



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 3

3rd. Session

Number 84

VERBATIM REPORT

FRIDAY, DECEMBER 6, 1974

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE JAMES M. RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Barr'd Harbour in the District of St. Barbe North. Actually, Sir, it is a supplementary to a petition that I presented to this honourable House yesterday signed by the majority of the communities in the electoral District of St. Barbe North. It reads that the undersigned and there are thirty-three residents of Barr'd Harbour who sent this in, it reads: "The undersigned residents of the area from Barr'd Harbour to St. Barbe, " in this case just Barr'd Harbour, "support the following proposal of the action committee, a nonpolitical group working to improve local conditions. Since our electrical service is poor with many outages, many homes and businesses suffer from it. This past weekend the electricity was off from 11:15 A.M. Friday until 11:00 A.M. Saturday. Many peoples water and sewer systems froze and broke and people cannot live under these particular conditions any more."

Now, Sir, I would like to speak

on this petition just briefly in support of it. The situation in St. Barbe North is this, there are approximately 100 miles of so-called road with forty-three communities spread along that 100 miles. There is one diesel generating station in Cook's Harbour serving Boat Harbour, Wild Bight, Cape Norman and Cook's Harbour. There is one generating station in Flower's Cove serving all of the other forty communities in the whole of the district over approximately forty miles.

Now, Sir, the problem is basically this, as you go south the electrical lines around the St. Barbe Bay Basin Area are subjected to the salting and sprays and severe wind and snow and this sort of a thing and therein lies the problem in the St. Barbe Bay Basin. This is about halfway down the coast or south from Flower's Cove. Consequently what happens is this, is that quite often particularly in the winter, autumn and spring the electricity goes off in communities south of the St. Barbe Bay Basin, which represents about twenty communities.

Now, Sir, I have made recommendations to the Minister of Mines and Energy and to the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission to establish a permanent diesel generating station in the Plum Point Area to serve St. Barbe South to Bard Harbour and let the Flower's Cove generating station serve from St. Barbe North to Eddies Cove or Big Brook.

Now, Sir, these recommendations have been made for two and a-half years and nothing has come out of it at all. We have asked therefore for mobile generating stations to be located in the Plum Point Area, Sir, and that has been turned down. Now the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission have advised me in writing, as well as the Minister of Mines and Energy last year that they would be upgrading the electrical lines in the whole of the District of St. Barbe North before this coming winter. Sir, to my utter amazement and disappointment and surprise, when I visited the district in late summer I found all the materials, all the insulators, all the cross-arms, all the regulators and all the wires for the upgrading of the electrical lines sitting behind the power plant in Flower's Cove. To my knowledge,

Sir, I assumed that the upgrading is going on at the present time. If so, I would submit, Sir, that the work that these linemen can do on upgrading the electrical lines at St. Barbe North at this time of the year cannot be anything equivalent to what could have been done during the summer. The people of St. Barbe North are going to suffer the same outages, the same fluctuations in voltages, therefore burned out electrical appliances, the same freezing up of furnaces and what have you that they had last year and the year before that.

Sir, I think it is time that the government, the minister responsible for the Newfoundland and Labrador Power Commission, the Minister of Mines and Energy to get on the ball with respect to this and establish a permanent diesel generating station in the Plum Point Area. Sir, now I can guess why probably this is not being done, they are hopefully trying to get -

MR. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable Member for St. Barbe North is entering into a bit of debate and he is being rather long in presenting his petition. I draw Your Honour's attention to Standing Order (92) on petitions which says "That in no case shall such a member occupy more than five minutes in so doing," that is in offering the petition to the House, "Unless by permission of the House upon question put." So the

honourable member has used up pretty well all of his five minutes and he is also entering really into the realm of debate in presenting his petition.

MR. ROWE: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am purposely trying to explain the situation which exists in the District of St. Barbe North because this has been going on for two and a half years without any improvement whatsoever.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: As a matter of fact, I will answer the honourable minister's question, Mr. Speaker, if I am allowed to. I certainly will.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The Standing Order as mentioned by the Minister without Portfolio is quite correct. The member who is presenting the petition is allowed five minutes and he should be very conscious of the relevancy in speaking to the prayer of the petition. I feel the honourable Member for St. Barbe North was straying somewhat from the rule of relevancy to the prayer of his actual petition and was merely entering into what one might call a debate.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I think I have about a half minute left if I remember correctly and I will end it by answering the honourable Minister of Social Services' question. Has it only been for the last two and a half years? Of course, it has not been only for the last two and a half years, Sir, but I will say one thing, that the use of electrical appliances and the use of electricity has increased dramatically in the last two or three or four or five years and therein lies the reason for the fact that they are having these problems. For instance, they finally got a T.V. tower in the district there a couple of years ago as a result of the Federal Government and they bought new T.V.s.

So, Sir, I support the petition and I ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petition?

The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the Minister of Mines and Energy who is absent today and in Ottawa, I certainly can assure the honourable gentlemen opposite that he and the Power Corporation have been paying a great

deal of attention to the situation with respect to energy on the Northern Peninsula. I have no doubt that they are certainly doing what they can to improve facilities. I suggest to the honourable gentleman that he remind him on Monday about his petition so he can make sure that the right steps are being taken.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. Barbe North.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I thank the honourable Minister of Fisheries for his support of the petition and I hope that the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy will support this petition.

Sir, it is not stated correctly as a petition as such but it has been signed by an individual and has been sent in on behalf of 132 citizens of the Community of Forresters Point in St. Barbe North. The letter, Sir, which is not really in the form of a petition, I will precis it for you, is basically for a community stage to be set up in the community of Forresters Point.

Now, what I would like to point out to the Minister of Finance and I think he has a pretty good understanding of the problems in St. Barbe North with respect to the fisheries because I have been sending a fair amount of correspondence to him relating to it, is this: Again you have a number of small communities and because of the nature of these small communities obviously you cannot expect a great major fish plant in the District of St. Barbe North that would satisfy all of the fishermen in all of the communities. Therefore what is required, Sir, are specialized or semi-specialized community stages in practically every community in the District of St. Barbe North, in this case Forresters Point.

These people, Sir, the 132 people here are either fishermen or, if you want to call them fisherwomen for they work in the processing end of the fishing. Sir, the problem is that they have to export the products of the sea to somewhere like Port Au Choix and therefore the people in the community lose the spin-off employments that you would normally get from the fisheries.

Now, Sir, this community stage is very badly needed in Forresters Point and I would ask the Minister of Fisheries to give every consideration

to supporting this petition because now or in recent months or over the past year, I understand that community stages do come under the jurisdiction of the Provincial Department of Fisheries rather than the Federal Department of Fisheries. So, Sir, I give this petition all of my support and I ask that this petition be placed on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to treat the petition with sympathy.

I think that the honourable gentleman - or a copy of that petition or letter was sent to me and the Department of Fisheries is going to study this situation at Forrester's Point and see what we can do as to whether a community stage is a priority in that area and to see what we can do to provide it. I have some information here that I will give the House later on as to the tremendous, the fantastic amount of work done by the Provincial Department of Fisheries in the last twelve months in the supplying of fish handling facilities, community stages, slipways, haulouts, you know, dozens and dozens and dozens, and a lot of them on the Great Northern Peninsula and in other districts. There has been a fantastic amount of work done. The new Assistant Deputy Minister, Mr. Burden has a smoothly functioning group now working in the Department of Fisheries on such items as this.

Now community stages as to whether they are federal or provincial is somewhat mixed as the honourable gentleman knows. Community stages originally were constructed here by the federal government. I think the administration of them was taken over by the provincial government, some have been built by the provincial government but it is not a question of jurisdiction of one or the other. Sometimes a province provides a facility although it is really within federal jurisdiction in order to help the fishermen of the province. So this is something that really needs to be straightened out with the federal government. We have built slipways, for example, when slipways really are within the jurisdiction of a facility that the Government of Canada should provide. Certainly wharves, breakwaters, dredging and these kinds of works and longliner slipways, small boat slipways are definitely facilities that should be provided by the Government of Canada.

But in connection with this petition we are aware that they want the situation studied. It is not the only place in the province that also is requesting a community stage. Within the limits of the money made available to the department, we will certainly see what we can do for Forrester's Point.

PRESENTING REPORTS OF STANDING AND SELECT COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a report, this is the Annual Report of the Department of Fisheries for the year ending March 31, 1974. There are copies that will be provided to all honourable gentlemen and to the press. I am not sure but I think it is the first annual report that the department has had or certainly in this form. There is a very fine picture of the then minister in the report but even better than that there is a statement which outlines the fishery policy of the Government of Newfoundland and then it goes on to illustrate how the department is now organized, and how the department is reorganized. It has been vastly expanded, Mr. Speaker, since the bad old days of 1971 and previous years. It shows now how the department is now organized. It has a great deal of information on the kind of work that is going forth in the department, technical upgrading, inshore fishing gear demonstrations, cod trap modifications, Dutch beam trawling -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Honourable gentlemen may not be able to understand it. So there is altogether, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: So altogether, - Mr. Speaker, why is it they do not want to learn anything. Twenty-two years of ignorance, they want to continue. Sixty-eight pages of fact filled, exciting information on the fisheries of Newfoundland and this is going to be hot. They are getting free copies. We would ordinarily sell it for about five dollars a copy.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVENORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Premier is going to be in his seat this afternoon, I have a few questions.

AN HON. MEMBER: No the Premier is out of town on a matter of urgent public business.

MR. ROWE: Oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Getting ready for the election.

MR. ROWE: Getting ready for the election. That is what I figured.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. E. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I guess the correct person to address this question to would be the Minister of Health or possibly the minister responsible for the Newfoundland Liquor Commission which would be the Minister of Finance. In view of the record \$24 million profit made by the Newfoundland Liquor Commission this past year, and in view of the recommendations from the Newfoundland Medical Association, is it the intention of the government to institute a rehabilitation programme for

the victims of alcoholism using a part of the profit from the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They have one already.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if they already have one would they outline their programme please?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. H.R.V. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I am glad that the honourable member has given me the opportunity to answer this question. The first part; as far as the Newfoundland Medical Association stands on this issue, I understand that there has been a committee studying this for the past six months. They are waiting for their recommendations.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: No, on the other profit of the Liquor Commission, Newfoundland Liquor Corporation, I would like to correct perhaps a misconception that it would appear from the statement and I think it has been interpreted particularly by the opposition that there was \$24 million made on sales of \$31 million. That is not correct because the \$31 million represents sales out of stock but in addition to that there are the total sales of beer which amount to some \$17 million on which commissions only are paid. It is not a sales profit. It is a commission so that the actual earnings of the Board of Liquor Control are approximately \$24 million on \$46 million which makes a gross profit of approximately fifty per cent.

That is entirely different than the conception which I think the press has arrived at. In that instance I would like to take the opportunity also, Mr. Speaker, to say that the pamphlet which has been publicly criticized, which I contend is the finest illustration of what the Board or Corporation is doing, these pamphlets cost twenty-four cents each which for such a print job is extremely cheap. They go to all the suppliers throughout the many countries in the world that supply the various liquors, wines, spirits and so on to their corporation. They go to each and every other Province and I think they show a very creditable position of the Province of Newfoundland. I am somewhat resentful and object strongly to the fact that when an exceptionally good job has been done by a very well run corporation on behalf of the people of Newfoundland that it is subject to

such unfair criticism because this is one of the better efforts that the Province has undertaken.

MR. ROWE: Is the minister suggesting that we are criticizing the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission? I cannot remember any exact instances this afternoon particularly of having criticized the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. Although the minister's answer to the question or information that he is getting on with is relatively interesting, he has yet to answer the question that I asked originally. I would like the minister to cite the criticism of the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission by the opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The honourable Member for St. Barbe North rose on a point of order which really was not a point of order at all.

DR. A. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in answer to the Member for St. Barbe North on the medical aspect of the Medical Association, there has been for some months past a committee of the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation, Department of Health, Department of Education studying and making recommendations regarding the whole process of rehabilitation including the subject of alcoholism.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for St. Barbe North.

MR. ROWE: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: This programme or intended programme; will that come out of the profits or be paid for out of the profits of the Newfoundland and Labrador Liquor Commission?

DR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, that is not a question that I can answer.

MR. ROWE: The Minister of Finance might answer it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. EARLE: To answer the question, Mr. Speaker: Of course, the profits of the Liquor Corporation go into general revenue. General revenue supplies every operation of government including education, health, welfare, justice, all of these operations of government, I think, invariably touch upon education and the control of alcoholism.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I assume that the honourable Minister of Justice is responsible for the appointment of an ombudsman for the Province. I was going to address the question to the Premier but

MR. ROWE: would the minister indicate to the House when an ombudsman will be appointed for the province?

MR. HICKMAN: In due course, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: Order Paper.

MR. F. POPE: I thank the minister for his specific answer, Mr. Speaker. A supplementary - Is there any truth to the rumour that Mr. Nutbeem, the Premier's brother-in-law, and who will be shortly unemployed, is to be appointed as the ombudsman for the province, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, that is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: An excellent choice.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: We do not know.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That question is out of order. It is not one that requires an immediate answer.

The honourable Member for Labrador South.

MR. M. MARTIN: I have a question which I would like to direct towards the Hon. Minister of Fisheries regarding the pamphlet which was distributed. I note the absence of any printers logo here, I am wondering if the honourable minister could tell us where it was printed?

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know where it was printed, Mr. Speaker. I could find out but tenders were called and it went to whoever was the lowest as is invariably the case in these matters. I will try to find out, I do not know.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, will the Minister of Education be in his seat this afternoon?

MR. MARSHALL: Well, Mr. Speaker, I presume he will be but at the same time perhaps we could find out whether the Leader of the Opposition and the Member for Bell Island

MR. F. ROWE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. It is not usual for government members to ask the opposition questions but it is usual for the opposition to ask honourable ministers questions. I think it is a perfectly legitimate question for me to ask.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I assume that it is just as much in order for a member of the opposition to wonder whether a minister will be present as it is for a minister to wonder if others will be present. Both questions are out of order.

MR. F. ROWE: the answer to my question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I just said, that both answers are out of order.

MR. F. ROWE: Is there anybody acting on behalf of the Minister of Education at the present time, sitting on the other side?

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure the honourable Member for St. Barbe North seems to have been directing his question towards the Chair and I am sure he is also aware that the Speaker is in no position to answer questions.

MR. F. ROWE: I have an urgent question to ask in the matter of education. I would like to know whether the minister is going to be here during the question period?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Twillingate.

MR. H. C. GILLETT: Before we have the Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. I am wondering if he can tell us the response to the appeal for applications for fishermen to register, licencing of boats and fishermen themselves? Are they responding to his satisfaction?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Mr. Speaker, that is a programme of the Government of Canada and it is within their jurisdiction, so I really cannot answer the question. I did ask them the other day, how it was coming along? I think they said, that it was going satisfactorily but it is not our programme.

