



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SEVENTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 1

1st. Session

Number 61

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, MAY 11, 1976

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GERALD RYAN OTTENHEIMER

The House met at 2:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. PINEOIT: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition signed by 132 residents of the community of Woodstock in my district. The prayer of the petition, Sir, is that the road leading to the community of Woodstock be upgraded and paved as soon as the present work is completed on the La Scie Highway. Now I understand that that work will be completed this Summer and I suggest then and the prayer of this petition suggests that the government should then turn its attention to other roads in the area, specifically by roads that lead to the La Scie Road.

The road leading to Woodstock, Sir, serves two communities, there is the community of Woodstock and the community of Pacquet. Those two communities have between 1,000 and 1,200 people living in them. Many of the people work at Advocate Mines in Baie Verte and Rambler Mines in Baie Verte which means they have to drive that road at least twice a day. Also the children in the communities of Woodstock and Pacquet have to be bussed into Baie Verte to high school. So therefore the road is extensively used by everybody in the area.

We are only talking about four miles of highway, four miles going out to Woodstock from the La Scie Road and there is another two miles going down to Pacquet. So it is a total of six miles of road altogether. I think, Sir, the request is a reasonable one. I think the people have requested it in a reasonable fashion in that they sense the priority of the La Scie Road first but they request that when that work is done then attention be given to other areas. I support the petition and I ask that it be laid on the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to support this petition presented by my colleague. I think the people of Woodstock and Pacquet

MR. J. WINSOP:

are being very reasonable in their request. That is a particularly bad piece of road to have to drive over and it must be pretty rough on their equipment. They have to move back and forth every day. I have much pleasure in supporting the motion.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay .

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition. Again it comes from the community of Woodstock. This one is signed by 134 residents. The prayer of the petition is that Canadian National Telephone Communications upgrade their services in that area. Now, Sir, I am the first one to realize that that is not the total responsibility of the provincial government. The people realize it and they have made it clear, I believe, in the prayer of the petition. What they are asking is that the provincial government support their efforts and my efforts in dealing with CNT, that they upgrade the necessary services in that area.

What has happened to this point, Sir, is that we have three or four families on the one telephone line and of course that is practically an impossibility to use the telephone service at all. What needs to be done is extra cables need to be installed in that area so that we can cut down the number of telephones on the one line. The people have been in touch with CNT and they are requesting that the appropriate department in this government support their efforts. I support the petition and again I ask that it be laid on the table of the House and referred to the appropriate department.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in speaking in support of the petition I would like to point out that only yesterday at a meeting with the federal Minister of Communications, the hon. Madame Sauve, that we discussed this very problem whereby in many different areas of the Province the telephone service needs to be improved

Mr. Morgan:

and the agreement is now that there will be a study carried out this Summer by the Federal Government, and also with the Provincial Government participating as well, and it is hoped that this study will be completed by the end of this Summer. And the purpose of this study is to define the problems that now exist with regards to poor telephone service where we have three or four families on the one line, and poor reception and this kind of thing, four lines. And once it is completed we then agreed to meet again to define possible solutions or determine them, and also to determine possible means of funding to overcome these problems, in particular with relation to the government telephone service, and when I say government, I mean the CN Telecommunications. So I am very pleased to support this and the hon. gentleman can be assured of my further efforts in that regard.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Placentia.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of the residents of Fair Haven in Placentia Bay. It is a small community on the South side of Placentia Bay, it is approximately nine miles from the main road. Now this is as they have it written, this is a petition from the telephone subscribers of Fair Haven. "The telephone service here is useless, because half of the time the phones are not working, lines are always open, there are only four party and multi-party lines here. We would prefer a two party line system instead of the above. When we are using the phone anyone can hear the conversation. There are no cables here just open wires. If it is stormy the phones ring and they will not stop, and if they have a power failure they are out altogether. There is no battery or emergency power, if electric power is off for days. Therefore we have no telephone service.

The nearest community is eighteen miles from here where we would have to report a power failure or an emergency that may come up due to a power failure. We are paying the highest rates anywhere in the area for this services. Our last monthly bills were increased from \$4.44 for exchange service to \$5.35, plus a bill for \$1.52 for what

Mr. Patterson:

they call exchange adjustment service. According to a price list we received from the Regional Director, Mr. J. Goose, the rate for a four party line is supposed to be \$3.50. We asked CN why we are paying the higher rates? They say, they are paying for mileage. We do not understand why we have to pay this higher rate, and no other community has to.

For instance, the subscribers of Little Harbour East is connected to the Chance Cove exchange. They are about the same distance from Chance Cove as we are from Bellview exchange, and they do not pay any mileage there. We would not mind paying the higher rate if we had a decent system, but what we have now is useless. We want the service improved or a new one installed. If this cannot be done we want it disconnected altogether. Nothing is almost as good as what we have now, at least we would not have to pay for nothing. Please give this matter your immediate attention."

I beg that this petition be tabled in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. A. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition presented in behalf of the people of Fair Haven by the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson). This problem, Sir, is typical of a problem that exists pretty well all over Newfoundland. I know in my own district, in the community of Petites, sometimes the telephone service is out for weeks - it is not CN by the way - it is out for weeks on a stretch. It has been out since before Christmas, I do not know if it is back in yet or not. And down on the South Coast CN are just finished installing a new telephone system in the community of Grey River, and they put in a new system with party lines where you have three or four people on the one party line, and I have had complaints from Grey River. Now they have moved into LaPoile in my own district and they are putting in a new telephone system where you have the party line, you will have three and four and five people on a line, and the same way in Grand Bruit when they get around to putting the telephone system in Grand Bruit. So they do not seem to be very

Mr. Neary:

conscious of the problem, But with the latest electronic equipment that is available today, you would think CN and Newfoundland Light and Newfoundland Telephone Company would be, especially when they are putting in a new system, putting in the latest equipment available where people could have privacy, could have a private line.

So, Mr. Speaker, I just mention that in passing in supporting the member's petition because the people have made a very valid point, Sir, and this is typical of what is happening all over this Province. I think it is about time that both the Newfoundland Telephone Company and the CNT started to change their outlook towards the telephone service in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: I would also like to support the petition presented by the hon. member for Placentia, for the people of Fair Haven. They have typical Southwest Coast telephone service as pointed out by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). It is very typical,

MR. J. HINSON:

Four party lines. fine! I think some people have as many as ten. I know they have had them and the quality of the telephone service all over the coast is very, very poor and leaves much to be desired. I am very pleased to hear the Minister of Transportation and Communications say that he is going to do something about it and I hope it is very positive and very soon.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, just a few words in support of the petition from the residents of Fair Haven. The hon. gentleman who presented the petition and myself met with the residents of that community not too long ago, approximately three weeks ago and we discussed this very problem and other problems as well. I assured them then and I also assure the hon. gentlemen of this House that this matter will be brought to the attention of the telephone company to find out the reasons why a new exchange which was installed in 1974 has not been connected and put into operation. So this matter will be brought forward by myself to the regional manager of the CN Telecommunications in this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. George's.

MRS. MACISAAC: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 201 residents of the Codroy Valley in the district of St. George's. The prayer of the petition is, "We, the undersigned citizens of the Codroy Valley petition your department to provide us with larger and more adequate slaughtering facilities than are presently available in this area." In commenting I would like to say that the livestock industry in the Codroy Valley is definitely on the incline and the slaughtering facilities available in that area right now are very poor. The building is old and dilapidated. It is much too small to serve the needs of the district or the area and barely meets the requirements of the Department of Health and other departments concerned. I think if we are to encourage livestock industry in that area or in any other area of the Province one of the prime concerns should be adequate slaughtering facilities. I hope that this will be considered by the

MRS. MACLEAAG:

department, favourable consideration. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this petition be placed upon the table of the House and referred to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, I support the prayer of the petition for two or three reasons. Number one is that it is the first petition that has been presented by my hon. friend.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

MR. NEAPY: Not the first petition? I thought it was the first petition.

AN HON. MEMBER: The third.

MR. NEAPY: The third petition. But anyway I support it for another reason, Mr. Speaker, that my hon. friend represents a district that adjoins my own district of LaPoile. So I have to pass through the district of St. George's every time I go down to my own district. I must say that I am -

MR. S'ALLWOOD: Was the member got a permit?

MR. NEAPY: No, you do not need a permit. You do not have to get an immigration visa or anything to pass through the Codroy Valley. But it has to be one of the most beautiful parts of Newfoundland and I have noticed as I drive down there that there are a lot of cattle in that particular part of Newfoundland. I do not know as my hon. friend says - I can only take my hon. friend's word for it - that the number of beef cattle, dairy cattle in the area is increasing. I would believe this to be true because I have noticed in the last year or so, the last couple of years since I have been going down that way that there is a tremendous number of cattle now. You can see them from the road as you drive by and I am rather amazed and surprised that they do not have adequate slaughtering facilities in that area because if there is ever an area of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, that is a natural habitat, a natural region for beef cattle and for dairy cattle it is certainly in the Codroy Valley and also for farming for that matter. So I would be interested in hearing what the Minister

MR. NEAPY:

of Forestry and Agriculture has to say about this matter. I support the prayer of the petition and I hope that the member for St. George's (Mrs. MacIsaac) will get the wish of her constituents granted and that they will get improved and increased slaughtering facilities in that area.

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

HON. J. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I met with the farmers on two occasions, one in Robinsons, and latterly to that out in the Codroy Valley. While I was there the people who had organized the meeting had me take a look at the slaughtering facilities out there. Unfortunately at that point in time the hon. member was incapacitated and could not make the meeting, and I was aware of the petition at that time. They gave me a copy of it, and I indicated to them that it would be more appropriate if their member presented it in the House of Assembly. While I did not give them any commitment which I cannot do, we certainly will give it every consideration. I think that one of the more prime areas for agricultural in this Province is that area of the Province. There is a lot of good farmland out there. Certainly the farmers have been very active out there for quite a number of years, and it is my hope that we could institute the facilities they need to increase livestock production out there. They have a very small slaughter house now that in no way serves their need, and I appreciate that. I think they appreciate too the problems we have in saying yes we are going to do it in a given year. I undertook no commitment to them, but certainly to give every sympathetic consideration to it, and I did promise too that I would speak on it, and give that indication in the House of Assembly. But I would certainly think that it is a petition that, in my opinion, merits consideration. And if we are to see an increase in livestock production on the West Coast especially in the Codroy Valley area then better facilities will be needed. So I can assure the hon. member and the people who signed their name to that petition that every consideration will be given to the request that is made. Unfortunately I cannot give any time frame as I told the people at the meeting, but every consideration will be given to their request.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. L. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would also like to support the petition. I am glad, first of all that the minister has spoken, and is taking an active part in this particular part of our Province where so much could be done in the field of agriculture. I am also

Mr. Woodrow:

supporting it because of course it is good for the Province, And it is also good for the West Coast. I feel that members of the West Coast of the Province, not being prejudiced of course towards the East Coast of the Province, it does not matter what party we represent, I think we have to try to unite and work together for that part of our Province. Once again I am not being prejudice towards the East Coast, I am not saying that at all. But agriculture for the West Coast of our Province is a very important thing. And incidentally it would also have a bearing on the districts of Humber East, Humber West and the district of the Bay of Islands. So I give my wholehearted support to the petition that my hon. friend from St. George's (Mrs. McIsaac).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any further petitions?

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

HON. E. M. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. In view of the fact that his department with DREE's authorization, as he tell us, I do not doubt him for a minute, of course, have called tenders for roads in a number of areas in the Province which roads will be paid for, which contracts will be paid for by a Federal-Provincial arrangement, could the minister tell us (a) why no tenders have been called for the Northern Peninsula Road, because as he has told me privately work will be done on that road this year I understand, and secondly, when tenders will be called for work on the Northern Peninsula Highway, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the only answer to that question I can give is that the Federal Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, known as DREE, has not given my department the authority to call tenders for that any work on the Northern Peninsula. What permission they have given us for various projects, these tenders have now been called, but to date they have not given us the authority to call tenders for any work on the Northern Peninsula.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the minister did not answer the second half of the question, although he may not be able to, but could the minister tell us then - he said DREE had not given authority to his department - whether DREE has given authority to any other department, and if not is there a hold-up? What is the hold-up?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, my only contact with the federal Department of Regional and Economic Expansion was to request permission to call tenders. The negotiations for the work to be carried out by the federal-provincial agreement was done by my colleague the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs. My only contact was to request permission to get tenders called so the work can commence as soon as possible, because of the shortness of the season. So maybe the hon. gentleman, my hon. colleague, the Minister of Intergovernmental-Affairs may feel like commenting on the answer to that question.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker.-

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is going to add a few comments.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, negotiations have taken place in connection with the Highways agreement for this year now and

MR. CROSBIE: we thought the matter was settled long ago. Last Wednesday I saw the Deputy Minister of the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion, in Ottawa, and I have suggested to them the urgency with which this matter should be approached. All items are agreed, that I know of. We cannot say what the programme is because, of course, the procedure is that there should be a joint announcement. We can only confirm that the roads for which tenders have been called are included in the programme, but we are hoping to sign a two-year-programme.

MR. ROBERTS: Where is the hold-up, here or in Ottawa?

MR. CROSBIE: The hold-up, if that is what you want to call it, is in Ottawa, because it was all settled as far as we were concerned, quite some time ago. Then there was some discussion about a week or ten days ago about certain changes which we have agreed to, and we are now waiting for procedures to be followed up in Ottawa. In the meantime, they did give their consent to tenders being called on these six roads, I think, that are in the paper.

I think it has to go to the Federal Treasury Board, and how long this is going to take I do not know.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank both ministers, Sir, and if I could ask the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs a further question, a supplementary? He said that there were some changes requested, and I want to be awfully clear. I thought I heard him say that the government here have now agreed to these. Is this, in fact, the situation that the government here have agreed to whatever these requested changes were and that it now awaits, I suppose, executive action by the government at Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the programme was put up long ago under the programme that we suggested. But about ten days or two weeks ago certain changes were suggested from Ottawa with respect to certain roads in this agreement. We, being statesmen,

MR. CROSBIE: swallowed our annoyance at this and we have agreed to the changes up there. The man who pays the piper calls the tune. Therefore, these changes were agreed to last week and we are now waiting for them to let us know when its -

MR. NEARY: Hot cake.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I cannot very well say that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for JaPoile, then the hon. the member for Windsor-Buchans.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the hon. the Premier, Sir, I would like to direct a question to the government House Leader, and ask the government House Leader if in view of the fact that Statistics Canada today announced that more than 1,000 people are unemployed this month as compared to last month, that we now have record joblessness, record unemployment in Newfoundland, what measures, what emergency measures are the government going to take in the way of job creation to deal with record unemployment in Newfoundland at this particular time?

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MP. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, it is true that there is high unemployment. That is nothing new this time of the year in Newfoundland. This is a cyclical thing that has been going on for a great number of years. The other thing is that this government since it came into office some five years ago have made great strides in creating jobs. The only thing is of course as we must all recognize that there are more people coming out of school, university, trades college and onto the job market every month and every year than there possibly can be jobs created for them to fill. So that this is the situation and we have created many, many more jobs by government action.

AN HON. MEMBER: Can the minister list some of them?

MP. WELLS: I cannot list now. I could go through and provide them there is no question about that. But I think the point is not that the government has to or can even introduce crash programmes to take care of things of this sort but rather that the government have long range and proper programmes that will of themselves as time progresses take care of the - or insofar as that is possible - of the matter of job creation. But I think it would be silly for anyone to suggest with the numbers of young people leaving school, leaving trades colleges and leaving university, that in any given month or any five Spring they can all be taken care of and jobs found. But in due course they can and will be absorbed, Mr. Speaker, into the labour force.

MP. NEAPY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister aware that in the announcement by Statistics Canada today that one of the statistics released was that the work force has remained stable over the -

MP. DOBEPIS: It is smaller now than it was a year ago.

MP. NEAPY: Actually it is smaller than it was a year ago. So that explodes the minister's argument. But I wonder what the minister would tell the House. In the long range programme what projects will be launched this year in the public sector to create jobs for those

MR. NEARY:

who are looking for work? Included in the long range programme this year, what part of the long range programme will be started this year to create work for Newfoundlanders who are unemployed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister without Portfolio.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, on the matter of the first point that the hon. gentleman made which was that the work force, that the number of jobs in other words, is decreasing.

MR. NEARY: No, no. The total work force.

MR. WELLS: Oh, the total work force is decreasing. That under the present system, Mr. Speaker, is difficult. There are so many causes for that. The fact that people, as I understand it, engaged in training of one sort or another. The fact that various people from time to time may want to be off the job market.

MR. NEARY: Forced to leave them.

MR. WELLS: They are using new formulas. People from time to time -

MR. ROBERTS: The figures are computed on the same formula.

MR. WELLS: People from time to time leave the Province and go elsewhere as they always have done in Newfoundland. There are so many factors, Mr. Speaker, involved there that it is impossible at any given time to say what the cause of something is. I am sure if Statistics Canada were aware of the complete causes of any of these phenomenon, they too would say so.

MR. NEARY: The second part of the question is what programmes will be started this year.

MR. WELLS: The Government of Newfoundland as we all know is caught up in the business of fighting inflation which is not only common to Newfoundland but common to Canada, common to the Western World. The Anti-inflation Board has imposed certain strictures on us and on this government, you know, which cannot be ignored. The programmes of the government and what the government is going to do by way of spending public monies of course are well-known and these are public matters. The expenditure of public monies will give a

MT. WELLS:

certain number of jobs this year in Newfoundland. They always do.

The other things of course, Mr. Speaker, is that the job market will pick up in Newfoundland from now on into the Spring and Summer as it always does. And there is nothing really to change the overall position vis-a-vis Newfoundland and the job market except of course that circumstances entirely beyond the control of Newfoundland, in fact to some extent beyond the control of Canada, has meant that this is a difficult period in terms of job creation.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the view given to me by the Government House Leader on behalf of the Premier and behalf of the government, Sir, I am dissatisfied with the answer to my various questions that I put to the minister about unemployment and job creation and I wish to debate the matter during the Late Show on Thursday coming.

MP. SPEAKER: A supplementary?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I want to ask a question if it is in order, Mr. Speaker.

MP. SPEAKER: Right. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my question should not take long to answer. It is to the Premier. Could the Premier confirm or deny as the case may be, that the rule applying to ministers for travel within Canada is that they are not to use first-class air travel? You know what I mean, not to travel first-class where there is economy class space available.

MP. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMTER MOOPES: As I understand it, Mr. Speaker, I am not - I will check it and make absolutely sure. As I understand it, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: That is the rule.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, this question to the Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment. Will the minister advise the House as to whether or not he has received any complaints or requests to investigate the property damage both public and private that have resulted over the past five or six days from the high water levels that have been permitted to accumulate in Ped Indian Lake. As the minister is aware the level of Ped Indian Lake is controlled by Price (Nfld), by the use of their dam at the run off in Ped Indian Lake.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

MR. MURPHY: To my knowledge we have received no complaints or any correspondence relating to same. The only thing I know, is last week there the hon. member expressed some fears that the waters were rising on Ped Indian Lake and there was great fear that the dam was going. I think this was a little bit of hysteria arising from the other. But quite frankly we have not received any intimation from anybody as to damage. If the hon. member is aware of any I would be only too happy to have it checked out.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: One supplementary, Mr. Speaker. To the minister, Sir. Damage has occurred. Public roads are washed out and cabins are falling out into the lake. That is a fact. Now the question, Sir. Will the minister assure the House that his department will investigate the damage with a view to determining whether or not the damage was justified and whether or not the people whose property has been damaged have a right to expect to be reimbursed? If so, by whom?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and Environment.

MR. MURPHY: I would appreciate it if the hon. member would give me a memo. I do not know if it is the responsibility of the Department of Environment or not to look at these things but I will certainly see that the department responsible will check it. I will in the first

MR. MURPHY:

instance. But if the hon. member will give me a memo I would be only too happy to have the thing checked out and let him know perhaps this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy if he is listening, Sir. Would the minister care to comment on the latest announcement by Eastcan that they are not planning to abandon exploration off our coast this Summer in spite of the fact that they do not have the equipment yet and they do not have any detailed plans as to where and when they are going to drill which makes the minister's statement yesterday look kind of sick and jaundiced and squeamish to say the least?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, it is a wonder that any company like Eastcan or any other deigns to do any business in this Province whatsoever because every time they are asked for a comment or questioned or say anything their words are twisted in every conceivable direction.

MR. ROWE: By whom?

MR. CROSBIE: By whoever hears it, By the press, by the media and by others.

MR. ROWE: Well not this Opposition.

MR. CROSBIE: Eastcan has been checked with. There is absolutely no change in Eastcan's plans for exploration activity off the Coast of Labrador this year, none, absolutely none. Eastcan are chagrined, disappointed, humiliated that whenever they are asked a question or whenever any discussion comes up the whole thing gets twisted. As a matter of fact Eastcan are coming down here May 20 to discuss with us their programme for the year and all the details of it. There is always a slight chance that they may have difficulty getting ships and getting the equipment just when they need it.

MR. ROWE: How big is that slight chance?

MR. CROSBIE: Their intentions are and their plans are to have two drill ships and a semi-submersible rig in operation off Labrador this

MR. CROSBIE:

year. That is their plans. The semi-submersible rig to come on in September because it can be used later in the season. Something may happen. There is always some small chance that something may happen to delay one of the ships, the semi-submersible rig or whatever. But that is their plans. That is their intention. And unless some fortuitous event outside their control occurs that is what they will be doing in this Province this year. Eastcan are exploring on the most prospective area of the whole Eastern Canadian offshore, and naturally they are going to go full tilt ahead.

But the question asked about, is this 100 per cent sure, is everything signed, sealed and delivered this year, they will have to answer. Well there is always a slight chance there may be delay or we might not get a ship or whatever. Then it gets twisted that they are not planning to do a programme here this year. I met with them only two weeks ago in Quebec City when they told me what their plans were. They are coming down here again on the twentieth. These are their plans. They have no intention of not conducting extensive exploration work off the Coast of Newfoundland this year unless something occurs out of their control to prevent it. So that is the position on Eastcan.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. POWE: A supplementary. Mr. Speaker, I hope the minister would forgive our anxieties but when one reads a press release from the staff at Calgary, Alberta stating - well I will put it in the form of a question.

MR. ROWE:

Is it true or is it accurate this statement here that the company has not yet secured drilling equipment for the Summer's proposed offshore programme on the Labrador Shelf? Is it true that it has not worked out details of where -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: He cannot answer that.

MR. ROWE: If the hon. minister wants to get up on a point of order he can do so, Sir, without jabbering away there. But would the minister suggest that the news report is erroneous and inaccurate or whether it is true? This is what we are trying to find out.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to answer questions from Mr. Dennis Duffy or Duffy Dennis -

MR. ROWE: But he is with Eastcan.

MR. CROSBIE: - or whatever the name is - what is his name?

MR. ROWE: Dennis Duff.

MR. CROSBIE: Dennis Duff. We have spoken to that poor gentleman in the last twenty-four hours who is chagrined that every word he has uttered has been twisted and who says he will not be uttering any more words because you cannot utter a word down here that is not twisted out of all reasonable shape. I do not know if Eastcan has the contracts entered into and signed and so on and so forth. I am informing the House of what their plans and intentions are. It may be that they have not got these ships signed up yet. It may be the ships are doing other work and they have to wait and see exactly when they are available. That is their business. I am telling the House what Eastcan's intentions are, what they intend to do this year if they are not prevented by acts of God, the Queen's enemies and other fortuitous events -

MR. ROWE: Or the government.

MR. CROSBIE: - force majeure out of their control.

AN HON. MEMBER: They are anxious, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: Are anxious, yes. They are on the best area off Labrador.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And are making every effort.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. minister is speaking.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) is right on, Mr. Speaker, they are making every effort.

MR. POWP: The government had all sorts of good intentions.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile and then the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NEAPY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Minister of Transportation and Communications about the strike by highway employees in the White Hills. Could the minister give us some information in connection with that strike, what it is all about, what caused the two employees to be dismissed and why the grievance was not straightened out through the grievance procedure of the NAPE agreement and so forth? Either the Minister of Finance or the Minister of Transportation. I do not care which one answers as long as we get the information.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will not answer the question in relation to the dealings with NAPE. That is not my role in government. The Treasury Board are dealing with NAPE. But I will give the House of Assembly the reasons for the suspension of two employees of my department at the White Hills. They were involved in a bit of a ruckus on the depot site during working hours and in my view it was improper conduct. There was also damage to government property and because that the suspension for one day was given to two employees. As a result of the suspension I understand a number of employees walked out in protest of this suspension.

MR. NEAPY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. What is the proper procedure in the case of improper behavior on the part of employees? Is it a warning in writing or is it a one day suspension? What is the proper procedure under the agreement, under the NAPE agreement?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. DOODY: There is a meeting being arranged this afternoon between Mr. Locking of NAPE and Treasury Board officials to look into what the grievance is, what the situation is and what the regress is, what the solution is. I am not sufficiently familiar with the background on it to

MR. DOODY:

report to the House in any detail at this time. Later on this afternoon, as I say, I hope the Treasury Board and NAFB officials will get together and whatever the situation is at that time, you know, I will be in a position to inform the House tomorrow or whenever the next question is.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. As the minister knows there has been a lot of discussion and concern about the ferry rates coming into Newfoundland and I am wondering - I have information that indicates I believe the minister may have meetings in store in this regard - I am wondering how serious the problem is from the information he might have available within his department at the moment and what if anything can be done about it and what does he hope to achieve hopefully at meetings if in fact there are meetings in the foreseeable future?

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

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. My colleague, the Minister of Tourism and myself will be meeting tomorrow with the federal Minister of Transport, the hon. Otto Lang to put forward Newfoundland's position, the Province's position in opposition to the increase in ferry rates both from North Sydney to Port aux Basques and from North Sydney to Argentia. As Minister of Transport I am particularly concerned over the substantial increase in the cost to move freight

MR. MORGAN:

from North Sydney to Port aux Basques. The increase is fifty-two per cent. This is the new increase that is now imposed by East Coast Marine Ferry Services. What I am concerned about is the possibility that this increased cost of moving freight across the Gulf will be eventually passed on to the shippers and to the consumers. So that is one major point for tomorrow's discussion.

The other is that we are quite concerned over the substantial increase in the trucking rates to Argentina. They have increased the rates there by thirty per cent and no increase coming into Port aux Basques which means that practically from here on in 100 per cent of all the trucks will now be coming into Port aux Basques and not Argentina. The Province's position is that we would like to see more truck trailers, the heavy vehicle traffic coming into Argentina and more of the freight going on to the rails from Port aux Basques. So these are the points we will be putting forward to the federal minister tomorrow. Of course my colleague is concerned over the effect it is going to have on Tourism because the accommodations on the boats has increased by sixty per cent coming into Argentina. These are substantial increases. We feel it will affect, economy, number one and also the tourist industry, number two. So we will be putting forward our position tomorrow to the federal minister in the hope that he will reconsider this matter and to roll back these increases.

