



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 2

2nd Session

Number 58

VERBATIM REPORT

Thursday, April 19, 1973

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 10:30 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! The honourable the Minister of Education:

HON. G.R. OTTENHEIMER(MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform the Legislature of the appointment of three principals for the three new vocational schools which are nearing completion at Happy Valley, St. Anthony and Baie Verte. For Happy Valley the person appointed is Mr. Albert Dobson. Mr. Dobson was originally an Englishman. He received his education at Boulton Technical College and graduated with a higher national certificate in mechanical engineering. Mr. Dobson moved to Newfoundland in 1967 and was employed as science instructor at the District Vocational School, Grand Falls. He will be taking up his duties as principal of the Happy Valley Vocational School on the 1st of May.

For St. Anthony the person appointed principal is Mr. Thomas Hancock. He is thirty-one years of age and a graduate of Mount Allison University with a diploma in engineering and a bachelor of science and bachelor of education degree. Mr. Hancock has been employed as lecturer in applied mechanics and mathematics at the College of Fisheries, St. John's for six years and for the last three years has been school supervisor with the Vineland Integrated School Board. Mr. Hancock will take up his position on the 1st of May as well.

For Baie Verte the gentleman appointed principal is Mr. Francis Pollett. He is thirty-eight years of age and following graduation from high school he was employed in the electrical field, for twelve years with American Smelting and Refining Company. For seven years Mr. Pollett was employed as an electrical instructor at the District Vocational School, Grand Falls, and for the last two years he has been supervisor of instruction at the District Vocational School, Carbonear. Mr. Pollett's appointment was effective April 16, 1973.

I have one copy to be tabled and a couple for the opposition.

PETITIONS:

MR. J.A. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the executive committee of a group known as the Defenders of Signal Hill. The prayer of the petition reads, "We the undersigned humbly petition the Newfoundland House of Assembly to prevent the further commercial development of any part of Signal Hill directly or indirectly under its control."

Mr. Speaker, our generation holds Signal Hill in trust. It represents more history than most places in North America. It has witnessed our development from an outpost to a province and has played an active role in guaranteeing that development. In recognition of this fact, the Federal Government has set aside a portion of this hill as a national park. On the fringes of this park the province holds some land, in trust and administered by St. John's City Council. It has proposed to develop some of this fringe. The argument that is used is that the present area now under consideration is neglected and unsightly and that public funds are not presently available for this site. It has been suggested that the construction of a television station would do much for the area. I would suggest that it will do more for the television station.

If we argue that a good development is better than no development where do we stop? What about good restaurants, good hotels, good machine shops and good crematoriums? We cannot make chalk of one and cheese of another. However much one intends it a television station is not a monument, it is a commercial development that requires many ancillary services, not all of them desirable especially on Signal Hill, parking lots, garages, lunchrooms, rest-rooms, water and sewer and a continuous stream of commercial traffic. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, a television station will grow. If we are to judge by past records the proposed television station will double in size every ten years. Having allowed the initial building on the

hill, how will future councils be able to refuse further expansion? The end result even in our lifetime could be a vast network of studios and antenna that will reforest Signal Hill.

Surely this is not the only possible site. What about the Southside Hills? What about the back of town? But if the City Council in its collective wisdom decides upon its intended course, what price will they charge the developer? I would suggest a million dollars, as that piece of real estate is priceless. Think what it would cost to put there.

MR. S.A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I rise to support the prayer of the petition, Sir, but I recognize the fact that minority groups have the right to be heard and they have the right, the same as any other group of citizens in this province, to present a petition to this honourable House. I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that I am one member of this House who cannot support the prayer of the petition. I think this is a step forward and we have not reached the stage in Newfoundland yet, Sir, where we can block -

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member will permit. This is not a debate on the merits or demerits of the petition. The honourable member is at this point requested to keep his remarks short and to the point and not to enter into debate.

HON. A.J. MURPHY (MINISTER OF SOCIAL ASSISTANCE): Mr. Speaker, if I may. I think this is a point of information or privilege, whatever it is. I have just been asked by two members on the back now if they could speak on this and not support the petition, and I told them as far as I knew one cannot speak against the petition as such. Could I get a ruling on that, Sir, because I know there are many who would like to take part in this debate, if you want to make a debate of it?

MR. SPEAKER: To my knowledge - it maybe not as extensive as I would wish it to be, the procedure on petitions is set out

fairly clearly in the standing orders and there may be short comments on it. It was the subject of a detailed ruling by the Speaker in last year's session and certainly it would not be in order for wide ranging debate on the merits or demerits of the petition. It may be the subject of emotion. There are other vehicles of approach to this problem. At this point, if honourable members should wish, it could adjourn so that I could get a definitive answer on this problem. At this point I do not think that debate would be permitted.

MR. ROBERTS: As Your Honour says, when Mr. Speaker (Russell) was here I think the gentleman from Placentia West raised a question. That was quite a long debate and our Speaker did take the time to give us a written ruling and it is obviously not in order to debate a petition. I cannot recall any time when - one can stand and make a comment and the comment can be, "I support the petition" or the comment can be, "I do not support the petition." I think either of those is in order provided it does not step over that thin line which Your Honour must lay down as to what is a mere comment or what is debate. Debate is out of order on a petition because we just receive petitions almost as a matter of consent. But surely it is in order for a member to make a very brief comment provided it does not become debate. Of course we look to Your Honour to tell us when a comment becomes debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will just sum it up then in one word by saying, Mr. Speaker, that I think the prayer of the petition is nonsensical, Sir, and I am against the prayer of the petition although I recognize the fact that minority groups do have a right to be heard.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of the petition. I most assuredly rise in support of the petition. I agree, Your Honour, to explain very briefly why it is that a member from a place as far away from St. John's as Labrador should feel

concerned enough to support what would on the outside look like a purely local situation. I submit, Sir, that Signal Hill and all that it means to us, Signal Hill is a national shrine and St. John's is my capital city as well as everybody else's. I think it is a measure of where we are at the moment that we should have so little concern for our heritage. I agree that Mr. Sterling had a very good idea. His concept was good and I applaud his sense of the aesthetics, his concern for aesthetics but I submit, Sir, there are other areas in this city where such a facility could be placed without destroying the national character of Signal Hill. This should be kept as the national shrine that it is.

I do most assuredly support the petition.

MR. J.C. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few brief comments on the petition. I cannot support the petitions and I do not support the petition for the simple reasons that the proposed structure will not be built within the historic park area. It is not being built within the Signal Hill area really. It is known as the Battery area really. I think this kind of development is going to enhance the beauty in fact of the Signal Hill area and I cannot think of any more appropriate place for a media complex than in the area where the first communication started with Marconi.

So I cannot support the petition.

MR. P.S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I rise and I certainly cannot support the petition presented by the honourable member for St. John's North. I believe the proposed television communications nerve centre which is proposed would be a step in the right direction in giving the proper service to the people of Newfoundland in television. I believe not Signal Hill but close to Signal Hill, on the Upper Battery where this complex is proposed, is the right and proper location for such a complex to be established. I cannot

support the petition.

MR. H.W.C. GILLET: Mr. Speaker, I feel too that I cannot support it, with all due respect to the minority group which, as my honourable colleague has already mentioned, does have a right to be heard. I would certainly be against any commercial complex going there but a broadcasting station as such I think would be on the part of Newfoundland the most wonderful memorial to Marconi, because it was from that site that the first message went through the air and this, a broadcasting station, is doing just that. That is why I cannot support the petition, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: If honourable members will permit, it is quite possible that every honourable member here would like to speak to this petition it being a matter of certainly urgent municipal concern. However, we do have other business to do. While this is a topic on which honourable members no doubt could expound at length, I think we should at this point move on to other matters.

QUESTIONS:

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the answer to question number 232, on the order paper of April 19, 1973, asked by the honourable member for St. Barbe North.

MR. SPEAKER: Gentlemen, before I leave the Chair it has been brought to my attention that we have in the galleries seventeen grade VII, grade VIII and grade IX students from St. Thomas, Grand La Pierre School in Fortune Bay with their teacher in charge, Mr. Merrill W. Reid, and Mrs. Reid. I trust that your visit to the galleries today will be interesting and informative and on behalf of the honourable members here I welcome you to today's proceedings.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

HEAD XIV - Fisheries - 1401(01):

HON. F.D. MOORES (PREMIER): Mr. Chairman, in the opening remarks I will be comparatively brief today but on this particular subject of

fisheries where the general discussion is on the first vote, it could be very easy as well to go into great depth and great length talking about fisheries as they pertain to our province. However, I will make the remarks brief because I am sure the debate will be a good debate on fisheries today, because it is of serious consequence and of a serious nature to our province. I am sure members on the other side as well as this side will have what I will hope will be worthwhile comments to make rather than just a critique of what the situation is.

I would also like to say that with the resignation of Mr. Cheeseman the details that maybe required may take a little longer but it will be available to everybody. I apologize for possibly not being as aware of some of the exact details as he would have been. But before, Mr. Chairman, getting into the specific programme for the fisheries of this year, the fisheries in Newfoundland have always been a political whipping board for every political party. That is exactly what it has been, a whipping board because fisheries are always talked a lot about. It has always been great election discussion but in fact the fisheries have probably been the most neglected of any department of government.

We as a government are nowhere near where we wanted to be at this time after a year in office but the fact remains that more has been accomplished in the past year than any other one year since Confederation. The fishery is important but it is also as it is operated and conducted in this province very frustrating. It is an industry that has problems that are unique in themselves. They maybe even more unique when the neglect that we have had over the many years, with the method of how the fishery was prosecuted since the days we started, and it makes it even more frustrating and more difficult when one sees what needs to be done.

We have gone from a system in this province where we had

a futile system, if you like, in the fisheries. We also suffered now, in retrospect, in the fact that the fish always came to us and we never had to go to where the fish were. Our fishery was geared to catch fish when they came on shore but in fact while this was happening European Nations were indeed building equipment and gear and methods that made them go and look for where the fish were and made them go and hunt fish, which we are now finding ourselves in the same position and have to do. The change of attitude that is required, the change in equipment that is required means that we must have a new approach in its entirety to the fishery.

Another thing that makes it frustrating and difficult to project the fishery as we should do is the attitude really of the Federal Government. The Federal Government in Ottawa, as good as they are in some ways, when it comes to the matter of fisheries programmes really have not given it any great consideration or any great degree of importance in their thinking, whether it is the conservation of the fish stocks themselves, which is federal jurisdiction and which is absolutely imperative if the fishery is to survive and be healthy, as is essential for this province, or whether it be the installation of facilities. There was a time in the days of Mr. Pickersgill, when he was in public works, that wharfs and breakwaters and the like were not too difficult to get because at that time they were much a part of their political pork barrel but today the facilities that are required, which are federal responsibilities, and I am talking of the tidewater facilities, are very difficult to arrange in Ottawa. There is in fact very little interest in the fisheries in Ottawa, as was demonstrated by the absorption of the Department of Fisheries into the Department of Environment.

A great deal more I am sure will be said on this today but in fact the fishery does go provincially and federally hand by glove, by its very nature of its being deepsea and on the water and a federal responsibility from high tide out.

The industry in Newfoundland has grown very fast in the last few years. The fishermen themselves have developed strong unions, I think, stronger than anyone would have thought was possible even just a few years ago. This has done two things; it has given the fishermen a unified voice, which is important, but it has done even more than that; it has meant the interchange of knowledge through the union organizers, through their various conventions and so on, a change in knowledge and ideas as to what is the best way to earn the best dollar, if you like, or prosecute the fishery in the most meaningful manner.

We have seen better methods being employed in the fishery in most of our areas up to now with our fifty-eight foot longliners which are really developing into multi-purpose boats as opposed to just longliners. We have seen different equipment being used around the province like ringnetting. We have seen scallop fisheries develop, shrimp fisheries develop, multi purpose boats and new species being caught. A great deal more work needs to be done in this area, particularly in the identifying of commercial quantities of new species of fish as for instance the Japanese market that has opened up for caplin. What can be done in caplin reduction as they have done in Norway is all very interesting and all very possible and beneficial to the province.

The companies themselves have progressed to a much more efficient degree than they had been previously but the government have not kept up when in fact, we in government, both governments, should be leading the way. This applies especially in the field of technology and programmes, whereby we can provide incentives to get better gear, better equipment and to assist people in knowing and becoming aware of the different methods that are available for catching as well as the different types of fishery that there are available to our people today. At one time in Newfoundland, it was not very long ago, the only fish was the codfish. I do not know what the production

of cod is today compared to all the other species combined but I would suggest that it is a comparatively small percentage when one looks at herring and all the other fish that are presently being caught.

As I mentioned, the downgrading by Ottawa has not done anything to help our cause and we have not done enough ourselves. However, our plans for this year are that we plan to do a great deal more. Last year there was an under-expenditure in fisheries from the original budget to the revised figures of almost \$2 million. I think it was \$1.9 million. When you consider that this money was in fact not spent, this is wrong, because the fishery is certainly an area that needed it. But in the way of explanation I would like to give a few of the figures that are available as to why. Nine hundred and forty-nine thousand dollars of that amount was transferred, in fact to the Newfoundland Industrial Corporation for the trawler that was being built at Marystown. That takes nine hundred thousand dollars off the top of that. The other items that had variations in the estimates under the capital works and loans grant were the fishery service centres, where eight hundred thousand dollars were budgeted and in fact three hundred and forty-two thousand dollars were all that were spent.

Small boat slipways; the estimate was three hundred thousand dollars and in fact we got up to three hundred and seventeen thousand dollars. That one was overspent. Community and fish handling facilities were six hundred thousand dollars and in fact nine hundred and thirty-six thousand dollars were spent. Unloading facilities on wharves; fifty thousand dollars were allocated and seventy-three thousand dollars were spent. Fisheries access roads and that is to the facilities on shore; two hundred thousand dollars were allocated, sixty-four thousand dollars, in fact, were spent.

When we look at these figures, the upgrading of vessels and equipment, the bounty on special gear and equipment all add variations but what happened in fact was that construction was delayed as a result of unusually severe winter conditions resulting in a shortfall of two hundred and fourteen thousand dollars on the capital side.

The Department of the Environment over the past years has been developing a programme to provide financial assistance to fishermen and other vessel owners who wish to upgrade their existing craft and/or fishing equipment. Our programme was therefore deferred so as to tie in with the upcoming federal subsidy programme which left us a shortfall of five hundred thousand dollars.

All in all, to sum up, the construction that was delayed amounted to two hundred and fourteen thousand dollars, the improvement programme which I just mentioned, which was done because of the delay in the federal programme, amounted to five hundred thousand dollars. The expenditure of nine hundred and forty-nine thousand for the trawler was in fact done by the N.I.D.C. rather than the Department of Fisheries so in fact what was spent and the unallocated allotment last year was short-spent by two hundred and eighty-two thousand dollars. This explains why it was done. It is not necessarily saying it was a good thing that it was done, it is given in the way of explanation.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the fishery, we are talking about really three areas that are concerned in this particular function. Number one, is the catching of the fish itself. This is done by inshore and offshore fishermen. What we are looking at in order to improve the catch of the fishermen themselves, first of all, as I mentioned earlier, is better gear and more availability to that gear in making it easier to get it. Training in new areas of fishing. Where at one time we had a deep-shore fishery, a deep-water fishery (trawler fishery, if you like) and an inshore fishery, I think we are looking at today, with the multi-purpose boats and the possibilities that are available, what I think they call in the United Kingdom, middle-distance fishing or middle-water fishing. In other words, people go out for two or three days as opposed to just going out for the day or going out for a week or ten days. With the gear that is available and with the multi-purpose boats that will be coming more available all the time, and that is where the emphasis is now, both from the fishermen and the government priority point of view, this is a fishery that will very

definitely be playing a very real part in the future.

We also have to try to help our fishermen understand the new methods that are available, such as mid-water trawling, if we are talking about the multi-purpose boats. When I say mid-water trawling I am talking about, of course, the difference between ground-fish trawling on the bottom, the actual net in between. We are talking about new methods of scallop dragging, of shrimp fishing, of things that in some areas where these bodies are now being found but where people had no idea how to go about it. We are talking about the development, together with the federal government, of identifying commercial quantities of the new species and as I say, more importantly, probably, the instruction as to how to take advantage of these. It is only a very few years ago, for instance, that the first turbot was shipped out of Newfoundland in a frozen condition. I am not talking about pickled turbot. It is only a very short while ago that all these different species, shrimps, scallops, all these fish that have come in and are now being exported in commercial quantities.

The first phase of the fishery itself is actually catching it and these, very briefly, are a few of the problems and a few of the methods I think where the emphasis should be put. The second phase of the fishery, the fishing industry, or whatever we want to call it, is the processing. That has become more efficient in recent years but it is still staggering when one realizes that between thirty and forty percent of all the plant capacity in the province is all that is utilized during any given year. It is just over thirty percent of the fish plant capacity that is actually in use in a given year, which is a figure that has to be overcome if we are going to be as proficient and as efficient as our international counterparts.

The third part of the fishing industry is one at which we have been very bad in this province, as has Canada for that matter, and that is the reprocessing and the marketing of reprocessed goods that should and must be done in this province. Reprocessing of herring alone would employ literally thousands of individuals. The difference between

the huge amounts of herring that are being landed for fish meal as opposed to what could be done if we were talking about four or eight ounce jars of marinated herring or what have you, is quite phenomenal. We have herring, we have all these speciality items, we have any of the fish that we ship out in bulk form which, with the proper technology and the proper expertise, should and will be done in this province.

Some of these steps we plan to take this year. We hope to initiate the beginning of all of them this year. We will be establishing the regional offices this year. We will be, for instance, taking the various new methods of catching fish. like the ringnet I mentioned a while ago, the various types of gear and boats that are available now. The Department of Fisheries will be taking the display, if you like, of instructional films, of boat models, their total exhibit, and will be taking a tour of the more isolated parts of the province and this will particularly include the Labrador Coast where this sort of knowledge is not readily available because of the lack of television and other things that are available to a lot of people in the province. These things will be started this year.

The DREE - ARDA agreement - we hope to sign up an interim two-year agreement very shortly which will assist greatly in the establishment of bounties or assistance for gear, for service centres around the province. These are the things that will be given first priority in the DREE - ARDA agreement which we are negotiating right at the moment and should be hopefully done within the next few weeks.

One thing I would like to point out, Mr. Chairman, before we start getting abused too much for fisheries performance this year, and that is the figure, the total amount that has been spent on the fishery since 1963 - 1964 until this year. 1963-1964 there was \$1.5 million allocated to the fishery; 1964-1965, \$1.5 million; 1965-1966, \$2 million; 1966-1967, \$17 million but that included \$13 million for the Marystown operation and - \$13.5 million as a matter of fact for the Marystown shipyard construction which really in fact was not the

fisheries programme as such. 1967-1968, \$4 million; 1968-1969, \$5 million; 1969-1970, \$4 million; 1970-1971, \$3 million; 1971-1972, \$6 million, last year, even on the revised figures there were \$7 million spend and this year the budget is for in excess of \$10 million. In fact we are spending some three or almost \$4 million more than our last highest year ever in the fishery, this year coming up. A great deal more than that probably should be spent but first of all we have to identify the problems and we have to make sure we are on the right track to cure them.

For instance, the trawler development programme we have in mind does not show in the estimates because of a different method of financing and a different method of approach for that, which I can easily explain when we get to that area or if anyone has any questions on it. Basically, with these few remarks, Mr. Chairman, I will sit down and listen to what the other people have to say and I will do the best I can to answer their questions as they come up.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, the Premier in his opening remarks has told us very little. The Committee now has dealt with every department of government and we find fisheries one of the most important departments of government left until last. I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is exactly where the present government places the fishery of this province, at the end of their priority list.

Two years ago, Mr. Chairman, the Progressive Conservative Party went out and campaigned on a major topic of emphasis on the development of the fishery. The fishermen were gullible enough, quite a few of them, to swallow hook, line and sinker two of those promises made by the Progressive Conservative Party, and a great majority of the fishermen are responsible for putting the government in power today. However, I would say, Mr. Chairman, there is no group of people more disappointed in the actions of the government than the fishermen of this province. Now, Sir, the promises made to develop the vital resources are invisible. The Tory talk of two years ago has turned into promises emptier than the cod traps fished along the

northern part of Labrador for the past two or three years.

The honourable the Premier attempted to divert public attention from his administration's own mismanagement of the much heralded but to date nonexistent programme to develop the fishery. When his chief officer abandoned ship, as its floundering became obvious to all, what should the Premier do but rush out to call a press conference and lay the blame on Ottawa for the resigning of Mr. Cheeseman.

MR. NEARY: And blamed it on the opposition.

MR. WINSOR: And putting part of the blame on the criticism which Mr. Cheeseman was taking in the House of Assembly. Mr. Chairman, Mr. Cheeseman received very little criticism from this side of the House, but the Premier is left in fear. He is not telling us the true facts as to why Mr. Cheeseman resigned. He has not given us the reason. Roy Cheeseman had more spunk and energy than to resign from the cabinet because he was criticized by one or two members of this House and even at that, very little. Roy Cheeseman is a man, I would say, with a strong character, who saw danger. He served in the last war, he was used to criticism, he was used to facing up to situations, sometimes beyond which he had any control. But, Sir, to say that Mr. Cheeseman resigned because of criticism and his failure to get all the co-operation from Ottawa, I would say is very misleading indeed. I would also say that it is very unfair of the Premier to label Mr. Cheeseman, to indicate that the man was not stable enough to withstand the criticism and carry out the functions of that department.

The real reason for Mr. Cheeseman's resignation, when it is all brought out, is the fact that Mr. Cheeseman was disillusioned, he was embarrassed, he was confused both with the policies of the Premier or the government and I would say much confused with the Minister of Finance. Mr. Cheeseman went out in 1972 and he campaigned on the Progressive Conservative manifesto. He went to Hermitage and promised

the fishermen what he would do for them but much to his sorrow and regret, on the eve of the budget he discovered that he could not go back to the people of that district with a clear conscience because he knew that the people of that district had greater expectations of him. In disillusionment, in confusion, in disarray he saw no other course but to resign.

Now what do we have? We have a Department of Fisheries without a minister, without a deputy minister. ~~The~~ deputy minister was put out to pasture, on full salary I might add, but nevertheless that position should have been filled if the Premier saw fit to remove that gentleman. The Department of Fisheries is too important a department of government to be allowed to go very long without even a deputy minister not to say the importance of a minister. I cannot see, Mr. Chairman, how the Premier is going to be able to manage that department bearing in mind his other duties and the time that he can spend devoted to that department. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that the gentlemen who are responsible for running that department will be very confused and I might add here, anything we say on this side of the House will have no reflection whatsoever on the officials of that department. I had the privilege and the opportunity to work with those gentlemen, not permanently but certainly permanently after July 1971. I found that the officials there were very co-operative and had good ideas. Those gentlemen, together with others, could develop a programme for the fishery of this province.

Now, Sir, let us go back to some of the promises on which the Tory Party came into power. They used that manifesto through the Speech from the Throne of March 1, 1972. It stated that the Department of Fisheries will be greatly expanded immediately so that it can provide much greater assistance and information to the fishermen of this province. The department will be drastically increased in size. What a contradiction. In March the department was going to be increased in size and what do we find? We find today, fifteen months later, a department shattered, a he minister so confused he had to resign and no

deputy minister. Here we are, Mr. Chairman, the department has fallen apart in the seams. "It is my government's intention to establish regional office of this department at select locations." Now, Sir, when the honourable Premier replies he can give us the information as to where those locations are. "These branches will be established in order to provide better service to fishermen living in those areas. If the much expanded Department of Fisheries is to be fully effective, the fishermen themselves in all parts of the province must be directly involved." The only trace of anything being done in that regard, Mr. Chairman, is the task force, the Provincial Planning Task Force Committee on Fisheries. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that this is the ultimate refuge for the indecision which will result in the proliferation of other task forces or committees, which will result in a chain reaction of one committee after another, which will end in self-destruction of the government who have not the courage to make vital decisions regarding the fishery of this province, which was outlined in the Speech from the Throne of March 1.

Mr. Chairman, the Premier indicated very strongly in that press release that Ottawa was responsible for Mr. Cheeseman's resignation. Now, Sir, we or at least I did not always agree with the actions of the Federal Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Jack Davis. As a matter of fact, we often disagreed with his policies. I would say, Mr. Davis perhaps contributed more to the defeat of the Liberal Government in this province by the fishermen than any other means. He advocated and he brought into force certain regulations which were not acceptable to the fishermen. But, Sir, I am not qualified to debate the merits or demerits of Mr. Davis' programmes. Scientifically, he felt that there were certain regulations which must be brought in for the conservation of certain fish stocks, and I suppose sometimes one has to be cruel to be kind. However, the effects of those regulations, especially those pertaining to the salmon fishery, had a very bad effect on the Liberal Government of this Province when we were out campaigning in 1971.