MR. COLLINS: Tell him to ask the Member for Gander/Twillingate whoever he is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Fogo.

MR. E. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not who I really should address this question to, probably I will address it to the Minister of Finance. Has the Board of Civil Service Commission, has that been fully staffed now? Would the minister care to give the names of the Civil Service Commission?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Finance.

HON. H. R. V. FARLE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): The Board has been fully staffed. The names just escape me at the moment of those who are there. I will get the answer for the honourable member.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador North.

MR. M. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Touring Minister of Tourism, I met him going through the terminal at the airport at the beginning of the week heading for one of our second biggest cities.

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: Take your time, Bill! Take your time!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: I did not say anything derogatory towards the gentleman, he was just on his way to Montreal.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, the question that I would like to ask the minister, if he would care to inform the House the amount of money involved in the last agreement between his department and the federal government on native funding for the province? If he can tell us the amount of money that is involved over the three year programme and the amount that will be given for this particular fund each year? He does not know anything about it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Tourism.

HON. J. HICKEY (MINISTER OF TOURISM): Mr. Speaker, is the honourable member talking about an agreement with DREE?

MR. WOODWARD: No, I am talking about a federal/provincial agreement where your funds come

for native people, the Indians and Eskimos in Labrador.

MR. T. HICKEY: Sorry, Mr. Speaker, I have just gotten back a few minutes ago. I have not even been into my office yet as such. This subject seems to escape me. I certainly will investigate the matter and see what I can find out for the member. He might even find that he should address it to another minister unless he wants me to go into a dissertation about my getting stormbound and all of that. I will be glad to tell him how bad the service is, all of that stuff.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Labrador North.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, maybe I did but I was under the impression that the Minister of Tourism was responsible. Maybe the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation is responsible and I would ask if he would answer the question.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. T. DOYLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation is responsible for the Federal Provincial Assistance Programme. At the present time, the amount involved is \$1.5 million per year but as was announced jointly by the honourable Mr. Jamieson and myself about two weeks ago that amount will be increasing to \$4.5 million come the first of April, 1975. Those figures were announced jointly about two and a half weeks ago.

MR. WOODWARD: \$4.5 million for each year thereafter?

MR. DOYLE: \$4.5 million for the five year period from April 1, 1975 to 1980, unless otherwise negotiated.

MR. WOODWARD: That is less than what they are already getting.

MR. DOYLE: No, \$4.5 million per year.

MR. WOODWARD: \$4.5 million per year.

MR. DOYLE: Right. Just one of the recommendations of our commission report.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier, I would like to address a question to the Minister of Justice. In order that he can get the question straight I would like to preface it just shortly. We believe in the absolute right, Sir, of the P.C. Party on the various radio stations to carry whatever programme they do have. However, the question, Sir: Will the Minister of

Justice, Sir, assure the House -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is getting to the honourable member.

MR. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker, it is not getting to me. Every time they go on T.V. they win more votes for the Liberal Party.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! If the honourable Member for St. Barbe North intends to ask a question then I suggest he get on with it.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I suggest respectfully that I do have the right to be heard in silence and I am asking a question as well. Will the Minister of Justice, Sir, assure this House that no government money nor government personnel nor government equipment were used to produce that hour long programme on the coverage of the P.C. convention on CJON.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The honourable member should know. He was at the convention.

MR. ROWE: I did not go to the convention.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I think the matter of that particular topic was brought up a day or two ago in this Legislature and at that time I made a ruling that questions pertaining to that particular telecast should be directed towards the T.V. station concerned.

MR. ROWE: They were, Mr. Speaker, directed to the stations concerned.

I would like to ask another question, Sir, relating to the convention. Did Newfoundland Information Services have anything to do whatsoever with the issuing of credentials at that P.C. convention or did any of the personnel of Newfoundland Information Services have anything to do at that convention whatsoever.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is a complete abuse of the question period. The government is being asked certain questions to give a little bit of innuendo so that there can be a little bit of this type of news going out. That is not within the government's knowledge at all and it is insulting for a member of the House to even insinuate that that kind of thing would go on. So if he wants to use the question period, I suggest he ask questions but not be able to use it for this purpose.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The question asked by the honourable Member for St. Barbe North is out of order.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Yes, I agree, Mr. Speaker. The honourable Member for Bell Island would do a much better job. I agree one hundred per cent.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Could the Minister of Justice, Sir, indicate

whether or not any government aircraft were used for the purpose of transporting people to that convention?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The question is out of order.

Motion (2) is the motion re the fisheries to be moved by the honourable Minister of Fisheries?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move the motion that is on the Order Paper, Motion (2), which I hope and expect will be endorsed by all members of the House. Only time will tell about that of course. The resolution itself, forgetting the preamble resolves that the House support the efforts of the Government of Newfoundland in conjunction with the Government of Canada to devise a scheme of financial assistance for the fish industry of Newfoundland and Labrador that will permit the fishing industry to continue to operate in the manner that permits the efficient and properly managed company to gain a reasonable return on its investment and the fisherman and worker in the industry to receive fair and adequate returns for his labour till such time as the recovery of the fishing resources on the inshore and Continental Shelf waters off the East Coast of Canada permits a self sustaining industry to operate once again and that the House of Assembly convened urges and enjoins the Government of Canada to take unilateral action during 1975 to control the fishing resource on the inshore and Continental Shelf waters off the East Coast of Canada for the benefit of the Canadian fishery and to take steps to ensure proper enforcement and surveillance measures unless a satisfactory international agreement is reached that permits the same results at the Law of the Sea Conference during 1975.

That is the resolution, Mr. Speaker. The purpose of it is to permit this House to debate the present position of the fishing industry of Newfoundland in matters associated with that industry. Now, Mr. Speaker, what I want to do is tell the House what our fishery policy is. The annual report that was tabled here today outlines that. I would suggest that it has been many years, many, many years since this Province had a fishery policy. It certainly did not have a fishery policy from 1949 to the end of 1971 that was very discernible to anyone. It was mostly

a collection of ad hoc actions that would get resurrected every few years when an election approached and other than that there was no co-ordinated programme of action for the fishery of the Province of Newfoundland at all. That situation has changed since the end of 1971. The lack of a fishery policy for this Province on the Province's behalf shows, Mr. Speaker, how important the fishery was deemed by the Liberal Party of Newfoundland for those twenty-two or twenty-three years.

The attitude of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland towards the fishery of Newfoundland was further illustrated, Mr. Speaker, when I was appointed Minister of Fisheries at the beginning of October, 1974, when to my amazement and it must have been to the amazement of every single fisherman in the Province of Newfoundland, we heard the Leader of the Opposition come on radio and T.V. and I must say he said some very kind words about me and I appreciated that, he has a very warm feeling for me but in any event he did say some good words about me, but he came on radio and T.V. really to denigrate this cabinet shuffle, to tell the people of Newfoundland that poor John Crosbie had been demoted, he had been taken from the Department of Finance and put in the Department of Fisheries and demoted to the Department of Fisheries, a minor department. That shows where the priorities of the honourable Leader of the Opposition are in this Province, Mr. Speaker. What a statement for a leader of a political party in Newfoundland to make when someone is appointed Minister of Fisheries. To say it is a demotion, does that not show how that honourable gentleman regards the fishery? In fact I have heard him make very few statements about the fishery, very, very few statements about the fishery since he has been Leader of the Liberal Party in Newfoundland. He was a member of the Cabinet of the Newfoundland Government from 1968 when he stepped in over the backs of Wells and Crosbie. When they resigned until the end of 1971 we saw no great attention paid to the fishery during those three years.

So we have a position, Mr. Speaker, where the fishery here in Newfoundland is not regarded as of much importance by at least the Leader of the Opposition. Perhaps some other members of his Party might regard it as of more importance but it is not deemed important by the

December 6, 1974.

Tape 1941

RH - 3

Leader of the Opposition. What did I hear today, Mr. Speaker, when I turned on the radio to listen to CJON news at one fifteen?

7708

What did I hear? I heard the Leader of the Opposition making fantastic pronouncements on the fishery.

AN HON. MEMBER: No!

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, he had fresh proposals on the fishery today at 1:15 P.M. on CJON News. Presumably, he knew that this was going to be debated this afternoon. I do not know whether he had a copy of it. He was going to revolutionize the fishery. The honourable gentleman now being out of power and having no responsibility for what government does is completely irresponsible in his statements and utterances. He was going, today at 1:15 P.M., to set up a fresh fish marketing board. He was going to whip the fishery into shape in two or three brief moments on CJON. That honourable gentleman who had three years in the government when nothing was done was overnight going to do that. He was going to implement the Harris Report, which he thought was of the first importance and all the rest of it. Well that is certainly inconsistent with his statements of just a few weeks ago that the appointment of a cabinet minister to the Department of Fisheries is a demotion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, one thing which should be very clear to the honourable gentlemen of this House (Some of them are trying to obscure it, particularly those on the other side.) is what the constitutional position is in the fishery. What is the constitutional position? I was dumbfounded here about a week ago, when a few words were being said about the fishery in this House, when I had pointed out that the fishery, that what happens as soon as you put your toe in the water and step off the land as far as the fishery is concerned that that was the constitutional responsibility of the Government of Canada. We have not a jot nor a tittle of jurisdiction over the fish, not while it is in the water. You might have something to say about it when it is landed and goes into a plant. It is the Government of Canada who has the constitutional responsibility and the power in connection with the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, I was amazed to hear the Hon. Leader of the Opposition try to scoff at that and intimate that it was not so and that this government had the responsibility.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, that is what the honourable gentleman did and that is what he will continue to do. That is what he will do all during this crisis, Mr. Speaker, no matter what is done by the Government of Canada or the Government of Newfoundland. He will try to say that it is the Government of Newfoundland that has the responsibility. That will be his policy because his policy is one of complete and gross and utter irresponsibility because all he wants to do is fasten and fatten on any misfortune that strikes the Province of Newfoundland to try to gain some political advantage from it. That has been his course of action. Perhaps, he will be more statesman like, if he speaks on this resolution this afternoon. One can only hope so. The signs and the portents are not good, they are not good, that the Leader of the Opposition will take a statesman like position on this matter. We can hope for the best, but the signs are not good.

Now here is the B.N.A. Act, Mr. Speaker. We did not pass it; we did not think it up; we did not invent it. It was passed in 1867. We had nothing to do with it. Not one of us is 104 years old. We were not even around when this was passed by the four provinces that originally confederated.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: You were not there "Ank"?

Now what does Section (91), subsections (10) and (12) say? Section (91) outlines the powers of the Parliament of Canada and (12) says that they have authority exclusively with respect to these matters. It says: "Seacoast and inland fisheries are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the Government and Parliament of Canada."

Section (92) sets out what matters are within the competence of Provincial Legislatures and the word "fish" is not mentioned in any one of them.

Quite clearly the fishery, the fish, is within the constitutional and legal jurisdiction of the Government of Canada. If, Mr. Speaker, as a result of Canada not having been able to take action that would preserve the fishery resource, if as a result of that, the fishing industry of Newfoundland and Nova Scotia and Eastern Canada is in desperate straits today, it is the Government of Canada that has the legal, the moral and the constitutional responsibility and power to do and to take the measures that must be taken to save the fishing industry of Eastern Canada. They do not deny that. I have not heard them deny it yet. The only one I heard scoff at it is the Leader of the Opposition who wants to try to convince the people of Newfoundland that all responsibility for this lies

with us, the little Provincial Government of Newfoundland. Well that is not the case. I would not advise him to try to spread it to the public because if we had to go up and down the length and breadth of Newfoundland and Labrador and across the Dominion of Canada to establish that fact, we will do it. It will be irrefutable and irrefragable and irreconcilable.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is no trouble to you.

MR. CROSBIE: Now that is the constitutional position, and we are going to look to the Government of Canada, and if they do not do what we think they should do, but we have every confidence they will, you will hear us on the hilltops and in the valleys and in the outports and in the inports and in the cities and on the beaches saying,

AN HON. MEMBER: Even at Hogan's Pond.

MR. CROSBIE: Even at Hogan's Pond - To make the welkin ring but I do not think that is going to be necessary because one of the encouraging things, Mr. Speaker, about the present situation is that the Government of Canada seems to be well aware of its responsibilities. We hope and expect that a major programme of assistance to the fishery will come out of this because if it does not I do not think there is any sense trying to fool ourselves that the fishing industry of Eastern Canada will be doomed.

Now what is the importance of the fishery to Newfoundland. Having established the constitutional position, and I hope we will never hear it suggested again that this is all our responsibility, the province's responsibility, constitutionally we do not have it, but the province, Mr. Speaker, can support the fishing industry, it can make loans to fishermen, it can subsidize gear, it can do these other kinds of subsidiary things but we cannot licence fishermen, we cannot control the fishing resource, we have no jurisdiction there. We can help the industry. We can help the fishermen. We can do things on land. We have jurisdiction on property and civil rights, and, of course, the Government of Newfoundland attempts to do that.

Now how important is the fishery in Newfoundland today? Is it some poor foolish thing that we should just allow to die away, "burn the boats" (that was the old slogan) "burn the boats". Is that the position? Should we forget the fishery as it seems to have been forgotten for many years or should we take some action to help save it? How important is it to the

province? Well, Mr. Speaker, just a few figures: In 1969, the total labour force in this province was 146,000. The number of fishermen inshore and offshore was 17,770 (that is including part-time fishermen). The total number of fisheries production and related workers was 4,400, so the total in direct employment in the fishing industry was 22,170; and fishing industry employment as a percentage of the labour force was 15.2 per cent. That was in 1969.

Now in 1973, our labour force was 180,000. The number of fishermen inshore and offshore was 15,342. The number in fisheries production and related works was 5,700, for a total direct employment in the fishing industry of 21,042 or 11.7 per cent of the labour force. So there has been a small decline in total direct employment in the fishing industry but it is still, Mr. Speaker, the employer of 11.7 per cent of our total labour force in this province. There is no way particularly with the geographic location of fishermen, there is no way that this province could ever tolerate a situation where the fishery had collapsed.

Now what is the main problem. Here are some figures that illustrate. It is not a figment of anyone's imagination that the decline in the resource is the real source of trouble at the moment, Mr. Speaker. In 1969, the total amount of sea fish landings in this province, in thousands of pounds, was one billion nine million and four pounds, one billion nine million pounds landed, it had a value of \$29,455,000. Then it declined in 1970, and 1971 and 1972 until 1973 the amount landed was 675 million

pounds having a value of \$47 million. The value has been going up and up as the landings decreased. In the first ten months of 1973 - the first ten months now to compare to this year to see what is happening this year - in the first ten months to the end of October, 1973, 600,619,000 pounds of fish were caught. For the first ten months of 1974 only 439,141,000 pounds were caught.

