



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 22

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, APRIL 1, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

HON. JOHN C. CROSBIE (Hon. Minister of Fisheries): Mr. Speaker, I think we should take note of the anniversary date today, this is the twenty-sixth anniversary of the Province's Confederation with Canada. Of course, last year was a special occasion on the twenty-fifth anniversary. But I do not think we should let the day go without officially noting that this is our twenty-sixth year of Confederation. And I am sure that all members of the House hope that we will have another good year this year as a part of the Canadian Confederation as we have had in increasing measure over the last twenty-five.

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

AN HON. MEMBER: Just take note that Joey is in good health.

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (Leader of the Opposition): He is getting ready, getting ready.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, on this side, we would like to join in taking note of the anniversary. Actually, Your Honour, it is twenty-six years and one day today, because, as is well-known, Confederation did not come on this first day of April, but rather at one minute before midnight on March 31, 1949. Confederation has been not only good for Newfoundland, it is hard to conceive where Newfoundland would have been today without Confederation. It has shaped our lives, and it has shaped them very much for the better. The years ahead, I would hope, will be even more productive for Newfoundland, more productive as a member of the Confederation.

I also feel, Mr. Speaker, that the next twenty-six years will and I hope in fact they will bring, I believe they will see and I hope they will bring a change in the nature of Confederation. The last twenty-six years, Sir, and even today we have been a "have-not" Province. I would hope that during the next twenty-six years, Sir, Newfoundland will become a "have" Province and thus play an even fuller role in Confederation than we have. But I think the House Leader is well-advised to take note of it. It was an auspicious day in Newfoundland's history, a day that has brought betterment and brought joy and brought better conditions in every way to all the people of Newfoundland. I think it is only fitting that we, as a House of Assembly, should commemorate it. And I think also we should commemorate, without getting into current politics, both present and wishful on the part of honourable gentlemen opposite, to commemorate the role played by, both by Mr. Smallwood and by the men who worked with him. We would not have had Confederation in 1949 if it had not been for the work of Joey Smallwood and the men who worked with him, including, I may say, the honourable gentleman's father who, although he did not sign the Terms of Union for reasons which he stated publicly at the time, worked long and hard to make Confederation come once the decision of the people had been rendered in the two Referendums, particularly the second one, and then after Confederation worked equally hard at being a good Canadian and making Confederation work and making Newfoundland a part of the Canadian Confederation.

So in noting the anniversary, we should note the contribution of those who made it possible. I think it is only fitting that this House, on this anniversary, should note both these events, the men and the event itself, and I would hope would recognize them in an appropriate fashion. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

HON. H. COLLINS (Minister of Forestry and Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, in view of several misleading statements that have been given to the press during the last couple of days with regards to the operation

of Eastern Provincial Airways in Gander, I would like to try and clarify the situation. First of all, I would like to say that the President of E.P.A., Mr. Keith Miller, announced some weeks ago that his company intended to consolidate their mainland operations from the various points, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Quebec into Halifax for the simple reason that it made good economic sense.

At that time the President, Mr. Miller, saw fit to come to the Province, the provincial government. He also had meetings with the Gander Chamber of Commerce, I understand, and certainly with the Gander Town Council to explain to the people involved just what was happening so that nobody would misunderstand the approach which E.P.A. was taking to the overall economic problem.

The people who are moving into Halifax, it is not a case of providing new jobs, it is a case, Mr. Speaker, of consolidating the operation, moving people from the ends of the various routes into the Halifax area for resting purposes and for training purposes. I might add that within the next two or three days, certainly within the next week, the headquarters of E.P.A. at Gander will be moving into a new facility, a new building, not a new building, but a building which has been renovated extensively to the tune of about \$2 million. All their headquarters staff will be moving in there within the next week.

I would also

like to point out that negotiations are now in progress with this government, the provincial government, with the Government of Canada, in connection with the establishment of a major maintenance and servicing facility at the Gander Airport. The idea behind this is that all the maintenance work on the six 737 jets and the additional jet which is coming in pretty soon, plus all the other different types of aircraft which are used on the Mainland to service Mainland points, all those aircraft will have all their maintenance done at the Gander facility.

In addition to that what is known in the trade as "D" checks which heretofore has been done in Vancouver, or at the factory in the US, all those checks will be made available and - not make available, all those checks will be performed at the new facility when it is provided.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the provincial government, always cognizant of what is going on with EPA, the need for maintaining the growth of EPA activities in Gander, sometime ago gave approval to a major extension of the Gander District Vocational School. I think the cost is in the order of \$1 million and one of the main reasons for that is to provide facilities for training young Newfoundlanders in the trades of aircraft mechanics and aircraft frames mechanics, that is aircraft engine mechanics and aircraft frames mechanics.

EPA anticipate that when those services are performed at Gander that an additional eighty to ninety top paid mechanical types, engineering types of jobs will be made available. Now with the extension to the District Vocational School in Gander, we hope to be ahead of the game to the extent that young Newfoundlanders will have been in there, will have obtained their degrees, their certificates, whatever it is they do obtain at the vocational schools. The courses are accredited by the Department of Transport so that when

those jobs come on stream, young Newfoundlanders will be ready to go in there and take the jobs.

My reason, Mr. Speaker, for bringing up this, I think that a lot of people have been a little mischievous, if you might call it that, in trying to stir up some doubts in the people's minds. Certainly in Gander during the years there has been enough doubts, adequate doubts stirred up, people have been tormented by statements here and statements there, what is going to happen and what is not going to happen and I want to put it on record that this government reaffirms its faith in EPA by doing everything in their power, along with EPA, to ensure that the company not only maintains its Gander operation but that the thing grows and expands.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable Member for the District of Gander did not make it clear, Sir, whether he was speaking as the government's representative on the Board of Directors of EPA, if in fact he is, if in fact the member is on the Board of Directors of EPA, or if he was speaking as a minister speaking on behalf of the government or speaking as the Member for Gander District. The minister did not make that clear, Sir, because I am not quite sure whether this matter comes under the minister's department or the Minister of Industrial Development.

The minister, Mr. Speaker, also did not make it clear whether or not the Province had made a bid to get this new hangar that is being constructed in Halifax at the cost of several million dollars, if the provincial government here in Newfoundland had made a bid to get that moved to Gander. When they were making the move, Mr. Speaker, the honourable minister did not make it clear, the move was going to be made anyway, did the Government of Nova Scotia outbid the Government of Newfoundland, did they give any concessions to EPA? Why, if it was being moved, could it not be moved to Gander? This is the question, Sir, this is the thing that is bothering people. Why? If they are

going to consolidate why not consolidate a movement to Gander and
move -

MR. COLLINS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I listened to what the member said, Sir, and I could see no justification at all for consolidating the operation in Halifax when it could have been consolidated in Gander just as well. All the facilities are there and the minister did go on and tell us, Sir, about the expansion to the vocational school and all the other wonderful things that are being done in Gander to accommodate EPA and so forth. So why not? We are just as good as Nova Scotia, Sir. Our people are just as well qualified. Why not consolidate in Gander rather than Halifax. The minister, Sir, did not clarify this matter at all. As a matter of fact all he did was muddy up the water a little more.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I will see if I can clear it up a little bit for the honourable member, he just -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Okay the honourable Leader of the Opposition -

MR. ROBERTS: I think Your Honour is about to make a ruling on the point I raised without my needing to raise it, but the honourable gentleman has no right to engage in a further debate with the gentleman from Bell Island anymore than the gentleman from Bell Island has no right, nor did he, enter into a debate with the gentleman from Gander.

MR. SPEAKER: That was the point I was about to make. I think the point might be able to be raised at another time, but I am afraid we could get into a debate on the whole matter at the present time. Before I recognize another honourable member

I would like to welcome to the galleries today Mr. William Wiscombe, Mr. Frank Kennedy, two councillors from the Marystown Council and Mr. Danny Cochrane, the Town Manager of Marystown. On behalf of all honourable members I welcome you here.

The Hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations,
HON. E. MAYNARD (MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS): Mr. Speaker, I have two short statements here, one regarding the appointment of an Assistant Deputy Minister of Manpower. After the appointment of Mr. May, the former Assistant Deputy Minister of Manpower to the Chairmanship of the Workmen's Compensation Board, ads were run in various papers inviting applicants to fill the vacant position. Thirteen applications were received and a selection committee of senior government officials was set up to interview the applicants and to make recommendations.

The Committee reported to me a few weeks ago, and I am now pleased to announce the appointment of Mr. Robert K. Langdon as the new Assistant Deputy Minister of Manpower with the department. The appointment comes at a fairly critical period when the Province is deeply involved in the formulation of comprehensive manpower policies. Mr. Langdon's background will serve well in that category. He was born in 1936, a native of Northern Arm North, Botwood. Mr. Langdon has held various jobs with provincial and federal governments over the years. He is a former Field Apprenticeship Supervisor with the Newfoundland Department of Labour. He has been Principal of two vocational schools. For the last seven years he has been serving in various categories with the Canada Manpower Department in Eastern Canada. At the present time he is a training consultant for Canada Manpower in Newfoundland and Labrador. The appointment will become effective in mid-April.

I would also like to make a short statement regarding the appointment of members to the Buchans Task Force. On February 15, 1975 a meeting was held at Buchans to discuss, in general, procedures to be used to investigate and report on the future viability of the town, as per the recommendations of the Dyer Industrial Inquiry

Commission Report. There were sixteen people from government and various organizations in the area, union, town councils etc. at the meeting.

The concensus was reached at that meeting that the best procedure to be followed would be the establishment of a Task Force consisting of the following; three representative of government, one to act as chairman, one representative of the town council, one representative of the company, one representative of the Development Association, one representative of the union, and one representative of the town at large to be drawn from the area of the Town of Buchans which is not represented by the elected council.

I do not have the names of all of the members being appointed by the various bodies at this time. But they have made their selections, as I understand them. The three government members of the Task Force will be Mr. Langdon, whom I just made an announcement on, is to be appointed the Assistant Deputy Minister of Manpower, and he will act as chairman. The other two members will be Mr. J. A. Brennan, Assistant Deputy Minister of Forestry, and Mr. John Allston, the Senior Planner with the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

I will be asking the Chairman to convene a first meeting of the Task Force as soon as possible and he will be in contact with the other parties involved within the next few days.

We are hopeful that the Task Force will present a report to government by the end of 1975 but in any case we are asking that the Task Force report back within a period of one year at the most.

The Task Force will be directed to decide on various alternatives measures that government may take to ensure the future of the town in the event that the mines may close in the next three to four years.

While I am on my feet, Mr. Speaker, I would like to make just a very short announcement, I have been informed by the union, the fishermen's union, the President, Mr. Richard Cashin, that the dispute with Bonavista Cold Storage Company with their plants in Grand Bank

April 1, 1975

Tape 877 (Afternoon)

PK - 3

and elsewhere has been settled. The Bonavista Cold Storage Company has agreed to accept the same terms and conditions as the other five companies. I would assume that the strike is going to be over.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, first of all with reference to the minister's third announcement, that we, of course, welcome as enthusiastically as does he the news that the hold-out company, the Bonavista Cold Storage people have now agreed to make and to accept the same settlement that the other five companies involved in the trawlermen's dispute accepted last week. I know that will be welcome news to all concerned, the people of Grand Bank, the people of Fermeuse and the people who are affected directly by those operations.

Now with respect to the statement the honourable gentleman made about the Buchans Task Force, Mr. Speaker, we are delighted that at long last the minister has been prodded into action with respect to this important subject. He has doddled and doodled and dipsied and dandied but at last he has acted, and I would hope that the few gentle reminders advanced by my colleague from Bell Island during the debate on the Manpower estimates last week, helped somewhat to prod the minister.

The announcement, however, Mr. Speaker, does not really deal with the problem. This is not the place to debate it but it is the place to say, Sir, that the community of Buchans, according to the Dyer Report - and nobody has seriously challenged the evidence put forward and the conclusions arrived at by Professor Dyer in his report - the community of Buchans is under a death sentence. That report says that known reserves of the mine will run out in a period, I believe, three to five years but a very short period indeed. It suggests that the appointment of the Task Force as being a positive and forward looking step that the administration could take. It has taken the government a number of months, I do not have the precise number here, but it has been the better part of a year to do something

as simple as appointing a committee. When they have done it, they still have not done enough. It is not enough, Mr. Speaker, to say that the government hope that the Task Force will report to the government by the end of the year. I think the Task Force should be mandated to hold public hearings in the Buchans area to begin with. They should be mandated to make recommendations with respect to the future of Buchans and to what can be done to provide alternate employment. The only reason people went to Buchans to live was the opening of the mine there some fifty years ago. If that mine is to close there will have to be an alternate source of employment provided for the people of Buchans or there will be no economic reason to have a Buchans.

The minister's statement is an extreme disappointment. It has taken him too long to come to it. He has not put a deadline on it for recommendations. He has not asked nor directed the commission to hold public hearings so that the people of Buchans and any others who are interested can be involved. I find it amazing that there is no representation from the Department of Mines and Energy which presumably would have had a major, and hopefully will have a major input into the work of the committee. The Department of Industrial Development is not involved in the membership in the committee. I said we have one man from Manpower and a very fine man indeed. He sounds to be. Secondly, we have Colonel Allston, the planner, a municipal planner, a man skilled in making regulations and administering regulations about land use and the like. Who is the third?

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Brennan.

MR. ROBERTS: And we have Mr. Brennan, one of the senior foresters and a man very knowledgeable in the field of forestry. Maybe all these men have something to bring to that Task Force. But, Sir, the Industrial Development Department should be there

and so should the Mines and Energy Department.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by saying that in this Province, the history of these task forces, be they federal or be they federal-provincial or be they entirely provincial, has not been at all a happy one. We all remember the situation at Placentia and the Placentia area a few years ago. We all recall the on-going saga of Goose Bay where the Task Force to date seems to have produced very little. I would hope the Buchans Task Force will not follow this precedent. We are facing the possibility of a very real tragedy at Buchans, the whole reason for existence of a community of 3,000 people being removed, it is incumbent upon the government to act and to act now. The Task Force is but a very tiny step. I would hope the minister, shortly, will be in a position to take major steps and certainly we will be prodding to do that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I do not know if the honourable Member for Bell Island is rising to speak to this statement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: It has been the custom of the House to allow replies to ministerial statements by the Leader of the Opposition or representatives of that particular portfolio. I think the honourable Leader of the Opposition has made a few comments with regards to this announcement. I am not prepared to recognize anybody else at the moment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister made three statements, Sir, in one, three in one.

MR. DOODY: - the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: My colleague commented on two, Sir, two of the statements.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The Chair has made a ruling. It is not prepared to recognize -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do you mean to tell me I cannot comment on the first part of the minister's statement.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! That is correct.

MR. NEARY: What have we got, closure, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Although the names of the honourable gentlemen have not been brought to my attention, I have been informed that we have some councillors from Summerford and New World Island in the gallery and I would certainly welcome these gentlemen to the galleries today.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: I would like to file several copies of the Fish Inspection Amendment regulation of 1974.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social

Services, Sir, would the minister care to tell us if this situation that developed down here at the parking lot of the stadium yesterday in the give-away Santa Claus-like parade, the situation like the Da Nang situation, if that has been corrected?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Has the minister taken steps to correct this situation where they had a free for all down there?

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The member's question is out of order. It is very argumentative.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Tourism, Sir, could tell us when he expects the Norma and Gladys to set sail for Japan?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. T. HICKEY, MINISTER OF TOURISM: Should I take two weeks, I wonder? Mr. Speaker, I am sorry I cannot inform the House at this point. There are still negotiations going on with the federal government and I anticipate in about a week to two weeks there will be an official and final announcement on the world cruise.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary question for the minister, Sir, Would the minister care to tell us if the Norma and Gladys will be sailing to Japan under a Canadian flag or under the new Newfoundland flag?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know how long I have to answer that but I could go on for the next week and give the honourable gentleman a dissertation on flags. But if he has got a suitable one, we are easy to get along with. We are open to consideration.

MR. NEARY: Sir, supplementary, would the minister care to tell the House how much this voyage is going to cost to send this ship to Japan to take part in the Expo 75 Celebrations.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have already stated, I am not in a position to confirm or deny at this point that there will even be a trip to Japan by the Norma and Gladys. There has been a number of

statements indicating that we are hopeful of such a trip, of such a voyage. When a final decision has been made and when the negotiations are completed, complete details as to cost, trip, the whole bit package will be given.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder when the minister releases the details if he would include, include in these details, whether or not she will be carrying a load of flippers or whether they will be eating rice when they get to Japan.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! This question is certainly out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if I could direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Would the minister care to inform the House if the stretch of road between Bunyan's Cove and Port Blandford, that ten mile stretch that has been closed for the last two weeks is open yet or is it still closed?

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

HON. J. ROUSSEAU, MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS:

No, actually Bunyan's Cove to Port Blandford is closed to all vehicular traffic.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate when this stretch of road will be open?

MR. ROUSSEAU:

As soon as possible. Men are working down there and we are trying to get the roads open and keep them open. They are soft. We are trying to get the crushed stone and shale on all the roads and get them in passable condition. As soon as it is possible, we will.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister care to tell the House whether there is any equipment working on this stretch of road yet? What kind of equipment is there, and is it graders or bulldozers? What kind of equipment is being used to try to upgrade this road and get it open?

MR. ROUSSEAU: I do not have any idea. I really do not. There is equipment down there -

MR. NEARY: The minister would not be laughing -

MR. ROUSSEAU: What equipment is down there, I do not know. You know, there is equipment down there and it is working on the road.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell us on another stretch of road, Sir, that has to do with the same area, on the stretch of road between Bunyan's Cove and Musgravetown where only trucks, I understand, can use that road. Now, what is being done to upgrade that road so cars can move back and forth freely over it because that is the last hope the people have to get out of that area down there?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, if I may. I will give the full report and then he can, you know, - and this is the morning's road report. All roads on the Avalon Peninsula, Clarenville and Central Newfoundland are open except Bunyan's Cove to Port Blandford which is closed to all vehicular traffic. In Western Newfoundland overnight snow has blocked the following roads: the junction of Roddickton Road to Green Island Cove; Green Island Cove; St. Anthony air strip including Cook's Harbour; St. Anthony air strip to Goose Cove; St. Anthony to L'Anse-au-Meadow; Raleigh including St. Carols; Port au Port Peninsula; Blanc Sablon; Pinware; Pinware to Red Bay.

Side roads are blocked in the following areas: Daniel's Harbour to the junction of Roddickton Road, Codroy Valley. All snow clearing equipment is working. The roads are expected to be opened to day. Trans-Canada-Highway from Baie Verte junction to

Port aux Basques is very slippery due to freezing rain overnight. Most gravel roads are on half load limit restrictions and some are rough and soft. Fairly good driving conditions.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Could we have the steamer report?

MR. NEARY: Celsius or Fahrenheit? Celsius or Fahrenheit?

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my honourable friend and colleague, the Minister of Social Services.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. MURPHY: Just ask the question. -

MR. NEARY: Well, here is the question. I thought we were great friends, Sir. Would the minister care to comment on public statements made by the superintendent of the UC Home that all the children over there in that Home have not yet been looked after? Would the minister care to comment on that?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, very pleased to, Mr. Speaker. With reference to that I was phoned by The Evening Telegram on Sunday, I believe, at my home, with reference to this position of the children out of the United Church Home on Hamilton Street into other areas. I did tell them, Sir, that all arrangements had been made some months previously for to look after these children. I was rather surprised to read in The Daily News this morning that the lady who was an employee there, a trusted employee, had apparently contacted someone and said this is not so.

So, I did check and apparently the group Home on Patrick Street had experienced some sewerage problems over the weekend and a transfer could not be made of eight. One child had been already ready for adoption, I will not go into it, but for medical reasons just was not allowed at this moment to be taken out of the Home. We have a brother and sister there who are being placed outside of St. John's in a foster home, but again, for medical reasons they were asked to keep the couple of children, the brother and sister within easy reach of the Janeway Hospital for certain

reasons. So, for that reason, Sir, we could not immediately affect the changes that had been looked after or had been arranged for to take place over the weekend.

So, that is the story on it, Sir. As soon as the Patrick Street Home is ready, that could happen in twenty minutes, half an hour this afternoon, that will look after the eight for the group Home. The others, Sir, are really dependent on medical advice and for no other reason, but arrangements have been made, but the children's welfare comes first. So, the best laid plans of mice and men, you know, so on and so forth.

So, there is no need for consternation, no need to line up in the Avalon Mall to get petitions or anything else on this Home. Everything is under control, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation. Would the minister care to indicate to the House, Sir, whether or not he has received a request from a senior citizens' home, privately operated in Porterville, in the great District of Lewisporte, for financial assistance and if so, if the minister has received a request would the minister care to indicate to the House what action has been taken on that request?

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

HON. T. DOYLE (Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation): Yes, Mr. Speaker, such a request was received and the request, as such, does not qualify under the existing specifications of my department for such funding and the applicant has been so advised.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Is the minister aware that if financial assistance is not forthcoming that this home will be forced to close? It will either be sold or closed, leaving about twenty-odd senior citizens out in the street with nowhere to go. Is the minister aware of that? And if so, what alternative plans does the minister have to take care of these senior citizens who will be forced to leave that home if it closes?

AN HON. MEMBER: A hypothetical question.

MR. DOYLE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is correct, it is a hypothetical question. First of all I should state very clearly that the home in question is a privately operated home, and it is not operated by my department nor any other department of government. And the owners of the home have in the past requested assistance from government and government at this point in time does not have any programme of the type of assistance which this owner is requesting. It has been operated purely and simply as a commercial enterprise, which there is nothing wrong with that. And to the best of my knowledge, whether or not the home is going to go out of business if certain funds are not supplied is purely speculative and hypothetical and one that I am not going to comment on.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Has the minister received any recent communication from Mr. Porter, who operates that home at Porterville? Because it is not speculation, Mr. Speaker. I am trying to find out from the minister, Sir, if he -

AN HON. MEMBER: To a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - has this correspondence -

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

The Hon. Member for Bell Island is certainly free to ask a question, but he is certainly giving a long preamble to asking a question, a supplementary question.

MR. NEARY: My point is that this is not speculation.

Does the minister have the recent -

MR. CROSBIE: To a point of order.

MR. NEARY: Does the minister have the recent -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman is not asking a question.

He wants to make a speech.

MR. NEARY: Ah, sit down!

MR. CROSBIE: He is not asking a question.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair has already said that it feels that the Hon. Member for Bell Island is having a long preamble and thus making a speech. If he wishes to ask a supplementary question, it should be very direct and very precise.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Does the minister have the most recent piece of correspondence issued by Mr. Porter, say about three or four days ago? When was the last time the minister had contact with Mr. Porter, either personally in writing or otherwise?

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, from memory, the last time that I have personally had contact with the gentleman in question, either correspondence or verbally, was approximately two to three weeks ago. I have seen no correspondence in the last three or four days in this matter.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the same minister Sir, is yet in a position to divulge the financial commitment made by the Province towards the summer games? I have asked the minister now about fifteen times for the answer to that question. I do not have it yet. Does the minister have the information he promised the House?

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to correct that statement somewhat. The honourable member did not ask me fifteen times. He asked me on several occasions. In the interim the budget speech was presented in this House and in that speech and the estimates contained therein, is a figure for the '77 Canada Summer Games to be held in St. John's.

MR. NEARY: For this fiscal year?

MR. DOYLE: That is correct.

MR. NEARY: What is the total amount? What is the total commitment?

MR. DOYLE: If the honourable member, Mr. Speaker, would let me finish, I will do so. I would be delighted, Mr. Speaker, when the opportunity presents itself, and I hope it will within the next couple of weeks in doing the estimates of the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation to give full plans of this government's forward thinking policies in recreation, including the Summer Games of '77.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

On motion of the honourable the Minister of Justice. a bill,

"An Act Further To Amend The Judicature Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

1401-01, fisheries.

The Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I spoke for about an hour on our last day making some general points in connection with the department. I have of course a lot of information to give the committee as we go down through various subheads. I think I touched all the general areas last week and I do not want to repeat it all now. I think just before I sit down that I might mention, of course, that there is a great deal of interest in the Province in improvements to the unemployment insurance formula for fishermen or in the development of an income support programme to replace the concept of unemployment insurance as it now pertains to fishermen. This was a commitment that has been made by the present Government of Canada, particularly during an election campaign in 1974, and of course even before that when Mr. Davis, who was then the minister, made certain suggestions for changes that were given to the government and to the trade and for the fishermen to have a look at and to comment on.

Now, since becoming Minister of Fisheries, on every occasion when I have been in Ottawa in connection with fishery matters, I have asked the federal minister what the position is on any new income support programme. All I can tell the House, of course, is what I am told myself, that this is being worked on by Mr. Leblanc and his officials and I guess others. They are looking at a variety of alternative approaches to income support for fishermen. There are all kinds of complications, of course, involved in this, and it is not something that is going to happen overnight. They are looking at various alternatives, perhaps guaranteed annual income or revising the present unemployment insurance system and considering cash failure insurance, and looking at the

suggestions that were made in the Davis proposal. These are all being studied.

I believe it is likely that some changes are going to be made this year. I do not think that they are immediately imminent. Whether these will be the final changes or not cannot be told as yet. Whether there will be any major change in the application of unemployment insurance to fishermen this year is still not clear. Of course, only the Government of Canada can clarify that, but they are working on it. It is a difficult and complicated task, but it is being worked on and we are keeping in touch with them and stressing the urgency of this matter to federal officials. Of course, they are well aware of it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, there is no question that in Newfoundland today the terms and conditions and the quirks of the unemployment insurance system have an absolutely fantastic impact on what can be accomplished because everything else seems to center around it, particularly in relation to the fishery. There is no question that the present unemployment insurance plan must be changed with reference to fishermen as it is distorting how the industry works. It is unfair in some of its aspects and it is a pressing matter that we hope the federal government will be able to come with the changes that have been promised this year or certainly before the end of the year.

Another point that I might make, Mr. Chairman, is that our impetus on the new drive that we are giving the development of the herring fishery on the Norther Peninsula and Labrador is being continued and we are not abating our efforts. Several weeks ago I had a meeting in Plum Point with the fishermen for the Northern Peninsula, St. Barbe North, concerning our plans for the herring fishery on that coast during the coming season and our invitation to the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation to participate in the arrangements we have made with them.

Tomorrow I will be going to Forteau, weather permitting, in Labrador South to meet with the fishermen of Labrador South or

at least the area from Red Bay to L'Anse-au-Clair, to Blanc Sablon, to discuss with them their particular problems, a lot of which, of course, involve the herring fishery and some in other fisheries in the area. As I will make clear when we get to the detail on my estimates, there is a major effort being put by the Department of Fisheries this year into improving facilities on the Coast of Labrador South. I believe there are funds provided in the estimates for the improvement and upgrading of five community stages along that coast and other work that will be done in that area partly as a result of the Royal Commission Report on Labrador services.

In order to further that and to meet with the fishermen first hand and to have their views, we did meet with four or five of them who attended the meeting at Plum Point, myself and officials of the department will be spending tomorrow in Labrador South weather permitting to hear from them. They have put in a brief to us. The brief is prepared by a member of the Extension Department of Memorial University who has put into written form their concerns and what they feel needs to be done in that area of the Province. It should be a very interesting day.

So, I think that I discussed a lot of the general points last time. On April 8 there will be another meeting with the federal minister to discuss the various options that are there now for the rehabilitation of the East Coast ground fishery. It is going to be a very important meeting because time is passing and shortly after that meeting presumably he will be making recommendations to his colleagues as to what is to be done by the Government of Canada at the end of April for the East Coast fishery because, of course, unless major government assistance is available there will be no such fishery this year.

One other point that might be made, Mr. Chairman - I think I made it last time but just to make it clear again - the Select Committee of this House which has been appointed by this House to consider the inshore fishery or to give various people who are interested in the inshore fishery in the Province a chance to make their views

known publicly, has been asked by the House to report by April 30. They have been told, and I think it has been said in this House, that if they find that deadline is too short, that the deadline will be extended although any interim report they want to make by April 30 would be welcome.

Now, when that Committee was set up, Mr. Chairman, we made it quite clear we are not expecting miracles from this Select Committee or the members of the House on the inshore fishery. The first purpose of it was to give everyone involved in the inshore fishery a chance to make their views known publicly as to what the problems are and any solutions they have to offer.

The second purpose of the committee is to give eight or nine members of this House a chance first hand to hear these representations and to give us their views as to what they feel needs to be done and what the result is of their experience in these hearings. No one is pretending that it is a royal commission or that it is going to be a report comparable to a royal commission. It will be a report from some of our members as to what impression they have gathered as to the problems of this moment and possible solutions, what suggestions do they have as the inshore fishery is starting up now and certainly by the end of April. That is why the time limit is there.

But, the main purpose of this committee is to focus more attention on the problems of our inshore fishery at this stage because the trawler strike in particular has taken a lot of attention away from them. So, we are not expecting that it is going to be a royal commission or give us any kind of a royal commission report. As to whether there will be a royal commission on the fisheries, only events will tell, but it is quite certain from all the studies that have now been carried out by the federal government and ourselves that all the basic information that affects the East Coast fishery of Canada is now being assembled. What has to be done is not to examine the problems any longer, but is to decide on what are the proper

steps to take to ensure that the industry is assisted through the next three to five years when hopefully the market and the resource will be back under control and in proper shape so that the industry can stand on its own feet once again. That is what has to be devised by the end of April in part and certainly during the rest of this year because a lot of the structural changes that are, I think, needed in the long run in the fishery will not be decided upon by April 30. It will take the rest of the year to work those out.