MR. NEARY: His intentions were honourable.

CAPT. WINSOR: His intentions were good but they were not interpreted as such in this province.

Referring to the Speech from the Throne again. "Special emphasis will be placed on the tremendous need to upgrade the place of the fishermen in the social and economic life of this province. My government will immediately embark on a programme to encourage the establishment of additional advanced reprocessing facilities for fish within this province." Here I would like to bring to the attention of the Premier and when he replies he might be able to give me an answer: What are the government's intention on providing a fresh fish filleting plant or processing plant on Fogo Island? Fogo Island, Mr. Chairman, has a population of more than 4,000 people engulfing ten communities, The majority of them directly or indirectly depend largely on the fishery for survival. I would predict now, Mr. Chairman, that if there should not be a fish plant established on Fogo Island, the chances of that area surviving will be very, very limited, when we when we consider that there are about six hundred or more, six hundred odd fishermen on Fogo Island, with more than three hundred full-time fishermen and the only species of fish which can be processed on the island is cod. What the people of Fogo Island want is a processing plant which can process all species of fish (I think the honourable Premier would agree with me on this) If they are to be independent, self-supporting, self-sufficient, then, Sir, I do not see any hope for Fogo Island unless that fish plant is established there.

The honourable Minister of Justice some time ago made a statement to the effect that people have a right to live where they wish, and I agree with him. The honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, in his release the other day, said that when a development takes place, whether a national park or otherwise, the social upheaval and interference with a traditional way of life should be kept at the very minimum. We are firm believers in the creed that if people want to change their way of life, government has an obligation to help in that change. On the other hand, and this is the point I want to make,

if people are content and happy with their present life style and in the communities where they and their forefathers have lived for hundreds of years, then government, Mr. Chairman, have a very serious obligation to protect these people from serious social and economic upheaval. There lies the secret to the survival of Fogo Island. I trust the government will take heed and will fulfill their obligation and establish that fish plant on Fogo Island, because, Sir, about ten million pounds of fish is brought in by the longliners there and the inshore fishermen who unfortunately have not been very successful during the past years. All of that fish but cod is brought by vessels from Fogo Island to Conception Bay to be processed. All the labour which should be done on Fogo Island is now being carried out at fish plants at Harbour Grace or at Carbonear. This must stop and the people of Fogo Island must be given their right to be able to process and work in the fish plants like any other community.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that this will be a good debate. Many of the honourable members in this House who are representing fishing districts will certainly want to speak on this very important department and I trust the honourable the Premier will be very co-operative when asked questions. I am sure the Premier will endeavour to give us what information he can.

So, Sir, with those few opening remarks I will conclude by saying to the Premier and his government, the fishermen of this province expect a lot from him. They were told they would receive more, more would be done for them than by any previous government. Now, let us see what is going to happen. I will admit that perhaps one year is not a fair trial. I am not one to condemn wholly that too much has not been done, but what policies are being continued are policies we of the former administration started. It is only a continuation of those policies, therefore, Sir, I realize and the honourable Premier

must have realized when he was out campaigning in that election that there is no miracle and no man can perform miracles in the fishing industry of this province. We have a very precocious geographical location. It is not easy to adopt policies and bring them into effect so that it is going to be noticeable over a very short period of time.

However, Mr. Chairman, we will have to wait for another year and if improvements are not made to the fishing industry then, of course we will have to come back and suggest to the Premier that not only the ministers and deputy minister be relieved of their duty but he then as Premier will have to retire as well.

MR. F. B. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to speak on behalf of what must be one of the most frustrated districts in the province, and that is St. Barbe North when it comes to the areas of the fisheries, Sir.

Briefly, I would just like to outline what the situation is in St. Barbe North with respect to the number of fishermen, the gear and the facilities that they have there. This information was kindly given to me by officials of the provincial Department of Fisheries. The figures are for the year 1970 and there has been a great increase since that time and I have not been able to get the specific figures on it.

Sir, in that year, in the District of St. Barbe North, there were 659 bona fide fishermen. The number of gill nets were 2,119; the number of cod traps, 173; the number of hand lines, 730; the number of trawl lines, 4,377; herring and gill nets, 298; the number of salmon and trap nets, 81; lobster traps, 41,000 approximately; the number of small boats less than twenty feet, 37; between twenty and twenty-five feet, 198; between twenty-five and thirty feet, 131; between thirty and thirty-five feet, 30; over thirty-five, 6. Now, Sir, since that time there has been a great increase in the longliner fleet. I believe in St. Barbe North they must have upwards of twenty, twenty-five or thirty longliners in that one district alone, that much of an increase over the last two or three years. Sir, in that year the

total production in poundage of all species was 8,053,000 pounds landed, of all species, in the district for a total landed value of \$610,000 approximately.

Now, Sir, there has been a great increase in the number of fishermen I would submit and in the number of boats and the number of people involved in the fisheries from all points of view, in St. Barbe North. Unfortunately, Sir, there has not been a significant increase, since this administration took over, of the fish handling facilities in St. Barbe North. Unfortunately for these people there is a great fish plant, and I will explain why I say unfortunately in a few minutes, there is a great fish plant in Port Choix, Fisheries Products, and there is another great fish plant in St. Anthony, one just to the north and one just to the south. Consequently, Sir, there is next to nothing in the way of fish handling facilities in the District of St. Barbe North itself. Now they do have a number of community stages. There are community stages at Anchor Point, Cook's Harbour, Black Duck Cove, Savage Cove, Sandy Cove and Green Island Cove. but, Sir, as far as fish handling facilities are concerned that is it.

Now, since I have been elected, Sir, the people and myself are making approaches to the Provincial Department of Fisheries for what we call in the beginning a fish plant. Now, Sir, it was explained to me by the former Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Cheeseman, the economic lunacy of trying to get a fish plant in the District of St. Barbe North itself, since we do have these two large fish plants one to the south and one to the north.

What we gradually evolved to, Sir, was the need for better fish handling facilities, multi-purpose fish handling facilities or specialized fish handling facilities or feeder plants being established along the coast of St. Barbe North. Because, Sir, this district is primarily a fishing district. It is only industry that these people have up there. It is the only hope that they have for the future. It is practically the only form of employment except for a few

services and businesses and this sort of thing. But generally speaking, St. Barbe North is primarily a fishing district. Sir, there is a tremendous need for better fish handling facilities in that district.

Now I have to admit, Sir, that I have had a tremendous amount of co-operation from the officials of the Department of Fisheries and they have taken a tremendous amount of their time in the department and met with delegations from St. Barbe North and have explained the situation to me and to these delegations. But, Sir, unfortunately that is the only thing that the people of St. Barbe North have received from the Department of Fisheries and that is co-operation. There has been no action at all on the establishment of any type of fish handling facility.

One year ago, Sir, we made representation to the department to try and get something done with the new vegetable storage unit that was being established there in Plum Point. We were hoping to get that converted into some sort of a fish handling facility on the coast. To this date, Sir, that vegetable storage unit, the frame of it, is still standing there in Plum Point and the other materials and the machinery associated with it are stored out on the Brig Bay Point.

Sir, the one thing that I pleaded for last year was that this administration not take advantage of the rivalry between the Brig Bay Area, in the southern part of my district, and the northern part of the district. They are both looking for additional facilities. To be quite frank with you, both areas are going after that vegetable storage unit for the purpose of using it for a fish handling facility.

Sir, even as recently as last night I received a telephone call from some people in the Anchor Point - Flower Cove Area saying; "What is all this about the Brig Bay people having collected money to contribute towards the reconstruction of the Plum Point vegetable storage unit?" Apparently, Sir, some officials of the Department of Fisheries have now gone into the Flower's Cove Area and said; "Organize

yourselves, try and raise enough money so that you can get this vegetable storage unit converted into a fish handling facility." The same thing has been told to the people in the southern part of the district. Consequently we are right back to where we were last year the people are up-in-arms up there and it is likely to develop into a civil war before it is all over. Because I have never seen the like, where you get two groups of people who are fighting for something and end up fighting against each other and end up getting nothing because, well the rivalry there is so great.

Now, Sir, the latest understanding that I have from the Minister of Fisheries before he resigned is that if that vegetable storage unit is converted into a fish handling facility in the Brig Bay Area that the same thing or an equivalent facility would be put in the northern part of the district, up around the Anchor Point Area or the St. Barbe Bay Basin Area. That is the latest understanding I had from the minister. I had nothing in writing but we met with him in a delegation a number of times. That was the latest understanding that we had; he was developing a policy whereby a feeder plant system would be set up in the District of St. Barbe North.

Now, Sir, I do not want to be quoted as saying that a fish plant or a fish handling facility should go in a specific area of St. Barbe North. But the Department of Fisheries has a feasibility study, I believe, that suggests right where a fish plant should go or a fair size fish handling facility should go. The Department of Fisheries know full well that that is not in the northern extension nor the southern extension of the district. It is smack in the middle. The only way of not establishing a fair size fish handling facility in the district is to put a number of smaller fish handling facilities or feeder plants distributed throughout the district. Sir, there are no ice-making machines in the district. There are no haul-ups nor slipways in the district, so these great longliners are hauled up on the bare rocks in there. There is no marine service station in the district. Sir, the people in that district are the most frustrated group of people that I have ever come across in my life because the

potential is there in the fisheries but all of the facilities, the major facilities, happen to be outside of the district.

Sir, I would like for the Premier, because I have it from a reasonable source and authority, I would like for the Premier to listen to this because he could call me wrong on this if he wish but I have it from a reasonable source, Sir, and I have no reason not to believe what this person told me, that the Premier did make a commitment to an individual in the Brig Bay Area in the October election with regards to a fish plant. What I am wondering now, Sir, if that commitment is what in fact is holding up the situation in St. Barbe North? Because if there is a single fish handling facility or a fish plant to be established in St. Barbe North, the Brig Bay Area is not the place to locate it. According to all of the studies that I have seen and according to all of the advice that I have had from the fishermen - now I said, if there is a single facility - I believe that there should be a facility in the Brig Bay Area but there should also be a facility in the Anchor Point Area and the Flower's Cove Area, distributed up and down the coast. These facilities would not be major fish plants. I do not think there is one fisherman in St. Barbe North who is asking for a fish plant the equivalent of the Port Choix or the St. Anthony one because they realize fully that enough fish cannot be caught on the northwest coast to supply three major fish plants. But what we are asking for, Sir, is an improvement in the existing facilities.

So, Sir, I would appreciate it very much if the Premier when he rises to answer some of our questions will give some indication of what is in store for St. Barbe North with respect to fish-handling facilities within the very near future.

Sir, before I sit down I would like to broaden my remarks to what I consider to be the greatest failure of this administration in its fifteen months in office. Sir, this administration in its March 1 Throne Speech, which was delivered via television and which can certainly be considered the election manifesto of this administration, rose the expectations of the people of Newfoundland to

a degree which we have never witnessed in this province before.

Sir, the previous administration can be accused of rising the expectations of the people of Newfoundland on a number of occasions but we have never seen the like that we witnessed in the March 1 Throne Speech, which was a document which could be considered the election manifesto, which in the area of the fisheries raised the expectations of the fishermen in this province beyond the limits that we have ever witnessed in this province. Sir, I cannot help but and I feel it is my responsibility to point out what was promised in that Throne Speech and what has been done since that Throne Speech was delivered.

Sir, the Department of Fisheries, it was promised in that Throne Speech, will be greatly expanded immediately so that it can provide much greater assistance and information to the fishermen of this province. "The department will be dramatically increased in size, many new divisions will be established and many new services implemented so that it will reflect the importance that my government places on fishing as one of the major industries in the province.

"It is my government's intention to establish regional offices of the department selected at selected locations. Initially there will be branches of the department located on the Burin Peninsula, of the South Coast, on the West Coast and the Northeast Coast.

Now, Sir, the honourable the member for St. John's East stated publicly on a television programme in which I took part with him one afternoon, stated publicly that the Throne Speech is a very important document because it lays out the programmes for one full year of the administration, not for a term, not for a decade, not for two or three years but the Throne Speech outlines one year of the government's programme. Now, Sir, this document said that initially there will be branches of the Department of Fisheries located on the Burin Peninsula, the West Coast and the Northeast Coast. Sir, if it is stated that this is going to be done initially one can only assume that after that first year that there will be

other branches of the department set up. Sir, after fifteen months we do not see one branch of the department set up in any of these locations. There certainly have not been any announcements suggesting that there are to be further branches of the Department of Fisheries set up.

"My minister," Sir, "will encourage participation by all fishermen through discussion groups by providing them with the information developed in the department and through the establishment of regional advisory councils which will work with the department in the formation of future plans and policies affecting each particular region." Sir, the only information service that we have seen to the fishermen so far are these films to which the Premier related earlier in his remarks.

A third promise, Sir: "My Ministers will introduce a new programme to give better assistance to inshore fishermen to obtain boats, gear and equipment. A special incentives programme will be introduced to assist fishermen in obtaining large multi-purpose boats which can be used for dragging, seining, midwater trawling and long line fishing." Sir, I am not aware of any great new special incentives programme other than the Fisheries Loans Board Programme that was established under the previous administration and continued under the present administration.

"My ministers," Sir, a fourth promise, "will introduce legislation concerning a new financing approach to provide the supply of fish necessary for existing fish plants around our coast in order that they may be utilized to as near full capacity as possible." Sir, I am not aware of any great new financing approach for this particular purpose.

A fifth promise: "legislation will be introduced to establish a corporation which will own or lease rights on a new fleet of trawlers. This fleet will add to the production of new or existing processing plants. The new trawler fleet will be in addition to the existing fleets in the province."

Sir, in that one year promised programme we did not witness one thing.

A sixth promise: "My ministers working in conjunction with the federal government will establish a new and realistic programme of bait assistance to the fishing industry. These strategic locations will ensure a continuous supply of suitable bait and when necessary prohibit excessive export of scarce and desirable bait from the province." Sir, where is this programme, this new and realistic programme?

"Legislation will be introduced at the earliest possible date to establish in conjunction with the federal government an inexpensive shared cost and joint programme covering loss of gear." Sir, that new programme has not been introduced. I might admit, and I thank the Department of Fisheries for this, when an emergency situation arose on the northwest coast because of an early winter storm the provincial government did come up with a sixty per cent assistance programme for the fishermen on the coast and for that I thank the Government and I thank the Department of Fisheries.

However, Sir, the promise of an inexpensive shared cost insurance programme covering loss to fishing gear has not been introduced.

Another promise, Sir: "My ministers recognize the fact that the preservation of the fish stock is the most important single problem facing our industry. It is the intention of my ministers to make the strongest possible representation to the Government of Canada to recognize the tremendous importance of the preservation of fish in Canadian waters. My ministers will support any organization with this objective and further will make direct representation to the Government at Ottawa and with all the energy and reason at their command to bring about this desire objective."

Now, Sir, the other promises that were mentioned by my colleague for Fogo District, I will not repeat those. But, Sir, the important point that I want to make is this, I anticipate that the honourable the Premier will get up and say, "Well, we could not keep all of these promises because of the federal government in Ottawa." Sir, what I am criticizing is the fact that this administration just several weeks prior to an election that they knew would be called got up and

made these promises, knowing full well that they would have to negotiate and probably have to negotiate for a long period of time with Ottawa for the implementation of many of these promises. Sir, I cannot help but point out that a Throne Speech is a one-year programme, and the honourable the Premier and his administration knew that.

So, Sir, I felt duty bound to point out what I considered to be one of the major failings of this administration and that is in the the fisheries, when the people of Newfoundland expected so much from them.

So, Sir, I would like for the Premier, of course when he stands, to indicate to the committee, Sir, what is in store for the District of St. Barbe North, I know it is only one out of forty districts, but Sir, to try and give some indication as to what the fishermen can expect here, because the resources are there, the industry is there, the potential is there but the facilities are not there so that those people can make a half-decent living and get some of the spin-off benefits from the fishery.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, before the honourable Premier stands to answer some of the questions that have been put to him by my colleague, I would like to have a few words about this very important matter, to contribute something I hope to the debate here in the House. We have heard some good debates so far on the fisheries estimates. I hope that more members as the day progresses will participate in the debate.

Now, Sir, when the Premier gave his introductory remarks on the fisheries estimates, introducing the fishery estimates because we do not have a Minister of Fisheries at the present time, I was expecting, Sir, I sat back, I figured that we were good for an hour or an hour and a-half, maybe three hours for that matter. I was expecting to hear a free-wheeling, wide-open, clear-cut, firm statement of policy by the Premier, the Leader of the Tory Administration, on what direction, Sir, the fisheries were going to take in this province. I was very disappointed, Mr. Chairman, just to listen to the Premier sort of brush

over, skim over the items that he raised and again repeat something that he already stated outside of this House, that the resignation of the Minister of Fisheries was due mainly to the lack of sympathy from the Government of Canada, from the Department of the Environment in Ottawa.

The honourable the Premier did not repeat what he stated at a press conference down on the eighth floor when the former Minister of Fisheries resigned, that it was because of some criticism levelled at him from the opposition that he resigned.

Well, Sir, when we were discussing interim supply in this House and we came to the heading of fisheries, I gave the Minister of Fisheries at that time a few gentle love taps, nothing compared to what he would have gotten, Sir, if he had remained in the cabinet and stayed in this House. My argument at that time was that that minister was most unhappy with the performance of the administration of which he was a part, in connection with the fishery in this province. He was disillusioned, disenchanted; the department had been downgraded, had become weak, maybe through no fault of the honourable gentleman who was Minister of Fisheries at the time, maybe because of the policy of the administration not fulfilling the promises that were made in two provincial elections in this province that helped him get into power. The Minister of Fisheries is gone now, Sir, so there is not too much that I can say about him. I can still level my criticism at the administration though; they are still there.

I would have expected the Premier when he was addressing this House a few moments ago to pay tribute to the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen and Mr. Pat Antle for the contribution that they have made to the fishery of this province. You cannot speak about the fishery in Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, without identifying Pat Antle with the fishery and the fishermen, a well known authority right across Canada on the fishery in Newfoundland, a walking encyclopedia on the fishery, Sir. I had the privilege a few years ago to attend a convention of the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen,

Granted there was not a big crowd there but the fishermen that were there, Sir, were enthusiastic, they had a great knowledge of the fishery, they knew what they were talking about. They were the grass-roots. They had a great deal of respect for Mr. Antle. After servicing this province loyalty for what? Fifteen or twenty years? Twenty years as President of the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen, what was the reward, Mr. Chairman, for an organization that kept the fishery afloat in this province when nobody else did, got the prices up? It may have been a slow, painful process, the fishermen may have become impatient but, Sir, they did get better prices for their fish, better conditions because of the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen and Mr. Pat Antle. What reward for that, Sir, for providing this outstanding service to Newfoundland by making a major contribution to the fishery of this province, both provincially and federally? Mr. Antle is as well known in Ottawa, Sir, as he is here in Newfoundland. What happened? This year the administration I suppose dealt the unkindest cut of all, the cruelest blow of all, Sir, they cut out the grant to the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen.

I do not know how long the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen can carry on without that grant but I do know this, Sir, that despite all that is happening in this province, despite the progress that is being made on other fronts, that the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen still has a role to play in the fishery of this province. I ask the Premier today to reconsider this matter of a grant to the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen. Nobody has asked me to make an appeal on their behalf. It is purely spontaneous, Sir, unsolicited. But I think it was a very cruel thing to do, I do not think that the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen can survive very long without that grant. Maybe they can. Maybe they have a few dollars stowed away, I do not know. I hope they have. I hope that they will be able to continue their good work on behalf of the fishermen of this province. All it would take, Mr. Chairman, is one highly paid import, that is all the government would have to do away with, \$30,000 a year, one highly paid import. We are bringing them in here in droves,

\$25,000, \$30,000, \$35,000, \$36,000 a year for doing things that are not in the best interest of this province, Sir, not in the best interest of the people of this province. Do away with one and restore that grant to the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen.

I know that history was made in this province a few days ago when Mr. Cashin was able to negotiate on behalf of a group of fishermen in Bonavista North, St. Barbe. Mr. Cashin was successful in negotiating the first agreement on behalf of a group of inshore fishermen. I approve of this, Sir, this is a gigantic step forward.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I am reminded by my honourable colleague here that they are not getting enough. The price of fish was never higher in the market but nevertheless, Sir, the fishermen are getting organized. You cannot do anything today without a union. You have to be organized, You have to put up a united front. Nobody appreciates that any more than Pat Antle. Mr. Cashin has been successful in doing something that maybe Mr. Antle

MR. NEARY: has not been able to accomplish. If Mr. Antle were a younger man and in better health, I do not think that Rick Cashin nor anybody else in this province would hold a candle to him. But nevertheless, having said that Sir, I think that Mr. Cashin and his Newfoundland Food Fishermen and Allied Workers Union are on the right track and I congratulate them for the progress that they have made so far in this province. There is room for two organizations at the present time; they are both trying to accomplish the same thing.

But the government dealt the death blow to one of these organizations, the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen, and it is only a matter of time I would think. Sir, I agree with what Richard Cashin is attempting to do. He is only attempting to do, Sir, what is being done in the Scandanavian countries, negotiate province-wide on behalf of the fishermen, and this is a good concept, nothing but good can come of it. Sir, I wish him luck. I know he has had a lot of hard knocks. I know the fish merchants of this province probably hate the very ground that he stands on, I say, the more power to him, the fishermen of this province have been exploited long enough.

I hope that Mr. Cashin and his organization will be able to overcome the obstacles, the obstruction that has been thrown in their way and that they will continue to forge ahead and get better prices and better working conditions on behalf of the fishermen in this province.

Now, Sir, I expected the Premier also when he rose in this House to say a few words about SOFA. No, not a peep out of him, Mr. Chairman, when the great issue today, Sir, in Newfoundland, in Eastern Canada, around our coast, the great issue is the depletion of our fish stocks, conservation, and I was expecting to hear a great discourse from the Premier on conservation. Well we will not have a fishery in this province pretty soon, we will not have a fishing industry, Sir, unless we focus more attention on conservation.

MR. NEARY: a word, not a single word out of the honourable the Premier. Untrue? Well maybe I was out of the House when the Premier talked about conservation. The Premier never mentioned SOFA. Did he? Did the honourable Premier mention SOFA?

MR. MOORES: Just conservation.

MR. NEARY: Just conservation - thought they went together, took it for granted that everybody understood they went together, SOFA and conservation.

Well Sir, I want to take my hat off today to SOFA. Yes,

I take my hat off to Jack Davis too, His policies may have been misunderstood and deliberately so, Sir, the Tories in Ottawa and here on the home front were able to squirt their poison against Mr. Jack Davis.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well maybe not all his policies but a good many of them. What Mr. Davis was trying to do, Sir, was misunderstood because of the great propaganda campaign that was put on by the Tories in Ottawa and some Tories on the home front. So, you would think, Mr. Chairman, if I had to elaborate we would be here longer than six o'clock this evening or twelve o'clock tonight. I will leave that to some of my colleagues. Maybe the Leader of the Opposition will deal with it. I want to deal with the fishery in a general kind of a way; I do not want to be specific at the present time.

I am rather disappointed that the Premier did not get up and enunciate government policy on the fishery. We have seen that happen so often in this session of the House, no leadership, no Minister of Fisheries to tell us what the policy is. The other ministers that we have heard piloting their estimates through the House have been on the defensive, Sir, they are edgy and jumpy and jittery, tearing up the microphones over there, they are so edgy, no policy and no leader in the House to state government policy and the Premier comes in today, Acting Minister of Fisheries, and I would expect better from

MR. NEARY: the honourable the Premier, At least I would expect a little recognition of SOFA that has done such a magnificent job in focusing attention on the need for conservation of our fisheries, Sir.

Mr. Gus Etchegary in particular, a one-man crusade with very little from the Tory Administration, Sir, very little help, lip-service half the time, the man has gone out of his way and I am well aware, Mr. Chairman, that there may be an ulterior motive behind all this. The fish merchants want to continue to stay in business but so do our fishermen, Sir, and in this case what is good for the fish merchants is good for the fishermen.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a switch.

MR. NEARY: It is not a switch. In this case, I said. It is logical, it makes a lot of common sense to me. If there are no fish, there are no fishermen to catch fish, to earn a living, there are no fish plants. I congratulate SOFA, Sir, I have not heard too much about the organization lately, I do not know if they are getting discouraged or what is happening, I would like to hear the Premier's comments on that matter.

