White Bay from Cape Bauld all the way through the communities Raleigh, Ship Cove, Cape Onion, of Quirpon, straight through Noddy Bay, L'Anse-au-Meadow, Quirpon, my hon. friend from Bonavista South knows them, as he has been all over that shore, Great Brehat, St. Carols, Little Brehat, which they have left, St. Anthony Bight, St. Anthony itself, even in Main Brook they fish out on Griquet and St. Lunaire. Mr. Speaker, all the way down to Harbour Deep and even to the two families still living in Little Harbour Deep they make their living from salt fish. I mentioned St. Anthony, that being one of the two communities the hon. gentleman knows, the other being Roddickton, a community that is somewhere near Roddickton.

Mr. Speaker, I know Bide Arm well and there are good people in Bide Arm, there are fine people in Bide Arm, and the hon. gentleman found out to his

MR. ROBERTS:

dismay how fine they were last November. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did as well as he deserved to in White Bay North and I did not have to try to hire any buses not to make trips in White Bay North.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to come back to the question of moving salt fish by bus. Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants to continue this rag-tag I will go on with him but your hon. has ruled that it is out of order. What I am saying, Sir, that in White Bay North last year the fishery was a ghastly failure. Let the hon. gentleman be still and know, to use a phrase. We hear a lot about the Labrador fishery, Mr. Speaker, but I was going through some figures the other day.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has already bet a very great figure and lost. Now, may I go on with my speech, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman sits over there and says "contemptible", and he says "ignorant", the hon. gentleman is being as contemptible and as ignorant as I have ever heard anybody in this House, and that covers a lot of contemptibility and ignorance.

MR CROSBIE: Contemptible and ignorant, both.

MR ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of what the hon. gentleman said.

MR CROSBIE: And I have listened to you closely when you speak on contempt and ignorance.

MR SPEAKER: The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence. No hon. member is to be referred to as "you" in this House. I have had to mention this on a number of occasions. Will the hon. member continue his speech and let the other hon. members, unless he yields the floor, listen to him in silence.

MR ROBERTS: Thank you, MR. Speaker!

As I was saying, the fishery in White BAY North was a ghastly failure. I was looking at some figures, some statistics, and they show that to take the area say between Cape Bauld and Cape St John in White Bay South, the amount of salt fish caught last year was nearly sixty per-cent less than that taken in 1968. In 1968, Sir, anybody who knows that coast at all will

MR. ROBERTS:

tell you it was a very dismal year. Not only, Mr. Speaker, was the amount of fish taken down nearly sixty-per-cent, the value of that fish was down again close to sixty-per-cent although there was some slight improvement in the price of fresh fish and, of course, there was a marked improvement in the price of salt fish.

Mr. Speaker, it has been quite properly pointed out that the Bill before us has nothing by means of a catch failure program. The member of Burin was most, no he was not eloquent on this point, Sir, he was not even knowledgeable but he was perhaps most clear in outlining the problem, the problem of the catch failure program and I listened with very great interest to the hon. member because I thought he might have been able to give us the answer. Certainly I know of no answer on it, Sir. If the hon. gentleman can supply the people of Newfoundland with such a program I think he will have done a very great public service.

The problem is a very real one, Mr. Speaker, so very well to talk of catch failures on the Labrador and to talk of gastly failures on the White Bay or of other areas throughout the Province and we agree that a catch failure program is needed. We have been advocating that for years publicly and privately. We have even prepared some plans, Mr. Ralph Hedlin and Mr. Merril Menzies, two of the brighter gentlemen who at one stage I should add, Sir, were retained by the Prime Minister of Canada, not of the same political persuasion as me, were retained by a Prime Minister of Canada to advise him on agricultural policy and to write his speeches and indeed the original vision came from the fertile mind of Mr. Menzies and Mr. Hedlin.

We had a catch failure plan and we put it up to Ottawa. They shot a fair number of holes in it, Mr. Speaker, it became quiet a leaky punt and sank somewhere, I suggest going across the Cabot Strait. There are a great number of problems in the catch failure program. For example, to what level should one subsidize? What happens, Mr. Speaker, if nineteen crews fish out of a harbour and seventeen get three hundred quintals, the eighteenth get

MR. ROBERTS:

fifteen quintals, the nineteenth has had a seriqys of water hauls and as my friend points out that has been going on at least since 1497 and as the Basque fishermen were here before that it was going on then. How do we subsidize that, Mr. Speaker? Do we bring them all up to the same level? Well my precedents do not go back as far as the hon. Minister of Education. Do we, though, Mr. Speaker, bring them all to that level of the seventeen crews? If we do then what harbour? Do we measure harbour by harbour? What are there eight hundred fishing settlements in this island yet and on the coast of Labrador? Do we bring all of the eight hundred fishing settlements to the same level? If we do, Mr. Speaker, what does that do to the level of individual initiative? What then is to stop a fellow from just hanging ashore or just taking his skiff out in the morning, his trapboat out and just going around the headland spending the day contemplating the mysteries of the Heaven, flat on his back and looking at the sun?