MR. NEADY: A supplementary to the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: Some hon gentleman has a supplementary?

MR. NEADY: A supplementary for the minister.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEADY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister if the joint consultative committee comprising of the unions of the railway, of the town council and of the Chamber of Commerce and various bodies in Port aux Basques and in Argentina headed up by Dr. Sullivan, the president of the Regional College in Corner Brook, if the joint consultative committee has had any input in the presentation that the Minister of Tourism or the Minister of Transportation will be making to Ottawa?

MR. NEARY:

If they have not had any input, have they been asked to make a contribution or have they been just ignored in this whole situation?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, nobody in this Province has been ignored because just last week I, in fact, recall making a public statement urging all concerned citizens in this Province to express their opposition and concern over the substantial increase in the ferry rates which is going to affect our economy. I have had substantial input from the various unions in the Province, the railway unions in particular and I have met with workers for example, employees of CN, in particular dockyard employees and others, throughout the Province. So there is nobody left out. I am hoping that everybody who is concerned about this matter will bring forward representation to me so I can put it forward to the federal minister.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Would the minister undertake to get in touch with Dr. Sullivan, the Chairman of the joint consultative committee, to find out the views of that committee who represent everybody involved in the transportation business in connection with CN, to find out their views and what contribution that they can make to this presentation that the minister is going to make in Ottawa. I say this in all seriousness because they have been at this for years and the cost of the meetings of the joint consultative committee is paid by Canada Manpower, paid by the Government of Canada. They meet once a month I believe. Would the minister undertake to get that information?

MR. MORGAN: I will.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy. I understand that the minister is, I believe, to go to the Mainland tomorrow, possibly Toronto. One, what is the purpose of the visit? Is it a conference? What is to be discussed and what does he hope to achieve?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, as to whether anything will be achieved, I do not know. But the purpose of the meeting; it is a meeting organized by the Province of Newfoundland as a result of the Premier's conference held here last August. There was a resolution passed that the question of patriation of the constitution and other matters in connection with the constitution, that the provinces should be canvassed during the year by the Premier of Newfoundland or by the Government of Newfoundland to ascertain what the positions were on that matter so it could be discussed again in August in Alberta. Of course in the meantime the Prime Minister has made the issue a very current one by his request or wish that the constitution be patriated which has been discussed briefly by the Premier I think at their meeting in Ottawa last week.

In any event the purpose of this meeting is it is a meeting of the representatives of the ten provincial governments, either their ministers of intergovernmental affairs or justice or whoever they have in charge of this question. The purpose is to try to see what the position of each province is on those questions so that their Premiers can be briefed for a meeting in June that they will be having with the Prime Minister to know what the various positions are so that they can consider the question in more detail in August at the Premier's Conference in Alberta. So the Minister of Justice and I will be there and Mr. Ahery from this Province. All provinces are going to be there I think except we have not heard from Manitoba yet but I believe they will be there also.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLICHT: Mr. Speaker, this question to the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. Would the minister advise the House what action his department intends to take with regards to the thousands and thousands and thousands of cords of wood that are now free floating on Red Indian Lake that are up on the beaches, up in the woods, thousands of cords of wood being permitted to flow free on Red Indian Lake by Price (Nfld).

MR. RIDEOUT: And Deer Lake.

MR. FLICHT: Well Red Indian Lake I am aware of. Hundreds of thousands of cords of wood over the years.

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

MR. POUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member brought that up a little while ago and I indicated that the department was not aware of it. I have checked into it in the department and we are looking at the matter now to find out just what wood is there and what our intentions are in respect to it. I said some time ago - and I was completely misinterpreted by the member when I suggested that woe to the one who left wood on it. I was talking of when we came under the Forest Management Policy and I hope I explained that to the member adequately the last time. As a result of questions raised recently by the member I have asked people in the department to check out just what wood is there and certainly if it is there we will have a talk. I hope to be meeting with Price, if it is Price wood in that area, next week in Grand Falls and we will certainly bring the matter to their attention at that time even if I do not have the report.

I will be meeting with Bowaters tomorrow morning here in St. John's, the general manager and the vice-president, the manager of wood operations and we will also bring that point to their attention as well and indicate to them that we are looking into the matter of wood that is left in these areas and especially on rivers. I think the time has come when we have to look at that as a means of transportation of wood. I think we are spending over \$5 million on forest access roads and hopefully we can use that form of

MR. DOUSSEAU:

transportation for wood rather than the rivers of our Province which suffer from them in the long run.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: To the same minister. Is there any good reason why if Price is at fault or Bowaters or whoever, why they should not be responsible? Surely the minister is not considering spending public money to clean up their mess?

MR. DOUSSEAU: The minister did not say that. The minister said that because of the amount of money we are putting in the forest access roads now there should not be a need in the future to use the rivers that we have always used traditionally in the Province to transport wood. I can assure the hon. member that if Price and Bowaters have left wood from whence it should come, that it is not this government's intention to pay for the transportation of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Time has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker:

BE IT RESOLVED that the regular order of business of this hon. House be suspended to discuss a matter of urgent provincial wide importance, namely, record joblessness throughout Newfoundland and Labrador at a time of the year when job opportunity should be opening up. With the outlook extremely bleak, Mr. Speaker, and no sign of jobs being created either in the private or public sectors it is a matter of utmost importance, Sir, that this House tackle the job of setting up an emergency job creation programme without further delay and that all other business of this hon. House should be suspended until we have dealt with Newfoundland's number one problem, namely, unemployment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for having the resolution in writing, Sir. I have a couple of more copies. The girls were not in the office at the time and so if Your Honour can read my hand writing well and good. If not, I can have it typed.

MR. SPEAKER: The procedure as hon. members know is that the Chair must now rule on whether it is in order for the hon. member to ask leave that the regular business of the House be postponed. If it is ruled out of order, that disposes of it. If it is ruled in order, then it is up to the House to decide whether or not the regular business will in fact be postponed.

In considering whether it is in order there are a number of factors which I am obliged to consider. The urgency of the matter is, I think, beyond dispute. The factor I next have to consider is the urgency of debate and in doing that I have to bear in mind what to the best of my knowledge is going to be the order of business or what is to be debated within

MR. SPEAKER: the next few days or within the near future. It is common knowledge to all members that the Estimates, which I presume will be called today, I can only use my judgement, the seventy-five hours will have expired, I believe, some time late today.

I believe in answer to a question a few days ago from the hon. the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), the hon. the House Leader indicated that when the Estimates were through, it was his intention to call the debate on the Address in Reply and the Budget debate. That was part of the answer, there may have been other things as well. Therefore it appears to me that there will be an opportunity in the near future for this matter to be debated. Now on both of those debates, the Address in Reply and the Budget debate, almost any matter of public interest to the Province is in order and it would certainly appear, from the order of business indicated by the hon. the House Leader, that within a very few days, within a very short time those debates will be called. That will provide the opportunity for debate and therefore I would rule that it is not in order.

MR. WELLS: Committee of Supply, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

Head XIV, Fisheries - Subhead 1401-01.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

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

Yesterday when the Committee rose we were talking about the matter of yields in our fish plant operations, at which time I stated that the yields in the Newfoundland fish plants are averaging, I believe, around 34 per cent whereas in other countries, in European countries, the yield is anywhere from 50 per cent to 60 per cent. I would not want to leave the impression, Mr. Chairman, to the Committee that the fault lies exclusively with the people who work in these fish plants. There are a number of factors that influence the amount of yield from our raw material.

MR. W. CARTER: I think probably one of the most dominant influences is the fact that our people, going back some years when fish was very plentiful, and a very inexpensive commodity, were not encouraged to become too concerned with respect to their yield. In fact, at that time, when fish was cheap, plentiful, I suppose they were not really encouraged to concern themselves with respect to the percentage, or the portion of the fish that was processed for human consumption.

And the other reason, and equally important reason, is the fact that having regards for the fact that many of our fish plants, when in fact pretty well all of them are seasonal operations, certainly a large number of them, the people who work in these plants are not given a chance, really, to develop any great expertise when it comes to the filleting of fish. That in itself is quite an art. It is something that calls for considerable skill and training.

Consequently, Mr. Chairman, when a fish plant is only in operation 30, 35 or 40 per cent of its time, and when its workers are only working that number of months or weeks in a year, well then I can say that it is awfully difficult to acquire any real proficiency in the matter of fish filleting.

This, Mr. Chairman, must be a matter of deep concern to all of us because today the situation is changed in that number one; we have a shortage of raw material and secondly; the price for the raw material has increased considerably to a point where now it is uneconomic to have 66, 67 or 68 per cent of the raw material used for other than human consumption. With that in mind, another factor too -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Other than for the higher priced market.

MR. W. CARTER: The higher priced market. As a matter of fact, in the report that was released a day or two ago by the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, it is pointed out that in the Atlantic region alone there is an estimated \$25 million of fish rejected on the basis that it is unfit for human consumption. \$25 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Meant for human consumption but rejected.

MR. W. CARTER: No. it is unfit. Meant for human consumption but because of deterioration of the product it is unfit for human consumption and consequently utilized for other purposes. \$25 million. Certainly in Newfoundland, while the amount is not as great, it is considerable. It is one that must be of deep concern to all of us.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is there a breakdown by province?

MR. W. CARTER: No, I do not have a breakdown by province, Mr. Chairman. Another thing, of course, which must be of concern to all of us, certainly it is of deep concern to the plant owners, and indeed to the fishermen themselves, is the matter of quality. I do not think that we can blame the fishermen for some of the poor quality of fish that is landed and eventually ends up on the filleting tables of our fish plants.

It is all very well for us as a government and as a people to insist on a better quality and to keep pointing out the pitfalls of the present system where, as I said earlier, \$25 million worth of fish is rejected and used for other than human consumption. But I think as a government we have a very serious obligation to provide the necessary wherewithal; ice making facilities and other facilities to give our fishermen a chance to produce a top quality fish. The fact that some of our fish is not up to par with respect to quality is costing the Province a lot of money, in that in many cases, not under all headings but in certain areas, fish from other countries are fetching considerably more on the American market than that which is being paid for Newfoundland produced fish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Similar, identical products?

MR. W. CARTER: Identical products but in different packs and different sizes and different methods. But certainly that is another problem of deep concern. I am told that under certain headings that Icelandic fish, for example, is now receiving twenty or twenty-odd cents a pound more on the American market than that being paid for fish that is caught and processed in Eastern Canada, especially in Newfoundland. That is not under all headings mind you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: At the point of import. This is not retail over the counter?

MR. W. CARTER: No, at the point of import. Right!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Twenty cents a pound?

MR. W. CARTER: In some headings. In what they call the five and ten pound packs. They are fetching as high as twenty-odd cents per pound more than fish that is caught here. I am not blaming the fishermen. I do not think it is fair -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is incredible! Twenty cents a pound?

MR. W. CARTER: I hope the Committee would not get me wrong, Mr. Chairman. That does not apply to all fish.

MR. NOLAN: That is not straight across the board.

MR. W. CARTER: That is not straight across the board, but under certain headings. Special type fish. Special packages.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Such as?

MR. W. CARTER: The ones they call the five and ten pound.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No not weight but -

PREMIER MOORES: All the large fish that is packed, special cure and special size.

MR. W. CARTER: Right yes. Under certain headings.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not get that. What did the Premier say?

MR. W. CARTER: Special cure, fish put up in special packs of special and different size.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well then in that case, if the minister will allow me, in that case it is not a greater price by twenty cents a pound because of a superior quality in the one and inferior in the other, but a speciality pack and speciality size and so on. Not necessarily better quality.

MR. W. CARTER: Not necessarily, Mr. Chairman. The difference cannot be attributed solely to the quality aspect of it,

MR. W. CARTER:

but certainly I would suggest that quality does play some part in that differential.

MR. NEARY: It is like butterball turkey and utility.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, right. But I am not blaming the fishermen, I am not blaming the processors. I think that there is an educational job required and assistance must be provided our fishermen to enable them to land a product that will end up getting into the fish plant in A-one quality condition and then going to the various markets in the same condition. With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, it was only last week that I announced a pilot programme which will take place in Admiral's Beach, St. Mary's Bay where we are going to endeavour to introduce new technology, new ideas, new concepts in the handling of fish.

MR. NOLAN: Whose district is Admiral's Beach in?

MR. W. CARTER: I believe it is in St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I would not hold that against the place.

MR. W. CARTER: I do not apologize for that because this selection, I might add, was not made by the Minister of Fisheries but made by a joint federal-provincial selection committee.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who have their instructions.

MR. W. CARTER: No, no. No, no, no. That is not the way we operate in the Department of Fisheries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well anyway it is nearer to the minister and the minister will visit it frequently.

MR. W. CARTER: It was a very democratic way in which that settlement was selected and I am quite proud to know that it happens to be in my riding, the riding of St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. NEARY: And what will happen there and what will happen in Bay Bulls?

MR. W. CARTER: Be that as it may - I will answer your question - I think it is a very, very important, an extremely important experiment. It is our intention to involve all of the fishing boats in the community of Admiral's Beach and there are a number of boats there of all sizes

MR. W. CARTER:

and all descriptions and types and what have you, boats that fish under all conditions, gill nets, cod trap, longlines, you name it, it is our intention to utilize all of the boats in this experiment and our aim is to, first of all, develop new technology which will enable us to outlaw the use of prongs or pitchforks in the handling of fish.

Now that might not appear to be a world shattering idea, a revolutionary idea. It has been tried before without success. When you realize that a fish from the time it leaves the net until it lands up on the filleting table has been pitchforked around six or seven times leaving in that fish probably fourteen or sixteen holes, I think it is not difficult for the committee to appreciate just how important it is that that method of handling fish be outlawed as quickly as possible.

MR. NEARY: What is going to take place?

MR. W. CARTER: One second now and I will explain. The fact that fish is handled that way contributes to the reduced yield because when that fish goes to the filleting line the filleters have to cut out these prong holes because they are damaged and to some extent - not to any great extent - but maybe we are talking two or three per cent, the yield is affected by the way in which the fish is mangled or pronged or thrown around by the use of these prongs.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Surely most of the pronging is done in the head not the body.

MR. W. CARTER: Well I would like to think so but I am sure that anybody who has witnessed people who are tired and having been out to sea all day and they want to get home to their families and get cleaned up and maybe involved in some other activity, that I do not believe they are too selective and really you cannot blame them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I believe the minister is right.

MR. W. CARTER: You cannot really blame them for not being too selective when it comes to where the fish is pronged. That is one aspect of it.

It is our intention working along with the fishermen in that community and with the help of government federal officials and our own

MR. W. CARTER:

engineers to develop a method whereby fish will be landed without the use of pitchforks. We will be installing on board the boats some system of conveyor belt or some method whereby the fish will not have to be pitchforked by the old traditional prong.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would they not be likely to prong it onto the conveyor?

MR. W. CARTER: No, no. I will explain that. What we have done, Mr. Chairman, is this. We have developed a type of a ring net and if you can visualize the old-fashioned brewis net - I am sure the older members know what a brewis net is. In the Newfoundland outports they would put their hardtack in a knitted bag and gather the head of that bag together and then put it in the pot and boil it. It was called a brewis net. This is what we are using only on a much, much larger scale. These nets will be installed in the holds of the boat. The fish will be taken out of the net and put into the holds of the boat in these nets. It will then be iced because on board that boat we will have ice that is being provided at the community stage up there. We just finished now installing an ice making machine that will produce ten tons of ice per day which is quite adequate to take care of the needs of the people up there, the fishermen.

That fish will then be brought in to the wharf where it will be unloaded by a wench which will be placed on the wharf. The net will be gathered up, tied up and then the wench will take the fish from the bottom of the boat in this net, lift it out where it will be put in an iced container which will be on the wharf.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In other words the fish have come out of the water into that net and stay in the net until the net is iced.

MR. W. CARTER: Ice will be provided. Our aim is to ensure that fish will not be without ice from the time it leaves the water until it ends up on the filleting table in the processing plant. That is our objective. It will then be landed in an iced container which will be on the wharf, which we have had to import, which contains about 2,000 pounds and then taken to the fish plant where it will be promptly processed.

MR. NEARY: It has to be trucked then.

MR. W. CARTER: In this case there is a filleting plant in Admiral's Beach. It is being operated by Newfoundland Quick Freeze. In cases where it has got to be transported, in cases where there is a plant for example as often happens, when the fish has to be transported from one community to another for processing, it will be transported in these large food containers, sealed, hoisted on board of a truck, taken into the plants, unloaded and put on the filleting line for processing. So at no time will this fish be without ice and that is very, very important.

MR. SMALLWOOD: These containers after they have proved themselves can be made here in the Province?

MR. W. CARTER: They will be and I understand there is a study already underway now to investigate the feasibility of manufacturing these containers in the Province. That would be a sizeable industry in itself because I envisage the day when all fish will have to be transported in that kind of a container.

MR. STRACHAN: Will that be a plastic type container?

MR. W. CARTER: It will be a plastic type container, yes.

MR. STRACHAN: Would the minister permit a question.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, go ahead.

MR. STRACHAN: I was wondering if you are going to all that trouble of handling the fish from the water right through to the processing covered in ice and so on, whether you were going to follow the Icelandic practice of bleeding the fish immediately it is taken from the water because that seems to be one reason why you can increase the yield by at least ten to fifteen per cent.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, all fish landed at Admiral's Beach as of now will be bled. All fish will be bled. We will have inspectors on the wharf, on the wharf head inspecting fish when it comes ashore. We will periodically have our inspectors go out to sea in the boats and keep a close eye on the procedure followed by the fishermen in the boats. As I said we will have inspectors on the wharf head constantly. As every fish is landed they will be inspected by inspectors.

MR. CANNING: Would the minister permit a question?

MR. W. CARTER: Yes.

MR. CANNING: At what point will the fish be bled, just as it comes out of the water?

MR. W. CARTER: Right. I presume when it comes from the water they will be bled right away, yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is the minister aware of the fact that this whole idea of bleeding the fish as they come out of the water originated with the late Michael Condon of the Southern Shore who practiced it himself for years and that it was practiced to a limited extent in the fishing port of Bonavista? While he is generous enough to let me intrude on him, is he aware of the practice of fishing coming in, being brought in from the fishing grounds live in the boat, the boat being so constructed that a large portion of it is actually, that the water of the ocean comes up into the boat through the bottom and with a net or something to keep the fish from escaping and the fish are brought in live to shore, into the market? I have seen it myself. I have seen it in Denmark. I think I saw it in Norway.

MR. W. CARTER: I have heard of that, Mr. Chairman. I am not sure that would be too effective when you are dealing with large quantities of fish, especially

MR. W. CAPTEP:

when you are dealing with fish that are maybe caught on a trawl or a gill net.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Trap.

MR. W. CAPTEP: Trap fish, the possibilities are there. That aspect of it I have covered, talking about quality, methods to improve quality. Then of course this will be a three year, hopefully a three year programme. The technology that is developed in Admiral's Beach will then be used in other communities and I am hoping that as we provide means, ways and means for fishermen to unload and to handle their fish without the use of pitchforks, I am hoping that maybe even by an act of this legislature that we will have to outlaw the use of pitchforks on board of fishing boats and maybe even go so far as to outline the use of prongs in our fish plants.

MR. NEADY: Would the minister permit a question? In this experiment at Admiral's Beach presumably the minister is talking about fresh fish and so forth but will there be any attempt at implementing smokers or canneries or anything of that nature in the Admiral's Beach area in connection with this experiment?

MR. W. CAPTEP: We have no immediate plans, Mr. Chairman. Certainly our big concern right now is not in the matter to which we can diversify the production of this fish but certainly first and foremost to devise ways and means to produce what will be the world's best fish, a top quality A-one quality fish. I think we can do it. I have enough faith in our Newfoundland fishermen, in our plant workers, to say with confidence that we are going to succeed in our effort to produce a top quality fish, one that will compete with that produced by any other country in the world. There is no reason at all -

MR. NEADY: No more cod blocks.

MR. W. CAPTEP: Not necessarily. There is no reason at all why we cannot do that when you realize that -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would not that fish which would be so superior to a lot of other fish, would not be salted and put in the poorer markets, it would be frozen, processed for the high priced markets.

MR. W. CARTER: Right, right.

MR. STEFANI: Would the minister permit a question. If you are going to this much expense - it is going to cost more this method of handling the fish - is the minister saying that this fish will be marketed separately from the rest of the fish? Because if it is just passed down the same filleting line and lands up in the same kind of cod block as all the rest of the fish, then of course obviously you would land in the hole. But there must be some separate method of marketing this kind of fish in order to get that higher price for that higher quality. Is this also being taken into consideration?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Keep its identity separate.

MR. W. CARTER: I have thought, Mr. Chairman, of that. We thought maybe of devising or designing a special label. That will more than likely follow in the second phase of our experiment. For example the amount of fish that we are going to process this year in Admiral's Reach will be maybe between 3 million and 5 million pounds. I have thought maybe and I have had people investigate the possibility, of maybe getting that fish into some of the, maybe the hotel chains in the States, some of the fish take-out things where quality is all important. I must confess that is not possible at this time, at this particular junction of the experiment. But I am hoping that once we - I might say too by the way that this experiment will be widely publicized. We are going to publicize it as much as we possibly can. As a matter of fact I have commissioned a local public relations firm E.J. Bonnell Associates, a name that is well-known to hon. members opposite because I think he has done considerable work for their party.

MR. NEARY: For the old Liberal Party.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes. Mr. Bonnell will be studying ways and means to properly publicize this experiment and to make sure that the right people in the right places know what we are doing. Slide presentations and brochures, film clips and what have you. That is our aim in that regard.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That publicity would be aimed at what market, where geographically?

MR. W. CARTER: We would probably use that information in conjunction with other agencies that are available, maybe in the American market.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course the first thing is to determine what the market is to be for this extra fancy quality.

MR. W. CARTER: Well I think, Mr. Chairman, the market is already established in that other countries - and I mentioned that at the outset of my remarks - other countries, Iceland, Norway, they are catering to that market, a market that demands good quality, top quality fish from their suppliers and I am convinced that we can break into that market and do it.

Another - and I am getting back to the question asked by my colleague, my hon. friend from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) - it is obvious Mr. Chairman, that this sort of thing will expand, the word will get out that we are taking these precautions, that we are endeavouring to process fish under very sanitary conditions, under the best of conditions and that our fish is being handled under extremely sanitary conditions as well. That word will spread and I think that in time - it is not going to happen this year - but I think in time it is going to reflect in the amount we will get for our fish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would not the minister agree that if he does not identify that fish, give it a separate and special identity, then all the propaganda in favour of it would be ineffective unless it's identity was made separate and recognizable? Because otherwise customers would be taking the other, the remainder of the fish which will still be by far the greater part of it and say, well they do not see any difference or any improvement. It has got to have its own special brand or name so that other fish will not be mistaken for it.

MR. W. CARTER: That is a good point, Mr. Chairman. We are quite aware of that, the need for identifying that fish and it will be. I cannot be sure it will be done this year but I can assure you that before the experiment ends -

MR. SMALLWOOD: The minister must first get the quality before he can identify it.

MR. W. CARTER: We must get the quality first. We must be able to

MR. W. CARTER:

attain that objective of producing an A-one quality fish and then we must be able to ensure an adequate supply. I believe that starting off at Admiral's Beach this year, next year extending it to other communities, I believe, I am convinced then that the quantities will be there to make it a very attractive proposition to our exporters and to the people in the States who buy our product.

MR. STRACHAN: Would the minister permit a question?

I understand the procedure you are talking about and agree with a good deal of it but I am wondering whether you have ever thought of marketing the fish fresh rather than passing it through further processing procedure. Four years ago or five years ago Air Canada was extremely interested in flying out of this Province fresh fillet provided the fresh fillet was of the highest quality, that is white, bled, out of rigor mortis and iced fillet. There were some containers designed by Air Canada for their flights because they had nothing to haul back from Newfoundland and was therefore interested in giving a fairly low price on the haulage. So I am wondering whether this was considered or could be considered as a possibility rather than passing everything down through the frozen chain.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, we have thought of that, Mr. Chairman. We still are studying the possibility of doing that. I do not think that mode of disposing of our fish products will enable us to take care of all of the fish we have but certainly it is something that we should be and will be giving very serious consideration to.

Mr. Chairman, I have touched on our desire and our plans to hopefully improve the quality of fish that is landed through the Admiral's Beach experiment. Another area, equally important, that we are considering under the same experiment is the matter of yield. Yesterday I mentioned the fact and again today, the fact that we are

MR. W. CAPTER:

maybe being short-changed as it were by virtue of the fact that we are not getting sufficient yield from the raw material, from the fish that we catch, thirty-four or thirty-five per cent. It is our intention in Admiral's Beach to work in conjunction with Newfoundland Quick Freeze Limited and with the Fisheries College who have undertaken to initiate a training programme in Admiral's Beach with fish filleters - these people will be trained into the latest technique of filleting fish and will be provided with the latest tools, the required tools and necessary skills and methods which will train them to get the desired level of yield from the raw material.

Once we have achieved that aim in Admiral's Beach, that of getting hopefully a fifty per cent yield, then we will transfer that knowledge and that technology to other fish plants and hopefully it will spread to the degree that all of the fish plants will be availing of the services of the Fisheries College and others with a view to increasing their yield to that which we hope to achieve in the Admiral's Beach experiment. That, Mr. Chairman, pretty well sums up the Admiral's Beach project.

MR. HICKMAN: Any Doodys down there?

MR. W. CAPTER: Yes there are a lot of Doodys there and I might add that some of them are taking part in the experiment.

Mr. Chairman, there are a number of things I could talk on today but in fairness to the other members I would not want to monopolize whatever time is left. But there are a few more things I would like to have a few words on before I take my seat. One is the matter of gear subsidy. We all realize - I am sure my predecessor, the present Minister of Mines and Energy recognized this fact as well as I do probably more so, but the present gear subsidy programme in the department is anything but adequate and very, very inequitable in certain respects. With that in mind I appointed a committee of the department, an internal committee who working along with the various fish gear supply houses and fishermen have submitted to me a report

MR. U. CARTER:

which contains, I think, several very worthwhile and very feasible solutions to that problem.

It is our intention within the next few months to change completely or maybe even initiate a brand new programme of gear subsidies. I have circulated a letter to every single fisherman in the Province, 15,000 of them, outlining my views on the subsidy, outlining some of the options that are open, some of the alternatives that have been suggested to me by this committee and asked them for their suggestions. The gear subsidy will affect very, very much our fishermen. I am of the opinion that in cases where we are going to initiate new programmes or change existing programmes that will have such an impact or possible impact on the fishermen themselves, I have embarked upon a policy of complete consultation with the fishermen. As a matter of fact since I became minister I have sent out no less than four letters to fishermen suggesting their advice on certain programmes, offering certain ideas and requesting their views. The response has been really staggering, extremely well.