In other words, Mr. Speaker, in 1974 we are going to catch and land in this province only one-half the total weight of fish that was landed in 1969.

Now, with codfish, just to look at codfish for those years; 239,746,000 pounds landed in 1969 and 177,560,000 in 1973. For the first ten months of 1973, 171,636,000 landed and for the first ten months of this year only 139,748,000 pounds of codfish landed in this province.

Well, Mr. Speaker, surely those figures there very simply show what the problem is. If only half the amount of fish is being caught and the number of processing plants have increased and their capacity has increased and the number of fishermen has stayed almost the same even though the value of the product caught is up, there is no way that the men involved in the fishery and the people processing the fish can make a decent living or a decent return on their money. That is the difficulty, that is the problem with which we are faced, Mr. Speaker.

Now, I have the quantity and value of all fish landings and species but it is not necessary to give all of those figures. In 1973 we had 13,195 inshore fishermen, that is fishermen on boats twenty-five gross tons and under; 2,147 offshore fishermen on boats twenty-five gross tons and over for a total of 15,342. Fifty-seven hundred people working in fish plants - that is the importance of the industry to this province, Mr. Speaker. Its importance cannot be over emphasized.

Before getting into the present crisis and the present situation, I would like to look for a few minutes at what has this government done in connection with the fishery, what has its policy been, how has it behaved as compared to the last government or to anything that has

happened in the last few years - a look at it generally. How important do we regard the fishery? How important did we regard it before this present crisis? Just let us look at that for a moment. I hope the Leader of the Opposition can hear me he is so very concerned about the fishery.

MR. WOODWARD: He has his PH's -

MR. CROSBIE: Good.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in 1970-1971 the expenditures of the government of Newfoundland on the fishery - that was the Liberal Government - it was the last year of that glorious administration, the Smallwood Administration which, for a few brief moments, a few weeks ago, we thought might come flashing back again but it turned out to be a flash in the pan.

MR. MURPHY: The contract was out.

MR. CROSBIE: The total amount spent by the government of Newfoundland on the fishery in 1970-1971 was \$3,033,000. I am leaving off the cents.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How much?

MR. CROSBIE: \$3,033,000 of a budget of, I guess it was in that year, \$450 million or \$500 million. \$3 million was spent gross. That is the total gross expenditure by Her Majesty's Outport Government of those days, on the fishery, \$3,033,000.

MR. COLLINS: Who was the minister that year?

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman who was the minister, I think, sits opposite biting his lips with frustration at the trouble he had to get any money for his department from the Smallwood Administration. They would not give anything to the fishery. They would give it to anything else, any crackpot who came in with any foolish kind of a scheme to get money to develop any kind of nonsensical industry such as the light bulb industry, the glow worm industry and all the rest of it. They got unlimited amounts of money but the poor honourable Earl when he was Minister of Fisheries could only get \$3,033,000.

MR. WINSOR: What year is the honourable minister referring to?

MR. CROSBIE: 1970-1971.

MR. WINSOR: 1970-1971. Now, to get the record straight, the minister need not get all excited and carried away. I am stating this in order that he should get his facts straight. I was appointed minister in July

in 1971 and the election was in October, 1971. That is the length of time I had as minister of this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: You did not anticipate the election.

MR. CROSBIE: I was just going to say, Mr. Speaker, that the honourable gentleman brought about an improvement. I was coming to that.

MR. WINSOR: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman over there brought about a dramatic improvement. I have to admit it, because in the financial year, 1971-1972 that ended March 31, 1972, the amount spent by the administration of that day was \$6,460,000. It had practically doubled. From January to March, the new administration was in and although I have not examined this, I would say that a great deal of that \$6 million odd was spent in those three months. It was an improvement. It went from \$3 million. You see in 1970-1971, there was going to be an election. Why bother spending anything on the fishery if there was going to be no election? That would be a silly waste of money. You have to give a few handouts in an election year. In the election year 1971-1972, it doubled up to \$6,460,000.

Mr. Speaker, what is being spent this year on the fishery? What is being spent this year? Is it \$7 million? Is it \$8 million? Is it \$10 million? Is it a dramatic doubling to \$12 million? No, it is \$16,501,000 that we will spend this year gross on the fishery Mr. Speaker. It is \$16, 501,500. If the Treasury Board does not get me under control, it might go to \$32 million.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: They are going to have their work cut out for them. Them shysters in the Treasury Board are going to get it. We are not paying any attention to their strictures, not when it comes to the fisheries. We are going to lash it out! They will have to get up early in the morning to get ahead of us. Oh, there is the President of the Treasury Board.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: That is \$16 million. That is two and one-half times as much as 1971-1972 and it is five times as much as was spent in 1970-1971.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think that alone shows that we attach a great deal more interest -

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, I cannot take this.

MR. CROSBIE: He cannot stand this abuse of the Treasury Board.

Now, I do not want to spend a lot of time on the present policies and so on. A lot of it is in that annual report that I handed out today.

What is the fishery policy of the government? To put it briefly, the fishery policy of the present government is oriented towards maximizing the economic benefits which accrue to fishermen, plant workers, processors and the province by rational exploitation of the fishery resource. That is the main policy objective. What has happened to the Department of Fisheries since we took over insofar as staff and organization is concerned? In January, 1972, Mr. Speaker, they had forty-six employees only. This miniscule, tiny, ignored, undernourished, famished, gutted, Department of Fisheries that was left when the last administration went out after twenty-two years of benign neglect of the fisheries had forty-six employees. Some of them were rusticated. What have they got today, November, 1974? They have ninety-one vigorous, clever, hard-working, energetic employees. It has doubled in the number of employees alone. There are presently twelve positions authorized but unfilled.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: When the Hon. Member for Gander was Minister of the Department of Fisheries he was a savage man to combat in Treasury Board when we wanted more positions. There are twelve there now that we are looking for people to fill. The department is now organized in a more efficient and more beneficial manner as is shown in this booklet.

We have nothing to hide. We are not afraid to show how the department is organized. You could not find out before. You would have to be there a year or two to find out how it is organized.

Mr. Speaker, now it is organized so that there is a minister, a chairman of the fisheries loan board and his organization and the department is divided into two main functions with two assistant deputy ministers; one, fishery development which covers the fishery development division and fishery technology, market research.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, I heard the Leader of the Opposition mention the markets today. Well we have a market research and project development division in the Department of Fisheries. It was unheard of before. On the other side of the department, there is the Assistant Deputy Minister of Fishery Services: Incentives and Assistance Division; Engineering and Facilities Division, organized to provide services and facilities to the fishermen of Newfoundland, smoothly and efficiently. The two sections are headed: (1) Mr. Gordon Slade, Assistant Deputy Minister of Fishery Development; (2) Mr. Joseph Burden, Assistant

Deputy Minister of Fishery Services, two brilliant young Newfoundlanders who are doing a fine job as any member in this House who has to deal with them knows.

Now, I just want to briefly touch on some of the programmes just to show how this government has regarded the fishery and the programmes that were in effect before the present crisis even hit us. There is a special assistance programme, gear replacement, that was brought into effect this year as a result of the ice damage, with the assistance of the Government of Canada but we had to do it anyway. Luckily for us because we need all of the help we can get, the Government of Canada is sharing the special programme, Gear Replacement Programme from, I think it goes from St. John's on the East Coast here, up the Northeast Coast and around the Northwest Peninsula to Cape St. Gregory and then up the Labrador Coast. One hundred per cent of the cost of replacement of fishing gear is being paid by the Federal-Provincial Government. That is going to cost us, we think, the two governments around \$4 million this year. We replaced to date 9,000 ground-fish gill nets, 9,000 gill nets replaced under this programme and 2,000 salmon nets to date. We are now about to issue orders for the material to construct and repair approximately 400 cod traps, 400. Compensation for the loss of lobster pots will be paid directly to the fishermen and the covering cheques are going to be mailed within the next several weeks. They are going to get cheques, I think it is, for half the cost of replacing the lobster pots. When they show they have replaced it, next spring they will get the other half. We are cost-sharing that with the Federal Government.

Now, if it does cost \$4 million, under the formula where we pay the first \$540,000 and then the Federal Government starts to share and shares more heavily as the amount increases, under that formula the cost to the Province will probably be about \$1,480,000 and the rest of it will be a cost to the Government of Canada. That is if it amounts to \$4 million. We have spent to date \$1,100,000. Claims outstanding are \$1,700,000. The estimated cost of the cod trap lost is \$1,300,000. We estimate the

total cost as being \$4,100,000.

Then, Mr. Speaker, there is the Fishing Gear Subsidization Programme which became effective May 18, 1974, introduced by my predecessor who by the way was responsible for all of this work of reorganization in the Department of Fisheries and responsible for the initiation of this Gear Replacement Programme, in fact responsible for all the programmes and projects that I am going to mention. I have only been there since October. This was all underway.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, he forgot his district and spent his time on the fisheries. So what I am now telling the House, Mr. Speaker, reflects great credit on the honourable member from Gander who is now in Forestry and Agriculture doing a similiar, wonderful job.

There is a new Fishing Gear Subsidization Programme. It came into effect on the eighteenth of May and I will not go into all of the details except to say that it is vastly expanded and that when a fisherman who now goes to buy gear, there is considerable assistance for him. I will not go into all of the detail.

The Fisheries Loan Board, just to bring the House up to date on what is happening this year, where the government provides fishermen loans at a subsidized interest rate of three and a-half per cent. Now, Mr. Speaker, this money costs us when we borrow it ten and a half or eleven per cent but we lend it to the fishermen at three and a half per cent. Reverse userý, we are using ourselves. They get it at three and a half and it costs us, say when we borrow, ten or ten and a half or eleven per cent.

This year the Fisheries Loan Board has made so far 175 small loans to fishermen, either to construct fishing vessels or purchase used vessels or purchase new engines or purchase electronic equipment or other equipment; 175 small loans totalling \$150,000: 164 loans to purchase used fishing vessels, \$1,400,000: sixty-one loans for new longliners, \$1,400,000. There are presently forty-eight longliners under construction. The total amount of loans to date this year -

MR. WOODWARD: How many longliners -

December 6, 1974.

Tape 1946

RH - 3

MR. CROSBIE: There are maybe five or six. I do not know the exact number. The total amount loaned to date then or expected to be loaned by the end of this month is \$3,033,000. That is not the full financial year. That is a considerable amount of assistance to the fishermen.
Do not let —

7721

the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Speaker, got up in this House and said, "We have done nothing to help the fishermen." I have just given three programmes. This is a tremendous Progressive Conservative concept. Then there were bounties to the fishermen.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Liberal concept "Burn your boats."

MR. CROSBIE: I will not go into the bounties but there are a number of different kinds of bounties. This year to the end of October we have paid out \$86,000 in the small boat footage bounty, \$114,000 in the tonnage bounty for longliners, \$24,000 in the rebuilding and the repair bounty.

What else have the government done, Mr. Speaker. If I really wanted to go into detail on this I could keep the House this afternoon and tonight and tomorrow and Sunday and I would still be outlining programmes of assistance for the fishermen, most of which have been instituted, inaugurated, consolidated and carried out by the present administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is a continuation of the Liberal policy.

MR. CROSBIE: The Liberals had -

AN HON. MEMBER: Burn your boats policy.

MR. CROSBIE: Three million dollars the Liberals spent in 1970-1971 on this whole programme, \$3 million was all that they could squeeze out of their genes for that. This year it is \$16 million.

What else is being done? Well, Mr. Speaker, when this government took over the administration of the province in January 1972 we discovered a case of chaos in the fishing industry particularly with reference to Burgeo where the union and the management of the company were involved in a death struggle. The management did not seem to want to recognize the rights of labour and so in this day and age, an irreconcilable situation, to resolve which the government purchased the fish plant at Burgeo for several millions of dollars and it has cost the Government of Newfoundland considerable since. Purchased it, not for any economic reason and not for any political reason but for social reasons because the situation had to be resolved in Burgeo when the plant was purchased.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman should go down there and get his hair attended to. It is a little lengthy in the flanks. He should have his hair Marcelled or whatever they call it.

AN HON. MEMBER: The beauty parlour burned down, go down and get it singed.

MR. CROSBIE: Anyway that was the Burgeo - had to take over the Burgeo fish plant, Mr. Speaker, for social reasons, for reasons of social justice and we are today struggling with the problem of establishing a new and modern plant there with the cost of the Liberal inflation that struck Canada in the last two or three years. The effects of the Liberal inflation is causing tremendous cost increases down there. Yes, there is inflation elsewhere in the world but the Government of Canada are only responsible for what happens in Canada. Anyway I am not going to criticize the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker. I have a warm relationship with Don. He and I are heart to heart and brain to brain and cheek to jowl, money bag to money bag, most of it coming this way I hope. So that was the Burgeo's fish industries plant.

We have made several guarantees of loans for processors of fish, most of them smaller people, Mr. Janes at Hant's Harbour who has since paid it off and so on. That programme is continuing where it is necessary. I will not go into the details of all of that. We have assisted Fishery Products Limited to acquire three more draggers by agreeing to guarantee fifty per cent of the lease payments. I will not go into the details on that.

You know it is staggering, I mean it boggles the imagination what is being done in this department this year. A positive, and extraordinary coup was the entering into with the Government of Canada of a DREE agreement, subsidiary agreement to provide twelve marine service centres in the province, twelve, not eleven, Mr. Speaker, I never said, eleven. I did not say ten. I did not say nine. I did not say one. I said, twelve.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who started it?

MR. CROSBIE: We started it. The first one was in Port Saunders, it was a fifty/fifty agreement. I remember well when I used to listen to the honourable gentleman who used to sit there, and he used to say, not 10,000, not 5,000, twelve marine service centres. Now the honourable gentleman is mixed up, the Marine Service Centre you were involved in, that went down to Logy Bay but it

has not done much for the fishermen yet. This is marine service centres, a new concept of - the first of them opened up in the honourable gentleman for Twillingate's District. What a government, Mr. Speaker! No political discrimination, everything even-handed.

The resolution, if I may read it, states: "Now therefore be it resolved that this House of Assembly convened support the efforts of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador in conjunction with the Government of Canada to devise a system of financial assistance for the fish industry of Newfoundland and Labrador that would permit the fishing industry of Newfoundland and Labrador to continue to operate in a manner that permits the efficient and properly managed company to gain a reasonable return on its investment and the fishermen and worker in the industry to receive fair and adequate returns for his labour until such time as the recovery of the fishing resource on the inshore and Continental Shelf waters off the East Coast of Canada permits a self-sustaining industry to operate once again and this Honourable House of Assembly convened urges and enjoins the Government of Canada to take unilateral action during 1975 to control the fishing resource on the inshore and Continental Shelf waters off the East Coast and so forth."

