

4597

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY,

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 20, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I wish to make the following statement in connection with the big game licencing for 1977 concerning season dates and moose, caribou quotas.

This year 11,000 moose licences will be available to resident hunters. This is an increase of 1,417 over 1976. Caribou licences also show an increase of 185 over the 1976 figure with 1,450 licences available for 1977. While the number of big game licences has increased for the resident hunters in Newfoundland, non-resident hunters will find a decline in the number of licences available to them. There will be a decrease of 105 moose licences and 35 caribou licences from the 1976 licence allocation.

Since the introduction of a licence quota on big game in 1973 the sale of licences to non-resident hunters has steadily declined today to the point where the Province is currently issuing only twenty-five per cent of the number issued prior to the 1973 season, 400 versus 1,800. Non-resident hunting is restricted to the inaccessible hunting areas which are not popular with resident hunters.

The season dates are approximately the same as 1976. The earliest opening date for moose on the West Coast, Coast, Central Newfoundland, Southern Coastal areas and Northern Peninsula is September 17th. The Avalon Peninsula and Coastal hunting areas along Notre Dame Bay area opens on October 29th. The caribou hunting season begins on September 10th. for all areas except the Northern Peninsula which opens September 12th.

Three of the four new caribou herds opened in 1975 will

MR. HICKEY: again have an open season this year. Grey Island and Fogo Island will open September 3rd. and close on September 15th. Merasheen Island will open from September 10th. to September 24th.

Applications for these three areas - Grey Island, Fogo Island and Merasheen Island - are restricted to residents of the immediate area of the herds. _____

MR. HICKEY:

Any adjustment in season dates have been made as a result of comments from the 1976 moose licensing returns. The special bow hunting areas for moose hunters have been increased to nine. Three areas on the West coast will be open to hunters using bow and arrows only -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Definitely bow and arrows?

MR. HICKEY: - yes - from September 17 to September 30 the areas are Trout River, Corner Brook and South Brook. The Eastern portion of the Island will have the following areas open from October 15 to October 28; Twin Lakes, Lewisporte, Bonavista North, Placentia, Salmonier and the Southern Shore. No special license is issued for the bow season. The only requirements being hunters are to use bow and arrow only and are not permitted to carry firearms. However, during the regular season hunters may use either firearms or bow and arrow.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Suppose a man wounds an animal with a bow and arrow, he is not allowed to carry a gun and the poor animal just suffers and dies.

MR. DOODY: It is dangerous to use a bow if he is too close anyway.

MR. HICKEY: No, he is to use another bow and kill it.

MR. MORGAN: An arrow I hope.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Has the minister ever tried that?

AN HON. MEMBER: It is just as well to kill it with a bow, 'Tom'.

MR. HICKEY: The minister is not too good with the bow. Everyone else is pretty good at him.

Applications for big game licenses will be available in early May through all post offices, wildlife offices and a number of government offices to be announced at a later date. As announced earlier, applications will be delivered in person to designated government offices and government officials. A complete list of locations of these offices, hours of operation, etc. will be publicized in newspapers throughout the Province well in advance of the period for accepting applications.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Social Services.

MR. BPETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Child Welfare Regulations of 1976, the Day Care and Homemaker Service Regulations of 1976, and the Day Care and Homemaker Services Amended Regulations of 1976.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I am awfully glad Your Honour heard my voice raised as it was. Mr. Speaker, my question, in the absence of the Premier and in the absence of the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation, is addressed to the acting minister. I understand the Minister of Tourism is the acting minister of that department. It grows out of the Premier's statement to the House yesterday, Mr. Speaker, his Ministerial Statement, and out of certain statements which have been made since then including statements made by Mr. Malcolm Smeaton who is the - I think his correct title is Business Manager with the Nurses Union as opposed to the APNN. The minister, I have no doubt has heard the statement, is aware of it. Could the minister tell us please, Mr. Speaker, when his officials, the Recreation Department officials, Rehabilitation Department officials, first became aware of the APNN complaints or the fact that the APNN had raised these serious matters?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the officials, meaning the deputy minister and the director of homes for special care of the Department of R and R, were aware of the brief for some three weeks prior to last week. I think it was approximately three and a half to four weeks ago that that was submitted. They were aware of some concerns of some nurses and also that members of the executive of the Nursing Association for some time - I cannot put a figure on the length of time - aware of concerns, aware of items which had been discussed of a general nature and in general terms but were

MR. HICKEY: not aware of any specific document by way of evidence to substantiate any of the concerns it expressed.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister. I understand that he said the deputy minister has for a month been aware of 'some concerns'; I think was the minister's phrase, but that these were not necessarily the concerns expressed in the memorandum from the ARNN. Is that a correct interpretation? I want to be sure I understood the minister correctly, if that is correct I will go on with the supplementary.

MR. HICKEY: No, Mr. Speaker, I think what I said was that the officials, meaning the deputy and the Director of Homes, were aware of the items as listed in the memorandum for some - approximately three weeks, because it was received approximately three weeks ago, were unaware of any evidence, documented evidence, letters signed, giving names, etc., etc.

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

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister for that. Let me then go at it a different way because I do not want to get into a debate. I am not allowed to, in fact. I do not want to get into an argument over semantics.

The Deputy Minister met on November 15th. with a group including representatives of the nurses and including, I am told, the gentleman from Mount Scio (Dr. Winsor), who is at present away from Newfoundland on public business. What that meeting brought to the attention of the minister? Were the matters discussed there brought to the attention of the minister?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I was made aware of that meeting to which the Leader of the Opposition refers.

AN HON. MEMBER: The minister or the acting minister.

MR. ROBERTS: With the minister, but the Acting Minister is the gentleman -

MR. HICKEY: I think it is fair to say that the minister met with those people at that particular time.

MR. ROBERTS: In November?

MR. HICKEY: I believe it was November. I am not sure of dates, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Leader of the Opposition can appreciate -

MR. ROBERTS: I understood there was a meeting in March with the minister.

MR. HICKEY: Well it could have been. I am not sure about the November one. I do know that my colleague the minister, and the deputy minister, met with those people and a couple of nurses, two or three, I do not know how many. Items were discussed at that meeting, concerns of one kind and another, but again no documented evidence.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister tells us that his colleague, the minister, the gentleman from Gander (Mr. H. Collins) met in - we know there was a meeting in March, I understand there was one in December as well, that is the one of which Mr. Smeaton spoke overnight.

What I do not understand is what action was taken following these meetings. I know that eventually a memorandum dated March 24th. was submitted by the ARNN and apparently nothing was done on that. But what action did the minister take after meetings were held by his deputy minister and by himself about the situation at Exon House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there has been a number of improvements and action was taken. I cannot be specific in terms of the number of items, and certainly with a little time one could pin down and get the areas of concern as expressed by those people and the ones that we have been able to sort out or rectify to date. But I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that

MR. HICKEY: a number of areas were corrected, a number of actions were taken, and it is in this context that I meant when I said the items were of administrative nature or concern with regards to shifts -

MR. ROBERTS: It did not deal with abuses, is that it?

MR. HICKEY: -when nurses would be on duty and so on and so forth.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Hold on 'John'. Did the minister say they did not deal with abuses?

MR. HICKEY: No, no, Mr. Speaker, I did not say that. There was discussion but no concrete evidence to support it. There were concerns expressed, some of those concerns led into discussion of schedules,

MR. HICKEY:

who is on duty, etc. and as I said a number of those areas have been corrected, were corrected as a result of those meetings and as a result of the representations.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed a further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A further supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Because the matters gets murkier and more complicated the more we get into it. What I do not understand—and perhaps the minister could help us — is how the meetings and the action which resulted — and I appreciate the minister's frankness and being so forthcoming — there were meetings involving the minister and the deputy minister and action did result; how the minister squares that with the statement the Premier made yesterday in which he said, and I quote, "What is upsetting to government is that these complaints were never brought to ministerial attention"?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: The complaints, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier referred to were specific complaints of abuse child abuse, kicking a child, concerns about the programme, training programme versus the functioning of the nursing people, the nursing staff, those were the things that I was referring to. What the Premier was referring to yesterday when he talked about this information not getting to the ministerial level — and I can say for that matter even to the deputy minister level—and which prompted the Premier yesterday to ask for and look for an investigation within the department was the fact that the documented evidence, the letters, supporting some of the things as contained in that brief did not reach the ministerial level or the deputy minister level and as a result of that this is what the Premier was referring to.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NOLAN: In his statement yesterday the hon. the Premier — this question is to the Minister of Tourism or acting Minister at the moment of

MR. NOLAN:

Rehabilitation - the Premier mentioned that he was going to bring in certain highly qualified people and so on to take a look at the Exon House and I would assume make recommendations and so on. But on the basis of the information, rightly or wrongly, that has now been made available through the press and so on, does the minister not think that we need an indepth hands-length investigation right now and that the report of that should be made public to clear this up?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I concur fully and totally with what the hon. the Premier announced yesterday because, as I have said to the media on a couple of occasions, I have been associated with Exon House and I do have an appreciation for the problems there and the nature of some of those problems and how some of the issues can be blown out of proportion. There is and there will be an in-house investigation -

MR. NOLAN: In-house is no good.

MR. HICKEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, it may not satisfy the hon. gentleman -

MR. NOLAN: That is right, it does not.

MR. HICKEY: but the fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that we are satisfied that the proper and appropriate action is being taken by government with regards to this issue and the greatest thing to come from it is a full assessment of the training programme and all that goes with it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Fisheries, Sir. In view of the fact that the lobster season opened in certain parts of Newfoundland today, and we are just about into the salmon season, could the minister give the House some idea of what returns the lobster fishermen are going to get for their labour and the salmon fishermen. Has the Advisory Board arrived at any recommendations to the minister or to the fishermen?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, no, I do not have any specific information as to what lobster fishermen and salmon fishermen will be getting for their catches. But certainly I understand that the union is now negotiating with lobster buyers with a view to having a much better price paid for lobster this year than in previous years. I think the lobster fishermen have registered complaints, and rightly so, that the amount they are getting per pound is far less than that paid Nova Scotian fishermen. And certainly I think the trade can and should be compelled to pay more than is presently being paid.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House what role the Fishery Advisory Board is playing in all this? Have they done any research on the price of lobsters, salmon and cod because we are almost into the cod fishery on the East Coast? Have they done any research on the prices of fish?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the Advisory Board is pretty well an ongoing situation. They have their intelligence people in the market place, and it is pretty well an ongoing situation where almost on a daily basis they are advised of the market price for different types of fish especially in the American market. Certainly the Advisory Board would be very concerned about the price of salmon and lobster and indeed codfish, and I am sure that if and when the time comes they will be very anxious to lend their support and help to the union and indeed anyone else, including the trade itself, in helping to establish a firm price for these two species.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate to the House whether or not the government, the minister or his department endorses the efforts of the lobster fishermen to get \$2 a pound for their lobsters this year? Is this supported by the minister or by the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, not only do we support the proposition that lobster fishermen should get more, we are seriously giving some thought to some kind of an arrangement whereby lobsters can be held over, because apparently what happens is that Nova Scotia lobstermen I think get as high as \$3 a pound, but then when the Newfoundland lobster comes on the markets then that, according to the Nova Scotians, that will have the effect of depressing the prices in the market place. So we are seriously looking at the possibility of providing storage areas, and this by the way, this suggestion came to light in a meeting we held in Port Saunders some months ago, was brought up by the lobster fishermen there and, I might add, supported by the union -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Reserving them high?

MR. W. CARTER: - yes - setting up areas, maybe in Placentia Bay; it

MR. W. CARTER: cannot be done on the St. Barbe Coast. Apparently there is three or four inches of fresh water on the water in that area and this makes it pretty -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not the whole Coast.

MR. W. CARTER: No, but in the areas where lobster would normally be stored. And this makes it impossible for lobsters to be stored in that area alive. There is a layer of fresh water. I think my colleague was at the meeting when this came out. I think he has probably had -

MR. MAYNARD: In every bay and cove.

MR. W. CARTER: In every bay and cove on the Coast.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is the difference in those bay and coves and bays and coves all over the Island?

MR. DOODY: More fresh water, fortunately.

MR. W. CARTER: And you have maybe less tide or - I cannot explain why but -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It hardly sounds right.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes. But it is right. The biologists have studied it and they found that there is a layer of fresh water which makes it impossible for lobsters to be stored alive successfully. So we are actively looking into the possibility maybe not this year, but certainly maybe next year, providing pounds or some kind of folding areas where lobsters can be transported alive, kept in those areas -

MR. SMALLWOOD: For how long?

MR. W. CARTER: Well they can be kept there pretty well indefinitely, I think. Under proper conditions they can -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do you have to feed them?

MR. W. CARTER: I would think so. Then allow them to go into the market place at the appropriate time and not during the glut period.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is one of the most exciting things I have heard in this session.

MR. W. CARTER: Thank you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: This is very exciting.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Tourism, in his position of Acting Minister of Health and Rehabilitation and Recreation. I understand there is a memorandum delivered by the ARMN to the Recreation and Rehabilitation Department on March 24, 1977. I wonder if the minister could tell the House to whom this memorandum was addressed? Who was it sent to?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: To be very honest, Mr. Speaker, I do not recall, I have a copy of the document and I am not quite sure. I do not want to take a chance on suggesting some name. I know that it went to the department.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the original questioner.