We are now in the process of preparing a monthly newsletter which will go out to the fishermen of our Province at which time we will keep them advised of changes in legislation dealing with fisheries, new ideas, new technology that is being developed in other countries, changes in the federal statutes as it applies to fisheries and in general a document that will keep them totally informed on what is happening in their industry and how they can best take advantage of some of the programmes that we are initiating.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What does the minister mean by the word 'gear'? It includes what?

MR. U. CARTER: Fishing gear would include all kinds of nets, ropes that sort of thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Engines?

MR. U. CARTER: No, not engines. This is gear required for fish catching, gear of all descriptions pretty well.

I have several ideas on that. I do not want at this time to announce what we will probably be initiating because I have to naturally

MR. W. CARTER:

discuss the matter with my cabinet colleagues and get their concurrence. But certainly it is our intention to maybe abolish the present gear system altogether and replace it with what I think will be a much more workable, a much more practical solution to the problem. The idea that I have in mind without going into any detail is to provide means whereby the subsidy can be paid direct to the fishermen. As it now stands the subsidy is paid to the gear supplier. I want to introduce a system whereby the fishermen themselves will be given the subsidy in order to give them that much more independence and enable them to go out and rather than be almost forced to buy their gear from a gear supplier and be at his mercy when it comes to price and terms and what have you, my aim is to get the money into the pockets of our fishermen to enable him then to go out and buy his gear on a competitive basis.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or to form a co-op.

MR. W. CARTER: Or to form a co-op.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A buying co-op.

MR. W. CARTER: The possibilities, Mr. Chairman, are unlimited.

I believe that by initiating that kind of a programme that the gear can be purchased at a much reduced price than that which is now being charged our fishermen.

Hon. members will recall that just recently, about two or three weeks ago, the government announced a policy with respect to the subsidy on small boats. We all know of course that boats over thirty-five feet in length, decked in boats, would qualify for a federal subsidy of thirty-five per cent of the cost of the boat itself. Boats under thirty-five feet were subject to a provincial bounty of I believe it was ten dollars a foot for a boat up to twenty-five feet and twelve fifty per foot for a boat in excess of twenty-five feet but not exceeding thirty-five feet. Because at thirty-five feet then the federal bounty came in play. Our new programme now is to pay a thirty-five per cent bounty on all fishing boats built or bought or purchased,

Mr. M. GARRETT:

rather, by fishermen to be employed in the fishing industry of thirty-five feet to a minimum of twenty feet. So that I am told is a very important change in our policy because there are a number of places where it is still possible to earn a half decent living from a small boat. I have places in my riding, St. Bride's, St. Mary's, St. Shotts for example where you have a very prosperous fishing community. All of the fishermen in St. Shotts operate in boats that are under thirty-five feet.

Now I contend that a lot of our fishing boat skippers, longliner owners, are bankrupt or if not they are certainly bordering on bankruptcy and unfortunately in many cases the poor people do not know it. They have been forced in many cases in boats that are much too sophisticated for their needs, much too large, much too expensive to operate. The reason being that in many cases the generosity maybe of the federal and provincial bounties made it easier for a fisherman initially to become involved in a longliner, a thirty-eight foot longliner than what it did for him to become involved in maybe a thirty-four foot trap-skiff. The initial cost to a fisherman in many cases would be less than the purchase or the building of a bigger, larger, more sophisticated, more expensive longliner type boat than what it would be in a smaller boat which in many cases would be quite adequate

MR. W. CAPTEP:

having regard for the area and the distance of the fishing grounds from the land. This new programme we hope will have the effect of eliminating that inequity, that very serious inequity that obviously has existed.

Another new programme that we have introduced is the matter of leasing of longliners to a select type fisherman. And I say a select fisherman because our aim is to get these boats into the hands of our good sincere interested fishermen, experienced fishermen. I might inform the committee that that programme has really caught on. We have had, I would say, in excess of 100 enquiries from people around the Province who are anxious to go fishing but because of lack of working capital, lack of the necessary financial resources, are unable to get into the industry but given a chance will be able to make a very worthwhile contribution to the fishing industry and to the Province and of course provide employment for themselves and several others. These people must be given a chance to go fishing.

CAPT. WINSOR: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. W. CAPTEP: Yes.

CAPT. WINSOR: Can the minister say how many of those boats have been repossessed and how many now have been leased, or rented to, or whatever arrangement they have made with the fishermen? Are any of those boats on lease right now?

MR. W. CAPTEP: Mr. Chairman, this again is a pilot project. We are not anticipating this year to get into the leasing of any large number of boats. It is a new idea. We want to see how it works. I think it will work. Our aim this year is to lease eight longliners. These longliners will be boats that will be coming back to the loan board from their present owners for a number of reasons. Maybe the owner lost interest in fishing. Maybe the owner died, left the industry and unfortunately in some cases the boats have had to be repossessed

MR. W. CARTER:

because of unsatisfactory arrangements with the present owners with respect to meeting their obligations to the loan board and to the government. Now mind you we are not going out and finding, you know, **any excuse**, to repossess a boat that is being used by a fisherman. I can assure the committee that before any fisherman loses a boat through repossession resulting from maybe not making his payments on time or ignoring his responsibility to the loan board, we give that fisherman every possible chance to redeem himself and to get back on an even footing with the loan board and hopefully to stay in the industry.

MR. NEADY: That is not what your predecessor said. Your predecessor said they were going to sock it to them.

MR. W. CARTER: That is the policy of our government. I am sure it was the policy of my predecessor.

MR. NEADY: No it was not.

MR. W. CARTER: I do not see how any Newfoundlander who has got any understanding at all of the fishing industry could possibly adopt a different policy from the one I have just explained. Our aim is to next year, hopefully, get into a much broader leasing programme because today to purchase and to operate a longliner, to properly equip that longliner, to enable the owners to make even a decent living from the industry, it is an expensive proposition. It is not a bull's-eye shop operation. You are talking in terms of anywhere from \$250,000 to \$350,000. A new fifty-four foot longliner today would cost in excess of \$200,000. Then you have the sophisticated equipment that is necessary and the various catching equipment that is necessary and it is a fairly expensive proposition. Consequently -

MR. NOELAN: Would the minister permit a question. Very briefly - and I do not mean to interrupt the minister in any way - assuming he and I wanted to buy a longliner tomorrow, what would we be required to put in and for what agencies, and how much would government, whether it is federal or provincial, put in?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, if the hon. member were a fisherman and

MR. W. CARTER:

if he wanted to buy a new longliner he would require a ten per cent down payment to start off with. He would qualify for a federal bounty of thirty-five per cent and also a provincial bounty of, I think, it is two hundred and something dollars per ton, plus the fact that he would require then some pretty sophisticated equipment - if he is going to give himself half a chance to make a living from that industry - plus the necessary nets and gear that is required plus the insurance which is a pretty hefty bill.

MR. DEARY: How can the ordinary guy afford it?

MR. W. CARTER: The ordinary guy cannot afford it. The ordinary person today cannot -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I would like to remind the hon. minister his forty-five minutes has elapsed.

MR. W. CARTER: I was under the impression that the minister, Mr. Chairman, who is introducing his estimates could continue.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Go on.

MR. W. CARTER: I will not delay. -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, I am sure it is agreed that he goes on as long as he likes. Would the minister say that whereas now the way a man gets a longliner with which to fish is that he buys it or builds it as his own expense or with financial help from the government of the Province and the Government of Canada? Under the new scheme he does not buy it at all, he merely rents it. He does not have to make a down payment and the rental will include the insurance and maintenance, would it?

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, there are many weaknesses in that leasing programme. I am the first to admit it and there are a number of changes that I intend to recommend that will be made before the next fishing season starts. For example my aim is to lease boats on an arrangement whereby we would as payment be prepared to accept a share in the boat, the boat share.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of the fish.

MR. U. CARTER: Because if a person, if a fisherman does not catch any fish and it often happens that he will work from daylight to dark and he will end up at the end of the season with not enough money to keep body and together. So I do not think it is fair to expect that man then to be able to pay a set amount for the boat that he has got leased from the government.

Under the present arrangement it does not work that way. We now have the fishing boats valued or appraised, we will have the rent on the appraised value of the boats advertised maybe over a ten year period or certainly the remaining life span of that boat. It works out where it is much cheaper and it is much easier. Even though the present system is anything but perfect - and I intend hopefully to make some changes next year - but it still enables the fishermen to get a boat with much less initial investment than that required of a person who intends to buy that boat or have one built. This system is by no means ideal but given the fact that it is an experiment and given the fact that there is a lot of interest in this new idea, then it is incumbent on us and on me as a minister to bring about some very necessary changes in that programme and I intend to do that.

But certainly we have to get involved in providing boats through that means to fishermen. We have to involve ourselves in -

MR. ROBE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to rise on a point of order. I do not know whether the minister is continuing on based on the assumption that he has ninety minutes or unlimited time as the minister but as the minister may or may not know he does only have forty-five minutes at the Committee stage except by leave. For our part, Sir, we would be willing to grant leave in view of the fact that he had quite a number of questions put to him. But I would not want it to be unlimited time. Probably if we could suggest something like ten minutes. We would be quite willing to grant leave for the minister to continue on ten or fifteen minutes with some of his comments that he might not have had an opportunity to continue on with as a result of the questions put to him.

MR. U. CARTER: Mr. Chairman,

MR. W. CARTER: I apologize to the hon. member if I may be abusing the privilege that was just extended to me, but there are so many things happening, there are so many things happening in the fishing industry. There are so many things to be done that I could, I am sure, stay on my feet for ten hours and even then I would only scratch the surface.

MR. ROWE: We only have three.

MR. W. CARTER: I would only scratch the surface on some of the programmes that we have in mind, some of the plans, some of the ideas, new concepts and also to give me a chance to express the undaunted faith that I have in the fishermen of our Province and the fishing industry of our country, particularly in the good fishermen of St. Mary's-The Capes.

MR. NEARY: And the Southwest corner of the Province.

MR. W. CARTER: And the Southwest corner of the Province.

MR. F. ROWE: And Old Perlican.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, this year we are going to involve ourselves in new boat designs. In our estimates you will see a vote, an amount of money voted to enable us to undertake new boat designs. We recognize, Mr. Chairman, the need for change in our boat designs. There are many criticisms of the longliners. I am hearing a lot of criticism, especially now when many of them are being adapted to the herring fishery, to the lobster fishery and maybe to a more extensive ground fishery.

We, this year, will be having a study undertaken with a naval architect who is now in the employ of the department, who will work in conjunction with our fishermen, fishermen's committees, fishing skippers, and others, fisheries geographers - is that the right word? - people who can inform us as to where the bodies of fish are, the distance they are from the shore, with a view to developing maybe an ideal fishing, multi-purpose boat, recognizing the fact, as we must, that a boat that is designed for the Northeast Coast is not necessarily suitable for fishermen from my hon. colleague's district, the Southwest

MR. W. CARTER: corner of the Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: As the Cape Island boats were not successful in our Newfoundland waters.

MR. CARTER: Right! We recognize the fact that a fishing boat, for example, that is necessary or that is practical in St. Mary's - The Capes or Placentia Bay might not necessarily be the same type that you would use in the White Bay North area.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: Consequently we are now looking at the Province in three and maybe four regions, where after considerable study and consultation takes place, we will be designing a boat specifically for that area. That I think is very important.

Mr. Chairman, I think that my hon. friend is getting impatient so I will have to bring my remarks to an end before I am asked to take my seat by Your Honour.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The minister can get up again, you know.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes. Mr. Chairman, let me say this; that it is our aim to develop the fishing industry to the best, to the utmost advantage and benefit to people who really count, the fishermen of our Province. The Department of Fisheries is a fishermen oriented, people oriented department.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: I am fortunate in that I have a very efficient staff. I have a number of people in the department who are totally committed, who are absolutely and totally committed to the development of the fishing industry and to the uplifting of our Newfoundland fishermen. I am very proud of that fact and at this time I compliment all of them. They are a very fine group of people. I would ask my colleagues opposite, and I am not presuming to tell them or to advise them on what subject they may speak, but I would ask them if they are going to dwell at length on this so-called gear scandal, and I suspect they will, but may I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that there are more important things.

MR. NEARY: Oh yes!

MR. W. CARTER: There are more important things right now to which we can address ourselves. I am more concerned with some of the more positive things that are taking place in our fishing industry, in our department, things that are dead are sometimes inclined to smell I know, but, Mr. Chairman, I am not presuming to tell the members opposite the subject to which they can address themselves, but I would only ask them to, if they are going to get involved in the so-called gear scandal, well then, for God's sake, you know, do not get too involved in it. Make Your point, do not repeat yourselves because there are so many other things, as far as I am concerned, of greater importance.

What has happened has happened. The courts will decide and the police will decide the degree of guilt and those who are guilty of any misbehaviour, people guilty of misbehaviour in our department or in the industry will be punished. I am sure of that. So I do not think any amount of talk here can change that. People who are responsible for misbehaving either in the Department of Fisheries, and I do not think they have, or in the industry will be punished of that I can assure you.

So, Mr. Chairman, I again say that I have total and complete faith in the future prospects of our fishing industry. I would only ask that the members of this House, my colleagues, give our people a chance. I ask that the government leaders in Ottawa give our people a chance, involve our people in more of the decision making processes. I sometimes worry and concern myself when I realize that a great many decisions that affect the fishing industry are made 1,500 miles inland in some ivory tower in Ottawa. And having spent seven years in Ottawa I have a pretty good idea of what that means.

MR. NEARY: You can share the blame.

MR. W. CARTER: No I cannot share the blame because unfortunately, as the hon. members knows, people in opposition are

MR. W. CARTER: not given a chance to exercise too much influence on the decision making process of governments, except in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER: Of course, being a very democratic party and a party that appreciates the contribution that can be made by all Newfoundlanders, Newfoundlanders of good intentions, we are quite willing and quite anxious to listen to our colleagues opposite and where possible, to adopt some of their ideas.

I have strong reservations as to the future direction of the fisheries as it applies to the Ottawa oriented, Upper Canadian oriented attitude. I have read the report my hon. colleague is displaying over there and I must say that there is not much new in that report. It is a conglomeration of press releases that have been made now from Ottawa for the past seven or eight years.

MR. ROWE: Good stuff.

MR. W. CARTER: Good stuff, yes. And I hope the government in Ottawa will recognize the need for early implementation of some of the ideas and programmes that are outlined in that report.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly shall endeavour to answer any questions that are put to me by my colleagues. I welcome the chance, as I said at the outset, to expose myself and my colleagues, in that sense, to the members opposite in defending the policies of our departments and the estimates now before the Committee.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Before I recognize the hon. member I should like to bring to the attention of all hon. members that we have distinguished visitors in the Speaker's Gallery in the person of Doctor J.O. McLean and Mrs. McLean. Doctor McLean is National President of the Canadian Red Cross Association and a former Dean of Dalhousie Dental School. I would like to

MR. CHAIRMAN: assure Doctor McLean and Mrs. McLean
our sincere welcome.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Chairman, I want to congratulate
the Minister of Fisheries for the way in which he introduced his
estimates. I am sure we can all understand his enthusiasm. A
young man entering into the Portfolio of Fisheries in this country
could be nothing but excited.

Capt. Winsor.

I am sure and I am sure all of us on this side feel that the hon. minister has a sincere desire to do what he can to bring about improvements in our fishing industry, and I am sure he will do all he can, as I said before, to pursue it, and bring our fishery to the place in which it should be in this Province. It is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that the minister should take over the portfolio of Fisheries at this particular time. When one realizes that the estimates of the Department of Fisheries have been cut from nearly \$13 million down to nearly \$6 million, Mr. Chairman, that is not too encouraging for the minister. And I am sure he would much rather have seen that original figure or the last year's figure of \$13 million retained and a little extra.

Then, Mr. Chairman, he takes over the portfolio where there is an alleged fraud of \$4 million, and this is a very serious matter. And I feel, and according to rumours, the morale among the high officials of that department is not all that good, especially since the previous minister, the now Minister of Energy made that appearance on CBC radio programme Here and Now. I think, Mr. Chairman, that the hon. minister was far from his best on that particular programme. He left the impression, Mr. Chairman, with his audience that the blame - he was sort of passing the blame for that programme to the officials of that department, and it is no wonder that the morale would be somewhat less than it should be. I am sure, Mr. Chairman, no minister knows better than that hon. gentleman that he and he alone is responsible to this House. He is responsible to the people of this Province, and he should not leave the impression with anyone that he was not in command of that programme of the Fishery Gear Replacement in 1974-1975. Mr. Chairman, it is like the master of a ship. The master or the captain is always responsible immaterial of who is on the bridge. He as the master is responsible for the safe navigation of that vessel, the safety of the crew and passengers if it so be a passenger ship. However, Mr. Chairman, it is unfortunate, as I say, that the hon. Minister of Energy left that impression, and one can hear it -

MR. DOODY: It was only left with you.

CAPT. WINSOR: Well, it is not left with me. It is common knowledge around the community and in the malls and in the shopping supermarkets and wherever you go. However, Mr. Chairman, I do not intend at this particular time to belabour that point.

MR. DOODY: In the malls?

CAPT. WINSOR: Yes, it is in the malls. You can hear it anywhere. I do not intend to belabour that point at this particular time, because there is a heading in the estimates of Gear Replacement, and I would choose to deal with it there if we have the time.

However, Mr. Chairman, as I say, the present Minister of Fisheries now finds himself in that position where he has this cloud hanging over that department, and I think the sooner we can get this thing cleared up the better it is going to be for him and for all concerned. Mr. Chairman, I would say that perhaps ninety-five per cent of the members of this House could stand in their place and speak for hours on the fisheries and say very little that has not been said many, many times before. The fisheries in one form or another affects the lives of a great many Newfoundlanders. Its influence outside of the urban area of this Province is felt in every aspect of life. As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, it is the life blood of a great many communities of this Province, and without the fisheries there would be very little reason if any for their existence.

Mr. Chairman, as the time is drawing speedily to a close, and I am sure a great many members want to speak on this important subject and important estimate, I do not intend to hog the time at my disposal. However, there are a few points that I would like to deal with. The minister yesterday spoke of the 200 mile limit, and in pursuing that matter he came into the point where this joint fishing effort, I think, is - he was elaborating on the joint effort. Now, Mr. Chairman, I am not all that excited at the moment about that joint fishing effort. If we are going to enforce the 200 mile limit then I would say, Mr. Chairman, let us enforce it to the letter for a period of from three to five years, and within that

Capt. Winsor.

time limit let us as Newfoundlanders, let us as Canadians, - and I think the hon. minister should go to the federal government for special assistance in this - let us increase our capability, let us increase the capability that we have of catching much fish which would be ours, I suppose, if we enforce the 200 mile limit then the foreign vessels will not be permitted to fish within that 200 mile limit. And this would be a breeding time for the Canadian fishery and especially the Newfoundland fishery, because, Sir, if we are going to continue allowing the foreign vessels to fish continuously, because to take the quota that we can take, then I am afraid that a 200 mile limit is not going to do all that much good. But if we have sort of a closed season for three to five years that will give ample time to replenish the stock and after that period of time it is then we should talk joint effort, not before. Because, Mr. Chairman, if we have the capability it does not only provide work and labour for the fish plant or the processing plants, it also provides the opportunity for our fishermen, more fishermen to get into their boats, to get out there and catch that fish. Because, Mr. Chairman, you know, in this world today of hunger in many parts, and today in the countries, in the Communist countries where there is a shortage of food - Russia today is having very great difficulty in providing enough food for its people, and they are lacking in protein. So, Sir, we here in Canada and especially in Newfoundland, we have a part of that protein food which the Communist countries need and they will always need it. As I was reading in Time Magazine sometime ago we have something in this nation, and something in this Province which is greater than the atomic bomb and that is a source of protein. We can do what the atomic bomb would not do by supplying the fish to the people or the countries that are now having difficulty in supplying their own needs with protein foods.

So there

CAPT. WINSON:

I would say, Mr. Chairman, is the route that I would follow if I were in authority. I would bring in the 200 mile limit and close it off for three to five years to make sure that we have sufficient stock there to enable us to catch all that fish and more than we are catching now by a great, great number. Our catch is, I think - what? - nineteen point nine per cent of all of the fish caught, a very insignificant percentage, Mr. Chairman, when you think of all of the fish that is caught out on the Banks.

Then, Mr. Chairman, while we are doing this it will give this Province a greater opportunity to provide more facilities for the fish we catch. There is certainly a great need for more and improved facilities. By the time it reaches three to five years and when it is ascertained how much fish is out on those Banks, the Hamilton Banks and the Grand Banks and on the Continental Shelf, then we should be ready to take full advantage of all of the fish that we can catch. I cannot emphasize this too greatly, Mr. Chairman. We are not catching enough fish. But if we do not get the 200 mile limit, of course, there will be no fish to catch.

Amazing as it may sound, last year Fogo district, despite the lack of the 200 mile limit, had one of its best inshore fisheries for many years. It has been that way for the last, at least, two or three years, since I have been a member for that district. So it is difficult to ascertain just what effect the 200 mile limit is having on some areas of the Province.

Now, Mr. Chairman, at this moment along the Northeast Coast there are thousands of tons of herring and no one fishing. Why are they not fishing? Many dollars can be made in the herring fishery right at this particular time. But if you go from Cander Bay all the way around to Wesleyville or Badger's Quay there is not one place, one community, one area where the fishermen can take advantage of that fish, to fish and make or help make a living for their families for lack of facilities. Mr. Chairman, this is one area I would request the Minister of Fisheries to pay more attention to so that those fishermen

CAPT. WATSON

In these areas can get out and fish the fish that is already there. They do not need a 200 mile limit. The fish is there now and it will come and go. It has been coming and going for the past four or five years and the fishermen are standing on the rocks because there are no wharfs, no sheds, no nothing and the people just cannot fish that particular species of fish.

It might be interesting to know, Mr. Chairman, that last year, I believe, the federal government put fish on the food aid list for distribution to the hungry nations overseas and herring and mackerel were included in that list. The federal government announced one week that it was going to buy the next week \$4 million worth of canned herring and mackerel. And they did buy it but they did not buy one can of herring or mackerel from Newfoundland. Where did they get it? They got it from Nova Scotia, P.E.I. and even Quebec. So, Mr. Chairman, here is one area where we certainly lost a great source of income all again because of the lack of facilities.

So, Mr. Chairman, if we are to take advantage and if the minister - and I am sure he is sincere - if the minister is sincere in doing something for our inshore fishery particularly, then this is the area in which he has got to concentrate for a few years, provide the proper facilities because, Sir, without the proper facilities all will be lost.

Now we have an area of community stages. There is or I think there was an agreement a year or two ago where the Province would take over the community stages. Whether that is so or not I am not too sure. However, it is the federal government who has been spending the money on the community stages and the provincial government are putting in very little if any to upgrade and improve the community stages. Here is another area where we must have more facilities. Mr. Chairman, if we are to take advantage of the fish that we have close to our shores, easily accessible and thousands of tons of it - I am thinking now of the herring fishery - then we must provide these facilities.

It is interesting to note, Mr. Chairman, the amount of money

CAPT. WINSOR:

that the Province has requested from DREE to develop our fisheries in comparison with the provinces of New Brunswick, Nova Scotia and Quebec. I asked the hon. Minister of Fisheries one day a couple of weeks ago, "How much did the provincial government request from DREE for developing of our fisheries." I think the minister stated that it was \$3.9 million. Well now, Sir, \$3.9 million is a very small amount when it compares to P.E.I. requesting \$15 million and Nova Scotia \$48 million and a vast majority of that was for to improve the fishing industry in those provinces. It is almost impossible to concede that the Province of Newfoundland which is a fishing province by a long shot, it is a fishing province much more so than I am sure Nova Scotia is or P.E.I., that we would only request from DREE \$3.9 million when little P.E.I. would request and get \$15 million and the province of Nova Scotia, \$48 million. So when the minister replies perhaps he could elaborate on that request, whether that is correct or not. I do not think the minister heard what I said. He was engaged in another conversation with the previous Minister of Fisheries, the now Minister of Energy.

However what I did say and I will repeat it, that the amount of money requested by Newfoundland from DREE was \$3.9 million that is in comparison to \$15 million from P.E.I. and \$48 million from Nova Scotia.

MP. W. CARTER: But they did not get it.

CAPT. WINSOR: Well they got a greater portion than Newfoundland got.

MP. W. CARTER: Where did you get your information from?

CAPT. WINSOR: Well the statistics show and information that I have is that the Province of Nova Scotia got \$40 million out of the \$48 million and P.E.I got close to the \$15 million. Newfoundland is getting \$3.9 million we hope and I do not think that agreement has been signed as yet.

MP. W. CARTER: It is certainly not our fault.

CAPT. WINSOR: Well it is immaterial whose fault it is. Did we not only request the \$3.9 million? How much did we request? If we

CAPT. WINSOP:

got \$3.9 million, had we requested \$29 million we might have gotten \$20 million. God knows we need it in this Province to develop our fisheries.

So, Mr. Chairman, here are some of the areas where I think we need some great concentration to provide our fishermen with more capability. Let us bring in the 200 mile limit. I think it is recognized by all now that we are going to get the 200 mile by 1977. Let us not advocate bringing in the foreign fleet. There are 275 foreign vessels on the Grand Banks and in the area of the Hamilton Banks I suppose now. They were there late January.

Capt. Winsor.

Let us concentrate on developing the fishing grounds within that 200 mile limit for the purpose of Newfoundlanders or for the purpose of Canadians. When we find that we cannot fish and cannot catch the quota then, of course, we should discuss the other problem of joint effort. The minister said yesterday that it was almost impossible to provide the capability. During the war years, Mr. Chairman, the United States and Canada latterly, they were launching an average of a ship a day of various tonnage, up to 10,000 and 15,000 tons. So it is not impossible to provide a capability if we concentrate wholly and solely on it. I do not think we should encourage other people to catch our fish off our shores after years and years of fighting, scratching and arguing to try and get the 200 mile limit. When once we get it by golly I think we should hold it, and have a closed season there until we can increase it, until we replenish the stock and then it is time enough to encourage other foreign countries to come in here and process their fish and send it away.

But, Mr. Chairman, in its 480 years of history the fishery has always been up and down. It has had its ups and downs all through our history. And the problems of being grappled with by government and this government has not up to this present time done anything worth-while in developing our fishery. Fishermen have and are complaining that they have been neglected and ignored, and they are not getting the attention that they deserve. They feel the government has failed to establish a sound fishing policy for the Province. And they contend it is the provincial government's responsibility to take the lead in formulating a good sound policy to develop the fisheries. The inshore fishery is in serious trouble, and our fishermen are almost bewildered. No one seems to know with certainty where or what it is doing or where it is going.