Now, Sir, the point of the point of order is this: The minister has gone at long-length to trace the history of the accomplishments of his department, of his own department since taking over and since the administration took over. He has taken the opportunity to criticize unjustly so, the actions of the previous Liberal Administration and Sir, this has nothing to do with the resolution that I just read to this honourable House. So, Sir, I suggest that the minister return to the resolution and that he should be ruled out of order on the grounds of being irrelevant.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure the honourable member has heard this Chair say many times that the rule of relevancy is a difficult one to rule on. It appears as if the honourable minister may have been carried away, his debate may have been a little irrelevant to the resolution.

MR. CROSBIE: That I am doing now, Mr. Speaker, is showing what we have done to try to establish a healthy and viable fishing industry that provides a decent living for the fishermen of this province and I shall be strictly relevant, never fear!

We have had to sit here for three of four days and listen to vapourings, pukings and mulings about electoral redistribution. When we get a chance to speak and expound upon some of the things the government have done honourable gentlemen wincing and flinch and skinch and interrupt with specious points of order. Ridiculous!

Now this is a picture of the marine service centre up in Durrell with the boats actually hauled out of the water. Our service centres work.

AN HON. MEMBER: A Liberal District.

MR. CROSBIE: The Liberal District of Twillingate. It does not matter it is justified from the fishery point of view. The honourable gentleman there will see that this is a picture of the centre, the first one completed.

AN HON. MEMBER: That should be your Christmas card.

MR. CROSBIE: That should be my Christmas card, yes. All right!

AN HON. MEMBER: The picture, you mean?

MR. CROSBIE: We shall get one for the honourable gentleman.

I am going to try to clue up this part of my remarks quickly, Mr. Speaker, because we want to get on with the problem. Twelve marine service centres that the federal government agreed now, under a DREE Agreement, to finance ninety per cent of the cost of and the whole programme is going to total (I just have to look at it quickly here again) almost \$12 million. Wesleyville, Harbour Grace, Durrell, Old Perlican, Bonavists, Port Saunders on which construction has started and six which are in the planning stages; Isle aux Morts, Port Union, LaScie, Fogo Island, the Placentia Bay - St. Marys' Area and Englee.

Another agreement under which water supplies are going to fish plants. Eleven fish plants are going to be assisted in financing the provision of waterlines to those fish plants at Port aux Basques, Burnt Islands, Little Bay Islands, Newstead, Comfort Cove (the Honourable Speaker's District) We have not forgotten the Speaker. Hermitage, Southern Harbour, St. Bride's, Admiral's Beach, Valleyfield,

Bay Bulls and New Harbour.

AN HON. MEMBER: Northing for Harbour Main-Bell Island?

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Labrador?

MR. CROSBIE: If the honourable member taunts I shall go on for a half-hour. In addition, Mr. Speaker, another \$1.5 million for various water supplies to fish handling facilities. This is a gigantic programme. Labrador is going to get first-class attention do not worry about that.

Now, I am just dealing with this year, Mr. Speaker. We are spending approximately \$4 million on marine service centres. \$1.6 on fish handling facilities:(small little facilities around the island where the fishermen need them) \$460,000 on slipways and haulouts, \$593,000 on Labour intensive projects and \$492,000 on access roads, water supply, refrigeration and the like. \$7,194,000 on those kinds of facilities.

It is remarkable! It is a remarkable programme initiated by my predecessor and carried out by his department. If any honourable gentleman is interested I have all the places where this is going on. I shall not read it all because it will take too long.

AN HON. MEMBER: Aw! Go on and read it.

MR. CROSBIE: No, I shall not do it unless I am taunted into it. Thirty-eight projects: Fish handling facilities - Baine Harbour, Fox Harbour, Admiral's Beach, Hermitage, Belleoram, Sibleys Cove, Port au Choix, Piccadilly, Trout River, Winterton, Peter's River, Anchor Point! Anchor point! Anchor Point, Fair Haven, Seal Cove, Seldom, Port Saunders, Brig Bay, Rocky Harbour, LaScie -

MR. NEARY: What about Harbour Main?

MR. CROSBIE: Rocky Harbour, La Scie - I discriminate against Harbour Main, it is one of our districts - Newmans Cove, Harbour Grace, Herring Neck, Upper Jenkins Cove - that is a new one on me - Garden Cove, Blue Cove, Conche, Leading Ticks, Merasheen, Oderin, Bay L'Argent, Fox Island River, Lawn, Campbellton, Salvage, Musgrave Harbour, Blue Beach, Bauline South, various communities, fifteen, for electrical services - Port de Grave. That is just fish handling facilities.

Then I could go on with slipways and haulouts. Heart's Content, Charlottetown, Labrador, Cape Broyle, Job's Cove, on and on and on. I will not read all the names.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Ten years old.

MR. CROSBIE: Not ten years old. This is all projects going on this year. Honourable gentlemen hate to hear what we are doing for the fishermen because they wanted to get up in the House and say we are doing nothing or we are doing next to nothing when we are doing all that money and people can do.

Now, I could go on, Mr. Speaker. I should give everybody a copy of this red file because it is fascinating what we are doing, just fascinating. Grants to industry - we have not got time this afternoon to go into it, what we are trying to do in fish harvesting technology and diversification. There is the Bonavista Cold Storage Company where they are trying new methods there; John Penny and Sons - most of these are shared cost with the federal government, fifty-fifty. Beothuck Fish - well, I may have to go into detail on some of this. The Newfoundland Hawk is being converted with our assistance and the federal government's, to triple parallel fishing. The Newfoundland Hawk is a vessel owned by Bonavista Cold Storage. In co-operation with the federal government we are spending \$160,000 with Penny's at Rames to convert the side trawler, "Penny Luck The Second" to a bottom and mid water trawler.

I am only skimming the surface of what is going on. We are providing a grant of \$150,000 - I do not know if this has been made public before - to Beothuck Fish Processors Limited of Valleyfield to

assist them in the vessel performance study of the "Beothuck Venture" which is an eighty foot, multi-purpose trawler designed and built in Norway. That is the district of the honourable gentleman from Bonavista North.

It matters not to us whose district it is or what party.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: That is Beothuck Fish. There is another \$50,000 being spent to convert the "Mac Mariner II", a fifty-eight foot conventional long liner owned by T.J. Hardy, to convert her to inshore and middle distance, mechanized long lining, introducing the Mustab Auto-Line system. I have not had a chance yet to find out what all these systems are but I say they sound quite wonderful.

There is another - the Harmon I and the Harmon II, these two vessels that were brought over to Harmon for the herring fishery in Harmon and were surplus, they were of no account, they went by the boards when the herring operation closed up. They have now been converted, Mr. Speaker, for mechanized long lining and gill netting, equipped with the Mustab Auto-line System and a full shelter deck equipped to fish 18,000 to 20,000 hooks and they can change from long lining to gill netting with a minimum of lost fishing time. They have now been converted to refrigerated bait and fish holds. Those two vessels are going to be operated now by the department. One is already being operated to see how this works, to see if they are successful. If they are successful, they will be sold or leased or some arrangement will be entered into after the experimental period. Now, \$500,000 is being spent on each vessel to convert them for that programme.

There is a Norwegian captain and engineer assisting in the training of the crew as to how to operate the new system.

We have got the three, sixty-five foot steel, multi-purpose vessels under construction in Marystown shipyard.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes and it is very nice.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Okay. - underway at the Marystown shipyard. The object

of that is to show the viability of such vessels and they have got the latest. This is putting it mildly. These vessels are of radical design, with all kinds of new equipment. They are going to have a capability to fish, ground fish trawls, mid-water trawls and stern seines on a single voyage.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: When they find them.

MR. CROSBIE: When they find what?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Fish.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, that is right. The honourable gentleman is quite right, if they find the fish.

So, these are just some of the things that are going on.

In addition to that, there is a lot of work being done in product development.

I wish I had the time to really go into what has been accomplished.

I was amazed and dumbfounded, Mr. Speaker, and I have a wide experience in government, inside and out, outside trying to get in, inside trying to get in,

in government departments to see the amount of work that is being done for the Department of Fisheries of Newfoundland in the last year or two years. I will not go into inshore drum-ring nets, seining and all the rest of the things that are going on. That is just to give a picture.

Now, of course, Mr. Speaker, we have the Fishing Industry Advisory Board underway with Mr. Rupert Prince. We could not find a chairman. We were criticized for a year. The government looked everywhere for a chairman. There was nobody who would take the job. It was too hot to handle. They did not want to get in the middle. There is no one who wanted to be Chairman of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board because they felt it would be a position too hot to handle between the union and the companies. We had to search over twelve months until finally not being able to find any outsider, who would accept or who was capable, we had to persuade Mr. Rupert Prince, who was the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, to become Chairman of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board. The poor man needs to increase his insurance. I hope he has doubled or tripled it before the insurance companies find out how hazardous that post may be. He was appointed several months ago.

Mr. Speaker, I think I mentioned to the House last week what is going on there now. He and his group are now working on developing the system, getting the information they need to make that really effective and functioning in advising the department, the government, the union and the companies as to what is happening to the prices, what is happening in the fishing industry. There will be legislation introduced in the House next winter in connection with that board. They will have the power to subpoena information if the information is not forthcoming freely to them. Mr. F.A. J. Laws is now being appointed secretary to the board. They are getting legal advice. They

have a small group of people who are developing all the necessary and to prepare the legislation that will be introduced during the winter.

It is going to cost by the way, Mr. Speaker, this will show you that money is of no object when it comes to the fishing industry, at least in small doses, it is going to cost \$88,000 for the next four months, the work being done by the fishing industry advisory board.

Now that is just a brief covering, Mr. Speaker, of some of the things that the government -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, because I want to give other gentleman a chance to speak, because I want to hear what kind of statesmanlike statements are going to be made.

Well just one other illustration. There is a fisheries development liaison committee now, Mr. Speaker, set up by the provincial department where representatives of the fish companies and the fishermen from around the province and federal officials and our officials meet quarterly to review the various experiments that are going on in the fishery. There was a meeting just on December 4, I was there for a few moments. I have here what their agenda was. The kinds of things they are discussing in getting the fishermen and the trade and the two governments together, Labrador shell fish and seed weed survey, drum-ring net, seining project in Trinity Bay, automatic longlining, scallop farming projects, the Labrador barge facility. The one item I forgot to mention was the new experiment of putting a barge up on the Labrador Coast to assist in the fishery, the Harmon vessels and so on and so forth, the various items that they discussed at that meeting and various reports. That is a very important step forward to have this fishing development liaison committee. Well all kinds of things like that are going ahead.

Now, Mr. Speaker, then to come to the immediate crisis and to speak about that for a few minutes. As all honourable gentlemen

know the fishing industry is not in very good straits this year, apart altogether from the ice problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes. Well despite all we are doing, Mr. Speaker, of course, we can only assist on the periphery of this problem I explained at the start we do not control the resource.

Now despite all of the things that the government is attempting to do in assisting the

industry. There is one industry where we cannot do very much and that is to protect since it is not our responsibility. As all members of the House know, I guess it was in August, there was a trawler strike in the trawler fleet. The strike was illegal. Collective agreements had not expired and it was very widespread and certainly indicated that there was something fundamentally wrong in the industry. There was certainly a lot of dissatisfaction.

The Premier and the then Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, after four or five weeks, were able to get the parties together and get the trawlermen to return to work on the agreement that a conciliation board would be appointed with certain broad terms of reference, that there would be a commission of enquiry into the whole fishery and the matter was publicized at that time.

Now the conciliation board report we have all seen. It was chaired by Dr. Leslie Harris, Memorial University and Mr. Paul Russell and Mr. Johnson representing the union were on the board. The report of the board illustrates, Mr. Speaker, what the problem of the industry is. I just want to touch on a few sections of the report here to illustrate some points.

Dr. Harris points out that the vastly increased catching effort and the vastly increased investment in ships and technology, that despite this catches are continuing to decline and he establishes that beyond doubt. He says the rate of depletion is largely attributable to European fleets operating on the Continental-Shelf or waters adjacent to our coast. He goes into the picture with respect to cod and he deals with that.

He says that we must create the conditions on page (15) in which our own trawlers can justify their existence in the economic sense and in which fish populations will sufficiently recover to yield a viable and continuing return to both inshore and trawler fishermen. He points out that we must convince Ottawa to make a unilateral declaration next year, if the Law of the Sea Conference is not successful and that is exactly the position that we have mentioned in this resolution.

He shows that declining volumes of production inevitably mean per unit costs and he outlines the various costs associated with the trawlers, that the unit costs increase as volume declines. He had access to the records of all the companies that appeared before him and there were five of them, Mr. Speaker. Dr. Harris had access to all their financial records.

Then he presents figures that show the average costs to the company of producing, processing and marketing a pound of fish on July 30, 1974. He illustrates how cost and return are related to product mix and explains that. That your return depends on the kind of fish you catch. Perch for example and yellowtail flounder are far less valuable than other species. He finds that the composite figure (page 20) comes to seventy-eight cents a pound. The cost of fish, labour, fixed costs and so on.

He points out, of course, that the prices vary by species and by pack and by product mix. So it is hard to give an average because it depends on the kind of fish they are getting. He says that none of the five companies are able to produce the appropriate product mix. The reasons are not far to seek. The species and packs stretching the higher prices are precisely those in short supply.

"Perch: Every sale of each pound of perch represented a loss in the order of twenty-nine cents. There is a preponderance of the least desirable of the flatfish the yellowtail and perch in the landings of all of the companies and that reduced their average selling price to a level well below that of production costs. The board found that if these prices and costs obtained on July 30, continued they all would be sustaining heavy losses."

"The market is stagnant at a level that makes the Newfoundland trawler based industry less than viable. On page (27) he gave his conclusions about the state of the industry."

"Fish landings were declining: The decline in landings meant lower earning levels for crewmen which resulted in loss of morale, problems in recruitment and the rest of it. The combination of the cost

of ships, the cost of money, the cost of fuel and supplies, the cost of labour all have increased greatly. Market prices were low."

Then he concludes: "The combination of the foregoing has produced a situation in which each of the five companies accounts were examined, has for several months past and is at present sustaining heavy losses."

The he goes on to look as he was requested to at the social requirements of trawler fishermen. He heard evidence pointing to declining competence among crewmen, difficulties

of recruitment, high turn over of crews and so on so that he conclude that trawler fishing is not now a highly desired occupation. He goes on to examine that. He finds that deep sea fishing is becoming less and less attractive to Newfoundlanders.

Then he looks at the income of trawler fishermen as compared to miners and the like and shows that the differential between the groups since 1970 has gone against the trawlermen over the last four years and that they have good reason to be dissatisfied with their lot.