MR. RIDEOUT: I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether in fact this particular memorandum referred to was indeed brought to the minister's attention?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: I take the question to be, Mr. Speaker, was it brought to my colleague's attention?

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, you as the Acting Minister.

MR. HICKEY: I am not sure. I would have to ask that question as such. I stated earlier I know that my colleague was aware of some concerns.

MR. HICKEY:

at the institution. He took some appropriate action on those concerns. As regards to this particular document, I do not really know.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: I wonder then if the minister could tell the House does he know, as the acting minister, what became of this memorandum?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I know what became of it. It was being acted upon by the department. Now, Mr. Speaker, this is very, very serious. I do not know what the line of questioning is -

MR. RIDEOUT: This line of questioning is serious.

MR. HICKEY: - and I do not question the right of an hon. gentleman to question as on those issues. But I want to make it abundantly clear -

MR. FLIGHT: We are concerned about what is happening at Exon.

MR. HICKEY: - that this document, if there is any suggestion that this document was in the Department of Rehabilitation and Recreation and was not being acted upon, then that is completely wrong because it is an untruth. It was being acted upon and I have already stated earlier in defence of my colleague that he did take action, was aware of some of those issues. I cannot truthfully or otherwise say that he had the document in his hands. So therefore I am not going to answer that question. But I do know that he did respond to certain issues which were the same kind of issues that were referred to in this document and that improvements and changes were being made.

MR. RIDEOUT: One further supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: One additional supplementary, the original questioner. Then the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I want to assure the hon. minister that we are as concerned on this side as he is about the matter and realize its seriousness. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not the material in the memorandum that I am talking about,

MR. RIDEOUT:

submitted last November to the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation, whether or not that memorandum indicated any abuse such as the abuses referred to in the latter reports that we have been talking about this last few days?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Yes, Mr. Speaker, there was reference to it and in fact as far as I know, as far as I can determine, this matter was discussed in a very general way prior to that. But as I stated earlier, in the absence of documented evidence - and if one says concerns for treatment of children or how children are treated, you know, that is not very much to grapple with. You must have specifics and you must have documented evidence in terms of specifics. And as far as I am concerned I am satisfied totally that that deputy minister and my colleague were not supplied with the specifics.

MR. NOLAN: Then why were you threatened yesterday at the press conference?

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

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, to a point of privilege. I have not been threatened by anyone. I have not acted under threat by anyone and the Premier of this Province has not acted under threat by anyone but indeed responded to evidence which was brought forward. And hon. gentlemen opposite should be pretty damn proud of that because we did not see that happen for a long, long time.

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

MR. NOLAN: We are not proud of 'Harold'.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman has made his explanation under a point of privilege. There is no matter for decision before the Chair, and I have indicated the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question again is to the Minister of Tourism, but it is relative to his Ministerial Statement today with regards to the issuing of big game licences. The statement indicated that there is an increase of 1,400 licences this year over 1976. Would the minister indicate to the House what was the basis

MR. FLIGHT:

for that increase, whether it was because his department determined that the moose population of this Province could stand that type of an increase?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, we only increase -

MR. MORGAN: We had four calves last year!

MR. HICKEY: We only increase the - Mr. Speaker if I could answer the question from my hon. friend. We only increase the quotas and the number of licenses to be issued when the population will allow it, and I can say that the fact that there has been an increase simply means that the biologist and the people who are concerned with conservation and management are prepared to state that we can afford and can allow and the herd can sustain that kind of a year.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: The minister indicated that there would be four hundred, approximately 400 non-resident licenses this year. How will those licenses be issued? Directly to the non-resident applicant or to the outfitters who will take the man in the woods?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the system

MR. HICKEY: whereby that is handled is through the outfitters in the Province. We make available to them a number of licences. They tell us their requirements and we make available to them a number of licences and they in turn sell them to the hunters.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The final supplementary, then I will recognize the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Would the minister indicate to the House if the resident hunters this year will have to remit their licence fees with their applications, as opposed to remitting their licence fees upon receiving their licences as they did last year? Will the applicants have to remit their \$15 with the application this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Yes they will, Mr. Speaker; as they hand in the application they will pay for it.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated that would be the end of the supplementaries in that line. It does not mean the hon. gentleman may not later perhaps get back with a question.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is addressed again to the Minister of Tourism, but in his other capacity as Acting Minister of Rehabilitation, if I can make myself heard at this point.

Mr. Speaker, the minister has told us - and we appreciate and share his concern with this situation at Exon House. It is very troublesome - the minister has told us that his colleague, the minister, the gentleman from Gander, was aware of, I forget the precise word the minister - I think

MR. ROBERTS: complaints was the word the minister used, or concerns, well before the ARNN submitted a memorandum dated March 24th and he has told us as well that the minister was aware of the memorandum dated March 24th. Whether he had actually seen the written document or not he certainly had been told what was in it. Then the minister went on to say, Mr. Speaker, that - and this is my question although it may not be phrased as a question, but I mean it to be one - that neither the material which came forward in November or the memorandum which was submitted in March constituted documented evidence. And so accordingly I would ask when did the minister or his officials become aware of, I think the minister's phrase a few seconds ago in the House was documented evidence, of documented evidence of the potential or possible or reported abuses of children at Exon House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, to correct one point the Leader of -

MR. NOLAN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry I cannot hear the minister's reply.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman stated he cannot hear the minister's reply, so presumably the minister should speak louder or others will speak softer or a combination of both.

The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. MORGAN: That would be a good compromise.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, to make one correction in the preamble by the Leader of the Opposition, I stated that the document as produced by the Nursing Association did not constitute evidence as such.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then somebody -

MR. HICKEY: Yes, but I did not make any reference to documents submitted, let us say, in November. The whole point of the issue wherein the Premier says he wishes and wished and has announced an investigation internal, in-department probably, as well as the institution investigation. But with regards of communications

MR. HICKEY: is the fact that the evidence which prompted us to act yesterday was submitted by the institution, or by people at the institution to the department, but that that information, that documentation did not reach either minister or the deputy minister until this past weekend.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Again, if I may be permitted very briefly, my understanding now is that the March 24th memorandum did contain evidence, to use the minister's phrase. No, I am sorry, that is not correct. Okay. The November memorandum did include "evidence" - that is correct, okay and that it was submitted in November but that it was not brought to the attention of the minister, or I think the hon. gentleman added the deputy minister, Mr. Pike, in this case. Well, can the minister tell us then how that squares with the meeting which was held in November 1976 to which I earlier referred that was attended by the deputy minister, by Mr. Moore, the Director of Special Care Homes, by the gentleman from Mt. Scio, who I assume was present in a professional capacity and

Mr. Roberts.

a number of other people? What was discussed at that meeting then if it was not the November memorandum?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the discussions at that meeting to the best of my knowledge, and based on the questions that I asked about it, centred around the overall conditions at the institution: One, the absence of a director or nursing, absence of an administrator. I am not sure if the administrator was gone at that point, but certainly it was during that time that he was leaving and so on. You see, there has been a new administrator of the institution, and a new director of nursing since that time.

MR. ROBERTS: Could the minister get the statement?

MR. HICKEY: As well as that, some other areas of concern but not to my knowledge, and based on my questions and the answers I have received, no such kind of evidence, which could be considered as evidence by way of documented.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

A very brief one. Could the minister get for the House - and I realize he probably will not have this himself now - two bits of information which I think may help to complete the jigsaw puzzle and thus show us the full picture? First of all the date of the meeting to which he just referred, the meeting at which the question of administrator and director of nursing and so forth was discussed; and secondly, the exact course? There was a memorandum dated - my information, which comes from what I understand to be very reliable sources, recommendations from ARNN were delivered to a ministerial official on November 25, and this apparently is the memorandum to which the minister refers to of having evidence of some abuses and which was not brought to the attention of the deputy minister and so forth. And this is

Mr. Roberts.

why I ask if he could get the identity of that official and what he did with the document, and secondly, the date of the meeting to which he just referred?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, for once and for all, the information which we see, which constitutes the necessity for the announcement by the Premier yesterday to look at the whole situation at Exon House, comes to us or came to us not in the form of a brief. It was not handed to anyone. It was sent through the mails, and they were in the form of letters.

MR. ROBERTS: When?

MR. HICKEY: Some time last Fall, I believe the month of November.

MR. ROBERTS: That is what I am talking about.

MR. HICKEY: And they did not come. But it was not a document in terms of a brief or anything of that nature.

MR. ROBERTS: No. Recommendations is the phrase I have been using. But in November? Well, why no investigation until now?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River followed by the hon. gentleman for LaPoile.

MR. HICKEY: Because, Mr. Speaker, we did not know about it until this weekend. Those are the documents that we say did not come to our attention.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications. It is a totally different subject. Could the minister give us an update on any negotiations or progress concerning the possible airstrip programme for the Labrador Coast?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the progress being made to date is to the effect that the federal government has carried out a master

Mr. Morgan.

plan or survey which resulted in a master plan for airstrips on the coast in Labrador. The Federal Minister, the hon. Otto Lang, has indicated the possibility of getting some of these strips moving or started in the 1977 construction season. However, a meeting will be convened some time in the very near future at Ottawa between the federal minister and myself and possibly the MP for the area, Mr. Rompkey, and we will be discussing the matter further in the hope that funds will be allocated this year to get at least two or possibly three airstrips started along the coast this year.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. STRACHAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: If it is a brief supplementary, I will permit it.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, it is as brief as previous ones.

Could the minister tell us whether the airstrip at Cartwright will be completed this year? It was supposed to be completed last year, but could he instruct us whether that will be completed this year, and whether the one at Rigolet will be started this year and hopefully completed?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, The airstrip at Cartwright was commended under the provincial government's plan to develop airstrips along the coast, and this was separate from the master plan now devised by the federal level of government. But that airstrip, tenders were let last year with a contractor from Deer Lake, Chalks Construction. We will be continuing that development there in 1977, hopefully to completion, maybe not to full completion by means of paving the strip, but by at least the total construction. And that programme is strictly under the provincial government funding with very little output from the federal level of government financially, in fact to the amount of only \$100,000.

MR. MORGAN: In Rigolet, Mr. Speaker, the situation there is we have a maintenance unit from our own department in Rigolet. The equipment was moved in last Fall. That equipment will stay in Rigolet until we complete the road reconstruction around the community and at least get the airstrip to a point where it can be used.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile, as I indicated earlier.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir, and I might say I gave the minister notice of this question a couple of days ago because I would not expect the answer off the top of the Minister's head. But with the controversy that has arisen because of the supersonic plane, the Concord that is now jetting back and forth across the Atlantic and that has landed at Gander and will probably be making landings at Gander, has the minister's department done any research in connection with the problems that are arising in other countries in connection with the Concord? Is there any danger to the hearing, for instance, of the people in Gander with the Concord landing at Gander? Has the minister's department done any research on this matter at all?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, last year the Concord landed at Gander as we all know and did a considerable number of tests at the Gander Airport. The runways at the airport were found to be satisfactory to the Concord people and the pilots etc., and also from my reports that have been gathered by the Director of Air Services in the Department of Transportation and Communications, Mr. Simmons, indications are from the people concerned in

MR. MORGAN: the Gander area, that they are quite pleased to be able to, hopefully, avail of the services of the Concord.

There are no complaints with regard to the noise level etc. which we hear from other parts of the world, particularly in the States these days, with regards to the Concord. So all indications are, and I would like to point out to the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, unfortunately last Fall I was asked to take a trip on the Concord as Minister of Transportation in the Province here, from Gander to London but unfortunately my busy schedule would not allow me to get away from my office.

AN HON. MEMBER: I signed the petition.

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker, the indications are that the Concord people are quite satisfied with the Gander Airport and the facilities there. The people of Gander are quite satisfied and hopefully can avail of the services of the Concord.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The thirty minutes have expired.

It being Private Members' Day the adjourned debate on Motion 10.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I only have a few minutes left in my support of the resolution, Sir, to appoint a select committee of the House to look into this whole matter of joint ventures.

I pretty well covered all the points that I wanted to make, Sir, and so I will only be a few more minutes. I know the minister is anxious to probably get into this debate. Mr. Speaker, I will be very, very interested in hearing what the minister has to say about joint ventures because I believe the

MR. NEARY: first joint venture in the whole history of Canada, probably in the history of North America, has just concluded.

I was listening the other day to a captain of a West German ship being interviewed, I believe it was by the CBC, and the gentleman - maybe I have the wrong impression, or I misinterpreted the gentleman - but he seemed to be less than enthusiastic about the success of this joint venture principle. I also heard, I believe it was one of the fish plant operators commenting on it, and he seemed to be a little more enthusiastic but I could not understand why.

My understanding, Mr. Speaker, of the first joint venture attempt in this Province is that it has been a complete flop and a failure. It has failed. We have not been able to find out in this House, Sir, who is paying for the landing

Mr. Neary:

and the processing of the fish in this Province. Is it the West Germans? Is it the federal government? Is it the provincial government? Is the cost shared jointly by the Province, by the West German people or by the government? What are the financial arrangements? I have put questions to the Minister of Fisheries and to the Premier about the cost of this joint venture. Because I am told that the processing of the fish cost much more than fish that is landed by Newfoundland boats. It has to be taken ashore. I believe it is landed in Harbour Grace, it is de - what do you call defrozen?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Defrosted.