Talking about SOFA, save our fisheries, Sir, which I think is one of the better things that I have seen happen in our province in recent years, because the fishing industry in this province, Sir, is still our biggest industry, but I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, we are not going to have it too much longer.

We hear about the government policy to spent \$40 million on new draggers, How many draggers is that? Twenty odd draggers. What is this going to do for our fishery and conservation? What is it going to do for the inshore fishery? This was the government that was going to concentrate a lot of its energies on the inshore fishery, now they are going out in deep water and you know what that means, Mr. Chairman. What it means, and the Premier mentioned this, probably the key word in his whole introductory remarks, technology - we have to bring new technology into the fishery.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, you bring new technology into the fishery and you are going to create unemployment. I am not an economist and maybe the economist could give me a continuing argument on that but it is a fact, Sir. Automate, mechanize, bring in new technology into the fishery and you are going to destroy the inshore fishery. You are going to force the man with the small boat, you are going to force him to go on welfare and I can see this happening every day in this province.

Apart from that, Sir, apart from that I am afraid that our fish stocks cannot stand it. Fish are not reproducing fast enough. I wish I could use the technical term that the biologists use on this, I am only an ordinary layman, but fish are not reproducing fast enough around our coast, not reproducing - that is as good a word as any.

Now we are talking about bringing in twenty more draggers to get out there with the foreign fleet, deplete our fish stocks.

MR. MOORES: They will be closer to the twelve mile limit.

MR. NEARY: They will be close to the twelve mile limit - no, they will be close to the shore and then we will have a worse effect on the inshore fishery and we have not heard one iota from the Premier today about the policy for inshore fishermen. Are we going to let it die? It appears that way, Mr. Chairman. Fishermen all over this province today, because of the publicity that the fishery estimates have gotten, will be sitting by their radios and televisions today, waiting to hear what is in store for them, what direction the fishery of this province is going to take, not a sound. No wonder somebody said they are completely bewildered and disillusioned and let down, they were conned by that administration, conned into voting Tory in two provincial general elections, and the development of the fisheries was one of the gimmicks that were used - cruel, Sir, immoral.

MR. NEARY: The Premi^{er} talked about everybody as an expert on the fishery, I am not an expert on the fishery, I may be a man-care expert like a good many more people but I am not stund either.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, well that may be debatable, but I can read and write and I can think and I think I have a reasonable amount of common sense and I know that there is no policy right now, that that department has suffered more under this administration and under restructuring than any other department of government. Last year they took \$1 million out, put \$900,000 of it over in the Department of my friend there, the Minister of Industrial Development.

They have been chipping away at the department. When an entrepreneur comes into this province today, interested in a fish plant, he does not go to the Fisheries Department, he goes to my friend here, the Minister of Industrial Development. They talk about Ottawa downgrading the fishery department and hooking it up with the environment, here you have the Department of Fisheries, the Department of Industrial Development, one cutting across the other. Nobody knows who is responsible for what.

The Minister of Industrial Development has the big draggers and the Minister of Fisheries has the dories, as they said in the interim supply vote, the punts. They talk about the Burgeo Fish Plant; we hear the public statements coming from the Minister of Industrial Development, not from the Fishery Department. It is being downgraded, Sir, it is being downgraded.

Before I leave the matter of conservation, Sir, I would like to hear the Premier tell us, because I have heard, I do not know where I heard it but I heard somebody say, somebody in authority say that this province cannot stand any more big fish plants. We should do with what we have now, in the interests of conservation.

MR. NEARY: I do not know whether this is logical or not, Sir. Perhaps the honourable Premier can tell us whether it is or not. We could stand a lot of more bait depots, Sir, collection units and freezers, small items that will help the inshore fishermen at a very low cost. We could stand a lot of that around our province, especially in Southern Labrador, around the south coast and the northeast coast. It would do a lot of good. It would not cost very much money.

But can our fish stocks withstand more big fish plants in this province? We have already seen what has happened to the herring industry in this province, practically destroyed, practically wiped out. So we need one more on Fogo Island, I do not know if the honourable member is talking about a big plant or not.

Sir, I think it is worth taking a look at before we get into opening huge, big fish plants in this province in the future. We should take a long, hard look at the fish stock. Consult with SOFA: is there any dialogue between the province and SOFA? They are the experts, consult with them. Consult with Mr. Pat Antle, consult with Mr. Cashin and his organization, find out if there is room for expansion. Is there enough fish or are we just living in a fool's paradise? Is it hopeless?

The honourable Premier talked about advisory councils, I heard him at it. Before the last provincial general election he had it into the Throne Speech. Well there are three ready made advisory councils - Pat Antle's organization, Rick Cashin's organization, and SOFA. I will bet you dollars to donuts, Mr. Chairman, that the government have not taken advantage of the wealth of information that these three organizations have on the fishery in this province. Instead they are plodding along in their own tired, old, worn-out way and making a sorry mess of the fishery in this province.

They cannot even settle that poor, old strike down in Bonavista, going on now for almost one year, going on for a year. It did not take them long to get into Burgeo. A month or so before the last provincial election in March, there were

MR. NEARY: choppers all over the place, planes zooming in, you would not know but you were back in the Battle of Britain. But what is happening to the strikers and the strike in Bonavista and these strikers, these fishermen, these Newfoundlanders that are trying to fight for what they think is right? They came in to the government at a demonstration here in Confederation Building and what were they met with, Mr. Speaker? A battery of policemen. That was the answer they got from the Minister of Justice and that administration over there, a battery of policemen with helmets on. One would not know but we were going to have a riot - a poor crowd of Newfoundlanders, fishermen trying to earn a living for their families.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did they have their helmets on?

MR. NEARY: As far as I know they did. They had them on the day the students were here. I do not know what idea they have, but it is a good point anyway. They do wear these helmets. Sir, they do wear these helmets when demonstrations take place at Confederation Building. I am not quite sure whether they had them on that day or not but I do know there was a fair number of policemen around.

MR. DOODY: It makes a good story.

MR. NEARY: It makes a good story. That is right. It is a good point. The Chairman did not ask me to withdraw it. Sir, they came into the government, asked for government help, support, co-operation, to settle up that strike in Bonavista, going on now almost a year. It will be one year this June. So far, Sir, to my knowledge, the administration has not lifted a finger to try to settle that strike other than to come out and say (which is like being in favour of motherhood) "Oh! The conciliation officer is available and if either party wish to avail of the services of the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations, our doors are always open."

MR. MURPHY: What is the usual procedure?

MR. NEARY: The usual procedure is take the initiative. What was the procedure in the case of Burgeo? \$2.6 million. That was

MR. NEARY: what was thrown out to Spencer Lake, under similar circumstances, by my honourable friend who is a member of that administration.

MR. MURPHY: Is Bonavista for sale? What price do they want?

MR. NEARY: I do not know if it is for sale. I do not know what price they want. I am not the government, if I were the government, I would find out and I would know and I would be able - the honourable minister does not know the answer to that question. Obviously it has never been discussed in cabinet, Sir.

Mr. Chairman, we heard the member, when they were crying out for help down there in Bonavista, what did the member do? He turned his back on them. He turned his back on them, Sir, and came out publicly and stabbed the workers in the back, sided with the fish merchants, condemned his fellow Newfoundlanders for trying to get better wages and better working conditions. They will not forget that, Mr. Chairman, they will not forget it when the next election rolls around.

Now, Sir, one other matter I want to deal with before I take my seat. The Premier also mentioned on a number of occasions, both inside and outside of this House, the further manufacturing of our fish. I am not sure whether that is a good thing or a bad thing, Sir. I am more inclined to think that it would be a good thing. It would be a good thing, further manufacturing and processing of fish, but I do not know if it is possible, Sir? It would be a good thing if we could do it. I do not know if this was another one of the off the cuff statements that the Premier made without thinking but I am told by people in the fishing industry that the Americans would rebel against this sort of thing.

You would see increased tariffs, Sir, of which you have never known the like, if we further processed our fish here in Newfoundland. I do not know if that is true or not, I would like for the Premier to tell us if he has adopted that as the policy of his administration. It may be a good policy. I think that if I were in his place I would try it myself. But is it possible to do it

MR. NEARY: without causing serious repercussions on the international markets? Is it possible? Could the Premier clarify that when he stands to answer some of the questions that are put to him by the opposition?

Before I take my seat I may as well deal with this too. I will give the Premier an opportunity to comment on this; What about the twelve mile limit? Would one not expect the Premier when he stood in his place in this honourable House to introduce the estimates of the Department of Fisheries, would one not expect to hear a clear-cut, understandable, simple statement of policy from the administration on the twelve miles limit?

Maybe I am naive, Sir, but I certainly would expect that, We did not hear it and there is not a week that passes in this province but we do not hear about fishermen, politicians up in Ottawa, threatening to bring out guns on their boats. Gunboat diplomacy they call it in certain circles. Not a peep, not a word, not a sound out of the Premier about this. What about it? What representations have been made to Ottawa? How strong? Are they just namby-pamby weak, wishy-washy?

AN HON. MEMBER: Wishy-washy.

MR. NEARY: Wishy-washy! Or is this government just taking a hands-off attitude? Leave it up to poor old Uncle Ottawa, let them handle it, They are on the hook, keep them on the hook. These are the things, Mr. Chairman, that we want answered in this honourable House.

We do not want feeble excuses and the Premier just skimping over Fisheries. Get up. Live up to the expectations and the promises that were made to the people of this province. Get up and tell us what the policy of that administration is going to be. Let us hear it in stronger words than we heard from the honourable the Premier when he opened the estimates of the Department of Fisheries.

MR. CHAIRMAN: There were three gentlemen on their feet almost simultaneously, The Member for Labrador South I think was quickest off the mark. However, the honourable members may sit themselves

MR. CHAIRMAN: out if they wish.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I think I would save the honourable Premier a lot of trouble by putting my kicks in now and then he can lambaste us at the same time, in the one breath. Unless the honourable gentleman wants to reply and then reply to me later? I am quite prepared to take my seat.

MR. MOORES: I just thought I would deal with the three most useless speeches first, because I think the one from Labrador South is probably going to be worthwhile.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, there is a great deal to be said along with all the rest that has been said. I think first, before I get into it and lose sight, there is one point. I would like to say that the remarks made by the honourable member for St. Barbe North regarding the specific problems of the fishermen in his district, I would like to support that one hundred per cent and vouche for what he is saying to be fact.

I had the occasion to work amongst the fishermen of St. Barbe North, the whole St. Barbe Coast, for a short period of time. The problem really is critical and a frustrating one. Having said that I would like to say, regarding the Premier's opening remarks, that his words are somewhat encouraging. However, we have heard encouraging words about the fishery and the solutions to the problems of the fishery for a long, long time, and what we really want now is some action and we do not have very much more time left to wait.

It is critically important that this government and everybody concerned with the fishery get on with the job of restructuring the whole thing, if we want to use a well-worn phrase.

The Fisheries Estimates, Sir, this year, notwithstanding the honourable the Premier's figures for preceeding years, I find to be the most discouraging and disappointing aspect of the entire

MR. MARTIN: budget for this year. \$10 million I think falls far short of what we should be able to expect for an industry that influences far more people in a far large geographic area than any other industry we have in the province.

There is indeed, as the honourable Premier says, a problem of identifying specifically what those problems are. I would submit that the reason the government have not been able to identify those problems to date is because they have ignored, almost completely, the advice or the potential advice of people who are well up on the problems of the industry. I refer to such groups as my honourable friend from Bell Island mentioned, the Federation of Fishermen, Fishermen's Union, SOFA and all the rest. I think we need go no further than these three groups to find all that has to be done.

It has been said many, many times that nothing is being done for the fishing industry. That is wrong. Of course, many things have been done. The problem is that they were not done in the right manner. Many things have been done in the right manner mind you but far too many things have not been done in the right manner. Many attempts have been made in an effort to bring the fishery up to its full level of potential but I think, generally speaking, we have been resoundingly unsuccessful in these efforts.

After many years, after many centuries, one would have thought that by this time we would be able to come to the nub of the whole problem. Instead we have been consistently treating the symptoms and ignoring the real causes. We have seemed to have always suffered from a collective sense of shame because of our history as a fishing society, and this is really getting down to where it is at.

Even those who have given lip service to the concept of a greater fishing industry, it appears really, secretly harbour the conviction that it was all a lost cause anyway and we should be

MR. MARTIN: looking somewhere else. The symptoms were easily identifiable and therefore having identified them, we should have been able to deal with them effectively. But what have we done? We have taken a look and said, if the fishery should fail, the simple solution to the problem is to pay the fishermen unemployment insurance.

If the plant were in danger of closing because of inefficiency or whatever, then the answer to that particular problem was to give it more funds so that it could remain open. The rationale was that the plant owner was doing his employees a favour by giving them jobs. There was nothing in it for him, it was all for the good of the people working for him. Therefore, because of inefficiency or anything else he was on the edge of closing up when he came crying to the government for more funds, not to keep his business going but to provide jobs for the poor plant workers, the outporters.

The inshore fishery came up year after year a failure, you see, and the answer was obviously to drop it and concentrate on the offshore fishery. I am not saying that we should not concentrate on the offshore fishery, but they both deserve to be dealt with separately, "Burn your boats and go to work in the factories."

The problems, Mr. Chairman, the problem has always been that we have never been able to accept the deeper implications, the social and economic conditions of the whole country as it is related to the fishing industry. The sad and undeniable fact of the whole situation is that we have never had any fishery policy as such but an ad hoc piecemeal bunch of solutions to a great problem that nobody has ever been able to get down and deal with.

There have been a number of admirable attempts at introducing new technology. The right concept was there. I disagree that new technology and more

sophistication is going to throw more people out of work. That is one of the inherent dangers but there is also the matter of supplying the inshore fishermen who have no means of supplying themselves, with the pitiful little income that they have, with better boats and more sophisticated equipment so that the inshore fishery itself can be carried on but with the assistance of new technology.

There have been some very good attempts to infuse new capital into the industry but by and large most of this capital has been for the betterment of the fish merchants rather than for the betterment of the fishermen. Some of it, a very, very small fraction of it had filtered down through. Sure the plants did remain open and that was a benefit to the fishermen but I submit, Sir, that a great part of that capital went into the pockets of people who are skimming the cream off the top anyway.

The fact that government have dealt in that manner with the fishery has no doubt kept the fishing industry alive over the past twenty years but as I said, the approach has been anything but a resounding success. The problem I guess is that past governments have never been able to understand what it is that they were really dealing with. There has been a real desire to forget the whole thing, "Ignore it and maybe it will go away." Well the fishermen of this province, Sir, have been here for many centuries and despite repeated attempts to forcibly make them go away, they are still here. I think it is in spite of rather than because of government effort that they are still here and that there is still a fishery. The emphasis for development has always been misplaced. Much, much too much attention has been paid to the doom-sayers who say: "The fishery is dead! Give it all up! Forget about it! The more people who say that in this province, whether they are in government or not, the more people who go around saying, "Forget the fishery! It is dead," the less likelihood we are ever going

to have of getting anything out of Ottawa, because that seems to be by far the strongest lobby right now.

The fishery is not dead. The traditional fishery is dead. The trap fishery may very well be dead but that does not say the fishing industry is a lost cause. All the more reason for a totally new concept of what the fishery is and what it means to us, and with all good haste I might add.

Here we are today, Mr. Chairman, sitting right in the middle of a great, hungry world. Fish prices I think in the New England market last week reached an all-time high of sixty cents a pound for fresh frozen fillets, way out of sight, far beyond the wildest dreams of even a decade ago. We should be taking advantage of that. We should be taking advantage of the good market conditions that we have. What do we do? We go around saying the fishery is dead. We go around asking what is the sense? The ground fishery is indeed in very serious trouble, the cod, the haddock. Some of the pelagic species, the herring, they have been very nearly depleted. They are in very serious trouble but there are other fisheries underdeveloped and undeveloped.

Do we now protest to Ottawa? No. So I am afraid I cannot be quite as charitable towards Mr. Davis in Ottawa as my honourable friend from Bell Island has been. The man is a walking disaster. Instead of looking at the potential of the fishery as it is right now, instead of getting down and cutting losses, modernizing, expanding new fisheries, what do we do? We spend ten million miserable dollars on the expansion of the fishery this year. That may very well be far ahead of what we have spent but the problems are far ahead too. \$25 million or something like that into encouraging somebody to come in here who should not be here at all, polluting our environment, disturbing our fisheries, dumping oil and chemicals all over the place, \$10

million for the fishery. At sixty cents a pound in the foreign markets we should have every floatable piece of equipment out there today trying to catch fish, a Dieppe mobilization, Every dory and barge that we have should be out trying to catch fish. We say the fishery is dead?

We are not going to deplete the fishery if we go at it in the right manner. There are underdeveloped parts of our fishery. There are fish stocks out there that are not even being touched and these can be very well developed for our own benefit and not for foreign benefit either. We have approached the fishery in much the same manner that we might have approached a difficult child. We attempt to pamper it and never get down to the basic problems.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I submit that the lack of understanding of the fishery was exemplified in the recent resignation of the former Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Cheeseman. It is misleading, Sir, it is buck passing to lay the blame for our province at the feet of Ottawa. This is our problem. This is the problem we have had to deal with for years and it is one that we are going to have to deal with. We can see the concern that Ottawa has, so let us stop beating the bushes. Let us stop trying to blame everything on Ottawa whether they deserve that blame or not and let us get down to putting our own House in order. We have to get down to the heads, guts and sound bones, as Mr. Cook might say. We have to start believing that this is a large-scale problem which affects a great majority of our population. We must show and clearly understand the social and the economic problems of our rural areas because the social and economic problems of our rural areas are the problems of the fishery, one and the same.

Politicians and aspiring politicians, Mr. Chairman, would do very well to take heed at what is happening because if nobody else is understanding, if nobody else is beginning to understand what is happening out there the fishermen themselves are. Finally

they have awakened to the fact that there is nobody to help them but themselves and they are doing that. They are beginning to articulate their problems and they are beginning to not ask for but demand in a very strong voice the right kind of action.

Do you know, Sir, that never, ever in our history has the price of fish been a political issue? Never once have we gone on a political campaign with the price of fish being the major issue. Sure politicians will bring it up and pay lip-service and all the rest but the single most important issue in this whole nation has been consistently ignored. Primary producers have been something less than able to control their own destinies in this province, but not so out West, not so in Saskatchewan. The Saskatchewan wheat farmers long, long ago decided to make the price of their wheat a political issue. In fact I believe, Mr. Chairman, that the roots of the party we now know as the Progressive Conservative Party may very well have sprung from the fact that the Saskatchewan wheat farmers were concerned about the price of their product. Unlike farmers in Saskatchewan, the Newfoundland fishermen have never had the same degree of concern or perhaps the same ability to get on with it - but that has changed. It is beginning to happen and I can assure you, Sir, and anybody else who wants to listen that never, ever again will this situation be allowed. The price of fish and everything else concerning the fishery will be an issue and is an issue and will be in any further political campaigns in which we might be involved collectively.

The problems of the fishery are the problems of all rural Newfoundland and Labrador and the root causes are the same. The fishing industry has been built and structured and exploited for the benefit of the few brokers who touch the fish as it passes between the fishermen and their consumer markets. That is the problem. When the time rolls around for these issues to

be brought out, when we submit ourselves again to the judgement of the electors, I can assure you that those electors who are in any way interested in the fishery will have plenty of reasons for making whatever choice it is that they are going to make.

Remember Burgeo, Sir, which was brought up a few minutes ago. Last year in this House many pious sentiments were expressed regarding Burgeo, about the passing of feudalism and paternalism when Burgeo was discussed in the House, yet very few if any politicians of the day seem to understand the basic issues involved in that set of circumstances. Nowhere have we seen in either the government or the official opposition any coherent policy to lift our people beyond that particular stage of development. Cure Burgeo, cure the problems of the Burgeo fishery, but that is not the case. Again we were dealing with symptoms. Burgeo was a symptom. Bonavista is a symptom. Cure the disease, Sir, that is what we have to do. This House and this government have maintained a position of studied indifference and worse, silent consent to support the forces of reaction. There can be no real fisheries policy or indeed any policy of rural development that does not deal openly and in a forthright manner with the fishermen as human beings and people, and he is dealing with another type of person, the fish plant.

Here, Sir, is the central issue. The fishing industry has been based upon the truck system. Until very recent years very little money if any passed between merchants and fishermen. This is the feudalism upon which our fishing society in Newfoundland is based, The whole fishing society and not just the industry. We cannot talk development in physical or economic terms only. We must understand the social and the human elements as well. We must develop our human and social resources so that we nurture a true independence in our people and we must cease to perpetuate the myth that ours is a ruggedly independent race, individualistic

yes, but not independent. As far as their culture and society will allow they are individualistic but not dependent.

We have a certain degree of independence. We are independent to make a choice of either starving or grovelling. Very, very little, Sir, has been done in recent years to change that situation. The only direct action any government has taken so far has been to pump more public money into the fishing industry when, as it periodically occurs, the fish merchants make a public spectacle of their own incompetence and ask for more cash to keep them afloat. Basically that is all that has been done. The money that the previous governments pumped into the fishing industry was done with little or no regard to the structure of the industry or to the pressures acting upon those employed therein. The previous government, after much pressure and in an election year, introduced certain legislation which ostensibly had as its goal the altering of the relationship between the fishermen and the buyer of his product. I refer to the Fishing Industry's Collective Bargaining Act. Unfortunately the authors of this legislation were reacting only to political pressure and with no true understanding of or sympathy for the problems of the people with whom they were dealing.

The present government have made some commitment to do something about this and we are still waiting, Mr. Chairman, patiently. Back in 1971, I think it was the honourable member from Fogo who was then the Minister of Fisheries and headed a delegation to Norway and Iceland to study this very relationship between fishermen and buyer, particularly as it affected the prices of fish. It was reasonably to be expected that any legislation arising out of this delegation's report would have come under the auspices of the Department of Fisheries but such was not the case. It was tossed as another bothersome problem to the Department of Labour. I fail to see the logic in that particular

set of circumstances. I could not see it.

If we are going to talk about new policy, and surely that is the first thing that we have to start talking about, a new fisheries policy ought to begin with legislation dealing with the firsthand sale of fish right down at the primary producer's level, legislation that supports the rights of fishermen and provides for them the vehicle to determine that they are in fact getting a fair price for their fish. The fact that such a vehicle has not existed in the past in Newfoundland has had serious economic and social effects. The economic effect is obvious, as they were not getting a fair price for their fish. But the social effects, Mr. Chairman, are far more sinister, far more sinister and demoralizing because they nurtured a feeling of suspicion and frustration that has damaged not only the image of fishermen but indeed it damaged the whole image of Newfoundlanders as a people, because it goes far beyond our borders. The effects of this kind of thing reaches into every foreign market that we have ever touched.

We have set ourselves before the world as a people capable of living with exploitation and of electing governments time after time that avoid dealing with this form of exploitation. I might remind the committee that on a number of occasions I have asked the Minister of Labour, who is now responsible for these matters, what steps his government are taking to set up the advisory board referred to in section 51 of the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act, 1971. I am told that it is now very nearly through the drafting stage. The Department of Justice still has it but it might very well be on the way up by this time. It is going to be very interesting, Sir, to see how this new bill deals specifically with section 51. In one way or another, Mr. Chairman, section 51 is going to go down in our history. That I can guarantee.

The other day we heard the Minister of Finance say that all segments of the economy were improving except the fishery or words to that effect. Foreign market prices for cod and red fish and other species of fish have had increases from twenty-five to fifty per cent in a little more than a year but that is not so for the fishermen, at least no automatic or relative increases, related increases. I think it was yesterday or the day before the Fisherman's Union announced significant increases in their prices because of negotiations that they successfully conducted. But I understand, Sir, that in order to achieve this they had to go through quite considerable time and effort and great anguish, I think, to try to arrive at the stage they are now. What should have been theirs, through normal, just, fair concern for their welfare, had to be squeezed out of a reluctant industry through conflict and confrontation.

Now, Mr. Chairman, these are not violent people. Our fishermen do not have that kind of tradition. That is not a part of our heritage. Perhaps that has been one of our problems. It took a great act of desperation I am sure on their part for them to take on their employers in the manner in which they have, to have been forced to do this kind of thing to protect their own interest. Now, Sir, given these circumstances, the fact that the fishermen are forced to operate in that way, the fact that world prices are such, like never before, higher prices than we ever could have dreamed of, given these circumstances the government have two choices. The government can either sit idly by and let the fishermen engage in bitter confrontation in order to get a fair price for their fish and fair working conditions or the government can show real imagination and dedication to social and economic change by creating the guide lines so that fisherman can ensure that he is getting a fair price for his fish and ensure that the profits of the fishing industry are kept in rural Newfoundland.