It is easy to say there should be a catch failure program, Mr. Speaker, and we would agree there must be and I believe there will be. But I did listen with a great deal of interest to what the hon. gentleman had to say and I agree with him when he says the need is there and indeed he is just repeating what we have said. I would have wished and I now ask him or any other member to let us have such a plan because to date the best brains that could have been brought to bear on it by the Government of Canada and what talents the Government of Newfoundland and our officials could bring to bear, have not succeeded in producing a plan that is acceptable.

Mr. Speaker, the Board, salt fish board which were authorized, if this legislation is adopted, to make a board for Newfoundland as well as for the other Provinces is a very great step forward. I am not going to go into it in detail, the other hon. members have, the minister has given a very fine speech in introducing it and I gather from the notes he has been writing intends if ever he gets the floor again to close the debate with a what I am sure will be a first rate speech as well. I just want to touch upon two

MR. ROBERTS:

points the Board will be able to do. The first is a subject that is dear to my heart and I have been criticized for it but so be it. The Board will make sure that the maximum amount that can be got out of a quintal of salt fish goes to the fishermen. The experiences of the past two or three years in Newfoundland have shown us conclusively that that has not been so, Sir. We now know between 1967 and 1968 that fishermen of Newfoundland paid a far dearer price in reduced returns for their catch than they had to. In other words, if you wish, Sir, the noble, kindhearted, gallant, public spirited salt fish merchants in St. John's, the exporters, beat it out of the hides of the fishermen as they have for at least four hundred years.

Well, Sir, those days are gone or will be gone with this Bill and I for one welcome it. I realize our merchants have played a role, they have supplied for fish on pretty despicable terms, as my friend from St. John's West pointed out with regard to L'Anse-au-Loup, was it, L'Anse-au-Clair that part of Labrador South. They have supplied for fish and they have taken the risks and many of them have gone bankrupt. My grandfather -

made or lost<sup>†</sup> one or two fortunes in salt fish, as well, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, the merchants of Newfoundland have not suffered as nearly as much as the fishermen. There will be no warning from me, and I suggest, Sir, from anybody on this side of the House, when the salt fish merchants lose their debt grip on the salt fish industry of this Province. Another thing that the board will achieve, Sir, touched upon by my colleague in introducing the Bill, by many members in speaking upon it, is to improve quality. Now, the hon. member for St. John's West touched upon the yellow fish company, which was sort of an yellow peril to the northeast coast for a couple of years and the Minister of Fisheries touched upon the buying of fish, tal. qual. The yellow fish company must take a share of the blame for that, a share, not by any means all the blame.

Mr. Speaker, the fishermen of Newfoundland do not have to take the blame. I remember one day standing on a stagehead in Harbour Deep, which for the benefit of my friend from Burin, is next to Little Harbour Deep, standing on a stagehead in Harbour Deep and watching a man split his fish, actually watching three men split fish.

Mr. Speaker, I am not<sup>a</sup> fish splitter. I would not know the first thing about it, but it seemed to me that I have seen fish split as skillfully with a meat cleaver, as it was being split that day by a gentleman in Harbour Deep with his splitting knife. I do not know a great deal about making fish, Sir, but I am sure that there was more salt in the water that that fish came out of than there was in the pile in which that fish was placed in store after it had been caught and split. I asked the fellow, Mr. Speaker. I said, "you can make better fish than that can you not?" He said, "yes, of course, I can." Well I said, "why do you not? Why are you not taking the care of splitting it? Why are you not making sure that the bone is lifted out evenly and all the other little tricks that mark a good splitter? Why are you not putting enough salt on it, as a ratio of so many quintals to a hog's head or may be so many hogs' heads to a quintal?" There is a ratio. Quintals to a hog's head. It would be

Very heavy salt, I guess, if it is hogs' heads to a quintal.

He very simply and I thought it was very well said. He said, "well, sir, why should I?" I get the same amount for it, no matter, if I do it this way or if I make the best sun dried fish." That was the result of tal. qual. buying, Sir. If the salt fish board does nothing else but end forever, any buying of fish tal. qual., then it will have achieved a very great step forward. I think it will do more, Sir. I think it is perhaps the single greatest step in our salt fish industry since, certainly since the Coaker regulations were defeated by the greediness of the merchants and that was fifty-one years ago now.

Now, Sir, in making his speech, the member for Burin and other members echoed this. They said that there should be no politics in the board. I do not agree with that, Sir. I would agree with him, if he said there would be no partisan politics, whether one is a Liberal or whether one is benighted and belongs to some other political faith should be of no concern at all to the salt fish board.