MR. NEARY: Defrosted. It has to be left for a period of time so that fish can thaw out because it is frozen when it is brought ashore, and then it has to be trucked down to Marystown.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not trucked after defrosting.

MR. NEARY: It has to be trucked - well, Mr. Speaker, my source of information in the community of Harbour Grace tells me that it did not create one single job in the community of Harbour Grace.

MR. H. YOUNG: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Processing. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have not had a report since Monday, maybe they did start on Monday, but the fishing industry is now starting again on the East Coast. I do not know if they are processing West German fish or processing local fish. And I want the minister to give us a few details. Mr. Speaker, that is why I am making these statements.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is nonsense.

MR. NEARY: It may be nonsense. Maybe it is nonsense. But I want to know who is paying for it. I want to know if the fish plants are being subsidized.

MR. W. CARTER: The West Germans are paying for it.

MR. NEARY: The West Germans are paying for it, so the minister tells us, well I want the minister to -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Because it is their fish?

MR. W. CARTER: So much per pound.

MR. SMALLWOOD: They catch it. They take it away back to Germany, so it is their fish, so they pay for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: So, Mr. Speaker, then do I understand from the minister that that this joint venture will not cost the taxpayers of this Province one cent? Is that the understanding the minister is giving the House, that the full cost of this pilot project will be borne by the West Germans?

MR. W. CARTER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Well okay, well and good then, Sir.

But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to hear from the minister if the first joint venture attempted in this Province up to now has been a success or not, and I would like to get the minister's reaction.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What they just had is a one shot thing. Now is that the pattern of the -

MR. NEARY: That is right. Well that is what we want to know, if this is going to -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well this is the first joint venture of 6,000 metric tons of West German fish that was suppose to be put ashore in Newfoundland, processed at Harbour Grace and at Marystown. Now I would also like to know why it was necessary to put it ashore in Harbour Grace. During the landing of this fish in Harbour Grace I am told by a very reliable source of information in that community that it did not create one job, putting that fish ashore at Harbour Grace. Now it may have created jobs now, I do not know about now in the plant, but it was trucked down to Marystown, and it was either processed or is in the process of being run through the plant now at Marystown. But I have been told - I do not know perhaps the minister can straighten me out on this, that they did not anticipate such huge ships, that the ships would be so big, and that they could not dock at Marystown, and they had to land their fish at Harbour Grace.

Mr. Neary:

But anyway these are a few details, Sir, that I would like to find out, and perhaps the minister can straighten us out. But, Mr. Speaker, the main thing is that we want to find out if this is going to set a pattern for the future. Because if it is, Sir, in my opinion, it could turn out to be a very, very dangerous pilot project. It could be very dangerous for the trawler fishermen in this Province, and in this country, not only in Newfoundland, but in the whole of Eastern Canada. Because if the fish plant operators who up to now have not been prepared to reinvest in the fishery of this Province, who have not been prepared to build fleets of draggers and trawlers that are necessary to provide the capability to catch the fish, and they take the line of least resistance and they find that the Europeans are easier to deal with, there are no unions, that productivity is greater than it is here on the Island of Newfoundland, then that is the route they are going to take, and they are going to force our own people off the very high seas that we fought so hard to get for the implementation of the 200 mile limit. And that is the danger and the weakness in playing around with the joint venture system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister himself just came back from a jaunt to Europe with the Premier to look at some boats and ships

MR. NEARY: ⁷ over there and I am not 100 per cent opposed to that. I think it could probably be a temporary measure to try to provide the capability to catch the fish that we are allowed to catch within the 200 mile limit, but it should not be a long-term plan. If these trawlers and boats are going to be leased they should be leased on a one year contract, one year charter. Because, Mr. Speaker, I think most members of this House will agree with me that what we should do is to - while this is only a temporary, stop-gap measure - is to look at what our requirements are going to be for the next ten or fifteen or twenty years.

MR. CARTER: We are doing that now.

MR. NEARY: Doing it now. I am glad to hear it, Sir. But I am raising it and I hope the minister will respond, because I think it is something that needs to be straightened out too. For instance, we have to decide, we have to decide in this Province and in this country, in Eastern Canada, if in order for us to take full advantage of the 200 mile limit if we have to build big factory ships like the Russians have now on the Grand Banks, that stay there year round. The hon. Premier, I believe, the former Premier was aboard of one of these ships, if I remember correctly.

They are huge ships, Sir, they leave Russia. They come and they stay on the Grand Banks for twelve months out of a year. They have smaller ships bringing over supplies and fuel and taking the processed fish and bringing it back to Russia.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And interchange of crews.

MR. NEARY: And interchange of crews. I think they stay for six months. What we have to decide, Sir, is whether we want to compete, if we have to compete, if we are going to be forced to catch the fish that we are allowed to catch within

MR. NEARY: the 200 mile limit, if we have to get big factory ships like the Russians have. If so will the crew be changed, say, like they do on the oil drilling rigs - once a month or every two weeks will the crew be taken back and forth on helicopter? Will they have the facilities on board?

My information, Sir, from people who have been on board of these ships is that they are absolutely magnificent ships. That they have theatres on board, they have libraries on board, they have schools on board so that young people who are interested in getting into the fishery can go and continue their education while they are living on board.

AN HON. MEMBER: And they have women on board.

MR. NEARY: And they have females on board, not to keep up the morale of the crew. They are there the same as you would work on shore in a fish plant. They have their job to do. And I understand that there have been cases when they were married on board.

MR. SMALLWOOD: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: I do not know if any children have been born on these Russian ships or not. They probably take them back -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who was married.

MR. NEARY: The crew, the workers on the factory ships. And they have great recreation facilities on board the ships. And, Mr. Speaker, what I want to know is, is the government, is the minister thinking about that kind of ship where instead of having the workers and the plant workers and the crew staying on board six months out of a year, they would probably stay for two weeks or a month and then be brought and forth to shore by helicopter, the same as they do with the oil drilling rigs. Is this what the minister is thinking about? And then a smaller type ship, dragger and trawler and what have you.

So, Mr. Speaker, there has to be some careful and serious planning put into this whole matter of the fishery in the future.

MR. NEARY:

The minister has, and I cannot help but repeat this, probably has the most responsible job now in the whole Cabinet.

SOME HON. MEMBERS Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: The fishery, Sir, and I have to say this again, the fishery in my opinion will be the most important industry in this Province in the future as it has been in the past.

MR. DOODY: I hope you will remember that on budget day.

MR. NEARY: I will, Sir, remember it on budget day, and I hope there will be a few more dollars in the Department of Fisheries estimates. Mr. Speaker, our whole lifestyle and the economy of this Province will go up or down depending on the future of the fishery. Granted, Sir, as my hon. friend has used the argument, as I have heard the hon. gentleman argue in this House many times, that you need the development of your mineral resources, that will come, that will come automatically. You need your paper mills and you need to utilize your forestry. My hon. friend may not agree you need your linerboard mills. I believe that could be a viable operation if the government had not leaped in when they should not have,

MR. NEARY:

if they had left it to private enterprise.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Or if John Crosbie had not been involved.

MR. NEARY: That is right. And we need, Mr. Speaker, we need other forms of industrial development in this Province. That will all come. But I believe our main thrust, the emphasis in the future, should be on the fishery. And we cannot afford, Mr. Speaker, to make -

MR. PATTERSON: What about, "Burn your boats?"

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is a myth, by the way. That is a myth, Sir. I have heard that quoted from one end of this country to the other. I have asked the former Premier of this Province if a statement was made to the fishermen of this Province to burn your boats. And I am told that the statement was never made, although it has been quoted, I suppose, more than any -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It never happened.

MR. PATTERSON: "Burn your boats!" I read it in a book, in fact. It was a book written about the Great Northern Peninsula.

MR. NEARY: But who was the book written by?

MR. PATTERSON: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well I am sure the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) is quite capable of speaking for himself. But I remember -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Could I have the name of the book? Write a note over and tell me.

MR. NEARY: I must say I never heard the hon. gentleman make the statement and I do not think the statement was ever made. It might have been made by somebody else, but not the hon. former Premier of this Province. I remember they used to say the hon. former Premier was a dictator. I was three and a half years in the hon. gentleman's Cabinet and not once, Sir, did the hon. gentleman interfere with my running of the Department of Social Services, not once, not once. The only time I had a little bit of -

MR. SMALLWOOD: What could the Minister of Finance be laughing about? What is funny about that statement? What merited the laughter? What was it?

MR. DOODY: I have every right to laugh if I feel like it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of course, of course.

MR. NEARY: But it is no laughing matter, Sir, because -

MR. SMALLWOOD: But if a man laughs without reason he is an imbecile. Now what is the reason?

MR. NEARY: Well, in that case we have ninety per cent on the other side, Sir, who are in that category, because last night we saw a little bit of laughter from the other side from the obnoxious statements that were being made by the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter). But, Mr. Speaker, it is no laughing matter. I do not think the statement was ever made. But anyway, I am not going to get sidetracked. The hon. gentleman can very well take care of himself. But I hope, Sir, that when the Minister of Fisheries participates in this discussion, in this debate, that the minister will lay out a short-term plan and a long-term plan for the future of the fisheries in this Province. I think the minister has a very heavy responsibility on his shoulders at the present time. I think the minister is capable of doing it. Now that is not blarney, Sir, and malarky. I have travelled with the minister. I know how the fishermen feel about him. In their hearts right now they feel that here is a minister who is sincere, who they think can help them, who they think can do something for the fishery of this Province. But we are going to have to put it on a business-like basis. We are going to have to break with tradition. We are going to have to improve our productivity. And we are going to have to do an inventory of what we have at the present time and use that as a foundation for planning for the future.

So let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the minister will be able to tell us what the government's philosophy is, what the plans are for

MR. NEARY:

the future of joint ventures and what long and short-term plans this government has for the future of the fishery in this Province. We are calling for a select committee of the House. I have an open mind on that, Sir. I am open. If the Premier and the administration feel in their wisdom that it should not be a select committee, that it should be a special committee of some kind, well then I have an open mind. I am quite prepared to go along with that. But I think, Sir, the important thing is that the government, because of the serious nature of this business, and that we cannot afford to make a single mistake or blunder at this point in time regarding the fishery, that the Premier and the administration will be well advised to draw upon the brains, if there are any brains in this House, to draw upon the intelligence and the brains of members on either side of the House, cross party lines. This is no time to be partisan, no time to be political. It is a pretty, pretty serious matter and the whole future of Newfoundland is in our hands. So I do not care if it is a special committee or a select committee. Sir, I would like to see the Premier set up some kind of a committee of members of this House representing all sides of the House to look into this whole matter of joint ventures and to assist the minister and to try and provide some help to the administration in laying down a solid foundation, to lay down a short-term programme and a long-term programme for the fishery in this Province.

MR.SPEAKER: Hon. member for Twillingate.

MR.SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, may I begin my brief remarks-I hope they will be fairly brief. One never knows in commencing a speech just how long it may turn out to be, especially if it is on the great basic original industry of this province the thing that brought people here and supported them for nearly 500 years. - I would like to begin these brief remarks by paying a tribute to the minister of Fisheries. Not because of his political beliefs or his political loyalties or his political allegiances. He began his political life as a Liberal, as a friend of mine, personal friend of mine, who worked in my office when I was Premier, did a good job in that capacity, then ran as a Liberal candidate under my leadership and sat here in this Chamber very much in the physical position he is in at the moment. He was not very far removed geographically from where he sits at this moment.

Subsequently, he having been elected deputy mayor of the ancient capital that is St. John's, he ran for the House of Commons and was elected but on another ticket under the auspices of another party. As minister of fisheries in the present administration I believe, I believe - my belief may not be shared by all hon. members on this side of the House. I cannot help that and if it is so I regret it - but my own belief is that the hon. minister is using all his ability, whatever that may be, certainly all of his sincerity and all of his personal ambition, using all that to try to do a good job as Newfoundland's minister of fisheries. I would say that all Newfoundlanders ought to appreciate that in him, as it ought to appreciate the same kind of service in any minister or any member, as it ought, in my belief, to appreciate the services that are being rendered to Newfoundland by the hon. member who just took his seat, the member for LaPoile.

Now having said that, and before I go on to ask one or two questions, may I say for the record, for perhaps for the twentieth time, that never in my life have I advised the fishermen of Newfoundland to burn their boats. Never in

MR. SMALLWOOD:

my life was I that stupid, was I that foolish, was I that silly, was I so imbecilic as to advise the fishermen of Newfoundland to destroy or to burn their twenty, thirty thousand boats or whatever the number might have been around the time that I was alleged to have said it.

I never said, Burn your boats, destroy your boats, eat your boats, do anything with your boats except use them to produce fish, or anything approaching any such remark I would have been a damnable fool. I would have been a complete imbecile, and no one ever accused me yet of being an imbecile. That is one charge that has never yet been laid against me, of being an imbecile, of being stupid. Oh, I have been charged with many things but never with the crime of stupidity. I have often quoted here in this House when I was Premier the old saying: that God could forgive every sin but one, the sin of stupidity. That is one sin that God never needed to forgive me for because I have never been stupid. I have made mistakes but I have never been stupid. How stupid would a Premier of a province have to be, the Leader of a political party in Newfoundland - now if it were Ohio or Wisconsin, perhaps

MR. SMALLWOOD: perhaps - but in Newfoundland where for 500 years the basic industry of our people has been the fishery, how stupid would the leader of a political party have to be to advise the fishermen to burn their boats?