That is not happening today. This in itself, just by virtue of keeping this money in rural Newfoundland, will work wonders in stimulating the economy.

The Minister of Finance might very well then have his budget surplus next year. Why are the government so reluctant to tackle this problem? Why have governments been so reluctant to tackle this problem? One might suspect, Sir, that it is because we have a fish-merchant government. If that be the case, then to do such things as giving the fishermen their rights to bargain properly would be to incur the displeasure of the real governors of this province if this be the case, the fish merchants and their counterparts in industry and commerce.

Now, Sir, a very good barometer for anyone wishing to forecast the movement of future political storms will be the actions of this government in dealing with this matter of the new legislation, section 51. Section 51 will go down in history. The second step in a fisheries policy is that regarding marketing. Now I realize that the phases such as marketing agencies and marketing regulations are not too well taken by my friends in certain other political caucuses. Hearsay it is. Marketing agencies, good heavens! Socialism of the worst order! We do not hear very much talk of these. "Denial of the free enterprise system", they say. Well, Sir, as far as I am concerned every freedom has its limitations. One is free within our society to do as one pleases, as long as it is not infringing upon the rights and privileges of others. That is a freedom with certain limitations.

The free enterprise system as we know it gives free license to anyone to gouge his neighbour just as much as he pleases, free license. Let the weaker perish if they will! Well of course that is what has happened all down through the years. Our fishing industry, which was once our national pride, has perished because those engaged therein simply gouged each other

to death, all in the name of good, healthy competition I might add.

Let me just for a moment, Sir, relate a major episode in our more recent history: Back in 1968, the fishery was still floundering along through the middle ages, the salt fish industry got into trouble. There was no programme governing the marketing of fish. There was no programme governing the relationship of fishermen with fish buyers. The practices were nineteenth century to say the least. For some reason, in that year, 1968, probably because of their haste and their greed to get as much fish as they could lay their hands on, fish merchants wound up with a great deal of very poor quality fish, rotten fish in fact pink fish. Now traditionally it has been the practice to dump this kind of fish, as it was not the first time it happened, on the world markets for whatever the markets could stand. "The devil take the hindermost, let her go!" The results of that practice were apparent to everyone except the fish merchants.

We developed a reputation for poor quality fish. We really did. We had a reputation in the world markets for having an inferior grade of fish and the industry that was our pride and job became secondary to Norway and Spain and the rest because they had better quality controls. Their government agencies and their union agencies and their merchants agencies, whatever they were called, did not allow poor quality fish to be dumped on the world markets. It did get through. Some got through of course but generally speaking this was the policy, but not so in Newfoundland. So in 1968, along with this not so extraordinary situation came along another quite extraordinary situation, devaluation of the dollar, devaluation of foreign currency. Our merchants stood to lose quite a few millions. So the result was that after prevailing upon the provincial and the federal governments to bail them out, the governments came up with a plan to ensure that our world markets did not become a dumping ground for cheap, rotting

Newfoundland fish, the federal government agreed to buy up the entire catch, \$2.2 million worth, I think something roughly in those figures.

Now the understanding to the companies from the federal government was that the prices to fishermen paid out of this \$2.2 million would decline only in relationship to the normal decline because of the devaluation of the dollar - a gentleman's agreement between the fish merchants and the federal government who were providing the money. So what happens? The decline in salt fish prices that year was between \$2.00 to \$3.00 per draft but when squaring up time came as usual, where do you think the poor fishermen got it? The same place he always got it come squaring up time. Instead of living up to their bargain with the federal government in Ottawa, these gentlemen of the fishing industry made up their losses by gouging the fishermen a wholesome \$5.00 to \$8.00 per draft and not the \$2.00 to \$3.00 that should have been normally expected, Not a bad little profit that. A criminal act of exploitation, Sir, that could not have happened anywhere else but in this very province. It is not an isolated case. It was simply an example of the kind of thing that the government have been letting happen all along.

Now as a direct result of that fiasco, the federal government were quite embarrassed by this whole episode, they decided to set up the unholy marketing agency. We got the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation and I might say, Sir, that it has done an exemplary job of protecting and indeed improving our salt fish markets. They are doing very, very well. So now what do we find? Now we hear little rumors and rumblings that the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation may be phased out. I do not know how true this is but it is being circulated. Now why do you suppose this is? Well, it is because of course there is a powerful lobby in Ottawa of the fresh fish entrepreneurs who are hungry for the fish which the Salt Fish Corporation are having.

to put into their markets. This must not be allowed to happen, Sir. The Canadian Salt Fish Corporation must be protected. If this should happen, it would be a dark, dark day for this province. It would be a backward step of the worst kind.

So there is a very, very good market, a very lucrative market for good quality salt fish and the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation have been crying to get more fishermen to put their fish into salt production. So what we see is a total lack of co-ordination or integration between these two segments of the fishing industry, the salt and the fresh fish segments of the industry, with the result that we are getting good fish into frozen production that should be going into salt production. The return is much higher. This is what the Norwegians and the Icelanders do incidentally but then it really is not very fair to compare us with Norwegians or Icelanders because they are far, far, far more progressive than we are and it is not really fair to utter both in the same breath.

It is interesting to note, Sir, that back in 1968 when the world markets were suffering because of devaluation of the dollar that these two countries, Norway and Iceland, were able to withstand the impact of the decline in frozen fish prices because they did have the agency set up to deal with it. In fact, to add insult to injury, they blamed the Canadians for the decline in the market because as it stands we may say that the Newfoundland merchants were gouging the fishermen and that is an undeniable fact. The fishermen were at the mercy of the merchants because they were unprotected, they had no union, they had nobody with enough strength to fight for their own interests. But likewise the Newfoundland merchants in the world markets were in just as precarious position. They did not work together. They did not co-operate. There was cutthroat competition and when they got out into the large brokerage areas they were as much at sea, so to speak,

as the fishermen back home. This is where Norway and Iceland had it all over us.

So what happened was that while our own fish merchants were here dickering and indulging in their favourite pastime of cutthroat competition, the brokers in the U.S. played the small processors off against one another, to the advantage of the brokers of course. A proper marketing policy, such as Iceland and Norway, would have provided stability in such a situation. They have not done as we have done here, put all our eggs in one basket.

There is another example, the herring industry: The exploitation that occurred on the Southwest Coast of Newfoundland in the mid 1960's, another fine example of the barrenness of Newfoundland's politicians in the field of fisheries policy. One company on the Southwest Coast, Sir, during the time back in the 1960's, processed close to one hundred thousand tons of herring and most of it incidentally going into animal food. They paid their workers an average of \$1.25 an hour and paid the fishermen \$18.00 a ton for herring. This, Sir, was about one-quarter of what the fishermen got in other countries and other areas of Canada, notwithstanding the fact that they were all selling into the same market. Completely and totally elogical - the profits were exorbitant.

Fortunately we no longer put our herring, to the same extent, into fish meal but then, of course, the herring fishery on the Southwest Coast is practically gone, raped, nothing left and so are the profits of the fishermen and the workers. The profits of the fishermen and the workers in this particular industry incidentally were not being kept in rural Newfoundland but they were going to companies from outside this province. Today, Sir, on the Coast of Labrador and in Northern Newfoundland, there is a real possibility for developing a herring fishery that can compensate in part for the decline of the cod fishery. There is

April 19, 1973

Tape 1277

JM - 14

no indication whatsoever that this government has a policy to ensure that the development of that fishery will be in the best interest of the people of those areas.

5659

There are at the present time on the Coast of Labrador and on the Northern Peninsula merchants who are much the same kind of operators as the salt fish operators. We are back in 1968 and subject to the same conditions. They lack the necessary capital and the necessary marketing expertise to do the job properly. They are trying but they do not have it. They are not up there and they do not have the money, they do not have the experience, they do not have the wherewithal to get out and do the job properly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Leadership -

MR. MARTIN: A large part of it is leadership. But yet they are the ones that we send out to exploit this industry, regardless, let them go, nineteenth century. Last year one of these companies, operating in Quebec, Labrador, went bankrupt. They went bankrupt notwithstanding the fact that the price of herring was better than ever before. Part of the problem again was quality, no quality control. Well the Government of Quebec has now given the marketing of the herring on the Quebec side to the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation. Will the Government of Newfoundland do the same? Is the government of this province prepared to pass over to the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation the jurisdiction for marketing herring amongst other species? Their indications are very, very gloomy, Sir.

It appears to me from the evidence of the past year that the Conservative Administration is less than likely to do the right thing with regard to the Salt Fish Corporation at least. I say this because of the experience the people of Nain had with their char fishery last year. I sincerely hope that this is not an indication of government policy. I prefer to believe that it was a mistake, maybe a mistake of the heart perhaps. Last year was a backward step for Nain, I am afraid. When the Liberals were in power they did at least allow the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation to market the char that came out of the Nain plant. The char, if I may

remind the committee. Mr. Chairman, as I said before, is a very high quality product which has a very lucrative market. They were doing a very, very good job in Nain of producing a high quality product and the problem then became one of marketing.

Well the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation did try to do some marketing on that and they got a very, very good price. Now what do you think, Sir, the Conservative Government did last year? They took the produce from the Nain plant and instead of letting the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation market it, even for the same price but I am sure they would have gotten a better price, they took and they gave the whole consignment to a chap named Mr. Cohen from Montreal. I sincerely trust that Mr. Cohen made a good profit, a small agent from Montreal. I wonder, who is Mr. Cohen? One of the main planks of the conservative platform, if I recall, in 1971 and 1972 was a rural development policy based on Scandinavian-like planning.

Sir, the callous and cavalier way in which the government dealt with the Salt Fish Corporation and reverted back to the old fish merchant politics seems one of the most discouraging things I think that this administration has done. I sincerely hope, Sir, that it was a mistake of the heart.

AN HON. MEMBER: Ownership of that plant by the way should have been put in the hands of the people.

MR. MARTIN: That was a stated government policy but it was the indication that eventually when that plant got to the point where the people employed therein could manage it themselves that it would be passed over to them.

AN HON. MEMBER: They would become the owners.

MR. MARTIN: They would then become the owners. It would be interesting to see what this government plans to do about that particular situation. Now quite obviously the herring on the Labrador Coast and along the Northern Peninsula could be

treated in the same way as the salt cod fish. We could learn, if we choose to, from our past mistakes and structure this new industry along twentieth century lines instead of allowing it to struggle along through the middle ages.

The third point of a fisheries policy; Sir, it is my understanding that every company which has a loan from the government must place a member on their board of directors, a director appointed by the government. That was the case and I assume it is still the case. Now I would like to know what is the function of this nominee. Is he there only to confirm an audited statement? Is this all that he is there for, just to confirm the books? Well his role really should be to analyze the statements of these companies and the government ought to exercise its responsibility in seeing to it that the fish companies behave as good corporate citizens and act in the best interest of this province instead of acting in the best interest of the directors and owners of those companies.

What about the relationship of our own Canadian companies to companies in the United States? Where is the real profit from the fishing industry in this province going? These are questions that everybody in the province have been talking about for years, for twenty years. Anyway, previous government did nothing about it and if the experience of the people of Nain is any indication we are going to get less sympathy and less action from this government. This is one area in which this administration must prove themselves or be tagged for what is apparently the case here.

The fourth point of a fisheries policy is a very emotional point which has to do with strikes and the whole matter of relationships of people involved in the industry. If the government are not going to do anything about this, then the fishermen are. The fishermen and the plant workers are going to do something about it and they have started to do something about it. The fact that

it is happening and continues to happen, the fact that the fishermen and the plant workers are taking it upon themselves to restructure (if I may again use that wholesome word) their own industry, gives us cause to hope. As for the so-called commitment to further processing, this cannot be done unless there is a comprehensive fisheries policy.

Now I would like to deal with three points of the policy that I have just broadly outlined. The first one is the relationship of fisherman to buyer. The second one is the marketing of the product. The third is the problems of additional capital, modern technology and more sophisticated production facilities. What about the relationship of fisherman to buyer? In the past it has been a feudal relationship and I am not talking about the very distant past either, Sir, in fact one could still find pockets of this feudalism still intact. In any case the residue is there and the stigma remains. This is then what the problem in Bonavista is all about. Bonavista is not terribly much different from Burgeo. We have heard it said that it is a matter of employer-employee relations. It goes far deeper than that, Mr. Chairman. The situation at Bonavista as in Burgeo is a direct result of a kind of society we have in rural Newfoundland. The wages and this kind of thing have in fact very, very little to do about it. It is not just another labour management dispute. I say, Sir, that it is the responsibility of the government to check this kind of situation. Surely we must not have government going around interfering in labour management disputes but then Bonavista is not and I must repeat and repeat and repeat that Bonavista like Burgeo is not simply a labour management dispute. It is our whole social structure erupting. It must be dealt with as such.

What is the government prepared to do about it? Allow the owners to bully and intimidate these people because of inequitable legislation? That is what we have on the books right now is

inequitable legislation. One thing is very, very sure, that if the government are not going to do anything about it, then the people of Bonavista themselves will. Plant workers and fishermen, to them, Sir, it is simply a matter of survival and if you push people far enough and ignore them long enough then they have no option.

Insofar as section 51 is concerned, of that piece of legislation, this has to do with a marketing organization and is the central point in the restructuring of the fishing industry. Without it the fishing industry will never achieve the vitality it needs to survive on its own merits, without continual injections of government subsidy. But section 51 is only one part of a major piece of legislation that has to do with, amongst other things, the very important aspect of fishermen, plant workers, managers, buyers relationships.

Now to return then to what will happen under section 51: For one thing it is going to change, if it is properly administered, the inefficient practices which are now strangling the industry such as this practice of trucking fish. The cost factor, Sir, is atrocious in trucking fish. We are witnessing the effects of totally un-co-ordinated collection of the primary product within the old fashioned cutthroat methods which lost us the primacy in the world's fishery many years ago. The same thing is still continuing. We are seeing the fish being collected from virtually right under the wharves of fish plants which are operating in one area and trucked over great distances to fish plants in other areas. It is nonsensical. It is stupid. It is not only foolishly extravagant and inefficient but it has a serious, detrimental effect upon the quality of the finished product, with the end result that Newfoundland fish, that infamous phrase, has earned a poor reputation generally and that is a poor reputation which is doing a great injustice to other processors. I might mention here that, at least it was the case last year, other processors, such as Beothuck Fisheries, do not deserve that stigma. Beothuck Fisheries, in Vallyfield

in particular, are turning out a very, very high quality product. The prices for that quality of fish should be reflected on the books of Beothuck Fisheries and in the paychecks of the people who work in the plant and the prices to fishermen. It is not doing that because the whole fishery is being downgraded by the quality of fish generally, Newfoundland fish.

Feeder plants, Mr. Chairman, I sincerely hope that the policy of feeder plants is not going to be a general all encompassing, overall policy for the entire province. There are justifications for putting feeder plants in certain areas of Placentia Bay, the other side of St. Mary's Bay maybe, along the Labrador Coast, maybe up the St. Barbe Coast. In certain areas there is a justification for feeder plants but there is evidence that this government is using the feeder plant policy as a pork barrel or using feeder plants in close proximity to already existing fish plants. This is in direct conflict to the government's stated policy on further processing. What do we have at the present time? One, a declining resource. The fish are getting scarce. There are excess production facilities in fish plants which are affecting the cost of running the operations and which of course affects the amount of wages which can be paid and the price of fish.

Feeder plants, if not properly controlled, would increase the handling and is an expensive operation which must be paid for again out of the prices of fish, out of the wages of plant workers. But perhaps the most disastrous affect of this policy is that it will seriously inhibit the maintenance of a high standard of quality. Increased handling will most certainly lower the quality of the product.

Lastly, if we are to talk about putting together a real workable fisheries policy, what about modernization, new technology, more sophisticated production facilities? I do not mean automation to the nth degree. I mean getting fishermen out of

boats that were designed for the trap fishery and into boats that can be used more logically in the fishery as it now exists, allowing them to get into the harvesting of different species. They are all interrelated, all must be tied together into some kind of overall design for the industry. The industry has no sense of direction. The industry is content to go along day after day, year after year, swinging along on the tide and that is exactly where we are going to stay.

The backbone of the fishery, Sir, the workers themselves, the fishermen and the plant workers, this is where it all must start. Any new policy must start, must revolve around this aspect. Where is the policy and where is the plan? More to the point, Sir, where are the policymakers and where are the planners? What is being done? I would like to see this government, this administration, give a little more leeway to some of the very fine and able people they have in that department. I would also say too that there is a lot of deadwood that should be chopped out but there are some people down there with some very, very good ideas, very capable people who heretofore at least have been muzzled. I think if anything is to be done, if there is to be any kind of heed paid to what is going on at the bottom of the pyramid, down amongst the plant workers and the fishermen, then the right kind of liaison must be established, the field workers must be given a little more room to maneuver.

I have several questions to put concerning the general policy of the department and I imagine I will have an opportunity to deal with these as we go through the various heads. But while I am on my feet and without boring the honourable members too much and before I lose sight of this, I have a couple of specific points I would like to make. The Federation of Fishermen: Sir, I agree with Mr. Antle's statement that maybe the best thing ever happened to the Federation of Fishermen was for them to lose their

annual grant. It maybe a blessing in disguise. That is neither here nor there as that is not what I want to talk about.

Regarding the use of this money, For the benefit of honourable members, let me just go back over where this money came from. Originally a fund of \$685,000 was established by the old Commission of Government. It was inherited by the new provincial government, after 1949. Now this money was taken from the old salt fish fishermen by the Commission of Government. They set up a rainy-day fund I think they called it and it was taken off the exports of salt fish between the years 1942 and 1946. Salt fish fishermen paid into it, Sir, and no one else. Mr. Smallwood's government then became trustees of this fund, after the first provincial election. Thereafter the interest on this fund was to be given to the fishermen each year through their federation which was established I think in 1952. Now we find that the grant has disappeared from the estimates, from the revenue report, from whatever. The question, Sir, is: Did anyone in authority who were holding this money in trust have in fact the authority to take that money for other purposes? If so, should it not have appeared in the Auditor General's report under revenue or as a gift or donation from the Newfoundland fishermen or whatever? Where is it reflected? We would like to know under what authority it was taken away? This money belongs to the fishermen. How did it get into the fund and where? The fishermen and the public have a right to know.

I think, Sir, the disposal of this fund should have been left to the House of Assembly rather than to the Treasury Board or the Department of Finance or whoever else made the decision. If I may (I do not think I am breaking the rules of the House) refer to an article in the "Evening Telegram," Saturday, April 14, 1973, where they were reviewing the federation and that particular fund. I quote, "The fund no longer exists and has not existed for several

years," the honourable Minister of Finance speaking. "Further evidence that the fishermen's fund is a part of the past is contained in legislature statements made by the former Premier Smallwood in June, 1970. Mr. Smallwood said at the time that the fishermen's fund had been transferred to the Consolidated Revenue Fund to form part of the general assets of the government."

Now, Sir, the convention report of the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen, April, 1971. I quote from a statement made by former Premier Smallwood to the convention, in part. "The government had some money which belonged to the fishermen and an offer was made to the federation that some of the interest earned on this money would be paid over to the federation each year and this amounted to approximately \$20,000 to \$30,000 yearly. We felt that this was the best way to handle this money, as the Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen would be working for all the fishermen even those not members of the union. The Newfoundland Federation of Fishermen has done noble work. As politicians know, people forget easily the favours which have been done for them over the years . . ."

The question remains, what has happened to the money and why? That money belongs to the Newfoundland fishermen and that money should be spent to their benefit alone. If there is nothing else to be done with it, Sir, then I would suggest that perhaps we should set up a special bursary or a special scholarship fund specifically for the children of fishermen, but I do not think that it is fair to put it out into the general consolidated fund and let it go where it may. This money was held in trust by the government for the Newfoundland fishermen.

Furthermore, Sir, I agree with the statements made by the honourable member for Bell Island. Mr. Antle has been Mr. Fisheries for many, many years and whether you agree with Mr. Antle or you do not agree with him is beside the point. There are many areas in which I do not agree with him for what he has done, but nevertheless he was the man at the helm for many, many

years and at least kept the fisheries in the public eye. Mr. Antle is no longer young. He has devoted much of his life to that federation and I am sure that he is not yet ready to step down. I do not know where his salary is going to come from. If the federation membership do not intend to increase the membership fees, uphold the membership fees, perhaps Mr. Antle will be without a salary. That is rather unfair. I think that at the time that Mr. Antle is prepared to step down and go into retirement, which he has justly earned, that a part of that same fund should be taken for his retirement pension.

While I am still on my feet, I would like to touch briefly on some of the other subjects brought up so that the honourable the Premier can have at us all at the same time. Information services to fishermen are woefully inadequate. I trust that the honourable gentleman will see that something is done about this. There is no point in having government programmes if the fishermen do not know anything about them. Catch protection and indemnity insurance - some are taking advantage and some are not. I think they should be informed as to the advantages and encouraged to take advantage of them. I think there should be a special fund set up to deal with the kind of disaster which befell the fishermen of Fair Haven a couple of days ago. This is a recurring thing and it is not an unknown situation. Protection of stocks - we cannot go around saying that it is a federal government responsibility. We all know very well exactly how the federal government exercises their responsibility in this regard. It is atrocious.

As for SOFA, maybe I should not comment too much. Being a director of that organization, I would be accused of blowing my own horn. I do believe that here is an organization which could very well benefit the Department of Fisheries by providing very, very detailed information.

I think I have exhausted most of the other

points, except for one very important point that I have saved for the pièce de résistance. Burgeo was purchased apparently in order to take it off the hands of the Lake Group. It was hoped that it would be turned over to the people of Burgeo who have paid for it many times over, but this has not happened. That is neither here nor there. I would like to have a specific answer to this question: When was the actual cash transaction made finalizing the taking of possession of the Burgeo property by the government? The property includes the fish plant and ancillary operations around the store and barber shop and what have you. When was that actual cash transaction made? At what date?

With that I will leave the honourable Premier to answer some of these questions and hopefully get back into the fray as we go through the various subheads.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I would like to have just a few words in this debate representing, as I do, the largest single fish producing constituency on the Eastern Seaboard. Some items have been raised by honourable members and some I would like to deal with but obviously I do not have time now. Just before we adjourn for lunch I think we should put the Burgeo Fish Plant in its proper perspective. This administration did not take over the Burgeo Fish Plant. Honourable members will recall that some time after the October election, I think it was November, 1971, and certainly not later than December, 1971, that plant was expropriated by government. This in my opinion placed the present administration in a pretty awkward situation because the provincial government nor this House did not have and does not have the right to expropriate anything other than the plant itself. They could not expropriate the druggers. They could not expropriate all the other enterprises that form part of the social and community life of Burgeo. No power is conferred upon government or could be conferred, or should be conferred to do this.

When we assumed office we found ourselves in a pretty unusual situation. Not only had we on our hands a fish plant that had been taken by expropriation but we had nothing else, no draggers, no source of fuel supply, none of the other amenities that were part of the Lake operation nor did we have the right to take them forcibly but only by negotiation. There is another thing that people seem to overlook. There is a provision in our Expropriation Act which in my opinion placed the Lake interest in an unnecessarily powerful position. I would say that Mr. Lake was laughing all the way to the bank the day that the expropriation order was served on him because there is a provision in our Expropriation Act which says that if you expropriate a business that is a going concern, then you pay not only the market value but you pay relocation costs. This, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion and I can say it now because the negotiations are over and I was not a party to the negotiations but I can tell honourable members that it would be no difficulty at all in any court of the land to have that interpreted as to place a financial burden upon this province as a result of that expropriation far, far in excess of the amount that was actually paid for the total package. That, Mr. Chairman, in my opinion was what put this government in a position where we were not moving from a position of strength in that case.

At the same time the plant at Burgeo fortunately is starting to produce. I would assume and would hope that with proper management it will become a viable operation. There is no doubt at all that if that plant is to survive and there is no reason why it should not because there is a history of productivity amongst the deep-sea fishermen of that area which certainly will suggest to us that the future of Burgeo is sound and good, but if it is going to increase its productivity and to increase the earnings of the fisherman as well as the plant worker, then the time in my opinion has long since passed when I would like to see

some concern for the people who go to sea on these druggers. Everyone talks about the fish plant workers, the inshore fishermen but I never heard anybody in this House get up and speak with any great feeling or any great concern for the real fish producers in this province, the people who land the high percentage of the total fish production, the people who go to sea, starting in January, and find that the summer months are the time of the year when they regard fishing as a bit of relaxation compared to what they have to do the next year.