So, those are my

general remarks, Mr. Chairman. I will try and answer any questions as they are asked or posed or as we go down through the various items. And I am prepared to spend however much time the House wants to spend, naturally, on discussing these estimates.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, let me first of all say that with response to the minister's closing remarks I would think that any time we spent discussing the Fisheries estimates would be well spent. I think the minister comes to this Committee in a way that none of his predecessors have done, at least none of his immediate predecessors, and I suspect some of his not so immediate predecessors which share this unenviable distinction. I think the minister comes armed with knowledge. Furthermore, I think, the minister has made some serious study into the problems of the fisheries, and has done some hard thinking about some of the hard problems and even harder questions which we in Newfoundland are going to have to deal with. We are going to have to confront them. We are going to have to find some answers.

I think the time will be well spent just for the simple fact that the fisheries are so very, very important to Newfoundland. We do not need to go through it again in any detail, Your Honour. I assume we are all intimately familiar with the figures. These may not be the most up to date ones available but they are the most recent I have. The number of fishermen - and this is a matter more of art than of science because we have no definition of fishermen. We all know what a fisherman is. I mean that is no problem. But, I do not think any government department - and perhaps the minister could confer - there is really no list of who are the fishermen. I mean the minister made a policy statement recently which, I think, centered about that fact, and quite wisely maintained the traditional position of governments in Newfoundland these past couple of hundred years that really anybody who wants to go fishing can go fishing, and therefore is a fisherman.

The figures which I have show that there are approximately 15,300 fishermen in Newfoundland, fishermen or fishing related industries, and by far the greatest number of those,

of course, Your Honour, are in the inshore fishery. Indeed, I think, it is probably correct to say that approximately twelve per cent of our labour force at present, not the number employed, but the labour force, approximately twelve per cent, about one out of eight, would be employed directly or indirectly in the fishery. And that in itself makes the matter important, but then when you add on to that, Your Honour, the fact that in most parts of Newfoundland the fishery is really, if not the only reason for existence, it is the basic reason for the existence of communities, and of homes, and of, you know, society in every sense of the word.

Really, Your Honour, if you go around this Province, if you take aside a very few areas, Labrador West, the fisheries have no impact at all there except a few of the constituents who go out and possibly on the 24th. of May catch some trout or catch - indeed I do not know if they can go fishing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister who represents that constituency says a lot more than the few - their only interest in fishing as such is the sports fishing end of it. And I suspect there are a few other constituencies where that is true. Stephenville, the Town of Stephenville, one of the new seats of Stephenville is not terribly affected by the fishery. The district of Port au Port would be. There are a very few districts in Newfoundland, particularly, Your Honour, when we come to the Northeast Coast, that great stretch of coast that begins, I suppose, really begins about Bay-de-Verde, which is the first large fishing community. St. John's is one of the largest fishing communities in this Province, and it always has been. But, you know, if the fishery were to disappear from St. John's we would not have lost the economic base of this city. The city exists by taking in, essentially, to use a metaphor, the washing of the rest of Newfoundland and then laundering it and sending it out hopefully washed. Indeed a gentleman who once sat in this House, and no doubt, will again, Mr. Wells, Mr. Clyde Wells used to refer to St. John's as being a parasite.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: A colourful phrase, one which St. John's probably found offensive, but one which is not necessarily inaccurate in the sense of describing the economic role.

But, Your Honour, the point I am making is quite simply that this is the first time in this House we have had an opportunity really to discuss the fisheries in the way it should be discussed. I hope that, there is not exactly a full Chamber, indeed we have an understanding that there will be no quorum calls during the sittings of the Select Committee, but I think it is indicative of the fact that there are so few members here. I regret the fact that the Select Committee is not here, Sir. I know they are having sittings, and I know they have the right to have sittings, and I know that they are under a deadline. Still I regret very much the fact that the Chairman of that Committee when he realized that the fisheries estimates were to come on - and he must have realized it, because on Thursday when we rose the Minister of Fisheries finished his introductory remarks on this heading of his salary - I regret that the Chairman did not immediately get on the phone to his colleagues on that Committee, the eight or nine other members who service on the Select Committee and say, look, boys on Tuesday they are going to be doing estimates for the Fisheries Department. We are all interested in the fisheries, let us be there. Let us be there to see what is said, and see what we can learn. Let us also be there so that we can add to the debate.

And I resent that. I think it is unnecessary. The Committee could have just as easily - I know they have a full schedule - the Committee could have just as easily have sat tomorrow, as sit today in Carbonear and Placentia. One can get to Carbonear, and one can get to Placentia reasonably easy at any time. In view of the fact as the gentleman, the Minister of Fisheries has already pointed out the Committee have sort of been told that their 30th. of April deadline is a little flexible, that they could have easily taken the day and spent it here in the House.

Now, Sir, I listened with great interest to what the minister had to say. I think I have followed everything he said. And I must say he is the first Minister of Fisheries, and I am trying very carefully

to avoid getting into the sterile debate of the twenty or thirty men who held that portfolio over the years, but certainly he is the first Minister of Fisheries, in recent years, who has taken hold of that department. His immediate predecessor was an unfortunate experience for the fishermen of Newfoundland. Immediately before that the Premier was Acting Minister of Fisheries, and that was a charade. But the minister has taken hold of the department, and, I think, that is a very good thing. The minister - he has already gone after me, he may again - when he was appointed I said that I thought it was a demotion for him. I think it is. He may challenge that. He moved from being in a portfolio that is traditionally number two in the government to one that while it should be number two or number one is not.

While it was a demotion for the minister, I have no hesitation in saying that I think it may well have been the best thing to have happened to the fisheries certainly since this administration took office. And I would be prepared to say on judgment yet to be rendered that it may well have been the best thing in many, many years. For all of his reasons I listened with great interest to what the minister had to say. He cannot claim to be a fisherman by birth or even by descent. I suspect his ancestors abandoned the fishery fifty or one hundred years ago, about the same time as did mine. Indeed his grandfather and my grandfather were engaged in a - I was going to say - no I will not say it - but at least mutual business dealings which each of them intended to be to the other's disadvantage.

MR. DOODY: No wonder they both got out.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I am not sure whether they both did get out, Mr. Chairman. But the honourable gentleman cannot claim to have been descended from a long line of fishermen but he can claim, and in fact has brought to the fisheries a lively appreciation of the problems. Well, I hope so. I think it is necessary because the Newfoundland fishery today is beset on every hand by problems and by difficulties. The word crisis is overworked, it is a word that particularly those gentlemen who write radio news headlines dearly love, but I think it is

April 1, 1975

Tape 883 (Afternoon)

PK - 5

probably not inaccurate, Our fisheries today are approaching a crisis. They may be in the midst of a crisis. It may be about to burst upon us. But if it not already here or about to burst upon us, it is not very far away.

And I listened with great interest to what the minister had to say because I believe that he appreciates this fact. What he said was good as far as it went, but

did not go far enough. I would hope when the minister speaks either again in this debate on the minister's salary, and it is our hope on this side, Mr. Chairman, that in this department as with most others will have the extensive debate on the (01-01) heading, the minister's salary and then we will take whatever time the committee sees fit for this and then we will go down through the items, relatively quickly. If there is some question that we wish to ask we shall or if there is some comment the minister or one of his colleagues wish to make, well then of course they will.

The thing that struck me about the minister's speech was the fact that he offered no solutions. Now I am not saying that he should have offered a panacea, I am not sure that there is any all embracing solution to the problems of our fisheries. I am quite convinced there is no perfect solution. Fisheries have been studied and studied and studied and then studied some more. Over the years we have had royal commissions, task forces, high priced officials, smart politicians, we have had every kind of study that could possibly be imagined. But I think what is remarkable, what underlies all of the reports that have been submitted and all of the speeches that have been made is that nobody has come up as yet with the perfect solution. Most people who have approached the fisheries have not come up with any solutions.

I would hope the minister, when he speaks again, whether he speaks on this particular item or some other throughout the Fisheries Estimates, will outline to us the range of his thinking, the range of solutions which conceivably could be brought to bear. Some people advocate for example that we should nationalize the fisheries, by which I understand them to mean that we, the people, through the government, should buy out all of the private industries in the fisheries and they should all be held in the name of the Province or in the name of the Crown or some Crown Corporation or some publicly owned body,

be it provincial or be it federal-provincial or be it, for that matter, entirely federal.

I am unable to understand how that is an answer to the question. It may be a desirable move to make. I have nothing against the philosophy that there are some types of activity that the public should own and that only the public should own. It may well be that the fishery is such a line of activity. Nor do I have any argument with the philosophy that there are many types of activity that the government can effectively carry out. I do not think that anybody would for a moment suggest that we should, in Newfoundland or in Canada, allow private companies to build roads and then rent them out for toll roads. That could be done. There are countries in the world that need - we nearly got to that point at one stage in Newfoundland. There was a suggestion back in the late twenties that Mr. Henry Ford of the Ford Company, the original Mr. Ford was going to bail out Newfoundland, as I recall it. We were in financial difficulties then, as a Dominion as a country, and in return for that all he wanted was the simple concession of a - he was going to build a road across the island too, we would have had the Trans-Canada forty years earlier than we did, all he wanted in return was a very simple concession, the right to charge tolls on the Trans-Canada.

Well, I do not know how serious that proposal was and I do not recall the year in which it was made. It may have been when the Monroë Administration was in office or it may have been when the Squires Administration was in, but whatever administration was in, spurned it and scorned it. I do not think anybody would say anything about that. But the nationalization of the fisheries, Mr. Chairman, is not in itself an answer. There is a lot of public money in the fishery now and I think that gives us at the very least the right to control the fisheries, to control the activity of the fishing companies, but I am not sure that owning all the fishing companies and,

for that matter, owning all the fishing boats would take us any further forward. But it is one option.

There are a number of others which I could outline. The point which I am trying to make is that I would like the minister to give us some outline of his thinking, of the administration's thinking. The minister resisted the trap which many felt he might fall into, the trap which many of his colleagues have fallen into over the years of attacking Ottawa, of trying somehow to pretend that the answer to all Newfoundland's ills are in Ottawa. I think the answer to a great number of our problems lies in Ottawa. Ottawa has jurisdictional control of the fisheries that we do not and Ottawa much more importantly has access to sums of money that well beyond our means as a province.

But what sort of future does the minister see? What kind of fishery are we going to have? Are we in Newfoundland today on the verge of seeing happen in the fishery what has happened to our logging industry? Ten or fifteen years ago there were in Newfoundland 20,000 men who made part of their living from the logging industry. All along the Northeast Coast, all through Central Newfoundland, all down through Western Newfoundland, men would go into the woods camps or into the woods and log for a month or two or three, make a certain amount of money and then they would go the rest of the year and they would fish or they would work on the roads or they would farm. Most of them would fish, of course. We had what the economists tell me was sort of a plural economy.

Over the years, and a very few years indeed, Mr. Chairman, we have seen a fundamental change in the logging industry. I suppose today, Your Honour, there might be 3,000 men making a living out of the logging industry. They are making a very good living. Some of them, the men who work with the Bowaters Company, have just signed a contract for a very substantial rise in their wages. Almost without exception, Mr. Chairman, they are full-time loggers. They are men who have no other regular activity. They may be laid off for a month or two in

the Spring or in the Fall, most of them are off now because of the roads, the fact that the ice and frost is coming out of the ground and it is not possible to operate on woods roads, indeed it is not possible, as the Minister of Transportation told us earlier, it is not possible at times to operate even on the regular roads in parts of this Province right now. But are we going to see that in the fishery? Maybe we will. Then if we are going to, should we? Or should we try to prevent it? It is all very well to say that, you know, it is inevitable, that it is going to happen that we are going to have a full-time fishing industry, and certainly on the South Coast, the trawler fishery, the fishery which begins at Catalina, that is the most northerly port, to have trawlers fish into it now, it goes right around, I suppose Port aux Basques is the most westerly community with a fish plant now, there is nothing north of Port aux Basques by way of fish plants in which trawlers are based. That is essentially a full-time fishery now. That is very important. It is all-important to those areas, but it is not the numerically important fishery and it is not the fishery that is important to the other fishery, the fishery which is important to the Northeast Coast of the province. I am concerned about that fishery.

I think the problems of the trawler fishery are very real. I will say a few words on it a little later when I talk briefly about marketing and talk briefly about fish stocks. These are problems which affect the fishery, the trawler fishery. They also affect the inshore fishery, but what is the future for the inshore fishery? What ranges of choice do we have? Can we develop in Newfoundland a fishery that is part and parcel of the rural economy? I do not think it could be maintained, Your Honour, that we can develop along what I call for purposes of convenience, the Northeast Coast, but really is the ice bound coast because that is the distinction, Sir, the ports from Bonavista North, the outharbours from Bonavista North and around into the Straits of Belle Isle and then the Labrador Coast, particularly that southern coast from Lance aux Clair up to Red Bay and to Mary's Harbour,

I suppose all the way to Cartwright or the communities out of which the men fish because they do not fish out of Cartwright, as Your Honour knows, but they move to Cartwright in the Winter. In the Spring they move out onto the Coast to Tub Harbour and Packs Harbour and Spotted Islands and these communities and fish there.

That fishery is determined by the ice, by the Arctic ice and by the inshore ice. So it cannot be a year round fishery. It cannot be a year round fishery for the fishermen. Well then, what is going to be the future? We can extend, I believe, the role of the fish plants by trucking fish. Indeed, I understand that a certain amount of this has been done. Fishery Products have done a certain amount of this. They extended last year the season at Twillingate. The Fishery Products Plant at Twillingate worked longer than it previously had because fish was trucked into it. How far can we extend this? Can we do it at Bonavista? There is a fish plant there. Can we

do it at Twillingate? And we go up as far as LaScie, the next large fish plant going North. What about Englee and St. Anthony, the other two large plants along the Northeast Coast? What about Port au Choix, which has a longer fishery now. Port au Choix must be eight or nine months of a fishery now, but it is still closed for a period over the winter.

MR. F. ROWE : They are lucky to get nine months.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend and colleague from St. Barbe North says that they are lucky to get nine months. They are, but they get a longer season by several months than do people fishing just on the other side of the Northern Peninsula, who really do not fish very much beyond mid-November at the latest, and cannot get fishing in a normal year until well on into May. Last year it was July 12, and they were still losing nets through ice action.

Well maybe we will be able to extend the plants, the working season of the plants by trucking or for that matter by freezing fish round. Perhaps trawlers could operate into those plants and could - it would mean extra freezing capacity, holding capacity, Your Honour but large quantities of fish could be put ashore, frozen round, held there, and then processed over the months when now the plants are closed. I would like to hear the minister talk about this, whether he thinks this is a feasible idea, whether it is something that is going to be done. But what about the fishermen themselves? Can anything be done to extend their season? I think some steps can be taken, better boats, better equipment. We cannot do anything about the ice. You know that is beyond any man's control. But I am worried about the fishermen along the Northeast Coast. I have seen, even in the few years that I have been in public life, Your Honour, and I have come to know a little about the fishing along the Northeast Coast, about the life of the people

who depend on the fishery, I have seen what amounts to a quantum change in the fishery. I suspect we have seen more change in the traditional inshore fishery of Newfoundland in the last ten or fifteen years than were seen in the two or three hundred years before that. Up until a very few years ago, the fishery was an inshore fishery and most of it carried out by men who fished within sight of land and who came home, who came to their home community, their home port every night. Whether they salted their fish or whether they sold it fresh and then it was processed by a fish plant, in either case, they processed it quickly and their fishing income was a portion of their total income. It may have been a large part. It may have been a smaller part in some cases, but it provided an essential part of their income. And by turning to the fishery and by the other jobs that from time to time became available to them, working on roads or on construction or on logging or what have you, these men managed to make a living.

Well, I am coming to believe now that I do not think that that is possible any more. I think that has been the experience of my constituents. Of really anybody who has looked at the Northeast Coast would have to come to the same conclusion. The Storey Committee, the committee headed by Professor George Storey and Mr. Alexander and a number of other learned gentlemen from the university, really did not come to grips with that question. I had hoped they would. In that sense the committee's report was a disappointment. They assumed that the traditional plural economy could continue. I do not know whether it can.

MR. BARRY: Did not the commission say they agreed to the -

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Mines and Energy, I am not sure.

I have it here, but they may well have assumed. They certainly assumed that it should continue.

MR. BARRY: I think a Director of the Bargaining Committee said that they thought it would continue.

MR. ROBERTS: You know, they may well have come to the conclusion that it could continue, but they gave little attention to it. As my

colleague and friend from Bell Island says, they tended to direct their attention, first of all to the licencing question which they were asked to look into - well that is fair enough - and also into the marketing end of it. But we still do not know. I do not think anybody could put forward the Storey Committee Report as being at all a useful document on that point, the point of the future of the traditional inshore fishery or, I think, they use the terms, plural economy or something of that sort of thing that sociologists come up with, but the guy who makes part of his living fishing and the rest of it wherever he can.

MR. BARRY: You do not have the hard cold facts on the number of dollars they can make -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, we are lacking in data. Indeed, it is staggering. The minister, having been in government now for a year or two, would, I know, agree with us. It is staggering how much information there is and how little of it is really useful. Governments in Newfoundland, and I suppose in Canada, have vast whacks of information at their disposal but remarkably little of it is useful or is in form that is particularly helpful to policy makers. For example, as I mentioned, we do not know how many fishermen there are. We have no definition that I am aware of, even statistically, of what is a fisherman?

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, it would help to know whether we are talking about five per cent of the people of Newfoundland or fifty per cent.

MR. BARRY: Well, it depends. Maybe a definition of a fisherman for different purposes, for the purpose of income stabilization, that is one thing, and for the purposes of gear replacement maybe is another thing.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, as the minister says, the Minister of Energy, we can have different definitions for different purposes. And indeed the fishermen's fishing industry Collective Bargaining Act has a definition of fisherman in it that is about as embracing and all-

inclusive as it could be, which is a definition for that purpose, for the purpose of the Collective Bargaining mechanism.

The fact remains, on the inshore fishery, we just do not know exactly what is involved. We all have our ideas based to some extent on personal knowledge, based on our reading of history, based on what we know about the Province and what we have learned from our endeavours over the years. But the fact remains that we do not know what is going to happen along the Northeast Coast, and the people there, Mr. Chairman, are beginning to sense, and I detect a very real feeling of malaise.

I think Dr. Llewellyn Parsons who worked at the university on a recent study on Career Aspirations and Career Expectations of Students and of their Parents in Newfoundland was one of the most revealing documents that I have seen or read of in some considerable time. I do not propose to paraphrase what Dr. Parsons and his group came up with, but I think I am being accurate when I say that their finding was, with respect to the inshore fishery areas, the ice fishery areas, that very few parents wanted their children and very few of their children wanted themselves to enter the inshore fishery as a career. That was the aspiration side. When it came to the expectations side, a very large percentage of the parents and students involved felt that they would end up in the fisheries. And the moral there, of course, is that the fisheries, in the eyes of this study or these people, and I think it is an accurate feeling, the fishery is not a desirable way to make a living, the inshore fishery. And that, Mr. Chairman, presents a very real challenge for the minister and for the policy makers and for all the people in this Province. Because if there is no inshore fishery, if the traditional inshore fishery along the Northeast Coast does not continue, then the Northeast Coast, as we know it, will not continue. And we will see, Mr. Chairman, I venture to predict, changes in population and in the way people live

and in the places they live that are far greater than any we have ever seen in Newfoundland. Because in community after community along that coast, Mr. Chairman, the only reason that people settled was to prosecute the inshore fishery. And now if they cannot prosecute the inshore fishery, the question then comes, what are they to do? What are they to do?

Earlier today in the House we talked briefly about Buchans. The people of Buchans, economically, are living under a death sentence. The feeling is that mine, the Buchans mine, that supported those people for all those years, will close, will close within the very near future of three to five years.

Well, what is going to happen to the inshore fishery? Is it under a similar death sentence? I do not think it is. I hope it is not. But I would like to hear the minister's views and his comments and his opinions, because I believe this is one of the essential questions facing us today. We can talk about income security programmes, and I will say a few words about those because I think they are an important part of the answer. We can talk about new gear and technology. But what we need is a commitment by the people of Newfoundland and by the Government of Newfoundland, and I do not in that sense use the word government to speak about a Tory Government or a Liberal Government, I am talking about a government as a collective expression of the will of the people, the wish of society. We need a commitment

to preserve our fishery and to develop it and to make it a viable industry in 1975 terms. It is not now. I do not know if the minister has any data. I have none. I have not been able to get any. I am told none is available on the age group distribution of the nine or ten or eleven thousand men who now prosecute the fishery - he is shaking his head to indicate he does not have it. My own observation of my own constituency and other places I go is that most fishermen in this Province are very much on the older portion of the work force. There are very few young men going fishing. I speak here of the inshore fishery. There are some. I could name a dozen men in my district who are young men, who have made a commitment. The Port au Choix area, Anchor Point, Port Saunders, many young men have taken on large commitments in the form of longliners, small trawlers and that like and are committed to the fishery, but by and large, if there are 10,000 men working in the inshore fishery, I would venture that as many as 8,000 of them are within five to ten years of a normal retirement from the work force.

Now, what does that mean for Newfoundland? I think the figures are accurate. I can only put them forth as a suggestion as an estimate or as a guesstimate. Statistics Canada cannot give us any information. The various fisheries departments cannot. The minister, I gather, has been unable to locate any. It might be a very useful study and perhaps when we come to registration, not in the sense of licensing but registration in the sense of getting some information, a very useful piece of data would be exactly what is the age group structure of our fishermen because, Your Honour, if my assumption is correct, it shows that the fishery is dying. If that is not acceptable, and it is not to me, then what steps should we take to try to get younger men to come into the fisheries?

As part and parcel of that, we have got to answer the question,

can we get younger men to go into the traditional inshore fishery as we have known it and as it is still practiced in large parts of this Province? The rough figure we are always given is 10,000 fishermen, Sir, in the inshore fishery. There may be - how many longliners are there - 500?

MR. CROSBIE: In that area, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Of the order of 500 longliners. Given five men to a longliner crew, that is 2,500 men. That leaves us by these calculations approximately 7,500 inshore fishermen, men who prosecute the fishery from trap-skiffs, from small boats using gill nets, very few traps left, some hand lining, most of them a combination of whatever they can turn their hand to. I have come up the figure 7,500 inshore men, but I am not putting these forth as laws of the Medes and the Persians. I am going from about 10,000 in the inshore fishery. If there are 500 longliners let us take five as being a medium crew, medium sized crew, that is 2,500. That leaves us roughly 7,500 who prosecute the fishery by traditional means. This are the same men who fished for lobsters by and large, or who fished for salmon. They are not the men who fish for crab, but then again the number of men prosecuting the crab fishery is relatively small, possibly a couple of hundred in all and it is confined to relatively small - I am sorry?

MR. CROSBIE: There is about just over 600 longliner type vessels.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I thank the minister. So if there are 600 -

MR. CROSBIE: And about 8,000 motor boats.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Well, then my rough figuring was not too far off, the information he has that -

MR. CROSBIE: They say here about 10,400 inshore ground fish fishermen plus 8,000 motor boats and the rest in the longliners.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, in other words, my figures were not that far off, but I thank the minister. So, we are talking maybe 8,000 men. The longlinermen are in a little sub-category for these purposes. They are not as outdated technologically as are the inshore boats.

The age of those 8,000 men, I would suggest, on an average or on a medium, Mr. Chairman, is very, very high. Their sons are not following them into the fishery and that holds a real message for us economically because many of the very large number of people unemployed in Newfoundland today, many of them are younger people and if they cannot look to the fisheries and they are not able to find alternate employment, then our problem as policy makers and as a House of Assembly is far greater.

It also presents a social problem and I cannot underline this too heavily, Mr. Chairman, because I think it is crucial. The Northeast Coast of the Province just cannot exist in its present form if there is no work available for the men and the women who live in these smaller communities. Over the years, I have heard talk about well, we will develop nodal communities. That was a great phrase that the officials and the experts had at one stage and we are going to have little roads linking communities. Well, the centralized schools are a good example of a nodal type of concept. There it is applied to education, but it also could be applied to the fisheries.

There may be something in that particularly if the length of the fish plant operating season can be extended by the means I have suggested, either trucking in fish from areas where fishing can continue longer than it can in ice areas, or by freezing fish round and then processing it a little later on. That is sometimes done now, for example, in Fortune where you get a glut of fish coming over from the Burin Peninsula, from the Point May - Lawn-Lamaline area. During the trap fishery they freeze the fish round in Fortune and then they process it a little later on when there is a lull or a lag in the trawler landings.

What is going to be done? I hope the minister will speak to that point. I think it is absolutely crucial. Indeed, I would not want to say that any one problem is the single most important problem in the fisheries in Newfoundland today, but I think it is

fair to say there is no problem more important than that question of the future of the Northeast Coast, the future of the traditional inshore fishery. I think even under redistribution there are twenty-five or thirty seats in the area affected. That shows the number of people who live in these areas. You could really start, Your Honour, I suppose you could start at Port de Grave District and you could work all the way around the Coast, certainly into the St. Barbe District and the new Port au Port District, the Bay of Islands District to a lesser extent. The people there tend to work in Corner Brook or in that area. But in all that area the inshore fishery is paramount and I would hope the minister, I would ask him if he would speak to that. At this stage I am not quarrelling. I may or may not quarrel with him. That depends on what he says, but I think it is a major problem. I think it is one which only now is emerging and I suspect we have not got very long to try to solve it.

If something is not taken, action is not taken, I do not think I am being an alarmist, but I am saying that in five or ten years I can see the fishery, instead of having 8,000 men in inshore boats, maybe there will only be 1,000 or a couple of hundred. If they are getting, as I suspect, if we getting to the point where the labour force is getting on up in years, they will begin dropping out of the labour force and no replacements coming in. That may be inevitable. I hope not. If it is inevitable, alternate sources of employment have got to be produced. The Rural Development Department has been a cataclysmic failure in this sense. It may or may not have been set up to try to deal with this problem, but if it was, it has not. I am not even sure they understand the problem in that department, but it certainly has not come to grips with the problems of people in our small fishing communities to provide viable employment.

If there is no future, if that is the conclusion that we come to, we as a House or the people of the Province, then in fairness the

April 1, 1975.

Tape 866

RH - 5

people of the Northeast Coast should be told that, so they can plan their lives accordingly and so they can build their communities accordingly, if that is to be the future. But we are seeing a steady drain in population now, Mr. Chairman, and I am not talking about resettlement. We can talk about that if we wish, but in

in outhabour after outharbour along the Northeast Coast, and along the West Coast we are seeing a steady drain away of people, the younger people. Part of it is inevitable. There has always been a movement from rural areas to urban areas. I suppose the first big example of it was when Dick Whittington came up to London, I think it was in 1315 to become the Lord Mayor. There has always been this drain. Many members of this House, the honourable gentleman for Placentia West grown up in the community of Brigus, a rural community which at one stage was the third or the fourth largest community in all of Newfoundland.

MR. BARRY: I was born in Red Island.

MR. ROBERTS: He was born in Red Island, but he can take no claim for that. He left Red Island at an early age, and therefore it may have been the cultural centre of Placentia Bay. But he grew up, his formative years were spent, as I understand it, in Brigus. The honourable gentleman came to St. John's to make his home and to carry out his life's work as have thousands of Newfoundlanders. But that pace is accelerating, Your Honour, the pace of change is accelerating, and as I have said when I began this we may be witnessing what I can only call a quantum jump, a jump completely unlike any that has gone before in the inshore fishery in this Province. That is one point that I would hope - I have developed it at some length - but I would hope the minister would speak to it. I make no apologies for dealing with it at some length. I think it is important enough, I think it is important enough, in fact, Sir, that we were to debate nothing else in this session of this House of Assembly except the fate of the inshore fishery and what future there is, and what can be done to make the future what we believe it should be and what people want it to be, then we would have earned our keep. I think it is one of the great issues. It may or may not be a political issue but it is one of the great concerns, one of the great issues that must be dealt with by anybody who is interested in the public problems of Newfoundland today, and who is interested in trying to make this Province a better place to live in.

The minister is going to Ottawa, as he told us, today week

to attend a meeting called by Mr. Leblanc, I believe the other four ministers in Eastern Canada, the Atlantic Provinces and Quebec will be there. They are going to have a look at some studies that have been prepared. It may be premature but I hope the minister would give us some indication of exactly what range of options are being considered. A one-day meeting in Ottawa is not going to solve any problems. The most that could happen at a one-day meeting is that five men and the minister at Ottawa, Mr. Leblanc, six men, come together with their officials and they agree upon a series of decisions. But the studies I am sure are going ahead, they have been underway, we are told, for months now, and the deadline of April 30 was set some months ago, It is not going to be met, apparently. We are not going to have any long range settlement by the end of April. Indeed I do not think it was ever realistic to expect one.

When the minister talks of middle range programmes - just what is, what sort of time range are we talking of? The next few months? The next year, two, or three? And when can he see, and when can he see a long range plan being worked out? And what can he see in it? All these meetings are very useful, and I am sure there is much information passed back and forth. But we have been studying the fisheries now - this administration came into office a little more than three years ago, I think the fishermen of Newfoundland, who believed rightly or wrongly that the Liberal Administration had let them down. We can debate that if we wish, but they believed it, whether they were right or wrong - I think three years ago they believed that the Tory Administration would somehow come to grips with the problems of the fisheries, and would make some major changes. Certainly they were encouraged, the people of Newfoundland, the fishermen of Newfoundland were encouraged to believe that by the Premier and by statements made by other members of that government. Well, here we are three years later, We still not have seen the answers. We have not even been told what types of answers, what range of possible answers are being considered. I am not blaming the minister for the sins of his predecessors. They have a heavy enough burden to carry on their own, but I think the minister might indicate to us the sort of ranges we are looking at. Just what is being considered?