MR. J. CARTER: I believe it though. You said that once.

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. gentleman believes it? The hon. gentleman has an inordinate capacity to believe anything evil about me. I mean, there is no limit to his credibility. He will believe anything on this earth. If someone ever hints that I committed murder he will believe it, that I committed rape he will believe it, that I committed embezzlement he will believe it, that I committed cruelty to animals or to children, that I was a wife beater he will believe it. Any crime or sin or offence or felony of any kind that anyone ever hints, he will believe that I committed it.

MR. J. CARTER: Right!

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is quite true. That is quite true and I have know this for some considerable time, and I must admit that I have not heard the hon. gentleman speak in this House ever, and I have only heard him since I have been re-elected here because he did not have the honour to occupy a seat in this House when I was here before, in those twenty-three years. But in the last year-and-a-half he has occupied a seat and I have heard him speak four or five times, and not without complete enjoyment on my part. I enjoy his wit, I enjoy the nimbleness of his speech. He has a very good command of English, he has a store of anecdotes and funny sayings, and I enjoyed every one of them. And above it all, I have marvelled, I have never ceased to marvel at the bottomless pit of his animosity, of his vindictiveness, of his hatred. I think it is

MR. SMALLWOOD: inexhaustible, and all expressed with wit and with humour and with good fun and amusement, and I have enjoyed every moment of it.

And some people have said, "How in God's name can you take that?" "Well", I have said, "if it were from the Premier, for example, or even the Minister of Finance, I would be a little more concerned. But coming from the hon. member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter), to me it is a matter of inexpressible joy and amusement." I pay the hon. gentleman that tribute, if he can accept it.

MR. YOUNG: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): I would like, Sir, for you to explain what the hon. gentleman's remarks now have to do with the joint ventures. I think he is rather irrelevant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I could explain to the hon. member, my dear friend the hon. member, who once pleaded with me with tears in his eyes to allow him to run as my candidate for the Liberal Party in Harbour Grace District, with tears in his eyes -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WHITE: How about that, 'Haigey'?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I say this to my dear friend, the hon. member, that I can explain a thing to him but only God can give him the intelligence to understand it when I do explain it. That is beyond my power to give him that much intelligence.

MR. SPEAKER (Collins): Order, please!

To rule on the point of order:

I have to rule that the hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), his remarks are not irrelevant. He did preface his remarks by stating that they did bear upon the remark ascribed to him in relation to boats and the fisheries. The hon. the member for Twillingate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SMALLWOOD: I thank Your Honour.

MR. YOUNG: What about the time you wanted me to run and I would not run?

MR. WHITE: Go home, boy.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I thank Your Honour for the ruling that Your Honour has given and I do hope that my dear friend from -

AN HON. MEMBER: What friend?

MR. SMALLWOOD: - from Harbour Grace will take due note of the fact that he must not tangle with this particular member when it comes to matters of parliamentary procedure, practice and precedent. I have quite a long record of experience in those matters that he has not yet had. He will

MR. SMALLWOOD: in the course of time no doubt if he continues to be Deputy Speaker, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, to learn and to acquire experience and knowledge, and I wish him well. I wish him well in that because I have no feeling of animosity whatever toward him, sometimes a feeling of compassion, pity, but always love and regard.

MR. YOUNG: How do you like the -

MR. NOLAN: He is more to be pitied than laughed at.

MR. WHITE: He is more to be pitied than laughed at. Ignore him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I will not be diverted further from my hon. friend, the Minister of Fisheries, for whom, as he must know by now, I have a lot of respect, a lot of admiration. If I were Premier of this Province today I would want to have as Minister of Fisheries the man who is now the Minister of Fisheries. I am not hinting. I am not trying to entice him. I am not trying to get him to cross the floor nor any coalition of that nature. I just want to say to him that I respect and admire him and I believe that Newfoundland - You just heard a moment ago a tribute, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Fisheries from the hardest hitting member of this House, will hardest hitting member that this House has seen since Peter Cashin, and he was the hardest after Sir. Michael Cashin. And there you have in a direct line from about 1918 or 1919 to now the three great battlers - Sir Michael Cashin, Major Peter Cashin and the present hon. member for LaPoile. We just heard that hard hitting member praise our present Minister of Fisheries as a good minister and praise from Sir Hubert is praise indeed.

May I invite the minister to tell me if I am correct, and even if he just nods I will be happy to have that confirmation of my belief that this great Labrador Sea, and the great Labrador Sea lies of course off the Coast of Labrador and the member for the district who is listening outside will know

MR. SMALLWOOD: what I am talking about as the minister will, that the 200 mile limit in a peculiarly Newfoundland sense, not just Eastern Canada, not the Atlantic Seaboard of Canada, but the Newfoundland Seaboard of Canada, that the 200 mile limit means chiefly, primarily, not only but primarily, the great Labrador Sea which is now the great reservoir of groundfish, of codfish for this Province, not only because it has a vast stock of codfish but is the supplier of codfish to the whole Northeast Coast of the Island of Newfoundland. Is that not broadly correct?

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, I would think so.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the minister thinks so and I am glad to have this confirmation. Now, so that the importance of the Labrador Sea and this enormous stock of codfish which must number trillions, not millions, not billions but trillions of individual codfish - somebody told me one time that there was so much codfish on the Grand Banks that if they all came in to Placentia Bay, which is our biggest bay, they would fill that bay from the bottom up to the surface of the water, the entire bay, so there would be no room for any water. In other words an incredible, a fantastic solid mass of codfish which of course without water could not live. But that is how much fish there would be, now this is twenty, thirty years ago when there was no question of shortage, of diminution of the stocks at that time, but today that is what you could say about the Labrador Sea - enormous, staggering stocks of codfish. I would assume the minister would with a nod confirm broadly the truth of that description. Yes.

Now, Sir, I also had the impression that precious few Newfoundlanders have gone there fishing.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Oh we have gone up and down the landwash hardly ever out of sight of the land, of the foreshore. We have done that for generations, for centuries, fishing along the coast, the shore of Labrador. But I am talking about that great Labrador Sea. What is it - 100, 150, 200 miles off the Coast of Labrador, the shoreline of Labrador, that virtually no or very few Newfoundlanders have ever fished in those tremendous waters, so far as codfish are concerned. I take it that that is broadly correct as well. The minister confirms by his nod that my assertion is broadly correct. He allows, I allow for some exceptions. There may perhaps have been some Newfoundlanders down there, but broadly speaking that is not where Newfoundlanders have gone.

Now I come to a third point. If that is where the vast volume of fish is to be found, and if Newfoundlanders have not been in the habit of going there fishing, who is going to do the fishing there in future? At the moment the government, with the consent of the Government of Canada, the government have entered into a joint partnership arrangement with the West Germans to go there and catch - what is it? - 6 million metric tons or -

MR. DOODY: Six thousand

MR. SMALLWOOD: Six thousand metric tons, which is a lot of fish. And that is for what, one year, for this present -

MR. W. CARTER: We have finished it now.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well if it was a one shot operation when they would get their six thousand tons, metric tons, that would end that. That has been done. That experiment is now over.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A point of order has come up.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, could we have a quorum call?

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum has been called.

I have been informed a quorum is present. The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

Mr. Speaker, if these are facts, and the minister confirms that they are, that is where the vast bulk of the fish are, that is where Newfoundlanders generally speaking have not gone in the past, and that is where the Germans and perhaps the Russians and other Europeans, the Poles and so on, have gone. My first question to the minister is this: - and before I ask him the question let me say to him that I was talking with the operator of a fish plant, a large fish plant, a very knowledgeable general manager and owner of a fish plant just a few weeks ago, and I asked him the point-blank question. He has been a personal friend of mine for many years. And I said to him, "Tell me, in your opinion do you see for the next ten, twenty, thirty years, do you see the deep-sea fishery of Newfoundland being carried on by Newfoundlanders?" He said, "What exactly do you mean?" I said, "What I mean is, do you see the deep-sea fishery and especially the Labrador Sea where this vast volume of fish are, do you see that being prosecuted in future by ships owned by Newfoundlanders and manned by Newfoundlanders?" We had been discussing the joint venture idea to which he had a favourable reaction. He was favourable to it. He thought it was the right thing to do. He thought it was all right. And I said, "Well all right, but these are Germans. It is a German ship. And we have a few Newfoundland observers on board, but we have a captain or two, and we have some practical men, maybe - what? - four or five, six, eight men on a ship in a ship that had - what? - 100 to 150 men -

MR. W. CARTER: Seventy-five men altogether.

MR. SMALLWOOD: - seventy-five men, with three or four or five or six Newfoundlanders on board to watch, to observe, to take notice of what was going on; but these ships were German ships, they were enormously big, they were enormously modern, they were enormously scientific, they had the last word in the world in the techniques of finding and catching fish, they had enormous comfort

Mr. Smallwood.

and luxury on board, as my friend here described to us, and three or four or five Newfoundlanders to watch and look and report to the minister or to anyone else as to what they saw. We discussed that, and then I asked him the question: Do you think that for the next five, ten, twenty, thirty years that great fishery - you know, within the 200 mile limit - to get which it has taken over ten years. Mr. Diefenbaker rather threw cold water on it. Mr. Pearson said, "Yes, it could and it should and it must be done." And he went, and they both went. Mr. Trudeau came. He has been there now for six years and it is about this year - is it? - January, we finally got the 200 mile limit. It was a tremendous battle to get it, argument, propaganda. The Liberals claiming the credit for it. The Tories claiming the credit for it. For what? Ten, twelve years. But we have it now as of January past. Now how good is it to us? We know that it is this good; that if the stocks are allowed to increase, to regenerate, it will be wonderful for our inshore fishermen along the Northeast Coast. Wonderful! There surely is no room for any argument about that.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

It is going to mean a lot more fish coming into the land that we can take with longliners, we can take with traps, we can take with the old ways of taking fish along, you know, a mile, two, three, four, five miles off, or a bit more, off the land. But the deep sea fishery, is this going to be a Newfoundland thing or a European thing? That is what I want to know. My friend, the owner and operator of a large fish plant, told me that in his opinion in ten years there will be hardly a Newfoundlander going off to sea in the fishery. When I wrote my autobiography, I confessed my shame that I have felt when I heard that my successor, the present Premier, had announced a magnificent programme to build a fleet of draggers at Marystown, the government to build a fleet of draggers at public expense, draggers that would be owned by the government, but not operated by the government but rather to be rented, to be leased, to the fish plant firms or even to be sold to them. But the government would build a fleet, what was it, forty or some large number of draggers. When I read that I was acutely ashamed that as Premier I had not thought of that. If I had I would have done it. And I congratulated the Premier in my autobiography for doing it. Now it has not been done, and I am honestly curious to know why. Is it because the government have decided privately within their own ranks, or in the inner circle of the government, have they decided along the same lines that this fish plant owner and operator has done as he told me three, four weeks ago that in his opinion in ten, fifteen years there will be virtually no Newfoundland fishermen going deep sea and above all going to the Labrador Sea off the Coast of Labrador? Have the government come to the private conclusion that the fish firms, the plants, are not going to be interested in going in debt to build ships? Have they decided that our men are not going to be sufficiently attracted to go and man those ships? After all, Mr. Speaker, and no one will appreciate this more than does the Minister of Fisheries, after all,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

you look at the Newfoundland of this moment and what do you find? You find thousands upon thousands of young men with their grade eleven. You find thousands of young Newfoundlanders who have gone through the trade schools. You find thousands of Newfoundlanders who have gone through the Fisheries College and you find thousands of Newfoundlanders who have gone through the university and who have got their B.A. or their M.A. All together in Newfoundland at this moment you have got tens and tens of thousands of young men of the age that you would expect to find manning the deepsea fishing fleet. You have got them who are graduates of schools of one kind and another, are they going to be enticed, attracted to go deep sea fishing?