The whole if you want to call it tragic history of the fishery development in Newfoundland, going back to the days Coaker, always evolved and developed at the expense of the fishermen who lived between Cape Ray and Cape Race. The Coaker regulations were designed to crucify the people on the South Coast and did it very, very effectively by not allowing them to move their fish to the market in February, March, April and May, fish that they caught in January but rather to hold it until the fall of the year when their prices were depressed. This is what I have been waiting to hear in the last twenty years, some concern for people who are doing and who are responsible for the major portion of the fish production in this province, and these are the fellows who go out to sea on the druggers.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If the honourable minister will permit, it being now one o'clock I do leave the Chair until three o'clock this afternoon.

The Committee resumed at 3:00 P.M.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN (Minister of Justice): Mr. Chairman, when we adjourned I was mentioning the impact of the deep sea fishery on the total fish production of this province. May I give some indication to this committee as to exactly what that impact is? Last year, 1972, the total landings for Fishery Products Limited at Burin was forty million pounds of fish. At Burin there is a total labour force, ashore and afloat, of 450 men and women, with eight trawlers and three more to be added to the fleet this year.

Booth Fisheries in Fortune, which has had very little government input in the way of financial assistance, landed fifty million pounds of fish in 1972. They employ 540 persons ashore and afloat, with a fleet of eight trawlers and they are currently on an expansion programme of \$3.2 million which will be finished in the fall of this year, without any government assistance. I think a very significant development that has occurred in so far as Booth Fisheries is concerned is their input into the inshore fishery during the past year and the year that we are now in. They, together with the provincial and federal government's programme, are encouraging the inshore fishermen in the area from Point May to Lawn to buy longliners. I believe that that inshore fishing area is going to see pretty well a twelve month employment from hereon in.

Bonavista Cold Storage in Grand Bank had a total production last year of thirty-five million pounds of fish. They employ 370 people, ashore and afloat, with a trawler fleet of nine. I do not have the figures for the Marystown production. I would suspect that Marystown is somewhere between forty and fifty million pounds of fish.

What I am suggesting to this committee, Mr. Chairman, is that there is no way that government or this House of Assembly can forget

or ignore the contributions of the deep sea fishermen of this province. When you look at Fermesue, Trepassey, Marystown, Burin, Fortune, Grand Bank, Harbour Breton, Gaultois, Burgeo, Ramea and Port aux Basques, you suddenly realize that there is where the majority of the fish production in this province comes from.

Catalina is beginning to be developed as a deep sea fishing port. I think it is significant that most of the crews fishing out of that area also come from the south coast. Harbour Grace used to be and hopefully will be again.

The simple fact is, Mr. Chairman, that as far as the inshore fishery is concerned, the Government of Canada have written it off, and make no mistake about that. They have. We, as a province, have an obligation to see to it that if there be any hope for the inshore fishery, that they get a great deal of encouragement from us. As the member for the Burin District, I deeply resent the tenor of debate that this House has seen since 1949 which has always been, without fail, in the interests of the fishermen of this province but to the detriment of the deep sea fishing population of Newfoundland. This is wrong. It is totally wrong. It is historical. The honourable member for Labrador South gave a speech today which was identical, if you read Hanaard, to the speeches that were given by Sir William Coaker back in 1920. But always the policies of the fishery development in Newfoundland have been aimed for the political support that comes from the northeast coast which is vital and important. The dagger has always been in the back of the people who fish out of the south coast of this province. As I said earlier, the Coaker regulations set the deep sea fishing fishery in Newfoundland back fifteen years. It was done under the guise of orderly marketing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, several honourable members who have participated in this debate suggest that the Government of this Province should take the initiative insofar as the conservation of the

fisheries is concerned. Now it is a very simple fact, it is not a question of making Ottawa the whipping boy for the fisheries. The fact is that under the British North America Act, the Province of Newfoundland, this Legislature, has no more control over the conservation of the fisheries and over the offshore mineral rights, the offshore fisheries, in the twelve mile limit, than this Legislature has over the next moon shot. Jurisdictionally, this falls exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Government of Canada.

We have heard all kinds and read all kinds of debates in the House of Commons about gun boat diplomacy. I am sure that honourable members will recall that at the last Law of the Sea Conference, which I think was in Geneva, when Canada proposed that there be a twelve mile limit, that this was lost by one vote. Two years ago I found myself at the same table as a Minister of the Government of Canada and I had the audacity to suggest that Canada should use the same approach as Iceland and that we should, without any hesitancy at all, adopt the principle that the Continental Shelf belongs to Canada and that we have the right as a Canadian Nation (not as a province. We have no right as a province) to enforce conservation measures on our Banks off our shores. The Minister from the Government of Canada followed me and suggested that as a lawyer I should know better than that. The Government of Canada are not prepared to take this action unilaterally.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to me this is a lot of nonsense. Iceland, Norway and Russia have shown that they are prepared to take this unilateral action. Oh, there is a bit of discussion in the ICNAF and maybe some eyebrows in the United Nations, but they have done it. I think it is very significant that Russia has closed to all foreign ships the waters off their northern shore, including their own. They, with their highly mechanized ships, have come to our Grand Banks

Querré, Mizzen and St. Pierre Bank and off the Labrador Coast and decided that whilst their stocks are being replenished, they will clean out the Banks off our shores. If you have any interest in the inshore fishery, Mr. Chairman, you realize that cleaning out the Banks off our coast also means the end of the inshore fishery.

Three years ago, when I was in opposition, there was a resolution introduced into this House by a member of the opposition, asking that this House unanimously support a resolution calling upon the Government of Canada to take unilateral action with respect to the conservation of our fisheries. At that time, as I recall, there was a meeting of various governments involved in the North Atlantic Fishery, in Moscow, and the motion was defeated. The suggestion was that the Government of Canada would take a brave, courageous stand and would advise those in attendance that we were going to take some action to protect our fisheries. The simple fact was that it was hardly raised at the meeting at all. My belief is that the Government of Canada are far more concerned with being a good international citizen than in protecting the fisheries of the East Coast of Canada. This year, for instance, or early in the New Year the next Law of the Sea Conference is to be called.

This government have made it clear and will make it even clearer, at the meeting of first ministers scheduled for the end of May, that we want on the agenda the right of provincial input into the Law of the Sea Conference. I am not certain at this time whether this is going to be acceptable to the Government of Canada. To me it is inconceivable that there should be a Law of the Sea Conference without the Governments of Newfoundland, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, British Columbia and Prince Edward Island being given the opportunity to indicate to the federal delegates what we believe should be the firm position of the Government of Canada at this conference. I have an uneasy feeling, Mr. Chairman, when I look at the draft agenda for the

Law of the Sea Conference and looking at the previous conferences, that our national government will be far more concerned with the discharge of oil and waste materials from ships plying the Atlantic Ocean than it will be with protecting our fisheries. It was not very enlightening to me as a Canadian to realize that the greatest input of the Canadian Government at the last Law of the Sea Conference was with respect to the rules of the road at sea and that the conservation of fisheries was not even discussed.

Now I am only quoting a statement made by the former Premier of this Province in a debate two years ago, when he suggested that because the gross national product of Canada, of the gross national product less than two point seven per cent is fisheries and that really the Government of Canada have very little interest. The change of name of a particular department is not too relevant. What should concern all of us as Newfoundlanders, the fact accompanying this change of name and the abolition of the Department of Fisheries in Ottawa is that you have to go way, way down the line before you can find an official in that department who has any responsibility for fisheries. The deputy minister openly admits that he has no real responsibility for fisheries. It is for environment; it is to take care of pollution in the City of Toronto; it is to decide on the height of the smokestack in the City of Toronto; it is to decide on the pollution of the Great Lakes. That is his real input. That is the real input of the Minister of the Environment in Ottawa. This is why I believe, Mr. Chairman, forgetting party politics at all, that Newfoundlanders owe a great deal of gratitude to the Opposition members from this province who during the past four or five years have tried to bring back into the House of Commons a realization that fisheries on the East Coast of Canada play a much greater part in our provincial product, gross product, than it does with the gross national product. They have a hard battle to fight because there are not that many

votes, Mr. Chairman. There are not that many votes in Eastern Canada. There are a lot of votes in downtown Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver where they are concerned about the smoke belching from high stacks and where they are concerned about the environment, the ecology of these areas.

You say, what can this province do? We have no jurisdictional rights with respect to the twelve mile limit. It would be ridiculous for us to try and get a navy and go out and arrest ships within the twelve mile limit. They would laugh at us. We have no legal right to do it. The law, being in Ottawa, has been ongoing. I was present, Mr. Chairman, when the then Minister of Fisheries put the province's case very firmly and very strongly to the Minister of the Environment and asked for unilateral action. The reply that we got publicly (I am not disclosing any confidence because I was in Fortune when the position of the Government of Canada was stated very clearly by a minister of the crown) was that there is no way that the Government of Canada can maintain its prestige within the international community and at the same time enforce unilaterally conservation measures off our coast. The question I ask, Mr. Chairman, is: "Why not?" Why can we not? Iceland can do it, Norway can do it, Russia can do it, The United Kingdom can do it, The United States has done it on the George's Bank but for some strange reason we do not have the courage and maybe we do not have the muscle to take this unilateral action. Mr. Chairman, make no mistake about it that unless the Government of Canada are prepared to take this action, the fisheries in Newfoundland are in rather serious trouble.

Less than ten years ago the much maligned fish merchants, if that word is still in vogue, who were involved in the deep sea fishery along the southcoast of Newfoundland, were suggesting that haddock, which at that time was the big producer in Newfoundland, was on the verge of extinction. The Government of Canada laughed at them and said that they did not know what they were talking about, that it was their own selfish motives that were suggesting that they take some action to protect the haddock fishery and they ignored it. You could not get a meal of haddock on the south coast of Newfoundland today if you were prepared to pay

a fortune for it. The Russians went out there and dragged the spawning grounds and the haddock has disappeared.

Now we are into mid-water trawling, particularly in the Gulf. This seems to have had very salutatory effects from the point of view of the earnings of the fishermen with respect to rose fish. But the same knowledgeable people are predicting that the rose fish is on the verge of extinction unless there is some control, some action taken by the Government of Canada. If you look at the per trawler production with respect to cod, flounder and sole, you see a very frightening decline in the per man production.

Mr. Chairman, we as a government have made our position very clear to the federal government. We are now insisting that at the meeting of first ministers that this be on the agenda. We have not received yet an indication whether the Government of Canada or the other provinces are prepared to include this as part of the topics of discussion. I want to assure this committee that as a government we have no alternative but to vociferously demand action by our federal friends in Ottawa. There is no doubt in my mind that this is not going to be an easy road. It is not the kind of road where we are going to find sympathy. We are not going to find too much sympathy from the Government of Canada. The Government of Canada are far more concerned with looking after the manufacturing areas of this nation. They are not going to be uptight over an industry that contributes two point seven per cent to the gross national product. But what we never have been able to get through their thick heads is that the economy of Newfoundland and to a lesser extent the economy of New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and Prince Edward Island is very heavily dependent on fishery conservation and fishery production.

There has been a suggestion that bait depots and freezers and that sort of thing should be included in the provincial

estimates. I say, Mr. Chairman, that we should not do this. The Government of Canada has exclusive responsibility for providing these facilities. They have been abdicating (this is not in a partisan sense) for the last twenty years their responsibility in providing these facilities to the fishermen of this province. All we can do, Mr. Chairman, is to try and get the message through to those who have the responsibility for it and that unless they take decisive action the impact on the economy of this province is going to be very serious indeed.

Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Bell Island raised a question. In my opinion ordinarily there is very little difference in the philosophy between the Liberal Party and the Progressive Conservative Party throughout Canada. A great deal depends (I am sure honourable members will agree with this) on the personnel that you find at a particular time in a particular administration. You may find some great differences in philosophy between the New Democratic Party and the philosophy that was espoused by the hon. member for Labrador South today, which was purely and simply new Democratic policy. It cannot work. It will not work but it is the philosophy. The hon. member for Labrador South is entitled to that philosophy.

AN HON. MEMBER: Social Reform.

MR. HICKMAN: It is not Social Reform. It is the kind of reform, Mr. Chairman, that would sound the death knell of the fisheries in Newfoundland. There is no question about it. Can you imagine a bunch of elected representatives and civil servants trying to run the fishery? All you have to do is compare the CN with the CP and you can get your answer to that or compare Air Canada with Canadian Pacific Air and you will get the answer to that. We do not have the input and we cannot do it.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is a difference in philosophy on this one point and I do not find too much difference in philosophy - I have been in both parties.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: If there is a philosophy in either party, I have not been able to ascertain it as yet. There is one difference in philosophy between the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and the Progressive Conservative Party of Newfoundland. That difference was enunciated very, very clearly by the hon. member for Bell Island. He did it by way of a question. He said, "Why is the trawler programme, the programme for the development of the fish plant within the Department of Industrial Development instead of the Department of Fisheries?" There, Mr. Chairman, is the difference in philosophy. The difference in philosophy is this: We as a Conservative Government accept and subscribe to the principle that the development of the fisheries of this province falls fairly and squarely within the category of industrial development. That is the difference. Fisheries is sort of the line department that will develop new programmes but make no mistake about it, Mr. Chairman, that on the Peninsula of Burin, where you have 2,000 people employed full time in the deep sea fishery that that

is industrial development, with all the social demands, with all the community demands that you will find in Corner Brook, Grand Falls or Labrador City or St. John's. This is where we differ with the Liberal Party. I can very well recall, Mr. Chairman, when I first sat in this honourable House, in 1966, as a Liberal, a plea for housing developments in the larger fishing centres of this community. In order to get that housing development I had to work a conspiracy with the then Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, now the honourable the Minister of Finance. I put in a plea and he interrupted me and said that he would be prepared to change the existing policies of housing development and take it out of St. John's and Corner Brook and Grand Falls and extend it to the Burin Peninsula.

Now he and I were severely chastised for a rather marked departure in policy, because the Burin Peninsula was regarded as a fishing district, and you do not having housing developments in fishing districts. This was the philosophy. I said, "No, Sir, the Burin Peninsula is just as much as an industrial area as the district of Grand Falls or Humber Districts or Labrador West or the St. John's or Avalon Peninsula Area.

This is the difference in philosophy. Why are we going into a trawler expansion programme? I will tell you why, Mr. Chairman, because now the number of trawlers that are presently fishing in the area from Fermuse to Port aux Basques cannot maintain the present level of landings unless there is a substantial increase in the numbers of trawlers in the next five years. The income - and maybe not just that area, and I include Catalina in that area and Harbour Grace, but the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that without any protection off our shores then we are going to have to increase the dragger fleet that are fishing out of this province.

This is not an input into the pockets of the merchants. This is not bailing the merchants out because they are in financial difficulties. This is simply a matter of survival and a matter of providing employment in the industrial area of the whole South Coast.

Now Mr. Chairman, the honourable the member for Labrador South talked about the quality of fish that is coming out of this province. I suggest, Mr. Chairman, that we have to weigh our words very carefully when we talk about the quality or the lack of it in the fish products moving out of this province. I have reason to believe that the product coming from the South Coast of this province and going into the American market is regarded by our American consumer as being of the highest quality. I would be very disappointed indeed if there were any suggestion by the press or anyone else that the quality of fish from Newfoundland leaves something to be desired.

The fact is, and it is a fact that we should be very proud of, that it has been on a very, very rare occasion indeed when any fish products moving from Newfoundland to the United States is being held up by their health department because of the lack of quality. What we should be proud of, Mr. Chairman, very proud, is that the product of our fish plants is very, very much in demand on the part of our customer, our only customer really, our only customer of significance, the United States. It is not true either, Mr. Chairman, to say, in fact it is quite incorrect to say that the problems that the fishery found itself faced with in 1968 due to the devaluation of the dollar -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Not on your life.

The real reason for that problem was, Mr. Chairman, that the United States of American, upon the insistence of a gentleman named MacBundy George MacBundy, who was the Under Secretary of State and whose brother happened to be in the fish business in Gloucester, convinced the government of the day that they should remove the restrictions insofar as fish coming from behind the Iron Curtain was concerned. Suddenly you had the Poles and the East Germans in particular, flooding the market in the United States with fish that was heavily subsidized, where they were not concerned with the profit motive

and before we realized what had happened they cut the legs out from in under us. I think it is to the credit of the Government of Canada today that they came to the rescue of the Canadian fishing industry not by fixing the price but by saying, "If you will maintain the price at twenty-two cents a pound, if there is any surplus we will buy it and hold it.

But the real reason was a marked, somewhat difficult to explain, change in the policies of the Government of the United States. If you can believe what you read. Mr. Chairman, in the press, of the food storage in the United States, I would not dare suggest that this crisis would ever occur again.

We are not as a province passing the buck. We are not as a province trying to shed our responsibility when we call upon the Government of Canada to show some initiative in the field of fishery development. They and they alone have the jurisdictional responsibility for this effort. There has been a suggest that there should be some further control over marketing. There has been some praise heaped upon the Salt Fish Corporation. I have yet to be shown where the Salt Fish Corporation has produced the kind of activity and the kind of income for Newfoundlanders that it was designed to produce when it was first implemented. There has been a decline in the amount of salt fish produced in this province. The government of this Province of Newfoundland is very conscious of this. If the Salt Fish Corporation is going to survive as a viable entity in Newfoundland then, in my opinion, it has got to be prepared to put some money into the modernization of salt fish production throughout our province. This they had not been prepared to do. You can debate the fishery question ad nauseam in this House but the simple fact is that a man who hauls his trap, if he can sell his fish not gutted, head on, to a fish plant; he is going to do it as opposed to gutting the fish, splitting it and curing it and selling it to the Salt Fish Corporation.

Now you do not need very much imagination and you do not need too many dollars to put the fishermen in a position where it

will be viable, and where the effort will not be that much more intensive to split and put the fish, salt it and dry it in the new dryer system that we tried to get going in this province a few years ago.

This government have made pretty (I hope the honourable Premier will not object to this) strong representation to the Government of Canada with respect to the future of the Salt Fish Corporation. I believe that we have succeeded in convincing the Government of Canada and the Minister of the Environment that if the Salt Fish Corporation is going to survive then funds have to be made available to them to enable our fishermen to participate economically and with the same effort in that phase of our fishery production.

I have reason to believe that the Government of Canada are prepared to authorize the Salt Fish Corporation this year to make funds available to our fishermen to split and cure the salt fish. If they should not do this, Mr. Chairman, if they should not do this then the Salt Fish Corporation might as well lock the doors and walk out. But let this committee know, let there be no mistake about it, that the initiative for this change in policy on the part of the Salt Fish Corporation came from this government, the Tory Government of Newfoundland. This is where it came from. I would hope that with new innovations and changes in the method of production that the Salt Fish Corporation will be able to pass on to the fishermen the income and the standard of living that they are entitled to receive.

Let me say one more thing, Mr. Chairman, in closing. I think it is a wrong approach to suggest in this committee that the fishery of the province is dead. Sure there are troubles. Certain it is that the inshore fishery is not as profitable or voluminous as it used to be. But if we can get some protection, some conservation methods for our offshore fishery then, in my opinion, the inshore fisheries future is assured. But I think it would be wrong and I have tried in my few remarks to try and indicate to this committee that when you

talk about the fishery it is quite wrong to be parochial, it is quite wrong to talk about the inshore fishery to the exclusion of the deep sea fishery. It is quite wrong to spread the feeling of gloom and doom insofar as the fishery is concerned because, if we spread this feeling throughout Newfoundland, then obviously our people are bound to turn to other sources of income. It is equally wrong to continue the philosophy that has prevailed in this province ever since it has been a province, that fishing is not an industry. It is an industry, a labor-intensive industry, an industry that has attracted, certainly on the South Coast of Newfoundland, some bright young men into it.

I was at a meeting a couple of years ago when a gentleman who was involved with organizing fish plant workers and fishermen was kind enough to get up and suggest that the fishing industry is now being occupied by people who could not find gainful employment in any other sphere. He totally overlooked the fact that we have on the South Coast today a pretty large percentage of university graduates who find themselves as masters of dragnets. He totally overlooked the fact that it is very much in the interest of a young man today, coming out of university or coming out of the Fisheries College, to decide to make the sea his career. He can make \$20,000 or \$25,000. He is worth it. He has a \$2.5 million ship under his feet. He has responsibility for the livelihood of the crew members. He has an equal responsibility for the amount of work the men are going to get in the plant and the women are going to get in the plant.

Mr. Chairman, the time has arrived, I suggest, when in deciding on the amount of recovery Newfoundlanders should have from the earnings of the fishery, that we put the thought on the deck of the dragger out in front; his earnings must always be higher than anyone else. If they are not higher there is no point in fish plant workers trying to negotiate a contract, there is no point in talking about collective marketing. I have yet to be shown that collective marketing will come

close to producing the sales that pretty active competition will produce. We get no mileage at all, except some political mileage, out of debating and criticizing the Newfoundlanders who have been prepared to put their money into the development of the frozen fish industry in this province. If we had left it to government, if we had left it to co-operatives, if we had left it to groups, if we had left it to public servants we would not have a fish plant in this province right now. If the profit motive that so prevails throughout North America be still valid then, Mr. Chairman, we would be much wiser and we would be far more beneficial to our fishermen-constituents if we encouraged these people to continue to expand their production capacity.

I believe that this administration have shown an alertness to the needs of the fishing communities throughout Newfoundland. I believe that if one should check the votes that have come before this House from the Department of Fisheries for the last five years that whilst one may argue, as the honourable member for Labrador South has argued, that it should be more, that there has been a very dramatic increase this year and last year in the vote for the Department of Fisheries, bearing in mind our very, very limited jurisdiction.

HON. F. D. MOORES (PREMIER): Mr. Chairman, after the brief remarks made by my colleague from Burin, after the fifty minutes, I thought he was going to be responsible as we had agreed to try and get this debate finished by six o'clock, I thought he was going to be responsible for Easter Eggs the way he was going there for a while.

But he really did put forward a very, very good case for the fishery in our province. The three things particularly that he mentioned - and I would like to deal with each of the speakers who have spoken regarding the points that they have raised. One was regarding the Law of the Sea Conference where we have asked Ottawa to put, on the agenda for the Premiers and Prime Minister's Conference from the 23rd. to the 25th. of May, an input from the provinces regarding the Law of the Sea Conference. That letter has

gone forward to the Prime Minister, requesting that it be put on the agenda, and we are hoping for a favourable reply because we do think, contrary to any opinion to the contrary, that it is important to the future and the conservation of stocks in Canada to have the provincial input there.

The member for Rurin also mentioned, regarding the jurisdiction of the offshore water, the federal government were responsible for the fisheries area. He also inadvertently mentioned the word "offshore" oil development. I can assure the honourable member and I am sure he misinterpreted it when he said this, because we feel very strongly that that is a provincial matter because it happens to be the land under the sea as opposed to the waters moving over it.

The trawlers that will be supplied or that will be built will be for the supplying of fish for those fish plants throughout the island that are under-supplied and short on capacity now.

I would like to deal with the remarks that the honourable the member for Labrador South made. There is very little there other really than a well prepared philosophical speech expounding on ideology which really I suppose most of us have very little to disagree with. It is an ideology and I find that when one takes a theory and tries to put it into practice, it is not always as easy as getting the theory itself.

I agree with the fact that the fishery in Newfoundland is not just an economic problem or a specific problem with any one section of the industry but also involves the sociological aspect of our whole development as a people and as a province.

The fact that there has been no overall policy I think is clearly agreed by any people who are in the know in the fishery, whether in government or in the industry, the fact that there has been no overall government policy that can be applied with any meaningful affect. We have had an ad hoc approach in the past, but then again to correct it, it is easier said than done, but it must be corrected. In this case it will be.

The member for Labrador South mentioned the trap fishery as being probably on the way out and new methods will have to be

found. I agree with that comment, I think we are looking at middle-water fishing moving farther afield. There will be some trap fishery for some years to come but it will not be the major fact that it was in the past in this province.

One area where I disagree very strongly with the honourable member is when he says, "Passing the buck to Ottawa regarding jurisdiction of the offshore limits." Mr. Chairman, there is no question whatsoever that Ottawa is responsible for the offshore operations of shipping. Now we can make all the representations we can, as forcefully as we can, but in the end analysis it is a fact that Ottawa is responsible for the offshore area.

Regarding the situation at Main last year: information was required specifically by the honourable member - I will get the information on that. I was not familiar with it. It is certainly worthy of checking into and it will be done. I will pass the information on to the gentleman at that time.