And perhaps then if he takes the people of Newfoundland and the fishermen of Newfoundland into his confidence, we might get a better policy. I believe we would.

The Select Committee exercise, Your Honour, will not serve that purpose. The Select Committee will provide a forum, and it is providing it whereby people can come forward and, I think it is fair to say without detracting from those who appear before the Committee or those who are on the Committee that we will in almost every case merely hear the repetition of points of view that have been made before and suggestions that have been advanced in earlier days. What is needed now

is not further studies. I would infinitely prefer a Select Committee to be set up to have a dozen ranges open to it, a dozen possible policy options and then go to the fishermen of Newfoundland and the people of Newfoundland and say, now here are the types of things we could see being done. There are arguments in favour of each and against each. You give us your view. That is the sort of leadership that I would expect from the Minister of Fisheries. He has not been in the job quite long enough yet to expect him to do it, but I would hope very shortly we will be in that position for the inshore fishery, for the deep sea fishery, the trawler fishery, the ice-free fishery, whatever Your Honour wishes to call it. I am very disappointed at the - I think the Select Committee is being sent off to do their work with both hands tied behind their back. All they are doing really is going around the Province, maybe valuable but it is not enough, going around the Province to hear briefs. People are not being asked to respond to initiatives or to respond to policy suggestions. They are being asked merely once again to go through the well known litany of what is wrong with our fishery and what should be done about it.

I do not think for a moment the government are looking to the Select Committee for policy ideas. The mere fact that the Committee was only set up as a last minute decision two or three weeks ago, and I say it was a last minute decision because it was not even referred to in the Throne Speech. The idea of select committees was not foreign to the government. There was a Select Committee referred to in the Throne Speech, but it was not the Fisheries Committee. It was a last minute idea, obviously, for political purposes. If we are going to have an election this year I suspect the government would want to be able to say well, we did set up a Fisheries Committee and we heard the peoples' views. But I do not think the government are looking to it for advice or for suggestions. The minister's statement that there is going to be a meeting on the

eighth of April which is going to look at further suggestions put forward by the officials is a much more meaningful statement for the fishermen of Newfoundland than the hearings of the Select Committee. I think the Committee could have done even better work than it will do. Mr. Chairman and his members will try very hard, but I do not think they are being given the ammunition to enable them to do the job properly.

Mr. Chairman, if I could turn briefly to some of the specific problems which I see confront our fisheries now, I would like to make some reference to three specific areas, the marketing area, the technology area, call it the offshore stocks area, whatever one wants to call it, but let me call it that for the purposes of these few remarks. Let me speak first about offshore stocks. This is the glamorous part of the problems of the fishing industry. It is a problem that is very well known. It has been extensively publicized. The SOFA Organization, the Save Our Fisheries Association, which seems to have become defunct, I do not know if - Is the minister -

MR. CROSBIE: No, it is defunct as far as I know.

MR. ROBERTS: It is defunct.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that may very well have been, but, I mean, it seems to have disappeared, but it has served a very valuable purpose for two or three years. It is sort of, not a distant early warning device, but as an early warning device. I think the problem is well known. I think most people in Newfoundland feel that they are aware of the problem in declining stocks and the problems of over-fishing. I think the solutions are equally well known. We debated it at some length in this House on a resolution which I brought in and which was amended by an agreement between myself and the gentleman from Placentia West. But it is essential that we get control of our fisheries out to the edge of the Continental Shelf, the Margin. It is essential for two reasons. One is a negative one,

passive one. That is to preserve what fishery we now have, to preserve what we now have. The trawlers, I think one of the reasons underlined the very long and very bitter dispute, the trawlermen strike which happily has now ended was the fact that boats, trawlers, were getting constantly smaller catches. A few years ago one of the modern stern trawlers, if it did not bring in a half million pounds of fish for seven days at sea, the captain would be looking for employment elsewhere. Now, if the one of the stern trawlers in ten days at sea can bring in 150,000 pounds of fish, that is considered a pretty good voyage. Well, that has obviously knocked the economics of trawler fishing right into a cocked hat.

So, we have got to preserve our stocks. We have got to make sure that they are managed properly. It is obvious that no international agency can do it. ICNAF has failed completely. We have tried the ICNAF route. It will not work. That is why I feel that it is the duty of the coastal state, I think that is a widely accepted view,

that is why I feel that if Canada does not succeed in getting an agreement internationally at this Conference in Geneva now, the LOS III, then we should go ahead and act unilaterally. We have all sorts of precedents for it in Canada. We have our own domestic precedents, the Arctic Territorial Waters Pollution Bill, pollution Act is probably the most recent, the most in point. We have all sorts of precedents internationally going way back to the anchovies swimming off the West Coast of South America, and the unilateral proclamation of 200 mile limits in the early '50's. Or the Americans in 1946 in the Truman Doctrine unilaterally proclaiming their jurisdiction of the minerals of the Shelf. We do not have to be ashamed of unilateral action if it is the only way to achieve what is an essential end. It does not make us bad boys internationally. And in any event I have long ago come to the conclusion that we should stop worrying about rocking the international boat, we should start being concerned about the man in the fishing boat.

But, Mr. Chairman, there is a very positive reason why we should take control of the fisheries out to the Margin of the Shelf, and that is, we could then increase our total fish catch by three or four hundred per cent. Because whatever fish were caught then, Sir, would either be caught by Canadian ships or - and I would very much regret this - by foreign ships acting under Canadian licence. I think Canada should catch the fish, and then if other countries need it as they do, we should sell it to them. We can catch it and process it as cheaply as can any other people. We do not have to go across thousands of miles of the Atlantic Ocean to catch the fish. We do not have to create great huge factory ships, We have our factory ships. They are on shore, fish plants. We should not deny these countries access to the food they need. If they are prepared to pay a fair price for it, we should be willing to sell it to them.

So to me the convincing argument, the glorious future that we could get out of the Continental Shelf control, control of our fishery resources, is a vast increase in the fishing industry in

Newfoundland. Not just the inshore fishery but in the deep sea fishery where we now have four communities on the Burin Peninsula thriving, prosperous because of the four fish plants there. In Trepassey, Harbour Breton, and Gaultois, Ramea, Burgeo, all of which can have a great future if the stocks are preserved. Port-Aux-Basques, Bonavista, which should become a trawler port, Catalina, Harbour Grace should become a - here in St. John's where we now have five or ten communities thriving on the trawler fishery, we could have twenty or forty. And I think that should become a cardinal point of the policy of the Government of Newfoundland. The Continental Shelf is securing the control of that fishing resource, Sir, is absolutely vital to the future of this Province.

Let me turn then to the question of technology. Within the past two years, and I speak particularly here of the inshore fishery, we have gone through a revolution in gear and technology. A few years ago, Your Honour, almost any man could get into the fishery. All he had to have was a trap skiff or a punt or some sort of a boat, a couple of hundred dollars worth of nets and he was a fisherman. Today, Sir, the fishery, even its simplest form, its economically most primitive form, that fishery is becoming a very capital intensive industry. It is nothing now for a fisherman to have \$20,000 or \$30,000 worth of boats and gear. Even a trap fisherman is talking of that sort of money. Longliner fishermen, who used to be contemplating an investment of \$30,000 or \$40,000, longliners are now coming to \$100,000, \$150,000, \$200,000. They are now beyond the means of an ordinary fisherman. Even with the programmes which may have been adequate in the past, the programmes under which most of those 600 longliner type boats were built, of a ninety per cent loan, and a fairly generous repayment terms and low interest, there is no way, Your Honour, that our men could move into modern fishing boats with those programmes.

We have always been a few years behind in technology in Newfoundland, or in Canada for that matter. It has been said that generals are always concerned with fighting the last war. Well, Mr. Chairman, we have been equipping ourselves constantly for an ever

April 1, 1975

Tape 889 (Afternoon)

PK - 3

outdated fishery. And I would ask the minister what he can see, what he is going to do, what he proposes to help. The costs are going up,

boats are being repossessed, and the minister might speak on that. I understand that the Fisheries Loan Board has embarked on a policy of becoming much more strict. They are cracking down, my colleague says on the people who have loans and who have not been able to repay them. Well that may be a very good business move, but it may be very bad policy. It may well be, and indeed I know of a number in my own constituency, men who have fished very hard, who have just not been able to make enough money to service the debt. They cannot deny the fact that they have not serviced the debt. They have not met their legal obligations.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that might be a good thing. But I am concerned and I would like to hear the minister - there has been no statement of policy on it. It has just been a tightening of the screws, a more Scrooge-like attitude. I am not sure that it will benefit our fishermen. If a fisherman is not able to meet his commitments, then I do not see how it solves the problem or it helps the Newfoundland Commonweal in anyway to take his boat away from him, and what investment he may have in it goes. I always understood the Fisheries Loan Board had adopted a de facto policy, it may not have been a written one or a published one, but a de facto policy, if a fisherman had not been able to make his payments because he had not been able to get the fish and he had tried very hard to get the fish, they would not take his boat away from him. They would sort of add it on.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: That is still true.

MR. ROBERTS: The Fisheries Loan would be a very never-never loan indeed. Because it really was not intended as a loan, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, now that is not true.

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe we should move, Mr. Chairman, to a concept of providing fishermen with boats. And, I think whatever we do on

on the Northeast Coast, the inshore fishery, it is going to involve getting our fishermen into bigger boats. If the inshore fishery does not suffice, and I do not think it will in its present form, I do not think it can continue in its present form with small trapboats, we are going to move to near deep water or to mid-water technology that is going to involve very large sums of money. Maybe the time has come when the government should adopt a concept of the government owning the boats and renting them to fishermen. We will take a certain portion of what the fisherman catches in a year. We do it with text books. If we could do it with school text books, why cannot we do it with fishing boats? It might cost a fair amount of money. I suppose, Your Honour, you could invest, well, \$100,000. each, you could invest \$50 million and only have 500 boats. That might be enough, but in a Province that is now talking of borrowing \$1.6 billions and that is a floor, it will go up from there to develop hydro electric power, surely we can contemplate \$50 million or \$100 millions going into the fishing industry.

I think along those lines, we may have to look at gear banks. While I am on gear banks, what happened to the -
AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well it has been in about seven throne speeches.

Whatever happened to the committee set up about nine months ago, in the middle of an election? It is amazing, Your Honour, how this government's initiatives in the fisheries come in the middle of elections. On June 17, 1974 the Premier, obviously reacting to, I venture to say, some panic calls from Mr. John Lundrigan and other Tory candidates who were about to pay the price at the polls for the Premier's neglect of the fisheries, The Premier issued the following statement. I assume he issued it. He came out from our Information Service. It read: Within the next week a committee will be set up to investigate the concept of a fishermen's equipment and gear banks in an effort to help offset the rising costs

of fishermen of the Province. The government's subsidy programme which ranges from forty to six per cent is not resulting in lower costs for fishermen's gear and equipment. The fishermen are not receiving the full benefits of the subsidy programme, when they are faced with almost daily price increases.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Premier said it?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, yes. Well I do not know whether the Premier said it, as my colleague asks, it was over the Premier's name. It says, I believe - so it must have been the Premier - it says, I believe part of the problem lies with the suppliers of fishmen's gear. It seems that the suppliers were inflating their prices as soon as increased subsidies are announced. I am not satisfied with this situation. This is why I have asked the Minister of Fisheries to set up a committee to determine the full facts of the matter. The make-up of the committee will be announced by, it names the Minister of Fisheries, who was then the member for Gander, in the near future. And I would hope that their investigation will bring positive results.

Well, Mr. Chairman, nine months is a pretty good gestation period. It is as

long as any of us enjoyed. I do not know whether the committee was set up or not. It may well have been that the most- the Premier's next positive in fisheries was to remove the Member from Gander as Minister of Fisheries, but I would like to know what came out of it. I would like to know the results of the investigation. The Premier states his belief. He does not lay a charge as such but he states his belief that the suppliers are inflating their prices.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the heavens alone know that I am not going to stand here and defend such charitable institutions as John Leckie Limited and others. They are obviously in it for the buck. They are going to get all they can out of it and one of the regrettable things is that we are coming to a stage where we have a near monopoly in fishery supplies.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They are about the only one -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, Leckie's are certainly the largest firm in the fishing supply business now, nets, ropes, and what have you. I do not know what proportion of the market they have, but it is a very large proportion and it is getting larger. Are they inflating their prices? The government have the power to find out. If this government can take a judge of the Supreme Court a year-and-a-half to inquire into allegations which were unfounded and made against my colleague from Bell Island, surely they can find out, surely they can find out about inflated fishing gear.

The Premier has stated his belief. Now, I assume his belief was well founded. One can only assume it was. I will give the man the benefit of the doubt. He is not here today. I do not begrudge him his holiday. I hope Bermuda is a pleasant place to be and I have no doubt Bermuda has its fishery problems too, and doubtless is being investigated. Mr. Chairman, I would like the minister to tell us exactly what has been done. Has that committee being appointed? If so, have they reported? If so, what did their report state? What action has been taken? Furthermore, I would like to know whether the

Premier's belief has been borne out and if so, what are the government going to do about it? Maybe we should have a crown gear corporation. It has been suggested by a number of people, my friend from Bell Island, the gentleman from Bonavista South who is so helpful to the Minister of Fisheries. Indeed, I do not see why they do not make him at least associate Minister of Fisheries.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Minister of State -

MR. ROBERTS: Minister of State for the Fisheries. No, I would not put him that high.

MR. NEARY: - only allowed to attack Ottawa.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, a number of honourable gentlemen have suggested this and maybe it should be done. I do not know if it would lower prices, but at least it would guarantee that there was no inflated profits in it. A crown corporation could sell gear for exactly the same price as it bought it, together with whatever the justifiable overhead charges are. Then, if we are going to have a subsidy, let us build in the subsidy.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the minister may say the fishermen abuse it, but the fact that there may have been abuses in gear programmes is a telling commentary on the minister as much as it is on the fishermen, the minister or his predecessor. I realize the minister inherited many of these things and cannot be held to account for them, but it is a pretty damning indictment of the administrative set-up set up by the gentleman from Gander. He presided over the birth of this monstrosity that has allegedly cost us millions of dollars.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, now, now, the gentleman from Gander now plays his usual game of asking if I am against it. Well, Your Honour, I do not like bad eggs, but that does not mean I am against hens, and that is the answer to the honourable gentleman. That is an answer in full measure and one which is intellectually every bit as honest as his

approach. If the minister has nothing to contribute, he should be as silent now as he was during his tenure of the office as the Minister of Fisheries. We are talking about serious problems. The Minister of Fisheries has approached them seriously. If the honourable gentleman from Gander, if the honourable gentleman from Gander, he had his couple of years in the fisheries and he was a complete and unmitigated disaster. Indeed, the best thing the honourable gentleman ever did for the fisheries of Newfoundland, Sir, was leave the portfolio. The best thing he did, it was the most positive thing he did.

If the honourable gentleman wants me to debate his tenure of office, I would be delighted to do it, but I do not feel particularly it would help the community to get ahead and I think it is quite relevant to the minister's salary, Sir. But I do not think it would be particularly - it would be great fun, be amusement, but it is like taking candy from a child. It is poor sport. The minister would be well advised to keep quiet and let his colleague, who knows something about the fisheries and has an appreciation of the problems deal with it.

If we lost, if we, the people of Newfoundland, lost a million or two millions through that Gear Replacement Programme, then the administration is more to blame than anybody else. They are the people who paid it out. They are the people who set up the system,

but I am concerned now about this gear bank, and this great announcement, this great announcement that the Premier made less than a month before the election. And I am sure I am not being uncharitable nor inaccurate when I say the fact that it was announced during an election was the major reason the Premier made that announcement.

MR. NEARY: It is too bad he is not here to answer it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well the Premier, if we had to wait for the Premier to be here the House would be sitting in mid-August.

MR. BRETT: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: We would still only be on the Fisheries estimates. He has left his assistant here, which is a clear case.

MR. BRETT: You spend a lot of time -

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman for Trinity North is one of the few men who can enter a room and add nothing to what is in the room.

MR. BRETT: Very funny!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman, - indeed the honourable gentleman adds considerably to the presence of a crowd in the room by leaving that room.

MR. BRETT: Very funny!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Chairman, the gear bank problem is a very real one. The government last year moved to increase subsidies. Quite a substantial extra amount of money was made available. And I do not blame the government, I do not hold them to account for the fact that prices of gear are rising. I blame them for what they control but they cannot control that. But, Sir, our fishermen are running into rapidly increasing costs, and they are increasing far more rapidly than their ability to meet them. So, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate if the minister would speak to this point. I am sure he is familiar with the Premier's press release but if not I should be happy to send him a copy of it. I read it in its entirety. As far as I know there has been nothing done since, but I confess that I may not know everything on this point and a number of others that the minister could tell us.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like him also to tell us of what he thinks of this idea of a gear bank, whether we should have a crown corporation that purchases gear. So maybe Mr. Leckie goes out of business. Well, that is tough. My heart breaks for John Leckie Limited. My heart breaks even more for the fishermen of Newfoundland. If we can get gear into the hands of fishermen cheaper then let us act, let us set up a gear bank. Maybe we should lend fishermen gear, just as we, I think, should lend them boats. If we are going to have fishermen, Sir, they have to have equipment, and if they cannot afford to get the equipment on their own then they are going to have to get it from public funds. That is as obvious as the night following the day. We use large sums of public money to invest in economic development. Let us use some money here.

While I am on the questions I would like the minister to deal with, and I realize this one is a legacy from his colleague, his predecessor, - I do not know. The Minister of Health obviously has a crucial question, Your Honour, but I am trying to ask the Minister of Fisheries whose estimates are now on, and perhaps my cousinly colleague could do me the courtesy to let me make mine, unless it is absolutely crucial, in which case let us adjourn for five minutes. But I am talking about fisheries, and the Minister of Fisheries may be minister of a number of other things. And I could tell the minister he is going to get his strike because of his maladroitness handling and no other reason.

But the thing I want to bring up to the minister now is, exactly what happened to the trawler fleet? His predecessor announced that tenders had been awarded for trawlers, the famous trawlers. The Premier, Sir, had them sailing. I thought I saw my colleague for St. Barbe North earlier looking at the P.C. Times - the P.C. Times that was the one from Hermitage was it? Where they tried a con job. Oh, yes, yes, the P.C. Times, Your Honour, Tory Times, Volume I No. 3. It ceased publication after the third issue. It ceased publication on Polling Day. Your P.C. action government, It may be Your Honour's, it is not mine. But I read now - it has been put under a number of

tables, and indeed it is in with those people in Hermitage district who are unfortunate enough not to have indoor facilities have also put it to good use.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now Tory times are hard times, no matter what it says on the booze glasses they used at Tory Conventions. Anyway, "New Trawler Programme Will Expand Fishery" is the headline in this document. Your P.C. action government is proceeding with one of the greatest most imaginative fish development programme ever undertaken in North America.

(Paragraph) the paragraph is important, Your Honour, it indicates a new thought. The government has decided to establish a trawler programme at a cost of \$60 million over the next three years to greatly expand the Island's fishing industry, provide many hundreds of jobs on the fishing trawlers themselves, and many hundreds of new permanent jobs in fish processing plants around the Island.

It names the Premier. Oh, I could read it. It is not improper.

Premier Frank Moores and Fisheries Minister Harold Collins say - in unison they say this - that when in operation the government owned trawler fleet will provide existing fish plants with a continual large source of supply so that they will be able to operate at a continually high level of employment. So far so good, Your Honour. I mean, Your Honour, I know, is with me and we all devoutly wish that that was true. The people in the Hermitage district were deceived by the Minister of Fisheries on this point. It goes on.

The government will order twenty ships immediately with the first seven to be delivered at the end of 1974, the next seven at the end of 1975 and the remainder at the end of 1976. Already naval architects have completed plans for the ships and shipyards in many parts of the world have been contacted to give quotations on building the new vessels.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is true.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I have no doubt. Maybe a letter went out saying, this is a contact, give us a quotation. Now what I want to do, Your Honour, and it is really unfair to hold the present Minister of Fisheries responsible for this. I have no doubt he will give us one of his spirited defences. Maybe he will go on the offence, which is his usual practice when he cannot defend.

But, Your Honour, in November 1973, and all of this was not published under the Lieutenant-Governor's imprint, I think it is fair to regard it as being a statement of administration thinking on a number of points. I doubt if it was in with the law. The law required every newspaper to be deposited in the Department of Provincial Affairs. But it was

widely circulated in a portion of the Province during a time of some public discussion of the issues therein. I want to know exactly where the seven ships are that were going to be delivered at the end of 1974. Perhaps the minister could give us their names, their cost and where they are now being used? I do not have a reference here, but I am sure I could find one, because I remember the Minister of - what is he? - the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture he now is, briefly until he gets turfed out of this portfolio, as he has been out of two others, announcing in the House that tenders had been awarded. Either saner heads prevailed or the ministry backed off from what would have been a very unwise proceeding. But I venture to say that the Minister of Fisheries will be unable to give me the names of those seven ships, because no contracts have been let. Indeed, Sir, the only activity we have seen is we have seen a vast amount of money lashed out on Harmon I and II to convert them. They are still at Marystown being converted. Are they out of Marystown now?

AN HON. MEMBER: One is down in St. John's Harbour.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then the honourable gentleman is much closer to St. John's Harbour than I am. I certainly hope the honourable gentleman is. Harmon I and II then have been converted, and there are the three experimental boats, which as of about ten days ago were still decorating the Marystown Shipyard, very strange looking vessels.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sculpin.

MR. ROBERTS: The sculpin is an ugly fish, and it may be that the sculpin, as such, would not be an unfair name for them. But they are still there. They have been there for two or three years. I do not know whether they were built as a make-work project for the yard in an effort to keep the yard going

or whether they were built as a serious innovation in the fisheries. Where are they going to go fishing? I think the strike that was caused last week was caused by, as I understand it, British workmen coming in to work on those ships.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, the Atlantic boats.

MR. ROBERTS: The Atlantic boats, the new trawlers for Atlantic Fish. But in any event, they are there. Vast amounts of public money have gone into them. They have not as yet caught even a sculpin. As far as I know, they have not even been in the water. They are still sitting there, the three -

MR. DOODY: One of them is in the water now and the other two -

MR. ROBERTS: One in water?

MR. DOODY: The Minister of Fisheries knows.

MR. ROBERTS: Well he knows everything. Well we will let him speak about it.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: He says one is in the water and two others, three years later, are still a lovely baby blue colour, Your Honour, just the nicest baby blue, Your Honour could want, and there they sit decorating the foreyard of the Marystown Shipyard. Well I would like to know what happened to the trawler programme. It obviously has been consigned to the junk heap, and I think that is probably a good thing. There may be a time in a year or two when we will need such a programme. We do not need it now. So the government might let us in on their thinking. believe, I have not looked it up, but in the estimates a year or so ago, there was a large amount of money - it must have been the Industrial Development Department - to enable some ships to be constructed.

MR. DOODY: There is some money in there now, a subsidy for ships.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, but that is Atlantic Fish. I am talking about the great new plant, the ones the Premier used to boast about before. I give the Minister of Industrial Development full marks. He is even cannier than I had thought and I had always thought he was a fairly canny fellow, but if he was so canny that he resisted the suggestion that these should go into his estimates, more power to him. I could look through the estimates. There was some money, I think in last year's estimates or the year before. The Minister of Fisheries, as he then was, was very much on his feet defending the great programme and either he knew it was a charade, in which case he was misleading the House, I do not think he was doing that, or he was distributing his ignorance of the matter.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Conditions changed.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, conditions changed. They changed overnight and a great long-range planning programme suddenly came to nothing. Out of those twenty ships, Sir, not one keel has been laid, not one rivet has been riveted and not one fish has been fished. The only thing that has happened to that programme is the Minister of Fisheries was replaced. That may be in itself enough to justify it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, we must save that. That should go into the archives as an historical document along with a lot of other broken promises by the Tory Government. Now, let me talk about shore facilities, Sir. The minister spoke at some length on shore facilities and there is a fair amount of money in his estimates this year for shore facilities, most of it coming from Ottawa - a large - What? Seventy per cent, ninety per cent.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: DREE agreements, ninety.

MR. ROBERTS: DREE agreements are ninety per cent, and the ninety per cent is the Ottawa contribution, the ten per cent would be ours. I have had a great deal of correspondence with the minister with reference to projects smaller than the type of project contemplated by the DREE agreement. We do face a problem. I have been corresponding mainly about places in my own constituency but there are others, other

communities around the Island where fishermen do not have proper facilities and they cannot get them. I would like to hear the minister say what can be done. His present programme is not adequate to meet that need or at least, as I understand the programme. Nothing would give me more pleasure than to hear the minister say that there is sufficient money in there to provide facilities for places like Straitsview or L'Anse-au-Meadows or St. Julien's or Croque, all the smaller communities where men still and must still for a period of years look to the inshore fishery for some sustenance. What is going to be done then?

I have already talked about the prices along the Northeast Coast, Sir, but I want to refer to it again because I think it is very much part of the technology aspect of our fisheries problems. We have got to get our men into bigger boats and that is going to mean a complete change in the type of operation we now have. I think probably the Fisheries Loan Board should be made into a Fisheries Grant Board. I am not so sure we should give fishermen boats. I think we should give the fishermen the right to use a boat for a year or two or three or five, as long as he uses it. Then if he does not use it, if he wants to drop out of the fishery or go elsewhere or do something else, then the boat would be available for the public.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, my friend has made a good suggestion. We should be able to trade in his boat, but he has got to be able to get into those bigger boats and that is going to require, as I see it, large amounts of public money. We have a lot of talk about the Hamilton Banks in the House and I have no doubt tomorrow we will have another few thousand words, Sir, when we come to Private Members' Day. The Hamilton Bank question is obviously of great importance to the fisheries along the Northeast Coast because that is the source of our stocks. The fish which men catch along the Northeast Coast,

by and large, is fish that comes from the stocks that is spawned on the Hamilton Banks.

If we had control of the two hundred mile Continental Shelf limit, we would have control of the Hamilton Banks, as I understand it, and thus the point is well covered in the resolution which I moved earlier and which the House accepted unanimously. The minister spoke about unemployment insurance. Again, he was not able to tell us very much that was new. I am not sure there is much new that he could tell us, but I think there are two points that must be made there. First is that we are today at the point where there must be an extension of unemployment insurance for fishermen. Fishermen are entitled to five, six of their fishing contributions is it? Five, six, for a maximum of eleven or twelve weeks because, of course, the period in respect of which they can get contributions is limited and the period in which they can draw is limited. Those unemployment insurance benefits are now running out. I suppose I have heard from 100 fishermen in the last three of four days and I am sure every honourable member has. All along the Northeast Coast or anywhere, men are drawing unemployment insurance benefits on the fishing benefit. Their benefits are running out.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, it certainly has never worked, my friend says. I hope that the Government of Canada are going to extend them. They have a perfect rationale. The ice that came last year not only prevented the men from getting fishing as early as they would have but it had the other affect of preventing fishermen from getting a normal season's catch and that had the result of decreasing the number of stamps and thus decreasing the amount of benefit and the number of weeks in which they were entitled to receive it, and now we are at the situation. Even if we did not have the ice we would still have the problem. The system has got to be ended. The quicker the better. As the minister says, the Government at Ottawa stand committed to this.

I saw Mr. Andras, Bob Andras when he was here last week. I had lunch with him. He reaffirmed to me that they intend to meet the changes and they hope to make them this year. I do not know if it is proper to debate it any length now the type of programme that should replace it, but it has got to be an income security programme. Unemployment for fishermen was a tremendous leap forward in the 1950's. It was the only time, the first time that the fishermen ever had any guarantee of any income beside that which they could get from selling their catch. But if it was adequate then, and it was certainly the best that could have been done then, and all the things that Jack Pickersgill did for Newfoundland during his service, politically, in Ottawa, the unemployment insurance to fishermen ranks among the greatest. It is no longer adequate now, I think it should be replaced with a straight income security programme. We declare fishing zones in different parts of the Province, and if a man fishes assiduously and throughout that period in that fishery he should be entitled to a guaranteed income, a minimum income. Otherwise, we are not going to get men at the fisheries.

I would like to hear the minister's view at perhaps a little length on that. I would like to hear any report he has as

to what is happening. I think Jack Davis was very much on the verge of bringing in a programme when the electorate in Coast-Capilano removed him from further activity in the Federal Fisheries field. How far are we on now? Will we see this programme this year? What are the government of the Province doing? I am not referring merely to a sterile argument such as we will have if we ever get to a motion which stands, I believe, in the name of the gentleman for Trinity North, the one on incomes - is it in the gentleman's name? There is a motion on the Order Paper about an income security programme, is it in the honourable gentleman's name?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I have done him a disservice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, the power house from Bay de Verde,

But you know that will be largely a sterile debate of your mother takes in garbage or whatever the type of argument is. I want to know what is going to be done for our fishermen this year?

Finally, Sir, let me talk briefly about the marketing. Am I up to my ninety minutes yet? I only have ninety minutes but then I can sit down and speak again a little later. Am I up to ninety minutes yet? I have -

AN HON. MEMBER: They are going to agree with everything you say and then they are going to let you get up again.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that is it, I mean, you know, one can speak more often than once in Committee if one wishes.