Mr. Spaaker, to say that there should be no politics is to say that it should not be concerned with the public issues of the public good. The salt fish board is a political board. It is not a partisan board, but a political board and if it ever is not a political board, Sir, it has failed the public fishermen it must serve.

I do not expect the hon. member for St. John's West to agree with me, Sir. Indeed I would be worried, if he did. I would be very worried, if the hon. - and while I am on the hon. member for St. John's West..

MR. CROSBIE: You will not be on him very long.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I would not want to be on him very long. He talked about an idea that has a certain appeal. He is not the first to talk about it at all, Sir, and that is the erection of a fresh fish marketing board similar in concept and structure to the salt fish board which is being constituted by Ottawa and which we are going to authorize, if this legislation is accepted.

The Atlantic Development had begun a study on it. With the disappearance of that board one and a half years ago, I understand that the study is now being carried on by other authorities of the Government of Canada. We are looking forward to it eagerly and we will have it soon. The study is not just on nationalization of the marketing process, Sir. The study deals with all aspects of a marketing period, because there might be many ways to improve the present marketing situation short of having a Government board. Certainly it is an area that must be looked at, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest that it will be one of the next areas that will occupy the attention of those concerned with fisheries' policy.

Mr. Speaker, we have also heard a great deal from the member for Burin, from whom we hear a great deal anyway. We have heard a great deal about the lack of planning and he cited the fact that within the past year, there has not been a great deal spent on A.D.B. fish plant program. Now he is right in the fact, Sir, that is correct. He is a little wrong in his analysis, I suggest, because the true picture is that the A. D. B. program ended, when the A. D. B. ended. As a result of our representations to DREE, the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, we have succeeded in having several new fish plants systems installed; Englee, I believe is to be one, Gaultois on the southwest coast; Grand Bank, in the hon. gentleman's own district. Are there others; since the A. D. B. program ended. These are not under the A. D. B. program, Mr. Speaker. These are under the new program which replaced it. The program ended, because A. D. B. ended and in event the funds allocated to it were exhausted. To say that it was a result of a lack of planning on the part of this Government, I suggest, is to misrepresent the picture as it really is.

The hon. gentleman has made a political career of sorts on insinuations and innuendos suggesting that the Government of Canada have



no confidence in this administration. That is nonsense, Sir, but the hon. gentleman is entitled to his views. But to suggest, on the question of fisheries, this Government are guilty of lack of planning, is just to ignore reality. It was this administration, Sir, which seven years ago called the conference. It was this administration which six years ago brought before this House, the Salt Cod Fish Marketing Board Act. It was made law in 1964. It was this administration, Sir, which commissioned, which carried to Ottawa a detailed fisheries' program and is still by far the best that has ever been developed in this country and still the motherload of good and useful and helpful suggestions on policy in the field of fisheries. If that is not planning, Mr. Speaker, I do not know what planning is. That is some of the best planning that has ever been done in the field of fisheries. It is true that it is four or five years old now and so it has been updated continuously and continually. It is a first rate piece of work.

As for the hon. gentleman's suggestions that we do not get on with Ottawa and his treatise soporific<sup>as</sup>, it was on the fact that, "honey catches more flies than vinegar", a sentiment with which we would all agree. I might point out, Sir, that it was less than a year ago that there were debates in Ottawa affecting a man who, more than any other Minister of Fisheries since we became part of Canada, has been a good Minister of Fisheries for Newfoundland, the hon. Jack Davis the present Minister of Fisheries and Forestry.

Since he became minister, Sir, we have had a price stability program which I think it is fair to say, saved the industry last year, saved firms from bankruptcy and enabled them to keep on employing people. We have had a salt fish marketing board program, which is a joint step forward and one we have been lobbying for for years. We have had catch failure programs to buy up fish, last year and the year before. We have had far more progressive legislation, progressive administration than we had with all the ministers who went before, be they Liberals or be they Tory. We now are getting the

twelve mile limit. We have a twelve mile fishery zone and hopefully we will even get enforcements, because as the Premier told the House the other day, Mr. Speaker, without enforcements, even a twelve mile territorial seas is really meaningless.

Mr. Speaker a year or so ago there were debates in Ottawa in which the hon. Mr. Davis was involved representing the Government of Canada. And in those debates he was called hard words - now those tend to be a feature of debates - Remember, now remember the newly arrived member for Burin who has found his true political home and I am sure he would want me to say, after a number of years wandering over the desert sands. So, hon, gentleman says we must have honey instead of vinegar. I wonder if he would not mind communicating that to the noisy six in Ottawa, who called Jack Davis a trout fisherman.