Now the Premier has admitted, and he made that admittance I think in one of the speeches - perhaps the Speech from the Throne - a year ago or two years ago that he was very disappointed at the slow and almost no progress his government has made in the fishery. And an

Capt. Winsor.

awful lot of fishermen share that same belief. And this was brought out, Mr. Chairman, in the last election. When you take the results of the last provincial election, last September, you will find that a great number of our fishing districts voted against the government, and they voted against the government because they were dissatisfied with the present government's attitude in providing and developing a good sound policy for our fishery. They were expecting a genuine effort on the part of the government to improve their lot and assist the industry. They are, as I said, very disappointed in spite of the promises made by this government. Nothing of any significance has been forthcoming. There has been a continuation in some areas of the previous government's programme, and I think here of the marine service stations which were introduced and brought about by the previous administration, slipways, ice making and they are all good, and I am very pleased to see the present government continue these. But, Mr. Chairman, it was discouraging to hear the Minister of Fisheries, after the budget was brought down, take to the airways and say, "Well, my estimates of the Department of Fisheries have not been cut. It was just the areas where it was a one shot deal." Mr. Chairman, there cannot be any one shot deal if you are going to develop a good sound fishery policy. One shot deals are no good. It is an ongoing and continuous effort that we have to make to develop the fishery.

Mr. Chairman, if the present government do not take some positive action and take it very soon then I am very much afraid that the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador will very soon have no fishermen because, Sir, as I say, the inshore fishermen are very discouraged, and they have not seen anything to excite them yet in spite of the programmes which the hon. minister has announced, the programmes which he has announced during the past two or three years. They are not exciting to the fishermen. I do not know if it is a lack of publicity, but if the programmes are that important to the

Capt. Winsor.

fishermen then I would say to the hon. minister get it out into the fishermen's hands so they will know. They are out there screaming out for direction in which way to go to be able to provide a decent living for themselves and their families. At the present time they are lost. They are like a man at sea in the fog. They do not know which direction to go, and they are following the old status quo, do what their grandfathers did. If you go out along the Northeast Coast today you would find them setting out the cod trap the same as their grandfathers did years ago, and I might add there has been no device, no gear or any equipment devised yet that can take the place of the cod trap providing the fish is there. There is no faster way to catch thousands and thousands of pounds of fish than in the old conventional cod trap. However when the inshore fishery failed the fishermen were forced to go offshore, and this is where the longliner came into being.

Now undoubtedly over the period of years the longliner now has become more or less obsolete. But when the longliner was introduced, Mr. Chairman, it was the best thing that was known to provide the fishermen with facilities to catch all of the fish they could. But, Mr. Chairman, what has happened since those forty-eight and fifty-eight feet longliners were brought into being? The fishermen at the beginning steamed ten to fifteen miles from shore and they could catch all kinds of fish, but then the distance increased. It increased now to where they are going from Fogo Island out forty and fifty miles outside of Funk Island, and they go in from Bonavista Bay out in line of Baccalieu, which is nearly fifty to eighty miles, and that too has increased now where it is almost impossible for a longliner fisherman to go out and tend his nets and get back within a twenty-four hour period. They have to stay out for longer periods to make the trip worth-while, and this is where the longliner now has become obsolete. But we must concentrate now on a larger boat, more speedier boat, better equipment, more ice making machines, because, Sir, it is no use for the longliner or

Capt. Winsor.

any type of boat to go out unless they are equipped with the proper equipment and especially ice making machines, and I do not know - perhaps it is not easy to install ice making machines on the boat itself, but they certainly must take sufficient amounts of ice to be able to make sure that that catch is well preserved, and when they get to land that the fish is going to be of good quality.

The minister spoke of the new pilot project for Admiral's Cove, and here again I can share his optimism, and we sincerely hope that it will be what it is indicated to be a pilot project which can be transferred from Admiral's Cove to different areas of the Province.

CAPT. WINSOP:

That is one way that we are going to have to more or less educate our fishermen into a more modern way of fishing. Now, Mr. Chairman, during the past five years we have had five Ministers of Fisheries, almost one a year and almost without exception, Sir, they have on numerous occasions excused the lack of a sound fishery policy on the grounds that it is a federal responsibility. We all know, Mr. Chairman, that the broad general policies relating to the fishery do come under federal jurisdiction but surely, Mr. Chairman, every fisherman in this Province knows full well that the provincial government has full responsibility for the developing of the means whereby fishermen can catch fish, the resources that our fishermen need to harvest the product of the waters and to see that they have suitable facilities to increase their catch and for handling their catch. These and other responsibilities the provincial government cannot shift to the federal government.

If we are going to make fishing a viable industry with a profitable outlook for the men involved then we are going to have to take positive steps to encourage and to make it worth-while for our fishermen to participate both in approach and technique. I would say, Mr. Chairman, that let us not be slow to go to Ottawa for what is rightfully ours but let us not blame them for lack of development in the policies that are rightly a provincial responsibility.

So, Mr. Chairman, it is along those lines I think that we must concentrate if we are going to do anything worth-while for our fishing industry. As I said at the outset I do not want to hog this time. I would suspect that perhaps we are less than three hours down now and I am sure every member would want an opportunity—because it affects a great many members in the House — would want an opportunity to speak on the fishery. Before closing I would strongly suggest, Mr. Chairman, that when we get to the end of this estimate that someone will move a motion that the time for the debate on the fishery estimates be extended for another ten hours.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

CAPT. WINSOR: I do not think we can do justice to the minister. I do not think we can do justice to our fishermen. I do not think we can do justice to the industry by having four hours - and that is what it has been - four hours to debate the estimate in spite of the fact that the amount we are debating is much less than it was last year, \$5.9 million. It is like the old saying, a drop in the bucket. What are we expected to do? In all of the minister's enthusiasm what can he do with that amount of money? We can have all of the desires one can possess but if he has not got the finances to back him up then I am very much afraid that the present minister will end up like the other four, very little done, no new policies and our fishery, inshore fishery especially, will be in the same position five years from now as it is today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for LaPoffe.

MR. READY: Mr. Chairman, there is a lot of common sense in what the hon. member for Togo (Capt. Winsor) just told the House in connection with his views on the fishery in this Province and there is a great deal of sense in what the hon. minister told us in introducing his estimates. But, Sir, the thing that has always bothered me about the fishery in Newfoundland apart from the fact that - I do not suppose there is an hon. member in this House or outside of the House or a person in Newfoundland today who is not an expert on the fishery. You go up to the Mainland of Canada. You go down in the United States, people will talk to you as if you came right out of the fishing boat. They think that everybody in Newfoundland is a fisherman and they look upon you as a - if you go up to Toronto somewhere the first thing they want you to do is to sing the Squid-jiggin Ground for them. I suppose ninety per cent of the Newfoundlanders do not even know the wording of the Squid-jiggin Ground.

But, Sir, the thing that always concerned me about the fishery is the fact that in all the millions of dollars that have been pumped into the fishery over the years, in all the things that have been done, all the

MR. NEARY:

projects that have been carried out in the fishery, the fishermen themselves have not been asked or have not been involved in any of the planning or in any of the projects in which this money was spent. The fishermen themselves, the ones who are actually involved in the industry, the people who know more about the industry than anybody else, I would say in most cases were ignored when it came to implementing plans in this Province for the fishery. They were ignored and as a result, Mr. Chairman - and it is past history now - but as a result, Sir, millions and millions - I do not know but over a billion dollars has been wasted in Newfoundland, money that came from the Government of Canada, that came from the taxpayers of Canada, that came into this Province was wasted on foolish projects that were of no benefit at all to our fishermen.

I can give the House an example of what I am talking about. Down in my own district in the community of Isle aux Morts - and the hon. minister and I had the pleasure of holding a public meeting in the Lions Center in the community of Isle aux Morts to speak to fishermen along that coast - in the community of Isle aux Morts there is a fish plant owned by B.C. Packers called Nelpack Fisheries. That is the local name. It is a subsidiary of B.C. Packers. It started out as a herring plant. It operates about, I would say, a maximum of two and a half months out of the year. It started out processing herring and if the hon. former Premier, the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) will remember there was a raging controversy following the opening of that herring plant, processing fish meal because of the smoke, because of the pollution. When there was smoke when the wind was in a certain direction you would not know but the fog was in in Isle aux Morts and the smell and the odor and the pollution was terrific and there was a controversy raging the likes of which we have never seen in this Province. Eventually B.C. Packers, Nelpack Fisheries had to correct the pollution by spending hundreds of thousands of dollars putting in a new system to try to control the pollution.

Mr. NEAVE:

But they were processing herring and they along with other companies from outside of this Province cleaned up the herring stock along the South Coast. They cleaned her out and as a result conservation measures, very drastic conservation measures had to be implemented and today B.C. Packers, Melpack Fisheries in Isle aux Morts operates at a maximum of two and a half months out of the year, not very much for the people of that community to look forward to. All they can look forward to is about two and a half months employment. And B.C. Packers one of the leaders in the industry, one of the biggest in the industry have refused to process ground fish in that plant even though, Mr. Chairman - this is what got me started off on this about the extravagance and the waste of the millions of dollars that have been poured into our fishery by the Government of Canada and by the provincial government - even though that plant is **equipped to process** ground fish, B.C. Packers have refused so far to get a couple of dragners, two or three dragners to feed into that plant and to process ground fish and to provide more employment for the people in that community.

You know, Mr. Chairman, what they did a few years ago? They went to DPFE and they said to DPFE, **"Look we need some money** for refrigeration and we need some money for ice making machines."

MR. NEARY: I do not know who handled the application at DREE, but he must have been pretty stund. A few miles down that coast, down in Burnt Islands, you have a plant that operates practically on a year-round basis, operated by Eric King Fisheries, that keeps the whole community going, keeps the whole community employed practically on a year-round basis who needed ice making machines at that time. They made an application to DREE but somehow or another, Sir, B.C.Packers were better lobbyists than Mr. King; who is only a poor little fish plant operator in Burnt Islands, so when it came to making the decision the decision was made to put the refrigeration and the ice making machines in Isle aux Morts. Gave it to B.C.Packers. And these ice making machines up to about a month ago, Sir, have not been used. And here is Eric King Fisheries down in Burnt Islands, and Gabe Billiard in Fox Roost and Margaree starving for ice, and the fishermen starving for ice and here you have ice making machines in Isle aux Morts that were put there by DREE grants not being used.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Are they being used now?

MR. NEARY: Well I tried this year to make arrangements with the manager of Nelpack Fisheries for Mr. King and the fishermen to use the ice making machines.

MR. DOODY: Some hopes!

MR. NEARY: The minister says, "Some hopes", and that is the way I feel about it too. Some hopes with the attitude that B.C.Packers have towards this Province. They come in, they rape the ocean floor of this Province and then they take off. They have a beautiful plant down there quite capable of processing groundfish, closed eight and-a-half months. Eight months out of a year. The minister and I had a meeting there and we heard the fishermen talk about it. And I presented a petition in this hon. House on behalf of the fishermen -

MR. DOODY: That is Nelpack you are talking about now, not B.C.Packers.

MR. NEARY: Nelpack. Nelpack, that is B.C. Packers. Nelpack is a subsidiary of --

MR. DOODY: It is a joint venture.

MR. NEARY: Well, it is more than a joint venture, it is a subsidiary.

So you can see, Mr. Chairman, how ill-advised, how foolish a lot of the money was spent in this Province that came from the Government of Canada. The millions of dollars that was poured in here from the Government of Canada. We have never had a master plan. We cannot turn around and blame that administration over there. The previous administration is just as much to blame, although the previous administration probably did more for the fisheries than the present administration. All the fish plants that we have in Newfoundland at the present time, I believe, were all constructed during the time my hon. friend was Premier and there was a Liberal Administration. I do not think there has been one new fish plant opened in Newfoundland since the Tory Administration took over. Not one.

There has been no fishery policy.

There never has been. Let us face it, Mr. Chairman, there never has been a master plan for the development of the fishery in this Province. There never has and there still is not today despite the encouraging signs that were given the House by the hon. the minister, and it is not the hon. minister's fault. I am not **blaming** the hon. minister for a lack of a fishery policy. There has never been a master plan, there has never been a fishery policy, there is still no fishery policy today except the rumblings that we have been hearing from Ottawa in the last week or so when Mr. Romeo Leblanc, who seems to have some how or other, even though he is from New Brunswick, I do not know if he is from a fishing settlement or not, but who seems to have a tremendous grasp of the fishery, especially on the East Coast of Canada, and who is now beginning to be recognized by journalists

MR. NEARY: and by the experts as one of the best Ministers of Fisheries that Canada has ever had. And I am inclined to believe this, Sir. The only thing that concerns me about Mr. Leblanc's policy is the fact that, and the minister might perhaps comment on this when he gets an opportunity to speak again, is that Mr. Leblanc and the experts tell us that there are too many fishermen in Newfoundland chasing too few fish, and that we have too many fish plants, and that we have too many boats.

Now, Sir, this is rather frightening. What the minister is really saying is that some of the smaller fish plants in this Province have to go. They have to shut their doors. And the minister is telling us that eventually the fishery is going to boil down to a hard core of professional fishermen. That the day of the hand-lining, the day of the fellow going out in his little dory and doing a little jigging, earning maybe a part of an income for himself and his family, that that day is over. Because we can see in the last couple of years the severe restrictions that are being placed on lobster fishermen, the severe restrictions on the salmon fishermen and the moonlighters. So it looks to me like it is being narrowed down to the fact that over the next two or three or four or five years that what you will have in Newfoundland are people who will man the draggers and the trawlers and you will have a hard core of professional fishermen who will have boats, maybe the ones that the minister spoke about, that will be leased, or maybe a new type of boat. There may be a need for that although I do not think the day of the longliner is over. So this is rather frightening, Sir, when you think about it, because this may involve a lot of human suffering in this Province.

It may not be deliberate on the part of the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, or our own Minister of Fisheries, but, Sir, unless I am not grasping the situation, not interpreting the situation correctly, that the minister in Ottawa and the Government of Canada are telling us in this Province is that we have too many fishermen chasing after too few fish and we have too

MR. NEARY: many fish plants and some of these plants are going to have to be closed.

MR. H. COLLINS: Does the hon. member want to say which ones?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask the Provincial Minister of Fisheries to tell us that. I put the question to his predecessor, the minister's predecessor a year ago and the minister told me at that time that there was no list. But it will mean that you do not have to write a book to the people of this Province, they get the message that there is likely to be a lot of suffering because of the upheaval that is going to take place in the fishery in the next few years. A tremendous upheaval.

And a lot of the inshore fishermen, as my hon. friend from Fogo (Capt. Winsor) pointed out, are getting very discouraged and have already abandoned the fishery. And you know, Mr. Chairman, this is another thing that used to get me up tight and still does get me up tight, and that is our attitude towards the fishery. We have nobody to blame in this Province for a lot of the failures in the fishing industry but ourselves because of the attitude that our people themselves have taken towards the fishery, our educational people in a lot of cases. As my friend the hon. the Minister of Education could probably tell us, kids in school are told, "Look, if you do not study hard and get your grade XI and go to university and get your certificate that you can hang on your wall, that you are likely to end up like your father, a fisherman." You would not know but it was a disgrace. You would not know but it was the lowest form of life. I have heard schoolteachers, principals of schools say to the kids, "Do you want to be like your father out in the boat from daylight until dark or do you want to be a doctor or a lawyer or a dentist or a druggist?"

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or a politician.

MR. NEARY: "Or a politician?" God forbid! But I have actually heard that myself and I have heard it at school

MR. NEARY: graduations. I have heard people who were invited in as guest speakers say, "Oh we are so thrilled to see these students all dressed up here this evening. They are going to go on to university and they are going to become professional people. Thank God they do not have to follow in their father's footsteps and get up at daylight in the morning and go out and maybe come back with an empty boat." You would not know but it was a disgrace. So our

MR. NEARY:

whole attitude, Sir, our whole attitude towards the fishery has been wrong, has been negative, and we have not in our whole history, we have never developed a master plan for the development of the fishery. It has been higgledy-piggledy, take potluck, carry around the policy in your vest pocket half the time, no master plan. And Ottawa half the time did not know if they were coming or going. When there was an election coming up or there was something drastic happening in the fisheries, rush up to Ottawa, put your hand out, give us a few more millions. And we, to a certain degree I suppose, spoiled the fishermen in that regard. No trouble to get a community stage, or a breakwater or a wharf or a water supply, half the time put in communities that have now been abandoned under the resettlement programme, absolutely no planning. It is amazing that Ottawa has tolerated it as long as they have, going up looking for handouts, just stick your hole in the dyke to try to keep her afloat.

MR. DOODY: Your finger.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. DOODY: Your finger.

MR. NEARY: Or your finger. What did I say, to put your - ?

MR. DOODY: Put your finger.

MR. NEARY: Put your finger in the hole in the dyke. And that is what we have been doing for 400 or almost 500 years in this Province. And I have nothing but strong condemnation for the way the government, the way this administration has handled the fishing industry, for their attitude towards the fishing industry. I think it has been scandalous what has happened over the last four or five years. At least the former administration built a few fish plants and built up the industry to the extent that we know it today. That was done by the former administration even though there was no master plan, even though Mr. Monroe and all his crowd would parade in every time there was a slump in the market. They would come in looking for a few more dollars to bail them out. I doubt if they have ever paid it back.

MR. NEARY:

The Minister of Finance over there would be a wealthy man today, not personally, but as Minister of Finance for this Province if he could only go out and collect the money that was flung out to the Monroes and to that crowd that leached off the government and off the fishermen of this Province for so long. Sometimes I wonder if we should not have a full-fledged investigation into the way that money was spent and the way it was handled. Half the time they were down in Florida living in the laps of luxury, and they would come back. When there was an emergency they would fly back, rush into the government for another loan, and then you would have to give them another loan to bail them out to try to keep her afloat.

MR. STRACHAN: With their sales agencies down in Florida.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. STRACHAN: With their sales agencies down in Florida.

MR. NEARY: With their sales agencies down in Florida and down in the United States like Mr. Spencer Lake has his right now down in Boston, I think it is.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no point in the pot calling the kettle black. All of us are responsible for the state of the fishery, not any one side of this House, not any one minister or any one politician. We all have to share the blame. But I must say over the last - well since 1972, I have not seen much encouragement at all for the fishery of this Province from the other side. And the only ray of hope now that I have seen so far is from the present Minister of Fisheries who is an outport man himself, who comes from a fishing community. The hon. Premier must have been right out of his mind when he appointed the previous Minister of Fisheries. He appointed a gentleman from Gander who is an honourable gentleman, a man that I respect, but represented an urban community. And then the hon. Premier himself for awhile was acting Minister of Fisheries, a man who should know the industry, whose late father was very prominent in the fishing

Mr. Neary.

Industry in this Province and the Premier himself was in the fishing business who should know it fairly well. Not very much happened when the hon. Premier was acting Minister of Fisheries. And then the hon. Premier takes the member from Circular Road, the **elite, who was not even educated in this Province, he would not know a sculpin from a cod fish, and makes him Minister of Fisheries.** And under that minister, one of the biggest scandals in this Province that ever happened in this Province took place. And the minister has the gall and the audacity and the nerve to come out and sort of put the blame over on his staff, and to tell us that the minister was not responsible. He could not look after every little detail in his department. A new political doctrine in Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, a new political doctrine in the free world, a minister telling us that he was not responsible for the action of his own department, the minister who presided over a department where three or four or five million - God only knows how much - dollars was obtained under false pretenses. And God only knows how much more is involved. We have not even gotten around to the bounties on boats yet. We only heard of one case. There may be other cases where there are fraudulent claims involved in bounties on boats let alone the replacement of fishing gear. And then the minister tells us, "Oh, how could I keep an eye on everything? How could I go down and check the vouchers and the invoices?" And besides that the minister says, "We had to get the gear out because the fishermen had to go fishing." And out of the other corner of his mouth the minister is telling us that he knew all along there were fraudulent claims.

And, Mr. Chairman, I submit that it would not make one iota of difference if there had been a delay of two weeks, three weeks, a month, two months. The fishing industry would have survived, and the fishermen would have survived. And the minister can get up and say all he likes about criticism from this side of the House, about the minister attacking the poor old fishermen of this Province. That is all completely irrelevant, Sir, and a red herring, because what the minister did not tell us in this hon. House - and it took the Auditor General to do it - was that there were fish suppliers involved, fish gear suppliers, not the

Mr. Neary.

fishermen. The minister zeroed in on the fishermen and made no mention of the suppliers of fishing gear at all in this hon. House. It took a fire over at the Viking Building. If that fire had not occurred the authorities would have never known that \$3 million or \$4 million was obtained from this government and from the Government of Canada by fraudulent means. And that minister has to accept the responsibility for that policy, for that sloppy, inept -

MR. HICKEY: What policy?

MR. NEARY: That policy that was developed by the minister who in this particular instance was incompetent and negligent in his responsibilities as a protector of the public treasury. And the minister can get up and twist and turn and squirm and do all he wants. He can dance the jig all he wants to, and he can get up and he can squirt his poison back at the members on this side of the House. He can get personal. He can assassinate people's characters all he wants. That minister presided over that department and is responsible. He is responsible for the neglect and is responsible for the policy and the procedures that were followed by the minister's officials in the administration of this gear replacement programme. There are no excuses for him. I know it must hurt the minister's pride. I know, Sir, he must feel like a heel after getting up in this House. When the Mifflin inquiry took place, and it was revealed that a few welfare recipients over on Bell Island, instead of using the building material for which they were given orders for, they went and got fridges and photographs and television sets and that sort of thing, the minister was the first on his feet to tell the House. - and here I am now over here in Opposition. I was not an Independent then, I was up with the Old Line Liberals - to tell the House that the member for Bell Island (Mr. Neary) should be flicked out of the House. for

Mr. DEAPY:

allowing this to go on, \$150,000 worth of welfare material abused. And Mr. Michael Harrington or Mr. Wick Collins of the Evening Telegram said not only should I be flicked out of the House but I should not be allowed to be a shadow minister in the Liberal cabinet, a shadow, let alone a minister, a shadow minister. That and fifty cents will get you across on the ferry to Bell Island. A shadow minister, that is what they said, a shadow. The Leader of the Opposition should not even tolerate, **the** member for Bell Island **as** a shadow minister in his caucus. Here we have a minister with two ministers, one, two, presiding over a department where millions of dollars were paid out through fraudulent claims, claims that were falsified, paid out under false pretenses.

The minister during the time he was passing his estimates last year blamed it on the fishermen and made no reference at all to the fishing gear suppliers. The reason the minister did not make reference to it was because he did not know about it. And it took the fire. If that fire had not occurred and certain records had been destroyed the people of this Province, the House and the government and the hon. the Premier and everybody else would not have known that there were fraudulent claims involving millions of dollars. The minister should hang his head in shame.

I suggested some time ago that the hon. the Premier should have suspended both of these gentlemen. They should have been suspended from their ministerial responsibility. That is what would have happened in any other country in the world. Why over in England, I think it was yesterday, Jeremy Thorpe the leader of the Liberal Party had to resign because some homosexual wrote him a couple of letters and accused him of sleeping with him and Mr. Jeremy Thorpe, leader of the Liberal Party had to resign, he was forced to resign, a big scandal.

I do not see the present Leader of the Opposition in his seat. I do not know what his comment would be on that but the gentleman had to resign. Just imagine in the permissive society we are living in

MR. NEARY:

Jeremy Thorpe, leader of the Liberal Party, because somebody wrote two letters to him was forced to resign. But, Mr. Chairman, we are supposed to pattern ourselves after the British Parliamentary system. We are supposed to be - this House of Assembly is supposed to be, the example is supposed to be followed from Westminster. Well what would happen, Sir, if a minister of the government in Westminster in England was caught napping, was negligent in his responsibilities and his duties to the people that he represented and allowed skulduggery to go on right under his nose and allowed the public treasury of the nation and of the province to be ripped off for several millions of dollars? What would happen in England? The man would be forced to resign.

I know what the hon. the Premier is up against. He does not have a majority over there enough to give these two hon. ministers the flick. If the hon. Premier had the majority he could probably say, "Gentlemen you have been negligent in your responsibility and I am sorry but if you do not pass me in your resignations I am going to have to suspend you while this investigation is going on", because the Premier knows full well that this police investigation will make no reference at all to the negligence of the ministers that were involved in that department, who headed up that department. The police investigation will only deal with criminal aspects of it, not the political aspects of it. I hear rumors that the Minister of Mines and Energy is going to run in the by-election in St. John's West, the federal by-election. Well I say to that, "Hear, hear". Let him go up, go on up to Ottawa. That minister has to be the most expensive minister that we have had in the history of this Province with the blunders that he has made and especially with this fisheries thing, the most expensive minister in the history of Newfoundland. If the minister resigns in St. John's West that means that Mr. Leo Barry will then go over and seek re-election in the by-election in St. John's West left vacant by the minister when he goes out and runs federally and Mr. Leo Barry will try and get back into the House as

MR. NEADY:

Minister of Mines and Energy. And to that I say, "Hear, hear".

MR. COSBIE: Is this from your usual reliable source?

MR. NEADY: That, Sir, is from my usual reliable source which is very seldom wrong. I got a pretty good track record so far. So do not be surprised in the Fall of the year if the Minister of Mines and Energy hails out and opens up St. John's West for Mr. Leo Barry to get back in the House, the only man who knows the government's policy on mines and energy. And we will say, farewell, good bye, adios, farewell and so long to the most expensive minister, the minister who has made the most poofs and the most blunders in the history, in the political history of Newfoundland.

MR. MURPHY: Will the hon. member have a farewell party for him?

MR. NEADY: No, there will be no farewell party, Sir, and I guarantee you there will be no weeping or gnashing of teeth.

MR. DOODY: There will be gnashing of teeth in a few minutes, when he gets up.

MR. NEADY: Yes I know what is going to happen. Mr. Chairman, I can forecast, I can predict and so can the hon. member predict what is going to happen. The minister is going to get up and in typical fashion he is going to start his usual name calling, his character assassination, he is going to get nasty and rude. We are going to hear about the training that he got up in St. Andrew's. The principal of St. Andrew's was on television the other night telling us how stunned half of this crowd were when they were up in finishing school. They were not educated in Newfoundland. High mucky-mucks sent off to the Mainland to finishing school, who learned how to be nasty and how to turn up their noses at people. Everybody else is scum and dirt under their feet. That is what we are going to hear. How hard the minister works. We are going to hear it all now when the minister gets up. But all of it will be a red herring and all of it will just be an excuse for his ineptness and his incompetence and negligence.

MR. MORGAN: That is something he is not, incompetent.

MR. NEADY: Oh the minister was in this case incompetent and the

MP. NEAPY:

minister has been the most expensive minister in the history of Newfoundland responsible for bulldozing and bullying the government into making decisions that are costing the taxpayers of this Province millions of dollars.

But, Sir, getting back to the fishery for a moment. I want to say that yesterday when my hon. friend was introducing his estimates I was rather interested in the sort of a travelogue that the minister gave us about the trip the various ministers had to Europe last year or had a couple of months ago. The travelogue was most interesting. I have been in most of the places that the minister spoke about.

MR. PECKFORD: Privately?