AN HON. MEMBER: undertaking.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, you know,

AN HON. MEMBER: By leave? By leave is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Carried out by leave.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank my friend for Bell Island, and the gentleman for St. John's West for this unusual example of amicability between the two of them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know if this is coming light casting the shadows.

MR. CROSBIE: in the new party.

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. - well they would be both at home in a new party. I must say, if they were there it would be a very odd collection indeed. The honourable gentlemen have served before this in the same party. Fortunately for our side, they no longer do.

Now, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour is going to say I am being irrelevant. I apologize.

Let me talk for a moment or two about marketing. It is obvious there are going to have to be major changes in the marketing system for our fish. We heard a lot of talk about restructuring. Much of it is loose talk. It is a word that is in vogue right now. We are going to restructure the industry. I would like to ask the minister exactly what he can see coming out of it? Are we going to move to one desk marketing? Are we going to be able to develop further markets? A very large proportion of our fish now goes into the American market, eighty or ninety per cent. Are we going to be able to get into other markets? Are we going to be able to get into other kinds of fish? Are we going to have - will we have one desk or two desk marketing? Are we going to be able to have public or private or a combination? What is the future? Are we going to go on as we are with the chaos? And if some small fish plant owner is holding fish stocks and the banks are on his back, and his credit is getting a little tight, he calls up Gloucester, he calls the broker and says, look, move it, move it at whatever you can get, and if it knocks two or three cents off the market go ahead and do it, just sell the fish, I have got to have the money. That has happened not only with the small ones, Atlantic Fish used to be known for doing that two or three years ago. They knocked the bottom out of the Gloucester market, the American brokers, time and time again. I

do not blame them for it but certainly it was not the way the marketing should be conducted. What about a system whereby the government take control of the fish. Is that a possibility? Take control of fish when it is caught and then direct it to plants for processing and direct the type of processing. The Salt Fish Corporation is short of product. It could sell two or three times the product it now gets. We have unsold frozen fish which cannot be turned into salt fish, I realize. But once the fisherman throws the fish over his boat or the trawler crew puts the fish ashore, is it of any importance to anybody except those who process the fish further what form it takes? Why can that fish not be processed into salt fish in plants, instead of into fresh fish? We cannot sell the fresh fish. We can sell the salt fish. What about tinned fish for international programmes?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Third World.

MR. ROBERTS: Third World. Why should we send money overseas when we can send food? The money is used to buy food. I am told that a very small part of frozen fish, the stocks now on hand, can be used and made into tinned fish. But what about all our future production. We cannot sell what we are now producing and indeed, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that is - I do not know if seal is a fish or a mammal, but I mean they can tin the product. Sure, sure they can and it would provide a lot of industry. You can have canneries that are large operations or you can have canneries that are relatively small operations. Maybe that is something the Rural Development Department could look into.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Well, yes, the one on the Lady Johnson, the junior Member from Harbour Main tells us. I can imagine what got canned on the Lady Johnson. I do not think it had anything to do with seals. It may have had a lot to do with flippers. But we are going to have to have major changes in our marketing setup. The present system is really chaotic and I do not know if it has ever

worked well. I do not know if we ever got the maximum return. But Newfoundland's production is a relatively insignificant part of the total fish production of the world. It is a very large part of the total fish production of Canada, the Eastern Canadian production, but why should we compete against ourselves. It is in our own interest to get the greatest possible return we can whether the plants are owned by the Province or whether they are owned by industry, by private enterprise within the Province or whether they are owned by these multifarious and nefarious multinationals. It is in our own interests to get the greatest possible return. Then we can get the wages up and then we can get the returns up and then if the government have loans they can get them back and new plants will be built.

Can we get new markets? Can we get new types of product? This is the way I think our thinking should be running. I am told by the experts in the fishery that this is the way, it is the type of thing that has got to come in the fishery. What are the minister's thoughts? What are the government doing about it? What about the Fishing Industry Advisory Board? In the dying days of the Smallwood administration, I think it was our last term, we brought into this House legislation, the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act and it was adopted, I believe, unanimously, but it went through very quickly.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Apparently, the penalty for defying the Speaker in those days, Your Honour, was the same as it was today. No, I think actually the bill was debated at second reading before the walkout came, but -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Was it not? I have not checked it, but be that as it

may, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There were sixty bills that went through in one day.

MR. ROBERTS: There were sixty in one day. The House Leader can only eat his heart out, can only eat his heart out, Sir, at that. He has already got the House Leader's disease, that he thinks if we could give the Order Paper three readings in an afternoon we have done our day's work and the ideal session is a one day session with His Honour coming for a five minute opening and a five minute closing and in between the entire business of the session being done. That is the House Leader's dream and his predecessor, Mr. Curtis, Les Curtis, had the same dream.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: Am I out of order, Sir?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): I think the honourable member knows that he is out of order at this point. He is being irrelevant.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I did not know I was out of order but I suspected I was probably trespassing over that thin line as to what is relevant and what is in order.

In any event, what about the Fishing Industry Advisory Board? That act, the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act had in it the constitution of the Board.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Labour or fisheries? -

MR. ROBERTS: Ah!

I am not sure where it is now. It is an orphan.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is moving.

MR. ROBERTS: Why is it moving or has it - it is in the fisheries estimates but has there been an order passed to move it?

MR. CROSBIE: We hope to have the legislation.

MR. NEARY: Well, it could be there for two years.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the board was not appointed for a year. So the then Minister of Labour, who is once again the Minister of Manpower in this game of musical chairs, the cabinet play, announced that it was defective, and it is true that in the act there was no power to subpoena books and records. It still is not. After five sessions, four full sessions of this administration, we still have seen no amendment, which I think would leave a charitably minded Newfoundlander to argue, as many of them have, that the government had no intention of making that board work. In any event, in due course, they were embarrassed into appointing a board, and they appointed a board. The Chairman, Mr. Anderson, a very well-known gentleman, who had served with distinction as a bank manager for many years, resigned before the ink on his commission of appointment was dry. Mr. Anderson resigned. I do not think he was in office a week. The gentleman from Labrador West, I think, was Minister of Manpower during this debacle.

There were two other members appointed, Mr. Gar Pynn, I believe, and Mr. Pat Antle. Both of them had a great deal to bring to the board, but they never had the opportunity to do it because the board never met, not once, not ever.

MR. ROUSSEAU: It met once.

MR. ROBERTS: It met once. Is that why he resigned, is the minister telling me?

MR. ROUSSEAU: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Well, you know, I accept -

MR. ROUSSEAU: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: I accept what the minister says but at the same time it would be then fair to say that if the chairman resigned because he did not anticipate the work load, and it was heavier than he wished to take on, being a retired man, that says something about the minister or his officials and the approach they made to Mr. Anderson in asking him to take on the job.

In any event the board lurched briefly into existence and surfaced for a very short while and then it disappeared into limbo, and then in due course Mr. Antle resigned for reasons of ill-health and very much to the regret of all concerned with the fisheries. And then it became necessary to utilize the talents of Mr. Rupert Prince in some position other than that of the Deputy Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Prince, an estimable civil servant, very knowledgeable - in many ways an ideal choice for this position - was appointed to be Chairman of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board. That was either during the election or one of the recurrent pressure crises that came after the election. Because the government act only under duress, Sir, in the fisheries or everywhere else. Other than that they are a do-nothing administration. What has happened since? I know that Mr. Prince is alive, because I have seen him recently, and I am glad to know that he is in good health. He went to Caracas for six or eight weeks last summer to attend the L.O.S. Conference, the Law of the Sea Conference and that is fine. I have no doubt he brought back a good report, and a very full report and a very expert report. But what has happened to the board since then? Why has no legislation been introduced? We have, in this session of the House, Sir, dealt with major legislative issues. We moved the joint services

from one department to another the other day. We put a comma back in the Marriages Act, the Solemnization of Marriages Act or we changed the word health to something else or something else to health. We dealt with major issues. Why have we not dealt with this issue? It is a very simple amendment. I predict it will get support on every side of the House.

MR. NEARY: Do not forget we debated the supernumerary judges.

MR. ROBERTS: My colleague reminds me that we debated at some length this crucial question, and there were a number of meetings, Sir, in Northeast Crouse in support of the principle of having seven supernumerary District Court judges in Newfoundland. Indeed, Sir, I understand there is a powerful ground swell of opinion now coming in Coney Arm, and it is a very powerful ground swell because there have been nobody living in Coney Arm for the past fifteen years. But they are concerned about the supernumerary judges. Well when are we going to get an amendment to put some teeth in the fishing industry Collective Bargaining Act or a Fishing Industry Advisory Board Act whatever legislative form the government wish it to take. What has the board done?

The inshore plants now will be heading up for negotiations, those that open. When are we going to see, when are we going to see some action by the Board? I understand the Board's function is to inquire into all the relevant facts in the fishing industry and then to recommend the types of prices that might be contemplated, maybe providing an answer to that eternal problem where the companies say they cannot afford to pay and the union says they can. So, the thought behind the Board is to get an impartial and knowledgeable third party and to make it an integral part of the, not the bargaining process, but the collective bargaining process. Perhaps the minister can tell us about that.

Finally, Sir, in this brief outline of some of the concerns we have, I would like the minister - he does not need to put his cigarette out, I will be a minute or two yet - to talk about the problems of the Northeast Coast plants. I am told there is a very real possibility that none of the plants along the Northeast Coast will open this year. I know that the people at St. Anthony have been told that the crab plant which provided employment for 100 people last summer will not open this year. I do not know if the other crab plants, Mr. Janes at Hants Harbour and Mr. Hussey at Port de Grave, Mr. Boyd Way's plant, Beothucks Fisheries over in Valleyfield, the Bonavista Cold Storage people at Bonavista, I think those are the only people in the crab business in Newfoundland but what are they going to do? What is going to happen to all the Northeast Coast plants? They have taken terrific losses, I understand, on a realistic system of cost accounting. The government surely cannot allow them to remain closed. They must remain open, but I would like for the minister to tell us what sort of action they are contemplating. It is not enough to say it is Ottawa's responsibility. That is a sterile and an empty policy. What are the government doing? What are they prepared to do? Are they going to take steps necessary to insure that these plants do operate?

I am referring particularly to the plants at Bonavista, LaScie,

Twillingate, Englee, St. Anthony, the Northeast Coast plants.

Mr. Chairman, let me conclude by pointing out a few facts which may be of interest to the committee. It is significant that in this year when we are told emphases are going on the fisheries, the net expenditure by the department will decrease by \$3 million which is twenty-three per cent of the expenditures comparing 1975 to 1974. It is also worth noting that the contribution from the Government of Canada through DREE is increased. It will be more than \$7 million, most of it going on capital works projects including the marine service centres, the fish handling facilities and the fish plant water systems. Last year the comparable DREE contribution for these capital works projects was about \$4 million. So, DREE's money is going up. The Government of the Province's contribution is going down. Maybe it is interesting to get the precise figures.

According to the table on page nine of the estimates, the government will be spending about \$5 millions this year on fisheries and last year they spent \$7.6 millions. That is their estimates. Those are net figures, Your Honour. I find that very disturbing. It perhaps shows that the oft expressed concern is that founded in reality.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: It is off about a quarter, the figures I have. About -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, in net figures. We will talk about some of the detailed estimates as we go through them, but I think it is worth noting that the Fisheries Minister or his officials, obviously, expect fewer new boats to be built this year. The funding provision of the Fisheries Loan Board is down by thirty-five per cent or \$1 million this year as opposed to last year.

Indeed, Sir, if we look through these estimates, leaving aside DREE where they are providing some money, it is hard to see just where any increased emphasis is going in the fisheries. We talk about fisheries development and it is true that under that heading some money is being

April 1, 1975.

Tape 898

RH - 3

spent, but the government proposed to spend only \$1.35 millions there in total this year compared to \$1.975 millions last year. That is about a one-third decrease. They are spending roughly two dollars this year for every three they spent last year on that important head. The minister's salaries are up, not his salary as such, but salaries in his office are up substantially.

I do not know if that is going to be of much help to the fishermen. General administration is up substantially. Field services are up by not very much. Programme planning and review, which could be a very important area, is increased substantially by about \$70,000 from \$34,000 to \$105,000. Fisheries development is down. General expense for fishing demonstrations is down. The expenditure on fishing vessel experimentation is down.

MR. NEARY: You know why that is down because there has been no fare issued to George McLean.

MR. ROBERTS: Well that may well be. It will be interesting when the time comes to ask how much Brother McLean ripped off on this one. I do not know where it could be buried. It is probably to be found in Social Services or Rehabilitation.

In any event, as a general comment, Sir, we are not satisfied with the total amount of money that the government are asking for. If in fact this is a \$1 billion budget, and I have my doubts, and if we ever get to the budget speech I will outline those doubts, but I have my doubts that this is a \$1 billion budget in the government's terms. But the fact that we can only find -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has five minutes remaining of his ninety minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank Your Honour, but it may have been during a momentary lapse of Your Honour's normally attentive attention but I understood we had consent that I could carry on by leave until - I will not be much longer anyway, but you know I - now I have lost what train of thought I had, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: What? I am sorry?

AN HON. MEMBER: The \$1 billion budget.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes, that is right. In a \$1 billion budget, it is a matter of regret that the government can only find

less than \$10 million in total and that includes current and capital account. That is a matter of regret. That figure would be larger if one were to take in the DREE money. But why should the government claim credit for DREE money? They are quick enough to blame DREE or to blame Ottawa, and let them give credit where credit is due. There are in case after case, Sir, the allocations requested are down. The amount of money that will actually get through to our fishermen is down in case after case, after case, which is not good enough.

Finally, let me say that the minister at the very start of his opening remarks talked about the varying roles of the Newfoundland Government and the Government at Ottawa with respect to fisheries. He quite correctly said that it is a shared jurisdiction and that our powers as a Province are limited. I jotted down the words he used. He said that our role must be a supportive role. That may be correct constitutionally but the minister did use those words. I jotted them down. I was very sorry to hear him use them because I think they are a revealing insight into the minister's thinking and because they reveal a state of thinking or an approach to the policy problems of the fisheries which I find acceptable. They may be correct constitutionally. But, Sir, this is not a matter of constitutionalism or a matter that lawyers are arguing before the Supreme Court and that we will get into the constitutional law text books. This is a matter of our life's blood as a Province and as a people. We need more than a legalistic view. What we need is a commitment, a commitment to preserve our fisheries and to use the public funds that are necessary to do that. There is a need for national action. And part of the problem, and I would be the first to say it whether there was a Liberal Administration in office at Ottawa or whether there was a Tory Administration in office in Ottawa, is that we do not have enough clout in Ottawa. Our M.P.'s try hard, and I am very interested to see two of them here today, the gentleman from Gander-Twillingate and the gentleman from

Bonavista-Trinity-Conception, who both have been listening to a part of this debate. If we had seven like them in Ottawa, instead of just four, we would be further ahead.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: They have made a very real contribution, which the electorate have recognized. The electorate have recognized it by returning them to office and by defeating the Tory Candidates against them on elections which were fought out, in large measure, on fisheries' issues. It is not without significance, Sir, that the fishing areas of this Province have rejected the Tories in Ottawa.

But, Sir, Ottawa has not done enough. I would be the first to say that, and Ottawa has a great deal more they must do, particularly with money. But, Sir, we have not done enough, provincially, either.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: My friend and colleague has given me the lead,

MR. ROBERTS:

Either he has seen my notes or his analysis of the problem is the same as mine. It is our role as a Province, Sir, to provide the lead and the initiatives. And it should be the role of the Minister of Fisheries to be a constant thorn in the side both publicly and privately to the Government at Ottawa and to the fish industry and to everybody else connected with the fisheries advocating a policy, pushing it, defending it, promulgating it, lobbying for it in every way he can. What we need is a long range plan. We do not need any more studies. What we need now is some hard thinking. I think the minister is capable of that. And that is why I say that his accession into the Fisheries post may well be the greatest thing that the Moores Administration have done for the people of Newfoundland, next to leaving office when the time comes. I expect well of the minister. But I am disappointed that so far he has not outlined that long range plan. I hope he will now. I think this is the place and time to do it. He may not have all the answers. I do not expect him to. But I have raised a number of very important topics going right to the heart of the fisheries problem in Newfoundland. And we do have a problem. It is getting worse. For all the money and talk and effort and study and consultation and everything else it is getting worse. Every year it is getting worse. Well how long does it go on? We have had enough band-aid philosophies now. What we need, what we need now, and we need it right now, is a programme that will cure the disease and not just treat the symptoms.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I think before anybody else sneaks in the Opposition I better try and deal with some of the points that the Leader of the Opposition has brought up. And first I would also like to welcome the Member for Gander-Twillingate to the House, a former clerk of this House of Assembly, particularly his last couple of years of clerkship. He was very helpful to myself and other members of the House who had recently gone to the Opposition side and needed counsel. In parliamentary procedure in these matters he was very helpful. We were briefly together in the same party after 1972 and he is now gone to the Liberal Party, and I am with the P.C. Party. In any event

I would like to welcome him here today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: And I am sure that he has some quite amusing memories of this House of Assembly.

Now the Member for Bonavista-Twillingate, or Bonavista-Trinity-Conception passed me on the way. As I was going to the P.C. Party he shortly afterwards went to the Liberal Party.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: So it is difficult to keep track of all of these things but I would like to welcome him too.

Now the Leader of the Opposition is not correct, Mr. Chairman, in saying that the fishing areas of this Province have rejected the Federal P.C. Party. I think this is a very important point because two of our federal members who are P.C.'s, of course, also represent important fishing areas of the Province. Mr. Carter, the M.P. for St. John's West and Mr. Marshall for Number-St. George's-St. Barbe.

Now to get on to deal with some of the points that the Leader of the Opposition has raised. I was quite interested in his speech, and in fact I thought it was a very good effort for him, and delivered in a very serious, for the most part, in a very serious manner. The odd jibe or two against my predecessor as Minister of Fisheries, which I must say I thought was uncalled for, and unfair because my predecessor as Minister of Fisheries has nothing to apologize for and did a very fine job there, and in fact was the minister when the Department of Fisheries Provincial was re-organized in a very meaningful way, and when many of the present personnel of the department were recruited. And I think he did a very fine job and does not deserve that kind of insult or innuendo or smear, and it is unnecessary really, and it was unnecessary, is unnecessary and is not true. Now I do not want to just get into a big hassel with the Leader of the Opposition because we are dealing with serious matters. But I just want to make that comment on those few parts of his speech.

Now when I said, Mr. Chairman, in introducing this, when I mentioned that the Province's role was supported among other things of the fisheries because the Government of Canada has the chief constitutional jurisdiction over the resource and what happens in the water and so on, I was just explaining what our role was constitutionally. Believe me we do not intend to take just a supportive role only. We are not taking such a role nor do we go to Ottawa or anywhere else with any sense of timidity. I have never yet been intimidated by anyone -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: And certainly there is nobody in Ottawa can intimidate me from the Prime Minister on down. In fact, I voted for the Prime Minister to make him Liberal Leader. And I rather think that he owes me a vote of thanks, not the other way around.

AN HON. MEMBER: I thought you backed Mitchell Sharp.

MR. CROSBIE: No, no I was for Mitchell Sharp for awhile and then we went over with the Trudeau forces.

AN HON. MEMBER : I thought you were a Winter's man.

MR. CROSBIE: No, I was never a Winters - No, no, no. That was you, you were with the corporate forces, I think.

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you vote for Trudeau since?

MR. CROSBIE: I have not given him a vote since. He has been a major disappointment but I will not be irrelevant, Mr. Speaker. We do not think that our role is supportive in any other than the constitutional sense, and I note the point that the Leader of the Opposition makes. I would also like to thank him for his kind remarks about myself and I hope that he is right and that we can accomplish something in the situation we are now in.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: That is very sure. But I am on a tack today that I hope to be preserved until eleven p.m. this evening, Mr. Chairman, of being sweetly reasonable with honourable gentlemen opposite.

Now, I just want to deal with some points the Leader of the Opposition made and I am going to start from the end of his speech and go back, I believe, because he is usually ass-backwards himself. Now, that is a bit of a slip. I have not quite got to eleven p.m. yet I know. I withdraw that, Mr. Chairman. The honourable gentleman -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh! I apologize. I also apologize to the Leader of the Opposition. I did not mean it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the amount of money to be spent by the Department of Fisheries this year, to take one of his last points first, the amount is just in excess of \$18 million. A large part of that is money that is going to come from DREE for marine service centres and for water systems. The honourable gentleman said should we take credit for DREE money? I say, sure we should take credit for DREE money. It is not every Province that has got a DREE agreement in the fisheries. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, the only Province, I am pretty sure I am correct in this, that has a DREE agreement in the fishery is the Province of Newfoundland and we can take credit for that along with giving credit to Mr. Jamieson and the Department

of Regional and Economic Expansion for that because we put up to DREE a programme that they could accept, that made sense for the Province of Newfoundland, that was providing needed facilities in the way of water systems, the fish plants, marine service centres and they accepted that and it was accepted by the Government of Canada. Therefore, we can take credit for DREE money. Sure we can. There are all kinds of other Provinces that would like to have an agreement such as we have got, two agreements with DREE, such as we have got where they are putting up ninety per cent of this kind of money. At the same time, we want to give, and I pay Mr. Jamieson tribute as I have earlier in this House for the fine job he is doing in Ottawa and we find that our co-operation with him is excellent and that his concern is the Province and to get as much for the Province as he can. We certainly have no quarrels with him at all.

So, while we give DREE credit, we also take credit ourselves for putting up something that they could accept that is useful to the Province and we hope there will be further such agreements. Now, in the amount of money to be spent, \$18 million, is four times, certainly well over three or four times what was spent up to 1972 a year in the fishery. But forget that for the moment. It is still a considerable sum of money when you make that comparison, but these estimates that are now before the House, Mr. Chairman, as I explained last, I think it was last Thursday, we are not suggesting that this is all we are going to spend in the fishery this year. In fact, we know that we are going to spending considerably more than this on the fishery this year, except we do not as yet know in what manner and therefore it is not represented in the estimates. We are going to have to ask the House for supplementary supply next winter when we come back because there will be spending in the fishery this year that is not reflected in the estimates.

I am going to move, by the way, Mr. Chairman, that before the committee finished with fisheries, an additional \$500,000 in connection

April 1, 1975.

Tape 901

RH - 3

with the settlement of the trawler fishermen's dispute because we now know that that figure is established and we want to add it to the estimates. There is no question that we will be spending, and my colleagues in the Cabinet have given me the assurance that they realize it may be necessary, that we may have to spend considerably more monies in the fishery in Newfoundland this year than are represented in the present estimates and they have said that if we have to do it and if they agree with how it is proposed to be spent, they will assist in lashing it out or authorizing it to be lashed out.

So, you just cannot look at the present estimates, Mr. Chairman, and say this is it for this year. We know very well that it will not be it for this year and that the first

call on any Lieutenant-Governor warrants during the coming year will be from the Department of Fisheries. I, who formerly had to fight against all these attempts by the spenders to spend more, will this year be leading the parade of spenders with the others trying to restrain me. Such is life. It is much more popular to be a spender than it is to be a saver.

I have noticed, Mr. Chairman, an increase in my popularity from 98.2 per cent of the public to 99.6 since my change of portfolios.

MR. NEARY: The order is now Joey, Neary, Crosbie.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: The increase in support.

MR. CROSBIE: Just to deal with some other points now, because we are getting onto six, the Fishing Industry Advisory Board. The Fishing Industry Advisory Board, Mr. Chairman, what is happening with that? Well what is happening with that was Mr. Rupert Prince was appointed after a long search last year, late last Summer or early Fall, was appointed as Chairman of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board. He had been Deputy Minister of Fisheries.

The sincerity of our purpose is shown by the fact that we had to take the man who was then Deputy Minister of Fisheries and put him in that position because we could not find anyone of sufficient stature who would undertake the job. They all did not want it because it is an unenviable one where they are going to be attacked by the trade, and they are going to be attacked by the unions and they could not win and they did not want to undertake it. So we had to persuade poor Rupert Prince that it was his duty to undertake this job and he is undertaking it. Now what has happened since?

There were two members of the Board, one was Mr. Gar Pynn of Memorial University, he is now head of the Commerce Faculty. He is still a member of the Board. The other was Pat Antle who is no longer a member because he resigned because of his health. So, Mr. Pynn and Mr. Prince, who is the Chairman and Mr. Pynn is a member of the Board, they

are working now on the way in which they want the Board to operate and they are working now on the legislation which will be put before the House at this present session.

The Fishing Industry Labour Relations Act or Collective Bargaining Act now just has one section that applies to that Board and that just was a few lines saying there shall be a Fishing Industry Advisory Board, and it shall be three people. It does not give any of its powers or duties, you know, it deals with it very little. The legislation of course to come before the House of course will deal with the powers of the Board, the powers of subpoena, records if they need to do that. It will outline what his responsibilities will be and what his role is to be. They are working on that and it is in the hands of the Department of Justice, a lawyer there working with the Department of Justice and when we finish the estimates it will be placed before this House of Assembly to deal with.

In addition to that, Mr. Jim Laws, Mr. F.A.J. Laws, who was Special Advisor to the Minister and has been since 1972, has been appointed as Secretary to the Board and he is also still performing a few functions for the Minister of Fisheries, particularly in connection with Placentia Bay, but his main duty is to be with that Board and he is the secretary and they have retained two or three other, they have seconded a gentleman from Ottawa who is advising them in certain areas. They just finally succeeded in finding an accountant with experience in the fishing industry who is advising them on what kind of information they are going to need in assessing costs, etc., and so on in the fishing industry and they are using Carl Sullivan from the Department of Fisheries who is a Fishery Economist. In other words they are doing the necessary work so that they can function effectively once the new legislation is passed by the House and they can start to operate.

Now the way things have gone, Mr. Chairman, in recent months, of course it gives one some reason to have to think twice about what the functions of this Board are going to be. Its function basically

is to establish what all of these factors are, what the costs in the industry are, what the marketing situation is, what all aspects are that might affect collective bargaining and to give that information to the parties and to the government and since it is coming from a neutral source it should be acceptable to all. But it is equally clear, Mr. Chairman, that over the past few months, that was shown very clearly and conclusively by the fishing trawler companies, that their costs were such they could pay no more in increased benefits or wages, but that did not stop the union, of course, from persisting in their attempt to get better wages and working conditions,

even though it was shown conclusively and accepted by third parties and that there was no way the industry could pay more. So that might give some cause to consider how effective this board can be in that collective bargaining situation. And any union can well say, well fine, you have shown that the fishing companies or X company cannot pay us any more wages or salaries or improve working conditions that are going to cost them money. But so what, they will say, If you cannot pay more than this, you should not be operating or the government should provide you the funds so that the company can pay us more. So, you know, the value of their role in the collective bargaining process, I think, is open to some real question as to how effective they can be. However, their role will not just be restricted to providing information in collective bargaining situations because they are also going to be performing a function of doing studies for the government or providing the government with information and other jobs of that nature. So their role is going to be expanded over what it was originally in the legislation passed in 1972. And we can only hope that it will be an effective role.

By the way, Mr. Chairman, they have their own office space now, and they are moved into it.

MR. NEARY: The Viking Building.

MR. CROSBIE: No. Offices not even connected with the Viking Building, not the Crosbie Building nor the Chimo Building nor any building like that. They are in an entirely neutral building.

MR. NEARY: What is the name of it?

MR. CROSBIE: I have forgotten the name of it. Maybe out at Carnell Agencies.

MR. NEARY: Out on Crosbie Road.

MR. CROSBIE: Out on - no, not in the funeral home, no.

AN HON. MEMBER: O'Leary Avenue.

MR. CROSBIE: On O'Leary Avenue. So they are now moved into their own

quarters. So that should answer his question, I think, on the Fishing Industry Advisory Board.

Now plants on the Northeast Coast, Mr. Chairman, that the Leader of the Opposition is concerned about and which we are all concerned about. As far as plants on the Northeast Coast are concerned, Mr. Chairman, we want to see that they open or we are going to see as far as we can that they do open. This will all depend on the measure of assistance that the Government of Canada is going to give the industry after April 30. Because unless they give a generous measure of assistance there will be few of any plants open. And the provincial government will do its share, particularly in connection with plants on the Northeast Coast which may not be economic to operate but which should be operated for social reasons. And I said that last Thursday.

For example, we are going to take the necessary steps to see that St. Anthony, Twillingate and Port au Choix, that these plants open. Those plants all lose money, Mr. Chairman. Those three plants owned and operated by Fisheries Products all lose money. If they open this year it will only be because this government is going to provide them with the necessary funds to open those plants on the basis that we know that these plants cannot make money. But the social objective of providing employment in those areas where they have no alternatives and so on mean that this is a social cost government should accept, and we will accept it.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about at Catalina?

MR. CROSBIE: Catalina, of course, you know, is in a different position because it is a trawler operation. So as far as plants on the Northeast Coast are concerned, as long as there is some decent and reasonable level of assistance from the Government of Canada, those plants, or certainly most of them will be opened.

Now the queen crab situation is a bit different, Mr. Chairman. The position there now, and I am going by memory, because

I have forgotten to bring up my file on the queen crab, is that they have a very heavy inventory. They have been talking to the Fishing Prices Support Board and Mr. Leblanc for the last, oh, six or eight weeks, and there have been several meetings. And steps have to be taken to see that their present inventory is disposed off or they will not be able to open at all.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: The federal people have said to them, there are certain things they have to do themselves if they want to get rid of their inventory. They have to try to market their product more rationally. They cannot all be out competing with one another, that they got to consider such matters as perhaps having one or two selling desks for queen crab and not as there is now, ten, twelve or fourteen companies all out trying to sell the same product. And they have put up a plan of action to the Government of Canada.