Now, it is important to notice something he says on page 33, Mr. Speaker, because on page 33 he talks about the creation of a corp of professional trawler fishermen skilled in their trade. This is who he is suggesting should get paid the kinds of amounts that he mentioned, the professional trawler fishermen.

Then he deals with professionalism which has nothing to do with punch clock mentality but implies a high degree of competence and pride in performance and hard work with a full appreciation of the essential fact, the profits are related to productivity and a greater individual effort is likely to lead to greater personal rewards. That should not be forgotten, Mr. Speaker.

Dr. Harris does not recommend what he recommends for the angishores and the few that are lazy and the ones who do not want to go out in twenty-four ships a year and so on. He is talking about professional trawlermen, skilled, who do a hard days work for a days pay.

It is important to notice this: "If however", Dr. Harris says, "the fisherman can demand in equity an appropriate return on his investment of labour", he says, "the capitalists can legitimately expect a return on his investment that makes the labour both possible and profitable." That should not be forgotten, Mr. Speaker, because nearly every politician in the country, all of them, are willing to say that the trawler fishermen should have a higher income and reasonable return and a reasonable amount for his labour but very few of them will say a word about the fact that the trawler company or the entrepreneur or the businessman who has a fish company must get some return on his investment or he is not going to invest

in the fishery. That should not be forgotten. This is not just a crisis that affects the trawler fishermen nor the inshore fishermen. This is a crisis that affects the whole fishing industry of Newfoundland.

If a man cannot invest money in the fishery and get a return on it, a decent return, he will not invest anything in the fishery. If I have \$10,000 to invest and I look at the fishery now, I certainly would not invest it. I would not see any chance of getting the return. I can invest it down with one of the trust companies and get ten or eleven per cent on my money. I do not have to risk it. I do not have to do anything. I give them my \$10,000. I do not have to do a tap and they will pay me ten, eleven or twelve per cent. So, I would be a fool to put that into the fishery unless I can make a return in the fishery. I think that cannot be overstressed because there is so much "Cheap Jack" politicizing about the situation. We will not have a fishing industry if we do not have entrepreneurs and risk takers who want to invest their money in it. That is why -

MR. MARTIN: Nationalize them.

MR. CROSBIE: Nationalize them the honourable gentleman from Labrador South says. Yes, we should nationalize everything in this province so we can all share the poverty that would result.

I am not against nationalizing the fishing industry if that was the only solution but I would do it with a great deal of reluctance. Where will we find the entrepreneurs to operate if the whole thing is owned by government? Where will we find the risk takers? Where will we get the Paul Russells and the Harold Lakes and the Spencer Lakes and the Alec Moores and the people who are now in the industry and Mr. Ed Janes and all of these people who are in the industry now if we nationalized it? That is too simple a solution.

Now, if there was no other answer, of course, sure. I do not care, nationalize anything if that is the most pragmatic thing to do and the only way it can be a success.

MR. MARTIN: Subsidized would be the word.

MR. CROSBIE: But I do not see any necessity for that. I say this, Mr. Speaker, I am not one of those who is just going to go around criticizing

the Newfoundland Fishing Industry. There are a lot of good men in it that have done a good job, who have invested their money in this province and they should be recognized and get some appreciation for that. I include the Lakes and the Russells and the Monroes and a whole host of others. I mentioned Alec Moores and Ed Janes and there are dozens more that I can mention, T.J. Hardy and all of the rest of them.

Now, what their labour policy may be. I mean,

they may be, this one may be very reactionary in his labour policy and he may impose and fight the union to the death and so on and so forth. I am not discussing that. I think that is crazy and that is changed in any event but these men are hard workers and they put their money where their mouths are,

AH HON . MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, they have taxpayers money too. They have had assistance from the government also. There is no reason why they should not as long as they follow general lines of government policy. So I do issue any blanket condemnation of the industry of Newfoundland, that has done certain things wrong but if we are going to have an industry you will not have it, if as Dr. Harris says "You have to have an appropriate return on the investment of labour and an appropriate return on the investment that makes the labour both possible and profitable."

Now we nationalized everything in this province, Where is the money going to come from I wonder, to pay for government services and the rest of it. What we want is the fishing industry where the men are well and decently paid, where they are making a profit and where they pay taxes to the Newfoundland Government so we can use it to expand or increase government services. So easy solutions can talk about nationalization. This is just not sensible.

National Sea - I have mentioned the Newfoundland owned companies - National Sea, Atlantic Fish, B.C. Packers, these companies may or may not stay in the industry. They will not stay in the industry if they cannot see in the future, a year or two, or four or five years that they have some hope of making a return on their money, they will not stay. That is why the government have to come up now with a proper scheme. But to go on now and just to follow in Dr. Harris' Report, he makes an important point there. "It is not just the trawler fishermen and the fish plant worker that we have to think about." He says on page 35: "That a skilled trawler fisherman who through productivity demonstrates his skill should at the present time be able to claim earnings ranging between \$13,000 to \$20,000 per annum, for a work year averaging 240 days." He does not say that

every trawler fisherman, he does not say that. It would not be practical. He says "A skilled trawler fisherman who through productivity demonstrates his skills." That has to be remembered, Mr. Speaker. We should not forget that.

Then in a lot of the next part of the report he deals with various points in the collective agreement, which I will not touch on now. I only want to touch on the general principles, and to get to his conclusion or his conclusion in connection with the trawler fishermen. He suggests that the system should be changed by which remuneration is decided so that the significant figure would be the price of fish expressed in terms of cents per pound. It proposes a change there, and suggests that there should be a minimum income level for trawler fishermen. It goes into that.

Then he makes certain findings about the cost per pound of landed fish and says that it is four cents now for the labour content. What he proposes is that it will probably rise to 5.4 percent, that is if the minimum earnings for full-time fishermen during the next contract period should be \$13,000 approximately for twenty-four trips, averaging at least 150,000 pounds per trip. Now we have done our own calculations on that and think his cost figures are too low. "If that were done, he says, "it would cost another one point four cents per pound." We think that it would be at least another cent per pound over that, and so on but these are details but important details. They will have to be dealt with in collective bargaining.

Then Dr. Harris goes on to suggest how different changes in the way in which fishermen are paid and an income averaging formerly and so on. We do not need to go into it all here.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well I am going to mention something about that now in just a couple of minutes.

He concludes on page 77, Mr. Speaker. He says "It is our view that for several years to come and perhaps until more sensible fish management policies will have time to be implemented and to produce an effect, until the markets improve appreciably, the viability of the

industry will remain in doubt." He recommends to government that immediate action be taken to establish a mechanism through which the companies can to operate while assuring the fishermen a fair return for their labours. Then the question is "What level of subsidy is required and how is it to be applied?" The answer to the first

question will only be found after thorough analysis of each company's operation and continuously updated data and so on. Then he goes on to his conclusions, that if the trawler fishing industry is to be viable, returns to the fishermen must be substantially increased and so on and so forth. The government intervention must take the form of subsidy. There has to be a carefully controlled monitoring system. And the companies now are losing from twelve to thirty cents per pound of marketed fish and the rest of it.

So, Dr. Harris's report then, Mr. Speaker, illustrates what the great problem of the industry is today. He makes certain findings that the companies are losing money heavily. He finds really that there will not be a fishing industry if this continues for another period of six months or a year because they will have to give up operating. They cannot continue operating with such heavy losses. He finds that the main reason for the losses is the decline in the resource although the market has worsened.

He has recommended that if you are going to have a trawler fishing industry, the trawler fishermen must get more. They must get an increase. Now, we agree with all of these major findings of Dr. Harris but this is a Conciliation Board Report, Mr. Speaker, and the parties have to meet and negotiate on the basis of it. We do not want government becoming so involved that there is no longer going to be collective bargaining in the fishing industry. So, we have to remember that.

I am not saying whether Dr. Harris is correct in arriving at \$13,000 as a minimum for a trawlerman that he should make if he goes on twenty-four trips. That is for the parties to bargain about. The union was only asking for something that amounted to around \$10,500 in the collective bargaining negotiations. It may be that they will settle at something less than that. Collective bargaining still has to take place and there are a lot of other points in the report that they still have to deal with.

Before they can do anything, Mr. Speaker, they have to know what governments will do for them. Well, before the report was received

I had seen the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa and he was aware, from our conversations and from a trip he had to Nova Scotia about the serious problem in the fishing industry. First it was thought that this might just be another temporary situation such as happened three or four years ago but the minister is convinced by what he had heard, that this was indeed a very serious crisis and that there will be no fishing industry in Eastern Canada unless it is dealt with. He has appointed a study group headed by Mr. Doucette of the Fresh Fish Marketing Board of Manitoba I think it is, to head their team of people. We have our task group here in the province who have met with them. We are constantly in touch with the industry itself and with the union.

Within the next two weeks anyway, by next week, they will be reporting to their minister or merely to the federal minister and presumably within a week or two after that or certainly during the month of December, it will be announced what assistance the government of Canada and this government are going to give the trawler fishing industry to enable it to continue operating over the next few months, probably for an interim period, a period from September to March, so that there will be more time to develop a long term policy of assistance because the assistance is going to be needed, not just this year and not just the first half of next year, but it would appear likely that it is going to be needed for the next two, three, four or five years until the resource available to the Canadian fishermen is again sufficient.

If that kind of assistance does not come from government - and it must come primarily from the federal government, they have the money and they have a constitutional responsibility - if it does not, they will be making a conscious decision that it is not in the national interest to have an East Coast Fishing Industry.

Now, the reason, Mr. Speaker, presumably, that more vehement steps were not taken by the government of Canada to establish a 200 mile fishing zone or economic zone or 200 mile limit before, was because it was not felt to be in the national interest that they should anger and endanger their trading relations with other countries in the world, that the sale of wheat and the sale of manufactured products and so on and

so forth was more important nationally than the fishing industry. They therefore, have not chosen to act like Iceland or like some other country might act that was dependant on the fishery.

That having been a choice of the government of Canada over the last five to ten years, that they would not stir and muddy up the international waters and their trade patterns and the rest of it by taking sterner steps to protect the fishing resource off East Coast Canada. That having been their decision, we having been sacrificed or the fishermen of the East Coast and the fish processors having been sacrificed to other goals considered to be in the national interest, then the government of Canada can surely fairly be asked now to provide the money necessary for the next four or five years to keep the industry operating and healthy and the fishermen employed, getting additional level of remuneration

remuneration until the resource is sufficient for them to operate without more government assistance. That is basically what the Government of Canada has been asked. It is very simple. That is what they have to come up with because it is their duty to come up with it. I am not saying that they should have adopted a different position in the past or that their view of the national interest may not have been right over all, or that they had to do what they had to do. I do not want to criticize them unjustly. But that having been the position, then surely they must now take the steps necessary to keep this industry going so that the people who invested their money in it can see some light at the end of the tunnel. I mean these companies do not want government assistance. They prefer to be independent. When they get assistance from us and the Federal Government now they will no longer be independent. They are not going to be allowed to operate just any way they like. They are going to be given guide lines as to how they are going to operate. Their operations will be monitored. Their financial statements will be monitored and will be checked so that the amounts of assistance can be decided and whether they need more or less or whether the assistance should go up or down and what they are doing.

There will not be assistance without control and the framework of control. They know that. They do not want it but they have no choice today because if they do not get it they will not survive. They are therefore all willing now to give their financial statements and open up their books and the rest of it because if they do not they are going to go belly up. They will not last another twelve months anyway. So they do not want this help from the government. If they can see their way in a year or two or three that they can then operate again without government assistance, they will certainly be delighted to get out of that position.

There are a whole lot of things that have to be decided at this time, Mr. Speaker. It is fantastically complicated, What kind of assistance? How to do it without rewarding the inefficient? They are not all managed with the same degree of efficiency. What are we going to do with the coasts, with the plants on the Northeast Coast that are not economically viable, that should not by any sensible economic standard operate? What

do we do with them? If they are to continue to be operated because of the social consequences, because of where they are located and there is no alternative kinds of employment, if that is the decision then they should be financed on a different basis than the rest of the fishing industry. They should be dealt with on a social basis and operated by government or assisted to be operated and subsidized on a different basis because some of these plants will never and can never be economic but it may not be possible to shut them.

The industry is now, and there is no question, Mr. Speaker, in the next few months going to have many changes in rationalization. Now, the Leader of the Opposition mentioned the day he said it would be desirable to have one marketing, I forget the word he used, one marketing desk for all of the fresh frozen fish, I do not know if he meant of Newfoundland or of Eastern Canada. The Province of Newfoundland cannot do that as he well knows. That is a matter of federal jurisdiction, international trade and commerce and marketing boards. That may or may not have something to be said for. I certainly heard it argued in the past, that this is a step that is logical and reasonable. Well this is certainly the time for this to be looked at. I would not say right now whether it is the right move to make or not. I do not know nothing about it to know but if the industry is going to be assisted well obviously the time has come to really have a look at that concept and see is it practical and can it be done. You certainly could not do it for Newfoundland alone, it would have to be for Eastern Canada. Those kinds of things can be looked at. I would not say that this is a step that must be taken.

So this kind of work is going on now, Mr. Speaker, night and day with the people involved, looking at all of these issues. They are not

all going to be solved in the month of December, hopefully some interim solution then and then the longer term by March. Mr. Speaker, at the same time, once this review of the trawler fishery is concluded, as soon as they can get over the hump of this immediate, then they are going to look at the inshore fishery. There was some mixed up reporting from here yesterday as to what I said about that. These task force groups will be looking at the inshore fishery as soon as they finish this immediate problem of the trawler fishery which is caused by the conciliation board report and by the fact that the boats will all be coming in in December and may or may not sail at the end of December.

As soon as they finish that they will be looking at the problems of the inshore fishery because the inshore plants are in just as dire straits as the plants that have trawlers, mostly for the same reason, that they cannot get sufficient foot through. The inshore fishermen have the same problem, arising costs and so on and so forth, no matter how much government assistance there is, as other fishermen. That problem has to be dealt with too and cannot wait very long.

It is our understanding, Mr. Speaker, that the Government of Canada and the Prime Minister is concerned about the position of the primary producer. We are therefore expecting a very favourable reception at Ottawa for any programmes of assistance that are developed in the inshore fishery and for the fishermen also. We are awaiting anxiously the income support programme for fishermen which the Government of Canada is working on and which is now being revised from the one suggested last year. This is of great importance. Now we are not going to belabour and berate the Minister of Fisheries of Canada or the Government of Canada that they have not produced that now. We are very anxiously awaiting it but we know it is tremendously complicated and he wants to be satisfied that it is a good improvement on the present unemployment insurance scheme for fishermen and so on. But that is of first rank importance for the Government of Canada to come forward with the income support programme for fishermen, particularly for the inshore fishermen and badly needed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what about the union? One of the big problems

in the Newfoundland fishery for many years has been the lack of a strong union that was acting for fishermen or fish plant workers. We all know how Mr. Coaker's union, what happened with that, how well it did and what its career was but from 1949 certainly until four or five years ago there was no strong union that existed in the fishing industry and that represented fishermen or fish plant workers or trawler fishermen. That was a bad situation because too much power on one side of any situation is not good socially and leads to injustice and leads to inequities and the rest of it. There is today a union, the Newfoundland Fishermen Food and Allied Workers Union, that has become successfully organized in the last four or five years that now represents the fish plant workers and trawler fishermen and fishermen in various areas and is now a strong countervailing force in the fishing industry in this Province. It was badly needed and now it is there and it had a struggle getting there. It would not be much good as a union if it had not had a struggle getting to where it is today.