MP. NEAPY: Privately and I paid my own expenses. I was in some of the places before I even got into politics. I was in some of these fish markets that the hon. minister spoke about. I was there when the auctions were being held. I do not think they would work in Newfoundland although John Murphy there a couple of years ago thought we should have a fish market in St. John's and auctions the same as they have in Europe. I do not think that sort of thing would work in Newfoundland. It was a good travelogue. The minister is very interesting to listen to. I enjoyed it. It brought back some pleasant memories because I love to be around fishing communities. Every time I went to Europe before I got in politics, when I had to thumb a ride over on an ore carrier or get over some other way, get over there and bum around for a couple of months - the minister brought back some pleasant memories.

But I was hoping that apart from this travelogue which was all very good - this is not happening in Newfoundland. Maybe the minister visualizes, somehow in his mind he relates this to the Newfoundland of the future. Maybe this is the message the minister was trying to get through to us. But the only positive suggestion that I heard from the minister was this experiment in Admiral's Beach to upgrade the quality of our fish which I think is very good. But I do hope, Sir - and I want to give the minister a word of warning in connection with this, do not just concentrate all the efforts in

MR. NEARY: Admiral's Beach and forget about the rest of Newfoundland because I can tell the minister that down in Burnt Islands Eric King Fisheries is already marketing fresh fish down to the United States. I believe it is the first time it has been done.

You see, Mr. Chairman, we put too much confidence, too much faith in the cod block. The big problem in Newfoundland for 480 years was marketing, and in that marketing mix is quality. We lost our West Indian market for salt fish because of quality. We will loose other markets because of quality. We put all our eggs in one basket as far as the cod block is concerned. So that it why it is essential in this Province that we diversify our fishery. That is why I am so glad to hear that the minister is going to carry out this experiment. But do not concentrate entirely on that because if the minister and the government just pay attention for the next three to five years, I believe the minister told us the experiment would go on, then the rest of the Province should not be neglected, and should not be discouraged.

We have to develop and overall policy. We have to encourage people like Eric King who is now - incidentally, Mr. Chairman, this may be of some interest to the minister - they send fillet from Burnt Islands down to Boston where it is transferred to another trucking company in Boston and taken into New York where you have the big market, millions of people. It takes the truck from the time it is loaded in Burnt Islands until it turns around and gets back to Burnt Island, it takes three days and they are paid cash in Massachusetts, in Boston.

MR. DOODY: On the barrel-head.

MR. NEARY: On the barrel-head. And it is not the has been flown out of Newfoundland into mainland cities. Gabe Billard from Fox Roost - Margaree has been doing it for the last year or two.

MR. PECKFORD: Northcotts has been doing it down in

MR. PECKFOFD: Lewisporte.

MR. NEARY: Northcotts has been doing it. Other people have been doing it. The only trouble is, we have not cultivated it. We have not, Sir, we have not cultivated the Canadian market for fish. We have not cultivated it. We have not cultivated the United States market with the right kind of fish. Our problem is that we have stuck to the fish block. We have been brainwashed by the fish merchants who are too lazy half of the time and have no initiative. As long as the federal government bails out the subsidies to them, and as long as they can get their handouts, they do not have to show any initiative at all, just keep sending the fish block down, get it processed in the United States and that is good enough. Well it is not good enough for the fishery of this Province. Not good enough any more.

As my hon. friend pointed out, a year ago the Government of Canada put fish, put mackerel and herring on the list of food to be supplied to the starving countries of the world, and Don Jamieson, Minister of Industry and Trade and Commerce, our representative in the Government of Canada, going abroad, travelling throughout the world, had to come out a few months ago and tell us that as far as fish products are concerned, he was going throughout the world with nothing to sell. Nothing to sell. So what we have to do if we want to capture that market, we have to get into smoking, we have to build smokers, we have to build canneries, we have to develop our salt fish.

Mr. Chairman, that brings me to my final point and that is in connection with the Fisheries College. I do not believe, Sir, in connection with the Fisheries College that we should build another - what is it you call these things? Mausoleums is it? - I do not think we should build another mausoleum. I think we should shrink the Fisheries College to a nerve centre, maybe an office over in the Crosbie Building somewhere. I firmly believe, Sir, that the Fisheries College can accomplish more by putting men out into the field. Put them out into the field

MR. NEARY: instead of herding the fishermen into St. John's at the cost of hundreds of thousands of dollars every year, Let the Fisheries College run a little office somewhere and farm the men out. Send them to the various communities throughout the Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They do. They do.

MR. NEARY: They do it to a limited degree but they herd most of the fishermen into St. John's for gear mending, for boat building and for this and that and the other thing. Nine chances out of ten, as I have said so often in this House, looking for a place to get in in the warm out of the cold winter months, instead of going out.

You do not have to build up a big Fisheries College. I would shrink it and send the people out into the field. Let them go out with the fishermen.

MR. MORGAN: They have done that for years.

MR. NEARY: I know it has been done to a limited degree. I am not saying it is not done. But what we are talking about now, what we are hearing rumours about from the Minister of Education when he brought in his estimates, we are talking about a polytechnical institution and the number one priority, I understand, is the Fisheries College.

MR. HICKMAN: All the technologies.

MR. NEARY: All the technologies? Well all the technologies should be taught out in the field, as far as the fishery is concerned.

MR. MURPHY: It cannot be.

MR. DOODY: It will all be electronic equipment.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, I am not talking about electronic equipment and that sort of thing. I am talking about going out and instructing and listening to the fishermen out into their communities, and not bringing them into - they bring them now to my friend's district of Northern Labrador. I went over on a number of occasions to present their certificates -

MR. MURPHY: Certificats.

MR. NEARY: Certificats, as the academics call them.

Instead of that - I bet you my hon. friend, the member for Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), a gentleman who went up to Nain, that I was responsible for signing a little contract with for a few paltry dollars, and built a fish plant in Nain, that this is the sort of thing that the Fisheries College should be doing. Out into the field building the smokers and building the canneries and showing the people how to process the fish and improve the quality. Never mind herding them all into St. John's and having to put them up in barracks and all kinds of unnecessary expense with their board, and just probably nine chances out of ten, just trying to collect the Manpower allowances or get a place to go for the winter.

Mr. Chairman, I think the Fisheries College should be taken from the Minister of Education, with all due respect to the minister, and put under the Department of Fisheries. How can the Minister of Fisheries utilize, as he tells us he is going to do in the case of Admiral's Beach, take full advantage of the College of Fisheries, Navigation - and what else? I can never remember -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Marine Engineering and Electronics.

MR. NEARY: How can the Minister of Fisheries -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Call it co-operation.

MR. NEARY: You can call it what you like. I remember Social Services and Rehabilitation when they were separated. Do you call that co-operation? Now you have chaos and you have the same thing in the Fisheries. The Minister of Education should not mind one bit giving up the College of Fisheries to the Minister of Fisheries. I think that is where it should be, under the minister's department. Not that the minister needs more responsibility or needs to build up an empire, but I am sure the minister could put it to better use than it is being put to at the present time.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I have to remind the hon. member that he has a half minute left.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Chairman, I thank Your Honour for reminding me that I have a half minute left. We are rapidly running out of time, Sir, and I am glad I had an opportunity to make some contribution to this debate. Maybe later on tonight, before the estimates finish at nine o'clock, I may get a chance to have a few more words.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I hope not to take too long -

MR. SMALLWOOD: He got up about a half minute after I got up, Your Honour.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, do I have the floor?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, he is a minister.

MR. CROSBIE: Do I have the floor, Mr. Chairman? I hope not to take too long a time here because these are the estimates of the Minister of Fisheries and not mine. But I think that it would be wrong for me not to say a few words on some of the matters that the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), has addressed himself to.

Mr. Chairman, I will not spend a lot of time on this because it has been gone over before and gone over in detail. But I do not think the records should be allowed to remain in a false condition simply because time after time this matter is brought up again.

Mr. Chairman, the Department of Fisheries and the people who work in it, or the people who work there have been put in a very difficult light and in a terrible light by the way that the matter of this gear programme of 1974 has been dealt with. There is no scandal, Mr. Chairman, in the Provincial Department of Fisheries. None whatsoever. There is certainly, an unfortunate situation with respect to certain people who have made claims under a gear replacement programme of 1974, and who falsified and made false affidavits to make claims and thereby got gear they had not lost or got back payment for more gear than they

MR. CROSBIE: had lost. And it appears that in addition to that there is also some fault with certain gear suppliers, or at least one gear supplier, who made false claims in co-operation with certain fishermen or alleged fishermen under that programme.

There is no

Mr. Crosbie.

scandal in the Department of Fisheries. This did not originate in the Department of Fisheries. This abuse of the programme did not originate in the Department of Fisheries. This abuse of the programme is not by any person in the Department of Fisheries. This abuse of the programme was by the people who this programme was designed to serve or some of them, a minority of them. Certainly the great majority did not abuse it. That is where the scandal is if you want to call it a scandal. But it has been treated by the media and by the press as though this was some great scandal in the Department of Fisheries. It is a scandal in connection with certain clients of a programme that two governments instituted to overcome a disastrous situation on the Northeast Coast in the year 1974. And for anyone, you know, to pretend that there is some great scandal in the Department of Fisheries is a grave disservice to the people in the Department of Fisheries. Now it is quite legitimate for the Opposition or anyone else to criticize the administration of the Department of Fisheries and say, "Look here you should have caught those people who are making false claims or you should have been able to ferret them out, and you did not do it. That is poor administration."

MR. SMALLWOOD: Did not the minister himself say that he did not have enough staff to carry out the programme without -

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, if you had had five times the staff you could not carry out this programme and ensure that no false claims were made, because you would be years investigating everyone's claim and tracking it down and making sure that they had gear that they lost before. I will come to that in just a moment.

When this emergency programme was originated it was known by both governments that it could be subject to abuse. There was no other way of replacing the gear of thousands of fishermen on the whole coast from St. Shott's down here in the district of Ferryland up to Cape St. Gregory on the Northern Peninsula and including the coast

Mr. Crosbie.

of Labrador and getting gear back in their hands to fish with in the ground fishery during the 1974 season without taking the chance that the programme is going to be abused. And the whole guts of the administration of the programme was that the claimant, the man who said he lost gear had to complete an affidavit swearing that he lost it. And if he completed an affidavit swearing that he had lost gear, the claim had to be accepted, because there was no way, Mr. Chairman, without a detailed investigation by auditors and everyone else quizzing the man's family and his relatives and members of his crew and other members of the community where you could ascertain how much gear he had before the ice damage and how much he had after. It is just that simple.

Now there were 6,500 claims of which 500 were rejected. That is 6,000 claims in this short period of time. And the amount of gear that was eventually replaced - it has got a value of about \$7.1 million, cod traps and hundreds of thousands of lobster pots, 8,200 hung groundfish gill nets, 8,200 groundfish gill net kits and so on and so forth, 6,000 claims and some seventy-five to a hundred suppliers. So the matter to be corrected then was, were the fishermen on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland going to be in a position to fish in 1974 or not? Because the ice came down and stayed down until the end of July or early August. It went out again. They put the gear out, the Arctic ice came back in again, and the result is that a great majority lost nearly all their gear. So this government, and my predecessor as Minister of Fisheries, the member for Gander (Mr. Collins) and the Premier initiated a move to replace their gear so they could go back fishing during 1974. And they were able to induce the Government of Canada to go along with that programme. The Province was going to attempt it itself. We got the Government of Canada to agree that they would move under the peace time disaster formula, and help finance it. The original estimate of what the programme might cost was between \$3 million and \$4 million. It turns out to be \$7.1 million. There is absolutely no proof at all that there is

Mr. Crosbie.

a \$4 million fraud or a \$3 million fraud or a \$2 million fraud or even a \$1 million fraud. There may be proof that there was fraud in the several hundreds of thousands of dollars. But no one can say with any justification whatsoever that this was a fraud of \$3 million or \$4 million or \$2 million or \$1 million.

So, Mr. Chairman, in those circumstances it was decided - and this was in the middle of August, 1974 - that the question of salmon nets, lobster pots, and herring nets, and cod traps could be left to be dealt with during the Winter. Now most of the abuse of this programme has been in the area of groundfish, gill nets and twine and so on.

MR. STRACHAN: Would the hon. minister permit a question?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes.

MR. STRACHAN: I agree with the statement that the minister made that it would require five times the number of staff in the department in order to dilligently handle this programme, and I wrote that in 1973, in the Fall of 1973. But I am concerned a little bit that the Department of Fisheries was warned in the Fall of 1973 that already there was some problems with the system of assignments and with the system of affidavits and why they did not, therefore, tighten up the system for 1974?

MR. CROSBIE: Because this was not the regular system.

I mean we are not dealing now with the regular gear subsidy programme. We are dealing with the special programme of 1974 to replace -

MR. NEARY: Well the whole thing seems to be falling out of line.

MR. CROSBIE: The other programme is a subsidy of about fifty per cent of the value of a man's gear. Now, you know, you are unlikely to claim much under that if you got to put up fifty per cent yourself. This was a programme to replace one hundred per cent of the cost of a man's gear. Now I disagree with that, and the Department of Fisheries I am sure would never again agree to a programme that involves the paying of one hundred per cent of the cost of replacing gear, because it was an invitation

Mr. Crosbie.

you know, to people who have no scruples, to people who think that if you can get something from the government, it does not matter how you get it, it was an invitation for them to go hog wild. It should have been a deductible. Looking back on it, on how that programme went, there is no question that in any future programme there should be a deductible for twenty or thirty per cent to discourage that kind of thing. But this was a programme that would replace one hundred per cent of the cost, so those other items could be dealt with during the Winter. But most of the abuse took place in connection with groundfish, gill nets and kits and webs and nets and twine and so on that had to be gotten in the fisherman's hands if he was going to fish during the rest of 1974. And to make a claim under the programme, the essential thing was that you had to complete an affidavit. You made a claim. You notified the department or a federal fishery officer or whoever that you had lost gear. You were visited, they went, they discussed it with you, you signed an affidavit, made out a claim, and you kept a copy, and a copy went to the department, and then you went with your copy to the gear supplier and he supplied you with the gear, and you gave him the affidavit, and you signed a receipt saying that you had received the gear, ten gill nets whatever it was, and then the gear supplier sent it in to the Department of Fisheries for payment, and if it was processed and checked out all right it was paid.

Now, you know, anyone who knows anything about life at all knew that there was going to be some abuse of this, that there would be some number who would abuse it. But that risk had to be taken if there was to be any emergency programme whatsoever. And the procedures for administering this programme were agreed upon between the Federal Department of Fisheries and the Provincial Department of Fisheries before this programme ever started. So they had agreed on how it was to be administered. And, Mr. Chairman, I became the

Mr. Crosbie.

minister in October of 1974. By that time the deadline was September 10. All claims had to be made by then. The programme was in operation. But as soon as I went there I knew, I was told, that there has been abuse of this programme, that it was being abused. But there was no way to handle it unless we were going to send a special investigating team to visit every fisherman who made a claim, and it would be another year or two before they ever got their gear replaced. So we had to take the chance on what kind of abuse there would be of the programme knowing that there would be some abuse.

Now the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) who is so statesman like in his criticism here today, was braying like a wild ass all during those months, that we were not getting the gear out quick enough and that we were acting like Scrooges, and that we were giving the boots to the poor old fishermen, and that anyone who would suggest that any fisherman on the island had a dishonest bone in his body was a scoundrel and a rogue -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: - and a spawn of the fish merchants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: That is what he suggested in those days. He was not saying, "Administer this programme carefully. You watch what you are doing. There might be some fraud. Are you checking out the affidavits. and so on. No the hon. quagga was braying like a wild jackass to get the gear out, get the gear out, extend the deadline. The deadline was September 1, and then it was September 10 and then the outcry was that the deadline should be extended to October, November, December. The hon. gentleman's interest in the administration of the programme has only arisen recently when he thinks it gives him some little weapon to attack the hon. gentleman who he is now speaking with. Well fair enough, fair enough.

MR. CROSBIE: We know how the hon.gentleman operates. The hon. gentleman suggests that I do not know a sculpin from a cod fish. I know a gentleman from a skunk, I can assure this hon. House of that. I can tell the difference between the two and I know which the hon. gentleman is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Pure Crosbie. Pure Crosbie.

MR. CROSBIE: But I will not say which he is.

MR. NEARY: Thanks be to God I am not one of your crowd.

MR. CROSBIE: I know a gentleman. I know someone who has some feelings of honour. I know one of those from one who has no principles. I know a gentleman from a slanderer who is protected, usually, when he conducts his slander. I know the difference between those things.

MR. NEARY: I have not put my shares in NESCO and watch the profits build up.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not care what the hon. gentleman put his shares in or whether he has any shares.

MR. NEARY: I do not put money in trust and watch the profits build up.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. Low-life.

MR. NEARY: I am not the Godfather.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. Quagga. The hon. Ululater, howling and wailing in mock criticism of the terrible things that went on under that programme. If he had had his way, it would have been a lot worse. The hon. Pseudologist - look that up in the dictionary and then if you find it is unparliamentary, I will withdraw it.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I was on a CBC programme a week or two ago questioned by a crusading journalist on that programme.

MR. NEARY: A fine outstanding Newfoundlander.

MR. CROSBIE: A fine aggressive, young journalist. Now I will take full responsibility. I do not mind for one second. I will take responsibility for what happened in the Department of

MR. CROSBIE: Fisheries from October to October, the year I was there.

MR. NEARY: Then resign.

MR. CROSBIE: I am not going to resign. Why should I resign?

MR. NEARY: Because of incompetence.

MR. CROSBIE: What happened in the department that should cause my resignation? Nothing. Not one thing happened. Nor should my predecessor, the member for Gander (Mr. H. Collins). He should have a statue put up to him by the fishermen on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland, because of the actions he took with the Premier.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSBIE: A statue! Not to be vilified and attacked in this House by some hon. gentlemen who suddenly acquired an interest in the administration of the affairs of the Department of Fisheries. Yes, he should have a statue. I do not need a statue, and I do not want one. In fact, sometime I feel, in this House, that I am already a statue to be able to sit here and endure it.

Mr. Chairman, I take responsibility, as a minister, for what happened in my department. But when some crusading young journalist says, "Were you down to check the claims as they came in? And why are you not down checking the claims when they come in?" I am not taking responsibility for what some clerk does down in the department when he looks at a claim.

MR. NEARY: If you are a minister you have to.

MR. CROSBIE: I take responsibility for the administration of the department. I am not going down to check claims or see how they are checking claims. What do I have a deputy minister for? A director of administration? An assistant deputy minister -

MR. NEARY: Do not be so cowardly.

MR. CROSBIE: - if the minister is going to go down and check all that kind of nonsense! And that was my reply to him.

MR. CROSBIE: And the employees of the Department of Fisheries were not chagrined and they did not feel I was avoiding responsibility, because I have had nothing but phone calls and letters from them thanking me for sticking up and defending them, both on CBC and on CJON.

MR. NEARY: You had all your relatives phone in to CBC.

MR. CROSBIE: Look, the hon. Quagga has had his turn. The hon. Wild Ass has had his turn and it is now my turn.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it was also the press or somebody in the press tried to foment the suggestion that the Department of Fisheries, Federal, was not onvolved in this thing. And I happen to think that Mr. Len Cowley, who is the regional director, is an excellent man in the Federal Department of Fisheries. First class. And he went on the air on CBC after a certain interview of his was twisted beyond recognition, he went on the fisheries programme on CBC Radio and this is some of what he said. Interviewed by Garth Cochrane.

MR. NEARY: What date?

MR. CROSBIE: I do not have the exact dates. Within the last two weeks.

MR. NEARY: The last two weeks?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes. He said in answers to questions by Garth - oh yes! Now some of the reason for the problem was there was no gear registration programme. There was no registration programme for fishermen up to that time. Now, today, there is a registration programme for fishermen. You have to register. And they have started a gear registration programme. The only gear where there was any record of what gear you owned was, I believe, with salmon gear and, perhaps, lobster pots and maybe herring. But in the ordinary fishery there was no gear registration information.

If John Smith, fisherman from Ming's Bight says he lost ten nets, you cannot go check. There is no annual return from him as to what he owns in gear and so on,

MR. CROSBIE: registered with the Federal Fisheries or anyone else. So you had no where to check.

And Mr. Cowley said, and he was comparing this to earlier activities, problems, that they had a loss of income claims due to ice. "The result was we ended up having to pay more fishermen than we felt were fishermen, but there was nothing we could do to prove it.

The gear programme ran into the same problem. I want to point out, even though the Province administered the programme, we in large collected most of the information for them. And if we had administered the programme we would still have come out with \$7.2 million worth of gear lost." That was Mr. Cowley, the Federal Fisheries Director in Newfoundland in this interview.

Further on in the interview he is asked other questions by Garth Cochrane. "A lot of people do not know the pitfalls of this type of programme. They think probably it is just poor administration but it is not. That is just the long and the short of it. It is a programme that no matter who had administered it, even if the police had administered the programme, they would have still had a gear loss of \$7.2 million."

Now that is the long and the short of it, Mr. Chairman. If we were to have this programme -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of which a certain proportion was fraudulent. But it is a loss of \$7.5 million. Is there an estimate of how much was lost?

MR. CROSBIE: No. I would say it is in the hundreds of thousands. Mr. Chairman, as the members of the Committee know, there is an intensive investigation on now which involves checking every claim and every gear supplier.

MR. NEARY: There is more than one gear supplier involved.

MR. CROSBIE: I agree. From my personal knowledge, I know of one. There may be more.

MR. NEARY: Why try to crucify one and let the rest get away?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, there is no one crucifying. We do not intend to crucify anyone. If the police investigation turns up evidence, who ever they turn it up against is going to be prosecuted. That is in their hands, not in the hands of this government. There is an intense investigation still underway of the whole programme. In addition it was expected, Mr. Chairman, that there was going to be some individual claims that would be false and that we could not catch. What steps could be taken were taken. In cases where there are claims over \$5,000 and anything looked fishy about it, the man was visited again by a federal officer as well as a provincial officer, and they checked further to see whether they could verify a claim or not. Certain steps were taken and ones that could be taken, but further than that you could not go.

What came to light subsequently, and which makes the matter much worse - I mean, it has to be expected that some minority, and this programme encompassed not just full-time fishermen, anyone who had a net out, any part-time person, anyone who says he is a fisherman and has gear can claim under the programme - but what turned out to be worse was that we discovered, when I was Minister of Fisheries that - and that is why I say one gear supplier - that at least one gear supplier had engaged in what appeared to be a fraudulent scheme to rook this programme. To do that, of course, he had to have the connivance and assistance of certain people who were supposed to be fishermen to co-operate with him, because they had to make false claims and they had to sign the false receipts. Because for any claim to be paid, remember, you had the fisherman's affidavit and he had to sign on the invoice that he had received his gear.

When that came to light, and it came to light as a result of the fire and the intense investigation after that, I told the Deputy Minister to call the police in and they

MR. CROSBIE: started their investigation. That was last August. And hopefully they will soon get to the end of it. So it appeared that we were taking a risk that there would be some individuals who would make false claims, but the greater good of the greater number had to count if the gear was to be replaced at all. But when it appeared that it went further than that, and that there was a possibility that some of the gear suppliers, at least one and maybe others, were also engaging in an attempt to do even worse than individuals making false claims, that is when this thing got intensively investigated.

MR. NEARY: Is the government concentrating on one supplier now or on all of them?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I am telling this Committee that of my own knowledge I only know of one. There may be one, there may be five, ten, two or three. I do not know. That is in the hands of the R.C.M.P. and the C.I.D. When they are ready they will report to the Department of Justice and when the Department of Justice says the evidence is there, they will start to prosecute. So I do not know how many there are.

So, Mr. Chairman - I forgot now the point I was on before I was interrupted - in any event there will be prosecutions. Now before this came to light, both the Federal Department of Fisheries and the Provincial Department were dissatisfied with how this programme had gone. You would have to be a fool not to be dissatisfied. You could not go anywhere in the country without being told of rip-offs, or getting anonymous letters that someone was ripping the programme off. And meetings were held during the Fall of 1974 and in June of 1975, a major meeting of federal and provincial officials, to report on how this programme had gone, to point out its weaknesses, to make recommendations to both governments so that if there is ever need of another such programme how these weaknesses can be avoided and so on.

Mr. Crosbie:

This has been gone into. We had to take a risk in July and August and September of 1974 if we were to assist the ordinary majority of honest, hard working fishermen to get back to fishing.

MR. NEARY: What nonsense! That is nonsense!

MR. CROSBIE: Oh that is nonsense is it? And during the whole period -

MR. NEARY: It is a red herring! It is an excuse!

MR. CROSBIE: That is a red herring. The hon. gentleman is -

MR. NEARY: A feeble excuse.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. gentleman always gets figidy when he hears the facts or the truth. He is only used to dealing in innuendo and slanders -

MR. NEARY: I have learned that from the Liberals and the hon. minister when he was over there.

MR. CROSBIE: - and the broad brush. The hon. gentleman I do not know where he learned it, but he certainly learned it well.

So, Mr. Chairman, there is no alleged fraud of \$4 million, there is no attempt to put blame on the officials of the department, not by me. The way the news treats this and so on throws a shadow on them as though there is a scandal in the Department of Fisheries. There is no scandal in the Department of Fisheries. There is an abuse of this programme by some of the people the programme was designed to help.

MR. NEARY: The Fisheries scandal. I do not say there is scandal in the Department of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Right! But it has been given the inference as a scandal in the Department of Fisheries, and it is not.

MR. NEARY: The Fisheries scandal.

MR. CROSBIE: And, Mr. Chairman, I defend them now. I say that the Department of Fisheries was never in better shape than it has been in the last two or three years in this Province.

MR. NEARY: Nobody said it was not.

MR. CROSBIE: It has expanded over what it was. It is a far better department than it ever was before 1972. There are good people in it. The deputy minister and his assistants are first class people who got a good concept of the fishery and they have got ability and they are

Mr. Crosbie:

young. The weakest part of the department is this gear business, is the gear programme, is the regular gear subsidy programme which has always been difficult to administer, and which there was a scandal in in 1970 when there had to be prosecutions there because certain suppliers had found a way to go about making false claims in 1970, and then the regulations were changed in 1971 and they have been changed again in 1974 to try and correct these things. It is a difficult programme to administer. And the present minister is now looking at some way to replace it entirely with some other form of assistance. This has always been the weakest part of the programme of the Department of Fisheries, it has always been the least satisfactory programme to administer, the programme most subject to abuse, and that is apart altogether from the 1974 programme.