MR. SMALLWOOD:

This plant owner and operator told me, No, he thought not. He thought they would not. Now if our own men will not go deepsea fishing, if they will not, no matter how attractive you make the ship, no matter how good the food is on the ship, no matter how comfortable the quarters are on the ship, no matter what attraction you offer by way of a short time at sea and an equal time ashore, no matter how attractive you set out, or the plants set out, the ship owners set out to make life on the draggers attractive, no matter how much you do that, you will find increasingly as the years pass, an ever increasing difficulty to get men to man the ships.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Why would that be?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is a question I am asking. I am not answering the question. I am asking it. Will it turn out to be the case that because on the one hand we have an increasing number of young men of the age, now mind you, in the outports - I am not talking about city youths or Corner Brook youth or Grand Falls - I am talking about the outports generally that always generated the supply of fishermen, did they not? I am talking about them. In them today you have got thousands of young Newfoundlanders who have a higher level of education than we have ever known in the past. And the question I am asking is this - not answering, asking - Will you find it possible and practical and likely in the future to get them to go fishing on deepsea draggers even if the pay is good, even if the accommodation on board is quite comfortable, even if the food is good, even if the hours are not oppressive, are we doomed to see the day when the plants will not be able to get men to man the ships? Would that by any chance be the reason or part of the reason why the plant owners seem to be powerfully disinclined to launch into the deep with new ships? I do not find any over-powering desire or planning on the part of the fish plants to launch out into the building or buying or even leasing of ships. Would the minister,

Mr. Smallwood.

in his reply, give me, in the House, his opinions. He must have thought of these matters. He has got to have thought of them. I am not originating these thoughts. He must have had them, and he must have heard them from other people. —

Now that brings me to a final point and that is this; we know it is desirable, but is it possible to making fishing a career? So that if a young fellow goes up to the university and he gets his B.A., his ambition is not necessarily to become a teacher, to become a civil engineer, to become a doctor, to become a clergyman, to become a journalist, to become a politician, his ambition is to launch himself upon a career in a modern fishery, and not a cod trap, not even a longliner, but a great modern, ultra-modern deepsea floating plant in which he can earn a salary better than he would get if he were a bank clerk, better than he would get if he were a plumber, or an electrician, better than he would get at almost anything else he could go at: Is it practical or is it just a dream? Is it just a pipe dream to think that the fishing industry can be made so modern, so attractive, so honoured, honoured throughout the community of Newfoundland that thousands of young men be attracted to it as a place to make a career, where you go to work and you earn your \$18,000 or \$20,000 a year, and after

MR. SMALLWOOD:

an apprenticeship you become a mate, and after a little longer you become — a captain and you are making your \$35,000 or \$40,000 a year. Is that a pipe dream? Twenty years ago if you had suggested that you would have been locked up, and you probably deserved to be locked up. But today, Sir, as the Minister of Fisheries could tell us, today you have skippers of longliners making what in a year - \$20,000, \$24,000 \$28,000, \$30,000? I have met owners and skippers of longliners on the Northwest Coast of Newfoundland who had, each man, a skipper had his longliner which was worth what, \$150,000? He had his car. He had his motor home. He could take his trip to Florida. A fisherman, a fisherman? Yes, a fisherman. So is it too much of a crazy dream to think that perhaps you could make the deepsea fishery so great and attractive and profitable that it would be the career for a young man, not just to be a teacher. Today I am told that in the teaching profession you can make up to — the Minister of Education could confirm or deny it by nodding or shaking his head — you can make up to \$30,000, \$32,000, \$34,000 a year, not perhaps teaching exactly but supervising teachers. That you can do only if you are a teacher to begin with. Can the fishery be made into something to rival any other trade or profession, except perhaps law, medicine and science, but of all the ordinary ways of making a living, can fishing be made so good as to be thoroughly competitive and to attract thousands of young Newfoundlanders into it?

I wish that the minister would address himself to these two or three points in answering my hon. friend here and any other speakers who will be addressing the House. I must say, one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine - there are ten, one-third of the members of that side - one, two, three, four on this side - is that because I am so deadly dull a speaker or is it because the subject of fish is so deadly dull? Why is it? Why is it? Is there any bigger topic we can

MR. SMALLWOOD:

talk about in Newfoundland today, except the financial condition of our Province, the financial condition of the government, which is a little less than the financial condition of the Province, short of that is there anything greater we can talk about than the state of the fisheries and the prospects this Province has for its future? However, it is one thing to be a backbencher. It is another thing, I have found - this is one of my discoveries - it is one thing to be a backbencher, it is another thing to be a Premier. As a Premier you can call your Cabinet together, your colleagues in the Cabinet, and every word you say is heard and is listened to. You do not have to be a dictator. You have to be a leader. And if your colleagues think that you are the man who lead them to victory and will do it again, they will listen carefully and respectfully to what you say, and you can get things done. If you are a backbencher, what can you do? You can make speeches. That is all you can do. I am not used to it. I am used to making speeches, yes, to tell what we have done, not advocate that this be done or the other thing be done, that you should do this or someone else should do that, as Premier you make speeches, when you do make speeches, announcing what you have done, what you have decided to do, what you are about to do. And it is quite a different story when you sit here and you have seven or eight members on the government side and four on your own side

MR. SMALLWOOD:

and you talk about the greatest problem confronting our Newfoundland people today and they are just wishing you would shut up, and they are wishing you would shut your mouth -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: That is not true at all.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is not true?

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Everybody here wants to hear you.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, but everybody, how many are here? That is the point. Right now the last minute, Oh, yes -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SMALLWOOD: The hon. member I know, the hon. minister has just come in, the hon. member for Grand Falls, Minister of Industrial and Rural Development. If I could not be Premier of Newfoundland I would be torn between my ambition to occupy the position presently occupied by the hon. member for Grand Falls, and the hon. member for St. Mary's the Capes.

MR. DOODY: You would not be too anxious to say that next Friday.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That would depend on whether I wanted to be popular or unpopular. If I wanted to lose every last bit of respect and love and affection of the Newfoundland people, I would take the ministry of Finance, I would not hesitate to do it. I can tell the hon. gentleman that either he will end up the most respected, even revered minister in the present government, or the most hated and despised. He will end up respected and revered, that may take ten or twenty years to bring about, but will end up, he will end up the most respected and revered minister on that side of the House today if he brings down a budget - and Mr. Speaker, I am not under the rules, I cannot debate a budget which has not yet been brought down. I cannot debate the budget - I can say this broadly and generally that if he brings down a budget that I can vote for, conscientiously vote for, if he brings down that kind of budget his name will go down in history as a great minister, as a great benefactor, as a great patriot. But if he brings down the kind of budget that I cannot

MR. SMALLWOOD:

vote for he will go down - what is it - reviled, unhonoured and unsung. However, I do hope the minister of fisheries will take what I have said with some little seriousness and perhaps in his closing the debate will deal with one or two of these points. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the hon. member for Twillingate for his very kind reference to myself and certainly I hope I can live up to the confidence that he has placed in me. He has asked some very important questions with respect to joint ventures in the future direction in which the fishing industry is going, and I shall endeavour within the next thirty or forty minutes to provide some answers. First of all, Mr. Speaker, I should maybe give a few statistics with respect to the fish catches, the total allowable catches that have been set by Ottawa in the area referred to by the hon. member, areas known in the ICNAF circles as being 2J and 3KL, which takes in, I believe, from Cape Chidley in the north up to probably Cape St. Francis, or may be even a little further south, in the south. So, Mr. Speaker, maybe I could circulate these figures?

Mr. Speaker, the 1977 quotas for codfish especially within the 200 mile limits were established by ICNAF. ICNAF, of course, is an international body made up of seventeen fishing nations of the world, those that have in many respects traditional fishing rights within the north west Atlantic. When hon. members receive this table they will see that for 1977 in the matter of cod the total allowable catch that was established by ICNAF, I presume on

MR. W. CARTER: the advice of their scientists, was in the order of 162,000 metric tons. The Canadian fishing effort in that area for cod to 1977 was estimated to be 67,750 metric tons.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Was it 162,000 or 160,000?

MR. W. CARTER: I am sorry. 160,000 tons.

MR. ROBERTS: Metric.

MR. W. CARTER: Metric tons. Leaving a surplus that was subsequently allocated to various foreign nationals for 92,230 metric tons. So to sum up that figure, Mr. Speaker, 160,000 tons was the total allowable catch designated by the scientists and by ICNAF, that is of cod, 67,000 will be taken by the Canadian efforts thereby leaving a surplus of 92,000 tons approximately.

MR. ROBERTS: 67,000 was all inshore?

MR. W. CARTER: No, that would be - Yes, mostly inshore and probably a little offshore.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the minister will allow me? The remarks that he is making will be in Hansard to be read by the historians, but the map will not be. When he says that the total allowable catch of cod for this year, just this year is 160,000 metric tons, and that Canada shares 67,750 and others 92,000, when he says that what he is talking about is the areas shown on the map as 2J, 3K and 3L. But as the map will not be printed in Hansard, I take it I am correct in saying that is beginning in the North off what?

MR. W. CARTER: Off Cape Chidley, pretty much I think.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no. 2J is well below Cape Chidley.

MR. W. CARTER: Probably Cartwright.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, no, North of Cartwright. Where about is it? It is around Nain, is it? All the way South to South of Cape Race that is the sweep - Cape St. Mary's, Cape Race, North to about Nain.

MR. W. CARTER: That, Mr. Speaker, is the ICNAF area defined as 2J, 3KL. As the hon. member said, probably slightly North of Nain to South of Trepassey or Cape St. Mary's, that area. Mr. Speaker,

MR. W. CARTER: that of course says that 100,000 tons have been given to foreign effort, to foreign nationals, of which Canada will receive practically no, indeed no visible benefits. I am not aware of any benefit that is accruing to Canada as a result of that 92,000 metric tons being given to foreign countries.

MR. SMALLWOOD: May I interrupt the minister, please? Will they in fact in 1977, does the minister think that they will in fact, the foreigners, take the 92,000 metric tons?

MR. W. CARTER: I think they will, Mr. Speaker, and the danger of course is they just might take more than 92,000 metric tons.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will they take that?

MR. W. CARTER: I am sure they will. Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Then will Canada take the 67,000?

MR. W. CARTER: Yes, it will. It will take certainly close to 67,000 and I submit that it will take pretty well all of that quota, 67,000 tons, included in which is the 6,000 tons, by the way, that we have negotiated with the West German Trawlermen's Association.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well that is Canadian.

MR. W. CARTER: That is Canadian. That comes from the Canadian quota. Mr. Speaker, so of the 160,000 metric tons of cod in that area that we have just defined the only benefit that will derive to Canada, the only economically motivated condition that is attached to any fish is that which will be derived from the 6,000 tons that the Newfoundland Government and Ocean Harvesters and Fishery Products have negotiated with the West German Trawlermen's Association. Six thousand tons, which meant 2,400 tons of

MR. W. CARTER:

fillet were landed in Harbour Grace, half of which will be processed in Harbour Grace in the Ocean Harvesters plant, and the other half will be processed in the Marystown plant owned by Fishery Products. I am told that the 2,400 hundred pounds of fish that will be landed in Harbour Grace will provide employment for maybe three or four months for probably 150 people.

DR. FARRELL: Twenty-four hundred?

MR. W. CARTER: How much? Twenty-four hundred pounds -

MR. NEARY: Tons.

MR. W. CARTER: - or tons rather of block fillet. Of course, the same situation prevails in Marystown. Another 2,400 tons will provide another 150 jobs for Newfoundlanders for two or three months of the year.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Doing what?

MR. W. CARTER: Filleting, deboning the fish, thawing the fish out, removing the bone -

MR. ROBERTS: It is partially processed -

MR. W. CARTER: - freezing it, repackaging it and freezing it.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is headed and gutted at sea and frozen.

MR. W. CARTER: And frozen.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And then defrosted and filleted ashore.

MR. ROBERTS: It is filleted at sea.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is correct?

MR. W. CARTER: No, the ships that are catching the fish, Mr. Speaker, have large factories on board. They caught the fish, headed the fish, removed the inside, the gut, filleted the fish, froze it in blocks -

MR. SMALLWOOD: And froze the fillets in blocks.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes. Landed the fish in Harbour Grace, distributed half of it to Marystown and half to the Ocean Harvester plant in Harbour Grace where now it will be thawed, reprocessed, deboned - I am sure the member for Hermitage can follow me very well - deboned -

MR. ROBERTS: That is the pin bone.

MR. W. CARTER: The pin bone removed, the V bone or pin bone, repackaged, frozen and then sent back to West Germany.

MR. ROBERTS: Repackaged in similar packs.

MR. W. CARTER: Some will be in - I think it is called the one and five pack - is it? - the smaller consumer pack, some will be in block form.

MR. ROBERTS: Will the minister permit a question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. W. CARTER: Sure.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the minister.

My question is this: What percentage of the labour - if we take at a value of a hundred the normal amount of labour that is involved in taking a fish that has been caught and making it into the final product as it leaves Newfoundland, - what percentage of that labour is done on board these factory ships and what percentage is being done on shore? In other words, you know, is the process of taking out the head and the gut and if you wish the rough fillet, which is what is done at sea as I understand it, is that fifty per cent of the total labour process or is it a higher or lesser value?

MR. W. CARTER: It might well be fifty per cent, Mr. Speaker, but I think the fish would have to be headed or at least the gut would have to be removed. I sometimes think we should maybe stop referring to fish as being headed and gutted and maybe say eviscerated. It might sound a bit better than gutted.

MR. ROBERTS: It is an honourable Newfoundland phrase.

MR. W. CARTER: All right.

But the fish would normally be gutted at sea. I am told that the business of filleting it, especially by machine, does not require that much labour. Maybe the hon. member for Hermitage can correct me here. But the business of thawing it out and deboning the fish, the labour would probably equal that which would take place on board of the ship or close to it.

MR. W. CARTER.

But certainly I am not suggesting, Mr. Speaker, that they 1977 joint venture is the end-all. I am not suggesting that it is the type thing that we are going to be involved in for the next -

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is not the morn.

MR. W. CARTER: That is right.

It was a one shot pilot operation, and we have learned a lot from that operation. I am not sure that the people who are involved in that joint venture are making any money this year. And to answer the question asked by my friend from LaPoile, the fish is caught by Germans, landed by the Germans on board their factory ships, gutted, head removed, filleted, frozen, landed in Harbour Grace. It is then accepted by the plants. The company that will be doing the final processing and the owners of the fish, Nordsea, a West German company, have negotiated a per pound price for filleting. I understand that the price the West Germans are paying the two companies, the West Germans will be paying the two Newfoundland companies involved, Ocean Harvesters, Fishery Products, for the processing that they will be undertaking in their

MR. W. CARTER: respective plants. I am not sure if I should say this or not, but the amount that is being paid per pound is in excess of twenty cents. I believe it is around twenty-one or twenty-two cents a pound.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is over and above the cost of catching the fish and processing it on board and then getting it to the market?