This union, Mr. Speaker, and its leaders had to accept responsibility with the power that they now have. As to what happens in the next month or two in the fishing industry in Newfoundland, a great deal will depend upon Mr. Richard Cashin and the Fishermen Food and Allied Workers Union and how they react, what their reaction is. The fishing industry and the Province — one of the worst things that could happen at the present time with all of these situations underway and all these balls in the air and all these negotiations going on and the development of programmes of assistance and the rest of it, one of the worst things that could happen would be another interruption in the trawler fishery or either the companies or the men refusing to sail back after December. So we have to ask the union when the companies can inform them what they can do after they know what the government programmes of assistance are going to be, to be reasonable and as long as there is reasonable improvements and increases to go back to the fishery, and some of this may be on a part time basis until the whole thing can be worked out at the end of March, a lot will depend on the union. The union has to be responsible, Mr. Speaker.

December 6, 1974.

Tape 1956

RH - 3

There are four main elements in this particular situation. One is the Government of Canada, to have them recognize their -

7730

responsibility and to put up the needed money, the sensible plan. Secondly, the province who is going to contribute what we can. We may find we have to supplement it or they may ask us to share such and such a percentage.

Then, there is the union which represents the men involved and then there are the various fish processors who have, I think, Mr. Speaker, carried on very responsibly since July. They carried on. They did not attempt to decrease their prices. They carried on paying the prices and so on although they were absorbing very, very heavy losses certainly since the spring. None of them have yet panicked and we have not had any dramatic announcements that any of them are going to get out of the industry. They have not attempted to pressure either government in that manner. They are acting very responsibly. They have gotten Mr. Peter Gardner who has developed a brief for them on what their position is and how they see the programme operating and what the facts and figures are. They have been in constant touch with both governments, co-operated to the full. We will have to have the co-operation of the union before all of this is over. I feel sure that we will get it.

So, what is the position then, Mr. Speaker? The resolution that I presented to the House to enable the fishery situation generally to be debated is not a controversial one. The debate really is a little early. We will certainly have to have a major fisheries debate when the House opens again at the end of January or early February when it is known exactly what kinds of assistance the two governments have come up with and how they are being administered because that will be the real time to debate this.

We did not want to be accused - we were unjustly accused by the opposition, the Leader of the Opposition, of not wanting to debate the fishery, the silly little play acting that goes on and political tactics. You know, when the House opened, the first day it opened, the opposition brings in a -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. That is a good point. The first day we opened they bring in an emergency resolution to debate the fishery, you know, for nothing

but publicity purposes knowing the Speaker would not accept it and having been told that the Harris report would be tabled the next day, the Leader of the Opposition brought in a resolution that there be an emergency debate on the fishery the day before. That was the silliest motion ever brought into this House for partisan, political reasons, the one brought in on opening day by the Leader of the Opposition when we assembled here again, after I told him the Harris report would be tabled Friday. We could not table it until Friday because of our agreement with the union. He then moved that we have an emergency debate on the fisheries and nobody even had the Harris report. What kind of - not chicanery - but what kind of play acting is that? What kind of a serious approach to the problems of the fishery is that, attempting to use the crisis in the fishery for partisan, political advantage when the House opened after having been adjourned for two or three months, to try to make some supposed great point, that instead of debating redistribution, the House should be debating the fishery?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Debating it today with three of them over there.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, and today when we are debating it, in the Liberals ranks of the House there are three men present, three of them present, three only. So, the opportunity is now here, Mr. Speaker, to debate the fishery but the debate that will come at the end of January or in February will be far more valuable because we will then know what both governments exactly have done, what they are proposing, how it is being administered and we will be able to see whether or not members agree with what is then being done.

So, the resolution itself is quite a neutral one, that the House support the efforts of this government in conjunction with the Government of Canada to devise a scheme of financial assistance that will permit certain things to happen in the fishing industry of Newfoundland and that the members of the House urge the Government of Canada to make a unilateral declaration with respect to the Continental Shelf Waters next year, if there is not a satisfactory conclusion to the Law of the Sea Conference. There is nothing controversial in that. I am hoping and expecting that all members can support that. At the same time we

are quite willing to listen to any suggestions that may be seriously put forward as to what should be done.

Now, there are a whole lot of other issues that can be discussed in the fishery, Mr. Speaker. We cannot discuss them all here today and there will be other opportunities. At the time of the appointment of the Conciliation Board, the Premier stated that there would be a Commission of Enquiry appointed to look into the fishing industry generally. Now, the position has not changed. There will be a Commission of Enquiry appointed to look into all phases and aspects of the fishing industry

in this province. It is not yet appointed for a very simple reason, Mr. Speaker, that neither the federal government nor our government nor the industry nor the union at this time have the time to put the effort into making submissions to a royal commission, preparing briefs and putting a position forward. They simply have not got the time, they are all working day and night to try to deal with this immediate situation, which hopefully will be resolved in December and certainly on the long-term basis, by March. It is just not practical to appoint this commission yet.

When we get over this immediate situation and have it, hopefully, under control there will be then in the next month or two months the appointment of a commission to have a look at the whole fishing industry and the whole fishing situation here in Newfoundland. That will include the inshore fishery, the offshore fishery, the pelagic fishery and the ground fishery. The whole scene will be looked at.

The situation with respect to the government trawler programme, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: that a study has been done by R.P.C. Resource Planning Associates and we have the results of that study. I have been dealing with them on it but in the meantime, the present situation is upon us and until there is a resolution in what we have been talking about this afternoon, just how the government's trawler programme will go forward and its size and extent, whether there will be an option system or a partial option system and the like will not be decided until after this is done, in view of the changing circumstances in the fishing industry today.

Licensing programme for fishermen: There are a whole lot of other points that could be gone into that are not exactly germane to this resolution.

The point of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, is this: "That the House support the efforts of this government with the Government of Canada to now come up with a scheme of financial assistance that is necessary if the industry is to survive. Not just the next three months or four months but the next three, four or five years and that the Government of Canada take steps to deal with offshore resources next year unilaterally if it is not concluded at Geneva or concluded in 1975."

That is the sense of the resolution. If the opposition or anyone else in the House has any suggestions to make that would be of help in this situation we shall certainly note them. Or if they have any suggestions to make outside the House or if they want to write a letter at any time making suggestions they will certainly be looked into. This government has made a major effort to assist the fishing industry of this province where it can and with what resources it has. It is prepared now, Mr. Speaker, to go even further. Our resources are not unlimited. We are expecting the Government of Canada to bear the greatest part of the brunt but we will do our share hard though it is to get the money for everything that is needed in this province. There are going to be a lot of changes in the fishing industry in this province and in Eastern Canada in the next twelve months. A tremendous number of changes in this industry and I think that most of them will be for the best. One of the brighter features of the present situation is that I think that now the Government of Canada is well apprised of the facts of the situation and ready to help. Certainly the Provincial Government is and will.

There are several other things that we are going to do in 1975 that I shall not touch on now, Mr. Speaker, except to assure the honourable gentleman from Labrador South that the position with respect to the herring fishery in Labrador South is going to be vastly changed next year as well as along the northwest coast. We are dealing now with the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation and they are being asked to move in there and do the necessary with our help to see that with regard to the herring fishery the potential there is properly developed. That should have started this year but for some reason it got slipped up. Anyway, it certainly will start next spring and meetings have been held with the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation. An announcement will be made when we get all the details worked out with them.

I should also like to tell the Member for Labrador South or Members for Labrador that we intend to put more emphasis on the Labrador fishery next year, including assessing their inshore resources,

introducing new fish harvesting technology and continuing

the mobile support facility, the barge, "Labrador The First". That started up there late this year and will be continuing to operate next year. All of those things were recommended by the Royal Commission on Labrador. We will continue to give what assistance we can up there.

So I think, Mr. Speaker, that I have really covered all that I need to cover at this point today.

MR. M. MARTIN: Before the minister closes his part of the debate and since he did bring up this particular section of the report, there is a matter for clarification, Mr. Speaker, on pages forty and forty-one, fish handling facilities. The names of several communities in Labrador occur two or three times. I am wondering if it is a misprint, a typographical error or whether or not we are going to have many more facilities than is indicated in the honourable minister's programme?

MR. CROSBIE: I will have to check that as to whether there are several projects or just a name repeated several times. It will have to be checked. I would think it would be several projects.

MR. MARTIN: Naming off several communities, there is also one named Labrador South. So I think probably somebody in the department does not really know what is happening down there.

MR. CROSBIE: I would say that there is some tremendous enthusiasm for Labrador South in the Department of Fisheries just making sure that it gets on the list for such facilities.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is the present situation. Certainly within the next two weeks there will have to be some announcement as to what is going to be done in this interim period. I hope to see Mr. LeBlanc in Ottawa on Tuesday to discuss the situation. His officials will have reported to him by then. He has to go to Treasury Board. He has to go to Cabinet. If he has something concrete presented to them that he can accept, we will have to do the same here in the Province of Newfoundland. We have to keep in touch with the fishing industry itself to see then if this is sufficient, to see it has been sufficient to carry on. They have to negotiate with the union to complete their collective agreement and to settle how much exactly

their remuneration will be and the exact terms of that and how it is going to be done and the exact amount. All of this has to go on in the next few weeks so that hopefully the trawler fishery will resume after Christmas, while we can deal with the longer term and look at the inshore fishery also. We are not forgetting the inshore plants. I saw Mr. Alec Moores today and Mr. Fred Earle and people like that. They are not being forgotten and they saw Mr. Doucette on Tuesday and made their position very clear to him. They have a request into Ottawa for special assistance because of the damages suffered by them in the ice situation this year on the Northeast Coast which they have not heard back from Ottawa on yet. We are not going to forget the inshore fishermen.

So, Mr. Speaker, that is some of the steps that the Provincial Government has been taking this year on the fisheries. I tried to bring you up to date on what is going on as a result of the Harris Report and what has to be done and I welcome any suggestions that anyone has that are seriously given as to what else can be done.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Would the honourable minister give the House his opinion on this? If Canada is unable to come to a unilateral agreement on the resources, what would he suggest then that Newfoundland should do? I think he made a suggestion in one of his speeches at some time or other, that he would lead an army to Ottawa to enforce sunboat diplomacy. Is the minister still -

MR. CROSBIE: I think that the honourable gentleman did not hear correctly. What we are suggesting to the Government of Canada is that if next year they are not successful in concluding a satisfactory agreement at the Law of the Sea Conference, that they should then declare unilaterally the 200 miles economic zone or the Continental Shelf doctrine or what you will in connection with the fishery. If the Government of Canada does not do that, all we can do is bring to bear on them such pressure as we can, such publicity as we can and one of the devices certainly that would have to be thought seriously about would be a march on

Ottawa. You know, well, to lead a group to march in Ottawa peacefully and actually not an armed group to get publicity for the cause and to increase the pressure on the Canadian Government. There are any number of means can be adopted. Although, frankly I doubt that any of that would be required because I am convinced that if the Government of Canada does not see this conference successfully concluding next year, that they will and the United States of America is also likely to declare a unilaterally 200 mile limit or whatever it is. If they do not, then all this province can do and will do is to exert such pressure as it can in the forces of public opinion throughout Canada to try to encourage the Government of Canada to take that action. But I frankly do not think that it would be necessary because I think they realize how serious, in fact, I know they realize how serious the situation is.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. DUNPHY): The honourable member, the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may say a few words in behalf of those of us on this side. Some of my colleagues, I hope, will wish to speak in this debate just as I assume and I hope that some of the honourable gentlemen on the other side will participate as well. Perhaps I could begin by saying a few remarks in the same sort of general mode and to the same purpose as the minister has just given us in the last hour or hour and a half.

Let me begin, Mr. Speaker, by saying that I am sorely tempted but I am not going to indulge the minister and I am not going to engage him in a partisan debate or play his little game. I think that this matter of the fisheries and particularly the matter of the resolution or the matters dealt with in the resolution and the Harris Report and the matters about which he spoke, are infinitely more important than the sort of matter that might conceivably be treated in the partisan fashion with which the minister began his speech.

I am the first to say that the minister quickly realized the error of his ways and about midway through his speech - I was not in the chamber throughout it but I heard it all, thanks to the marvellous instrument of broadcasting or whatever it is we have that picks up the priceless words

that are uttered in this chamber and relays them to the rooms on either side through a p.a. system or some sort of broadcasting system. I heard what he had to say. Midway through his speech or partway through his speech he changed his tone and his approach completely. I am very pleased about that. I would enjoy taking the minister on in debate. It would be great fun. We could talk about what was done by the Liberals and what was done by the Tories and what was not done by the Liberals and what was not done by the Tories.

I could say lots of things. He talked about the fact that the Liberals put no money into fishery. I just thought of the Williams Port Whaling Plant where his father and the company got a loan and left the money there through no fault of their own. The Liberals backed them and the idea did not work. There was something like \$450,000 of the public's money left at Williams Port in White Bay North, money that had been backed or lent by the government as a guarantee to that particular enterprise of harvesting one of the products of the sea. Well, it did not work.

I could talk about the herring plant on the north side of Bay of Islands where again several hundred thousands of the peoples' dollars were invested and the investment did not work out. I do not blame the honourable gentleman. I do not think he had anything to do with it. Nor do I blame his father who had everything to do with it. His father was a great entrepreneur. The more I see of public life in Newfoundland and the longer I am at public life in Newfoundland and the longer I am listening to discussions of problems and what we must do in this province and how we should do it, I think anybody who looks at it will come to the same conclusion, that what we need in Newfoundland are more entrepreneurs.

I think the Minister of Industry or Industrial Development will agree with me. We do not need people who will think that industrial development is buying a sock for a dollar and selling it for a dollar fifty. What we need are people who will come in and take our resources and develop industries so that we can benefit from them. We can argue about the terms under which those resources should be made available. That is another matter.