So, Mr. Chairman, I do not doubt that the morale of some members of the Department of Fisheries is taking a beating, but it is not taking a beating because of me. On every occasion I have defended them and I defend them now. And I accept fully my responsibility as a minister, except when I am being questioned by some, you know, expert on CBC or anywhere else who tries to allege or pretend that I should be down doing the work of some clerk in the claims department or checking them out, I mean that is so ludicrous that to mention it, you know, I mean the minister has got to try to set the policy, he has got to participate in the Cabinet, in general government decisions. In his administration, he has to depend on his deputy minister. I accept responsibility for it, but it is other people who have to do the administration. If the Auditor General comes in with a report that is critical, you ask them to check it out and make sure that if changes are needed that changes are implemented, which by the way have been done in connection with the 1974 report and the 1975 report. No minister can be down checking every item in his department. That is not to say that you are not responsible as a minister. Sure you are responsible as a minister, and I do not mind taking that responsibility and I have. And I do not blame the officials at all. The officials of the Department of Fisheries were

Mr. Crosbie:

given an impossible task to carry out, and unfortunately some minority of people, you know, abused the thing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to say one other thing about, you know, this gratuitous insult thrown out by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) to the Monroes. The Monroes, the insulting words he used about the Monroes. The money flung out to the Monroes, and the loans that the Monroes had, and had they paid them back, and how often they go to Florida and the like. What utter, infamous, slanderous, irresponsible, it is typical of that member to smear a whole family like the Monroes.

MR. NEARY: Have they paid it back?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, you know, I am not buddy-buddy with the Monroes, but I say that the Monroes have done an awful lot for this Province and the fisheries. And unless we have got entrepreneurs in this Province who are prepared to risk their own money, and are prepared to risk their own time and effort, and take risks you will have no fishing industry in this Province because if the fishing industry ever has to be run by the government a hundred per cent in this Province God help us.

MR. NEARY: How much money did they get?

MR. CROSBIE: And I say that this Province - I congratulate the Monroes on what they have done for this Province with our help. They had to be helped by the last government who was glad to help them, and they had to be helped by this government.

MR. NEARY: How much?

MR. CROSBIE: But there is no Newfoundland indigenous family in the fishing business that is any better than the Monroes, and I think that this Province owes them something. And what money they have made they put back in here and they work had. Well, I do happen to know they are not down in Florida all year long. I do not know if they have been down in Florida at all this year. And if they do, if Mr. Monroe or Denny Monroe went to Florida for a couple of weeks, so what? Half the Province is headed to Florida. They are hard-working, they are interested in Newfoundland, they are Newfoundland owned, and for the

Mr. Crosbie:

assistance we have given them we have got a lot of value.

The member for Trinity North (Mr. F. Rowe) - is that is what it is called still, Trinity North? There is a plant in Catalina that revolutionized the whole area, and it is there operating all year round, because we assisted Monroes in getting more trawlers to put in there. And when it came to this Atlantic Fish Plant down in Marystown, we are a lot better off having the Monroes operate that plant than Atlantic Fish, a subsidy of some great conglomerate that does not care what happens to this Province.

MR. NEARY: Time will tell.

MR. CROSBIE: And for any member, it is typical of the member for LaPoile, it is typical of his low-life tactics that he would get up and make such a gratuitous insult about the Monroes, and it might be reported in the paper -

MR. NEARY: Well the Crosbies have thought the same.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes. I am here to defend myself, and I can defend myself against the low-life.

MR. NEARY: What about the men's residence down at the General Hospital?

MR. CROSBIE: Listen to it!

MR. NEARY: Newfoundland's Dehydration. No wonder you would protect them!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman,

MR. NEARY: You are all tarred with the one brush.

MR. CROSBIE: I say this is typical of that gentleman. If he had his way there would not be an enterprise in this country because any one who worked hard and made a success would have to leave it under the weight of his vehemence tongue, because he is jealous of success.

MR. NEARY: Oh my, listen to him!

MR. CROSBIE: Because he is jealous of anyone who does anything. He wants to drive them out for some reason, I do not know what it is in his past.

MR. NEARY: I am just trying to be firm with you.

MR. CROSBIE: I say again, Mr. Chairman, we have gotten good value from the Monroes. The Monroes live here in Newfoundland and they are

Mr. Crosbie:

interested in this Province. And we can participate with them, and they will accept our policy. We are far better off assisting them than we ever were assisting some outfits from away, you know, to whom this is only a minor part of their activities. Now the Monroes are not perfect, and I disagree with some things they have done and so on, but the Monroes and the Lakes and others in the fish business in this Province, I say we are lucky to have them. We do not have to agree with them all of the time, but I would be small minded if I did not defend them in the House. I know it is popular, you know, if you are saying that the fishermen are terrific and wonderful, there is a lot more of them than there are of Lakes and Monroes and the rest of them. But I say that we have got - and I do not agree with everything they do, and when I was Minister of Fisheries I did not either. I am sorry.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: Would the minister have any knowledge of how many people the Monroe Organization employs including their draggers and fish plant workers?

MR. CROSBIE: Well it would be at least 2,500 to 3,000, you know, that may be an underestimate, it is minimum of that.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It would be more.

MR. CROSBIE: I would say, but I am not talking about how many fishermen they buy fish from, it may be more than 3,000.

CAPT. E. WINSOR: You know, employed.

MR. CROSBIE: So, Mr. Chairman, I know that other gentlemen want to speak in this debate, and as the member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) wants to speak, so I should end it up. So I say, Mr. Chairman, -

MR. NEARY: You rade such a fool of yourself you should sit down, boy!

MR. CROSBIE: Well that is a matter of opinion, Mr. Chairman. I may make a fool of myself, but I hope that I never start out deliberately.

MR. NEARY: Go out in the West End, boy! Go out in the West End.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I may make a fool of myself, if I can finish my thought, but I hope that I have never gotten up in this House and deliberately tried to injury or hurt the reputation of someone who was not in this House -

MR. NEARY: I have got a few scars from the hon. gentleman and I can prove it.

MR. CROSBIE: - and who had no connection with this House, Mr. Chairman. I have never gotten up here and taken low swipes at Monroes or Nearys or any other family.

MR. NEARY: I have got a few scars.

MR. CROSBIE: I will stand up in this House with any low life who wants to attack me and I will defend myself.

MR. NEARY: What about the Mifflins?

MR. CROSBIE: But I will never stoop so low as the hon. Quagga from LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Low, slanderous, dirty, filthy!

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Chairman -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Just listen!

MR. NEARY: Now the minister cannot take it, He can dish it out but he cannot take it.

MR. CROSBIE: Is it not unfortunate that we do not have television in this Chamber? If the public could see how that hon. gentleman behaves himself, what he is really like they would not have such a favourable impression as they may have of him now. He is all right when he is behind your back on the open line programmes, he is all right, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman when he is attacking -

MR. NEARY: Do not be selfish.

MR. CROSBIE: - people not in the House, when he is making certain broad accusations about how they are in Florida, and how the money is swung out to them, but when he is being answered he cannot even sit still.

MR. NEARY: Do not be jealous now.

MR. CROSBIE: He is over there he cannot keep his mouth quiet when somebody else is speaking.

MR. NEARY: Your profits are going up, your shares are in trust, the profits are getting bigger. Do not worry. Everything is all right.

MR. CROSBIE: Now I had a few other points to make, Mr. Chairman, but

Mr. Crosbie:

I think that I have made the essential points. I know that we have a Minister of Fisheries now who has got his heart in the job. Frankly I was disappointed to leave the Department of Fisheries. A year is not long enough. You need to be at least three years in any portfolio to get your teeth in it. There were certain changes and new programmes instituted while I was there, and I am quite proud of my record there. I am not ashamed of that gear replacement programme in 1974-1975. I am sorry that some people abused it. I am glad that the offenders are being carefully investigated and they are going to be prosecuted.

Mr. Crosbie.

I know that if there is another such programme that it will be administered differently. I know the present minister is looking at the whole gear subsidy programme so we can get a grip on that and change it. I wish him well in job. I know he is going to do a good job, and that he has the interests of the industry and the fishermen at heart.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, this Committee cannot even begin to measure the importance of the fishing industry by the fact that the \$16 million that the minister is asking us for is only one and a quarter per cent of the \$1,250,000, 000 of the whole budget. The importance of the fishing industry cannot be measured by the trifling amount, relatively speaking, trifling amount the minister is asking for of \$16 million out of a total of \$1,250,000,000. You can measure the importance of the fishing industry more by the fact that of all the seats in this House, in this Chamber, fifty-one seats, including that of the Speaker, twenty-nine are from fishing districts - now that is well over half - you can say this of those twenty-nine districts that in some of them the fishery is the be-all and the end-all. In some of them the fishery is not as important as in others. In some of them the fishery may be even the least important industry in them. But taking all twenty-nine you can say this with truth that they would be in a sad condition if they had not the fishery. You can go over them. You can take the coast of Labrador. What would it be without the fishery? You can take Labrador South and White Bay North. You can take White Bay South - Baie Verte. You can take Green Bay. You can take the Maritime part of Exploit's district. You can take a large part of Lewisporte district. And you might say all of Twillingate district. And you might say all of Fogo district, a very large part of Bonavista North, a very respectable part of Terra Nova, a very large part of Bonavista South, a great

Mr. Smallwood.

section of Trinity North, a sizable portion of Bellevue, most, nearly all of Trinity South, nearly all or well a large part of Carbonear - Bay de Verde, the Bay de Verde part of it, a large part of Harbour Grace district, a very large part of Port de Grave district, out here on the St. John's Shore - I do not know the name of the constituency now, it used to be called St. John's East Extern -

MR. W. CARTER: It still is Extern.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It still is Extern.

- but all of the district of Ferryland, all of the district of St. Mary's - The Capes, all of Placentia East, all of Burin - Placentia, all of Grand Bank, most, nearly all of Fortune, a very large part of the district of Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, all, every last inch of LaFoile district, a sizable part of St. George's district, most, nearly all of Port au Port district, some at least, not much, but some of Stephenville district, all of Bay of Islands district, and a large part represented by the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, the St. Barbe coast. Twenty-nine of the fifty-one constituencies cannot live without their part, the part that they have, of our great fishing industry. That being so, you cannot measure the importance of that industry in Newfoundland by the fact, the rather startling fact that in a total of \$1.25 billion, twelve hundred and fifty million dollars that the government are asking for in this year's estimates, only \$16 million are for the Fisheries, one and a quarter per cent. This means, Mr. Chairman, that the one and a quarter per cent should be a much bigger figure than that, and the other figure, the \$1.25 billion, should be a much smaller figure. It should be smaller when you compare that figure with the amount of money the government have or are going to have in the current year.

Having made that point may I now make this point. This debate on the estimates of \$1.25 billion, this debate which is limited

Mr. Smallwood.

to seventy-five hours, in other words \$16.50 million for every hour of the seventy-five hours or well over one quarter of a million every minute, \$275,000 will be passed on the average every minute of these seventy-five hours. And I plead once again, I plead, especially with the Government Leader of the House, but I plead with the Premier of the Province, and his colleagues in cabinet, in the name of common sense, and in the name of justice, in the name of fair play to Newfoundland change that rule, that seventy-five hour rule with twenty, twenty-one and maybe there will be twenty-two or twenty-three before the year is over sitting over here. Do not limit us to seventy-five hours debating \$1 billion. It is unjust to Newfoundland. It is wrong. There is no conceivable defense of it, no way to defend it. It is as wrong as wrong can be.

Now thirdly may I offer very sincere congratulations to the minister, the Minister of Fisheries. In my opinion he gives indication of being one of the best Ministers of Fisheries that Newfoundland has ever had, as a Province -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: - as a Province or as a country we used to be before Confederation. I knew that Sir William Coaker was one magnificent Minister of Fisheries, magnificent. I think that the late H. B. Clyde Lake was a good Minister of Fisheries. But I would say that the present minister can take his place among the very best of them in the last forty years, and we have had some good Ministers of Fisheries. We had Aiden Maloney, a magnificent Minister of Fisheries. No argument, no debate, there can be no debate about that. Aiden Maloney was a magnificent Minister of Fisheries, and we had others, but the present minister can take his place, I believe, among the best of them. And he has in this present session, since he became minister, thrown off, indicated, stated here, declared, announced more creative ideas, creative and

Mr. Smallwood.

constructive ideas for the development of the fisheries and help for the fishermen, and the fishing communities than we have heard in a long time. And I wish him well, and I hope that whatever happens, this year or next year, or the year after in this Province and in this Chamber that he will continue to be a minister, that he will continue to be Minister of Fisheries, and that he will be lucky enough to have colleagues who will see that he gets more than one and one-quarter per cent of the budget, whatever that budget may happen to be from year to year.

Now having said that I am going to disappoint the minister by disagreeing completely with him, and agreeing completely with the former minister, the former Minister of Fisheries, the present hon. member for Fogo (Capt Winsor), and I take it the official Opposition's shadow Minister of Fisheries,

Mr. Smallwood.

and that is on this question of co-partnership - or what is it? - joint venture between the Newfoundland frozen fish merchants and the European frozen fish merchants. Mr. Chairman, I am in a fairly good position to disagree, because it so happens that I am the one person in Newfoundland who originated that idea. As Premier of the Province I negotiated with Japan's biggest fish company, Taiyo, and I negotiated with the fish people of Spain, and I negotiated with the fish people of Portugal, and I negotiated with the Government of Spain and the Government of Portugal. And we evolved a proposal under which Japanese fishing people, Spanish fishing people and Portuguese fishing people would come to this Island of Newfoundland and build fish processing plants under permit of the Government of Canada and, of course, of Newfoundland. They would under that plan fish in and out of Newfoundland. They would bring their fish in and process it in their own fish plants that they would build with their own capital. I am glad the Premier has come in because I believe, if my memory serves me right, he made a very strong pronouncement on this matter at the time, because it became very public. They would come in, and they would unload the fish into their own plants that they would build in Newfoundland with their own money. That fish would be in bond. It would be in bond, Canadian bond, customs bond. Their plants would become Canadian government bonded warehouses for customs purposes. They would not be permitted to ship that fish out of those warehouses, out of their plants, except to their own countries. The Spanish plant would ship to Spain. The Portuguese plant would ship to Portugal. The Japanese to **Japan.**

In other words they were not to be permitted to ship the fish that they would catch in what we might call "our" waters. They would not be permitted with regard to that fish

Mr. Smallwood.

to bring it in, process it, freeze it, package it, and then sell it in our markets. That is the United Kingdom, Europe, Canada and the United States. They would be obliged - and the fish would be in bond remember - they would be obliged to ship the fish to their own countries, back to their own countries. And as all three countries, Japan, Spain and Portugal are heavy fish eaters, and fish plays an enormously great part in the national diet, the diet of every family in those three countries, it was not imposing an unfair condition on them to require that any fish they caught in "our" waters and brought ashore on our soil and processed in their processing plants and warehoused in bonded warehouses that fish should go back to their own countries.

When I had worked that proposal out with the three countries - I went to Japan several times, I went to Spain several times, and to Portugal several times, Spain and Portugal as the guest of the governments - they were my host - and worked it out I then took it up with my own colleagues in my cabinet. They were excited by it. They were certainly deeply interested in it. We could see a chance that the Premier today sees of employment for some thousands of Newfoundland people, because one of the conditions we laid down was that the employees of those plants, except for a few key men, very important key men, should be Newfoundlanders. That was one of the conditions.

Now I ought to add this that the law of Canada - and I have no doubt that the hon. Premier is well aware of this, and he was probably well aware of it before, he certainly is now - under the law of Canada you cannot bring a ship into Canada to become Canadian without paying Canadian customs duty on that ship. Now if you do not do that every time that ship comes ashore in Newfoundland comes into seaport, they have to pay a customs duty to the Government of Canada on every pound of fish they land. So you either make the ship a Canadian bottom by paying duty on it to the Canadian Government and letting her become a Canadian citizen with a Canadian flag or

Mr. Smallwood:

if you do not, then you pay customs duty to the Canadian Government on every pound of fish that ship brings in. That, of course, had to be changed if the thing was to go ahead. The ships had to be permitted to come in without payment of duty, but to become Canadian nationals flying the Canadian flag. As a matter of fact at that time there was no Canadian flag, no distinctively Canadian national flag, but they had symbolically to fly the Canadian flag and become Canadian bottoms.

My colleagues in my cabinet agreed that it was worth-while provided the Government of Canada would agree. So I took it up with Mr. Pickersgill who was then our Newfoundland minister in the Government of Canada. He was very enthusiastic about it. He thought it was a superb idea. Then he took it up with the Canadian Minister of Fisheries. I forget who that was at that moment. But whoever it was - it might have been the New Brunswick man, Mr. Robichaud, maybe it was Mr. Robichaud - he agreed ardently and agreed thoroughly it was a magnificent idea. They then brought it in to the Government, the Cabinet of Canada, and they thought it was a good idea. Now so far the Spanish, the Portuguese, the Japanese thought it was a good idea. The Newfoundland Government thought it was a good idea, The Newfoundland minister at Ottawa thought it was a good idea. The Canadian Minister of Fisheries thought it was a good idea, and the Canadian Cabinet thought it was a good idea. Why was it not put into effect?

Now here my memory is absolutely clear, and unmistakable as to one-half, and as to the other one-half I am shaky, I am not sure, but I believe, I know, that Mr. Arthur Monroe denounced the whole idea, hip and thigh. He hit it with all he had. He denounced it. He was against it completely and absolutely.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

If the hon. member would permit me. It is very near to six o'clock, and I will have to leave the Chair very shortly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I believe that the hon. gentleman, who is now the Premier, and who was then one of the most important entrepreneurs, or operators in the frozen fish industry was equally strong in his opposition to it, and I think for good reasons. I think that the gentleman who opposed the plan then were right and that we were wrong. Now I believe it is the reverse. I believe that now they are wrong, and we are right in opposing it for the present time. But I will deal more perhaps after dinner with this matter, which is of such tremendous importance.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I now leave the Chair until eight o'clock this evening.

The Committee resumed at 8:00 P.M.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman, could we have leave to rise the Committee and report some progress and ask leave to sit again?

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply has directed me to report progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that the Committee has made progress, and asks leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again presently.

The Parliamentary Commissioner delivered to my office just a few minutes before the Committee rose, before 6:00 o'clock, a document entitled Special Report No. 1. Section (29) of the Parliamentary Commissioners Ombudsman Act reads "The Commissioner shall each year make a report to the Legislature on the exercise of his powers, duties and functions under this Act. The Commissioner may from time to time in the public interest or in the interests of any person or department or agency publish reports relating (a) generally to the exercise of his powers, duties and functions under this Act or (b) to any particular case investigated by him whether or not the matters to be dealt with in any such report have been the subject of a report to the Legislature." And since that special report was received this afternoon, and since it is a matter in which there is some public comment, and comment in the media, I thought it would be wise to have it distributed as soon as possible and that is now being done so all hon. members will receive a copy of it in the next few minutes.

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

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. J. R. SMALLWOOD: Before we recessed for dinner I had told the Committee that I had been responsible, I personally as Premier of the

Mr. Smallwood:

Province, responsible for the first attempt that was made to bring large fishing companies into the Province from Japan, Spain and Portugal to build fish plants in the Province, bring their fish into those fish plants, process the fish and then ship it back to the countries of origin, ship it back to Japan, Spain and Portugal. That I had brought it to my associates in the Cabinet, they had agreed. I had brought it to Mr. Pickersgill, Newfoundland's minister in the Canadian Cabinet, he had agreed, he had brought it to the Canadian Minister of Fisheries, I think, Mr. Robichaud, he had agreed. It had been brought to the Canadian Cabinet, they had agreed. And the thing you might say was ready to go. That is to say that the Japanese and the Spanish and the Portuguese would come to Newfoundland and build fish plants of their own, at their own expense, required to employ Newfoundland personnel, but permitted to bring in exceptional key personnel from their own countries, and required also to ship the fish back to their own countries. The Canadian Government would in that case permit the Japanese, Spanish and Portuguese fishing vessels to come in duty free which is exceptional, because normally the ships would pay duty or else if they did not the fish they brought in every voyage would pay duty to the Canadian Government which would make it prohibitive and quite impossible. All this was agreed.

I do not mean, Mr. Chairman, that the Government of Canada had passed the necessary Order-in-Council. It had not got that far, when in my firm knowledge one, perhaps the largest frozen fish operator in the Province, Mr. Arthur Monroe made a very powerful public pronouncement against the whole idea. My impression is that the head of one of the largest processing plants in the Province at that time a gentleman named Mr. Frank D. Moores who is now the hon. Frank D. Moores, Premier of the Province, was strongly opposed to it. But I am not sure of that, and the hon. Premier will himself remember whether he expressed opposition to it, But I do know that Mr. Arthur Monroe did, and that he was the largest processor of fish in the Province. And because of his powerful opposition which was made very public we dropped the whole matter.

Mr. Smallwood:

Now, Sir, I have to say to you tonight that I believe we were wrong, the government were wrong, Mr. Pickersgill was wrong, Mr. Robichaud, the Federal Minister of Fisheries was wrong, the Canadian Government were wrong in being willing to go ahead with that proposal, we were all wrong. And I believe that Mr. Monroe was right, and if the present Premier took the position that my memory tells me he did, and I am not sure of that, then he was right and Mr. Monroe was right. Because at that time it was the wrong thing to do to allow those nations to come in and spend millions of dollars to build modern fish plants and to fish into those plants, process the fish in bond, in bond, Canadian customs bond and then be shipped to Spain, Portugal or Japan as the case might be, and not to be permitted to ship it to our regular Canadian and Newfoundland markets, mainly the United States.

I think we were wrong, although at the time we thought we were right, because at that time there was probably only one man in Newfoundland who was filled with a deadly fear of diminishing stocks, and that was Mr. Gus Etchegary. One day Newfoundland, one day this House should pass special tribute to Mr. Etchegary -

MR. NEARY: SOFA

MR. SMALLWOOD: - because he was the man who launched the movement -

MR. NEARY: S-O-F-A, SOFA

MR. SMALLWOOD: - in Newfoundland.-

MR. NEARY: Save our fisheries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - to save our fisheries. He was the one man ahead of all others in the Province who saw the terrible danger that our fish stocks would become so depleted that Newfoundland would be in dire danger. Well, Sir, he deserves imperishable fame for that. And all Newfoundlanders should be grateful forever to Mr. Etchegary. And I have no doubt that it was Mr. Etchegary's influence that caused Arthur Monroe to take the powerful stand he took publicly against the proposals.

Now, Mr. Chairman, you will remember that if a ship leaves Japan, and I was instrumental in bringing the first Japanese fishing vessel to our waters, it was done at my suggestion and at my encouragement.

Mr. Smallwood:

The Taiyo Fisheries, perhaps the biggest fishing company in the world, owning and operating 1,000 fishing vessels, an incredibly great fishing organization. I got them to send a ship to Newfoundland and fish in our waters and make a report back to their head office in Tokyo as to whether or not it might be a wise thing for them to move some of their operations to our Newfoundland waters.

I also negotiated, as I had told the Committee before dinner, that I negotiated with the governments of Spain and Portugal and with the fishing interests of those two countries. Now the idea was this if a ship leaves Japan and comes fishing in our waters, if it leaves Spain and comes here fishing, if it leaves Portugal and comes here fishing and loads up and gets a full load, and goes back to Japan or goes back to Spain or Portugal, not taking, of course, as long to go to Spain or Portugal as it would take to go to Japan it would be a long turnabout. But if they could fish in and out of a Newfoundland seaport it would be a week's turnabout. They could go out from their plant in Newfoundland, fish, be back a week later with a load of fish. The result would be of course that those ships would take vastly more fish out of the water than they could

Mr. Smallwood.

ever take if they had to make the long turnaround from Japan to Newfoundland, load up, back to Japan, from Spain to Newfoundland, load up, back to Spain, from Portugal to Newfoundland, load up and back to Portugal. If they could just go in and out with a week's turnaround, they would take vastly more fish out of the water. Now at that time, Mr. Chairman, that was not something that gave us any concern, because there was virtually no one in Newfoundland, with the exception probably, the whole exception of Etchegary, who was worried about the stocks. The stocks of cod in our waters were inexhaustible. There was no way to reduce the stocks of codfish so as to be noticeable, no way. We are all familiar with the biological fact that a codfish would spawn - what is it? - two hundred million eggs, some incredible number of eggs and that even if only half or quarter or ten per cent of them were hatched and grew up to be codfish then the numbers of codfish would be incredibly great and inexhaustible.

I remember one time in a fit of enthusiasm about the incredible numbers of cod in the water saying this, that if Placentia Bay, which is our biggest bay by far, if Placentia Bay were to be filled solid with one solid jam of codfish so there was no room for any water, where there is water now, there would be a solid mass of codfish, that would not even be a speck of the codfish in the water, in the ocean. We all believed that the stocks of codfish were beyond exhaustion. So, therefore, if Japanese ships could make forty, fifty trips a year by fishing into a plant in Newfoundland and if Spanish ships and Portuguese ships could do the same thing, and take perhaps twenty times, thirty times as much fish out of the water as they were able to do having to go back and forth all the distance between Spain and Portugal and Japan and Newfoundland, then so what! It would not matter. It would mean that much more employment in Newfoundland. It would mean that many more plants to be built. It would mean the construction labour of building those

Mr. Smallwood.

plants. It would mean the operating labour, the processing employment in the plants. It would be grand. The more fish they got the better for Newfoundland. That was the way we looked at it.

Arthur Monroe, probably inspired by Mr. Etchegary and our present Premier - I want to pay him the compliment - he rather shook his head here before dinner, he did not remember too vividly. I ask him now. Does he remember whether he opposed that strongly?

PREMIER MOORES: I remember very well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The Premier remembers it well that he did oppose it.

PREMIER MOORES: I was speaking on it in the minutes at the time I gave it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right, okay.

So that I believe that Mr. Monroe was right and that our present Premier was right at that time as I believe that he is wrong at this time.

MR. MURPHY: Would the hon. member permit me?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course.

MR. MURPHY: Was the great objection to the building of the plants by the foreign powers rather than bringing them in and let us process them in our own plants? Was that the objection at that time?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no!

The objection was that they would take too much fish out of the water and that was an objection that could be made only by one who believed that there was danger of depleting the stocks which nobody else believed.

MR. MURPHY: How long ago?

MR. SMALLWOOD: When was it? I do not remember. I am never any good for years. Now I am out of office going on five years. The present Premier is in going on five years, and I would say it was three or four

Mr. Smallwood.

or four or five years before I went out of office which would make it between eight and ten years ago.

MR. MURPHY: In 1965.

PREMIER MOORES: That was 1956-1957.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that when it was, 1956-1957 which is about ten years or so ago?

MR. MURPHY: Twenty years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Pardon?

MR. DOODY: Give or take a decade, that is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, yes, of course. You know one arrives at the point, Mr. Chairman, when ten years here, ten years there, give or take, really does not mean all that much.

Now we hear the proposal from the administration.