Regarding handling methods of fish and quality control: I think this is something that probably is not very political from a federal or provincial point of view but I think it is something that has to be looked into very strongly and from a point of view of improving quality of our inshore landed fish particularly and this means putting in proper land facilities whereby the fishermen will have an opportunity to land their fish and see it is handled properly from that moment on. It means temperature control units, by the way, which we have installed, fifteen of them this year, with temperature control. We have started in that direction.

The feeder plant philosophy, the honourable member mentioned, I agree with as well, that they should be only in areas where they are feasible as an outlet to supply a plant rather than bleed an existing operation from its performance.

The boats and the education for various species, the honourable member did not go into that but I do not think there is any major

disagreement on our approach into that area as well.

Regarding the six hundred odd thousand that was there to provide the \$30,000 for the Federation of Fishermen. That amount of money was put into the Workmen's Compensation Disaster Fund by Act 103, declared in 1966-1967. That is where the money went and I personally would like to say now that this grant was carried on. It is now in the Workmen's Compensation Fisheries Disaster Fund. The use of that money, as I think the honourable member for Labrador South will concur, should be used for the benefit of fishermen in one way or another, where it is meaningful and so on. But that is where the money did go.

Generally the member for Labrador South spoke in a very socialistic vein when he referred to the fisheries. That is understandable when one looks at the past history of the fishery and particularly I think the very heartfelt, in-depth feeling that the member for Labrador South has for the industry. However, as I say, we in government cannot just talk the idealistic theory, we have to look at the practicalities of putting it into effect.

That leads me to what the honourable member for Bell Island had to say.

MR. NEARY: Control yourself now.

MR. MOOPES: It is very difficult to control myself when I think of the particular performance today on fisheries from the honourable member for Bell Island. The honourable member for Bell Island has put on some excellent shows in this House. He has also had some fairly intelligent things to say from time to time in this House but today, Mr. Chairman, without qualification, he gave the most uninformed speech I have ever heard in this House.

The honourable member talked about the policy and the lack of funds being put into the fisheries. In 1970-1971 the administration of which he was a part put in \$3 million in the fisheries. This year it is \$10 million. Not only is it \$10 million but there is \$1 million in industrial development for trawler development that is there, which make \$11 million, and possibly an ARDA-DREE agreement

for \$3 million more which could make it as much as \$14 million, from \$3 million in 1970-1971 to \$14 million today (I will be dealing with that again in a moment) when we have been accused of not putting any emphasis on the fisheries department. I will admit, Mr. Chairman, we have not put enough. I will also say that we will never be able to put enough to take advantage of our greatest resource but we are certainly going to head in the right direction in this regard.

I did pay tribute to the unions this morning, contrary to what the member said. We have also asked and received, from both the Federation of Fishermen and Mr. Cashin's Union, a full report as to what they see as the problems and the solutions in the fisheries. So when we talk about consultation then both unions have been asked, briefs have been received and the planning committee's reports which was part of this will be coming out this month.

Mr. Chairman, there is continuous dialogue, intelligent dialogue between those in the industry, those in the fishery and the government. It has to be improved and certainly it is not being aided and abetted by false innuendo that we heard this morning.

There was not one concrete suggestion in the honourable member's remarks. There was not even one meaningful question. He talked about SOFA, and were we concerned about that particular organization. Mr. Chairman, we have been concerned financially, morally and physically by the gentleman on my right, the member from the Department of Fisheries, Mr. Pupert Prince, who was at every meeting aboard and at home that SOFA has had, other than the period when he was ill. We have been represented at these meetings because we are very concerned about conservation limits and the management of the offshore resource.

There is one thing that cannot be denied nor ducked by anybody and that is the gutless position of the federal government when it comes to the management of the resource on the Continental Shelf. Whether we are backing SOFA or whoever, our position has been and is clear that we must protect those territories off our shore. We cannot do it as a province. The federal government must do it. But

whether it is Mr. Sharpe or Mr. Davis, you are looking at the gutless twins of politics in Canada.

Mr. Chairman, the trawler programme which the honourable member decries so easily, what he does not realize is that Canada has 70,000 metric tons on the Hamilton Bank alone, under the quota system (that we are not taking advantage of) by international agreement. One hundred and forty million pounds of fish, that is Canada's right to catch and we are not catching. So what are we suppose to do? Not catch it so that the Europeans can pick it up at the next round of meetings?

Mr. Chairman, the very idea that we should not develop our deep sea fishery as well as our middle water fishery and our inshore fishery is wrong. We must develop all aspects of our fishery. We must get the management of our fishery put under the control of Canada so that at least the resource is protected for the people in this country.

Regarding the reprocessing remarks, Mr. Chairman, basically they were to inane to comment on. The fact is that some plants in the province are doing reprocessing now. "That there is a fifteen per cent tariff. That our labour force here would have to receive less than they would in Gloucester, Massachusetts, for instance, if we did it here." We are talking about herring as well as block cod. We are talking about many species of fish that can be developed and reprocessed. It is certainly something which this government are, and I think quite rightly, going to do for the benefit of our people by becoming involved.

Regarding the member for St. Barbe North, I would like to answer the questions that he put, particularly also comment on his remarks regarding the Throne Speech of last year. He said that the government have not taken any action on the St. Barbe North Coast. This is I think incorrect. This one fact alone, that cheques for \$108,000 have been recently mailed to pay sixty per cent of the storm damage losses that occurred last year, which he mentioned in his remarks, shows that.

But I would like to point out at this time Mr. Chairman, that at the time the survey was made as to actually what storm damage did

occur it was a joint federal/provincial survey. When it came to pay the shot the federal government, as I say we are not wheat farmers, if we were we would have probably gotten federal assistance. When it came to pay the shot on the Northeast Coast, the provincial government had to pay sixty per cent and could not receive any assistance or could not get any assistance from the federal government. I would like to make that clear, that it was paid sixty per cent by the provincial government. That was all that was paid, unfortunately.

I agree with him on the centralization of processing in that area, if there is anything going to be put there at all. Where it is going to go is something that has to be decided. What group is the most

responsible to operate it is something that has to be decided. The building is available, the building that was to be put up for vegetables and fresh fruit, if I remember, in that particular area but the farmers in St. Barbe North did not see really how they could occupy the building or use it properly because in the season when the produce was coming in, the building certainly was not big enough so it could only be used for fish which is obviously in less supply than vegetables or agriculture in that particular district.

Whoever thought of putting a vegetable storage in St. Barbe North? With all due respect, Mr. Chairman, that had to be one of the classics of all time. I mean, unless we can nibble on rocks, there is no way that there is really much agriculture in the area. The thing to do with it now, we are going to turn it, hopefully, into a processing centre. I would hope, in conjunction and consultation with the member from St. Barbe North, we can decide where and together with the Fisheries people who have some expertise in this regard, decide where to put it.

Now the member for St. Barbe North, I am sure has an exact spot in mind but I hope it is not where the most voters are as opposed to the most pressure.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, just a comment here. The problem is that first when we were talking with the Minister of Fisheries about this we were speaking in terms of a fairly large building or unit or plant whereas later on the Minister of Fisheries tended to think in terms of specialized fish handling facilities, smaller units spread up and down the coast. I do not know if this is meant to be a great, large plant now or one of the small ones that the administration are going to set up along the coast.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect, I cannot see where any great, large plant could be supplied in that particular area,

MR. MOORES: with all due respect, so what you are talking about is either a small processing plant or a fairly elaborate feeder plant. I mean this is what we are talking about in that area.

I certainly cannot see the validity of two in the area and I am only talking now off the top, but what has got to be decided is where it does the most good for the most number of people.

Regarding the other remarks the honourable member from St. Barbe North made, and this was with regard to The Throne Speech itself and the fact that we were going to enlarge and expand the Department of Fisheries and put more emphasis on it, I think the fact that \$10 million in the Budget - \$1 million in industrial development and possibly \$3 million for DREE, \$14 million as opposed to \$3 million just three years ago, shows that we have put a great deal more emphasis on the fishery than ever before.

Number two - about getting the information out to the people: As I mentioned in my opening remarks, this year we are taking demonstrations of various boats, their capabilities, films on new methods of fishing, to the Labrador Coast, to the Northern Peninsula and to the other areas of Newfoundland where this information should be passed on to the people who are prosecuting the fishery, probably by more - I will not say antiquated methods - but older methods than are presently in vogue in other places.

The third point is: "Where are our better programmes?" Sir, we do have better programmes. We are building better boats or the fishermen are, I should say. As a matter of fact, at the present time there are one hundred and three boats under construction, at \$6.5 million, which is more than ever before, and in this category we now have fifty-eight and sixty-five foot boats which are meaningful, worthwhile and should be encouraged.

Regarding the supply of fish for the under-capacitated plants

MR. MOORES: in the province, two trawlers are being built and the trawler programme, as mentioned, is also going to provide some of the raw material for the shore worker who is presently under-employed.

Equally the inshore fishermen programme for better gear and methods and easier funds for borrowing towards gear, land banks and gear, gear banks if you like, are also in the programme for this year.

Regarding the insurance for catch failure - this is more difficult because in the case of the farmer Ottawa does share. Ottawa will not have anything to do with catch insurance nor gear insurance in the province. For that reason we are trying to draw up our own plan and we are hoping to get Ottawa to change their minds.

Regarding bait services in the province: Last year fifteen different areas had temperature control units put in, with bait supply units, at a cost of very nearly \$100,000. The other point regarding conservation, Mr. Chairman, we have made very definite representation to Ottawa.

Regarding the regional offices - the regional offices will be established this year. The locations have been picked out and the offices arranged. Other than the ones that are presently in existence, there will be one on the Avalon Peninsula, with headquarters at Harbour Grace, one on the southwest coast, with headquarters at Marystown, one on the west and northwest coast, with headquarters at Corner Brook, and field officers located in Port au Basques and/or Stephenville and Port au Choix, one on the northeast coast, with headquarters at Lewisporte, one on the east coast, with headquarters at Catalina and one in Southern Labrador, with a regional office located in Port Hope Simpson. It will be also possibly visualized this office being one of the more mobile type, and very serious consideration is being given to locating a field man in the Blanc Sablon to Red Bay Area.

MR. MOORES: So that is the stage of the regional offices. They are going to be completed. They are in these estimates and they will be done. It took time to get the identification of the locations. It also took time to make sure that we had the right locations to do the job that had to be done.

As the honourable member from Fogo, who is the past Minister of Fisheries, said and I think reasonably, we could not expect everything to be done in the one year, but we will continue to try and try harder in this particular case to get the job done that needs to be done.

The one thing that the honourable member from Fogo did say that I disagree with is that we left Fisheries until last because it is the last priority of this government. That is incorrect. I think the other night we could have very easily carried on with the Fisheries debate, very late in the evening, rammed through the estimates, but because of a very reasonable request by the honourable member for Labrador South, with which I totally concurred, that this debate was of far too much significance just to get estimates through. I think a lot of good things have been said today. I think a lot of time has been wasted as well.

Mr. Chairman, the honourable member from Fogo, who has had a lot of experience in the fishery, talked primarily in the past, so it does not really deserve much comment now. He is a gentleman, a kind man, and after the record of the previous government and fisheries, I can understand why today he was not really a very forceful man.

He asked one pertinent question that was significant and it was very meaningful. It was in fact as to when the department will get a full time minister and a full time deputy minister. The answer, Mr. Chairman, is within the next week to ten days.

MR. NEARY: I hear we are getting one from Ottawa.

MR. MOORES: No, we are not getting a deputy minister from Ottawa.

Mr. Chairman, anymore than the member from Bell Island is importing a tongue from anywhere else.

Mr. Chairman, before I sit down, I was going to sit down before that remark from the honourable member for Bell Island, but when consider today, if there were ever an example of words replacing any concrete information or concrete fact, if there were ever an exhibition of chaw replacing action, if there were ever an exhibition of asinine incompetence regarding a subject, I do not see how it could be improved upon, even though the honourable member from Bell Island is always trying to improve upon himself, with very good reason, then his particular participation in this debate. I do not want to get him riled up now so I had better sit down and see if we cannot get on with some business.

MR. NEARY: I hope the deputy minister will be a Newfoundlander.

MR. WINSOR: Has the honourable Premier any comment on the fish plant?

MR. MOORES: No. Mr. Speaker, I do not know if that comes under a head or not, but either way I cannot.

The situation that we have had - a proposal very recently received from the Co-op on the island, and it is of such significance that it has to be given more consideration than we have had time for and certainly it has not been included in these estimates but it will be included in government policy.

I apologize to the honourable member that we do not have the answer. I think he knows himself that the proposal was such that a snap answer could not possibly be given.

MR. MARTIN: I realize, Mr. Chairman, that I have spoken at great length and perhaps far too long on this debate already, but I would like to clear up one point raised by the honourable member from Burin.

Unless I do clear up that point, I am afraid what I have said before will have very little meaning, for some people at least.

I would like to say, Sir, that I am not opposed to a free enterprise system. I am not opposed to merchants setting themselves

MR. MARTIN: up to buy fish. I am not opposed to that at all, I am only opposed to the manner in which it is being conducted.

There is a place for the buyers of fish. There is a place for merchant systems. There is a place for the Fishermen's Union. There is also a place for government intervention in a system when it starts to fall apart or has never perhaps gotten together.

I think what the government have to do here is to make sure that the proper atmosphere is created in which all of these various agencies can work together. That, Sir, was the sum total of what I had to say this morning. Perhaps I should have said it then instead of now.

MR. F. ROWE: One quick question, Mr. Chairman, Could the Premier give some indication as to whether or not they will be able to decide upon a location for that reconverted vegetable storage unit in time for reconstruction to take place during the summer months or whether it is going to be held up for another year? Because once you pass the summer in St. Barbe North, you can forget about reconstruction during the winter.

MR. DOODY: Where did we say it was going?

MR. F. ROWE: Well, he did not say where it was going first nor last, Mr. Chairman.

The problem is, Mr. Chairman, that there is a group in Brig Bay, wanting it to go in Brig Bay, there is a group in Flowers Cove, wanting it to go in Flowers Cove, and there is a report from the Department of Fisheries suggesting somewhere in between, where there are no votes, I might add.

MR. DOODY: Just a second, when the honourable member and the delegation came in and talked about that, the vegetable control unit, did we agree at that time that we would have it moved from some point to Brig Bay?

MR. F. ROWE: No, there was never an agreement as to where it should go, Mr. Chairman, I am quite clear on that because I am well aware -

MR. DOODY: But we agreed to moved it.

MR. F. POWE: When we were having discussions with the honourable minister it was over whether or not the vegetable storage unit belonged to his department at the time or whether it should be passed over to the Department of Fisheries.

MR. DOODY: That did not take very long.

MR. F. ROWE: No, but it still has not been decided where it is going to go.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, I will try to answer the question. There is no designated site at this moment, to my knowledge. In consultation with the member and in consultation with the area and in consultation with people who will bring in a non-partisan report so to speak, it will be established in the area where it will do the most economic good and hopefully I see no reason why it should not be commenced this year.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate today and I hope I have learned something from it and perhaps on that basis I will say a few things that seem to me to be relevant.

Let me first of all thank the government, Premier and the House Leader for making the debate possible. If we had gone on on Tuesday night or Wednesday morning, whichever way you wish to look at it, we would not have had a debate anything like this, it may have been as long, it may have been longer, we do not know. We have not been very long. Actually we have only been two and a-half hours this morning and one hour and fifteen minutes. We have not been five hours yet on the fisheries.

It is a subject we all agree is worth it and the fact is that when we finish this debate I suspect the rest of the estimate, the rest of the votes, items in the heads will be dealt with fairly quickly and expeditiously. It further proves it. I imagine we will be off of this by six o'clock and on about other things.

There are two or three things, Sir, which I should like to say which do not seem to have been said so far today, which

Mr. Chairman, I think are relevant to any debate on the fisheries policy of the Government of Newfoundland.

Before I do that, let me deal briefly with a point made by the Premier who is usually very good with his figures but for once as I understood him was not. The actual - I do not have the Auditor General's Report here which would give us the actual expenditures on Fisheries in the last four or five years but I do have here the figures from the printed estimates which show that in 1971-1972, the last year in which the Liberal Party formed the administration, on their first go-round in Newfoundland's term as a province, the amount was \$5 million. In actual fact, according to the printed estimates it was \$4.96 million, but call it \$5 million.

I assume that figure is accurate. It is the revised figure and it was produced in a printed document tabled under the authority of the present Minister of Finance, in other words in the estimates last year.

Last year, Sir, in 1972-1973, the financial year which ended on March 31, three weeks ago, the estimated expenditure as voted by the House was a little under \$7 million, call it \$6.9 million. The revised expenditure was \$5.8 million, that is the figure, Your Honour, which comes from the estimates that now stand before the committee. There is a story I suspect in why that \$1.1 million was not spent. That must be the largest dropped balance of any department in the government, largest dropped balance absolutely and the largest dropped balance by far on a percentage basis. That \$1.1 million is on an expenditure of \$5.8 million, Your Honour, a little under one-fifth, so the department spent between fifteen and twenty per cent, depending on what one bases the calculation, between fifteen and twenty per cent less last year than they were authorized to do by the House.

That is unusual. Normally departments over-expend. This year the departmental request, Sir, is for a total of \$8.7 million in

MR. ROBERTS: round figures. The precise figure, of course, Your Honour, is committed to memory by now but it is \$8,747,300. In the printed estimates the Premier points out correctly that there is \$1 million over in industrial development for the start of a trawler programme but if we are going to do that I think we should compare apples and apples. While I do not have all these figures here, he would find it, in the years in which the Liberal Party was forming the administration of the province, there were substantial millions put into the fisheries through other departments.

For example the Marystown Fish Plant -

MR. MOORES: It was in Fisheries.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it was in Fisheries and also is to be found in Finance. The Mooring Cove Building Company is a crown corporation, it owns the plant there. There were expenditures made through the Department of Finance. It reports through Fisheries.

MR. DOODY: There was a \$13 million vote in Fisheries four years ago.

MR. ROBERTS: How much?

MR. DOODY: \$13 million.

MR. ROBERTS: That was partially for the plant-

AN HON. MEMBER: Shipyard.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, but I am talking about the fish plant. The shipyard I had not mentioned. The shipyard was built by the Fisheries Development Authority, there was a "generous" contribution from Ottawa of \$2 million and the rest of it was found by the taxpayers of Newfoundland.

So I think the record should be set straight. I am not overly proud of what was done by the Liberals during the years we were in office, on Fisheries. I think there is much of which we can be proud but there is a great deal of which we should not boast. I quite appreciate the fact, I do not think anybody today has gone through the quite sterile exercise of what happened in the twenty-

MR. ROBERTS: three years when the Liberals were in power. That is sterile. If one wants to do it one can, but it is sterile when it comes to talk of the ongoing affairs of the people of this province.

We played that game last year. It may or may not have been useful. We did play the game in the House, Your Honour, for several months last year. I think now we are quite properly on about the business of what is going to happen in Newfoundland, what is happening and what should happen.

Now, Sir, I did think the figures were relevant. I did not want to allow the impression to stand that all was quite as bad as it may have seemed. The Smallwood Administration gave a priority to the fisheries. I am not sure that it gave the priority that many people think it should have. Certainly in many of the smaller items they fell down. I think particularly they, we if you wish, I was part of that administration, Sir, quite proud of that, fell down with regard to the types of problems that I want to mention, the recognition of the fishery as a social area as opposed to merely an economic sector.

The Smallwood Administration, may it be recorded, Sir, made possible the deep sea fishery there is today in this province. There would not be a fish plant in this province today if it were not for the public money pumped into it during the years in which Mr. Smallwood was Premier of this province, there would not be.

I do not suppose, I could be challenged on this, but I do suppose there is a fish plant in respect of which there was not a large public commitment at some time or another. In respect of many of them, the commitments are still outstanding. They are being honoured as they go along.

The gentleman from Burin, who apparently envisages the fishery as being a capitalistic purview, I am glad to see him returning to the chamber because he and I have an honest

MR. ROBERTS: philosophical difference on this, the gentleman from Burin would be the first to admit that the plants of which he is so proud on the Burin Peninsula and with reason, were all made possible by government money, by public money. I could go through each of them.

The plant at Marystown of course is still owned by the government, by a crown corporation. It is leased to the Atlantic Fish, I am not sure what corporate body of Atlantic Fish but it is leased to Atlantic Fish in some form or another. The lease payments run up over a period of twenty-two years, as I recall it, to amortize the cost of the plant.

The plant at Burin is Fishery Products Limited. Fishery Products Limited are very progressive and a very able firm who have come a long way. I think the firm would be the first to say that it had substantial aid from the government but not as gifts but credit, and credit was hard to come by.

There was a period in 1968, Your Honour, when all we saw in the Cabinet was the then Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Maloney. Probably the finest Minister of Fisheries we ever had in Newfoundland, certainly the least sung, one of the finest we have ever had. Well, Mr. Maloney, I do not suppose there was a day he was not in Cabinet with a paper requesting more loans or more guarantees for all of the fish plants.

Nobody begrudged them, they were necessary because without them the plants would have gone under. This is the period of which the Minister of Justice spoke, Sir. The period during which the price of the - to take the bench mark price as everybody refers to, the price of five pound cod locks at Boston and Gloucester fell to something like eighteen and nineteen cents, that is what drove Birds Eye under. It drove the Ross Group back to England. They would not stand it, whether they could or not is beside the point, but they fell to eighteen and nineteen cents and the plants were costing twenty-three, twenty-four. A good plant

MR. ROBERTS: might produce it for twenty-one or twenty-two.

Well the Premier says it is lucky, I agree. I mean sometimes we are up to twenty-eight and twenty-nine. They could not hack it. Every business in the country lost money in those years. The fishermen paid a price because they were getting low prices for their fish. Plant workers got low wages, I was going to say starvation wages, maybe they were not even that good, but I mean it just was not in there. If the saying in the old salt fish industry was that "Cape St. Mary's Pays For All," then the price of the fish blocks in Boston is what pays for all now. What has made possible the dramatic turn around in the fortunes of the fishing industry in this province, Sir, the deep sea industry, in particular in the last few years, is the fact that the price has risen steadily. It is what? Sixty cents a pound now in Boston. I mean fish is almost like gold - sixty cents a pound for this product delivered in Boston.

But, Sir, the rise in the price of fish should not be allowed, must not be allowed to obscure the fact which I submit is the central problem in the fisheries today. The problem with which any government must be concerned, the problem with which anybody in the whole totality of the fisheries, whether it be the man who owns a company or the man who manages a company or the civil servant who implements and helps to develop policy or the ministers who develop policy or the opposition or the men who work or the men who fish, everybody must be concerned with one fact. It was touched on by the gentleman from Burin, in his usual eloquent way, and that is the supply of fish.

I have here some figures, statistics are not always the most useful thing in the world but statistics can be an indication. The staggering fact, Sir, is that if you take the total final fish landings of all types in Newfoundland for 1972, they came to 646.7 million pounds.

MR. MOORES: That is ground fish, I take it.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, I am sorry, that is all. That is ground fish, pelagic and shell fish. Ground fish was 480.6 million.

MR. MOORES: No, there had to be more herring than that, Mr. Chairman, maybe the figures are wrong.

MR. ROBERTS: Herring landings were 142 million; cod landings, 213 million. These are figures from Environment Canada, as of January 30. I have every respect for the assistant deputy minister (whatever it is).

MR. MOORES: No, I was just surprised myself.

MR. ROBERTS: No, the herring, as the honourable member for Labrador South pointed out, had fallen off to nothing last year compared to what went on before. 142 million, Mr. Chairman, is a lot of herring, that is 70,000 tons, unless -

MR. MOORES: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well let me repeat them though, these are figures I have from Environment Canada, I am not prepared to say they are correct except I think it is reasonable to rely on Environment Canada.

646.7 million pounds, all the figures I will give are million pounds, made up of ground fish 480.6 million, pelagic landings - what does pelagic mean, fish with a backbone in it?

MR. MOORES: Off the bottom.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh not ground fish, off the bottom. Where does pelagic come from?

AN HON. MEMBER: Liberalism.

MR. ROBERTS: It could be. Liberalism has never been on the bottom. The pelagic landings, herring, salmon and caplin, 159.0 millions. The total shell fish production was quite small, of course, but very valuable - 7.1 million. Cod landings were 213 millions, herring landings 142 million. Figures could be wrong but it is what Environment Canada have given us.

Now, Sir, the staggering thing about those figures is that they are twenty-five per cent lower than the year before.