Now on the assumption that they do get rid of their inventory, the present inventory, so that they can operate, the question is then going to be, what price are they going to pay the fishermen for queen crab? The price that they are going to pay, Mr. Chairman, I do not know the price yet, but it would be certainly considerably less than last year because the price of their product has declined so much and their marketing problems are such that they will not be able to pay the same price for queen crab. And, therefore, certain queen crab operations will most likely not be going ahead this year. I believe the Leader of the Opposition mentioned

St. Anthony, I think it was. And I believe Bonavista is another where the company has made a decision not to engage in processing queen crab this year. Well it may be that there is nothing we can do about that, I mean the queen crab is a product - it is not like salt cod or fillets, it is produced and sold largely to the restaurant and luxury trade. And if there is a world-wide recession where that kind of, where the purchasing of that kind of product is just decreased and a lot of competition from similar products that is just a fact that no government can overcome.

MR. NEARY: What about on board of E.P.A.?

MR. CROSBIE: Well last year we had it on E.P.A. for two weeks, and therefore perhaps we can get it on even longer.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, the Bell Island ferry.

AN HON. MEMBER: a short order cook.

MR. CROSBIE: So the position as to what will happen with the queen crab is not entirely clear yet, but steps are being taken.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Norma and Gladys

MR. CROSBIE: Now I think having dealt with those several points -

AN HON. MEMBER: A very helpful suggestion

MR. CROSBIE: Going back and forth there.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable Member for Bell Island has got the queen crab situation all figured out.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: What is good for the queen crab is good for the honourable gentleman for Bell Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: That is all that needs to be said or canned.

Now, Mr. Chairman, to come back to the Leader of the Opposition's original remarks - he regrets that the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery is not here today, as do we all. But they will be back here in the House tomorrow, and they have a heavy round of meetings set up and

the function they are performing is one that is very valuable also. So we just do not have the time to - and they are anxious to get out around the Province and have as many meetings as they can.

And to get back on the larger - well I have not got that much time to start the larger questions before 6:00 o'clock -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Let me just deal with one simpler point so that I can use up the last three minutes here. The meeting at Ottawa on April 8, Mr. Chairman, is not just to discuss what the alternatives are or to look at studies, we have got the studies. This book here has got eight or nine results of eight or nine studies, and we will have the results of a lot more. It is to give us a chance to discuss with Mr. Leblanc what he may be going to recommend to his colleagues in the federal cabinet later in the month of April, and to give our views as to what he should recommend or we may advise him against recommending something, or something that he is going to recommend. Now, of course, that kind of meeting has got to be confidential, and what he is going to say, and what our position is on it has to be confidential or he can not tell us, because he then has to go to his own colleagues. He may or may not change what he is recommending as a result of our views. So it is not just to look at these studies, we have all got the studies now and they are nearly all completed. I will give a list of them tonight. The facts are known, the problems are known. What we will be discussing with them is what they are going to propose that the federal government do at the end of April, and whether we think they should be doing something differently or that other measures should be taken in addition to what they are going to suggest. So it is a meeting that will hope to - it will be a final meeting really with them before they go ahead to report to the whole Government of Canada and hopefully have the Government of Canada adopt what they are suggesting is necessary to keep the East Coast Canadian Fishery going this year.

Now I think, Mr. Chairman, it would be better to leave the major points until after supper, it is just about 6:00 o'clock now. We might rise until 8:00 o'clock. I call it 6:00 o'clock or if you

will call it 6:00.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it agreed that we will call it 6:00 o'clock?

HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It now being 6:00 o'clock I do leave the
Chair until 8:00 o'clock this evening.

The Committee resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Chairman in the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Order, please!

The Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I have a few more remarks, I guess, in connection with the matters with which we were discussing this afternoon. As I mentioned, before we rose for this evening, the Leader of the Opposition made a very interesting speech to which I am now attempting to reply.

Now, to deal with the remarks as he brought them up originally, the Leader of the Opposition said that I had offered no solutions in my introductory remarks to these estimates to the great and many problems that now face the fishing industry, and that was quite true. I have not offered any solutions as yet and, as he himself said, I do not think there is any perfect solution to any of these problems nor do I think that these problems are going to be overcome in three months or six months or a year. It may be three to five years and there will still be problems and the problems will never all be gone.

Now, in talking about what might happen in the future or what might be done or what the solutions might be, I have to be careful since whatever the solutions are there are certainly going to be ones that require major participation by the Government of Canada as well as our own participation. I do not think, Mr. Chairman, that there is any way in which the basic problems of the fishery are going to be solved or could be solved or can be solved by the Government of Newfoundland acting alone, no matter what its will or what financial resources it wants to try to devote to it because, as we all note, far too much of importance of the fishery is controlled, in any event, are within the constitutional jurisdiction of the Government of Canada.

So, what kind of fishery are we going to have? Well, the kind of fishery that we are going to have, Mr. Chairman, is going to be

circumscribed by decisions that are going to be made by the Government of Canada and it is going to be determined by the outcome of the Law of the Sea Conference, and if that outcome is not satisfactory, if the nations of the world do not agree to recognize the authority of the Coastal State out to the Continental Margin or do not recognize the right of the Coastal State to control the fishery resource within the two hundred mile economic zone, if that is not reached, if no satisfactory solution to that is reached, then of course, what is going to happen to the fishery will depend upon whether Canada takes unilateral action, and if it takes unilateral action, what kind of muscle and what kind of strength it is going to have to enforce the unilateral action it takes. That is probably the most important, will be the most important determinate of what kind of fishery we are going to have because we will not have any kind of a viable fishery, if we have any fishery at all, unless the Coastal State, in this case Canada, gets control of the resource and manages it in a different way that it has been managed in the last ten years.

The concept of a maximum or total allowable catch, which has been a concept utilized by ICNAF and accepted internationally until recently, is not a feasible concept any longer because when you get to a situation where you are taking the total allowable catch of the fish stocks offshore, wherever the fish stocks are, as you reach the total allowable catch, the economics of the - you are already gone beyond economic viability and the people in ships involved in the effort can no longer make any money because the economics change as you reach the total allowable catch. So, that is now recognized. So, it has to be some kind of management resource. It has to be some kind of management regime which does not use a concept of total allowable catch but which uses something quite different. The catch should not be permitted on the concept of total allowable catch. That will have a big effect on the fishery of the future.

So, unless that is established, unless Canada establishes

control and properly exercises it over our fishing resource on the offshore waters, there will be no viable fishery left in this Province or Eastern Canada alone. So, without that, there are no solutions to the fishing problems of Newfoundland or the rest of the East Coast of Canada.

Marketing: In the longer run it is quite obvious that the industry is not going to be able to sustain itself either unless marketing conditions improve. Now, marketing conditions have gone up and down. Prices have gone up and down in previous years, but I mean one fact we are faced with is that Newfoundland is part of Canada, that Newfoundland is no longer, Mr. Chairman, a low wage area. The people of Newfoundland are no longer satisfied with low wages. They are used to a higher standard of living. They are living in the Canadian social security system. In Canada generally now, wages for the first time in industry are higher in many areas than they are even down in the United States of America. We are now in Canada where unions on behalf of the membership this year are looking for raises of twenty per cent and thirty per cent and fifty per cent and one hundred per cent, when down in the United States of America, realizing that they are in the midst of a serious recession, they are looking for at the most, for five per cent or ten per cent if they are looking for anything at all. Many of them are glad just to have a job and that is down in the great and wealthy United States of America.

Here in Newfoundland we are in a situation where the members of unions and employees are looking for increases in industry, pulp and paper, in the fishery, in the liner board, in government service they are looking for increases of twenty, thirty, fifty per cent. So, we are not living, you know, our fishery has got to be conducted now in an environment where lower wages, so on and so forth, are no longer acceptable. Well, that means, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, that while there is a great demand for protein in the world and everybody points this out, that the fishery must have a great long term future because of the requirement for protein where we got

people starving all over the world and Bangladesh and so on and so forth, that when we can get this protein, surely this has got a great long-term future. Well, that may be true, but the only place where we can afford to sell, Mr. Chairman, as our wages and salaries and as costs and so on in the fishing industry move upwards, the only place we can afford to sell is the United States of America where you can get higher prices. You can not get any kind of price for fish in Bangladesh. You cannot get any kind of a price for fish in Africa. In any event, you cannot sell them anything but salt fish because they have not got refrigeration and the freezing facilities to handle it, in any event.

So, we had to sell in markets like the United States of America and that is a market where the customers prefer meat and chicken and where the prices of meat and chicken have gone down in recent months whereas the prices of fish in the supermarkets have not, where the per capita consumption of fish is not very great, where their per capita consumption of meat and poultry is far, far greater and far more attractive to the consumer. So, we in this industry in Eastern Canada have got just about one market and that is in the United States of America and we are at the mercy of that market.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - petro dollars -

MR. CROSBIE: The petro dollars have not got a darn thing to do with it. The petro dollars have nothing to do with it. Where they need our fish, Mr. Chairman, is in countries of the low standard of living, low incomes that cannot pay much for the product and have not got freezing and refrigeration facilities and therefore can only use it canned or salted. So this is another fact that we have to contend with. When you are talking about marketing, we have to realize that Europe, that our chances of selling in Europe are far less than they used to be partly because of the tariffs, of the tariff

April 1, 1975.

Tape 905

RH - 5

barriers over there. When the U.K.s become part of the European common market they have a higher tariff on fish even than the U.S. does. Of course, they have their own fishing fleets and the rest of it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. The same thing is happening. There is discontent everywhere in the fishing industry. So, the marketing

side of it is certainly not clear. It is true that the world needs protein but it is equally true that the world has not solved the problem of how the people that need the protein get it while people who produce the protein get the price they need to get but pay high wages and all the rest of the things that are now expected and any other would be unacceptable in this Province and in the rest of Canada. So that is another major difficulty.

Now my experience the last five or six months, whatever it is since October, certainly Mr. Chairman, I am familiar with the problem and all of the studies that have been done by the federal government certainly mean that the problems are all laid out and I can speak for hours on what the problems are, but the solutions -

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, in general it is known. It supports really what has been generally felt to be the case, although there is a lot of interesting material in them. So what kind of fishery we are going to have is going to be dictated by these major spheres of activity on which the Newfoundland Government has little or no influence. Of course we have to do our part wherever we can have a part to play.

Now, what are some of the things that may happen in the future? It may well happen, Mr. Chairman, and it would be very desirable to have the ownership of the trawlers or the trawler fleets separate from the ownership of the processing companies. Now that has not happened in Newfoundland or Eastern Canada but it has happened in other countries, I suppose for historical reasons. But it would obviously be better if those who owned the trawlers were separated from those who owned the processing companies so that there would be two parties in a fairly equally strong position who would determine in their own relationship what the price of fish was going to be landed by a trawler fleet.

It may well be that that could only be brought about in future by government participation in a trawler fleet, or government participation

with industry in a trawler fleet, That is one of the avenues that is being looked at and one of the avenues that may be decided upon in the long run. It is equally true, Mr. Chairman, that the ownership of a trawler fleet today is not altogether a desirable thing to have. Trawlers are becoming tremendously expensive, with catches of the kind -

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. You are not going to make money on trawlers in any event, but you have got to have the fish or you cannot operate a fishing industry at all. Therefore you have to have trawlers. So it can be seen that there is either going to be government ownership of trawler fleets or some kind of government participation, because they are certainly not going to operate just privately owned and it would be desirable to have the ownership of trawlers held in different hands than the ownership of plants.

MR. ROBERTS: Why?

MR. CROSBIE: Because then what would determine the prices of fish landed by trawlers would not be an internal arrangement that the company has in its own books but it would be determined by two parties who would have equal power to bargain as to what prices should be.

MR. ROBERTS: Are the trawlermen artificially playing with the price of fish?

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I do not know if you can say they are artificially playing with the price of fish -

MR. ROBERTS: The landed price.

MR. CROSBIE: But the price as landed is something that they have to determine by their own efforts. It is not determined by anything other than the calculations they make themselves. Now if the trawlers were all owned by a third party who would not sell them fish for less than "X" cents a pound and they could not get any fish other than paying that.

MR. ROBERTS: "X" cents being an economic -

MR. CROSBIE: "X" cents being economic for the fleets. They would have to pay that, or give up. Whereas now the price they ascribe the fish

landed may be "X" or it might be "X" minus eight, or whatever suits them in their own calculations, but there is not any third party that can set that price. Well, that would be one advantage. The possible changes in the ownership of trawler fleet, marketing groups, this is another area that is being looked at.

As I suppose most members of the House know, in Norway I believe there is two now, there are three groups that do the marketing of fish in Norway, and then Iceland I believe, I am not sure if there is only one or two, two at the most, two I think it is. It may well be that the proper way to market fish from Eastern Canada would be, if not through one marketing agency, through several industry groups that would be supervised also by government, in this case the federal government that has the power to regulate International Trade and Commerce. This may be a better method of dealing with marketing in the future and it is certainly one of the matters that is being looked at now.

But these are all changes that may be made in the fishery that may bring some improvement but are not the fundamental, they are not overcoming the fundamental problems because the fundamental problems are really the ones that I have mentioned to do with the resource and marketing generally.

Now, you know what is going to happen to the inshore fishermen, is he going to disappear? Is he becoming the vanishing breed. You know, no one can really give the answer to that. It is interesting to note the number of fishermen in Newfoundland has not really very greatly changed in the last eight or ten years.

MR. ROBERTS: But the percentage of the work force certainly has changed.

MR. CROSBIE: As a percentage of the work force, yes. It has declined. It is now around eleven or twelve per cent involved in fishing or fish plants. But the number of inshore fishermen and the number

of fishermen themselves, the actual numbers have not changed greatly. So what is the future for an inshore fishermen? Well, he has no future in ground fish unless the Law of the Sea turns out to be successful or we have unilateral control. Assuming that there is some control put on over-catching, then he has got to become a man who is going to involve himself in more than one fishery as they now more and more do. They participate in the inshore ground fishery, codfish. He has to participate in catching herring, mackerel queen crab and other inshore species, if he is going to be able to make a half decent living at the fishery. So that is the way the inshore fisherman has to go.

Are the young people following in their fathers' footsteps? I think that the figures suggested by the Leader of the Opposition are probably accurate. That the majority of inshore fishermen today are older men. The younger men are not going to go into the fishery if they have other choices and today for the most part they do have other choices.

I believe that the survey that was mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Parsons conducted it, certainly showed whither tending in that direction when a very low percentage of those interviewed, I believe it was in high school, their school indicated that they would have anything to do with the fishery. So that showed the way things are tending.

So I would say that in the future there is likely to be fewer fishermen in Newfoundland because there are going to be fewer young people going to go into it as an occupation. They have other alternatives. Most of our young people today have other alternatives. They do not have to follow their fathers. In some areas and so on they still do. But for the most part they have alternatives. For the most part most of them are going to accept the alternatives. So I would say that in the future, assuming that we have a decent fishery as a result of changes that take place in the next several years, that you are going to have a smaller number of fishermen who are able to make a better living

by engaging in many fisheries inshore.

MR. ROBERTS: What is the social structure of our East Coast?

MR. CROSBIE: Well what is to happen to the social structure of the Northeast Coast, of course the Northeast Coast is going to reflect this. Now there is no alternative economic occupation for most areas of the Northeast Coast, other than fishing, that can be easily seen. The tourist industry is one possibility. Of course we have a short season and so on but there is a lot that can be done in the tourist area from sightseers and so on. There is that kind of possibility.

The government is attempting to give more direction and drive to rural development and to create what industry and assistance it can in rural areas and these efforts have met with some success. But they are not going to be sufficient to overcome the problem of the Northeast part of the Island of Newfoundland if the fishery collapsed altogether.

However, there was a greater effort being made than had been made previously. So that the Northeast Coast is going to depend, if it is going to depend on the fishery and such alternatives as tourism as can be developed once communications and transportation is improved.

So I would see that the Northeast Coast, and it is the aim of this government, as we have stated, I think, pretty clearly, that we do not intend to let the inshore fishery die insofar as is possible for this Province to do anything about it. Because to allow it to die would certainly be to allow the Northeast to die, and we do not intend to do that either. So as far as is humanly possible, I would say that in fifteen or twenty years time, assuming the resource comes under control, the Northeast Coast will still be there as it is, probably with fewer fishermen.

Now if the people on the Northeast Coast want the Northeast Coast saved and want their kind of life saved on the Northeast Coast, then they must also do things that are necessary to help themselves. For example, Mr. Chairman, it is not possible or feasible or sensible to have some kind of fish processing facility in every fishing village on the Northeast Coast. It is not sensible and it is not economically feasible, and it is as just as well for people to realize that. One of the main difficulties with the plants now located on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland is that they only utilize about forty per cent of their processing capacity. They got a very small put-through.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the processing plants operate during the season, for example or -

MR. CROSBIE: No during -

MR. ROBERTS: - annually?

MR. CROSBIE: No, annually. During the season at certain times, of course, they are utilizing all their processing capacity.

MR. ROBERTS: So we have to lengthen -

MR. CROSBIE: They have to be able to be put in a position where they can be used for longer periods of the year, and it may well be that some of these smaller facilities and plants, you know, will not be able to keep operating indefinitely. I will give some figures in a moment that shows the number of these.

Areas that want to have new processing facilities have got to consider the affect if they get them on the fish plants already in the area. For example, I mean the honourable gentleman should not be so foolish. He knows nothing about it, and do not interrupt me.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is that?

MR. CROSBIE: The member for Bell Island.

For example, there is a fish plant at Valleyfield,

Mr. Chairman, -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: - people of Newfoundland can hear what the minister is saying.

MR. CROSBIE: Look, I can either treat this subject seriously or I can get up here and sling the bull as the honourable gentleman would and the people of Newfoundland may appreciate that better. I think they would appreciate better hearing some facts for a change rather than this asinine -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: That is really inspiring.

MR. CROSBIE: There is a fish plant -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: If the people of Newfoundland can be inspired -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Honourable gentlemen, one honourable gentleman in particular persists in interrupting the gentleman who has the floor.

It is totally out of order and is uncalled for, unparliamentary and I suggest that he desist .

MR. CROSBIE: As I was saying, Mr. Chairman. There is a fish plant at Valleyfield and one of the problems of that fish plant is that it has not got enough put-through. Yet there are other communities along that coast that want a processing facility established in their community so that they can process fish there. Well, if fish is to be processed in other communities within the area of Valleyfield, so that that plant gets less fish to put through it, the result will only be that the plant at Valleyfield will eventually be forced to close while the plant put in at the nearby community will be forced to close also because it has no hope of success.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: You know, since we already have a sixty per cent excess capacity, it is hardly likely that we are going to be able to utilize all that. But if you have gotten to a stage eventually where that was being used at a decent rate, then you could consider more capacity. But what we do not need now in Newfoundland is any further processing capacity. We have got it coming out of our ears. We do not need more fish processing plants. We may need some processing capacity in certain areas but generally speaking in Newfoundland now we can process double what we are processing here now, double what the industry is processing. So, you know, if the Northeast Coast wants to be preserved, then it is time for them to also examine the situation and not to be making unreasonable requests to government to do things that should not be done, that is not in the interest of the industry and of the Province, generally, to do. That is another aspect that needs to be kept in mind.

There is no reason, Mr. Chairman, why we should not be able to ensure better co-ordination between the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation and the rest of the fish processing industry. It is obviously sensible if it can be done to put more cod fish into salt under the present circumstances than it is to produce cod blocks which are now getting a low price in the United States or wherever they are sold. So where that is practical and possible and where government can enforce it, we should encourage the fresh fish or the Frozen Fish Processing Industry to co-operate with the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation and the fishermen in putting more of the cod catch into salt. Now it is possible to do that to a degree, and it should be done. There is no reason that I can think of, Mr. Chairman, why we should not, if the federal government agrees that this can be done, and they ultimately control it, arrange in future, depending on what happens at the Law of the Sea and what arrangements can be made, for us to process here in Newfoundland catches of fish by foreign fleets under proper arrangements. Since we have a tremendous excess in plant capacity, if we cannot catch enough fish ourselves to enable those plants to operate at capacity, then if satisfactory arrangements can be entered into with other foreign countries or firms, there is no reason that I can see why, if arrangements can be made with Ottawa, we should not have fish landed here to be processed here for re-export to those European countries that are involved or whatever the arrangements might be.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: There is going to be far more employment given - what?

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Well, we are not sure whether - you know, this is not something that has been done to date, but this is something that Ottawa is also examining and having a look at.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Pardon?

MR. ROBERTS: Weeks recommended it.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Weeks, I imagine, recommended that before.

So there seems to me, I cannot see where the objection would come from if we can handle all fish our own fishermen can catch, and we still have excess capacity, why we should not use that to process the catches of foreign fleets under an arrangement satisfactory to us. To use that capacity and give more employment here would seem to me to be a logical thing to proceed to do.

The Canadian Salt Fish Corporation is also interested in the same kind of concept in connection with salt fish. The Canadian Salt Fish Corporation has - I forget the percentage now - but if they used forty per cent of their drying capacity last year or their curing capacity that was all they used, and I do not know if it was even forty per cent. The plants of their agents did not use nearly their capacity. The plant at Catalina owned by Mifflins was used little if at all last year in the salt fish business. So there are all kinds of capacity also for the drying of salt fish in Newfoundland now not being utilized. And there is no reason, Mr. Chairman, I can see why arrangements cannot be made with some foreign countries that want the salt cod fish for them to have their fishermen or fleets land fish here, when it is to their advantage to do that, to have it processed here and re-exported to them. That is something else that should be pursued.

Then you look at changing social conditions, Mr. Chairman, it is interesting to note that the result of the revolution, I suppose it was, in Spain last year, peaceful though it was and the change in social conditions in Portugal, have resulted in the fact that no longer are we ever to see again the Portuguese White Fleet that used to fill the harbour of St. John's. That

fleet will never sail from Portugal again because they can no longer get Portuguese fishermen who will travel on that fleet under the old conditions. They now expect more money and better conditions and so on and so forth. You cannot get the crews so that the Portuguese White Fleet will never again enter the harbour of St. John's. That day is gone.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why can they not get the crews?

MR. CROSBIE: Because they now expect better working conditions and better salaries and they are not going to sail under the old arrangements any longer.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE:

There was a Portuguese Delegation out visiting the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation last week.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: And the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation is hoping to do considerable business with Portugal this year and the coming year so that is another area that should be looked at.

Well, the Leader of the Opposition mentioned the trucking of fish and trying to use these plants on the Northeast Coast for longer periods of the year. Well, that is obviously all desirable, and as the road system improves this is all a help towards that end. We are still going to have to face the fact that in some of these areas of Newfoundland, and any cost-benefit analysis that would be to our advantage to keep them operating, whereas no private operator would be able to operate them and make money. But that is a decision that we have to make for social reasons.

So I covered some of the general points as the way that I see things may go. But, I think, Mr. Chairman, that I am not ready yet to say this is what the Newfoundland Government will do or will not do because I want first to see what the federal government are going to do, what we can persuade them to do, to see if we can agree with them. If we agree with them we are going to say it, If we do not agree with them we will say why we do not, or what else we think we should do, or what we will do to supplement what they are doing. And these are obviously problems that are going to have to be worked out by the provinces and the federal government not just to the end of April but over this next year, and it may be longer. Because many of the things which I have mentioned are things that are going to be solved by the end of April. I think that all we can expect by the end of April is to know what kind of financial assistance the Government of Canada are going to give to the industry inshore and offshore this year, while decisions are being made on these far larger matters of structure and the rest of it as to how it is going to operate in the future and while the question of the Law of the Sea is being settled. Because no matter what assistance is given by the Government of Canada or ourselves, as I said just a few minutes ago it will not matter unless the resource is

properly protected and it becomes economic to fish. It is not economic today to fish. The decrease in the return per unit of effort is gone down so much you can not make money sending a trawler out to fish. It is just as simple as that, and that is now widely recognized on all sides and it is the Law of the Sea Conference or what follows from unilateral action that will have to change that.

The technology - the Leader of the Opposition mentioned technology. By the way, when we are considering offshore stocks and the rest of it, I think that Gus Etchegary has done a great job for this Province in the last few years in that area. He is certainly one of the earliest people to bring the problem to the attention of the public and the governments. And he has been a first class spokesman for Canada at ICNAF, and has done an excellent job there. And our new man Cabot Martin who is over in Geneva now is keeping in touch with us weekly, and in about two weeks time we should know how that is shaping up.

Now in technology; The cost of longliners is becoming extremely expensive, as the Leader of the Opposition mentioned. I believe - I have not had time yet but I am sure this has to be done and will be done - that we have to look at the kinds of boats we are financing to see whether we should continue financing them at all, whether they are the right kind of boats. The general feeling as I gathered at Ottawa is that we have enough of longliners in this Province now, and that that kind of vessel should not be built any longer except to replace the present fleet of longliners as they become depreciated or, you know, worn out or deteriorated, that we should not be building new additions to the longliner fleet but only replacements. Now we should be modifying them and we should be changing them or improving the ways in which they can fish, if that is possible, but not building any more new additions. The costs have shot up. The costs are terrific. This has to be reviewed. It is being reviewed in Ottawa. We have to review it ourselves. We are experimenting, Mr. Chairman, and have spent a lot of money in the last two or three years experimenting. We have these three new sixty-five foot vessels completed now at Marystown. They will be completed in

the next several months. The first one will do her sea trials next week.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: The Lump Fish Roe or whatever the vessel's name is, it is some queer name like that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: That is not the name of it, it is the name of some fish -

MR. ROBERTS: I thought the Minister of Industrial Development -

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, they are the sculpin class.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: These three -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: These vessels have got, you know, new concepts and gear that have been suggested by Captain Wes Johnson of the federal government, and they are suppose to be able to do several different kinds of fishing, and this remains to be seen whether these new concepts of gear are going to work. But a lot of money has been put into this because it is realized that the old kind of vessel is no longer the thing, and we have to try others, and these sixty-five foot vessels which are mid water vessels are an attempt to see whether this is the way we should go. In addition to Harmon I and Harmon II have been mentioned, they have been refitted, and one of them -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, no, one of them is out fishing now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: It is down at the wharf here in St. John's, and one is down at Marystown and will be out when its electrical system is changed.

And there is a whole lot, when we get down through the estimates you will see where a whole lot of money is being spent -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: on attempting to find new equipment, automatic longlining equipment, and all the rest of it. So this is not being forgotten. Technology is getting a lot of attention in the Department of Fisheries in the last several years.

I think I have covered most of those general points that the Leader of the Opposition mentioned. Now it was suggested, Mr. Chairman, that there was a new policy at the Loan Board, that the Loan Board was cracking down. Well I can assure you this, that the Loan Board is not cracking up. And if you mean by, "The Loan Board is cracking down," that the Loan Board expects people to pay on their loans, who have the ability to pay on their loans, who have not paid on their loans for three or four years without any reasonable excuse whatsoever, then the answer is, yes, the Fishery Loan Board is cracking down. They are cracking down on those who for some reason or other have not paid on loans for three or four or five years when they had the wherewithal to pay on loans, where they had good catches, where they had no reason not to pay on loans except that somebody or some politician had gone campaigning and told them, look boy it is not really a loan, you are never going to be expect to pay it back. And those politicians were not P.C. politicians. Some of them, some of them had the strange idea, Mr. Chairman, that these were not loans that these were just something you forgot about, and only call loans. Well those people have learned different and they are going to continue to learn differently because I see no reason, Mr. Chairman, why a hundred people should pay on their loan and another thirty-three people should not, although the thirty-three have got the ability to pay on on their loans the same as the other hundred. That is discrimination.

AN NON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, no I am just using this as - I will give figures later on when we get down there.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister name names of politicians who made these statements? Name names, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: I will not at the moment.

MR. NEARY: He said they were not P.C 's. Who were they? Name them.

MR. CROSBIE: They were Liberals, naturally, who do you think they were. The same people - who would you expect them to be?

MR. NEARY: Well, name them.

MR. CROSBIE: They were not the N.D.P.

MR. NEARY: Give us the names.

MR. CROSBIE: You might have been one of them. I will have to check my list.

MR. NEARY: Am I one of them?

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Chairman, - it is the kind of thing that you would do.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister is practicing McCarthyism.

MR. NEARY: That is a Communist tactic. Go on let us have some names.

MR. CROSBIE: The Leader of the Opposition -

MR. NEARY: Give us the names.

MR. WILSON: Something called

MR. NEARY: Give us the names.

MR. CROSBIE: The Leader of the Opposition this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, himself said that these should not be considered as loans.

MR. ROBERTS: I said we should lend -

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, that is right.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, to a point of privilege.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman has the right to debate, and I do not intend to take that away from him in any way. But he has no right to misrepresent. And if he is going to refer to my remarks then let him quote them accurately. I at no point said that these were loans that did not have to be repaid. I said somethings, and I will say some more things about the minister's change in policy. But if the minister is going to refer to what I said let him - this is my point, Sir - let him quote me accurately and I submit that he did not.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, on that, the Hansard will show whatever the honourable gentleman said. I am just saying this, Mr. Chairman, that the Fisheries Loan Board is not repossessing boats in any great quantity. There have been some boats repossessed. There have been no boats repossessed from any fishermen who came in with any reasonable story as to why he had not paid for two, three, four, five years on his

loans. Every one of them is scrutinized very carefully. And those who have had to be gotten after and threatened with foreclosure are those who have had their boats repossessed, and there have not been very many. There may have been three or four, are people who have not paid on their loans for three, four, five or six years despite the fact that they had the financial ability to pay on them, and decided not to pay on them. Any

fisherman who has a loan from the Fisheries Loan Board, who has a poor year fishing, who has not the finances and cannot make his payments, he is forgiven for the next year.