They have been over, some of the ministers, including the chief minister, have been over to Europe, and they talked with great fish firms in Germany, West Germany and perhaps other countries over there. They did not go to Poland, but they would have found the same sentiment, without a doubt, in Poland. And I daresay that if they had gone to the Soviet Union, they would have found the same sentiment that those countries, the fishing interests in those countries, knowing as they know that the handwriting is on the wall for them, that the 200 mile limit was an inevitability a year or so ago, they knowing that, and with big investments in ships, fleets, whole fleets, costing them dozens upon dozens of millions of dollars with vast investment in their fleets, their catching equipment, knowing that the 200 mile limit was coming would naturally and from their point of view sensibly and reasonably say, "well if this 200 mile limit is coming we will not be able to go in those waters, 200 miles off from the shore, 200 miles off from the headlands of

Mr. Smallwood.

Newfoundland and Nova Scotia, Labrador, we will not be able to go and it is probably darn little fish we will get. But if we could make a deal with the Newfoundland Government or with the Nova Scotia Government or the Prince Edward Island Government or the Quebec Government, if we could make a deal with them whereby we could go in to their seaports and sell the fish that we could catch, not bring it back to Germany or Poland or Spain or Portugal or Japan, but bring it in to these fish plants, the one in Grand Bank, bring it into the fish plant in Fortune, bring it in to the huge fish plant in Marystown, bring it in to the fish plant in Trepassay, bring it in to the fish plant in Renew, bring it in to the fish plant here in St. John's, bring it in to the different fish plants, if we could do that -

MR. NEARY: I wish they would bring a bit in to Rose Blanche.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right, Rose Blanche, Port aux Basques, Harbour Breton, wherever the fish plants are.

- if we can make a deal like that it would get us a continuing supply of fish. It would keep our draggers, our ships operating. We would not lose our capital, and it would be a pretty good deal, and it should be a good deal also for the Newfoundlanders." Because as the Premier has told us it could mean employment for a number of thousands of Newfoundlanders in those plants more, over and above the number now. It would keep those plants working three shifts. It would keep those plants working virtually all the year round. Did I hear the figure 10,000 persons, additional persons? Well 10,000 persons at \$10,000 a year or \$12,000 a year would be how much? How much is 10,000 times 10,000?

MR. MURPHY: About \$120 million.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One hundred and twenty million wages and that "ain't" hay as the Americans would say. Is the figure right?

MR. HICKMAN: Ten thousand dollars.

May 11, 1976

Tape no. 2615

Page 5 - mw

MR. SMALLWOOD: But you are not going to have men and women working in these fish plants an awful lot longer at \$10,000. It is going to \$12,000 and before you know it it will be \$14,000 a year, and so you are talking of \$120 million to start, but it goes up to \$130 million, \$140 million, and that is a lot of money.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The idea has, on the surface, at least, it has the appearance of being a pretty good deal for Newfoundland, but is it?

Now, Sir, I say to you the time may come when it will be a good deal, but that time is not now. Nor is it on the day that Canada proclaims the 200 mile limit. Because, Mr. Chairman, I am informed - and when a member stands in his place in this House and makes a statement there goes with it the assumption that as an honourable man the information he gives he believes to be accurate because otherwise he is deceiving his colleagues in this House - I believe on first-class source information that right now, right now, each and every species of groundfish, cod, haddock, redfish, each species is badly, seriously overfished. Right now! At this moment! So I agree with the hon. former Minister of Fisheries, the hon. member for Pogo district (Capt. Winsor), in what he said here today. I agree.

The Canadian fishing fleet, that is the Newfoundland fleet, the Nova Scotia fleet, the Quebec fleet, the Prince Edward Island fleet, the Canadian fishing fleet right now, right now, is sufficient to harvest all the groundfish that it is prudent to harvest. Right now, the Canadian fishing fleet which includes our Newfoundland fleet, with one exception now, the sole exception of the fish lying off 150 miles, 180 miles off the coast, the shore of Labrador.

It will take -

PREMIER MOORES: And the East coast of the Province.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well, particularly off the coast of Labrador, which after all, is the mother lode, it is the mother supply for the whole Northeast coast for the inshore fishery.

Mr. Chairman, it will take the former Minister of Fisheries, who unlike anyone else in this Chamber, uniquely in this Chamber, has spent his entire life, except the few years he has been in this Chamber, and for a large part of the time in this Chamber he was Minister of Fisheries, his entire life has been on the ocean, the Northeast coast, the Coast of Labrador.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A very knowledgeable honourable member, and I agree with him. It will take from two years to five years for the stocks of fish to replenish. Now two to five sounds like - make up your mind, is it two, is it three, is it four, is it five? That depends on the species. Some species will take longer to regenerate -

MR. DOODY: Some are more anxious than others.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well that is not quite the criterion. There are other criteria. Their sexual energy and their sexual activity and the biological laws governing the conduct of the different species and kinds of fish, that is why we have to say - and the rate of growth, how rapidly they grow, how rapidly they mature sexually and otherwise - two years to five years for the fish stocks to replenish and take us out of the terrible danger in which we are now, tonight in this Province. That is why I say we should be, we Newfoundlanders, eternally grateful to Gus Etchegary and those who are associated with him in, what was it called?

MR. NEARY: SOFA. Save Our Fisheries Association.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Save Our Fisheries Association.

MR. MURPHY: Short for chesterfield.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The one man in this Canadian nation who pioneered in that tremendous movement. He must be a proud man and a happy man today to know that our country, our country Canada, is about to proclaim the 200 mile limit. Not that our country has been all that brave, not that our country, not that the government of our nation has been all that imaginative and courageous. After all it is not for nothing, you know, that the Senate of the United States and the House of Representatives of the United States, both passed legislation. And it is not for nothing that the President of the United States signed that legislation setting out the 200 mile limit off the United States coast, coming into effect sometime next year, is it?

MR. DOODY: This year. This is an election year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well if this is an election year, that would help. Of course, this is election year in Newfoundland. There is a miniature general election later on and that should help. But there is no election, unfortunately, our -

MR. DOODY: It will not help if Ottawa is not going to.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I was going to say, unfortunately a miniature general election in Newfoundland does not help too much with Uncle Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: An election in St. John's West would with the Minister of Mines and Energy running.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Now, Mr. Chairman, as it needs two years to five years to replenish our stocks, what we should be doing as soon as the 200 mile limit is proclaimed, what we should be doing is saying - by we I mean Canada - what Canada should be doing is saying to Spain, and Portugal, and Italy, and West Germany, and East Germany, and Poland, to all the European fishing countries, we should be saying to them, "You cannot put any effort into fishing inside the 200 miles except to a certain limited, specified extent off the coast of Labrador. You cannot go fishing in Canadian waters." We should say -

MR. W. CARTER: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course.

MR. W. CARTER: Would he not agree that if it is determined, on the basis of scientific assessment by biologists and what have you, that there is a surplus to Canada's capacity to catch or Canada's needs, having regard for the need to replenish and to allow the stock to rebuild itself - let us assume for a moment that once the 200 mile limit has been proclaimed and in force, let us assume that the biologists will determine in their wisdom that there is a surplus of stocks, fish of different species, cod, flatfish -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Surplus to what?

MR. W. CARTER: To Canada's capability to catch, and

MR. W. CARTER: having regard for the need to replenish.

Now then is the hon. member suggesting that Canada, a responsible member of this global village - if that is the right word -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Excuse me! Would the minister excuse me. Mr. Chairman, Your Honour is taking this out of my time, I hope.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: You mean this is becoming part of my time?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not take too long then.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Chairman, if it is determined that there is a surplus to our needs, to our own capability to catch, having regard for the need to allow the stock to replenish, well then, is the hon. member suggesting that Canada should sit on that resource and allow it to maybe die of old age, bearing in mind that we have millions of people starving?

Now then , if there is a surplus to our own needs and capability to catch, does it not make sense, Mr. Chairman, would not the hon. member agree that if we are going to give other countries a licence to fish for those surpluses, is it not incumbent on us as a government and a people to extract the best possible deal we can to keep our fish plants working?

Mr. Chairman, let me say this, if the hon. member would not mind.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Go on.

MR. W. CARTER: I am not suggesting - I think he is taking my comments out of context - I am not suggesting that we should even entertain the thought of allowing foreign nations to continue to fish, even after the 200 mile limit, if it can be determined that the stocks are in such danger of depletion that their fishing will further deplete the stocks and deny them the chance to replenish.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right! The hon. minister is my boy. I agree with him. He is completely right. If his assumptions are as he outlines, then his conclusions are inevitably right. Of course! Of course!

MR. SMALLWOOD: What I am saying is, that as of now on the information I have, not from the usual reliable sources that my hon. friend has from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), but on sources that I do not doubt, the Canadian fishing fleet now is sufficient to harvest all the fish that it is presently prudent to harvest with the sole exception of the fish lying off the coast of Labrador.

MR. W. CARTER: And caplin stocks.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Right! Now, Sir, we should say to those countries, "No".

MR. W. CARTER: Right! Absolutely!

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. None

Mr. Smallwood:

for the next two to five years, two to five years, two in some species, three in others, five in others. No, no fishing inside the 200 mile limit.' That is for Canada's sake, that is for the sake of those same countries, because they are going to go on, they are not going to die within those five years. They are still going to want fish when the five years are over. So it is in everybodys interest is it not to replace the stocks for them to have ample opportunity and time to replace, to regenerate. That is in the interest of the world.

MR. W. CARTER: That is what we are saying.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is in the interest of mankind. That is in the interest of everything that is reasonable. But if it is then that is the thing for us to do is it not, to stop the fishing until we are sure it can be safely fished?

MR. W. CARTER: That is our policy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I am glad to hear it. And I gather the impression that the hon. Premier is going to favour us with some remarks, and I have no doubt that he will amplify the statements he has already made, he will amplify them, he will fill in some of the details, and he will answer some of the points raised for which I thank him in advance.

I am not here in my remarks on the fishery estimates trying to score points against the government. I am not. For me life is just too short for that. I am trying to make points not against but for what is best for Newfoundland. And if there is no other person in this House who is looking on this thing purely, purely as a Newfoundlander, not as a Tory, not as a Liberal, not as a Reform Liberal, not as a politician, but just as a non-hyphenated Newfoundlander, I am that person.

Now I want to say this, Mr. Chairman, if Your Honour will do me the honour to count, even if only mentally, St. Anthony, Englee, LaScie, I always start North and come South along the Northeast Coast, go around Cape Race, go up the Southwest Coast, go around Cape Ray, go back up to the Straits, St. Anthony, Englee, LaScie, Change Islands, Fogo, Twillingate, Valleyfield, Charleston, Bonavista, Catalina, Port Union, Old Perlican, Winterton, Hant's Harbour, Greens Harbour, Dildo,

Mr. Smallwood:

Bay de Verde, Carbonear, Harbour Grace, Port de Grave, Quidi Vidi, Bay Bulls, Witless Bay, Tors Cove, Fermeuse, Trepassey, Arnolds Cove, Marystown, Burin, Lawn, Fortune, Grand Bank, Gaultois, Burgeo, Ramea, Rose Blanche, I have left out Harbour Breton.

MR. DOODY: That is all right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Rose Blanche,

MR. DOODY: Harbour Breton.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Burnt Islands, Isle aux Morts, Port aux Choix.

Now You will notice that I left out St. John's and I have left out Port aux Basques.

MR. DOODY: And Labrador.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No Labrador does not come into this table.

PREMIER MOORES: Southern Harbour and New Harbour.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Southern Harbour, no I would not put Southern Harbour in this list, and New Harbour, yes, I would put New Harbour in but not Southern Harbour. Southern Harbour that is where the phosphorus plant is.

PREMIER MOORES: No it is not.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no, that is Long Harbour.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, oh, all right. Okay. I have left out St. John's and Port aux Basques because the list I have read out here, and I have done it from memory -

MR. DOODY: A good job.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - is a list of the places in our Province that have large or medium sized, in a few cases, small sized modern fish processing plants, okay. St. John's has also and so has Port aux Basques, but with this difference that in St. John's and Port aux Basques if the two great fish plants closed down tonight and never opened again it would be bad, it would be unfortunate, it would be a sorry failure but St. John's would go on and so would Port aux Basques because there are other activities, other ways of making a living in those two places.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. I. STRACHAN: I think he should have on the list there Nain, Makkovik, Black Tickle, and I think around Marys Harbour where there

Mr. I. Strachan:

are plants as well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Okay I am happy to hear that from my hon. friend, and I add those names on.

Now these are places, Mr. Chairman, containing modern fish plants, large, small, medium, what have you, and these are settlements that will die, will become ghost towns if the plants in them die, if they die. I am afraid that my hon. friend, did I mention Old Perlican here? I did. I am afraid that Old Perlican is not, should not be in this list because they have not got a plant now. These towns will die if the plants die. Now the plants have got to die. It is utterly inevitable that they die if they do not continue to get fish. Their only raw material is fish, and if they do not continue to get fish they will die, those plants, and when they die the towns will die.

Now let me remind the Committee that the population of those towns, the total population of those towns when you include the neighbouring towns, take for example the big fish plant in Marystown, if you go in to that plant in Marystown and you see 300 or 400 Newfoundlanders working and you inquire, you will find they come daily to work in that plant from distances up to twenty and thirty miles, daily. If you go in to the plant down in Valleyfield you will find, you will see the cars and the buses and the pickups outside parked they come twenty, thirty miles to work. And the same over in Hants Harbour. In Hants Harbour they come to work from miles away to work. And so in many of those plants, what you have got is not just the population in the towns where the plants are, but the neighbouring towns, and so you come to a population of 70,000 that is directly employed in those plants, 70,000 people, population rather, depending directly, and you might say, exclusively on those plants.

But, Sir, that is not the whole story because you then have the multiplier jobs. Now when I first used to raise in this very Chamber the question of multiplier there would be a titter, and you know, the old man was off on his hobby horse again, the multiplier, and it took quite a while before everybody began to understand what

Mr. Smallwood:

multiplier meant. If you count up in our Province today the grand total number of productive workers in the fisheries, in the mines, in the forest industry, in agriculture and so on, count them up and you will find that they amount to about one-third of the labour force, the other two-thirds are doctors and clergymen and dentists and stenographers and -

MR. DOODY: And politicians.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - barbers, and taxi drivers, and teachers and God knows what, and members of the House of Assembly. The multiplier jobs, the people who get their living not by working in the productive industries but get their living because there are productive industries, if the productive industries were not there they would not have jobs and the multiplier in Newfoundland is not two to one, it is two and a half to one, in the United States it is seven to one.

MR. J. CARTER: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. Has not the hon. gentleman's time expired? I understand we are limited to forty-five minutes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! The hon. member still has ten minutes of his forty-five left.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am deeply grateful to the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) for his solicitude to see, he has taken care that I do not break the rules, that I do not go over my time. And I am so happy to have some one keeping careful check, but his watch, I do recommend that he get a more accurate watch, give him accuracy in his watch.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

And the multiplier population is at least 100,000 and 100,000 added to 70,000, Mr. Chairman, is 170,000, one-quarter of Newfoundland's population.

Now as I have only ten minutes I fear that I will not be able -

MR. NEARY: By leave you can have half an hour.

MR. MURPHY: Did the hon. gentleman just say 100,000 plus 70,000 is one-quarter of the population of Newfoundland?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not hear the hon. gentleman.

MR. MURPHY: I just said. Did the hon. gentleman say that 100,000 plus 70,000 is one-quarter of the population of Newfoundland?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes about. Four times 170,000 is what?

MR. MURPHY: Six hundred and eighty thousand.

MR. DOODY: The population is 650, 000.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well the population is 655,000 estimated at this moment. Six hundred and fifty-five thousand is our estimated population so DBS tell me or Canada's Statistics.

MR. CALLAN: Five hundred and fifty-five thousand.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Five hundred and fifty-five thousand. What did I say? It is 555,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do not use up any more of my time.

MR. NEARY: By leave we can give you another half hour .

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well I do not want another half hour, say twenty-nine minutes.

I would ask the hon. the Premier to listen intently and critically to what I am about to say. The longliner which I brought into this Province - and I am proud of that, I am not ashamed of that. My administration fathered the longerliner. It was a good thing while it lasted. But the longliner is not completely for the most part passe' now in our Province.

MR. DOODY: What parts of the Province?

MR. SMALLWOOD: In the main. In the main it is passe', in the main, not completely so, but in the main. They are doing very well down in Port aux Choix. The longliners fish in there even from all the way around from St. Anthony.

MR. NEARY: Change Islands are doing well.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Change Islands sometimes.

MR. NEARY: Burnt Islands.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not every year.

Generally speaking, passe'. It has served its purpose, and it has been a great purpose, and it served a great cause in its time. What is needed now is the near-water boat, the near-water boat. Now not right off where the deep sea druggers go, but somewhere in between.

MR. DOODY: Mid-water trawlers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mid-water or near-water I prefer to call it, near-water. It is not really mid-water.

I suggest to the hon. the Premier - the Premier made an announcement and in my book I intended to bring it here and quote what I said in my autobiography. I praised the Premier, and I confess that I was ashamed, I was chagrined that I had not thought of it myself as he did. He thought of it when he became Premier, he announced it, and I praised it in my book which, you know, is not just a newspaper or a magazine article. That book will be read one hundred years from now, every book is. A book lasts quite awhile.

MR. DOODY: That was the reference that made it a best seller.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That helped.

I suggest that the government embark on a programme of renting a fleet of 200 near-water or mid-water boats, five to eight men on each boat, which would be about 1,200 men, fishermen. These boats would fish seasonally. They would fish about ten months a year. They would fish on the Southwest Coast and on the West Coast, and on the Northwest Coast, and on the coast of Labrador and on the Northeast Coast and on the East Coast

Mr. Smallwood.

and on the Southeast Coast and on the South Coast. These near-water boats, with their five to eight men crews would fish seasonally clear around the Province depending on the season. It is not that the same boats would fish just in Labrador and that is it, the others would fish on the Northeast Coast and that is it, all the boats would fish everywhere. They would fish part of the year in Labrador, part of the year in the Strait of Belle Isle, part out in the West Coast, part in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, part of the Southwest Coast and part of the East Coast and so on, all 200 of them, 1,200 men. I am told that they would produce on the average one and one-quarter million pounds of fish each of them, 1,250,000 pounds gutted head on, one and one-quarter million pounds, gutted head on worth -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Per year?

MR. SMALLWOOD: At least a year.

- worth at least a year \$150,000 per boat, per year. A total of 200 boats will be 250,000,000 pounds, gutted head on, worth at twelve cents a pound \$30 million a year. Now in an eight hour day I am told 100,000 pounds of fish could be processed, and it would be work for 200 plant workers. I hope the Premier took note of that. One hundred thousand pounds of fish in an eight hour day to be processed would take 200 plant workers. So 2,000 plant workers it would take to handle 250,000,000 pounds of gutted head on fish. So there are 2,000 plant workers earning \$10,000 a year which is \$20 million, and 1,200 fishermen earning \$20,000 a year each, \$20,000 for the fishermen, is \$24 million. Now that is a total of \$44 million a year to the plant workers and to the fishermen, 2,000 plant workers, 1,200 fishermen. Then that would be 3,200 productive workers. There would be 500, at least; shipbuilders, boatbuilders, building the fleet, and they would make \$12,000 a year which is another \$6 million. Then the multiplier jobs would be 6,400 at \$10,000 which is \$60 million. That is 10,000 jobs, 10,000 jobs, new jobs that do not exist now, 10,000 jobs earning \$110 million a year. Now what would it cost to do it? That is the benefit. Now what

Mr. Smallwood.

would the cost be? You have to make a cost benefit study of everything. The benefit is \$110 millions a year, \$100 million a year going into the pockets of 10,000 people. Now that leaves 40,000 or 50,000 family people. Two hundred boats at \$375,000 each. The minister told us today that the draggers cost in excess of \$200,000. Three hundred and seventy-five thousand dollars for the near-water boats. That is \$75 million the Premier might take note of, \$75 million to create a fleet of 200 boats equipped, equipped.

MR. CANNING: Are they steel or wood?

MR. SMALLWOOD: It could be either, but probably wood.

MR. CANNING: Well you would not get one for that price with steel.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, I am told you will.

MR. CANNING: No.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am told on authority that I believe to be, what the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) believes about his authority to be, absolutely reliable. And if the hon. gentleman were to confer with me privately I would tell him the name of my source, and he would fall in line I know.

MR. CANNING: Well you cannot turn them out at Marystown Shipyards.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I would like to remind the hon. member that he has a half minute left.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My time is up?

MR. NEARY: You got a half minute.

By leave.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What can you say in half a minute. Of course, a judge can order a man to be hanged and that would not even take a half minute. So a half minute can be pretty valuable but not here in this Chamber, I think.

MR. NEARY: By leave you can have half an hour.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, I do not want a half hour, Your Honour, a few minutes, five minutes, eight minutes, a few minutes by the gracious tolerance of the House, of the Committee.

MR. WELLS: I suggest, Mr. Chairman, the hon. gentleman be given a few minutes to wind up by leave.

MR. J. CARTER: I object Your Honour. The hon. gentleman has dominated the proceedings of this House ever since he came back.

MR. NEARY: Oh, sit down, you overgrown galoot.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The leave of the House has not been given

I am afraid.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not unanimous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is not unanimous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman, I am just speaking for just a few moments, but I think that after the remarks by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) there are a few comments that I would like to make. First of all I am very impressed, Sir, again after many years by the statistics. I am afraid that I did not have a chance to digest them all but on a rapid calculation I would think that if they all came true we would need two million pounds of scrunchions to go with the rest that was landed during that particular time.

But at this moment I would not like to talk about the programmes that have been discussed here on the fisheries estimate with one exception, and the exception being the potential of offshore landings, foreign landings, Newfoundland filling in the quota that will be available to Canada and what our share will be. Before doing that, Sir, I would like to say one thing that the Ministers of Fisheries since my government came into power -

MR. SMALLWOOD: My administration. The Queen's government.

PREMIER MOORES: - and I have been proud of each and everyone of them.

MR. SMALLWOOD: My administration.

PREMIER MOORES: My administration.

Thank you to the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) Mr. Chairman. I am glad that it is my administration as opposed to his government in that case.

What I would like to say, Sir, is that the personal attacks this afternoon on the various Ministers of Fisheries, or particularly the past Minister of Fisheries, I think, are unjustified. I think the neglect that possibly the fisheries has had in this Province for many years is now slowly but surely being overcome. I think the men who have served in that portfolio in the last four years have been dedicated and genuine in trying to make a contribution and none more so than the present Minister of Fisheries. Sir, what I want to speak about briefly

Premier Moores.

tonight is the control and the conservation and what is going to happen to the fishery resource off our Province or off the Eastern Coast of Canada. The hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) mentioned about my opposition and others at the time of the foreign landings proposed previously, - and he was right in that, yes, I was one of several people who opposed it but not necessarily for conservation because conservation in those days was not really something that people were concerned enough about. People were not concerned about it. But mainly what the worry was at that particular time was the control of what would happen to the fishery destiny. Now at that time we had in this Province and still do to a large degree hereditary businesses. We had family businesses that had been through the feudal system, through the merchant system over the years and been established. It was a reaction not of, I suppose, survival but also one of subconsciously of Newfoundland particularly at that time and Canada to a lesser degree not having control of which way the industry was going to develop. Now as the hon. member also well knows I was involved in selling - and under very unfortunate circumstances, I am sure they would love to have the opportunity today - to the Uni Lever people in Great Britain. The reason for that was, and it is only an aside, I think, that over a period of generations any business that is an hereditary business is not going to be efficient in an international competitive community.

But now we are looking at a very different situation than we looked at at that time. We are looking at a 200 mile limit being imposed which was not even thought of at that time. We are looking at a 200 mile limit that would allow Newfoundland and Canada the security of supply, the security of employment and the bargaining power to maximize the people who are presently and mostly, by the way, utilizing that resource. In the past one could say that European interest in Eastern Canada was one of opportunism, opportunism for themselves and convenience of steaming distances, economics and so on. And today, Mr. Chairman, I would suggest that it is still opportunism, but the opportunism today

Premier Moores.

is for the Canadian nation and Newfoundland and Labradorian people rather than for the Europeans per se. The fact is today under our terms a great deal can be done to conserve the fish stocks, a great deal can be done for full employment and a great deal can be done for the efficiency of our industry. One of the figures that was not mentioned by the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) nor others since this debate started, and one of the staggering figures, I think, is that last year there were two million tons of fish caught off Eastern Canada, four hundred thousand by all of Canada. We landed approximately one-fifth of all the fish caught.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that two hundred thousand of that was caught in Newfoundland and Labrador. Approximately ten per cent of the total catch was caught and landed here.

Sir, I believe -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Caught and landed here?

PREMIER MOORES: Landed in Newfoundland, two hundred thousand tons out of two million tons caught.

Now, Mr. Chairman, no matter how much the quota is reduced even to allow the stock to build up to its full potential the fact is that whilst the two million tons may be halved, which would leave one million tons - and it will not drop that low, I am sure of that - but with one million tons still being caught today there is two hundred thousand tons being landed in our Province. The fact is, Sir, that with another two hundred thousand tons we would have full employment in all the present excess plant capacity. We would have the figures of jobs that the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) mentioned. These things can be done if the fish can be landed. Now, Mr. Chairman, the problem is how do we get the fish landed and what controls do we have? The fact is that the foreign fleets

Premier Moores.

and most of the fish they catch is on the Hamilton Bank and on the Eastern trench where Newfoundland nor Canadian boats have ever fished in any quantity. They fish for a different species than we do in that they fish the deep sea for cod. That sounds ridiculous to Newfoundland but the fact is that Newfoundland deep sea fleet does not fish for cod. It fishes primarily for flat fish and to a lesser degree red fish. I think that is a true statement. There is some cod caught but it is not -

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I ask the hon. gentleman?

PREMIER MOORES: Sure.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is my memory betraying me when I have an impression that he and his associates in the big company with headquarters at Harbour Grace and plants in a half dozen other places that he and his associates brought in special Birdseye ships to fish on the Hamilton Banks -

PREMIER MOORES: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - specially designed? Is my recollection correct that they discovered that even draggers of a more or less conventional type could also safely outlive the terrible gales? What was the mathematical term of the gales, a certain velocity you know?

PREMIER MOORES: O fourth 10.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. DOODY: - O fourth 10 on an O fourth scale.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am amazed at the hon. minister. The hon. gentleman knows if anything, God forbid, if anything should happen to the present Minister of Fisheries the Premier has someone waiting to take the job, the present Minister of Finance, go from Finance to Fisheries.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman, the fact is that during that time, but today which is more important, the German, the Portuguese, the Spanish, the Russian fleet particularly, fish off the East and Northeast of where we sit tonight, not on the South Coast. The Portuguese and Spaniards catch some cod there around the Virgin Rocks, Flemish Cap, some in the gully and the Grand Banks. The

Premier Moores.

member for Fortune - Hermitate (Mr. J. Winsor) well knows the areas probably much better than any of the rest of us but the fact is that there is a lot of flounder caught, a lot of flounder dumped. The fact is that a great many species that are being wasted by the Europeans who fish in that area and off Labrador and off the East Coast know that they catch only cod primarily, because it is primarily a cod catching area, but we are not catching it ourselves.