S<sup>r</sup>AN HON. MEMBER: They called him a jackass.

MR. ROBERTS: No they did not call him a jackass. They did not call him a jackass. They called him a trout fisherman. The silly six, stupid not silly. Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the hon. gentleman opposite should, I realize that politicia make strange bedfellows. The hon. gentleman should perhaps consult with his federal colleagues, his new-found colleagues. I think that we have got more out of the Government of Canada for the fisheries of Newfoundland than in all the years before and the credit goes to the Government of Canada the hon. Jack Davis in so far as it belongs in Ottawa. It does not go to any it does not go Mr. Speaker to the noisy six who called him a trout fisherman and used other harsher phrases. Mr. Speaker, I listened and I will listen again to the hon. gentleman for St. John's Centre let him listen and learn.

S<sup>r</sup>AN HON. MEMBER: He did not know it existed.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the hon. gentleman did not know it existed. Jack Davis did. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman needs lessons as to what the federal government has done we will gladly give them to him. But I am speaking on a Bill with respect to salt fish marketing, Sir. The hon. gentleman has a lot of listing in that case because he needs a lot of learning. The hon. gentleman knows it all now. Is he telling us he knows it all, have not learned anything, well then good, be quiet and listen. Mr. Speaker. the hon. gentleman is the only person I know who can be quiet with his mouth open and flapping, I have a lot of medical officers who would be most interested in that Sir,

S<sup>r</sup>AN HON. MEMBER: I imagine.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the hon. gentleman has a vivid imagination if he can imagine that. Bring his medicare card Mr. Speaker, and we will take him in. Mr. Speaker, I would like to close, I would like to close Mr. Speaker, but if the hon. gentleman does not want me to close I will be delighted to go on but I suspect his hon. colleague is about to spring to his feet, - the hon. gentleman's colleague is forebearing. I do not speak as an expert on salt fish Sir, I speak as an expert of sorts on what it means to one's district. It means a damned lot to my district. My people have gone hungry. And let the hon. gentleman and his beer peddling come down and try it in White Bay North. Did not the hon. gentleman at one stage represent a brewery?

Mr. Speaker, if I may in closing say just a word about the minister who has brought this Bill to the House. There seems to be some feeling that the gentleman will have another connection with the Salt Fish Board, I do not know about that Sir. I do know that the hon. gentleman has carried on nobly in the tradition of his predecessors, the only minister's of Fisheries that I knew personally were my friend the present friend the member for Trinity North, I am glad to hear he is doing relatively well in hospital. And of course, the late J. T. Cheeseman, a man who probably knew more about the fisheries than any Newfoundlander before or since.

My colleague the member for Ferryland has carried on locally in that tradition. And I have no doubt that if, in fact these rumours are correct he is by far the best that Newfoundland has to offer. He will be a loss if he is to leave us. He will be a loss to this House and to this Government and he will be a loss I may say to me personally, because I have a certain communion with the hon. gentleman not because we happen to share a desk. Mr. Speaker, let the hon. member for St. John's West mock, there is a time for mockery, there is a time not for mockery. If the hon. member wants to mock let him mock, let him mock.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, will the hon. minister permit a question? All I said was that I thought it was the hon. minister of Fisheries worse trial to have to share a desk with the hon. member. That is all I said Mr. Speaker.

MR.ROBERTS: I said, Mr. Speaker, let the hon. gentleman mock, let him mock if he wants, he is a pretty mockable fellow Mr. Speaker, but let me say what I have to say, let me say what I have to say.

MR.CROSBIE: Is anyone stopping you?

MR.ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman would just restrain himself. I think he finds it very difficult, very difficult. I have listened to the hon. gentleman for -

MR.CROSBIE: You are going to listen a lot more.

MR.ROBERTS: I will listen gladly, when he is order when he says something but let him extend to others the same courtesy that he claims for himself, claims for himself with indignation, let him be quiet Mr. Speaker, let him mock elsewhere, let him mock elsewhere. I do not care if the hon. gentleman wants my advice or not, when I have the floor Mr. Speaker, I am allowed to speak, let him mock elsewhere.

MR.CROSBIE: ..... and the hon. minister will not stop him.

MR.ROBERTS: I would not try to stop the hon. gentleman doing anything.

MR.CROSBIE: That is it, exactly.