There is no fault in the Fisheries Loan Board in the direction of strictness, Mr. Chairman. If the Fisheries Loan Board has any fault it is in the direction of too much looseness. So I can assure this House, Mr. Chairman, that there is no fisherman who had a difficult year or whose catch was not up to last years or who does not have the money because he did not have a good year or he was sick or whatever was wrong with him and therefore could not pay on his boat, who was not allowed to go on and those payments be deferred for another year. But there is a small minority who somehow got the idea that a loan from the Fisheries Loan Board need never be repaid. Well, that small minority are now being given a different impression.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Putting the blocks to them.

MR. CROSBIE: No, nobody is getting the blocks put to them. If the honourable gentleman wants to bring up the name of anybody who got the blocks put him we will have it looked into.

MR. ROBERTS: I would like to have the names of any politicians who has told a fisherman that a loan did not have to be repaid.

MR. CROSBIE: If the honourable gentleman wants names I will give him names.

MR. ROBERTS: I do want them. I ask for them now in order to challenge the minister to use them.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman is not going to get them now. I do not have them here with me. But Liberal politicians, that is one of their favourite campaign tricks.

MR. ROBERTS: Name them.

MR. CROSBIE: And they shall be duly named.

MR. ROBERTS: The McCarthyist tactic.

MR. CROSBIE: Forget it, it is irrelevant anyway. The point is -

MR. F.B. ROWE: To a point of order, Mr. Chairman. The minister has made, you know, fairly serious accusations. He said that certain Liberal Politicians have indicated to fishermen that they did not have to repay loans to the Fisheries Loan Board on their longliners. Now there are eight Liberal Politicians sitting in this House at the present time and the minister is tarring all of the eight members with the same brush. Now unless he is prepared to name the names of these people I would suggest, Sir, that he should withdraw these remarks completely.

MR. CROSBIE: It is funny how the honourable gentleman gets so serious and excited. I am not saying that any Liberal Politician -
AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Just a minute, Mr. Chairman. Look, am I allowed to speak or is the honourable gentleman? I do not say that any Liberal Politician who is a member -

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you speaking to the point of order?

MR. CROSBIE: I am speaking to the point the honourable gentleman raises. I have not suggested nor said that any member opposite has made such promises or any such statements. All I am saying is that some fishermen have been told in the past by politicians that they did not need to repay their loans.

AN HON. MEMBER: By Liberal Politicians.

MR. CROSBIE: It so happens that they were Liberal Politicians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: No, not me and -

MR. NEARY: How about the Minister of Finance?

MR. CROSBIE: - not any of the honourable gentlemen opposite

MR. NEARY: Or the Minister of Justice.

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

This is basically either a difference of opinion between honourable members, these are not unparliamentary remarks, they may be remarks that do not meet with a great deal of favour with one group or another. However, they are the substance of which debate is made and I suggest that this is what we should have. But we

should have it in the parliamentary manner which is that the gentleman speaking has the right to be heard in silence and all other honourable gentlemen have the right to be heard in turn.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope that explains the position of the Fisheries Loan Board.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: You really dug yourself in that time.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, the Fisheries Loan Board makes loans at three-and-one-half per cent interest. You get a loan at three and one-half per cent interest, you get a thirty-five per cent subsidy from the federal government, and another fifteen per cent and a loan from the provincial government at three and one-half per cent. Any person who gets those loans, who can repay on the loan, who has not suffered a misfortune and who has the economic and financial ability to pay on the loan should pay on the loan or else the programme should be changed completely and called the giveaway programme and is not a loan at all.

It is a loan programme and it is a generous programme and the hundreds of fishermen in this Province who have had loans and who have paid off the loans, they are owed a duty for us to see that others who got loans, who are able to pay them, also pay those loans off -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: - so they get no preference. And that is the policy, and that is going to continue to be the policy as long as I am Minister of Fisheries. That is the policy. Now, there are a small minority who try to get away with something and they are being dealt with in accordance with the agreements they signed. I can see nothing wrong with that, It is the proper course of action.

Now the Leader of the Opposition also asked about the gear bank. There was a committee appointed, Mr. Chairman, to look into

the gear situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who was on it?

MR. CROSBIE: I am going to go into that now. That committee has reported. Now the committee, and I will table copies of this in the House on Thursday -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: I do not have them all here. There is one that can be tabled tonight, for that matter, if you want it. This was a study of gear prices and gear bank feasibility conducted by James W. Hansen, Thomas A. Poynter and Robert W. Sexty. They were appointed last -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: They were appointed last Fall, early last Fall, Mr. Chairman. These gentlemen are all on the faculty of the School of Commerce at Memorial University. I do not think that any of them have a connection with the Mafia because the Mafia is not interested in universities or in Academia.

MR. ROBERTS: Neither is the government.

MR. CROSBIE: We do not care where the money comes from.

MR. NEARY: Oh! I see.

MR. CROSBIE: We do not investigate who buys our bonds. I invite the Mafia to buy fifty million of our next issue. We do not care as long as they buy the bonds and we get the money.

MR. DOODY: If we do not pay they can put a contract out on the Member for Bell Island.

MR. CROSBIE: They would have a job frying him.

So this group were asked, at the School of Commerce at Memorial, to do a study on gear prices and gear bank feasibility last Fall. They did the study and they have concluded. They investigated fishing gear prices throughout the Province and the feasibility of establishing a fishing gear bank.

The reason for the study was because there was concern on the part of the fishermen and the government about the adequacy of supply of inshore fishing gear and the prices of gear. Their findings

reveal that there is no significant discrepancy in the average prices charged for inshore fishing gear between Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. The two provinces that they directly compared were Newfoundland and Nova Scotia because Nova Scotia was the one that had an inshore fishery most comparable to Newfoundlands, so that their -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: These gentlemen are accountants and graduates in commerce with M.A's and B.A's and B.Com's and PH.D's -

AN HON. MEMBER: Rollie Martin's buddies.

MR. CROSBIE: They have nothing to do with Rollie Martin that I know of, but if they are his buddies they would be a fine group. I have never seen these three gentlemen.

AN HON. MEMBER: - a fine group.

MR. CROSBIE. These are people who know how to do a study.

AN HON. MEMBER: There is no doubt about that but -

MR. CROSBIE: It is a bit difficult to proceed because I am naturally timorous, Mr. Chairman, and the honourable gentleman's nattering has frightened me and disturbed me and I am getting upset and I do not know if I can keep on.

Now to get back to this - they found there is no significant discrepancy in the average prices charged for inshore fishing gear between Newfoundland and Nova Scotia. They also recommended against the concept of establishing a gear bank. They found that escalations in the cost of fishing gear have in the main been caused by significant increases in petroleum derivatives from which synthetic fishing gear is made. The reason for the increases in prices of gear is because of the increase in the price of gas, petroleum derivatives in the last year or two years.

They find, as I say, there is no material difference in the credit terms or supply time offered by suppliers in Newfoundland or Nova Scotia that would affect the price of fishing gear. There is an indication, they find, which could only be sustained by further investigation, that gear prices are slightly lower in Newfoundland and credit terms more favourable than they are

in Nova Scotia.

In looking at the feasibility of whether a fishing gear bank would be feasible or not, they concluded that it would be undesirable, based on findings; first, that the supply of gear in Newfoundland has not presented any serious problem except in isolated areas and for hung gear - I wish the Member for Bell Island were here because I would like to see him hung right up by the gear - only for hung gear in season, and they found that suppliers appear to carry adequate stocks of gear, supplementing gear that fishermen possess and they find that the availability of gear has not had serious lost income implications. In other words, if you lose gear through some disaster you can quickly get it replaced. There has been no difficulty that way, or very little.

They found that

fishermen have alternative gear, fishing gear available in most instances when partial gear losses are incurred and they find that depending on the intent of government subsidization, the prices charged for gear from a gear bank would most unlikely be substantially lower than those charged under private enterprise because of the costs of going into the programme and the difficulties you are going to have in any kind of government gear bank or government run operation where one out of every ten people, at least, who deal with you are going to feel that it is quite correct and cricket and the proper and right thing to do to screw the government if you can or to do the government if you can, because government is government. That would be one of the problems with a gear bank and they do not feel that the prices, if government did go into a gear bank, that the prices would be much different than the prices charged by firms and private enterprise at the moment.

Now, the conclusions of the study are given on page fifty-six and in essence, I think, I have summed them up there now. The supply of gear is not a serious problem. I mentioned that. The need for the gear bank is not clearly warranted as suppliers appear to carry stocks of gear, adequate stocks of gear. Depending upon the extent of government subsidization, the prices charged for gear would most likely not be substantially lower than those under private enterprise. The markup on gear is approximately fifteen to twenty per cent. By coincidence, the current bounty of twenty dollars approximates this markup.

The willingness of government to subsidize gear prices was largely determined of savings that might be realized from a gear bank and then they go into certain other considerations and suggestions that they make. So, Mr. Chairman, a competent body or group of people, professional people were asked to study the gear situation in Newfoundland, gear prices, supply of gear, whether a gear bank would be something, that it would be feasible and sensible for government to do and they found and recommended against. I have one copy here which I

can table in light of that study and I will try and get another six or eight copies to table on Thursday. I will not be here tomorrow.

So, that is the position on a gear bank. The commitment to look into gear bank and the gear situation was carried out and the committee has reported and it did not find any evidence of profiteering and so on as I have just covered. Well, that was the gear bank.

The trawler fleet, the Leader of the Opposition had quite a chuckle over the trawler fleet or he thought he was on to some fantastic point about the trawler fleet. Well, Mr. Chairman, as far as the government trawler fleet was concerned, the Newfoundland Government announced that it believed in the concept of having our own trawlers or looking at the possibility of a government trawler fleet. Before moving any further on that concept which would involve the expenditure of tens of millions of dollars, it had to be checked into thoroughly. The firm of a resource, the RPC firm in New Brunswick, Resource Productivity Council or some name like that or Resource Planning Consultants of New Brunswick -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Resource Productivity Council.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, - were asked to look into this whole concept and they have been looking into it for some twelve months or so with the aid of various officials of the Government of Newfoundland. The report we have is not in the final form yet, but just as we were getting their, you know, the final form of the report last summer and their study was just about being clued up to what kind of trawlers we went into and how they should operate and what kind of marketing system would you have and where would they fish and so on and so forth to fit in with the new Canadian Licensing System, just as that was being received, the present crisis in the fishing industry became more and more to the fore and therefore, as to what action will be taken in their report and even the finishing of that report has to await what happens in the present situation in the fishing industry. It would be a foolish government, Mr. Chairman, that would rush into the establishment of a government-owned trawler fleet before we know

April 1, 1975.

Tape 910

RH - 3

just what is going to come out of all our deliberations with the Canadian Government in the next few months and what is going to come out of the Law of the Sea Conference and the rest of it. So, a lot of work is being done in that area, a lot of information is being gathered, fishing plans have been devised, the kinds of trawlers that will be most desirable to be is being decided or reported upon, whether you have an auction system for the fish or how the fish would be sold by the trawlers and all those alternatives are being looked at. But before

take any further action on it, we have to see what is going to happen to the Canadian East Coast fishing industry first. That is where that matter stands at the moment. Thank heavens we proceeded no more quickly with it. Thank heavens it is still a matter that we can draw back from if we need to because I think we are lucky that we are not further committed than we are in that concept at the moment.

I think I have covered most of the points that honourable gentlemen opposite raised. I have exhausted the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Bell Island. I have almost exhausted myself.

The honourable Leader of the Opposition said that we do not need any more studies. Well, I happen to be of that view too, Mr. Chairman. There have just been a series of studies done and are now being completed under the auspices of the federal government and which we are getting copies of and which we have been involved in which has looked exhaustively at all phases of the fishing industry. Frankly, I do not see myself any need for any further studies. What has to be decided by the governments involved, us and the federal government and the other Maritime Province governments is what action we are going to take. The basic information is all here. It is all gathered now.

You can suggest all kinds of solutions. I can make 100 suggestions tonight that you might do this and you might do that and you might do something else in the fishing industry that would all sound good. But what now has to be decided is what we are actually going to do and to what extent we are going to go. Here are the studies that are underway now, most of which are now completed. Alternative policy objectives - that was a study. That is finished. The resource base production and distribution - part one of that was the offshore ground fishery, part two was the inshore ground fishery. They are completed. Part three was intersectoral linkages. That, in case you do not know what it means, Mr. Chairman, is an identification analysis of activities directly and indirectly dependant upon the fishing industry. In other words, what linkage does the fishing industry have with other industries. What is its linkage to ship building? What is its linkage with

sausages or whatever. Anyway, that study is called intersectoral linkages which is remarkable jargon. But that is all part of a study of the resource based production and distribution. That is being done.

Communities and employment, a description and classification of all the communities and employees dependent on the fishing industry. I have not seen that one yet but I think it is now done. Cost price relationships, analysis of production costs and trends in the cost price relationships - that is completed.

Here is an interesting study that I have not seen yet, national and international corporate links between firms. That is a review of the intercorporate relationships of Canadian ground fish companies. In other words, where does Booth fit in the corporate group of general bakeries or whatever the name of the company is that owns the whole food group that includes Booth. B.C. Packer is a small subsidiary of, what is his name, Weston, of the tremendous Weston conglomerate. Well, this study will show what is the relationship of every company to other companies that are now involved in the fishery, the national and international corporate links.

An audit of the financial situation of the firms; the companies are all being audited by auditors of the federal government to see what their financial situation is, their record of profits, their record of reinvestments, their ownership and parent-subsidiary relationships.

There is another study, government expenditure in the fishery, which is a study of federal and provincial government expenditures and programmes in the fishery including DREE. I have not seen that yet but that would analyze what every government spends on the fishery.

Another study is of the resource, the natural resource, labour and capital. In other words, the three components that are in the fishing industry and the capital requirements of the industry which are used. A further study is a study of the ground fish fleet, the Canadian ground fish fleet capacity and the economic performance of the fleet; how good is it, how old are the trawlers, when do they have to be replaced, what is it going to cost to replace the whole trawler fleet and the figure is huge. Another study is a

management regime for the primary resource to development elements of a new management regime, and to identify Canada's probable development possibilities, post-Law of the Sea. Ten studies on resource utilization, what is the optimum utilization of the catch, are we utilizing to the optimum the catch? How should it be utilized?

Part two - the market outlook, an assessment of the short, medium and long-term market outlook for Canadian ground fish products on domestic and export markets.

Part three - marketing organization and programmes. A study of the marketing organization in major ground fish exporting countries, with a view to identify efficient marketing structures for the Atlantic Coast ground fish industry. I have seen the study done in Norway, study done in Iceland, study done in Greenland and Denmark, that is the three I believe. So they studied all three of those, watched their marketing organization, how were they organized and so on, and so forth and how would that be relevant to Canada. Another study, alternative structures or strategies for the industry, looking at the fleet, their organization and management, marketing and so on and so forth.

Medium term and long term programmes is study number twelve, trying to design programmes to implement the strategies decided upon, the fleet mix, so on and so forth, plant rationalization and the rest of it and these are the basic studies that are being done are just being done now. Some of them are right here.

You know the facts are all going to be there, Mr. Chairman. There are some people who feel that a royal commission is needed and as I say there has not been one because we have not been able to find a suitable chairman, but I quite frankly do not see the necessity for any royal commission unless the necessity of it is an educational one. Perhaps there would still be one if - or perhaps there may not but I think the time has come, and I agree with the Leader of the Opposition, that we have had lots of studies and with the studies that have now been done and with the

information that is there, the problems are certainly identified, every aspect of them. The facts are there, whether the companies are making money or not making money, whether they re-invested the money they have made or whether they slipped money out to their head offices, as some people suspect they do, how they market it, what it costs, all of that is covered in all of these studies. The facts are going to be there without any doubt, and therefore what is now needed and has to be developed now within the next six to twelve months is what action governments are taking as a result of those studies.

Now I do not know any more really that I can say about what the future prospects are other than the list. As decisions are made they are certainly going to be reported, if the House is open, to the House, if not to the public.

I do not think there is any question, Mr. Chairman, that there is a lot of interest in the fishery and concern, and that is shown by the fact that the meeting held at Carbonear today was so well attended by fishermen in that area and I think it confirms the idea that the appointment of a Select Committee was a wise one.

So I have tried to cover the points that the Leader of the Opposition raised in his interesting remarks and there is a lot more information of course as we get down to the estimates that I will be able to give.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I have a number of points I would like to make with respect to the minister's remarks on the salary vote. I would like to talk about the Fisheries Income Support Programme, if that is the correct expression, and how it relates to females working in the fishing industry, whether they are in the boats and more specifically where you can get down to the scallop shuckers or we - and I think the scallop shuckers, Mr. Chairman, is only one example of a very serious and broader problem with respect to females engaged in certain aspects of the fishing industry in the Province, and this is one point I want to relate to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: I will talk about the Department of National Revenue,
the Unemployment Insurance Commission -

MR. COLLINS: You have not got the guts to criticize Ottawa.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I got the guts to criticize anybody in
the world, let alone Ottawa and Ottawa has fallen down very badly
with respect to this problem and

now the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the deposed Minister of Fisheries, will not dictate to me what I will say in this committee stage, Sir. So I will ask for the same respect that we gave the Minister of Fisheries in his dull diatribe on the fisheries. So that will be one point I will be bringing up, Mr. Chairman. The second one will be the confusion concerning who exactly is responsible for community stages, wharves, haul-ups, slipways and this sort of a thing in the Province.

And before I get to these two points, Mr. Chairman, I have to react to the last few comments of the Minister of Fisheries. Sir, I can only describe his comments as a message of doom and gloom as far as the fisheries is concerned in this Province. And I think this is most regrettable coming from any public person in this Province, particularly if that person is in government and more particularly if that person is the Minister of Fisheries. He painted nothing but a picture of doom and gloom and potential disaster and failure within the fishing industry. Sir, I will - we have all heard of John the Baptist. Now I think in this case we are talking about John the Honest. Sir the Minister of Fisheries has admitted and confirmed the fact that his administration, with their varying ministers, right from the Premier to Mr. Cheeseman, to the now Hon. Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the Premier twice as a matter of fact, and now the present Minister of Fisheries, in spite of the changing of the Ministers of Fisheries and the great glowing promises contained in the Throne Speech of March 1971, the Minister of Fisheries tonight has confirmed the fact that his administration has been completely and a complete failure in coping with the problems facing the fishing industry in this Province.

I will congratulate him on two things, Sir, One, he admitted it, and secondly, he did not take the cowardly way out, at least not so far, and did not do what had been done in committee prior to the day and in this House of Assembly over

the last few months and years, he did not viciously attack Ottawa on this subject. But, Sir, it is a sad spectacle to see the Minister of Fisheries get up and paint such a bleak and dismal picture. It was almost like confession night, Sir, to hear the minister get up and really offer nothing positive except to say that they are negotiating with Ottawa and apparently the negotiations and the talks are so delicate and the provincial government is so dependent upon Ottawa to assist the provincial government and get them out of the problems they are facing in the fishing industry that the minister has seen fit not to lash out at the federal government as has been his style and the style of some other honourable ministers on the other side of the House up to this point.

Now, Sir, I could not help referring to it because for the first time we have seen a minister, the fifth, I think the fifth - is that correct if you count the Premier twice because the Hon. Premier was Minister of Fisheries twice - we have finally seen the fifth Fisheries Minister -

AN HON. MEMBER: Gander.

MR. F. ROWE: Gander and

then the guy who - Cheeseman, Mr. Cheeseman.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Oh yes, the fellow resigned.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Cheeseman, right.

The fifth Fisheries Minister in this Province has awakened to the truth, and he has admitted that his administration have been completely unsuccessful in solving the problems in the fishing industry. For that he should be congratulated for having the courage to say it because, Sir, this minister, the present Minister of Fisheries belongs to the very administration that just over three years ago made great promises with respect to this industry.

I think, Sir, that the depression and any demoralizing spin-offs that we will have in the industry or amongst the fishermen will have resulted because of the fact that this administration did raise the expectations of the industry and of the fishermen on several occasions. These several occasions, Sir, coincidentally enough happen to be the Throne Speech election manifesto of 1972 and the Tory Times rag that was thrown around the district of Hermitage during the election campaign. These were the two major policy statements that came from this government regarding the fishing industry or the fisheries. They just happened to be during two election campaigns.

What did these policy statements or promises or con jobs say? Well, Sir, number one, in March, 1972 this administration said that the Department of Fisheries will be greatly expanded immediately so that it can provide much greater assistance and information to the fishermen of this Province. The department will be dramatically increased in size, many new divisions established and many new services implemented so that it will reflect the importance - I am quoting from the Throne Speech - my government places on fishing as one of the major industries in the Province.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What happened?

MR. F. ROWE: What happened?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What happened?

MR. F. ROWE: What happened, Mr. Chairman, is that the federal government input into the fisheries has increased whilst the provincial government's

input into the fisheries estimates has decreased. That is what has happened, Mr. Chairman.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Chairman, I would ask for the courtesy to be heard in silence or without being interrupted. I do not know what makes the deposed Minister of Fisheries so itchy and sensitive tonight. I mean, if the honourable minister when he was Minister of Fisheries managed to put the department in such a state that the Minister of Finance had to come from that particular portfolio into Fisheries to straighten it up, this is something that he will have to settle with his own colleagues and his own Premier. But, Sir, you know, if he is going to be sensitive, I just simply ask for a ruling to either he - I do not mind a little bit of jocular -

MR. COLLINS: Not when you are attacking the fine people who are working in the Department of Fisheries.

MR. F. ROWE: If the honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture has a point of order, Mr. Chairman, he can stand up and make it. Now, I ask simply for a ruling on whether I can be heard in silence or not.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The honourable member is still here, is he? The honourable member is asking for a ruling which is basically hypothetical in that the byplay between the two honourable members is certainly not out of the ordinary. However, the honourable member is quite correct in suggesting that he does have the right to be heard in silence. However, provocative and personal remarks directed from one honourable member to another, of course, are going to evoke a provocative and personal reply.

So, if honourable members would tailor their speech to the type of reply they wish to receive.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Now, Mr. Chairman, I was pointing out the depression and turmoil in the fishing industry and in the fisheries, if I can separate the two, because of the fact that this present administration had promised the world and raised the expectations of both sectors of the fisheries to the point where they were expecting solutions to problems and they have not yet had the solutions to these problems submitted nor implemented by the present administration.

Now, Sir, I pointed out one thing that this government promised, a dramatic increase in the size of the Department of Fisheries and presumably the expenditure. Another point, Sir, is that it was the government's intention to establish regional offices of the Department of Fisheries in selective locations throughout the Province and initially these branches were to be located on the Burin Peninsula of the South Coast, on the West Coast and on the Northeast Coast. These branches were to be established in order to provide better service to the fishermen living in these areas. The government undertook to directly involve the fishermen of this Province in formulating any policy that would directly affect the fishermen themselves.

Now, Sir, the only evidence that we have really seen of that has been the recently established select committee that is now travelling the Province. I would submit, Sir, that that committee will only hear what we already know because the fisheries has been studied to death by the Federal Government, by the previous Liberal Government and by the present P.C. administration. But, Sir, it must be pointed out that this administration was the administration that was going to solve all the problems and Sir, this is why it was such a sad experience to watch the Minister of Fisheries tonight get up and humbly paint a picture of doom and gloom.

Sir, the present administration said that they would encourage participation by all fishermen through discussion groups thereby providing them with the information developed in the department, and through the establishment of regional advisory councils which would work with

the department in the formation of future plans and policies affecting each particular region.

Sir, this administration also said that it would introduce a new programme to give better assistance to inshore fishermen to obtain boats, gear and equipment and special incentive programmes will be introduced to assist fishermen in obtaining large multi purpose boats which can be used for dragging, seining, mid- water trawling and longline fishing. Well, where has the action been in these respects?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Sir, this administration promised that they would introduce - Mr. Chairman, it is a sad commentary when honourable ministers on the other side of the House in defending their own inaction have to turn around and start asking for our policy. Sir, during the next election campaign our policy will be contained in the manifesto and the people will answer.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Going to sell it to the select commission?

MR. ROWE: Sure.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE Sure.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Chairman, this administration also promised that they would introduce legislation concerning a new financing approach to provide a supply of fish necessary for existing fish plants around our Coast in order that they may be utilized to as near full capacity as possible. And we have seen what has happened over the past three years. Legislation, Sir, now I am reading from a Throne Speech that was read in this honourable House carried by T.V., read by the Lieutenant-Governor, and the Throne Speech according to the Member for St. John's East is a very important document when he stated publicly on an "Analysis" programme - we both enjoyed the conversation very much. The honourable Member for St. John's East, Sir, did say that the Throne Speech was a very important document because it outlines specifically what the government's programme is for that year, not for the next three years, not for the next two years or for his term of office, but for that year. And, Sir, here we have the government saying that legislation will be introduced to establish a corporation that will own or lease rights on a new fleet of trawlers. This fleet will add to the production of new or existing processing plants. This trawler fleet will be in addition to the existing fleets in the Province. Great stuff, Sir, for elections.

AN HON. MEMBER: It was over then.

MR. F. ROWE: It was not over.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where is the Member for Hermitage?

AN HON. MEMBER: Hermitage! Hermitage!

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, this administration promised that they would work in conjunction with the federal government to establish a new and realistic programme of bait assistance to the fishing industry, and these bait depots will be located through strategic locations to ensure a continuous supply of suitable bait when necessary and wherever necessary in this Province.

This administration, Sir, promised that they would introduce at the earliest possible date legislation to establish in conjunction, again with the federal government, an inexpensive shared-cost insurance programme covering losses of fishing gear. Now I know what the minister's reaction is going to be to that, that they had to pay the shot themselves last year. But, Sir, there was no programme, an inexpensive shared cost insurance programme worked out in conjunction with the federal government or any other government or union or companies to protect the fishermen in this respect.

And, Sir, so it goes. There were four or five other momentous promises made by the present administration in March 1972, twenty-three days before an election campaign. And, Sir, my colleague the Leader of the Opposition read out some sections of the P.C. Times circulated during a by-election in Hermitage,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: and we can see that most, if not all, of these problems and commitments, and statements of policy have not been honoured by the present administration.

Sir, I can only condemn the present administration for not honouring their promises, honouring their commitments to the people of Newfoundland, and the fishermen in particular. I can congratulate the Minister of Fisheries for at least being honest -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: for at least being honest. He has demonstrated and admitted and confessed the complete failure of the present administration to deal with the problems of the fisheries.

MR. ROWE: Sadly Sir, I hope he has not destroyed any faith that other people in this Province may have in the future of the fishing industry.

Now, Sir, I realize that the problems of the fishing industry cannot be solved wholly and solely by the provincial government. In terms of the supply of the resource and the conservation of the resource and jurisdiction of the resource and the possibility of depletion of the resource, obviously this is an issue that has to be dealt with amongst various nations of the world, not just Provinces of Canada but States of the United States, and if the federal government is not successful at the Law of the Sea Conference in convincing other nations to establish this boundary of the 200 mile limit or the Continental Shelf, whichever is the maximum or whatever the formula is, I would be the first one, Sir, to stand up, unless there is a very rational reason provided, to stand up and criticize a government who did not put their best effort forward to obtain jurisdiction over our fishery resources in this Province and of the Eastern and Western Seaboard of Canada.

Now, Sir, I think it was regrettable that the honourable Minister of Fisheries saw fit to stoop low in his remarks. I agree generally with the Minister of Fisheries, that the Fisheries Loan Board is acting the way it should act. People enter upon an agreement. They put down a very -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Do not put words in my mouth.

MR. MURPHY: Perhaps your colleague did not agree with you.

MR. ROWE: He did so agree with me.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Is that the Leader of the Opposition or me you are talking about?

AN HON. MEMBER: Which one?

MR. ROWE: Anybody, Sir, who enters into an agreement, a loan agreement and has a small down payment, a low interest rate, and who can afford to repay the loan on their longliners should be done so. I can give names of individuals, I can give names, obviously I am not going to, but I can give names of individual fishermen who can pay the Fisheries Loan Board and

who are not doing it.

But, Sir, the minister may be quite surprised in my conversations with the Chairman of the Fisheries Loan Board what I have had to say about some of own constituents with respect to repayment of loans.

AN HON. MEMBER: What did you tell, lies?

MR. ROWE: Sure.

MR. NEARY: Do not get too sticky now.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Bravado over there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Sure.

MR. NEARY: Old conflict of interest down there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Put it in writing.

MR. NEARY: You put it in writing. How many bulldozers have you got hired out?

MR. ROWE: The fact of the matter is, Sir, that the majority of the fishermen of this Province are honest people, are honest people, and they try their best to repay their loans and for the Minister of Fisheries to get up and suggest that some people are abusing the Fisheries Loan Board because of the fact that they have been informed to do so by other than PC politicians, in other words Liberal politicians, and not have the courage to say whether they are past or present or to name them, I find adjectives, Sir, difficult to find to describe how I feel about the minister when he starts tarring honourable members with a brush of that kind.

MR. CROSBIE: I said it was past.

MR. NEARY: We were in the government.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Liberal Government.

MR. ROWE: Now, Mr. Chairman, I would like to turn to another serious problem which affects my district and I am sure must affect other fishing communities and districts in this Province. Now it is my understanding that at some point in time, and I wish the federal government would hurry up and get it underway because it was an election commitment and I think it is high time that the federal government get this Fisheries Income Support Programme implemented

April 1, 1975

Tape No. 917

NM - 3

in this Province or any other Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: A Liberal election.