MR. J. WINSOR: Certain times in the year on the South Coast. About once or twice a year they move in.

PREMIER MOORES: Inshore and you get it in the gulley, yes.

But the fact is, Mr. Chairman, that these foreign fish fleets do fish different grounds, and they do fish for different species. Now the fact is, Sir, that the stock on the Continental Shelf has to be protected. With two million tons last year the quota this year will be probably three-quarters of that which is getting very low. But the quota whatever is established from now on must be totally with the view in mind of bringing back the species so that we maximize the sustainable yield so that that stock of renewable protein in a world community that needs it is maximized to get whatever is the most we can get out without damaging the stock in the future. This has to be the

Premier Moores:

objective of Canada, not only the objective I would suggest, Mr. Chairman, but also the duty of Canada to make sure it happens.

MR. NEARY: If it is not too late.

PREMIER MOORES: In my opinion the inshore fishery has to be protected. There is no question about that. But what I have just said generally has to protect the inshore fishery by definition. If we have maximized the stock where it can be to the total sustainable yield, because countries in the world will not allow, Mr. Chairman, for it to be **raped** again. Canada certainly should not allow it. But the fact is that in my opinion the inshore fishery is a must because of the sociological obligation and way of life we have in this Province, It has to be protected particularly in certain areas, and when I say certain areas I mean certain areas of fish habit, if you like.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. Premier -

PREMIER MOORES: But I would say one other thing - Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. Premier allow me to be rude again to interrupt him, to ask him to yield for a moment? What the hon. Premier is saying is a terribly important speech, important to this -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The answer is, no.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - Chamber, and important to Newfoundland, and he has only sixteen minutes left.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: See what I mean.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would he agree to have some extension to the debate on the fisheries.

MR. NEARY: By leave.

MR. SMALLWOOD: A general leave.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Chairman, I do not think there should be an extension on it, and I will do my best having been reminded to finish in sixteen minutes.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that the -

MR. CANNING: It is only the fisheries.

PREMIER MOORES: No, Mr. Chairman, the hon. member for Burin-Placentia (Mr. Canning) said it is only the fisheries. I wish he was as objective

Premier Moores:

and so critical during the twenty-three years when he had the opportunity to be that, Mr. Chairman.

The fact is, Sir, that in my opinion the quota that will be established irrespective of what that amount is should not be a quota based on bilateral agreements between Canada and the other countries that are presently signing bilateral agreements with Canada. The quota for all of the offshore fish in Eastern Canada should be a Canadian quota. It should not be so much for Japan, so much for Spain, so much for Portugal, so much for Germany, it should be all Canadian. Now if Canada deems it fit that okay, X country can catch so much tonnage of fish to either take home if we cannot handle it or to land in Canada to handle under that quota which is a conservation quota Canada should have control of who catches it, how much, for what use, and for what benefit. Because, Mr. Chairman, I worry about one great thing with our national government, and that is this; we have had over quite a few years the pressure for the 200 mile limit and with the Department of the Environment and the Department of External Affairs we have finally gotten around through an indirect method of bilateral agreements to having an arrangement with each of these countries whereby they will accept the 200 mile limit by Canada. But what I worry about, Mr. Chairman, accepted under what terms?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: What terms are they going to accept the 200 mile limit under?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: The fact is, Sir, that they must have a policy in Ottawa that projects the Canadian and the world position, number one, of conservation; number two, of maximizing the sustainable yield; and number three, the one thing that has been missing to date is the commercial posture that Canada will take, the commercial posture that will allow our country, and particularly our Province to maximize the full benefits from whatever fish is caught in whatever manner.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: Now, Mr. Chairman, the fact is that there are a great many things that can be done. The fact is that as one European said to us when we were in Germany, I guess it was, he said, we have ships, we have markets, but peculiar enough the markets are as important to them as their ships, because they are fish eating people, they put up a lot of sophisticated processing, if you like, in handling fish. The fact is that these people say we have the markets and we have the boats, but unfortunately Mr. Premier we do not have a pond to fish in. And that is true. There are other expressions I suppose that are as appropriate, but they do not have a pond to fish in.

The fact is, Sir, that how can we in this Province persuade the Federal Government to make sure that our sociological way of life, our inshore fishermen are protected, and that the stocks come back so that they can grow into the fish killers that we have to have for tomorrow without Europeans manning boats or what have you. And the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) made one very astute, I thought, observation on the near-water fishery or the mid-water fishery as they call it in the U.K., they have the near-water, the mid-water and the distant. The fact is that our problem is in this Province, and I think most Newfoundlanders would agree, that if we had boats of 120 feet, 150 feet that went to Labrador, came down the East Coast, went to the South Coast, and went to the West Coast, I, Sir, would say that we would crew very, very few of them today, because most of our people are not used to mobility, we are not used to going and hunting fish, we are more used to inshore, to the fish coming to us. I am not saying that is bad. I am saying it is the way we have developed traditionally as a people.

Now if there are people who want to do this in the future I think there is a very big and large future for them economically in many other ways.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: But the fact is that it is going to take time, and for me the only people who should be encouraged to do it are those

Premier Moores:

who will want to do it.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that if we are going to have offshore landings taking into consideration the protection of the traditional ways we talked about, first of all, we do not nor can we as a country or as a province suggest that it be done for short-term benefits. It is not going to happen for at least a couple of years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right.

PREMIER MOORES: And in that couple of years the sociological and economic planning that has to happen is of major significance to this Province, so that the people are protected in the right manner.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, with the 200 mile limit properly exploited we have an opportunity to develop and utilize the greatest resource this Province has whether it be offshore oil and gas or the Upper Churchill or what have you, you are talking about a renewable protein food with a good way of life given the opportunity to use that way of life.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as I say the landing of foreign ships is only one phase of what we are talking about. We are talking about the training of our people. We have to make sure that the Newfoundland and Labradorian people have the opportunity to be trained in whatever method is necessary to maximize the resource. The fact is that we have to utilize the European ability for scientific data which we do not have in Canada. We do not have the research ships that go out and plot the schools of fish and the movement of those fish and how they can best be utilized. I would say the prime example today is this caplin stock of which there is 300,000 tons of caplin being caught this year. We do not know in Canada if that is destroying the bait fish, the food for the cod, we do not know. The Russians tell us it is okay, the Norwegians tell us it is okay, but they tell us it is okay but they are the only ones catching it. What I suggest, Mr. Chairman, is that all fish be of Canadian quota, and when we see the scientific data, when we apply the science to the oceans, that we have applied to everything else in Canada then we can say, "Yes, we can catch this sort of quota or

Premier Moores:

no, we cannot."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: The fact is, Sir, that with the landing of the fish that is available, and hopefully, as quickly as possible by our own people with the reprocessing which is a lever in our bargaining of allowing to catch, and getting fish into that market which is now becoming very much available to us the reprocessing of other species. For instance this year, I understand, that herring can be caught by Canadian ships. All the herring quota can be caught by Canadian ships.

But should we be shipping it out like we did before, Mr. Chairman? Whereby we shipped it out in barrels to Norway or Sweden or to Germany or France. Shipping it out in hundred pound barrels, and the barrels came from Norway.

MR. NEARY: They still are by the way.

PREMIER MOORES: Exactly. That is what I am saying, Mr. Chairman, what we have to do is that if Germany wants cod or if Germany wants perch or redfish, if they want that then they also undertake to put in the reprocessing expertise to allow our people to maximize to the fullest extent that resource which we have so under utilized for far too long.

MR. NEARY: What is the problem with the wood for our barrels? Is there any?

PREMIER MOORES: No. There is no problem with the wood.

MR. DOODY: It has nothing to do with the wood.

PREMIER MOORES: No, it has nothing to do with the wood. It was just the efforts of the people who were buying the product, putting extra effort in to make an extra buck off us by supplying the materials to pack it in. It was just that simple.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, we are on - and I have got a great many notes here that I think probably a major speech for all those concerned in the Budget Debate and the Throne Speech is probably what is required at this time. But what I am saying, Sir, is that we are looking at really a revolution in our fishery, and I do not mean

Premier Moores:

a revolution in our sociological, traditional background we have.
But we are looking at a time when if Canada misses the opportunity
to develop this resource that we have with the right commercial
attitude, the right conservation attitude, and with the right input
into the areas that are so concerned, Mr. Chairman, I might say
just this that for once if Ottawa would base its fishery

Premier Moores.

policy on the North Atlantic rather than on the yield from the upper Ottawa River, we might make the progress we want to do in the direction we want to go in.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER MOORES: The fact is, Sir, that this is not an attack on Ottawa. What I am saying is that Ottawa's objectives and Newfoundland's objectives must be one in the same because basically it is for the benefit of Canadians and in this case Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. The fact is, Sir, that - the other notes I have I would not have time to develop and not to say them I think would be wrong. I just wanted to make those few brief remarks and review of the estimates themselves.

MR. ROWE: Would the hon. Premier permit a question?

PREMIER MOORES: Sure.

MR. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, some of the comments made by the Premier have a remarkable similarity to, you know, the newly developed or the newly announced policy by the Canadian government, the policy of Canada's commercial fisheries. I was wondering if the Premier would like to comment very briefly in the time remaining on that particular policy, the new Canadian policy with respect to the commercial fisheries as it pertains to the Atlantic Coast, because it is a very important policy, and we have had very little comment on it from either side of the House up to this date?

PREMIER MOORES: As I said I will be speaking as I am sure others will in a major way based on that and our position as well. What I was saying was that Canada's objectives and ours, I think, are and should be the same. But what I am saying is this that there is one real worry with me in Canada and that is that their international politeness, whether a wheatsale is going to be affected and, therefore, fish may have to be swapped off. That attitude to me is unacceptable. But in a trade context it is not necessarily a nonfactor in Ottawa. I am afraid, - and I hope it is not - but I am afraid that it may be.

Premier Moores.

What I am saying is that I do not think there is a great deal of difference. I think there may be a degree of difference in urgency and the approach and getting the job done, because it is going to take time to do it well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Chairman, would I have leave to ask one more question because I was concerned with what you were stating there? I agreed with much of what you said, and from your last remarks I am wondering whether you feel that this Province should take the attitude or that Canada should take the attitude that Iceland has taken as far as considering unilateral action in the fisheries, the conservation of the fisheries?

PREMIER MOORES: The Province as opposed to the nation?

MR. STRACHAN: No, I was thinking of the nation really.

PREMIER MOORES: Of Canada?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes.

PREMIER MOORES: No, I think Canada is in a bargaining position as such with the 200 mile limit being set but I was saying that it is all going to be a quota, Canada's quota. And then if there are two thousand tons available that is considered by all scientists to be safe we have only the catching or the processing capacity say next year of five hundred thousand. I think it would be equally criminal not to allow the other five hundred to be caught in a world that is short of food. But in the meantime I say that the plan should be to have it all under Canadian / Newfoundland, Labradorian if you like, control as quickly as possible. But I would not suggest that we do what Iceland has done because Iceland's economy is ninety per cent based on the fishery. Their exports, I guess, are about ninety per cent. The other thing about Iceland is that they have the catching capacity to catch all the fish that are safe to catch really off Iceland now. They have made bilateral

Premier Moores.

agreements with Germany and other countries that they are not at a cod war with. The ones they have not made peace with are the British who are demanding more in fact than the Icelanders are prepared to give. A lot of people do not realize that Iceland, I think it was ninety thousand tons they were prepared to give the British and the British wanted one hundred and fifty thousand tons.

CAPT. WINSOR: Before the minister takes his seat, and I know there is about one minute left. In view of supposing tomorrow we were to get that 200 mile limit, and we do not have the capability of catching our quota or catching the fish that might be made available to us, would he then consider using or chartering by bare boat charter a number, perhaps a hundred of the trawlers that might not be used by the countries which are their own bosses?

PREMIER MOORES: There is one point I would like to make, Mr. Chairman, and that is I do not think we are ready if the 200 mile limit is announced tomorrow. I think Industry, Trade and Commerce in Ottawa today should be more involved in what is going to happen next in External Affairs. Now whether the methodology is to bare boat charter, to have Canadian bottoms by buying or whatever or registering in Canada, whatever the method is that is the sort of thing that I feel a committee of the federal and provincial government should sit down and now start to plan as to which is the best advantage for our own country.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

For the information of hon. members perhaps I should read Section (g) of Standing Order 116 which states: "At the conclusion of the seventy-five (75) hours provided by paragraph (a) of this Standing Order, or such lesser number as remain by reason of operation of paragraph (c) of this Standing Order the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on Supply shall put all questions necessary to carry every vote and item of each Estimate

Mr. Chairman.

not referred to a Committee appointed pursuant to paragraph (b) of this Standing Order and such questions are not debatable."

On motion Heading XIV - Fisheries, all items without amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading I - Consolidated Fund Services.

On motion Heading I - Consolidated Fund Services, all items without amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading II - Legislative.

On motion Heading II - Legislative, all items without amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading III - Executive Council.

On motion subhead 301-01 through to 301-02-04 carried.

MR. DOODY: On 05, Yqur Honour, there is amendment calling for a \$90,000 addition to subhead 703-02-05 for \$90,000 which is to have been the Planning and Priority Secretariat.

MR. CHAIRMAN: We are at 301-02-05 at the moment.

MR. WELLS: Domestic - Lieutenant Governor's Establishment we are at you see at the moment? Is that right?

MR. CHAIRMAN: 301-02-05.

On motion 301-02-05 through to 305-02-04, carried.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Chairman, there is a \$90,000 subhead 305-02-05, \$90,000 in the estimates of the Executive Council under a new subdivision, Labrador Resources Advisory Council, 305-02-05.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall the amendment carry? All those in favour "aye." Contrary "nay." Carried.

On motion subhead 305-02-05 as amended, carried.

On motion 305-02-08 through to 306-02-04 carried.

On motion heading III - Executive Council carried with amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading IV- FINANCE.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. I do not know if Your Honour is paying attention to the vote or not. On several occasions, Sir, there had been no "ayes", but "nays", and I do not believe Your Honour is paying attention.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is nonsense.

MR. NEARY: It is not nonsense.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: We had just one "aye".

MR. NEARY: There is complete silence from the other side, and "nays" from this side, Sir. I think Your Honour should pay attention to that.

MR. WELLS: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman. That is absolutely incorrect.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is a fact.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! It is my understanding the "ayes" have carried every vote up to the present time.

On motion 401-01 through to 406-04 carried.

MR. E. DAWE: We need someone in here to make a quorum.

MR. R. MOORES: Mr. Chairman, can these estimates continue without a quorum?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: I am informed by the Law Clerk that a quorum is present.

On motion 407-03 through 408-04 carried.

On motion heading IV - Finance, carried without amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading V - Manpower and Industrial Relations.

On motion 501-01 through to 506-02-02 carried

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! In calling the estimates an element of silence should be maintained so that members can follow the call.

Shall 506-02-03 carry?

On motion 506-02-03 through to 508-02 carried.

On motion heading V - Manpower and Industrial Relations carried without amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading VII - Justice.

On motion 701-02 through to 703-02-08 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 703-01 carry?

MR. DOODY: 703-01, Your Honour, there is an amendment thereto 703-01 to add \$25,000 in salaries that covers the two new district courts, the staff of the district courts. There is a \$25,000 addition to that vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the amendment? All those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", carried.

On motion 703-01 carried as amended.

On motion 703-02-01 through to 703-02-03 carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall 703-02-04 carry?

MR. DOODY: 703-02-04, Your Honour, there is a \$14,000 addition there for law books for these two learned gentlemen who are going to handle the two district courts, an additional \$14,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the amendment? All those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", carried.

On motion 703-02-04 as amended carried.

On motion 703-02-05 through to 709-02-02 carried.

Mr. Chairman: Shall 709-02-03 carry?

MR. DOODY: 709-02-03, Your Honour, there is an election act expense there. Subsequent to the estimates being prepared, there is a Ferryland District election or byelection being called so there is an addition of \$10,000 to defray the cost of that election. So that subhead should be increased with the leave of the House, by \$10,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the amendment? those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", carried.

On motion 707-02-03 as amended carried.

On motion 710-01 through to 712-03-10 carried.

On motion Heading VII - Justice carried with amendment.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall I report Heading IX - Recreation and Rehabilitation all items without amendment carried?

MR. ROWE: On a point of order.

MR. CHAIRMAN: A point of order has been called.

MR. ROWE: I am not sure, Sir, whether I can give you a citation on this but this appears to me to be a bit of a farce, as it is going now. I wonder if we could refer, Sir, to the Standing Order that Your Honour quoted earlier 116 (g), and I will just read it out: "paragraph (c) of this Standing Order the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on Supply shall put all questions necessary to carry every vote and item of each Estimate not referred to a Committee appointed pursuant to paragraph (b)." I wonder, Sir, in order to end this farce if I could suggest that we move the totals except in cases where there might be an amendment. And I think the operative word there is, put all questions necessary, and I think if we called the totals that would be the necessary action required. I think in fact, Sir, we did do this last year when we reached this stage with the exception of cases where we had the Minister of Finance move an amendment to a head or subhead. It is just a suggestion, because this seems to me to be totally farcical and ridiculous.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The hon. House Leader.

MR. WELLS: To the point or order, Mr. Chairman. I thank the hon. member for his suggestion, but we would prefer that every item be called as the Standing Order suggests.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The interpretation put on that paragraph (g) by the Chair which refers to all questions necessary to carry every vote and item of each estimate does make it incumbent that we do call every item for voting.

MR. SMALLWOOD: On that point of order, Mr. Chairman. Whether or not the members of the people's House in response to the Queen's ministers for money debate the request, we certainly have to vote the money or refuse to vote it, item by item.

On motion Heading IX - Recreation and Rehabilitation all items without amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading XII - Forestry and Agriculture.

On motion Heading XII - Forestry and Agriculture all items without amendment, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading XIII - Tourism.

On motion Heading XIII - Tourism all items without amendment, carried.

MR. NEARY: Could we have a counted vote?

MR. CHAIRMAN: A counted vote on Heading XIII - Tourism.

MR. WELLS: The members must stand in their place, Mr. Chairman.

MR. MURPHY: If you want to pass it on division stay on division.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour please stand on Heading XIII.

A counted vote has been called.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What are we voting?

MR. MURPHY: We have no idea, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What!

MR. MURPHY: The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is a little bit sleepy, I think. He wants to get home.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those voting "Aye" to Heading XIII - Tourism, please stand.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those voting "nay" to Heading XIII - Tourism please stand. The "ayes" have it twenty-four to one.

Heading XVI - Industrial Development.

Shall 1501-01 carry?

A standing vote has been called on 1501-01.

All those voting "aye" in favour please stand. All those voting "nay" please stand. The "ayes" have it twenty-seven to two.

On motion 1501-01 carried.

On motion 1501-02 through to 1503-03-02 carried.

MR. DOODY: On 1503-04, Your Honour, we move that that \$500,000 capital protection of refinery assets be deleted from the estimates as the receiver now has taken over that responsibility, and we move instead that an amount of \$365,000 under the same subhead as a current account commitment, 1503-04 be inserted in the amount of \$365,000 entitled, assistance to Come by Chance employees, which is really Provincial Refining employees, assistance to Provincial Refining employees, \$365,000. So delete \$500,000 capital and insert \$365,000 in current.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The \$135,000 go to the minister's salary.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is the Committee in favour of the adoption of the amendment. All those in favour "aye." Contrary "nay." Carried.

On motion 1503-04 with amendment, carried.

On motion 1503-05 through to 1507 carried.

On motion Heading XI - Industrial Development with amendments carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading XVII - Transportation and Communications.

Shall I report Heading XVII - Transportation and Communications without amendment? All those in favour -

MR. NEARY: In view of the poor performance of the minister, Sir, I would like to have the total counted, the vote on the total counted. Count of vote.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The question has not yet been put. Shall I report Heading XVII - Transportation and Communications without amendment?

All those in favour "aye." Contrary "nay." Carried.

MR. NEARY: Could we have a count of vote?

MR. CHAIRMAN: A count of vote has been requested.

All those in favour please stand in their place. All those voting "nay" stand in their place. Thirty-one "aye." One "nay." Motion carried.

Heading XVIII - Public Works and Services.

On motion 1801-01 through to 1803-04 carried.

MR. DOODY: On 1803-05, Your Honour, we move that that be increased by \$100,000 for the alterations that will be necessary to put the court room facilities in for these two learned gentlemen who have recently been appointed to the two district courts which was referred to earlier in the justice vote. It is another \$100,000. So it is \$100,000 addition to that subhead 1803-05 Justice construction. Well it is not Justice but it is for them.- Public Works and Services. So that is to be increased by \$100,000.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the amendment? All those in favour "aye." Contrary "nay." Carried.

On motion 1803-05 with amendment, carried.

On motion 1804-01 through to 1804-03 carried.

MR. DOODY: On 1804-04 Your Honour it is the same. There is another amendment. That subhead should be increased by \$36,000. Once again it is for furniture and equipment for these two hon. gentlemen who have recently been appointed to the two new district courts in the Province. So that is a \$36,000 addition for the two new district courts.

MR. NEARY: What kind of furniture do they have?

MR. DOODY: I do not know but it sounds like a better job than this one.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the amendment? All those in favour "aye." Contrary "nay." Carried.

On motion 1804-04 with amendment carried.

On motion 1805-01 through to 1809-03 carried.

On motion Heading XVIII - Public Works and Services
with amendment carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Heading XIX - Municipal Affairs and Housing
all items without amendment carried.

Mr. Chairman: Head XX - Consumer Affairs and Environment.

On motion Head XX - Consumers Affairs and Environment all items carried.

MR. WELLS: I move that the Committee rise, report progress.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It is moved that the Committee rise and report progress. Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the motion, all those in favour -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Chairman, before the Committee rises could the Minister of Finance tell me, of the \$1, 250,000,000, the government proposes to spend this year. how much have we now passed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: All of it.

MR. DOODY: We have passed all of it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I do not think so.

MR. DOODY: We have passed, you know, -

MR. SMALLWOOD: One billion -

MR. DOODY: One billion two hundred and fifty million dollars is your figure, that is not the figure that is in the estimates.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No that is why I want to know how much of that have we passed?

MR. DOODY: Well it is in here under the two subheads.

MR. SMALLWOOD: But we have not passed all of it?

MR. DOODY: Under Current Account then -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Some of it is under other legislation?

MR. DOODY: That is right. There is a little over \$1 billion under Current and Capital.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well there is a quarter of a billion not here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Just a quarter of a billion. Just \$250 billion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Is it the pleasure of the Committee to adopt the motion, all those in favour "Aye" contrary "Nay", carried.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress,

Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having passed estimates of expenditure under the following headings, XIV, I, II, IV, V, IX, XII, XIII, XV, XVII, XIX, XX all without amendments, and III - Executive Council, VII - Justice and XVIII - Public Works and Services with amendments, and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and have passed the following headings of expenditure without amendment XIV, I, II, IV, V, IX, XII, XIII, XV, XVII, XIX and XX, and have passed the following heads of expenditure with amendment III, VII, XVIII.

On Motion report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, it now being five minutes to ten I understand from most members that they would appreciate going home a little early this evening as the estimates have been passed so I would move, Mr. Speaker, that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday at 3:00 o'clock in the afternoon.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 12, at 3:00 P.M.

CONTENTS

May 11, 1976	Page 1
Presenting Petitions	7284
By Mr. Rowe on behalf of 132 residents of Woodstock asking that the road leading to the community be upgraded and paved.	
Supported by: Mr. Winsor	7285
By Mr. Rideout on behalf of 132 residents of Woodstock who want CNT services in the area.	7285
Spoken to by: Mr. Morgan.	7285
By Mr. Patterson in behalf of residents of Fair Haven, complaining of poor telephone service.	7286
Supported by: Mr. Neary	7287
Mr. Winsor	7288
Mr. Morgan	7289
By Mrs. MacIsaac in behalf of 201 residents of Codroy Valley, seeking provision of a larger slaughtering facility instead of those presently in use there.	7289
Supported by: Mr. Neary	7290
Mr. Rousseau	7292
Mr. Woodrow	7292
Oral Questions	
Query as to why no tenders have been called for the Great Northern Peninsula road and when will tenders be called. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Morgan.	7394
Nature of the holdup. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Morgan.	7294
Query as to whether the holdup is here or in Ottawa. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Crosbie.	7295
Executive action by the Government of Canada. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Crosbie.	7295
Unemployment statistics. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	7296
Programmes to be started. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	7298
Mr. Neary gave notice that he was dissatisfied with responses given by Mr. Wells, and that he wished to debate them on the adjournment.	7299
Economy class use in travel. Mr. Roberts, Premier Moores.	7299
Premier requested to confirm long-standing practice that Cabinet Ministers use second class on flights within Canada. Mr. Roberts, Premier Moores.	7300
Query as to whether letters objecting to changes in the means and extent of water run-offs have been received by the Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment. Mr. Flight, Mr. Murphy.	7300
Query as to whether people whose property was damaged have a right to reimbursement. Mr. Flight, Mr. Murphy.	7301
Eastcan's plans for offshore drilling. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Crosbie.	7301

Oral Questions (continued)	Page 2
Query re Eastcan's ability to find additional equipment. Mr. Rowe, Mr. Crosbie.	7303
Strike of employees in the White Hills area. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan.	7304
Supplies of beef locally. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Morgan.	7305
Query on the joint consultative committee. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan.	7306
Query as to whether the minister will obtain whatever information collected by the joint consultative committee. Mr. Neary, Mr. Morgan.	7307
Purpose of a conference to be held in Toronto. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Crosbie.	7307
Information sought as to Government action concerning thousands of cords of wood procured by Price (Nfld.) Ltd. are floating in Red Indian Lake. Mr. Flight, Mr. Rousseau.	7309
Query as to whether consideration is being given to the spending of public money to clean up Red Indian Lake. Mr. Nolan, Mr. Rousseau.	7310
- 0 -	
Mr. Neary made a motion to move the adjournment of the House for the purpose of discussing a matter of urgent public importance, namely, unemployment.	7310
Mr. Speaker ruled the motion not in order.	7312
- 0 -	
Orders of the Day	
The House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole on Supply.	
Head <u>XIV</u> - Fisheries Estimates (continued)	
Subhead 1401-01	
Mr. Carter	7312
Capt. Winsor	7337
Mr. Neary	7350
Mr. Crosbie	7370
Mr. Smallwood	7390
The Committee rose at 6:00 P.M.	7397
The Committee resumed at 8:00 P.M.	7398
Head <u>XIV</u> - Fisheries Estimates (continued)	
Mr. Smallwood (continued)	7398
Premier Moores	7421
The 75 hours allowed for debating the estimates came to an end.	7434
The Committee of Supply considered the matters to them referred having passed the following headings without amendment, XIV, I, II, IV, V, IX, XII, XIII, XV, XVII, XIX, and XX, and the following with amendment, III, VII, XVIII, asked leave to sit again and were ordered to sit on tomorrow.	
Adjournment.	7445