But the general type of an entrepreneur, a man like John Shaheen -
certainly much can be said for and much can be said against Mr. Shaheen and
much has been said against him and a great deal has been said for him -
but a man like that, an entrepreneur, there is

a great deal to commend, commend the late Ches Crosbie, the minister's father was such a man. The Liberal Government of the day backed him heavily and they backed many others heavily. All I will say, I do not want to get into it, it would be great fun, we could drag it out and we could talk about this and we could talk about that and so forth and so on. When the minister began his diatribe I scribbled down a few notes, I probably still have them here somewhere. Then I said, "No, the matter is much too serious."

What the Liberals may or may not have done during the twenty-three years that we were in office is on the record. Be it good or be it bad it is there. I could make a case that there would have been no fishery at all in Newfoundland today, no fishing industry if it had not been for actions taken by the government over that twenty-three year period. I think it could be a strong case, and while it could be argued against, I do not think any fair-minded person would not agree with that case.

I could make another case that more should have been done. I could say on that, that most of the honourable gentlemen on the other side were noticeable by their silence over the years on these issues. The Minister of Fisheries, as he now is, was in the Smallwood cabinet. He damned the Smallwood cabinet. He scorned my colleague, the gentleman for Fogo and myself and others. I did not hear the honourable gentleman when he was in the cabinet say anything about fisheries. He and I never sat together in a cabinet, I am the first to say that but I never heard him raise his voice. The Minister of Finance, whose family have a long history in the fisheries - the Earles of Fogo and who he, himself, spent much of his life in the fishing business in one aspect of it, particularly the salt fish aspect, in the buying and selling of it. I have yet to hear him in the seven or eight years he sat as a supporter of Mr. Smallwood and the Liberal Party. He was twice elected was he as Joe Smallwood's supporter, in 1962 and in 1966?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: He entered the cabinet in 1964. He was in the cabinet for four or five years. I could go on but I do not think that has any value. I think it would be a very arid and sterile debate. We might succeed in scoring a few points on one side or the other. I must say at times I play the partisan game. We all do in this House. It is a part of the essence of a parliament, and this is a parliament, Mr. Speaker, but I do not think that this matter, at this time should be treated in that way.

I was a little surprised, not hurt. The Minister of Social Services gets hurt apparently by things said in the House but I am not hurt by anything the Minister of Fisheries says, I am surprised. Every now and then I feel that the Minister of Fisheries is a man who takes things seriously, who faces up to the problem and then he slips from that standard and becomes his more usual bullying self. Well if he wants to approach this subject in this way, we will take him on. If he wants to do it here or he wants to do it in the country, we will equally take him on. That is fine but I think it is too serious, I think it is too important and I do not propose to take him up on his challenges.

What I said about his appointment to the portfolio of Fisheries, I said. It may have been the best thing ever to happen to the fisheries in Newfoundland to have the honourable gentleman made Minister of Fisheries, certainly his three predecessors in the Moores Administration; the Premier who held the portfolio with a notable lack of distinction on two occasions; the gentleman, as he then was, the then Member for Hermitage, Mr. Roy Cheeseman who left the cabinet in disgust and despair with the response of the administration of the problems of the fisheries; and of course that omnibus ministerial disaster the gentleman for Gander, that speaks for itself. I have no hesitation in saying that I think the appointment of the Minister of Fisheries may be the best thing ever to have happened to the fisheries in Newfoundland. I hope that it is. I would be the first to stand be it here or be it before the media or be it on a stage anywhere in this province to say so and to commend the minister.

The matter is far above cheap, partisan politics the sort of petty little game he wanted to play. To give the man his due at the end of his speech or the latter part of his speech, Mr. Speaker, I think he came around seriously to dealing with the problem. Well that is the way I propose to deal with it.

I

7764

only want to make one reference to the remarks he made. He has got this twisted idea in his mind that I, at some point, said something about the constitutional responsibilities of the Government of Canada and the government of the provinces with respect to the fisheries. I challenge the minister to produce some authority to support what he said that I said. Until he produces such authority, I will say that he is misquoting me either deliberately or by accident. I do not need a lecture from the Minister of Fisheries on the constitution. He may need one from me on the accuracy of reporting and ethics in debate.

The constitutional position with respect to the fishery is quite clear. The minister himself after having had his little sport and distorted what I said - I mean it is his bullying nature. It has always been in the minister and presumably always will be. It is one of the reasons why he is politically so beloved throughout the province. People do recognize him for what he really is. They give him credit for his ability. Then they give him an equal amount of censure or blame for his arrogance and his bullying. It does come through, Sir.

He said - I mark the words down - that out of the water the provinces do have jurisdiction, not complete but I say - all the learned gentlemen in the House will have to agree with me, the Minister of Justice and the gentleman from St. John's South, the gentleman from Placentia East, the gentleman from St. Mary's who has recently become learned, the gentleman from St. John's East, that seems to be all of the lawyers who are present today. We are a little below strength today. They all have to agree with the statement, that the provinces, once the fish comes out of the water and is brought to the land, the provinces or a provincial government, a provincial parliament such as this, acquire a jurisdiction. That is why the Salt Fish Corporation, Mr. Speaker, required legislative action, not only by the Government of Canada and the Parliament of Canada but by the House of Assembly and the government of this province and by the legislative assemblies in other provinces, Nova Scotia, Quebec - I think those are the two provinces that have passed legislation as of now to deal with salt fish.

It is a very low trick indeed, one not worthy of the minister,

indeed one not worthy of anybody with any pretensions to intellectual honesty, to pretend that the government of this province have no role in the fisheries matters of this province except the role of encouraging or warning or exorting the Government of Canada.

Offshore the Government of Canada have jurisdiction. The minister's way was - the Minister of Industrial Development has a very good voice and it does carry.

MR. DOODY: I am sorry.

MR. ROBERTS: If he wants to have a chat with his colleague, perhaps they could chat outside. I mean, I will not be offended if they leave.

MR. DOODY: Once again, I am sorry.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, you know, mea culpa is -

MR. DOODY: Please accept my apology.

MR. ROBERTS: I accept the honourable gentleman's apologies in exactly the spirit in which they are proffered.

MR. DOODY: I wish you all the luck you deserve.

MR. ROBERTS: May all your problems be ahead of you as they are. The minister has literally brought the House down, Mr. Speaker. The third time is lucky. Can we try again? Frank Moores is returning to the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the constitutional position is quite clear, that once we get offshore the Government of Canada, the Parliament of Canada have exclusive jurisdiction. Not only does the BNA Act say it but much more important the Privy Council at England, London when they had jurisdiction and our own Supreme Court in Canada have on a number of leading cases with which I am sure the minister is familiar - the fisheries case of 1898, I think, is the leading case on the point. If the honourable gentleman has not read it recently, he might want to. The provinces though, Sir, do have a very real constitutional jurisdiction. The mere fact that we are debating this matter today in this House, that we are debating the report of a Conciliation Board appointed by the Minister of Industrial Relations of this province, acting under authority of legislation of this province, shows how real and how intimate and how absolutely basic to the fishery is our legislative concern and our legislative power.

True we cannot control the Continental Shelf, only Ottawa has any jurisdiction in international relations, the Government of Quebec found that out to their harm, to their sorrow four or five years ago when, what was it the "Gabon" affair, was it? They tried to send people to represent the Province of Quebec at International Conferences and they were quite properly slapped down by the then Minister of Justice at Ottawa, Mr. Trudeau, he subsequently became, partially as a result of that, the Prime Minister of Canada.

But we do have as a province the right and the power, and I suggest, the duty to take legislative action in respect to the fisheries. The labour relations of the fisheries fall exclusively under our legislative jurisdiction. The National Labour Relations Board, The Canada Labour Relations Board, the federal legislation does not apply to the fisheries. It does apply to deep sea ships. I suppose trawlers would come under C.S.L. (Canada Shipping Inspection).

AN HON. MEMBER: Anything under ten tons.

MR. ROBERTS: Anything under ten tons. So I suppose the longliners come under C.S.L. and a large trap-skiff in that sense would come under C.S.L. But all the labour matters are under our jurisdiction as a province, Sir.

We are not debating here the report of the Conciliation Board appointed by the Minister of Labour for Canada. We are debating the report, we are debating, in part, the report of a Conciliation Board appointed by what amounts to the Minister of Labour in this province, the Minister of Industrial Relations at the time the board was appointed, the gentleman for Labrador West. He was acting validly and lawfully under provincial legislation. I do not know if they refer to it in - if they do not name the specific act but it does not matter, it is probably the Labour Relations Act that gives the minister the authority to appoint these Conciliation Boards.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, these people - Yes, it is. I am sorry. It is the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act, an act put in the books by the Liberal Government but it is a provincial act.

I think that fact is quite central, Mr. Speaker, because I am going to suggest that the crisis which now faces our fishery and, I think, it is common ground that our fisheries do face a crisis - that that crisis can be resolved only by joint action, and I mean not only joint financial action. The Minister of Fisheries, and I was glad to hear him say it, has indicated that the province are prepared to pay a proportionate share of the costs of implementing whatever measures are taken. That is important. I do not mean merely joint action in exhortation or in, you know, speech making and resolution passing (that is important) but I mean equally and even more importantly legislative action because I believe, my colleagues share this view, that we must use this opportunity. I am not saying this particularly, immediate day to day crisis. What I am about to suggest will not prevent the possibility of a tie up on the 31st. of December or whatever, you know, the immediate tomorrow danger. But the crisis which now faces this industry, I believe, should be the opportunity that we seize and we must seize it to put the deep sea industry on a basis where it can expand to the maximum extent possibly and where it can become a viable industry. I suggest today that the industry is not viable, and I suggest further that the lack of viability in the deep sea fishing industry is only in part caused by the resources, and the fact that the fishery resources offshore are fast depleting, they are obviously being over-fished. The figures in the report and what Dr. Harris and his associates have to say, are striking.

I have talked to a great many people who represent a great number of interests in the fishing field and represent a great number of academic and professional disciplinants and there they concur. Maybe one can quibble with the figure here or the figure there but the basic thrust of what Dr. Harris and his colleagues are saying must be accepted. It is not necessarily particularly new or particularly revealing but it is startling. But the problem is more than just a supply problem. The problem is one of marketing, one of selling what we catch, selling what we process.

I invite Your Honour to consider one simple statement.

It is I think fair to say that if one had to capsulize, if there is such a word, to incapsulate I suspect is the better word, the eighty odd pages of the Harris Report into two or three sentences, it will be something like "The amount of fishing effort that is expended per pound of fish caught

has gone up. The cost of catching the pound of fish has risen even more than that because the fuel and all of the other costs have gone up as well. The market price is down. I think too much emphasis is being placed, not too much - I think we have to beware that in placing emphasis on the first fact, the fact that we are not catching as much fish even though we are making more effort. There are more trawlers at sea now than there were a couple of years ago and they are catching less fish, less fish in the total but much, much less fish per fishing day.

I have been told, for example, a couple of years ago one of these new stern trawlers went out and did not bring back three, four, five hundred thousand pounds of fish in say a week's trip. That was not a good trip. That was not a good voyage. Today these trawlers go out for ten days and they are bringing back one hundred and one hundred and fifty and two hundred thousand pounds of fish. A longer period and less fish and of course it is costing much more to keep them at sea for any given period. Insurance has gone up, fuel has gone up, all the supplies have gone up, the cost of money, all the things that are listed by Dr. Harris in that report, all have risen, some of them very dramatically. Of course, wages have gone up but not nearly enough. That was the point which led to the dispute that in turn resulted in the appointment of the commission that in turn resulted in the report.

Mr. Speaker, the report confirms and I think it is absolutely basic and indeed I am going to move in due course an amendment to this motion, to make this point. We are prepared to support the resolution. We think it is a good one but we do not think it goes far enough. In due course I shall move an amendment to make the point that I am making now. We cannot sell the fish we have now. Even with the rapidly decreasing catches, we still are not selling our fish. I do not know if the minister dealt with this point at any detail, if so, I missed it. These are figures which have come to me, Sir. They are the official figures, "Supply and Demand Conditions for Ground Fish in the American Market During January, 1974."

Now, the American market, Mr. Speaker, is absolutely basic to our fishing industry. It is the only real market that we have. I think the late Cy Moores used to sell, when he was operating Northeastern Fisheries, a large portion of the product of that plant was sold in the United Kingdom. I think he developed that market and they did very well there. He was the only one for a while.

As far as I know now, ninety-five per cent of our fish is sold in the United States, a very high proportion. Certainly, it is the American market that Dr. Harris says is the market with which we must be concerned.

Let us just look at what has happened to stocks in the American Market, Sir. Some figures here for U.S. cold storage holdings, one million pounds the end of the month, August 1973-74, I have them for two years so one can get a measure of comparison. In August, 1974, there was being held in storage in the United States 80.6 million pounds of fillets of all kinds, cod, flounder, Greenland turbot, haddock, Ocean perch, Atlantic pollack, whiting and a category of unclassified or other, whatever you wish. A year before, August, 1973 they were holding 72.6 million pounds, about a ten per cent increase and that has been true. Why, the figures go back as far as January, the same thing. The increase, with respect, Mr. Speaker, to blocks as opposed to fillets, one pound packs or I.Q.P., the increase with blocks is even more dramatic. The end of August, 1974, there was in storage in the United States 92.8 million pounds of

blocks. Twenty-six point seven were Atlantic Pollock. Twenty-two point four were cod. Twelve point nine were minced fish of all species and then the others were made up of varying other species, a total of 92.8 million pounds. 64.5 million was the figure from one year previously. That is an increase of about fifty per cent in very approximate figures.

If we look at the picture in Canada, Mr. Speaker, we will find the same thing, the dramatic increases in inventories. These are inventories, Mr. Speaker, whether they are held by the brokers in Gloucester or by the wholesalers or by the converters or by the sales companies most of our companies have in the American markets. You know, Russell interests have Russell Fisheries Limited and the Lake interests have - well, now they are the same, of course. The Lakes own the Russells. Caribou Fisheries in Gloucester, I think, is the name of their selling firm. The Monroe interests for many years had Gorton-Pugh or they may have sold it now. I think they did sell it. They all have brokerage arrangements or sales companies in the States. Atlantic fish have them. The Booth Plant of course, is vertically integrated as part of the huge consolidated foods combine - combine I suppose is a legal word - but the huge operation known as Consolidated Foods. These are all on hand.

If we look at fish sticks and portions, fish that has been processed from the block state to the state where it is ready for sale to consumers, again we see a fifty per cent increase in holdings. The precise figure, as it was given to me, was 39.7 million pounds at the end of August, 1974. These are the latest figures that I have available. There may be later available but I have not got them. In August, 1973, 25.5 million pounds held in storage.

In Canada the same thing, Mr. Speaker. The figures for fillets. These are the end of July, 1973, there were 15.3 million pounds held in inventory in storage throughout Canada. In July, 1974, a year later, 24.4 million pounds. Blocks, 11.1 million in July, 1973. 18.0 million pounds in July, 1974. The pattern holds true throughout the months of the period under review.