MR.ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker let the hon. gentleman, let the hon. gentleman be quiet when he has something to say, if he has, let him say it until then Sir, let him be quiet, if he wants to mock and scorn let him mock and scorn. let him do it elsewhere Sir, and let him do it in another place, and at another time. As I have said Sir, if indeed the member for Ferryland the minister of fisheries is to leave us, he will be a loss, be a loss that this House can ill afford. But Sir, for anything , for anything other in this salt fish board it will be a loss that I suggest this House could not, would not happily accept. But Sir, if he is to leave us, if he is to leave us Sir, and that is the point I am making, the Salt Fish Board, then I think that is worth of him and worthy of this House. This Board Sir, can be of inestimable value to five, ten, fifteen thousand Newfoundlanders who still make their living from the Salt Fish industry Many of them are older men now, there seem to be very few younger men going into the salt fish industry. Many of them are older men Sir, men who have got

fifteen, twenty, twenty-five and thirty years of working life ahead of them, for these men the Salt Fish industry is of crucial importance. It has been neglected, the political football for 400 years, today, tonight with the help of Ottawa it is coming to an end. I hope that that is so, Sir, and I believe it to be so. Accordingly I, both as a member of the Government and as a member for an outharbour district, the district that lives or dies by salt fish. I take very real pride in supporting this Bill.

HON. STEPHEN A. NEARY:(MINISTER OF WELFARE): Mr. Speaker, it has been a long debate, but it has been a very important debate. And I would not let the opportunity pass without having my support of this Bill recorded. In supporting the Bill, Mr. Speaker, I would point out that my present portfolio provides me with constant reminders of the large numbers of our citizens who come to us for temporary assistance, but end up remaining on short term assistance for prolonged periods. Periods prolonged enough Mr. Speaker to make them recipients of social assistance on a really permanent basis. Many thousands of these people, Mr. Speaker, had been brought up to no other skills, than those employed in the boats and the ships and the processing plants of the fishing industry. Very few among these are trainable to other skills, so that they may support themselves and families without the assistance of Government. To make matters even worse, Mr. Speaker, most new industries for their success depend either on skills which the more mature among these people find it difficult to acquire, or they thrive on automation.

Because of our strategic position in the Atlantic Ocean we can yet afford a fishing industry which lays the emphasis on hand, rather than on sophisticated machinery. Hitherto, Mr. Speaker, the great curse of the industry which can still offer employment to the greatest number of Newfoundlanders, has been essentially the complete failure to market its product. The Salt Fish Marketing Board, Sir, is the first realistic attempt to move our chief industry, chief in terms of Manpower Employment Potential into the twentieth century needs.

May I hope, Mr. Speaker, that once this legislation has become truly workable, it will remove many of our good honest hard working citizens from our social assistance role.

MR. ANTHONY J. MURPHY:(LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker I would like to add my support to it. I am the only one on this side of the House I think attended the meeting, in the Liberals Commonroom, God forgive me, some seven years ago, when this matter was discussed. At that time we had Mr. W. J. Browne,

MR. MURPHY: the hon. W. J. Browne, and Mr. Greene, seven of us, we gave our unanimous support to the idea of the Salt Cod Fish Marketing Board, I think Mr. Browne was one of the ones who really plugged for the Board, because he was quite familiar with the Wheat Marketing Board in Western Canada, so as I say just to lend my support to the Bill and also if we what we hear is true, I add my congratulations to a certain popular Cabinet Minister on the other side, I feel rather happy that this gentleman that he named, will receive the job. He is a fine gentleman and he is one of ours. It sort of reminds me of a story a few years ago, when they were electing a Pope, a parish priest was talking to one of his parishioners, and he discussed who would be Pope, and the parishioner says, "I do not give a darn who it is, so long he is one of ours." So I feel the same way about the hon. minister, that we will have a good representative Newfoundland therefore, that Newfoundland is recognized for the great fishing centre it is, and I wish if the story is true, that I wish the hon. member the best of everything. And I know whatever he does, will be in the best interest of his fellow Newfoundlanders with whom he has worked for so many years and knowing their problems, and I can just say again, I support this Bill quite heartily and wish the new President of the Salt Cod Fish Marketing Board the very best of success in the future.

MR. URIAH STRICKLAND: Mr. Speaker, I do not want to rob anytime from the Minister that it will take him to close this debate. But I just want to point out one thing, and I have not heard anybody yet point it out, that if this legislation is to work in the best interest of the fishermen of this Province next in importance to the appointment of a President, whoever he may be, whether it is the hon. gentleman that has been referred to or somebody else, the very next thing in importance, as I see it, will be the inspectors that are appointed to rub shoulders with our fishermen. I can never forget something that I saw happen here in St. John's years ago on a wharf in St. John's, there was a disagreement between the man who was purchasing the fish, and the man who had caught it and ate it. The man who was purchasing the fish called the inspector, he called him down into his office, and without seeing the fish he



Mr. Strickland: He sided with the man who was buying the fish, against the man who caught it. And if these kind of men are appointed as inspectors, it will work detrimentally to the interest and betterment of our fishermen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman will allow me, the inspectors and the colours will be working for the fishermen, not for the merchants. The merchants will only get a commission for handling the fish, and for renting their premises. The fish will belong to the Board, which will function for the fishermen, and there will be nobody with any stake or any interest in cheaping the fishermen. No one, no one is buying it from them to sell it and make a profit, and put in his own pocket. Every dollars that comes back from the fish that is sold goes into the pockets of the men who produced the fish when you take off the bare expenses.