MR. W. CARTER: The net -

MR. STRACHAN: Who owns the fish from the point of catching to the point of distribution back into the European market? Who owns the fish? At any time at all does it belong to the companies of this Province?

MR. W. CARTER: No. The fish is caught by Germans, it is landed as German fish, it is processed and taken back to the country from which the ship originated.

MR. STRACHAN: But for twenty-seven -

MR. W. CARTER: But there is a reason for that. Maybe I can continue.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes.

MR. W. CARTER: As hon. members probably know there is a 15 per cent tariff in the EEC countries, and if that fish were landed as Canadian fish and processed as Canadian fish -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Pay a duty.

MR. W. CARTER: - and exported to Germany or to Europe as Canadian fish, then it would be subject to a 15 per cent tariff.

MR. STRACHAN: But it could be bought here and sold back to them and then exported.

MR. W. CARTER: No. no. It would still be subject to that 15 per cent tariff. Any fish exported into the EEC countries by Canada is subject to a 15 per cent tariff. We have asked the Canadian Government to

MR. W. CARTER: try and renegotiate that tariff because it is one of the stumbling blocks that is now preventing us from taking advantage of what we think is going to be a very lucrative market for fresh or for frozen fish products in Europe.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the German ship sold the fish to a Newfoundland processor and the processor processed it and then sold it back to the German, what difference would that be from the German buying it from a processor and it never was German fish? Would it not be equally dutiable?

MR. W. CARTER: It would be dutiable, Mr. Speaker, on value added. For example, even on the present arrangement, even on the present joint venture arrangement there is a tariff and the tariff, of course, is based on value added. I think the hon. gentleman will understand that lingo as well. Whatever value is added to the fish by virtue of its being processed in Canada, on that amount the country will have to pay a 15 per cent tariff.

There is one encouraging sign, Mr. Speaker, inasmuch as two countries, Iceland and Norway, both of which are exporting large quantities of fish to the European Common Market countries, have managed to negotiate a reduced tariff. Indeed, instead of paying 15 per cent tariff on their exports to Germany, they are only required to pay a 3 per cent tariff. We are hoping that in time, maybe a year, maybe a couple of years, hopefully not that long, that Canada will be able through its negotiations with Gatt and the EEC countries, will be able to renegotiate the tariff and maybe get it down on a level with that now being paid by these two countries to which I have just referred. Certainly if that happens, well then I think that there

MR. W. CARTER: will be opened up to Canada a very, very important, a very lucrative market. Because European people are fish eaters. They eat a lot of fish. In fact, they probably consume four or five times as much per capita as that consumed by the average North American.

Consequently, we are very, very encouraged by the prospect of being able at some point down the road, hopefully not too far, to be able to enter that very lucrative and very interesting market.

The other questions raised by my friend from Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood), Mr. Speaker, had to do with the Hamilton Banks and the fact that this is where a lot of fish congregate and, I suppose, in certain areas spawn. The Hamilton Banks are being referred to as the mother lode, as it were, the spawning ground of the fish that would normally be caught probably on the Eastern coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. Certainly that is why it is awfully important that every possible precaution be taken by the Government of Canada and by their scientists in establishing the total allowable catch in that area. And that is what prompted us to send a telegram some weeks ago to the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa in which we expressed some concern with respect to the total allowable catch that was established in 1977

MR. W. CARTER:

and at the same time expressed concern as to exactly what amount would be allocated by Canada to foreign countries in 1978. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, I could circulate a copy of this telegram for the information of hon. members. Is there a page here? All right, so we can do that later.

The hon. member for Twillingate (Mr. Smallwood) made reference or at least expressed some concern with respect to the future attitude of fish plant owners and if in fact they might just take advantage of the so-called joint venture concept, the concept of having foreign nationals catch fish within the 200 mile limit, whether fish plant owners would take advantage of that situation and maybe find some way around having to buy or build or at least own ships of their own and provide crews for those ships. Now I do not think that there is any chance at all of the plants being able to by-pass, as it were, the building of their own ships. They are certainly acquiring ships of their own and crewing them by Newfoundlanders. If I thought for a moment, Mr. Speaker, that this would become a way of life in future and that maybe our fish plant owners were to adopt that kind of a philosophy in that they would in fact as a matter of expediency try to get around the problem of having to buy or build ships and to man them by employing foreign ships with foreign crews, if I thought for a moment that there was even a remote possibility of that happening well then I would have no part of it and I would condemn in the loudest voice possible, in the strongest way possible, any company that would undertake to embark on that kind of a programme.

At least in another two months, by the end of June, Canada, Canadian scientists and officials of the Canadian Government, will be sitting down with member nations of ICNAF in countries to whom Canada has certain bilateral agreements at which time they will be establishing the total allowable catch for 1978. That exercise, which is a very important one, will be taking place sometime between now, I think, and about the first

MR. CARTER:

of July. They will sit down and on the basis of information that has supplied to them by their biologists and scientists and people who are supposed to know what it is all about, they will determine exactly how much fish will be caught within the 200 mile limit for 1978. It might well be, Mr. Speaker, that the allowable catch for cod in the Northern areas will be an amount equal to that which has been designated in 1977 as being the total allowable catch. So let us assume for a moment, let us assume for a moment that the total allowable catch for 1978 will be identical or at least close to that of 1977. Let us assume that the Canadian fishing effort will not increase from 1977 to 1978 which means that we will be catching approximately sixty odd thousand tons. Again the foreign countries will be given a license to harvest another 100,000 tons of fish because that fish which is in excess of the amount that can be caught by Canadian effort must be declared as a surplus. Under the terms under which the 200 mile limit was declared, consistent with the terms and conditions that have been laid down by the bilaterals that have been agreed between Canada and five countries, Russia, Poland, Norway, Portugal and Spain, bilaterals between these countries and Canada, give those countries the right to fish the stocks that are surplus to the Canadian fishing effort.

MR. J. WINSOR: Would the minister permit me to ask him a question? As is pointed out you are talking about the total of Canada's share. How do you stack that up with the fact that the boats are coming in now with far less than they can actually catch for the simple reason that it is not there? Stern trawlers that can carry five to six hundred thousand pounds are coming in with less than 20,000 pounds aboard. Now you say you think they will catch Canada's share of the cod. It does not look like it right now. So if they do not catch it, you are still going to give the foreigners more. This is probably why they are sneaking in over our grounds and looking for some of our fish because they are not catching that much either. How do you add that up with what you are just saying. It does not stack up in my book. They are not catching the fish. You say you think they will catch their share. The boats are landing far, far less.

MR. CARTER: Canadian or foreign efforts?

MR. WINSOR: Canadian. They will not catch their Canadian effort not their quota because it is not there. It is not there for them to catch.

MR. CARTER: I cannot really follow you.

MR. WINSOR: Well the boats are currently not catching the cod that they could catch if it was there. If the cod was there they would not be coming in with 20,000 pounds in a large stern trawler.

MR. CARTER: Yes, right. I am glad you asked the question because obviously it needs some clarification.

MR. WINSOR: It is a bit confusing.

MR. CARTER: Yes, it is like apples and oranges, Mr. Speaker. You have two different sets of circumstances. As the hon. member knows probably better than I do that it has become uneconomic now for fish plants operating say from the South Coast to undertake a directed codfishery on the Grand Banks. It has become uneconomical. Ships go out and they spend days and days upon days fishing, exerting efforts at substantial costs to the

MR. CARTER:

companies and they are coming back in half full. Indeed the average landing, the average potential landing of the average Newfoundland deep-sea trawler - and we have I think about eighty-seven altogether - the average potential landing, the catching capacity of that boat, that ship on a yearly basis is about seven million pounds based on, I believe, around twenty to twenty-five ships per year. That would be the average catching capability of that ship when in fact these ships are now landing with three and a half million pounds a year per trip on an average which means that the ships are only operating at half capacity. So the question is a very obvious and very legitimate one. How come? How can we talk about giving foreign countries surpluses of fish that is obviously not there? Of course he is right. There are no surpluses in the areas where our offshore fleet would normally fish. We are not talking about surpluses, Mr. Speaker, on the Southern Grand Banks or the St. Pierre Banks or the Burgeo Banks. We are talking about surpluses that would be in the Northern waters where the Newfoundland fishing fleet is unable to operate because they do not have the ice reinforced capability. Very few of our ships ever fish, say, in the Northern areas, Northern waters. Some have gone up there and tried to fish. But the damage that had been caused to their ships has made it uneconomical and indeed very dangerous for our ships to try, even attempt to penetrate those waters. We are not discussing surpluses or indeed using chartered ships in areas where the Newfoundland ships would traditionally fish or indeed in areas where they are only capable of fishing. We are talking about charters and foreign landings, surpluses in an area that is inaccessible to the Newfoundland fleet during the times of the year, three months, January, February and March, when fish is very plentiful in that area and when it congregates in that area and makes it quite easy and quite economic to harvest.

MR. WINSOR: Sir, your quotas. You are talking about 3K and 3L.

MR. CARTER: Some of these are in the South.

MR. WINSOR: They are traditional grounds.

MR. CARTER: Some of these are in traditional grounds,

Mr. W. Carter.

Mr. Speaker, but even though that is the case - and I will admit that 2 J and 3 KL does extend South to maybe beyond Trepassey, beyond Cape St. Mary's. But the ships that we are talking about do not fish in that area. The factory ships that are being used this year by the West Germans, I do not suppose they have ever been South, intervening South of the rim of the Hamilton Banks Shelf. These ships do not operate in the Southern waters. They are built at considerable expense to fish in the ice infested waters of the North and certainly it would not make sense at all to have these ships fishing, say, in the areas of 3 L or maybe even as far South as 3 K. This year the fish that they caught and landed in Newfoundland was caught right on the edge of the Hamilton Banks, slightly over the edge I am told

MR. J. WINSOR: There is a danger there also.

MR. W. CARTER: Yes.

But, Mr. Speaker this, like I said, is not going to be a Newfoundland way of life. It is not the end-all. It is not going to be there in perpetuity. It was a one-shot pilot operation.

MR. FLIGHT: The thin end of the wedge.

MR. W. CARTER: It is not the thin edge of the wedge at all.

It was an experiment. We learned a lot from that experiment. And I do not think we will be entering in any more such experiments in 1978, because we have now what we think would be a much more practical solution to that problem.

We started off by saying that this was a one-shot pilot operation. Indeed when we learned that the Canadian Government were contemplating giving other joint ventures to other provinces, Nova Scotia, Quebec, we learned that they were about to enter into joint venture arrangements with certain other companies in one case a Spanish company, in another case a German company called Nordstern. We objected violently to Ottawa and suggested that there is no need of

MR. W. CARTER.

nothing to do with it. Our advice is not sought and consequently they act on their own, and I hope on the advice of their experts -

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

MR. W. CARTER: Yes.

MR. STRACHAN. Is it not true that the quotas are set by the biologists, in other words, the scientists who suggest to government? Are you trying to imply that the federal government are responsible for it? The federal government accepted the figures given to them by the biologists, and these are scientific data. It is not a political decision.

MR. W. CARTER: Given by whom?

MR. STRACHAN: By the biologists, by the scientific personnel.

MR. W. CARTER: That is right. That is what I am saying.

MR. STRACHAN: So it is not a political decision. It is made on scientific data.

MR. W. CARTER: I am not suggesting. I said a moment ago that within two months Canada, officials of the government, will be sitting down with their scientists and biologists and will be determining what the allowable catch will be for 1978. I am not suggesting that it is a political decision. I would feel much more insecure if I thought it were. There is only one consolation that hopefully the scientists or at least the catches will be established on the basis of sound information given by scientists without any political ramifications at all. That is the only hope. If that is not the case well then we might as well pack up and go home because if you allow the politicians in Ottawa or indeed anywhere or in Newfoundland to be given that kind of authority then I would say we are in real trouble. But, Mr. Speaker, the allowable catch for 1978 will in all possibility be on a level with that of 1977. That will be around 160,000 metric tons in that particular area of that particular species, cod. We are not content to see that 100,000

MR. W. CARTER.

two or three joint ventures, and why destroy an additional 3,000 tons of fish if in fact we can learn the same lesson by catching 6,000 tons.

MR. J. WINSOR: If you have learned a lesson you proved a point.

MR. W. CARTER: We have learned a lesson and and we have proved that there are some points of improvement.

Mr. Speaker, getting back to what I said a moment ago, within a couple of months, Canada will be establishing the total allowable catch for 1978. We have wired Ottawa, and we have said, Look, we are very concerned, and we are expressing the concern of our fellow Newfoundlanders with respect to the establishment of quotas especially on the Hamilton Banks. The telegram that I just circulated to the House points out I think pretty well exactly what our position is in that respect. We have said that if - do not take any chances. If you are not exactly sure where you stand, if there is any doubt at all about the capability of the stocks in that area being able to sustain that kind of a harvest and be given a chance to replenish, well then give the fishermen of Newfoundland and Canada the benefit of the doubt and do not take any chances. We have told Ottawa in no uncertain terms that if in their wisdom or otherwise they decide to put a total ban on foreign fishing in that area that we will support them.