MR. ROBERTS: The year before, Mr. Chairman, the total landings in Newfoundland, these would be deep sea, mid-water, inshore and the fellow standing on the end jigging connors if he put them in a plant somewhere. To see some of the fish produced, I think that is what does happen to some of it.

For 868.2 million pounds, that is a decrease of 221 million pounds. Is that 100,000 tons of fish or have I lost some zeros? It is 110,000 tons of fish, a decrease of twenty-five per cent.

It was not uniform, Sir, ground fish are only down ten per cent. The pelagic landings were down fifty per cent. That is the herring falling off because they killed off that year's class. I do not know the name of the year class, but I am told the year class that produced the bumper crops in the Gulf of St. Lawrence in the last years is just about gone, just about gone, one of the classic instances of over fishing. Cod landings were down seventeen per cent, herring landings were down fifty-three per cent last year.

Now, Mr. Chairman, that is staggering, staggering for three reasons. First of all they are staggering because the effort put out to catch that fish last year was greater than the year before, there may not have been more fishermen. I will deal in a moment with the numbers of men in the fishery. The effort was greater, there were more boats, there were more longliners, there were several hundred more last year, there were more trawlers, so we are getting less return in catch. I am only speaking catch at this stage, less return per unit of effort, whatever unit of effort. One can measure it a lot of ways, trawler hours, trawler dollars. I am dealing in catch not cash, man hours whatever you want but per unit of effort put into the fishery by Newfoundland, we are getting far less return. Last year the overall total was down twenty-five per cent.

MR. ROBERTS: The second reason, Sir, is that this is a trend. I do not have here the figures for the last four or five years, I only have them for the two years but there is a trend.

MR. MOORES: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. The Premier has just made the point I was going to make, the graph of the total catch, Your Honour, has been descending relatively slowly but then it has taken a dip. The question is, Sir, where does the graph go next? Does it continue to dip precipitiously? Will it level off? Will it go up? Fish landings for this year, up somewhat. January and February, up 2 million pounds is not a great deal on a total production of 650 million a year.

The third point, Your Honour, the third staggering conclusion to be drawn from this, the third reason why this is a very serious question is quite simply the value of the product had risen sharply, very sharply. I suggest that that is not entirely, well it is not entirely unrelated to supply, it is not very much based on supply, If we could produce more fish we could sell it. I do not think, I heard nobody in the industry suggest seriously that if we had produced 870 million pounds of fish last year we could not have sold it at prices roughly comparable to that which we did get for 650 million pounds.

Our fisheries are relatively insignificant

nationally, when you look at the volume going into the big market, the American market. The Premier's father developed the United Kingdom market and sold a lot of fish there over the years. I do not think very much of our fish goes overseas now to England, except possibly, salmon. Everytime I was at the Savoy Hotel, I was a guest of somebody having smoked salmon, at a pound for enough to cover a dinner plate and you could read a newspaper through it, it was sliced that thinly. I thought that I recognized the salmon, He used to swim off Englee until he was caught, shipped over and smoked and then served up at a vast price in London.

Sir, to me that is the central problem of our fisheries. The actual value, Your Honour, last year in dollars and millions of dollars, was \$35.5 the return, the year before it was \$35.6. That is a very marginal decrease, it is a \$100,000 decrease on a total or point there. Not three per cent but point three per cent, one three-hundredth of the total value margin! So out bacon was saved last year, to mix the metaphor somewhat, Speaking of the fisheries, although the total catch was down twenty-five percent, the net return, the value as computed by Environment Canada was just about the same.

But, Sir, if we had been able to catch anything like the amount of fish we caught the year before, much less the year before that, if we had been able to catch even the same amount, bearing in mind we used greater resources, more and better boats - I do not have the figures here of how many trawlers there are, there were more trawlers last year than the year before, more deepsea boats, more longliners, several hundred more. The number of men in the inshore fishery, I do not know, but the number of men in the inshore fishery, Your Honour, is not a reflection, not an indicator of the economic situation of the fishery, it is an indicator of the economic situation of Newfoundland generally. In many cases the men who go in the inshore fishery, in district after district, are men who cannot get a job ashore, at construction, in the woods or whatever is available. If they can get the job ashore, they will usually take the job ashore.

There are many fishermen who are fishermen, who will fish no matter what jobs are offered. It is in their blood, it is their way of life, but maybe one third of the 20,000 fishermen in this province fish as a court of last resort. They cannot find a job ashore, they cannot find labour work nor construction work, driving a truck or whatever they can turn their hands to, so they will go back to the inshore boat. That is the inshore fishery in too many cases. It is not a fishery of choice, it is not a fishery of opportunity, it is a fishery of last resort.

We are faced with this situation. I do not have any easy answers. It is quite easy for the Premier and the Minister of Justice to say that it is Ottawa's fault. I concede without any hesitation that Ottawa is the power which must deal internationally, leaving aside entirely the legal and constitutional position. It would be completely chaotic to have provinces dealing internationally, to have Newfoundland sending off delegations to negotiate international questions or to have British Columbia doing it. It is reasonable to be represented on international negotiations, there are precedents. The Government of Quebec were represented at certain negotiations held in the Francophone countries, I believe in 1968.

There was quite a famous incident at the time when Mr. Pearson was the Premier of Canada and Mr. Trudeau, the present Prime Minister, was Minister of Justice. There was some suggestion that Quebec would like to send their own people directly. Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Pearson squelched that very effectively. The eventual result of the compromise, of course, was that Canada had a delegation but Quebec was represented on the delegation. Indeed, I think the Quebec minister was chairman of the delegation, a typical Canadian compromise.

Your honour, our fisheries today are facing a crisis. It is all very well to say that Ottawa must take the lead. I think that we in Newfoundland have put no pressure on Ottawa. Relatively speaking we have put none. The SOFA organization, Mr. Gus Etchegary and the

people who serve with him, are on the executive and making up the membership of that body have exerted some influence. The ministry opposite may well have. Publicly they have made some statements and privately they may have made far more statements, I have no knowledge but the people of Newfoundland, Sir, the Government of Newfoundland, all of the collective organizations of Newfoundland have not yet begun to put anything like the pressure which must be brought to bear if we are going to take the steps which must be taken.

Our fisheries, Your Honour, are not just an economic factor in this province, and this is where the gentleman from Burin went so hopelessly astray. On the Burin Peninsula, possibly on the Southwest Coast as a whole, maybe on the Southern Avalon, the fisheries are an industry but, Your Honour, if you start at Bonavista and you work your way north to St. Anthony or Cape Bauld and then you come down the St. Barbe Coast and you go up the Coast of Labrador, the fisheries, Sir, are not just an industry there, they are a way of life, they are the greatest single sociological factor we have. I agree the Premier said it, now I want him to do something about it.

The gentleman from Labrador South made that point. He was the first one to make it in this debate and I think, Sir, any understanding or any discussion of public policy towards fisheries in this province must be founded on that fact.

The deepsea fishery economically is booming, just booming. They are coining the money. They have had a lot of help, a lot of public help, millions and millions and more millions poured in. Wharves, trawlers, plants, price support programmes and that is fine but, Sir, the inshore fishery in this province and by that I also include the midwater fishery, the fishery which we well know from Bonavista North or from Catalina North, that, Sir, needs the attention of this government and to the lesser extent of Ottawa.

Mr. Chairman, the most encouraging thing I have seen in our fishery in the last three or four years and let me add that in 1972

Environment Canada using preliminary figures estimated that there were 15,450 men in the fisheries of Newfoundland of whom 1,800, in round figures, were in the offshore fleet. Last year, 1971, there were 15,900 men of whom 1,700 were in the dragger fleet. The most encouraging sign that I have seen in the fishery, Sir, in the last few years is a twin realization and the determination, a realization by our fishermen that they could control their own destiny to a much greater extent than they ever have before.

The Minister of Justice referred to Coaker. I think that anybody who tries to understand the history of Newfoundland or tries to understand what we have today in Newfoundland and who tries to do that without understanding and comprehending the work of Sir William Coaker, what he did right and where he went wrong, because Coaker did go wrong in the end, any person who tries to understand this province today without an understanding of Coaker's work is doomed. Because, Sir, Coaker, fifty and sixty years ago, indeed I am told that the shed at Herring Neck where he held his first meeting is still there, down in Herring Neck, in 1908. Coaker was a St. John's-man. He was born here in St. John's. He went north. He went north to Herring Neck, and to destiny then. Coaker was the first man to show the fishermen of Newfoundland that they had some power, they had power they were not using, and for a period of about fifteen years they used that power. Then about 1923 or 1924 it all slipped away. I do not propose to go into an historical disquisition, I am not sure that I am competent to and even if I were I do not propose to ask, to why the F.P.U. disappeared about the mid-twenties as an effective force, it did not disappear until I think it was, 1950, that it disappeared as an actual force but as an effective force, Sir, about the mid-twenties. What was left of it, the depression killed.

It was not until two or three years ago that our fishermen again had that realization and got with it, the determination. You can knock the Fisheries Collective Bargaining Act of 1971. It certainly is not a perfect piece of legislation, it was a response by a government to a movement and it was a good response. It needs to be improved

upon now and one of the failures of this administration is that in a year and a-half or a year and a-third they have not produced that response. I do not think it is for lack of ideas. I have seen a brief which Mr. Cashin, the president of the union, has sent round to each M.H.A. putting forth some excellent suggestions for revisions. I have seen no response in the legislation yet, I have seen no indication of what form the legislation will take. Whether it will be tinkering with the present scheme, which is essentially to equate a fisherman with other workers, (Right or wrong, that is what it does) or whether on the other hand it is to take the sort of path which has been adopted in the Scandinavian Countries which is far different in all of its implications than we know in North America and would if adopted produce quite a major social changes, quite major economic changes, very significant changes in the whole pattern of the industry and in the way of life which grows out of that industry.

Even with that present act which is not good, I am the first to agree that it is not good but it is far, far better than nothing, even at that, Sir, we have seen many of our fishermen organized. The other day we saw an historic breakthrough when Fishery Products and the Fishermen's Union, the Newfoundland Food, Fish and Allied Workers' Union, signed a collective agreement affecting only one plant in the first instance, the Port aux Choix plant, but also with provisions it will be extended to Twillingate and to St. Anthony. I hope before this season is well under way we will see similar agreements signed with every plant. I believe there already was one last year with Beothuck Fisheries, up in Valleyfield, in Bonavista North - Mr. Boyd Way and Mr. Tom Hallett. We have seen most of the action up until now has been in the fish plant workers. Now the emphasis is shifting and I am glad because until our fishermen do combine and do use their combined force to get their rights, they will not get them.

Many honourable gentlemen may know the old union song "Solidarity Forever."

AN UNION MEMBER: "The union makes them strong."

MR. ROBERTS: The union makes them strong. I am probably, other than the gentleman from Bell Island, the only member of the House who could say the words, I would not attempt to sing them. "When the union's inspiration to the worker's blood shall run, there is no power greater anywhere beneath the sun, Yet what force, what force on earth is weaker than the feeble strength of one?" Then as my friend says; "For the union makes us strong."

Well, Sir, you know the next verse. "They have stolen countless millions that they never toiled to earn, yet without their brain and muscle not a single wheel can turn."

MR. NEARY: Where did the honourable member learn that?

MR. ROBERTS: There are many things in my past the gentleman from Bell Island does not yet know about. "We could break their haughty power, gain our freedom when we learn that the union makes us strong."

AN HON. MEMBER: Put a tune to the words.

MR. ROBERTS: At least I have a few tunes, which is more than I can say for gentlemen opposite.

Mr. Chairman, I wonder if the page who is so enthralled by... Thank you! Please! Fuel! Fuel! Good, fresh water!

AN HON. MEMBER: Old Dick Nolan should have had his guitar over there when the honourable member was singing that song.

MR. ROBERTS: I can see Harry Hibbs campaigning now, Your Honour. Instead of the "Black Velvet Band" we will have "Solidarity Forever."

Your Honour, the union have succeeded in a very real sense. They have broken the historical pattern and they have set a new pattern. I hope that before this year is over we will see every fisherman in Newfoundland represented by a union, whether it is the Food, Fishermen and Allied Workers or some other union. It is up to them. I do not believe there is any other union really competing now but I hope they will move in. They are moving into my constituency and I am delighted. They have been a long while at it. They have been in the plant representing the people in the fish plant at St. Anthony, they have enlisted some skilled organizational help in their effort to enroll the inshore

fishermen around St. Anthony. All I can say is; "I hope the skills which have served to get me elected three times, maybe twice on my own, will be of some help to the fishermen there." It will be a new role for me, not to be a union organizer but to be helping the union organizer.

The significant thing about this is that despite the dire prophecies which we had, no plant is closed because of a union. Has, Your Honour ever noticed the standard capitalistic response when a bunch of men organize or when a group of men attempt to get higher wages? "We will have to shut her down," say the management. "We cannot afford it." Your Honour, I know of no plant in Newfoundland which is closed because of the actions of the union. Burgeo; I think this was the only social solution to it. I said so at the time. Bonavista; still no resolution. I have no idea what will happen in Bonavista but I do not understand, I cannot understand how one company operating one plant in Bonavista and another one in Fermeuse and another one in Grand Bank, good people, good company, the Russel family, and Bonavista cold Storage are good operators but how they can in conscience pay a man a dollar and something an hour in one plant and a dollar and something less an hour in another plant to do the same work. I do not understand that. My every sympathy goes with the men and the women on that strike in Bonavista. I think they are right as I understand the issues and I think that if that plant do not operate in that way, with equal wages for equal work, then again social action will have to be taken and I for one would support it.

As I said, the most heartening thing I have seen in our fisheries is the realization by our fishermen that they have power in their own hands and the determination to take that power and to use it. The honourable gentleman from Labrador South mentioned politics. I think he is wrong when he says the price of fish has never been a political issue in Newfoundland. Coaker roused the north on that. It has been a major political issue but the problem has been that it has not taken the place it should, because we still have not reached the happy state in

Newfoundland where the fisheries have become - the fisheries, let alone the price of fish, the fisheries have never become the political issue they should. This brings me squarely to a few of the remarks made by the gentleman from Burin.

Now, Sir, I have rarely heard as good an exposition of the authentic Tory, Conservative, reactionary, capitalist policy as the gentleman from Burin gave us in the committee this afternoon. It is an honourable policy, it has integrity, it may even have had merit two or three hundred years ago. I submit, Sir, it has no bearing at all on the world as we know it today. If that be the difference (there are many others in my view) but if that be the difference between that honourable crowd over there and this honourable crowd over here then, Sir, I stand gladly with this honourable crowd over here. We do not have capitalism in the fish industry in Newfoundland today, we never have had it. What we have had and if honourable gentlemen opposite want to say that the administration of which I was a part did this, that is true - they reflected the social considerations. Joe Smallwood also tried to get the fishermen organized and maybe he was the wrong man to do it. Maybe it could not be done by a Premier in office. That could be true but he tried, he tried twenty years ago when precious few other people were trying. He spent four years of his life in Bonavista, in the 1930's, trying to do it. I must say, trying to organize a union in Bonavista during the 1930's, when men were struggling for enough to live on, showed courage and daring. It may not have showed a hardheaded grasp of the practicalities but it did show courage, belief and daring and a willingness to do what was right.

We never had a capitalist existence. When the gentleman from Burin says; "The Industrial Development" that is nonsense, sheer, unadulterated, arrant, blatant, blagged nonsense. What we have had is a system where the only people who have had access to public capital are the capitalists, the management, the industry (and I am not anti-industry). They have their uses, they really have their uses. But there is not a fish plant in Newfoundland, as I said before, that would exist

today without government money. The honourable gentleman - and if it is the philosophy of that administration let them say so, I reject it, because they believe that the only role of the government is to help to make the companies wealthier. Do not anybody say to me a company is in business for any reason other than to make money for itself, its shareholders. It is not there to benefit people, it never has been. I may say that if so, I think, as a shareholder in one or two small companies myself, if so, I want to know why it is so. The whole purpose of corporate organization, Sir, is to make money for the people who own the company, the shareholders and the management. It has no other purpose. What we have had in Newfoundland for a couple of hundred years now, when Coaker tried it - the honourable member for Labrador South is not an historian but he should read of Coaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: We all must read Coaker.

MR. ROBERTS: I hope so. I hope so, because Santayana said that those who do not remember their history are condemned to repeat it. I do not want to see it repeated in Newfoundland.

MR. DOODY: That is why the honourable member ran in Labrador South.

MP. ROBERTS: When Coaker tried it fifty years ago or sixty years ago, 1919 - 1920, the roof fell in on him. The roof fell in on him! One would think it was the end of Newfoundland. They met down in the Board of Trade rooms. Quite interesting! The honourable gentleman, the Minister of Industrial Development, who has an able mind and a very quick mind should have looked into it.

MP. DOODY: Santayana did not...

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe that is because Santayana is dead and in heaven and the honourable gentleman has no connection with either.

MR. DOODY: That is right. That is why he was in the Board of Trade rooms.

MR. ROBERTS: I doubt if he were, he was a socialist. Unless he was there as a specimen, stuffed and mounted.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman may say so. The honourable gentleman opposite, the member for Burin, would have said so. Your Honour, I reject the view, my party reject the view, all that we have seen of this is not the answer, it may be part of the answer. But I think the time has come, to coin a phrase, when we must see in Newfoundland a policy, a deliberate and planned and rational policy. (If the honourable gentleman from Green Bay should want to call it a philosophy or a policy, he and I can argue the semantics of that) a policy of recognizing the fisheries as being a social, a social fact, not just an economic fact, not just industrial development. If, by the way, it is industrial development, as the gentleman from Burin said, why do we even have a Department of Fisheries? Certainly the Minister of Industrial Development is able enough to look after that as well. Maybe he should be and maybe he will be (I do not know) Minister of Fisheries.

Your Honour, the one thing we do not have now, Sir, is a fisheries policy. There has been some debate back and forth over the infamous Speech from the Throne on the 1st. of March 1972, which may have won an election, Your Honour, but which will be the death-knell of the present administration. I do not propose to go through the measures again but let me say, let me say, Your Honour, that the Progressive Conservative Party in this province raised the expectations of the fishermen to fever height, fever pitch, and they have delivered nothing. They may say that they have offered up the head, political speaking, of a minister but I say the department now is in a shambles, a complete and utter shambles. The fact that there is no minister is a political situation. The Premier said that he will ask the government to appoint a minister shortly. That is good. I am not too concerned about the lack of a minister for a few days or a few weeks. There has been no deputy minister, There are extremely able men at the assistant deputy minister level and elsewhere throughout the department but there is no deputy minister, there is no first mate, there is no captain and there is no

first mate, there is no programme. There is no programme and as we look through these estimates, Sir, there is still no programme. There is a lot of money. A lot of money, a lot of it going in facilities, plans, proposals, programmes outlined by my friend from Fogo when he was Minister of Fisheries.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Well sure. We will produce the documents if they want it. Your Honour, I wonder? I know it is late but really, there is - I do not know who is out in the gallery talking but he is very loud or they are very loud as the case might be.

There is no policy, Sir. The department is in a complete and utter shambles, promises are unkept, the programmes are unprogrammed. We hear the Premier now his Minister of Fisheries walked out on him and made a statement that was the most appalling confession of political defeat that I have ever read. I say nothing about the gentleman, the former member for Hermitage. He is a fine gentleman. He and I were, are and I hope will be friends but, Sir, this document, the one made public by "Information Newfoundland", on March 29, is the most shattering indictment. The minister's actions, not just in leaving the cabinet but in leaving the House, is the most, really the cruelest indictment that could be made of the complete failure of this administration in a year in office to come to grips with our fishery problems.

Ottawa can be blamed for what they have done and what they have not done but, Sir, the answer to our fisheries problem does not rest solely in Ottawa. It is a first-class cop-out not worthy of a government to blame everything on Ottawa. It is a first-class cop-out! I may add, if Ottawa is so bad as the gentleman from Burin would have us say, and as the former Minister of Fisheries would more or less indicate in his political last will and testament, what about the press release which "Information Newfoundland" issued on December 21, reporting on matters, reporting on discussions? "Considerable progress is reported" so said "Information Newfoundland" "as stated" (I am quoting now, Sir) "Mr. Cheeseman reports considerable progress on a number of items. Listed

a number of items in the press release."

Your Honour, it is just an excuse, it is just an attempt to try to step out from under to blame everything on Ottawa. The fact remains that the government have failed completely, dismally, totally and utterly in their first year in office to come to grips with the fisheries problems of this province. We have had the word, Sir, we have had the words again and again, we had them again today and I for one am prepared to believe the words are meant but, Sir, the actions must go with the words. I do not know what the year ahead will bring in government action. We will see a new Minister of Fisheries. That is good. I hope we will see it within a week or so and that is good. I hope he is not the putative candidate for Hermitage because if so, he will be unemployed very shortly. I assume one of the honourable gentlemen opposite, who is either in the cabinet or hoping to get in the cabinet, a backbencher, a supporter of the government, will be invited to join the administration and will accept that invitation.

I do hope that in a year from now we see some action, we see some performance, we see some policy in action because we have not. We have wasted an entire year. It is gone irretrievably. I do not know how much more I can say on that, Sir. I can say it again and again but I have made the point. Our fisheries are far more than an industry or anything else like that, they are the way of life of the people living in half the island. It is the primary source of income for 20,000 people.

The inshore fishery in particular may or may not be doing relatively well these days but its future looks grim. The midwater fishery, again I am not so sure we have the answers. The loans programmes, are they adequate? But above all, Sir, what we need is not just words from a government we have had the words, we have had all the honeyed words but we have not had any action. The Department of fisheries now is a bad joke. It really is, it is a very sick thing indeed. Whoever will become Minister of Fisheries will have a Herculean

task ahead of him. I do not envy him the task in one way and in another way I do envy him because the opportunity is there.

In closing let me ask about one or two points. The Premier may want to say a few more words on this. Let me ask about one or two specific matters. I wonder if there is anything new to report on Bonavista? Would the Premier say a few words about Bay d'Espoir? The Minister of Industrial Development has told us that there is no proposal from Mr. Spencer Lake nor from the Lake Interests in respect of down there, nothing detailed. There apparently has been some discussions and some chit-chat but what is the feeling of the administration with respect to a new fish plant in Bay d'Espoir? What about the question of fish supplies? Are these relevant? Are there enough fish supplies? I quite genuinely do not know. I do not know. I asked the Minister of Industrial Development and did not get an answer on that point but perhaps that is not his bailiwick.

Would the Premier tell us a little about the trawler programme? My understanding is that there are

at least two companies in Newfoundland that want to go ahead today to get trawlers and they are being stalled and stalled and stalled by the government, at least two but there maybe more.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two? Who are they?

MR. ROBERTS: Two. That would be breaching confidence. Each of them has been in touch with the government. Each of them has letters from the former Minister of Fisheries saying, "We promise you an answer within ten days or two weeks." The Premier can look up the files. They have to go overseas to get them because there is no capacity in Newfoundland. There will be no capacity in Newfoundland next year either. The government is deliberately, for whatever reason, delaying this. They may have reasons or they may not but they are deliberately delaying it and these affect two of the larger companies in Newfoundland, Sir.

I would like to hear a few words about the auction system. We heard a great deal about that a little while ago but I have not heard much recently. I think the Premier may have referred to it as I read the press reports of his speech in Harbour Grace two weeks ago. I would like to hear a little more about further processing. The Premier has a mystifying habit of just springing off to Toronto and making the most interesting statements to the "Globe and Mail" about further processing of fish. He is quite right when he points out that some of the people in some of the plants in Newfoundland particularly Fisheries Products are carrying fish processing to further stages. I confess, Sir, I have been unable to find anybody in the industry in Newfoundland who believes that this can work to a much greater extent than it has. The Premier mentions the tariff and that is certainly one of the factors. There are others. I wonder if the Premier would tell us in a little more specific detail because many people really expect that further processing of fish in Newfoundland will create hundreds or thousands of jobs. They have

been led to believe that by the Premier and by the administration.

To date there have just been empty promises. I would like to hear some details. I would welcome the news that it could be done. The Premier has mentioned the regional offices and I find it interesting that his defense of the fact that they were not set up last year was that their locations had to be determined. Sir, the locations of those regional offices were announced during the March election campaign a year ago.

MR. MOORES: Not all of them.

MR. ROBERTS: Not all of them maybe and they may not all be announced yet. We will have one in Harbour Breton before it is over I am quite sure. But the fact remains that the Premier's excuse is a pretty weak one, a pretty pathetic one when he says that they were not determined. They were announced. They were not all announced. The officers could have been at work a year ago. I do not know what they are going to do but they could have been at work.