MR. STRICKLAND: I am delighted, Mr. Speaker, to hear this from the Premier, because in the passed our fishermen have gotten the blame for all the bad fish that have been made in Newfoundland. And I have seen some good fish names, purchased from the fishermen, and then when they went to pack that fish, that these are squeezed to death by the machines that they were pressing it into the cans with or they were taking axes and cutting the fins of, or taking fifty-six pound weights and beating it to pieces. And that is the way that fish went to our markets. So I am glad that we will have somebody like inspectors, who will see to it, that the fishermen of this Province will get their just dessert, and this is long over due, and of tremendous importance as far as this legislation is concerned.

MR. ROSS BARBOUR: Mr. Speaker I come from a fishing family. The Barbour's made their living fishing on the Labrador. And I recall on several occasions in those yesteryears when the price of salt fish was so low, that we almost had to have thousands and thousands of quintals to make both ends meet. And then when they would straighten up in the fall of the year, they still would be in debt to the merchants.

Mr. Speaker, I support the Bill, because I know it is good for the fishermen of Newfoundland, as Your Honour knows, I represent one of the largest

MR. BARBOUR: fishing communities in the whole of Canada. There are 250 fishermen who do nothing else but catch fish, small boat fishermen and long liner fishermen. And because of that I indeed would be very remiss, If I did not rise and say that I am happy to see this Bill come before the House. And I would just like to say in passing, and I will not refer to it tomorrow when I speak in the Throne Speech debate, but I would like to say now, that I think, if the hon. Minister of fisheries is appointed to this high office every Newfoundlander should take off their hats to him, because he is a man who has the ability, the qualifications and the experience, and he understands the needs of the fishermen. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am happy to see, if this man becomes the President that the people of this Island who catch fish will be given a square deal. I support the Bill.

HON. A.J.MALONEY (Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I am naturally very pleased by the support given this Bill by the members of the House who have spoken in this debate. I would like to say that in my opinion the success of this the corporation which arises from this Bill will depend upon quite a number of things some of which have been mentioned in this debate. Some have not, but I would put before anything else Sir, as very necessary to its success and that is the cooperation of the fishermen and the cooperation of the people who are presently engaged in the processing of fish in Newfoundland.

I have made a number of notes down through the debate. They are to answer some of the points raised, they are not necessarily in any order and perhaps It may be that I will repeat myself in going through them, but I would like to answer some of the points raised by hon. members.

The hon. the member for Trinity South raised the question of ~~cutters~~ and inspectors. The hon. the Premier made a comment on that. I would rather see in the Federal Legislation Mr. Speaker, and in our own some other designation rather than inspector. I cannot say that I am very enamoured to the word inspector. I do not think that that is really what is meant here. I think rather what is intended here, and I think what should be here if it is not intended and that is the man should be a quality control man, a man who understands a good deal about the quality of fish and is able to grade the fish rather than a man who goes in on a premises with the word inspector written across his back and he automatically gives the impression of being a policeman of certain, to see that certain standards and specifications are carried out.

I have discussed this when I discussed the legislation with the Federal people, and this is their feeling as well, but they have not chosen to use what I consider to be a better word so the word inspector in their legislation is the same word that we use in our legislation.

I would like to touch on also, the question of catch-failure although it is away a bit from this legislation, but it was brought up by an number of hon. members. I would like to say this that this problem has

given this Government concern over the years and quite a number of people have been put to the task of coming up with a workable catch-failure program. To this moment I know of no such scheme that would be workable, that would have any meaning for the fishermen and that would be practical of implimentation.

The reasons for this I believe have been outlined by some hon. members here but, hon. members will recall or will know that there are 800 or 900 communities, and how does one go about measuring effort. It is realtively simple I suggest Mr. Speaker, to measure a man's effort if he were to plant several acres of wheat or grain, some vegetables or produce then they in turn be destroyed by hail, or rain, or by some act of God. It is very easy to measure his effort, the effort that he has put in and to compensate him for what he takes out or what he fails to take out.

I suggest that it would be a practical impossibility to do that in the fishery. I would say that the only way to cope with this problem of catch-failure is in a more positive way, and that is to make sure that our fishermen are equipped to deversify their effort. To move from one fishery readily and quickly into another. If for example a man goes to Labrador and it looks around the middle of July as if the fishery is going to be a failure in that part of Labrador and he is made mobile, ~~then~~ he is able to move to some other part of Newfoundland where the fishing is better, that certainly could have happened last year because a great many fishermen from the Conception Bay area went to Labrador and did nothing. Their families who stayed home, or their relatives who stayed home and fished in Conception Bay very often had more fish than they could handle.