Indeed, we have suggested to them that if there is any danger at all in allowing foreign effort or in allowing that type of a quota well then they should give some very serious thought to putting a total ban on foreign fishing efforts on the Hamilton Banks. The quotas, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, are not established by the Newfoundland Government. The TAC is not established by Newfoundland. The Minister of Fisheries of Newfoundland has no more to do with the establishment of the total allowable catch within Canada's 200 mile limit than the man in the moon. We have absolutely

Mr. W. Carter.

ton surplus go to foreign countries without some benefit coming back to our Province and our people. And unless we can provide the necessary catching effort one way or the other, either by way of charter - hopefully not, but maybe purchasing boats or some such way, some legal arrangement - well then we will forfeit our right to that surplus. We will forfeit our right to that surplus stock, surplus to the Canadian catching effort up to the total allowable catch. And that is why we have been going around Europe looking for ships trying to identify countries and areas where ships can be obtained at very short notice. The question has been asked by our critics as to why we are not talking about building ships in Marystown. Why are we not embarking on a building programme to provide ships of our own built by Newfoundlanders thereby providing a lot of jobs for a lot of Newfoundlanders in that area. Of course, that is the answer in the long run. That is the answer in the long-term. But there is no such thing as an instant boat building programme. You cannot today embark on a boat building programme that is going to be in place by June 30, 1977.

MR. J. WINSOR: (Inaudible)

MR. W. CARTER: I beg your pardon?

MR. J. WINSOR: I am not arguing -

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, that is something over which I have no control. Certainly our feelings are well-known and if the fish stocks are not there and if Ottawa then insists on establishing a TAC that is in excess of what it should be, well then I am afraid there are certain people that must accept that responsibility,

MR. W. CARTER: and the people are not in the Provincial Department of Fisheries or indeed are they in this House. I would be quite happy if Canada were to put a ban maybe on foreign efforts, but I am afraid that is not going to be so. Canada has made certain commitments without our knowledge or consent, has made certain commitments to certain foreign countries whereby they are required to allow those countries to harvest stocks that are surplus to the Canadian fishing effort. Canada is a responsible country in a global village and I do not think we could - If the scientists say that there are prospects for the harvesting of X number of tons of fish I do not think we could sit on that fish and just ignore the scientific data on which that decision is made. I do not think Canada could do that. Indeed I am not sure I would want Canada to do it. But certainly if there is going to be a surplus to the Canadian catching effort as it exists today well then we have a responsibility to ensure that we provide the necessary catching effort to enable us to catch part of what would otherwise be declared as surplus.

Of course, we know that in Newfoundland today we have a lot of fish processing capabilities. We have a large number of fish plants around the Island most of which are operating at probably less than thirty-five per cent of their operating capacity. We have to find some way to provide fish to these plants to make sure that they can become more viable and that they can be operating at as near full capacity as possible.

MR. J. WINSOR: Would the hon. minister excuse me? When the minister says thirty-five per cent of capacity, you are talking about total capacity and not normal capacity I believe.

MR. W. CARTER: Total capacity. We have -

MR. J. WINSOR: Total capacity would be three eight hour shifts where they are normally running one in most places.

MR. W. CARTER: Newfoundland today, Mr. Speaker, has the capacity

MR. W. CARTER: to process on an eight hour day at 250 days a year, 1.2 billion pounds of fish. We are capable of processing 1200 million pounds of fish per year, eight hours a day, 250 days a year, one shift. We are in fact processing I think in the order of 400 million, less than forty per cent of that figure, probably thirty per cent. And I have been told by inshore fish plant operators, plants that would normally be capable of all year round operation that it is absolutely impossible to make their operation viable or to place them in a position of being able to pay proper price for fish from fishermen, impossible for them to become good, corporate citizens in the area in which they operate or to make any worth-while contribution to the economy of the Province in their area operating at that capacity. Indeed I talked to the principals of a large fish processing company in Germany just a few weeks ago, a few days ago and I asked him, What would he do, what would his company do if they had a fish plant that was operating at less than fifty per cent capacity? He shot back without even a moments hesitation and said, " We would close it up. We would not keep that plant operating not twenty-four hours." Indeed that company which is one of the most progressive companies in the world I suppose, Nordsea, one of the biggest in Europe, last year with a gross sale of 0.5 billion dollars, that company -

MR. ROBERTS: Is that heavily subsidized?

MR. W. CARTER: No, not heavily subsidized, as a matter of fact no subsidies at all. No subsidies at all. That company would not consider operating a plant, would not keep it open, would put the padlock on door if it were operating at less than eighty per cent of its capacity. And yet here we are in Newfoundland thinking that we can operate fish plants around the island, in fact all together probably I do not know - fifteen or eighteen or twenty plants that are capable of year round operations, We think that we can operate these plants successfully in a viable

MR. W. CARTER: way at about thirty-five or thirty per cent of their operating capacity. It is absolutely ridiculous and I suppose that if the owners of these plants today were to follow the normal business practices that one would expect that not too many of them would remain open.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, we do not have a quorum.

MR. SPEAKER: Quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER: I would ask the Clerk of the House to count the House, please. A quorum is present.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, we were talking, I think, about the allowable catches and the fact that scientists will be determining soon what the allowable catch will be in 1978. I think that I should go on record now as saying that I have certain fears with respect to the advice that maybe Canada will be getting with respect to the fish stocks. I have certain fears about just how valid some of this advice might be, and that is why I would be quite prepared, as I said earlier, to support the federal government if, in fact, they saw fit to maybe cut back in 1978 on the TAC. Because even if they were to reduce the TAC by - and by that I mean the total allowable catch - if they were to reduce it to 100,000 metric tons, if they were to bring it back from 160,000 to 100,000 that would still be more than the Canadian fleet could harvest. In fact that would be 40,000 ton extra fish that could be landed in Canada with that kind of a very dramatic decrease in the total allowable catch.

That might be the way to go.

Of course Canada must be able to justify that kind of action. Canada must be able to justify any reduction in takes in the TAC because of these bilaterals that we have with the countries that I have already mentioned. But assuming that the allowable catch for 1978 will be pretty well on a par with the 1977, then unless we make every possible effort to acquire additional catching effort one way or the other, we will forfeit our right to harvest the amount that will be declared as surplus. That is why we are endeavouring to indentify ships that we can charter maybe, or at least acquire by one way or another, that will be acceptable to the Canadian

MR. W. CARTER: Government, when the time comes, as Canadian fishing efforts.

We want to be able to go to Ottawa very shortly and say, Look, we have acquired the additional catching effort for 1978 to enable us to catch another 40,000 tons. And I think we can do that. I think we can do that. Of course that would mean a fantastic input into the economy of our Province and it would provide many hundreds of jobs around the Province. Badly needed jobs, I should add.

These ships we hope will be partially manned by Newfoundlanders.

MR. W. CAPTER:

The hon. member for Twillingate today expressed some concern as to whether or not Newfoundlanders would go to sea in those ships, would be satisfied to join the ships and to become deep-sea fishermen. I personally think they will. Newfoundlanders have never been known to be backward when it comes to going to sea. We have fishermen who will go to the ice fields, live under conditions that are almost sub-human for a month or six weeks, surely these people would be satisfied to go to sea in some of these ships that are - the accommodations which are equal almost to a modern hotel. It is our intention to commence a training operation and hopefully it will be done this year this Fall through the fisheries college and Canada Manpower where we will train young Newfoundlanders to serve as crew members on board of these ships .

We are thinking seriously about the possibility maybe of getting some of our longliner crews. In the province, we have something like 500 longliners, with 500 skippers, probably two or three hundred crew members on board of those ships, good seamen. These ships would normally cease to operate around September, October, we are looking into the possibility maybe of getting these people, the longliner crews, to enter a training programme thereby enabling them to join these chartered ships say, in January, or December, spending three months fishing on board of these ships, coming back ashore maybe in March or April, then getting ready for their normal operation on board of their longliners.

That is one of the options, Mr. Speaker. The question has been raised by the hon. member for LaBoile as to just how we intend to make all these arrangements, under what auspices will these arrangements be made? Well, we are considering the establishment of a Crown corporation . I am not suggesting that we are going to do that but certainly it is one of the options that we are seriously thinking about, very seriously thinking about it.

MR. NEARY: The hon. Minister of Finance is -

MR. DOODY: The right wing looks aghast.

MR. CARTER: I personally think that might be the way to go. That fish

MR. CARTER:

will have to be landed. Responsibility for it will have to be assumed by someone, I cannot for the life of me imagine one of the operating companies assuming responsibility for that fish, that fish that is landed by these chartered ships and allowing it to be streamed out to small plants that are not operated or owned by that company. Our ambition is to have this fish landed, to have it held in storage, frozen, and then distributed to the various seasonal plants around the province that are capable of a year round operation.

MR. NEARY: — Would it not be better to process some of it right away?

MR. CARTER: No, because - well, yes it would be of course but the thing is we do not want this fish to be competing with Newfoundland fish. We do not want it to be thrown into the fish plants during the glut period, for example, when the fish plants are glutted when they have more fish than they can handle. So what we are suggesting is that the fish should be, maybe landed in cold storage, held in a frozen state and then trucked out to the fourteen or fifteen or eighteen plants around the Island that are capable of a year round operation.

MR. NEARY: I would be careful about that if I were you.

MR. CARTER: Do not have to be careful about it at all these plants cannot become viable.

MR. NEARY: You are adding to the cost.

MR. CARTER: No. You are adding to the cost one cent per pound. One cent per pound, Mr. Speaker, to transport fish, I am told that to transport fish from LaScie to Witless Bay cost one cent per pound by refrigerated trucks that can carry in the order of 40,000 pounds. That will not render that operation uneconomic.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I would like to remind the hon. minister that he has got about a minute.

SOME FON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. NOLAN: No!

MR. J. CARTER: Yes, by leave. His time was hung up by the living millstone.

MR. SPEAKER: I understand that unanimous leave has not been given the hon. minister. So the minister does have about thirty seconds.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, there is not much - I had hoped to get leave of the House to continue because I think this is a very important issue. I heard the Leader of the Opposition on today, by the way, my colleague's leader complaining that he has not had a chance to debate fisheries in this House.

MR. ROBERTS: Nor have we.

MR. CARTER: I am giving you the chance now. But I have been refused by your House Leader. I have been refused the chance to continue by your House Leader.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman's colleagues have refused some of our people leave to continue.

MR. CARTER: Two wrongs do not make a right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Two ones do not make a white either.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! In view of the -

MR. ROBERTS: It is a tit for a tat rule.

MR. CARTER: I hope, Mr. Speaker, that when the hon. member is tempted to make that kind of a statement that he will keep this day in mind.

MR. MORGAN: It could be interesting. I would like to hear the rest of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I believe I have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STRACHAN: I have listened to the interesting talk by the minister on this joint ventures and -

AN HON. MEMBER: -

MR. STRACHAN: I am not interested in arguing.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I believe that it is normal in the House that it is unanimous assent that the hon. member

MR. NOLAN:

opposite could have been given leave to go ahead. He did not have it. Now must we be derated from now on while the hon. member is trying to fulfill his forty-five minutes here. Surely he can be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order. I accept the ruling of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! A point of order is before the Chair. Is the hon. minister speaking to that?

MR. CARTER: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. CARTER: I accept the decision of the House to forbid me to continue. But I should point out to the hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker, that I think I was quite generous in allowing questions. I think I probably forfeited ten or fifteen minutes by allowing questions from the other side. And maybe if I did not do that or maybe next time I will think twice because I did have more things to say on the fishery. And to have been stopped I think is not quite right.

MR. NOLAN: The minister was stopped only because of the behaviour of his colleagues.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The point of order relates to interruptions of the hon. the member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and as has been stated a number of times from the Chair, remarks back and forth are permitted unless the House does become unruly in which case the Chair must intervene or on the other hand if an hon. member does request silence, clearly the Chair does have to ensure that he receives his rights in this regard. I understand the hon. member has requested silence for his remarks. So I would ask hon. members to give him that courtesy.

MR. STRACHAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, for your ruling.

The minister here was talking about quotas and total allowable catch, the TAC. If we look at the recent history over the last few years, originally the

MR. STRACHAN:

figure a few years ago was 600,000 tons which could have been caught out of the Newfoundland and Labrador waters. This was reduced gradually over the last three or four years, in fact, reduced quite considerably. The maximum sustainable yield as set by the biologists for last year was around the area of 260,000 tons. But because they wanted to be conservation minded and because these maximum sustainable yield figures are paper statistics, then the figure was reduced from 260,000 tons down to 160,000 tons, 167,000 tons I believe. Of that 167,000 tons 50,000 tons is allotted to this Province in inshore fisheries. It could go up as the minister is correct. It could go up, It could go up to 60,000 tons, 70,000, 80,000 or even 90,000 tons provided as the minister states we can show our capability for catching that fish.

The minister also states and quite rightly, I believe, that the surpluses that we are talking about in this joint venture scheme are surpluses only in Northern waters. There are surpluses in waters on the Hamilton Banks. And that is where our objection comes in on the joint ventures, number one. First of all, we believe that the Hamilton Banks, the fishing on the Hamilton Banks should be banned totally and completely. The Hamilton Banks -

MR. SMALLWOOD: For whom?