MR. F. ROVE: Yes, I think it is time it is implemented, Sir.

But there is another problem that involves mainly the federal government but requires the assistance of and the support of honourable members in the provincial House of Assembly. Sir, I hope that honourable members opposite will not take the attitude, oh, you have a federal Liberal Government up there in Ottawa, why do you not go up and talk to them and straighten it out?

Well, Sir, number one, negotiations with the federal government on behalf of a province usually take place between governments, not between oppositions and the federal government. Secondly, it involves a great number of different portfolios and a bureaucracy that defies description in Ottawa.

Now, here is the problem, Sir. If this fisheries income support programme comes into effect, hopefully that will solve the problem that the fishermen now have with the Unemployment Insurance Commission because unemployment insurance just does not work for fishermen. It just does not. But the other problem is that there are certain parts of Newfoundland. I will use St. Barbe North as an example, where you do not have one great big huge plant but you have approximately forty small communities, mostly all depend upon the fishery, and these people, some are involved in longliner fishery and bring their products down to Port au Choix fish plant or possibly even over to the St. Anthony fish plant, particularly if they are up on the Labrador side.

But, the vast majority of them are inshore, small boat fishermen and some of the longliner fishermen do not necessarily bring their products directly to any of these large fish plants. What they do, Sir, is they bring their shrimp, their crab, their scallops, their lump roe fish, their herring, their mackerel, their cod - well, it just so happens that the Straits of Belle Isle represents one of the few unique marine environments left in the world. There is a tremendous variety of species of fish and shell fish. But, that is a little bit irrelevant.

The fishermen do bring their products back to their communities.

Now, why do they do that? Sir, because sailing in the Straits of Belle Isle is not exactly a pleasure trip in the Caribbean. It is a rough trip at any time in the Straits of Belle Isle. The sooner the people can get into their closest port the better. So, they tend to go back to their own home ports or communities with their products because it is too far to go down 100 miles to Port au Choix, 150 miles or up around the top of the Northern Peninsula to St. Anthony.

The other reason, Sir, is that they want their wives and their children or other young people in the community to derive the benefits of employment of processing the products of the sea. Now, Sir, here is the situation. The fisheries in the type of community that I am describing is either a community stage fishery or a private family fishery using private little stages that people have actually built out into the sea themselves. They replace it every winter because the ice takes it away every winter. Even on the community stage, Sir, there is family involvement, particularly the wives of the fishermen.

Now, Sir, these shuckers, female shuckers, as the case in point, the women who actually take the scallops out of the shell, work very

long hours. The fishermen come in at sunset or just after dark, ten or eleven o'clock, they unload. They hit the sack around one or two o'clock and they are up again at three or four o'clock, back to sea. The women are shucking the scallops all day and into the night. Sir, what happens? They make payments to the Unemployment Insurance Commission, but they end up not deriving the benefits of unemployment insurance. Sir, even last year, after, - well, personally I had set up meetings with or tried to set up meetings with the Provincial Minister of Fisheries, the Federal Minister responsible for Fisheries, the Minister of National Revenue, Unemployment Insurance Commission personnel, the Member for Humber - St. Georges - St Barbe, Jack Marshall, myself and the President of the Fishermen Food and Allied Workers Union to try to resolve the problems.

Sir, this has been going on for three years. We had one meeting in Ottawa and I came out more confused than not because I had to contend with a number of federal civil servants who were going by the rules and the people were trapped because of the fact that they lived in a small little community of one or two hundred people instead of the City of Toronto. A woman who paid her unemployment insurance benefits then got some back, paid her unemployment insurance payments, I am sorry, made her unemployment insurance payments, got benefits for three or four months, got a letter in the middle of Christmas last year telling them that they had to repay their unemployment insurance benefits because they were classified as non-insurable.

Now, Sir, is that same woman - I had the list of them. It is a great list. There is one list there, another list there and this is only from three or four communities. Three or four hundred women, Sir, who paid Unemployment Insurance contributions and then collected for two or three months and then were informed that they did not qualify because they did not have a valid contract of service, a technicality. Now, Sir, the President of the Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers Union made a proposal to the Department of National Revenue which was agreed upon between the union and the

fish plants that if the women worked in a certain method or in a certain way, they would qualify for unemployment insurance. Everybody agreed. In May this agreement was made. In August, Sir, after the women had done most of their work, they were informed that they were not insurable because there was no valid contract of service and Sir, there is no way that anybody can tell me what is a valid contract of service. I have asked every federal civil service that I can, every provincial one, every federal politician in that area and every provincial politician.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Were you talking to Mr. Andras?

MR. ROWE: Yes. No, I was not talking with Mr. Andras. I was talking to his executive assistant because at the time I was trying to get this meeting arranged he was in hospital.

Now, while I am bringing this up, Sir, for the benefit of the Minister of Forestry and Agricultural to inform him that this is a federal law that is very unfair to the small fishing communities in this Province where you have women and wives of fishermen working. If that woman was in the City of Toronto or even in St. Anthony or in Port au Choix, they go in there on the payroll, they fillet the very fish their husband might have thrown upon the wharf and they qualify for their unemployment insurance, but because they live in a community, they are a victim of their own environment and own social structure, Sir.

Now why am I bringing this up in this Provincial House of Assembly in committee stage when it is a federal matter. I am bringing it up, Sir, because the Hon. Minister of Fisheries is going to Ottawa within the very near future. I know that there are some very sizeable problems, problems of a very great magnitude that have to be considered by the minister and his federal counterpart. But I appeal to the Minister of Fisheries to, if he has not already done so, to take a few minutes with the President of the Fishermen Food and Allied Workers Union, get the problem, if I have not explained it sufficiently to him tonight, get the problem in probably legal terms, which I am not capable of presenting here and while the honourable minister is in Ottawa, get this nuisance problem out of the way.

AN HON. MEMBER: The problem is with National Revenue.

MR. F. ROWE: Precisely, the problem is with National Revenue. But I mean there must be some liaison between the Provincial Minister of Fisheries, the Federal Minister responsible for Fisheries, the President of the Fishermen's Union, the Federal Minister of National Revenue, there must be some liaison created if it means that you are going to turn off thousands of women from becoming involved in processing the products of the sea. All I am suggesting is this, so what if it is a problem of the Department of National Revenue. It is a problem of the fisheries. I took the initiative at one stage of the game and trotted off to Ottawa at my own expense to try to resolve the problem and met with no success.

MR. MURPHY: What has National Revenue -

MR. F. ROWE: National Revenue is the department that decides whether or not a person really qualified for unemployment insurance benefits. The Unemployment Insurance Commission comes under Manpower and Immigration. But, you know, when it comes to the matters

of insurability and this sort of a thing or whether there is a valid contract of service that exists between individuals the Department of National Revenue deals with it. It is complex and I am sure the minister understands the problem, and I just simply appeal to him to bring it to the attention of the appropriate people in Ottawa and beat it out of them. Because quite frankly, I am getting pretty fed up with the Department of National Revenue on this issue.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE: Right, quite possibly, quite possibly.

Now the other thing, Sir, I think I have beaten that one to death. One other point is this, and I do not want to get political again, but, you know, the Hon. Minister of Fisheries and his colleagues will undoubtedly, close to an election year, shall we say, be going around talking about great marine service stations going up and going to improve certain community stages, going to provide haul-ups in certain areas, and I do not know, but I will suspect they would not say they were going to provide wharves, but certainly community stages. Now, Sir, I think it is time that somebody straightened out that miserable mess. Who is responsible for what? I mean we have community stages built under LIP projects. We have community stages built by the provincial government. We have community stages built by the federal government. And so if something goes wrong with a stage that was built under a LIP grant, neither the federal nor the provincial government will assume the responsibility for upgrading it. If it was built by the federal government, the provincial government will not accept responsibility for upgrading it. Sir, we have many community stages throughout this Province that need upgrading. Now the minister has already made announcements, welcomed announcements, there a few weeks ago in my own district of upgrading four, five or six community stages. But, Sir, it is all contingent upon

them getting money from Ottawa. Now if the minister is going to make announcements and take credit if he is successful in getting money from Ottawa, well that is politics I suppose. If he is going to make the announcement and is unsuccessful in getting money from Ottawa and then he takes a blast at Ottawa, the federal government, it is again politics, but at whose expense?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: No. At whose expense? The fact of the matter is, Sir, that we are approaching a fishing season when there is no definite commitment that many community stages in this Province will be upgraded to a standard acceptable to the Department of the Environment and consequently many of these community stages may not be operating. The other thing is, is that apparently the Federal Government is responsible for wharves. I do not know yet who is responsible for community stages. I was under the impression that the Provincial Government was going to assume responsibility for community stages.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not until the Federal Government -

MR. ROWE: Gives you the money.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Well, this is what I am saying. Okay. Now what happens if this is done and the wharf falls apart because the community stage and a wharf are inseparable.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - see the wharf is repaired.

MR. ROWE: And how do you do that?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: With nails and hammer.

MR. ROWE: Yes, where do you get the money?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: You go to Ottawa again. Now, this is what I am getting at.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Yes, this is precisely it. This is the point that I am trying to get across, Mr. Chairman.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Yes, this is the problem, that slipways are not but they should be haul-up slipways, haul-up and/or slipways, a wharf and a community stage should be one and the same thing in these communities. That is all I am saying. Now, if we are going to be picking around and talking about agreements that were made in 1965, 1967 or 1968 about who is going to pay what percentage of what for a community stage and we

cannot solve that problem for a community stage, what are we going to do about wharves falling down under the community stages and what are we going to do about slipways for the longliners to come in to be hauled up during the winter months and for that matter, what are we going to be doing about dredging?

Now, I suggest one of two things, Mr. Chairman, that either the Provincial Government accept responsibility for lock, stock and barrel and try to get the money through its own resources or from Ottawa, or they pass the full lock, stock and barrel back to the Federal Government, so at least we know who to attack, to criticize, to go after.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: I want to get a job done. So, what you do, Mr. Chairman, is you go after the people who hopefully will get the job done for you. At this point in time, personally I do not know, my Chairman of Fisheries Committees up in the district does not know. It does not sound like the Minister of Fisheries knows.

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: So, Sir, I mean the honourable Minister of whatever he is, junior Member for Harbour Main, can joke all he wants to about that, but I would like to see him up there with a fish knife in his hand on the fish stage in Savage Cove with a Northwesterly wind coming down in the middle of October.

MR. DOODY: You would not like to see that.

MR. ROWE: Sir, he would probably be filleted because they would not be able to tell the difference anyway.

MR. DOODY: You would not like to see that.

MR. ROWE: No. It would be an awful spectacle, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is a fish knife?

MR. ROWE: I realize that the honourable Minister of Fisheries does not know, or the deposed honourable Minister of Fisheries does not know.

So, Sir, really I would like for the minister seriously, without saying, well, Ottawa has not come through on this or Ottawa has not come

April 1, 1975.

Tape 921

RH - 3

on this or Ottawa has not come through on that, you know, to come up with a few positive suggestions as to what should be done in this area because we are talking about the inshore fishery here and it is still a very vital aspect of our fishing industry. I would suggest, I will make just two recommendations that the Provincial Government take the darn stuff over period - community stages, wharves, haul-ups and any dredging required there around it

and try its best to get money from Ottawa, if that is the way it has got to be done, or to hand the stuff back to Ottawa. But to have this in between, this mess that we have at the present time, is just simply not working. And on top of that, Sir, you know, we have problems with the - the Minister of Fisheries was also Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing at one stage, the past Minister of Fisheries was also Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, and he knows full well that Municipal Affairs have been dragged into community stage for purposes of getting a water supply to that stage.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have not.

MR. F. ROWE: They have so.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, we have had examples where there has been an agreement, not a signed agreement, where there had been co-operation between the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and the Department of Fisheries to get a water supply system to the community stage and at the same time supply the community. A good idea. But there is another factor, influence, entering the operation or the proper upgrading of a community stage.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Well, I do not know what the minister was talking about over there, He should have gotten one of his civil servants who understood what he was reading down here to explain it to the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, I think that is about all I have to say about that - it is this problem with the women who, the females who were engaged - I mean if this thing is not straightened up, Sir, I might wear - what is the button that he was wearing?

AN HON. MEMBER: Well, why not?

MR. F. ROWE: Well, why not button myself, if this thing is not resolved this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why not?

MR. F. ROWE: Why not? And the business of the community stages, and the auxiliary parts, wharves, slipways and so forth. So I would like

for the minister to comment if he would kindly do so, Sir, on these couple of points that I brought up.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: First of all, Mr. Chairman, I want to sincerely congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for making a very -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I genuinely want to congratulate -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I genuinely, Sir, want to congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for the fine presentation that he made in this honourable House today in connection with the matter under debate, the Fisheries estimates.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I am in this honourable House now, this is my fourteenth sitting of the honourable House, thirteen years and fourteen sittings. And I have heard it all, Sir, I have heard it all in fourteen sittings of this honourable House about the fisheries, Nothing new came up this afternoon. There was nothing came up this afternoon from the Minister of Fisheries that we had not heard before in this honourable House. But my colleague the Leader of the Opposition, Sir, made one of the most positive and constructive speeches on the fishery, one of the finest speeches that I have ever heard made in this honourable House, Sir, in connection with the fishery, especially the inshore fishery, and challenged the Minister of Fisheries, the Townie Minister of Fisheries, the Circular Road Minister of Fisheries, challenged him to state his administration's policy on the fishery. And then tonight we heard from my colleague, the Member for St. Barbe North who represents a fishing district, who made another major contribution, Sir, to this debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: A major contribution.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Sir, the Leader of the Opposition made some excellent -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The Leader of the Opposition made some excellent points in his speech.

And, Mr. Chairman, if the two speeches had been televised today in this honourable House, the speech of the Leader of the Opposition and the speech of the Minister of Fisheries, not forgetting my colleague the Member for St. Barbe North and

and myself - well, we are just the ordinary rank and file so we really do not count -but the Leader of the Opposition states the Liberal policy on the fisheries and the Minister of Fisheries was stating the policy for the government. If these two speeches were televised today, Sir, on television so that all the people of Newfoundland could see the Minister of Fisheries in action, making his statement of policy and the Leader of the Opposition making his statement of policy, how do you think, Mr. Chairman, the people of Newfoundland, especially the fishermen, would have voted on the basis of these two speeches, on these two positions that were stated by the Leaders of the two major parties in this honourable House? How do you think, Mr. Chairman, they would have voted? Now, just take these two speeches.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They are all gone to Australia.

MR. NEARY: No, they are all gone to Bermuda. They are in Bermuda shorts right now, down trying to get the navy to come up to protect our offshore resources.

Well, Mr. Chairman, one of the most uninspiring speeches that I have ever heard from that minister, the Minister of Fisheries, we heard it here in this honourable House today, Sir, Uninspiring. The message that came through loud and clear to me, Sir, and other members of this honourable House was a message of despair. It is no wonder, Mr. Chairman, that the young people are not following their fathers and their grandfathers into the boats after listening to the negative approach that the minister outlined in this honourable House today as his administration's policy concerning the fishery, especially the inshore fishery.

Is it any wonder, Sir?⁹ Was there any inspiration in his remarks? Was there anything in what the minister said in this honourable House today stating the government's policy that would inspire the young people to want to go fishing, to follow in the footsteps of their fathers and their grandfathers? Did Your Honour hear anything in those - if Your Honour was trying to decide tomorrow, what will I be? Will I be a lawyer, where I can milk legal aid? Will I be a doctor, where

I can clean her on M.C.P.? Or will I be a land speculator?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Re a Minister of Social Services.

MR. NEARY: Or will I run an engineering company? Or will I have a lease-back company? Or will I have an airline company? What will I be? I am faced with this great decision. Dress me up in me oil-skins - what will I be? A young man is faced with that decision. He says to himself, what does the future hold in store for me? He says, well, I heard what the Minister of Fisheries had to say about the fishery of this Province. Not much future in that, according to the Minister of Fisheries. So, I am not going to become a fisherman. I am not going to make my contribution to the Gross Provincial Product of this Province by going out and catching a few old fish. I would rather sit around and watch television or I would rather become a lawyer and flog it to the poor old fellows who are trying to buy a house and real estate transactions, second mortgages and first mortgages and real estate transactions.

Now, Sir, that is the kind of a picture that the Minister of Fisheries painted in this honourable House this afternoon and tonight when we resumed our sitting after eight o'clock. No inspiration on the part of the minister to get our young people to go fishing. The minister, Mr. Chairman, apart from being very uninspiring, apart, Sir, from taking a very negative approach to the whole matter of the fishery, the minister showed his lack of knowledge of the fishery.

Now, Sir, I am not an expert on the fishery by a long shot, but after fourteen years in the House, Sir, some of these things that have been said in this honourable House are bound to rub off on you.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Then, what happened to you?

MR. NEARY:

You do a little travelling around Newfoundland you pick up the odd clue here and there. You learn a few things about it, Sir.

MR. BARRY: You are an expert.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not. I am maybe a rocking chair expert on the fishery. But everybody in Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, everybody in Newfoundland is an expert on the fishery, at least he thinks he is. Even the Member for St. John's Centre, I have heard him make some great speeches in this honourable House on the fishery, because the minister, although he is a townie, a corner boy, knows the value of the fishery to this Province.

MR. MURPHY: I worked at it when I was going to school.

MR. NEARY: When the minister was going to school, after he dropped out of the sixth - not the sixth grade, what is it you call it then?

AN HON. MEMBER: The sixth book.

MR. NEARY: The sixth book, the minister went out and did a little fishing.

MR. MURPHY: That was on my holidays.

MR. NEARY: On the minister's holidays. But, Sir, even the Minister of Social Services knows the value of the fishery to this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: What is old conflict of interest saying over there. Sir? There is a gentleman now who is interested in the fishery.

MR. BARRY: Order! Order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: Order? Ham and eggs, if you do not mind. Could I have ham and eggs.

MR. DOODY: Just the eggs, you have enough ham to -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I will give you one example, maybe I will give you more than one example but I would at least give you one example of the lack of knowledge of the present Minister of Fisheries about his knowledge of the fishery. The minister was talking, Sir, about the fishery along the Northeast Coast and dwelt at some length on the crab fishery. You would swear that the minister was the minister responsible for crabs and not the codfishery of this Province, spent most of his speech this afternoon talking about the queen crab and talking about the crabs, an

expert. The minister in his three months as Minister of Fisheries has become a walking encyclopedia on crabs. The minister is beginning to look like one.

AN HON. MEMBER: I do not think that is called for.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not called for but, Sir, that is the impression the minister left with me. Along the Northeast Coast, Sir, I suppose the principle part of the fishing industry at the moment is the crab industry, but it is a luxury food, Sir, it is a luxury food and the minister told us that although we have in our waters a high protein food in a protein hungry world, that we could not sell it to the Third World, that we could not sell it overseas because we could not get the right price.

The minister, Sir, left me with the impression, rightly or wrongly, and perhaps when the minister speaks further in this debate that he can clear up this situation, the minister left me with the impression that he did not know that along the Northeast Coast of this province that we have one of the largest reserves of herring and mackerel to be found anywhere in the world. That is a statement of fact, Sir, and I challenge the minister to deny it. All herring is being used for at the moment, Sir, is for fish meal. I think they get one cent or a cent and a half a pound or something for it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Market is down.

MR. NEARY: It is in great demand, Sir, herring and mackerel is in great demand.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The minister cannot take it. Come back. Come back to your seat.

MR. CROSBIE: You are making me ashamed. Your ignorance -

MR. MURPHY: That is Romeo.

MR. NEARY: And the minister told us, Sir -

MR. DOODY: Wherefore art thou, Romeo.

April 1, 1975

Tape No. 924

NM - 3

MR. NEARY: The minister told us, Mr. Chairman, that we could not sell this mackerel and herring to the third world overseas and do you know something, Mr. Chairman, I slipped out in the office and I made a phone call or two and I discovered, Sir, that only in the last year or so that herring and mackerel was placed on Canada's food aid list, and the minister did not even know that. Probably did not know it until I mentioned it at this moment in this honourable House,

and salt fish was also, Mr. Chairman, put on the food aid list in recent months. I do not know but it was probably some time within the last year, probably within the last few months.

AN HON. MEMBER: How do you -

MR. NEARY: How do you what?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: You can it, can it. That is what you do with it.

Mr. Chairman, you know the big problem I think Nova Scotia now is -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: You can the herring and the mackerel.

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The key to it, Sir, the key to it is not to put it in cans where you have to use a can opener because Canada, Sir, was kind of half-stunned when they started canning herring and mackerel, sending the cans overseas, and they had no openers over there to open them.

AN HON. MEMBER: They sent them back.

MR. NEARY: No, they did not send them back, but it did create quite a problem, Sir.

MR. DOODY: We got another crowd going over with the openers.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I know the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development thinks this is funny, Sir, but you have to get -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman. If the minister was in Bangladesh or in South Vietnam somewhere, or one of the Arab Countries, he would know what I am talking about. He would not be able to go out and pick up a can opener wherever he wanted it. The minister might know all about bottle openers. But, Sir, in the Third World, believe it or not this created quite a problem that we were sending canned goods overseas and you needed can openers to open it. Now

they have developed a can that you just hook your finger into this little ring and you rip the can open. What do you call these ? I do not know what you call them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: At least I woke them up, Mr. Chairman. That is more than the Minister of Fisheries could do all day.

So, Sir, part of the solution to the problem along the Northeast Coast, Sir, -

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: no - is to get into the herring and mackerel fishery on a large scale and can it. Put it into these cans. Bring in, get DREE or get the minister or get the Minister of Industrial Development to set up some canneries and catch this mackerel and herring and can it and sell it to the Government of Canada so it can be shipped overseas.

MR. COLLINS: (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: The crab is a luxury meat, Sir. They only buy that, the millionaires down in New York are the only ones who buy that.

MR. PECKFORD: It does not matter who buys it as long as there is a market for it.

MR. NEARY: There is no market for it. That is the whole trouble. All these plants that I am talking about on the Northeast Coast, Sir, are not going to open this year because they have, as the minister told us today, a large inventory of crab meat on hand. They cannot get rid of it, and they are coming now on their hands and knees to the government to try to get the government to subsidize it, to bail them out.

MR. PECKFORD: The reason why there is no market is because local people do not buy it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, that is precisely why there is no market, Sir. The bottom fell out of the market. The bottom fell out, the price fell, and now the crab producers, if they sold now, would be

forced to sell for less than it cost them to produce the crab meat.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Cod fish is not hard to sell. Do not be talking such foolish nonsense. That is what the Minister of Fisheries has been telling us all afternoon. That is negative. That is negative.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon? The what?

MR. PECKFORD: It is not a question of whether it is negative, but it is a question of whether it has any validity or not.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, this afternoon and tonight the Minister of Fisheries expressed a view that we have been hearing in this Province for 400 years, the problem is in the United States market. The fish merchants, Ministers of Fisheries, governments have sat back, Sir, on their behinds and waited for the traditional buyers to come to buy the cod blocks.

There has been no real attempt - Now look! The Minister of Finance over there now looking over at me and I - the old, this is the old fish merchant attitude, wait for the traditional buyers to come knocking on your door.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Do not go out and look for markets, Sir. Do you know, Mr. Chairman, the real problem in the Newfoundland fishery for over 400 years, the real problem, Sir, and it is only now that it has started to surface, come to light, the real problem, Sir, has been marketing, marketing. Everybody talked about the problems of the fisheries, and subsidize this, and the fish plant operators need this, and somebody else needs this, and we need that, but the real problem in the fishery, Mr. Chairman, the real problem that neither the fish plant operators or the fishermen themselves were getting adequate returns on their money for the simple reason is they were putting all of their eggs in one basket and depending on the United States market to take the fish off their hands. And anytime anything went wrong with that market there was a depression in the fishery in Newfoundland, and we are seeing it again today, The warehouses are blocked with fish, and that fish has not started to move yet, and here we are just about ready to get into another fishing season, and the warehouses are still blocked and there is no indication that that fish is going to move in the foreseeable. I heard the other day on radio where there is a slow movement, not very much, it was not very optimistic. And, Mr. Chairman, we hear all this belly aching about let us extend the 200 mile limit, let us catch more fish, let us build better boats, let us get our gear banks, and let us get more people fishing. Well, Sir, what are we going to do with it if we catch it? Everything is blocked now, we cannot sell what we got now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can it.

MR. NEARY: Can it. Sure, it might be a good idea to can it for the Third World, for overseas because that is the only way you will get rid of your herring and mackerel, Sir. They do not have

refrigerators. They do not have the Minister of Social Services who will give them a fridge or a deep freeze whenever they want it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: They do not have a minister to give them McCain's soggy chips or pies.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is not nice.

MR. NEARY: That is not right. That is not nice.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I could not get my note to go down and get any. But, Sir, they do not have fridges. And the only way that we can cultivate this market to get the Government of Canada to buy this food, this badly needed protein food in a protein hungry world, is to package it right, do it up right. It is on the list. It was put on the list, herring and mackerel were put on Canada's food aid list within the last year for foreign aid. Why would they not buy it from us? They are buying it from Nova Scotia. They are buying a certain amount from New Brunswick. They are not buying it from Newfoundland because we are not putting up the right product.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, they are not Liberals over in New Brunswick, not according to what I can hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the big problem in Newfoundland in 400 years, over 400 years, Sir, of our fishery is marketing. And the minister today just referred to that rather casually, just brushed it off.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the minister can hear me. Do not worry, the minister is out there listening. Sir, I would submit that we are going to have to either persuade the Government of Canada to extend the terms of reference of the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation or we are going to have to set up another crown corporation to deal with the other produce of the sea with our fish fresh and our fresh frozen fish. I would prefer, Mr. Chairman, I think, myself to see the terms of reference of the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation expanded, but the only weakness in

April 1, 1975

Tape 926 (Night)

PK - 3

that argument, Sir, is that the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation - with all due respect, and I think they have done a fine job,

Aiden Maloney and his crowd have done a good job under the circumstances - but the only weakness in the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation, Sir, is that they have not put the emphasis on development. So, for that reason, it may be better, Mr. Chairman, it may be better to set up a separate crown corporation to handle the other produce of the sea, especially our fresh fish and our fresh frozen fish.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to set up another crown corporation, then how do we go about it? The minister today, in two speeches in this honourable House said, well that is not a matter for the Province. The Province cannot go it alone. That is a matter for the Government of Canada. Mr. Chairman, if my memory serves me correct, Sir, the present Minister of Fisheries was in this honourable House, I do not know but he was a member of the former Liberal administration, when the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation was established.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, before his time.

MR. NEARY: Before his time. No, I am sure that the present Minister of Fisheries was either in the Cabinet or he was waiting in the wings for Joey to invite him in the Cabinet when the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation was set up.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, it was set up - it was after 1966, after the 1966 election. - When?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: 1968.

MR. NEARY: In 1968. Well, Sir, in 1968 the present Minister of Fisheries was a member of the Cabinet of the Smallwood administration. I think he was Minister of Health when the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation was established, and the minister should remember the great fight and the great struggle that took place especially among the Provinces that rely heavily on the fishing industry. There had to be, Sir, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Nova Scotia. As a matter of fact, Nova Scotia has not yet come into the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is right. It was a non partisan issue. My honourable and dear friend has a good memory, even though, Sir, we may not agree. We may not see eye to eye on everything.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, some things we do. For instance, now we see eye to eye. This was a non-partisan issue.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Non-partisan. You were not there.

MR. NEARY: I was there, Sir. I was one of the ones that participated in that very historic, that very historic development. But, Mr. Chairman, the point that I am making, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You were not in the Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: No, I was not in the Cabinet. I was just a backbencher sitting inside the rail down there.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, watching with amusement the scuffling that was going on with the present Minister of Finance, the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Justice, roller skating back and forth across the House, sitting there in amusement.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: We got out before you got the -

MR. CROSBIE: Wait until they got out.

MR. NEARY: You often heard of the fellow getting the number twelve, Sir. Well, the Minister of Fisheries got the number twelve. He got the royal order of the boot.

Well, Sir, there had to be almost unanimous agreement among the Provinces of Canada, especially, Sir, the Maritime Provinces, before the Government of Canada would agree to establish this great Canadian Salt Fish Corporation. It was only due to the persistence and the salesmanship of Joey Smallwood, Sir, -

MR. DOODY: Is he coming back?

MR. NEARY: - in getting agreement, Mr. Chairman, in getting agreement with the other Provinces of Canada to make a united approach towards Ottawa that this Canadian Salt Fish Corporation was eventually established.

Mr. Chairman, right up to this very moment, up to this moment, the Minister of Fisheries or his predecessor, the spokesman for EPA in the House, or the honourable the Premier who has been Minister of Fisheries twice, or the minister before the Member for Gander who represented vested interests in the government and decided to leave because he could not stomach it any longer, their lack of policy on the fishery -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, I am talking about the minister that I was accused of causing to resign, that Minister of Fisheries because I gave him a few flicks one night -

MR. MURPHY: He said he could not stomach it?

MR. NEARY: No, he could not stomach - no, Mr. Chairman, the minister, former minister said he could not stomach the administration because of their lack of policy on the fishery. But, Sir,

We have had now three years of Tory Administration. We have had five Ministers of Fisheries, if you count, as my honourable friend says, twice when the Premier was acting Minister of Fisheries. Every one of them knows full well, Sir, as any member of this honourable House does, that before you can get another marketing body established or the terms of reference of the present Canadian Salt Fish Corporation expanded, before that can happen, Sir, you have to get the support of the other Provinces of Canada. Now, the minister is going for his pencil. He is going to make a note of that and write it down. That is a very, very, very significant point, Sir, and I do not blame the minister for wanting to write it down.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is just drawing a map.