I think there is need for greater mobility. There is need to see that fishermen are assisted in Government programs to move into such fisheries as the crab fishery, the shrimp fishery, herring when one or the other, say the ground fishery fails. I do not think there is any other way out of this problem. As a matter of fact, the fishermen in the district my hon. friend the member for Port de Grave, they, a couple of years ago then the fishery failed in that area, or was slow in the fall of the year, they betook

themselves to Twillingate and they wound up the season very late in the fall in Twillingate with a good voyage behind them. They had the boats Mr. Speaker, they had the desire to catch fish, they did not want to be dependent on Government relief programs, and I suggest that we will see more of that. That perhaps more than any scheme that we could bring, I do not know that it would be possible to come up with one that would be actuarially sound, the premium so high as to be perhaps meaningless to the fishermen.

If they can move around, there has never been a year Sir, when the fishery completely all around the island. It failed here or there, north this year, south the next year, and from my own experience, and from my own district fishermen have largely solved the problem of catch-failure by moving from Bay Bulls area say, to the district of my hon. friend the member for Placentia East, to St. Bride's and in doing so have come up with a good years work. I suggest that the answer to this problem might lie in a more positive approach and that is fitting fishermen to take advantage of other fisheries and other resources that may be around.

The hon. the member for St. John's West raised a question on the matter of fishing premises that may become redundant as a result of this legislation. Certainly it is a hypothetical situation and I would not dare to answer because of that. However, he went on to answer the question his own question I thought when he said that the corporation is setup to return the maximum amount of money to the fishermen. This means of course that the corporation is duty bound as a trustee, it is no more than a trustee of the money received from the market, a trustee on behalf of the fishermen to consider every possible efficiency that exists and this may indeed, call for a reallocation of premises. I do not know, it is a hypothetical situation, but I think the hon. member answered it where he asked the question, and then said that the corporation was bound to take these efficiencies into consideration if they were to live up to their charge, and that was to return the maximum amount of money to the fisherman.

I might say however, that there has been an assessment made

recently of the processing capacity in Newfoundland. It is cold storage and drying. There is adequate drying capacity and adequate cold storage capacity. That is a survey carried out by the Government of Canada, to take care of the present production. If there is more production, if there is a greater production next year perhaps there will be need for more drying capacity and more cold storage capacity.

If on the other hand the production is down, there will be some capacity in Newfoundland that will not be used entirely, if at all. At the moment I think, or at least it appears that there is adequate storage around and this deals with the question raised as well by the hon. the member for Burin, who doubted that there was on the Burin Peninsula sufficient storage and drying capacity to take of the production up there. There is. At the moment .....

MR. MALGREY: there was last year, there was the year before. I do not know what there will be in the coming year. It will not be known until after the voyage is over. The question was also raised Sir, of the clause in the Act, perhaps we could deal with now, and we will not have to deal with it later on. That has to do with Clause 18 (c) of exemptions. The hon. the Premier dealt with it quite adequately. A part he mentioned the Gaspé Bay cure, which is a special cure of fish on the Gaspé Bay peninsula. This is now finding its way into a gourmet market, and there is no problem there. The processes are able to pay the fishermen a fairly high price for it, therefore, it is exempted. It could be accepted under the legislation.

There could also be this situation Mr. Speaker, and that is there may be fishermen who would produce a small, a limited quantity of fish say for an institution such as a hotel or a delicatessen. This might be a private arrangement between an individual fisherman. There could be a very limited amount of fish involved, but certainly this is an area in which there would be very little point in the Corporation becoming involved, because the fishermen who elected to enter into this sort of small transaction, he would only do it if it were to his own advantage to do so. He certainly would not do it if the price that he were to get from that source would be less than he would get from the Corporation.

And there is also another area. There is a limited amount of salt fish put up I believe in Nova Scotia. It finds its way into baby food, shredded codfish. The hon. the Premier was a great grandfather the other day, he will need little cans of food. In the little cans there is Apple Sauce and Liver and all the other products. Shredded codfish is now finding its way into it. These are very small arrangements are entered into perhaps a company and a particular packer such as Heinz or any of the other people who pack baby foods. So it is not intended, the Corporation is certainly not intended to go into that, only if it is at the request of the people who are involved. So these are the exemptions that are foreseen and the Clause may look to be a very formidable one to the hon. member for St. John's West, but this is what is meant here in this particular clause of the Act. The hon.