Would the Premier also, Mr. Chairman, deal with one or two matters that have come to me? One is a district problem. I mentioned to him outside the committee about Englee, the Canada Bay Cold Storage. It is a plant owned by the government and it needs some repairs done on it. It is operated by Canada Bay Cold Storage, which is an arrangement between H.B. Clyde Lake Limited and John Reeves Limited, an Englee firm. It is the only operational fish plant in the area. The other one up at Boyd Arm is like the trawler programmes, it is under consideration. I hope we will see results from it quicker than we will see them from the trawler programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I certainly hope so, Sir. Also, Mr. Chairman, could the Premier tell us what he knows about the situation in Lark Harbour which of course is in the sovereign constituency of Humber West. I understand that a delegation has waited upon the Premier to talk

to them about the question of the fish plant there. On March 13, 1973, they were here. They had an appointment with the Premier, their member, to get some action on the proposal for a fish plant.

The letter I had, said that the Premier was not free to meet with the group as he had other engagements, and the long trip was fruitless. Although they were able to see the "then" Minister of Fisheries, they could not get satisfaction or commitment. The then minister said that the Premier would be contacting them later, but up until now no definite word has been received and time is still going.

The problem I gather, Your Honour, is not just government inaction or ineptitude, that is obviously there, but in addition to that there are two parties contending for the privilege or the right of establishing a fish plant out at Lark Harbour on the South side of the Bay of Islands. One is Maritime Packers, a firm with which the honourable gentleman from St. George's is not entirely unfamiliar because he sold his former fish interests to that firm. The other firm is the well-known Mr. Jim Hardy, T.J. Hardy Limited, up in Port aux Basques, who also has a plant in Rose Blanche. Does he? Is Jim Hardy in Rose Blanche as well? He has a big operation in Port aux Basques. He apparently has been buying fish up in Lark Harbour the last year or so, since the gentleman from St. George's went out of the business -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well Maritime Packers of course is some sort of agent of National Sea. I do not know what their relationship is but they amount to a stocking horse for National Sea. The question is, is there going to be a fish plant out there and if so, is it to be Mr. Hardy, whom the fishermen apparently prefer? The information I have is that they are very anxious to have Mr. Hardy operate in the area, coming up from Port aux Basques, rather than Maritime Packers which the Premier I think will confirm are somehow connected

with National Sea. I do not know of their direct links but they are linked.

Could the Premier also touch upon the situation at Pools Cove up in Fortune Bay District? There have been persistent reports of some sort of plant going up there, be it a feeder plant or be it who knows what. Inquiries I gather to the gentleman from Fortune Bay have produced remarkably little information to date and perhaps the Premier can help us on that.

I think that is about it, Mr. Chairman, except to mention the Fishing Industry Advisory Board. The gentleman from Labrador South has asked about it. Could the Premier indicate when this will be set up? Really the legislation, without it, is quite ineffective because the board is designed to ensure that all of the facts are available and that bargaining can go forth on the basis of valid and complete and factual information. Without this board there will be little chance that the unions and the companies can bargain in anything like an equal relationship. I was involved in the ministerial level work on the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act and certainly it was our thought then and our belief and still is that the advisory board is the key to the entire process. It does not have to be an expensive operation. It does not have to be a very big operation but it is a very vital operation. I wonder if the Premier could say a word or two about that.

Mr. Chairman, having said my few words I think perhaps I should ask the Premier - We will soon get it through, by six o'clock, I have no illusions there. I think it has been a useful debate, a very good debate and perhaps the Premier could deal with some of the points I raised.

MR. MOORES: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I hope I do not take as long in replying as the honourable Leader of the Opposition was in asking these particular questions. Regarding the Bay d'Espoir development, the answer for a fish plant in that area is, of course, yes we are. Our understanding was, from Mr. Spencer Lake, that

there was going to be a complex go in that area which would include a saw mill, a motel, fish plant and I think two or three other things that were relevant to rural Newfoundland. In other words a complex of all those things that rural Newfoundland could do well. So far we have had a telegram from the people in the Head of Bay D'Espoir Area regarding the proposition for the fish plant but we have not had a formal proposal from Mr. Lake on that matter as yet.

Regarding the trawler programme that -

MR. ROBERTS: Is there any problem with fish supplies?

MR. MOORES: No, the fish supplies there would obviously have to be by trawler because there are no inshore fishermen in the Bay d'Espoir Area. Mr. Lake may have done the study but to our knowledge we do not know it. He has announced that five or six, I think it was, stern trawlers would be required but we have no official notification of it.

Regarding the further processing in Newfoundland, this is a very moot point because some of the fish firms in Newfoundland are doing it at the present time, marginally but not to a great degree. When we talk about reprocessing we are talking about the possibility of herring, we are talking about the possibility of especially fish that is being caught and other items as well. Now it is understandable why the firms who are presently at it do not want to see further involvement of other people because after all it is a form of other competition coming in. However, there is a large company in Canada, a processing company and a distributing company, who are interested as well, in connection I guess with a Japanese firm. Other than that there is very little I can say about that specific group wanting to develop this type of industry here. I am hopeful that we can still persuade the trade to go into it either on a consortium basis or some basis in the areas where there is not too much conflict but where the reprocessing

can be done because with the reprocessing of fish in this province it will make a very real and definite contribution to the labour force being occupied in the province, particularly on a year round basis.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition asked about Englee.

I can just assure him that we will see to exactly what the problem is and if we can possibly do it we will. Lark Harbour, his facts were erroneous. The building that is there now is owned by Maritime Packing which is a branch of National Sea and two people have bid on it, both Newfoundland firms, and actually it is between National Sea and themselves right now. They both have applications in for assistance, I think to the Newfoundland Development Corporation, so they advised me, and whichever one is the successful one there I assume will be operating the plant in Lark Harbour.

The Pools Cove development I know nothing about. I do know about the Belleoram development which I assume the Leader of the Opposition is talking about. There will be a fish handling facility and a slipway go there. Regarding the other things the honourable Leader of the Opposition had to say, talking about the trawler programme itself; the reason it has gone under Industrial Development is because we have decided that financing and capital outside of government has to come from the private quarter as well as from government itself in this particular enterprise. The trawler operations in Newfoundland have been an adjunct really to the businesses as operated. Fish processing has been the primary concern of the people in the industry and the trawlers were a necessary evil for many years in order to supply fish to their plants. What we are planning to do and what we want to do is to get a trawler programme whereby we have the trawlers available either for leasing or landing, for auction, but certainly with the end objective being to supply fish for the down days

in the year-round plants now and for a prolonged season in the inshore plants. It is a much longer discussion than people want to go into here in these estimates today. It does not come under any of these heads but it will be the subject I am sure of considerable discussion in this House when it is spelled out specifically in the not too distant future.

Regarding the other remarks the Leader of the Opposition had to say, once again we had the facetious, the typical attitude of arrogance that he accuses us of in his very presentation of what the problem to the fishery is. He has accused us of failing in one year to do what in fact was not achieved in twenty-three. He stands as the great critic of the fisheries when, to quote the honourable Minister of Industrial Development, it is very obvious that he would not know a sculpin from a conner.

Mr. Chairman, we were listening to political gibberish backed by meaningless historical quotes, which is the Leader of the Opposition's wont. The fact remains that he did say the future was grim in the fishery. What has been said by the member for Labrador South and by members on this side today and by his own colleagues "If the future be grim for the fishery," saying it and believing it is not the answer to it. We have to believe there is a future in the fishery because if the people of Newfoundland are going to survive they must feel that, with optimism.

MR. MARTIN: To a point of order, I did not say the future is grim for the fishery. I spoke of the inshore fishery and I think the Premier will agree there is a world of difference, a great world of difference, Sir. I would ask him perhaps, not to set the record straight as the record will speak for itself, but perhaps to direct his remarks to what I did say.

MR. MOORES: If the honourable gentleman did say the future was grim for the inshore fishery, I say it is only grim, Mr. Chairman,

because of an attitude that the inshore fishery has a grim future. Instead of saying that what we need is to take these same people and get them better geared equipment so they can go middle-water. They are not going to leap on trawlers tomorrow morning. They do have an inshore fishery which they must start with before they move further afield. To say that it is a grim future under any context is not correct. If this province is going to be economically viable in our fishery, we have to take an optimistic view of the areas where we have problems and solve the problems and not just say that the future is grim, "hack it yourself." That attitude, Sir, we had for too long.

Irrespective of whether we like it or not, conservation is essential and federal-provincial co-operation is essential in any area such as the fishery where there are two jurisdictions. Mr. Chairman, we have been accused today of having no policy. This is wrong and incorrect. For people who had no policy in the fishery for so long, it is understandable for them to say so. But policy itself is useless unless we have the programmes to put that policy into effect. Programmes are essential to make policy work. Mr. Chairman, before this term of this government is over we will have both.

I would like just for clarification purposes to restate the figures I had regarding the expenditures of the past few years. In 1970-1971, the fact is that \$3 million was spent on the fisheries, that was the department budget. In 1969-1970, it was \$4 million. In 1968-1969, it was \$5 million. In 1968, Mr. Chairman, it was \$5 million; 1969 it was \$4 million, 1970-1971, it was \$3 million. Now there is real progression in the fisheries for you, a million off each year as we went along and then it went up to \$5.9 million in the election year. That was the grandiose scheme in the election year. At least last year, Mr. Chairman, it was \$6.8 million and we did under-spend, which is unforgivable, and this year it is

\$11 million. We are making progress and I will admit not enough. I will also agree with the Leader of the Opposition and others here today about the sociological problem of the fisheries itself.

When you do take North of Cape St. Francis really the inshore fishery, all in the Northern Area, we are dealing with a sociological problem as well as an economic one. The cure will cost money and certainly to change the attitudes, to change the equipment that is available will cost a great deal of money. This is a problem that we recognize and it is a challenge that we are ready to accept.

Mr. Chairman, just in closing and hopefully getting on with the heads individually, I would like to say that what we see and hear will go possibly to some degree towards curing some of the problems but really what it is going to take to cure this problem is the total involvement of not just the Department of Fisheries but a great many people in this province who are concerned enough to put an effort into it. Because the fisheries in this province has had a stigma attached to it for many, many years. It is what you did if you could not find anything else to do. That has to change because with the fish prices today, with the availability of material today, with proper education and knowledge, with a proper frame of mind and with a proper approach to the industry itself the fisheries can be what it should have been in Newfoundland for our whole generation or for our whole history. Mr. Chairman, that is the objective of this government.

On motion, total subheads 1401 and 1402, carried.

1403(01):

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, if the honourable minister could just give us an explanation of what has happened with the service station programme and whether or not it is still an ongoing programme.

MR. MOORES: That will be coming up under another head. I can go

into it now but it will be under the capital and loans vote.

On motion, total subhead 1403, carried.

On motion, 1404(01) through 1404(03)(04), carried.

1404(04)(01):

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I am wondering here what has happened with the community stage programme. There does not seem to be too much left in it. Is it strictly maintenance from hereon or have we wiped it out altogether?

MR. MOORES: All that is, Mr. Chairman, the maintenance of community stages. There are provisions in now in the other vote regarding the establishment of the service centre policy and this sort of thing which has this sort of accommodation attached to it. The particular vote we are talking about here is the provision for the supplying of new construction stages with essential equipment which includes, for instance, wheel barrows, water distribution lines, water pumps, weigh scales and so on that will allow for the proper handling of fish coming into the community stages. There are some forty newly constructed stages and that would be on an average cost of approximately \$1,500 each, but that is what it is for.

On motion, 1404(04)(01) and (04)(02), carried.

1404(05):

MR. MARTIN: The fisheries education and information service; Very briefly, I would like to know what it is all about and whether or not it is linked into the field services division and whether the field officers are in fact carrying out a part or some portion of this programme.

MR. MOORES: The regional offices were back in the fisheries development. There is \$100,000 in that vote, which was increased considerably in 1403(01) by the way. That is where the salary recommendation, that is for the regional offices. 1404(07) is the famous McLean debate of last year, I might say, which is not this year. What it is in fact is that \$4,000 which is being done

by the department itself will be for radio programmes which will be produced by the department. There is \$21,000 for exhibition, distribution and showing of the on-tour thing I mentioned earlier, of the films regarding the different types of fishing, the booth regarding the various types of boats available and so on that will tour the more remote parts of the province and hopefully others as well but particularly like the Coast of Labrador, for instance - \$18,000 for that. Two films which have not been awarded as yet regarding, I have the information here on them, an instructional film on midwater trawling and an instructional film for fish plant workers, on cleanliness, efficiency, reprocessing and that sort of thing and technology which will be approximately I think \$34,000 of the \$61,000.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, what concerns me here is that these programmes, these bits and pieces of information, the education programme does not seem to be reaching to people for whom they are designed. Now I am wondering whether or not, again I come back to another head but it is under fisheries education, the field staff are being given the leeway they need or perhaps the expenses they need to get these programmes out, to use what is quite an expensive thing.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, I am sorry, once again. It is when the field staff are out and when this exhibition for instance is on tour, there will be conferences held at the same time together with the field staff and advisory groups from the area and not just being talked to, in other words, with the field staff listening to these people as well. There is a vote in here for it. I will check if the honourable member wants me to and just let him know exactly where it is, but it is looked after in here.

MR. ROBERTS: Do we have something on that?

MR. MOORES: I was going to say on 1404(07) which the honourable member for Labrador South mentioned. I am sure he does not want

it to slip by. That \$4.5 million is for the construction of fishery service centres. There is \$300,000 involved but there is a great deal more than that because the ARDA agreement that we are presently negotiating with Ottawa this is a major part of that agreement. We are hoping in the next two years to establish fisheries services centres in the Harbour Grace Area, Bonavista Area, Wesleyville-Fogo Area, Isle aux Morts Area, Twillingate-LaScie Area, Placentia-St. Mary's Area, Englee Area, St. Anthony Area, Stephenville, Marystown, Old Perlican and these will be the major service centre areas of major content. The rest of that money is made up of the construction of small boat slipways and haulouts, construction of community and fish handling facilities and loading facilities on wharves for improvement of handling catch, construction of fisheries access roads, upgrading of vessels and equipment, bounties on special fishing gear - that is for new types of fishing, freezing and temperature control, bulk storage, labour intensive projects which have been done together with the winter works programme, and water supplies to fish handling facilities. These are the areas. I have a copious list here if the honourable member would like me to read it out for him or make it available to him after, whichever he likes.

MR. MARTIN: Make it available after.

On motion, total subhead 1404, carried.

On motion, 1405(01) through 1405(02)(03), carried.

1405(03)(01):

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, on bounties, I think there is a demonstrated need for a different type of boat, a smaller boat than we have under the present bounty system. I think the minimum length I believe is forty-two feet on which the federal bounty is given, forty-five feet. Is this going to be changed? Because there is a demonstrated need for a smaller boat particularly in areas such as the Labrador Coast where we have a short season

and there is no requirement to get into a heavy capitalized vessel?

MR. MOORES: This is the announced policy of the federal government where this one goes down to thirty-five and this is being negotiated also under the ARDA agreement right now to try if humanly possible to keep it at the fifty per cent level.

On motion, total subheads 1405 and 1406, carried.

On motion, 1471 - Block Provision: Canada Pension Plan, carried.

On motion, 1472 - Block Provision: Unemployment Insurance, carried.

On motion, Head XIV - Fisheries, without amendments, carried.

Head 11 - Legislative: 201(01):

MR. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, this has caught me a little off balance after the other going through quite as rapidly as it did. In the legislative vote there will be an amendment brought in by the Minister of Finance and the reason for the amendment for all intents and purposes will be an increase for the members of the House and others. Before going into that, I would like to clarify exactly what the position is and what the amounts are and the reasons why this government feel that they are necessary at this time.

Mr. Chairman, this means, in essence what we are talking about here is an increase for the members of the House of Assembly of \$1,337.00 in salary and an increase of \$666.67 in traveling expenses or expenses as such. At this time we are asking about in essence a \$2,000 increase for members of the House of Assembly,

from the present \$10,000, the salary being brought to \$8,000 and the expense allowance to \$4,000.

Mr.Chairman, I feel very strongly that this is not enough and not what the members, if they are going to give proper consideration to their districts, deserve. The fact remains that these are not easy times in this province. These are not times when we can really afford to give generous pay increases. This in fact means a pay increase of approximately six per cent since the last increase to members of the House. I personally feel that if we are to encourage people into public life, they are going to have to be paid accordingly. I am actually very sorry that this increase cannot be more than it is.

One other thing we are providing for in this vote, Mr. Chairman, in the changes or the amendment is an increase or an allowance for actual travel to the districts by the members to ensure that they can get back and forth to their districts as well as members from far away districts to be able to come and live in St. John's and have their expenses paid for when the House is actually in session. I think both these items are also of major significance.

It is not in this vote but it will be suggested that the cabinet ministers get an increase of \$1,000 on their salary.

That I might say is the first increase for any cabinet minister in six to eight years, in that area. That is once again I believe not an unreasonable salary increase for the amount of work that all these men are doing at the present time.

There are proportionate raises in salary for the officers of the House, the Chairman of Committees, a salary increase for the staff of the House, Deputy Chairman of Committees, Clerk of the House, Law Clerk, All these will be filed with the amendment. Basically, they are in fact the same percentage type increases we suggested for the members.

All I am saying, Mr. Chairman, is that a \$2,000 increase for the members of the House of Assembly and \$1,000 for the cabinet ministers (even though I am saying that it does not come under this particular heading) is not a large raise. If we are going to get people into politics, some day reasonable salaries are going to have to be paid if we want people to stay in politics when they come it but they find it is a much more expensive vocation than they thought they were going to find before. We are going to have to pay a salary whereby they can afford to remain in politics.

I suppose all members of this House, those that support this bill, will come in for some criticism. I do not think we should, Sir. I think in fact this particular raise is not a significant one. Certainly in my opinion it is not enough but one I hope which will be of some assistance for the members of the House.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, my colleagues and I have been consulted by the ministry, by the Premier and his colleagues, in respect of the proposals and I want to say now that we are in agreement with the proposals. I do not want any shirking of responsibility on our part. There is something strange, Your Honour, in the parliamentary system. We can sit in this committee as we have and we have voted near enough to \$700 million in expenditures and we can debate it and at the same time the ministry can sit down and bargain collectively with the employee groups, yet I suspect that, as the Premier says, there will be some considerable criticism of this House for raising salaries. I do not think that a \$2,000 raise, of which two-thirds is salary and one-third is an expense allowance, under the normal formula this makes it \$8,000 and \$4,000 total, and raising a minister from \$11,000 a year to \$12,000 a year for a man who has to run a department and take responsibility, is a great deal. There are many people in the province, I realize, who will disagree with that. I think any fair-minded person looking at it objectively, if anybody can,

and I am not so sure any of us can, would feel that that is not too much to pay.

Having said that I only want to say one other thing or two other things. First of all let me acknowledge publicly with thanks (I have before and I mean it) the fact that the administration have treated the opposition parties (I do not speak for the gentleman from Labrador South but I think he would concur with what I am saying) reasonably. I will not say generously. They have treated us reasonably, certainly much more reasonably than their predecessors did but not as reasonably or as generously as their successors will, I assure the Premier.

Let me say also that I do hope in the years ahead and in this we share a problem with every Legislative body in North America - we are the final arbiter of this House, of the expenditures of this province in any given year, which means we are the only people who can give ourselves raises. That is fair enough. We do it openly and we do it publicly. That is why I was particularly anxious. I could have sat here and sort of let it slide through and say nothing about it, just taken my cheque and go on my way. We do have the responsibility of voting ourselves raises. No Legislature in North American can solve this problem. I do not know what the solution is. I think we have to find the solution because there is no reason why legislators should not be paid adequately. If we want in politics and public life in Newfoundland men of stature and of ability and we have many such now, if we want more, then we are going to have to make it financially not necessarily attractive - we have an endless state of affairs where it is financially unattractive. The Premier I am sure has had the experience as have I of talking with people who were anxious to stand for election but said simply, "I cannot afford it." They were not being unreasonable.

Indeed I suspect that half the men in this House, Your Honour, could earn more in private life than they do earn in public life, but that is fine. Public life, if it provides them with an opportunity to look after a family adequately and decently, to look after themselves adequately and decently, is enough. That is all one should ask. We have to ensure that that standard is reached. I, for one, am not sure that even with these increases (I assume they will be approved. There will probably be unanimity in the committee on this, Your Honour) we have reached that stage even now. I do not have any solutions. It will be criticized. "Open Line" within the next few days I am sure will be quite hot. There will be letters to the editor and all that sort of thing, but nonetheless if we believe in what we are doing, then we should do it. So be it!

My colleagues and I feel that the government are on the right track. We are particularly impressed with the suggestion that members be paid for travel to and from their constituencies. That is one means of equalizing the disparities which had to come. It is far more difficult for the gentleman from Burgeo to represent his constituency than say the gentleman from Port de Grave. The gentleman from Port de Grave can commute by car if he wish. That is hard travel for the gentleman from Burgeo. The gentleman for Labrador South has to go by coastal boat or airplane or by shank's mare or by some form of transportation. This is one way perhaps to eliminate the disparities that are inherent in our province. I do hope that we will see actual expenses paid to and from districts to the members concerned, that where they spend to travel I hope the money will be reimbursed. Public servants who travel are paid. My suggestion would be that a member travelling to and from his district on political business because, of course, we are political people, would be paid on the same sort of scale. I think that that is reasonable and right. I do not think there is anything

improper about it at all. Having said that, I for one will vote for the increase, in committee, Sir, and my colleagues and I have discussed it and I can assure you that we are prepared to support the Minister of Finance's motion.

MR. MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, I find it to be a most distasteful task to be asked to vote on a raise of my own salary. It is not the kind of a thing I think that anybody wants to do. Doubtless we will all be subject to a great deal of criticism. I would not be hypocritical enough to vote against it because I have been saying publicly for a long time that politicians or legislators are not being paid enough. I agree that if we are to attract men into the public service or women for that matter who are prepared to put their time and effort into it, then they must be paid at least to the point where they are not going to suffer any hardships or too many hardships.

For the benefit of the gentlemen of the press, I would just like to say that the public will no doubt look upon this as another indication of grasping politicians feathering their own nests. It may be that the only time we come into the limelight is here in the House of Assembly during the short period of the year when we are before the public cameras and this kind of thing. It may very well be that traditionally the job of a legislator is to do nothing other than to sit in the House of Assembly and debate legislation. We must look at the realistic part of the situation. For one reason or another, we are being asked to do far more than simply being legislators. For my own part and I am sure that this applies to just about every member here, we are being asked daily to run interference with such agencies as the Unemployment Insurance Commission and the Manpower Office. "Find us jobs! Get word up to the Fisheries Loan Board! Write to the Iron, Ore Company to find work! Find out what happens when he gets fired!" In my own case, I am being asked to co-ordinate development programmes on the coast simply because there is nobody else to do it

and to promote programmes of development, not just through government but through private agencies. The time, distance and travelling eats up the time that a person would ordinarily have to do his own private work and earn private income. There is lobbying in Ottawa. There is time to be taken up in dealing with federal agencies, Bell Canada, CNR, and all the rest. We are simply not just legislators but it is becoming a full-time job.

I am prepared to put up with the criticism of the public. I will answer to the electors in my district when the time comes. In the meantime, I am certain that if I were not in the House that my income would be slightly higher, perhaps not very much higher but slightly higher and I would not have half the headaches. I would certainly not be hypocritical enough to say that I would not vote for this. Perhaps we are being paid enough for what we do, perhaps not. The public will have to decide that for themselves.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, in connection with the vote for 201-01, allowances, I would move that the amount of \$456,000 be increased by \$96,900.00.

AN HON. MEMBER: To what?

MR. CROSBIE: That it be increased by \$96,900.00 so that it becomes \$552,900.00.

On motion amendment, carried.

On motion 201-01, carried.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, in connection with 201-02-01, which is a travelling and expense allowance for members, I would move that the amount be increased by \$165,900.00 so that it becomes \$305,900.00. That is subhead 201-02-01, travelling and expense allowance.

On motion amendment, carried.

On motion 201-02-01, carried.

On motion 201-02-02 through to 201-02-05, carried.

On motion Block Provision Canada Pension Plan, carried.

On motion Block Provision Unemployment Insurance, carried.

MR. ROBERTS: If Your Honour would permit me, we would have to go back into committee to amend the totals.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

On motion Head XIV, Fisheries, carried.

On motion that the committee rise report having passed items of current expenditure under the following headings: Item XIV, Fisheries without amendment and Item II, Legislative with amendment and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair,

On motion report received and adopted.

MR. SPEAKER: This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Tuesday, April 24 at 3:00 P.M.