What this means, of course, is that we are not even selling what we are catching. Now, I will grant that we are not catching enough

and I will grant that the stocks are being overfished and I will grant that it is costing us a great deal more to catch what we are getting but we are not even selling what we are getting. The Harris report refers to the fact the market is down and so it is. I am told that there is no real hope of any significant change in the market in the months immediately ahead. Nobody foresees a dramatic rise. I hope I am wrong but the information I am given is that - what are cod blocks selling at now? Sixty, sixty-five cents? That range?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Fifty-eight.

MR. ROBERTS: Fifty-eight, a little below the sixty, sixty-five range. A year ago they were going to eighty-five. I can remember, indeed I was in the cabinet, when they were nineteen cents and every fish plant in Newfoundland was in with its hand out and every fish plant in Newfoundland got a government guarantee or a government loan to keep it going back in 1968 - and they talk about inflation. The break even point in those days was twenty-six cents a pound. Those were the days when Birdseye left \$6 million sitting on the shore in Harbour Grace. They went back to England to lick their wounds.

The Ross Steers Enterprise, the Steers family stayed in the fish business. They are in the salt fish end of it still. The Ross Plant which National Sea now have over across the Narrows, Mr. Speaker, left behind it in round figures about \$3 million. They sailed their trawlers back to England and \$3 million was left there.

Every other fishing enterprise, I think, in Newfoundland, at that stage in 1968, if I have my year correctly, 1968-1969 was about to go under. They were bailed out by government guarantees. I do not know if they have been retired or not since. The Minister of Fisheries could tell us. They may have even been increased but the market did come back.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Indeed that is what lead to the row between the Premier and Mr. Smallwood. I do not propose to go into it. I think it is past history but there was a row because

before the northeastern fish thing closed there was a lot of backing and forthing about government guaranteed loans and so forth and that is what led to the row between Mr. Smallwood and the gentleman who succeeded him as Premier, the Member for Humber East.

The fact remains, Sir, that the market is not giving us the return which we need. If fish were selling for a dollar a pound it may. We would have no problems. Indeed, if fish were selling for eighty cents a pound instead of fifty-eight, if we held (not if we held. I am not saying that it is entirely up to us to do it) but if the price had held at what it was a year ago the fish plants then, a year ago were laughing, they were coining money. I do not know what they did with it all. I have no doubt it was all put to use and most of it good use but a year ago the fishing industry was thriving, the deep-sea fishing industry. They were all in looking for new plants, but that was in the halcyon days when National Sea were willing to go into Burgeo and new trawlers - you know, the order book which we heard about at Marystown - much of it was ordered at that time.

Everybody at that stage thought that everything was going great. The market seemed good and everything. Well the market has fallen off badly. I am given a lot of reasons. I am in no position to judge why it has fallen off. The Harris people I believe say that one of the reasons is the fact that beef prices have come down and many housewives who had switched to fish in preference to meat because meat had gone so expensively, now that meat has come down they have switched back to meat.

Certainly a number of years ago when the Roman Catholic Church removed the obligation to consume fish on Friday as a mark - I do not know the theological significance - but

AN HON. MEMBER: To refrain from meat.

MR. ROBERTS: To refrain from meat on Friday and that ceased to be an obligation laid upon members of that church, that had a disastrous effect on fish sales in the American market, perhaps a tribute to the strength with which the members of the Roman Catholic Church assumed the obligations that their church lays as a condition of adherence,

during the Lenten Season in particular.

There is no doubt as well that the Alaskan Pollock, is it? The minced fish and the Alaskan Pollock had knocked the bottom out of our market. It was selling at twenty-two cents a pound, I think, and we were trying to sell out fish at eighty and eighty-five. They were in many ways, I am told, a comparable product. At least it seemed in the market acceptability. The Japanese product was made up into fish fingers. They finally found the fish that nobody ever thought they could find, a white, firm fleshed, non-oily fish. Of course, that is what is codfish or the British call it white fish. It is non-oily, it does not have a fishy taste a lot of people say. Although how fish cannot have a fishy taste I do not know. Although people speak English with an English accent, so I do not understand that either.

But it is white and it is firm-fleshed and when minced up and made into fillets or into portions of one sort or another, breaded or fish sticks or what have you, apparently it was comparable in the consumer markets. That quickly showed up in the buying through the Gloucester brokers.

This Minister of Industry looks quizzical. Have I offended him in some way?

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: No. Many people say that codfish, the white fish does not have a fishy taste. I think it has a very nice taste.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: I am told by market analysts in the States that one of the reasons the white fish sells so well is that in the eyes of many housewives, that mythical housewife, that it does not have a fishy taste.

MR. DOODY: You are really gone beyond me now.

MR. ROBERTS: It is not hard to get beyond the minister but -

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, the point I am making and I am making it at some length because I think it is very basic and I think that if we

as a House do not deal with it and if the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada do not deal with it, then this crisis will be resolved and will only be postponing the next crisis. That point is that we must come to grips with the whole question of where we sell our product.

We will come to grips, I believe, with making sure there is something to catch. Very important! Unless there is something to be caught and unless it can be caught at an economic price then there will be no fishery. Dr. Harris makes that point and a number of people have made it and it is irrefragable.

But equally, Mr. Speaker, unless we can sell that fish and unless we can sell it at a price that will enable us to pay the costs, then there will be no fishery either. I feel very strongly that this present crisis which is going to require, I think, for the first time, and I believe the Government of Newfoundland and the Government of Canada will do it, they seem to be indicating that, it is going to require direct and continuing subsidization to some degree by public funds of the fishing industry in a way that has never been done before. Up until now there have been grants made or loans made or there have been programmes of one sort or another, everything from salt rebates to building trawlers and the assisting with building trawlers and plants and what have you.

Indeed I suppose Your Honour, if you would add up the investment in the fishing industry in Newfoundland the last, take any period you want, five years or fifty years, you would find that I do not suppose five per cent of it is private, ninety-five per cent is public whether it be the Government of this Province or be it the Government of Canada. There is so little private money that has been put into the fishing industry that it is almost pathetic. I do not know if they could have put any more in or not. It does not matter how much they did put in, what is in is in, but it is a public industry now, public particularly when there are problems. We did not hear from the fish plant operators about their economic troubles when they were making a lot of money. There was no thought then given to long range planning. There was talk about the resource, yes, of course. So there should have been. The far greater problem is the economic problem because if we cannot sell it, Mr. Speaker, it is no good catching it. We cannot store it very long. One of the problems in marketing frozen fish is that it has a limited shelf life. Again people argue about how long it can be kept but I do not know, the minister might carry the figure. Is two years the maximum period in which frozen fish can be held?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, but it is of that order. It is not like - Well, I think they hold it a year at certain temperatures and they get down to very, very low temperatures another year and -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, my colleague who knows a great deal about the fisheries says over a year and indeed I have heard within the past week that there has been Newfoundland fish sold in the United States between twelve and twenty cents a pound, fish that has been held in storage for longer than a year and it is a matter of just getting it out. I understand every cold storage facility between here and Florida is choc-a-block with fish that cannot be sold. I mean I am told that. I pass it on. I believe it but I have no way to testify to it. I certainly have not checked every cold storage facility myself.

The problem is not just one of resources, Sir. The problem is very much one of marketing. I think that when we look at this resolution and when we look at the measures that must be taken to deal with our fisheries and solve this problem, we must bear that in mind. You see, we now have a problem. We have a problem in that our trawler fishermen are no longer going to settle for less than what they consider to be a fair wage and of course, the minimum has now been set. The \$13,000 figure that the Harris Report recommended is now the minimum. That is part of the problem because the companies say they cannot pay it and I do not think there is any argument with the fact that the companies cannot pay it. I have no doubt that if the companies had to pay \$13,000, they would not do it because they could not do it. They might pay it for a week or a month or a year but eventually they would go out of business. So, here it is square in the minister's lap, square in the Minister of Fisheries' lap at Ottawa.

I think this gives us a great opportunity. I think the Minister of Fisheries and I would be the first to say it publicly if he can do it. has the opportunity to revolutionize the fisheries in this Province. At this stage I am talking only about the deep sea fishery, the trawler fishery, the year round fishery, whatever you want to call it.

Now, there are four or five ways, Mr. Speaker, that we can approach the present problem. The two extremes are on the one hand, to nationalize the industry, whatever that might mean and on the other hand to just stand back and let her go and see what happens. It would be irresponsible almost

criminally so to advocate either course in my view. Nationalization will not solve any of the problems facing our fishing industry and I think the minister would agree with me.

The only people who would be happy if this industry were to be nationalized now would be the owners who would promptly have all their capital out, free and

clear and I am sure once a year from Switzerland or from Nassau or from where ever they chose to retire to send us lovely little postcards "Think of you." Having a wonderful time." "Glad you are there and we are here." That is no solution, merely to nationalize it and buy out the owners. It did not solve any of the problems in Burgeo, to buy it out. I confess that we started it and the present crowd compounded it by the price they paid.

MR. DOODY: It solved quite a few problems in Burgeo.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it resolved the labour difficulty but it -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Right. That is why we said we would buy it and that is why the government bought it. But it has not solved the economic problems. It has not solved the difficult - and it will not solve any problems now in the industry merely to have the government, be it the Government of the Province or the Government of Canada at Ottawa, buy out the owners. All it will do is give the owners whatever they have in it, \$1 million, \$2 million, \$3 million, I have no idea what the book value of their share is. None at all.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It would be considerable.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it would be considerable because they have been earning money over the years, while it might not be free cash, the equity does go up all the time. Not only would it be considerable, it would be a waste of money in a sense of solving any of the problems. So I think nationalization is out.

I think equally, nobody for a moment could countenance simply the laissez-faire attitude, standing back and letting her go. Nobody has advocated it. I am just laying out the range of options. I suspect what would happen if everybody said that, is most of the plants would close immediately. There would be no problem of getting men to crew the trawlers. There would be no trawlers to sail. No company would want to hire anybody to go to sea. The plants would close and when the inventories came down and when the market came up to the point where it was worthwhile to go to sea there would be a deal made and whether it was \$13,000 or \$15,000 there would be a deal made, a contract would be signed, a number of the trawlers

would go back to sea and away we would go.

If we just let market forces have their play, that is essentially what would happen. Again, that is beyond argument and again nobody could for a moment countenance that and it would be the death of the South Coast. The Minister of Fisheries when he spoke of the importance of the fishery to Newfoundland gave some figures and his figures and mine agree. The figures are correct. We have about 21,000 people directly employed in the fisheries of Newfoundland including the inshore, the offshore and the plant workers. About 5,300 of them I am told work in the year round plants and there are about 1,400 fishermen employed on the deep-sea boats. So you are talking 6,700 permanent jobs, if you wish, year round jobs. The others are seasonal ones.

The Minister of Fisheries touched upon but did not stress what I consider the most important fact about the fisheries in Newfoundland. It is true it employs eleven per cent or twelve per cent in round numbers of our present work force. Mr. Sneaker, large parts of this Province live or die on the fishery. It is not a revolutionary thought. Everybody would agree with that. It was worth stating again. If the trawler fishery, if the year round deep-sea fishery does not operate between St. John's if you wish, the plant here, Fermeuse, Trepassey and right across the Southwest Coast to Jim Hardy's plant in Port Aux Basques, there would be economic disaster on a scale never before imagined in Canada. I do not know of any area of Canada that has ever taken a blow like that. I know Elliott Lake when the uranium mines closed, Elliott Lake sort of went out of existence. Bell Island, we have seen that sort of thing. If the base were ever to cease to operate at Goose Bay we would have the same sort of problem.

These are just a community as important as that is. The entire South Coast of the Province would just cease to have a reason to exist. So we cannot just stand back and do nothing. Nobody has advocated that.

Well, I suggest, Sir, there are two ways in between. I would suggest that one of them is the right way and one is the wrong way for

governments, here and at Ottawa to proceed in this crisis. One is the traditional answer, the answer that has been followed over the years and that is to bail them out, to patch them up, to keep them going, call it the bandaid solution,

make them a grant or a loan or a subsidy, it does not matter. Put public money in to keep her going as she now is. I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: That is out.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I agree that is out. You know, the minister and I can agree on most of this but the point is, that is an impossible solution. It has been the answer by all levels of government and I venture to say, by all political parties in the past. So we agree that is out. The band-aid solution is out. That leaves I submit, Mr. Speaker, only one possible solution. Again, I am not talking about the immediate, short-range, tomorrow problem of an agreement between the fishermen, the trawler fishermen and their employers to keep the plants operating. That is a separate thing and indeed, one of the ironies of this debate is that we are taking a very particular case - maybe it is the lawyers because there are too many lawyers involved in this - a very particular case, a report of a conciliation board into a specific dispute. A large dispute, a significant one but a specific dispute and from that we are quite properly and quite importantly debating the much larger question of the whole future of the fishery.

The fourth alternative, the one which we should follow and I am quite sure the government agree with this, I would assume and hope the Government of Canada do as well, is to restructure this industry, to put a price tag on the millions that are going to go in. And it is going to be millions, Mr. Speaker. I have no idea how many but I suppose it depends on what formula is worked out. I have heard figures being discussed ranging from thirty-five to seventy million dollars a year out of public funds being necessary to be dumped into the deep-sea fishing industry to keep the plants going. I do not know if they are correct.

MR. CROSBIE: That is Eastern Canada.

MR. ROBERTS: Ah! But the Government of Canada must, as the minister would agree, look on Eastern Canada, and Newfoundland is a very large portion of Eastern Canada. What are we? Two-thirds of the fishing

effort in Eastern Canada is us? So we are talking twenty millions for Newfoundland.

MR. CROSBIE: (Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS: No, but the point is, it has a million dollars, it is going to be a large sum of money. Tens of millions. A very large sum. I think that we have a right as a government, the Government of this Province, the Government at Ottawa, to say that (I shall adjourn this in a minute because I assume we are not going to meet this evening. It is nearly six but let me finish with this thought) we as the public and custodians of the public treasury have the duty and a very strong duty to say to the companies, to the industry (the companies are more concerned with this aspect than the union) to the unions as well if need be, that the price of government aid, the price of public money is a complete and a thorough restructuring of this industry. We are not going to go on to solve this crisis and have another one a year or two or three from now.

We have had too many and I submit, that that is the importance, the crucial importance of this debate, of this crisis and of the action which will follow from it.

Mr. Speaker, it is about six o'clock. If it is in order I shall move the adjournment of the debate and the government, I assume, will then adjourn - or unless Your Honour - anyway, I will move the adjournment of the debate if that is the right thing to do.

MR. SPEAKER: Let it be noted that the honourable the Leader of the Opposition adjourned the debate and will be given the first opportunity to proceed next day if he so desires.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Monday, December 9, 1974, at 3:00 p.m.