April 13, 1970

Tape #448

Page 2

and #449

the member for Burin I thought raised what I thought was a very good introduction to the Bill. He could not have been listening. He thought that there might be other buyers and other sellers of fish in the Province as well as the Corporation. Well of course if this were to be the case, then why have a Corporation. A corporation is strength. It lies in the fact that it will be the sole buyer and the sole seller. Now this could be - this does not necessarily mean that the Corporation will buy physically every fish, and physically sell every fish. There are perhaps a number of arrangements possible within what I have said.

MR. WELLS: Before he gets off this point, the Minister referred to the Corporation exempting. Does that mean 18 (c) it speaks of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council making regulations exempting, not the Corporation?

MR. MALONEY: Yes, the hon. member is right. It is the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council would exempt on I suppose the representation of the fishermen, or the Corporation. I am not sure. The Corporation <sup>of</sup> itself of course has no - it will be given the power to licence. Will have to make certain regulations. The Corporation Mr. Speaker, will be the sole buyer, and will be the sole seller. But there is in the Province at the present time a salt fish industry made up of perhaps fourteen, fifteen, twenty firms, and certainly the Corporation would consider using these firms as agents of the Corporation. It would not seem to me to make much sense with a Corporation to go out and build refrigerated warehouses and to install driers, when we already have an existing capacity in Newfoundland. And the Corporation would enter into arrangements with these people to act as collectors and processors and perhaps shippers of fish. This is the business which they are well qualified to do. They have the refrigerated warehouses and the driers, and this would be an arrangement between the Corporation and the firm in question. But the main strength of the Corporation will be in the fact that it is - will enter the market as a sole seller. There will not be a number of sellers representing Canadian fish, and I should say Canadian salt fish because Nova Scotia has indicated and indeed has passed legislation, similar to what we have had passed here today, is



April 13, 1970

Tape #448  
and #449

Page 3

already through in Nova Scotian House, and so has the Province of Quebec.

Newfoundland production as I have already said earlier accounts for eighty-five percent of the Canadian salt codfish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. Minister know where the fifteen percent would be divided?

MR. MALONEY: It would be divided perhaps - it is fifteen percent less - Quebec Northshore perhaps about five percent. Nova Scotia itself perhaps about five percent, and the other five would be between Gaspé Bay, and a very, very small bit in New Brunswick.

MR. SMALLWOOD: So that would be Quebec really ten percent almost?

MR. MALONEY: Yes, the Gaspé Bay and Quebec Northshore. The Quebec fish incidentally, the Quebec production apart from Gaspé Bay cure has been coming into Newfoundland for a number of years. They do not export on their own, coming in from the Northshore the firm of S. W. Mifflin in Catalina has been buying the fish off the Quebec Northshore for a number of years. And this is likely to be - as a matter of fact Mr. Speaker, that firm supplies the fishermen on the Quebec Northshore.

So it will be Canadian salt fish because Nova Scotia will be a part of this Corporation, so Quebec and Newfoundland with eighty-five percent of the total Canadian catch, so it would be Canadian salt fish going into the market represented by one seller and that will be the Corporation. So that the strength of the Corporation from that point of view will lie in the fact that it will be the sole seller. There was a question raised by the hon. member for St. John's West I believe on the question of credit. And this is a question that is very important, the questions concerning fishermen.

There are a number of agencies already in existence, government Federally and Provincially involved in credit to fishermen, and I refer of course to the Fisheries Loan Board out of Newfoundland or the Province. The Fishermen's Improvement Loans Act of the Federal Government. That is two. There are the Industrial Development Bank will make loans to the fishing industry. This could be a group of either in the processing or to a group

April 13, 1970

Tape #448  
and #449

Page 4

of fishermen engaged in the fishing industry. And it is not intended that the Corporation place any of these agencies. I see it possible however, for the Corporation to make advances to fishermen perhaps through agents, to enable fishermen to get fishing. The reference in the Federal Act is a very limited one. It is to make loans of working capital on a seasonal basis to fishermen and producers in a participating province. All is said on that but that of course will have to remain undetermined to a large extent until the Corporation comes into being. There is one other question Mr. Speaker, if I may, and then I will conclude. Well the banks of course - this is not intended to replace the chartered banks nor the normal source of credit to the fishing industry. The one other question that I had made a note of it and that was phrased by I think the hon. member for St. John's West. It had to do with the appointment of directors. Each participating province may recommend one director, just one director from each participating province. He may be recommended to the minister by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

These are I think Mr. Speaker, I have covered the main points, there may be others. I think the principle of the Bill has been well established. I have done the best I could do with it, and I would like to thank hon. members for their support of the Bill. And also for the many helpful suggestions that have come from the hon. members who spoke in the Bill. Thank you.

On motion A Bill, "An Act Respecting The Marketing Of Salt Fish," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: It being now 11:00 P.M. I do now leave the Chair. This House stands adjourned until tomorrow afternoon at 3:00 P.M.