MR. NEARY: Because, Sir, as far as I can see, no approach has yet been made to the other Provinces of Canada. Even if there is an approach made, Sir, it will probably be some time before you can get agreement. It will probably be some time, Sir.

We support their farm policy out West, and the Minister of Justice speaking for the administration support their oil policy out west. Well, why should they not support our request for a fishery policy? Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Trudeau and the Government of Canada, Sir, will take this matter seriously, the Minister of Fisheries is going to have to do his homework. The Minister of Fisheries, as much as he might hate to do it, is going to have to go over to Nova Scotia, sit down and talk to Premier Regan who is a Liberal Premier and then he is going to have to go down to New Brunswick and talk to Premier Hatfield. Then he is going to have to go over to Prince Edward Island and talk to Premier Campbell, another Liberal -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: New Brunswick is Tory, yes, Sir. I forgot to say that.

So on, then, the minister is going to have to go up to Quebec and in his broken English, our government - or if he can speak a little bit of French he is going to have to talk to Mr. Bourassa and say, Mr. Bourassa, fishery is big in the Province of Quebec. Will you support our request to the Government of Canada to set up a Marketing

Board to take care of all the produce of the sea? Mr. Bourassa may say, I think it is a good idea, Mr. Crosbie. Glad you came up. And then go on right across Canada, right out as far as British Columbia where the fishery is big and come back with at least eight out of ten Prime Ministers, Premiers saying, yes, Mr. Minister from Newfoundland, you have a good point. It is not going to be easy, Sir. It is going to have to be a hard selling job. It is going to be tough. I do not know if the Minister of Fisheries with his negative attitude can live up to it or not, can come up to that.

Half the trouble with this administration, Sir, is that they are lazy.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What is the other half?

MR. NEARY: They are as lazy as cut dogs. Mr. Chairman, they can charm you on television, Sir, but they are not prepared to take off their coats and roll up their sleeves and get down to work. That is the trouble with them.

Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Fisheries knows that what I am saying is true, that you are going to have to go across Canada, maybe a half a dozen times, maybe a dozen times.

MR. CROSBIE: Then you would be asking questions about the expense of the trips.

MR. NEARY: What is wrong with that? Maybe the entertainment part of it may be a little bit too high.

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, there is going to have to be an approach made to the other Premiers of Canada. There is going to have to be at least ninety per cent agreement that they will approach Ottawa with a united front. Otherwise, Sir, Ottawa will just brush poor old Newfoundland off and say, look, boy, go home, forget about it. You have no support in Canada for this sort of thing. We set up a Canadian Salt Fish Corporation in 1968 and you are the only ones who are operating under it. Nova Scotia will not even come in. It is going to be a pretty tough selling job, Sir, but it has to be done.

Newfoundland could go it alone, I suppose, as the minister told us today, compete with private enterprise. But I do not think it would be successful, Sir, unless it is established by the Government of Canada and the emphasis put on development to try and diversify our fishery. So I would like for the minister, and no doubt I will provoke him into getting up to make a few more remarks, tell us what he has done has he done any homework at all in this regard? Or he is just sitting there waiting for Ottawa to say, here you go, here is your marketing board, is that what the minister is waiting for? Waiting for, Romeo wherefore art thou, give us our marketing board, waiting for to put it in the minister's stocking for Christmas.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. DOODY: John Perlin -

MR. NEARY: Oh, the Director of Cultural Affairs, \$21,324 a year -

MR. DOODY: Eat your heart out.

MR. NEARY: - for providing entertainment to the St. John's cocktail set.

So, Sir, let the minister tell us what has been done along these lines, if anything has been done. As far as I can see, Sir, nothing has been done. You just cannot sit down here on the fourth floor or over in the Viking building on Crosbie Road and wait for Mr. Leblanc or Mr. Prime Minister to come down and say, here is your marketing board. That will not happen, Mr. Chairman. It will not happen. Sir, I submit there is no future for the fishery of this Province unless and until the government takes over the marketing of all the produce of the sea. I know the typical old, stodgy old, glassy-eyed, red-nosed fish merchant. I am looking over at my honourable friend over there who looks like his blood pressure is going up every time you criticize a fish merchant. He feels as if he has to come to his rescue and protect him.

But, Sir, there are a lot of poor old fishermen turning over in their grave too. I know, Mr. Chairman, they may not like it, but it has to be done if we are going to do the job that needs to be done in the fishery in this Province. And the sooner we do it the better, Sir. That is the only salvation to make sure that both the fish plant operators, the fishermen themselves, the communities and the Province as a whole gets the returns from the fishery that it should be getting, and not just depending on the traditional market down in the United States waiting for Spencer Lake and his crowd to go down and see if they can pawn off a few cod blocks. We have to break new ground. We have to start marketing our fish all over the world, even if we have to start putting it in cans. These people in a lot of the countries I am talking about do not have refrigerators, as I mentioned earlier, Although the Minister of Industrial Development thought it was funny, they do not even have can openers. But we have the technology in Canada, and we have the brains and we have the thinking to be able to put the fish in cans that they can open by just pulling this little hood and ripping the top right off the can.

Mr. Chairman, there is a world shortage of herring and that is something that we have plenty of on the Northeast Coast. It is the most plentiful fish we have on the Northeast Coast and the minister made no reference to it. All he wanted to do, he had crabs on his mind, and he could not get it off his mind. Crabs, crabs, crabs running out of his ears, and herring. The most plentiful fish we have there, Sir, on the Northeast Coast is herring, and we have plenty of mackerel, and we are developing it. And the minister should give the House an explanation or a statement of intention of what his department is going to do about this. The minister also, Sir, sort of casually nonchalantly brushed over the income support programme, which may or may not be - I do not think it will be the answer to our fishery, but at least it will

April 1, 1975

Tape no. 929

Page 3

guarantee the fishermen an income, a decent income, the
income support programme. Unemployment insurance, as

my colleague rightly pointed out and the Leader of the Opposition, probably all the other members of the House, especially those who represent fishing communities will tell you that the Unemployment Insurance programme, Sir, has built in inequities as far as the fishermen are concerned. It is hard to administer, it is hard for our fishermen to get a fair shake under the conventional Unemployment Insurance programme and I think it has been demonstrated, Sir, beyond any doubt that there are a lot of difficulties administering a programme of assistance for fishermen under the conventional Unemployment Insurance programme.

What worries me, Mr. Chairman, is although we have heard a lot of guff and a lot of old lip and a lot of old chaw from all the ministers on the government benches, especially the Minister of Fisheries and his predecessor about the Income Support Programme which will be made applicable to bona fide fishermen in this Province, I will tell you what worries me about it, Mr. Chairman, and I intend to get to the bottom of it. What worries me about it, Sir, is that as far as I can see and from what the minister told the House today, that no formal presentation, listen to this, Mr. Chairman, I am going to make a statement now and the minister can confirm or deny it when he gets up on his hoofs again.

AN HON. MEMBER: Make sure he is ready now.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the minister better be ready because I am going to make a charge if I have to, but I will not at this particular point in time. But I am going to suggest to the Minister of Fisheries, that apart from the odd little conversation with the honourable Jack Davis who is no longer with us, who got defeated in the last election.

MR. DOODY: I understand he is a consultant in Ottawa, to the Minister of Fisheries.-

MR. NEARY: Apart from the odd little conversation with Mr. Leblanc, maybe I am not quite sure, I only heard the minister this afternoon say, well every time we have gone up to Ottawa we have mentioned this matter of income support to Mr. Davis. I believe I heard the minister say, I am

not quite sure about this, that on one occasion he probably mentioned it in casual conversation with Mr. Leblanc, the present federal Minister of Fisheries.

But, Mr. Chairman, would you believe that up to this very moment, Sir, and I challenge the Minister of Fisheries to produce the documentation if he has it, that no formal presentation has been made to the Government of Canada, no formal presentation, Sir. That is a pretty serious charge for me to make.

MR. BARRY: That is a charge.

MR. NEARY: I am charging. I cannot charge the administration with deceiving the fishermen, Sir, that would be unparliamentary. I am trying to think of a better way to phrase it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the administration led by the honourable the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries have left the fishermen of Newfoundland with the distinct impression that they are in there, boots and all, fighting Ottawa to try to get this income support programme, and do you know, Mr. Chairman, up to this very day they have not made a formal presentation to the Government of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the charge.

MR. NEARY: That is the charge and that is a pretty serious charge.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible) Resign! Resign!

MR. NEARY: I consider this matter, Mr. Chairman, to be a very urgent matter.

AN HON. MEMBER: Adjourn the estimates and have a debate.

MR. NEARY: We are going to have to have a debate and if the Minister of Fisheries wants to answer my charge, then I am going to ask him to produce the documentation, not because the honourable minister, Sir, because of who he is, can get up in this honourable House and get on television and go around the Province and make wild, irresponsible statements and expect people to believe him because of who he is.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who is he? Who is he?

MR. NEARY: Yes. That is what I would like to know, who is he?

He is only flesh and blood like myself.

MR. MURPHY: You made the statement, nobody else, because who of he is.

MR. NEARY: The honourable minister knows what I am talking about.

MR. MURPHY: No, I do not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Will the real John Crosbie please stand up.

MR. NEARY: Because of who he is, oh I am Mr. So and So, if I make a statement the people are supposed to believe me.

MR. MURPHY: Such a ridiculous statement.

MR. NEARY: It is not a ridiculous statement, it is a true statement.

MR. MURPHY: I think it is very unfair.

MR. NEARY: People of Newfoundland, Sir, a lot of them still look upon certain people. You have the class distinction. They look upon them as their betters, tip their hats, tip your hat, yes, Sir, sure. They expect you to tip your hat every time you pass them but because they make a statement whether it is inside of this honourable House or outside of the House, that does not make it authentic and correct, does it?

MR. NEARY: It does, whoever makes a statement.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: My colleague will make a statement and you will laugh and jeer at him and say, oh, he is in Opposition. This is politics.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The Minister of Fisheries can get up and make a statement and they will be like a bunch of seals pounding on their desks over there hurrah! because the Minister of Fisheries made it. If the Minister for Green Bay made the same statement

MR. PECKFORD: He would jump and down.

MR. NEARY: He would not get the desk pounding because he is not Mr. so and so, He is a stranger of that honourable crowd.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: But the Minister of Fisheries expects everybody to believe him because he made the statement. I said this so it has to be true. Well, Sir, it is not true. It is not true. No formal presentations or proposals have been submitted to the Government of Canada concerning this income support programme for fishermen. And I challenge the minister now to produce the documentation.

Apart from the odd little conversation, casual conversation in passing during a cocktail party in Ottawa or something like that, you know, Mr. Minister, we have got to get rid of this unemployment insurance and we have to get an income support programme. The Government of Canada, Sir, is up there waiting, sitting and waiting for this honourable crowd, Sir, to present a proposal to either one or the other, either the Minister of Fisheries - and, Sir, let me point out to the Hon. Minister of Fisheries that the Unemployment Insurance Act is not administered by Mr. Leblanc, it is administered by the Minister of Manpower and Immigration, the Hon. Mr. Andras who was in this Province the other day.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: And so, Sir, I would suggest to this honourable House that nothing is going to happen in this regard until, and unless

this administration are prepared to do their homework, are prepared to sit down and draft a proposal for the Government of Canada. Mr. Chairman, I have never known in my experience in political life in this Province the Government of Canada to be wanting. I have never known them to be wanting, Sir. When a realistic proposal was put in the hands of the Government of Canada, Sir, have they shirked their responsibility and their obligation?

AN HON. MEMBER: They have.

MR. NEARY: They have? The only time they reneged, Sir, defaulted, the only time that I have see them renege -

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you hear your honourable colleague?

MR. NEARY: Yes, I heard my honourable colleague. And that is not what my honourable colleague said. The only time they have reneged, Sir, is when you go up to Ottawa looking for a handout, looking for a blank cheque with no concrete proposal. Sure they would want to be insane, Sir, they would want to be crazy, loony, you would want to be bonkers, off your rocker to give the Premier or some minister from a province a blank cheque without saying what are you going to stand on? What is your proposal? What ground rules? Sir, that has not been done. And it will not be done, and we will not get the income support programme in this Province until it is done, until a proposal, a package is put together and sold to the Government of Canada, and they are just sitting there waiting, Mr. Chairman, as they always wait.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: All we hear - Look, Mr. Chairman, this is the pass-the-buck-administration to Ottawa. Everything is Ottawa. When Ottawa does something good, they want to take the credit for it. When Ottawa makes a boo-boo, criticize them. Blame it on Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, they make boo-boos, the same as any other administration.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: But, Mr. Chairman, I submit to this House, Sir, that this is too important a matter that the people and the fishermen of this Province are relying or are taking the administration at their word, and the minister at his words, that they are in there sweating bug juice trying to get this income support programme when in actual fact, Sir, they are not. They are not.

You talk about conning the Newfoundland people and the Newfoundland fishermen, Sir. It will all come out, Mr. Chairman, maybe as a result of my remarks tonight it will come out because I intend to find out if there is any concrete formal proposal in the hands of either one of these ministers in Ottawa or the Government of Canada and I am waiting for my reply momentarily. I might have had it today if I had pressed it hard enough. I want that minister tonight in this honourable House to stand up man fashion if there is no formal proposal made to the Government of Canada, stand up and be honest, man fashion, tell the Newfoundland fishermen that all they have been doing is playing games, political games and fooling around and they have not really gotten down to brass tacks at all. I know, Mr. Chairman, I know because of recent conversations that I had personally that the Government of Canada are eager to bring in an income support programme for the inshore fishermen in this Province. They are eager to do it, Sir, but they are waiting for a firm proposal, a formal presentation from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. Now, how is that for a shocker, Mr. Chairman?

MR. DOODY: Certainly got me upset.

MR. NEARY: Well, it should have the honourable minister upset.

MR. DOODY: It is not true.

MR. NEARY: Because it is true and I have asked the minister to produce the evidence, all the minister has to do is send down for his officials and say bring me up the file.

MR. DOODY: - minister have to do to stand up and say what it true.

MR. NEARY: Ah! Because the minister stands up and says it is true and I say it is not true, they will believe the minister before they will believe me.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Because I am only the poor, little old scroff, the peasant from Bell Island. Now, there is the Member for Circular Road, Because they had to believe him.

MR. MURPHY: Look at your record.

MR. NEARY: Yes, look at my record. What about redistribution? Look at that record, when my colleague, the Member for Labrador South was told that the Redistribution Bill was going to be amended by the Premier of this Province. We know what the track record is. We know all about the credibility of the administration.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Order, please!

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: Are you calling it eleven o'clock?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): The honourable member is supposed to be dealing with 1401-01 and has got somewhat sidetracked.

MR. NEARY: 1401-01, Sir, is the minister's salary. Well, after the revelation that I made in this honourable House tonight, Sir, about this Income Support Programme, I am half tempted to move that the minister's salary be reduced to ninety-nine cents.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Move an amendment. Move an amendment.

MR. NEARY: No, ninety-nine cents, Sir, not even a dollar. Now, Mr. Chairman, my colleague raised the very important matter of who is responsible for the community stages, who is responsible. Well, Sir, let me

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: And parts thereof.

MR. NEARY: And parts thereof. Mr. Chairman, I am not going to be quite as strong in my charge, if you want to put it that way, against the minister for his policy concerning responsibility for community stages. My understanding, Mr. Chairman, my understanding almost from the horse's mouth is that the minister and the administration accepted the responsibility for community stages some time ago. The minister may deny that. He may confirm it. I do not know. But the minister or his predecessor did accept the responsibility for repairing and improving community stages. Then, Mr. Chairman, when it came down to the crunch and the Government of Canada, the Fisheries Department, wanted to enforce the fishery regulations, wanted to enforce the health

April 1, 1975.

Tape 932

RH - 3

regulations and so forth, then the minister and his administration would not give one cent, one nickel to repair these community stages, to upgrade these community stages, to put water in these community stages, to put concrete floors in these community stages. They would not give

one cent. The minister already accepted the responsibility for it. When the minister accepted the responsibility, it was not only a moral responsibility. It was financial as well a moral. Now, the minister comes into this House tonight and tries to shift the blame back again on the Government of Canada, after saying, Mr. Chairman, to the Government of Canada, yes, Mr. Government of Canada, we will accept the responsibility for community stages.

When they try to enforce the health regulations and so forth, then the minister and his administration will not give one cent to assist in the repairs of these stages. As a result, Sir, a large number will not be allowed to function this year, including, I believe, I heard on the radio there a couple of weeks ago, in my colleague's district of Fogo, that the co-operative down there, is it, operate the community stage - will not -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The Fogo Island Co-operative.

MR. NEARY: The Fogo Island Co-operative have been looking for financial assistance.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They got it.

MR. NEARY: They got it? When did they get it? Did they get it today or yesterday?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Got it last year.

MR. NEARY: They got it last year. Well, Sir, they tell us -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They get it every year.

MR. NEARY: - they tell us that they will be unable to function this year if they do not get financial assistance from the government. My understanding is that they have been turned down. The minister said, no, you are not getting it, the same as he said to the other communities, after accepting that responsibility, Sir. Now they are backing down on it. As a result of the minister's inactivity, negative thinking, a lot of these community stages are going to be closed.

Now, why did the minister, Mr. Chairman, agree to take over these community stages if the minister and his administration did not have the money to repair them or had no intention of repairing them,

and now are back with hat in hand trying to get some assistance from the Government of Canada?

Mr. Chairman, it is getting kind of late. I could go on and on and on, Sir. I could talk about the fishery all night, although as I said in the beginning, Sir, I am only just an ordinary layman. I am only just a poor old ignoramus when it comes to the fishery. Well, one thing I do have, Mr. Chairman, is a lot of Newfoundland common sense and a pretty good heart too, but, Mr. Chairman, I cannot help but going back to the minister's speech this afternoon and tonight in this honourable House.

I would say, Sir, that the Minister of Fisheries is the expert on the balance sheet. Maybe he did a great job when he was Minister of Finance. That may have been his proper slot, Sir. When it comes to dealing with human beings and having that humanitarian feeling in your bones for your fellow man, for the fishermen of this Province, then I am afraid, Sir, that the honourable Minister of Fisheries falls down badly.

We heard the minister, Sir - I am not surprised because this is so typical of the thinking of this kind of vested interest, so typical, clobbering the poor fellows who got the loans to get the motor boats. The minister tried to cover it up by saying, oh, they made a deal, they agreed to pay this money back and by God, now we are going to get it. Well, Sir, I can tell the honourable minister in this honourable House that I know of cases in the last few weeks where motor boats have been confiscated and auctioned off and the owners and their families and their crews will now end up on welfare. Is the minister proud of that? Is that a statement to be proud of, just to get the balance sheet all straightened up.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Not true.

MR. NEARY: That is true. It is true, Mr. Chairman. It is as true as I am standing here in my honourable place in this House tonight, that boats have been taken, Sir, and auctioned off, and the families will be forced to go on welfare.

that is a proud statement for the minister to make and all in the interest of balancing the budget. The minister is look, talk about ice water in your veins, could not care less about the humanitarian aspect of it as long as he gets his money back and balances the budget, gets the old balance sheet straightened out.

I know, Mr. Chairman, the minister is probably going to look over at me when he gets up and say, well I was misunderstood, there is only a small minority, there is only a handful, they agreed to pay it back. They could have paid it back in the last two or three or four years or five years but they did not do it. We have no evidence, Sir, that these people had two or three or four or five good years. We have no evidence of that. Again we have to take the minister's word for it. Maybe if we had the names and looked into these cases, Sir, we may get a different slant on it. We may discover that some of these Newfoundland fishermen, some of our fellow Newfoundlanders are going to feel the brunt of our Newfoundland answer to Kojak, the honourable Minister of Fisheries. Maybe if we had the facts in front of us, Sir, and had the cases we might look at them differently than the minister does.

It is the kind of a situation, Mr. Chairman, where you have to move slowly. You have to move slowly, Sir, and this particular minister seems to have the technique of putting the boots to everybody, carrying out - No sooner moves into a new portfolio and the next thing you know the great witch hunt is on and the poor little old, not EPA, Sir, what happened to their \$12 million they borrowed from the Public Treasury?

AN HON. MEMBER: Disappeared.

MR. NEARY: Disappeared? Now they are down borrowing another \$2.5 million down in the United States. But not the big one, Sir, no, do not bother them, they are too close to home, but clobber the poor little fisherman and the poor little welfare recipient, put the boots to him. He is a chisler and a swindler and he is abusing the system, so the minister tells us. What utter tripe and nonsense. What nonsense!

Sir, I will not swallow that until I have a few more facts put in front of me. The minister can go ahead like a bulldozer if he wants to, bully boy. Bully the fishermen and the people of this Province all he wants and when the time comes to mark their x's in the next election, Sir, we will find out if they like that kind of policy or not.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that this debate is going to continue on far beyond tonight. These are just my few preliminary remarks, Sir. I have a few other things to say about the fishery and I will wait and listen to what the minister has to say, to some of these very important matters that were raised this afternoon by the Leader of the Opposition, by my colleague, the Member for St. Barbe North, and I hope, Sir, a few important points that I raised myself tonight that needs answering, that needs an explanation from the minister and from the administration, not just to stand up, Sir, and dance the jig and put on the little performance that the minister usually puts on, if I can only get the minister's attention. Not, Sir, to put on a show because this is no time for showmanship, this is a time for sincerity. I want the minister, if he ever wants to make his name in political life in this Province, to stand up tonight or tomorrow when he gets an opportunity and level with the people and the fishermen of this Province, just as my colleague the Leader of the Opposition did in this honourable House today. If necessary, Sir, Mr. Chairman, what I would like to see is the Leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Fisheries go on a one hour television debate and let my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, take the Liberal position that he stated in this House today and let the Minister of Fisheries state the government's position, one hour debate. If Mr. Stirling -

MR. DOODY: No matter who got clobbered -

MR. NEARY: If Mr. Stirling would donate the time, free time, let the two gentlemen get on and debate the matter as we saw it debated here in the House today, Sir, and then immediately call an election, put it to the people, let the people decide. I do not think there would

be any doubt, Mr. Chairman, in anybody's mind which way the people, especially the fishermen of this Province would vote in a Provincial General Election.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Chairman, we are indeed seeing an unusual love feast here tonight or love fest. The honourable Member for Bell Island when he started his remarks, for the first time in my memory, for the first time in living memory of any member of the House here, of this committee, praised the Leader of the Opposition. Now, what has happened in recent days to cause this love feast between the Leader of the Opposition and the loquacious Member from Bell Island? Not only that, but when the Member from Bell Island sat down the Leader of the Opposition applauded for the first time that I have heard in the House, the Leader of the Opposition applauded the Member for Bell Island.

MR. MURPHY: Were there any secret meetings?

MR. CROSBIE: Now, there must be strange fears troubling members opposite when that happens. Now, I have not got time - I have time to deal with the Member for Bell Island because I only need four minutes to deal with him, Mr. Chairman, because this is one of his vintage performances and an awful lot of nonsense and it drove me to poetry. Feeling numb from Neary's nonsense/ I rose quivering from my seat/ Good Lord, thought I quite weakly/ Could any other life be this sweet.

I am not up to my best inspirations. Romeo, Romeo, please hear my plea. Take Stevey Baby on your knee. I will not go on to the rest of that one. It is unparliamentary.

Now, I want to deal with the Member for Bell Island in the two or three minutes that I have left here. Mr. Chairman, my message tonight or this afternoon was not one of despair, but I think that the fishermen and the people of this Province are tired of the old Liberal rigmarole which was always to pretend that everything was wonderful, that no matter how bad things were or what the problems were that things were wonderful, that Mr. Sunshine was

going to, you know, that there was nothing wrong in the garden, everything was rosy in the garden. What the fishermen of this Province want is a discussion of what are the problems that face them and how they might be overcome. There was no message of despair from me or from this side. If we despaired, we would give up the government and we would not be attempting to deal with these problems. So, there is no despair on this side but we are not going to try to fool the fishermen or fool the fish processors or fool the fish plant workers or fool the people of Newfoundland that there is any simple solution to their problems and that is what my message is and I know that honourable gentlemen opposite will try to twist it all they can and twist anything you say. If you try to be honest and forthright and deal fairly with people, they are experts in twisting and turning the meaning and getting on the open lines and distorting what is being said and spreading deceit and distortion around the Island, but we will counteract that. We will counteract that.

They know who is telling the truth and I do not think there is anything to fear from the truth. Now, on the submission to the Government of Canada on income support, the government has made a submission to the Government of Canada in income support. My predecessor, the Minister of Fisheries, made a submission to Mr. Davis in response to his suggestions and we have written on a number of occasions and if we thought there was any point to it, we could table the correspondence. There has been no formal presentation in the sense that we put on our tails and tuxedos and our black shirts and white and formal suits and went to Mr. Trudeau or went to Mr. Davis or went to Mr. Leblanc and made a formal presentation, but if writing letters and sending them to Ottawa and having them acknowledged and making written submissions are formal presentations, that is what has been done.

The ball is in the Federal court where it is supposed to be. We are waiting for them to perform on the promise they made the

electorate of this Province last year and if we can only presume that they will perform on it, We are not being rude or obnoxious and knocking them every day to carry out this promise, but we are expecting them to carry it out. We know there is a lot of difficulties for them to overcome and we are constantly reminding them of this obligation and they are well aware of it and we will be coming forward with some kind of an income support scheme before too long.

Now, the honourable gentleman in concluding his remarks tried to pretend that I or other members of this government are only interested in collecting loans from the small man or the little fellow or treading on the hands and the hopes and the aspirations of the poor fisherman and the logger and the worker in this Province. Now, what a tissue of nonsense. Nobody is going to swallow that line. Where was the honourable gentleman when the time came to deal with Doyle? Where was the honourable fearless Member for Bell Island when it came to dealing with John C. Doyle who at the time had about \$110 million from the Province of Newfoundland guaranteed, and when he did nothing about it, not a thing, his buddy, John C. Doyle? Where was he when it came to dealing with the Sheehans and everyone else in the Province? He was right in their hip pocket and delighted to be there and not saying a sound and not making a sound and not uttering a sound. Only in the last two years has he become the fearless Steve ready to take on all comers, except his great friend and that working man, that member of the working class, John C. Doyle. Never yet has he attempted to come to grips with him. He is such a tremendous admirer of him.

I say, Mr. Chairman, it does not matter how small or how large a person is concerned that we are dealing with, They should meet the obligations they enter into with us unless there is clear and pressing reasons why they cannot do that and then, of course, extensions can be arranged.

Now, I would like to answer some of the remarks of the honourable Member for St. Barbe North and I will when we meet again on Thursday because I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we can discuss this subject at least for another week or two, at least a week or two and perhaps for another fifty hours and really give the subject the discussion it deserves.

MR. ROBERTS: How much have we got left, Mr. Chairman?

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Forty seven hours and twelve minutes.

On motion, that the committee rise and report progress and ask leave to sit again. Mr. Speaker returned to the Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having made progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports they have considered the matters to them referred and report having made progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand suspended and that the House on its rising do rise to adjourn until 3:00 p.m. tomorrow, Wednesday, April 2, 1975.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, April 2, 1975, at 3:00 p.m.

Contents

Page 2	Page
Oral Questions (continued)	
Request for financial assistance from a privately operated senior citizens' home at Porterville. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doyle.	2625
Closing of home is financial assistance not forthcoming. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doyle.	2626
Recent communications from the operator of the home. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doyle.	2626
Financial commitment by the Government of Newfoundland towards the '77 Summer Games. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doyle.	2628
Orders of the Day	
First reading, "An Act Further To Amend The Judicature Act."	2628
Committee of Supply (Fisheries Estimates, 1401-01)	2629
Debate continued by	
Mr. Crosbie	2629
Mr. Roberts	2634
Mr. Crosbie	2693
The Chairman left the Chair at 6:00 P.M.	2707
The Committee resumed at 8:00 P.M.	2708
Mr. Crosbie	2708
Mr. Rowe	2742
Mr. Neary	2766
Mr. Crosbie	2800
Adjournment	2803

Contents

April 1, 1975	Page
 Statements by Ministers	
The twenty-sixth anniversary of Newfoundland's Confederation with Canada. Mr. Crosbie, Mr. Roberts.	2608
Mr. Collins on Eastern Provincial Airways' plans to consolidate mainland operations at Halifax, N.S.	2609
Response by Mr. Neary.	2612
Mr. Maynard announced appointment of Robert K. Langdon as Assistant Deputy Minister of Manpower. He announced the names of government's three representatives on the Buchans Task Force. He further announced settlement of the dispute between the Newfoundland Fishermen, Food and Allied Workers Union and Bonavista Cold Storage Limited.	2614
Response by Mr. Roberts.	2617
Attempted response by Mr. Neary	2620
 Reports of Special and Standing Committees	
Mr. Crosbie tabled copies of the Fish Inspection Amendment Regulations of 1974.	2620
 Oral Questions	
Possibility of the <u>Norma and Gladys</u> sailing to Japan. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	2621
Would the ship fly the Canadian flag or the new Newfoundland flag. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	2621
The cost of such a voyage. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	2621
Closing of the road between Bunyan's Cove and Port Blandford. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	2622
Re-opening of the road. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	2622
Equipment working to reopen the road. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	2623
Action to improve the road between Bunyan's Cove and Musgravetown. Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	2623
Accommodation for children still residing at the United Church Children's Home. Mr. Neary, Mr. Murphy.	2624