MR. STRACHAN: For everyone.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All?

MR. STRACHAN: For all fishing. Number one, that fishery is a very expensive fishery. It is a fishery at a time of the year

MR. STRACHAN: when the ice is fairly heavy, when the vessels required are ice reinforced vessels with a capital cost of something in the region of \$12 million to \$15 million. There are vessels which go into that waters, vessels which are not Canadian vessels and vessels which we do not build and I think we would be foolish to get into any programme of building ice reinforced vessels for the prosecution of that fishery. And the reason is very simple. The Hamilton Banks are the mother lode but more than being the mother lode the Hamilton Banks are the nursery grounds of the fishery of the whole Northeast part of this Province ; the Labrador Coast, the Northern Peninsula right down in the Fogo area. That has been well specified by biologists.

MR. W. CARTER: You should go to Ottawa and make that speech.

MR. STRACHAN: I have already made this speech and already talked this speech with the Minister of Fisheries, the Federal Minister of Fisheries - Romeo LeBlanc and they indicated this and with Arthur May who also verified some of the things I am saying here. So of feelings and beliefs -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Could the hon. gentleman tell me when he says no fishing in the Labrador Sea or Hamilton Banks - no fishing now or ever by anyone, is that what?

MR. STRACHAN: The point we are making here is that no fishing now or until certainly a considerable period of time ahead, the scientists say to us, the biologists say it will take five or six years to build that fishery up. They are also quite sure that the catch of fish in the Hamilton Banks is not only mature fish but they are pretty sure by observations that the catch of fish there are immature fish as well being caught by the foreign draggers. That they can go and take the sizes and they will find fish which are virtually underneath the limited size according to the mesh size. They know that these fish are maturing fish. So our argument is that if these are, if this is the nursery of the fishery of the

MR. STRACHAN: whole Northeast part it can only be fished during the Winter. During the Summer these fish move. They move inshore. They move down into the Southern waters. They can only be fished during these months then why should we build these expensive, high capital cost vessels, ice reinforced vessels or think of chartering these ice reinforced vessels to go into these waters when that fishery is the nursery.

MR. SMALLWOOD: And in any case for a maximum period of what?

MR. STRACHAN: Three months, four months.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Of the twelve?

MR. STRACHAN: Of the year. That is right. That is what you are talking about four -

MR. SMALLWOOD: What would they do in the other months?

MR. STRACHAN: Well this is the problem you are facing -

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will they fish anywhere else?

MR. STRACHAN: You are faced with very expensive vessels, very high powered, high horsepower, ice reinforced vessels which require that extra horsepower to drive, fishing in waters elsewhere in this Province in which they are not required to have that horsepower. So you are talking about a fishery which is very unbalanced. So there is a great question then as to whether these vessels should ever be allowed to fish there and whether that fishery should be prosecuted at all. Certainly at the moment the figures, the scientists will tell you these figures are paper statistics. These maximum sustainable yields can only be based on a continually shifting catch. As the population is decreased by fisheries they have no base line. Their base line studies are insufficient on the Hamilton Banks in order to establish a realistic maximum sustainable yield figure. So with the result that they reduced the 260,000 ton maximum sustainable yield figure down to 160,000 ton total allowable catch - the difference between these two figures, and the reason is because they were scared or afraid of their paper statistics. Of that 50,000 tons is caught by Newfoundland in inshore fishery.

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is cutting it in half - 160 from 240 -

MR. STRACHAN: That shows you the value of their figures that even the scientists and biologists by removing, lopping 100,000 tons off, are not satisfied that their figures are accurate, not even by forty per cent accurate so with a result that they themselves are frightened.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In one year?

MR. STRACHAN: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: One year to the next.

MR. STRACHAN: That is right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Cut it in half.

MR. STRACHAN: They have lopped off 100,000 pounds last year so with a result that we are facing then a situation of prosecuting a fishery on a bank which is the nursery ground of the whole Northeast fishery on figures which are not reliable and which the scientists state are not reliable.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is impressive.

MR. STRACHAN: And so with a result that what we should be doing is the same as

MR. STRACHAN: good husbandry, good management anywhere else, at any kind of project whether it is farming, even trapping, for instance, or anything else, is to protect the nursery. You do not shoot caribou on the calving grounds so why should you ever consider catching fish in expensive vessels on the nursery beds, especially at times of years when you cannot get them?

The minister also then states that this surplus is totally in Northern waters and we are going into a joint venture system. He also states then that this joint venture system, first of all, was going to be the answer to the fish rates. And it was. This was going to be the answer. There was going to be a total joint venture system.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I am sorry, Would the hon. gentleman allow me? Does he understand and is he correct in - whom can I ask - is it actually the announced policy of the government to go beyond this year when they have a one-shot joint venture? Is this to be a permanent policy of joint venture fishing?

MR. STRACHAN: The minister has already indicated this is a one-shot deal. The minister has already indicated this is an experiment.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes.

MR. STRACHAN: An experiment is something in which you start and you carry on through and you conclude and you assess your results. Surely that is an experiment. This is something which was only started a few weeks ago, and only a few weeks into the experiment already it is a one-shot deal, it is the end, it is finished. What kind of experiment is it? That is not the way to conduct an experiment. Already the policy has been changed in the few weeks we have been into the

MR. STRACHAN: joint venture system. We are moving back now to a one-shot deal only. And that was because of pressure from the Fishermen's Union, from the fishermen, pressure that had to be placed on Nova Scotia and other provinces who also wanted to get into the joint venture system using the fish, essentially, from this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Quebec as well.

MR. STRACHAN: Quebec as well, absolutely. The argument then is that pressure is being placed on the minister who has now moved back from the whole joint venture scheme to a one-shot deal, then changed again from the one-shot deal joint venture scheme to a system, now, of chartering vessels to prosecute a fishery which we believe should be banned immediately. And we believe that Ottawa will agree with this as many of the scientists would.

We also believe that this surplus we are talking about that the foreign vessels are taking, 100,000, if we banned the Hamilton Banks fishery we would be left with a surplus of maybe 50,000, 60,000 or 70,000 tons. Our belief is that that fish will be far better caught, not by chartered, expensive, high capital cost vessels, it would be far better caught by inshore vessels. But when I talk about inshore vessels I am not talking about the traditional trap boats. We are talking about inshore vessels on the style of the Norwegian type vessels, the eighty-five footers, the ninety footers, the mid-water or the mid-inshore, or whatever you want to call it, not the traditional fish by the rocks in shore. We must change the fishery. The whole inshore fishery of this Province must be changed from the stationary fishery ashore, or close to shore, to a fishery, an inshore fishery, a true inshore fishery using vessels of lower capital cost which could be built in this Province very easily, could be built very

MR. STRACHAN:

easily, could be built very quickly and which are maneuverable, which can move around the Province and are not liable to be chopped out, not liable if there is a shift or a change in quotas all of a sudden, not to find any area to fish such as these ice reinforced vessels, if we get into them and we purchase them. What happens if we ban the Hamilton Banks? What are we going to do with an expensive vessel like that? Where else are they going to fish in this Province?

The whole thing to me absolutely and totally from the beginning smells. I do not like it. I think the whole thing is an abdication of our responsibility to the fishermen of this Province and to the fisheries policy of this Province. We have changed our minds. I have seen the minister change his mind a number of times. Starting out with a fully fledged programme of joint ventures, then back to a one-shot deal, and then moving back again to chartering vessels, and now the chartering of vessels is only going to be short-term. Always the fishery policy is a short-term fishery policy. Sometime in the future, sometime ahead, we are going to design and we are going to have a long-term policy but we need time. We need time. We need time.

I believe the time is now, and I believe that pressure could be brought to bear on the Federal Minister of Fisheries, and I believe that he would respond to it.

MR. STRACHAN.

I have heard statements of his, public statements, and I discussed this for more than three hours with him, and it is his belief as well that the fisheries must be re-oriented, that we seem to be locked into the idea of high capital cost vessels and what we must get away from that into the idea of having a balanced fishery, a fishery in which we do have the deep-sea. It is necessary. But we have a fishery which is an inshore fishery or a mid-water fishery, but using various techniques. At the moment we are totally and solely relying in this Province on either inshore fish in the rocks or gill-netters, longliners we happen to call them, but essentially they are using the gillnet. There are many other techniques of fishing groundfish in this world which have been developed elsewhere in this world and are used in Iceland, Norway and various other countries and have been used in this Province and demonstrated to be good and could be developed.

If you remember gillnet fishing is a very fashioned form of fishing. You set the net down, and the net is stationary. You are not a hunter of fish. What you need to be is more active and become an active fisherman and hunt the fish using the devices you have such as zonar and various other devices which are given to you. So our argument is that the whole emphasis should be changed from this one-shot deals and experiments which only go for a few weeks and are then found wanting. They should change totally the whole re-orientation of the fishery. The minister accuses us when I say this, of wanting small fish plants in every community. We are not talking that kind of nonsense at all. We are not talking anything of every man, every outport having a vessel or a boat of his own. But what we are talking about is getting people in this Province, the fishermen in this Province to be entrepreneurs, to have the ability to finance vessels up to ninety-five feet or possibly one hundred feet, vessels which can go out

Mr. Strachan.

fifty, sixty, seventy, eighty, one hundred miles out, vessels which can have the catching capability, vessels whose capital costs are no more than three-quarters of a million or a million dollars per vessel instead of the \$15 million to \$18 million we are talking here, vessels which are flexible, which can change, have a number of different gear instead of having the dragging system only, vessels which can change from one kind of fishery to another kind of fishery. Unless that is done, unless that kind of programme is brought in and developed and programmed, agreed over a number of years, then the fishery of this Province will always belong to the outside corporation and to other companies who have the expertise. I refuse to believe that West Germans can tell us, tell the people of this Province anything about the fishery except fishing in the Northern waters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: And the ice reinforced fishery, using these ice reinforced vessels is a very delicate operation. And I agree that they have expertise like no one else has expertise. The Russians have it as well. But that kind of fishery is a dangerous fishery. It is a fishery we do not need, a fishery we do not want, and a fishery that the biologists agree, pretty well agree, that is not necessary to carry on. The amount of cash out of it virtually makes the purchase of any ice reinforced vessels worthless for six or seven or eight months of the year. We do not need these kind of vessels.

So my argument then is that the whole thing, the joint venture, initially, the chartering vessels, the stopgap thing of trying to fill in, is totally removing the incentive from the fishermen in this Province, taking it out of their hands, dealing with companies and corporations from elsewhere, dealing with

Mr. Strachan.

chartering large vessels which cannot operate for many months of the year, dealing and fishing in an area of this Province in which we should immediately consider banning, absolutely totally banning. There is an idea of Bathurst Island in Sacks Harbour in the North West Territories which is a very good idea. There they hunt and trap white fox, and I am merely using it as as a parallel in husbandary. But they cut the island in half. The Northern part of the island no one can trap. That is the dams during the Summer where the white fox breath. During the Winter they trap only in the Southern part. And the Inuit people there and the settler people there make \$40,000, \$50,000, \$60,000, \$75,000 a year trapping these foxes and

MR. STRACHAN:

will do it every year because they are perpetuating, they are not disturbing the mother lode, they are not disturbing the nursery grounds, they are not hampering with any kind of figures. They are not interested in anybody coming in and scientists showing that they can catch them up there because it is within the maximum sustainable yield. You cannot do that in nature. All you can require is two or three or four years out of kilter and you are in trouble. So what we are stating then is that that fishery should be banned for a number of years. Every year it could be renewed until the catch figures are raised.

MR. CARTER: Will the hon. member permit a question.

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, sure.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, given the fact that that fishery will not be banned, that the Government of Canada in its wisdom or otherwise will not see fit to put a total ban on that fishery, given the fact that we have fish plants in Newfoundland operating at less than thirty per cent capacity with very little opportunity of increasing that supply because of the shortness of the inshore fishery, given the fact that we can maybe charter ships for a three month period to fish in that area in the ice infested waters, given the fact that this fish can be landed in Newfoundland economically, that it can be streamed out to these fish plants that would normally be closed and processed, economically, given all these facts, given the fact too that there is a shortage of fish in other areas as my hon. colleague from Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor) mentioned, that the fish plants operating on the South Coast and trawlers operating out of these plants are operating now at half capacity because of the scarcity of fish in the areas where they traditionally fish, given all these facts, does he still think that the joint venture concept or the concept of chartering ships and availing of that prolific stock is so wrong?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, absolutely. Availing of that prolific stock,

MR. STRACHAN:

my feelings are that that prolific stock as I have explained should be banned for the reasons I have explained. I also feel that as long as we are prepared through whatever joint ventures system we operate, we are therefore partners in crime -

MR. W. CARTER: There will be no ban on that stock.

MR. STRACHAN: - we cannot therefore pressure -

MR. W. CARTER: There will be no ban put on that stock.

MR. STRACHAN: Pardon.

MR. W. CARTER: There will be no ban put on that one area.

MR. STRACHAN: I beg to differ, I believe -

MR. W. CARTER: Are we going to forfeit the surplus? Are we going to allow the Russians to take it?

MR. STRACHAN: I believe if we owned up with a hue and cry, a hue and cry from the department -

MR. W. CARTER: Why do you not start it -

MR. STRACHAN: Oh it is started.

MR. W. CARTER: - with your friends up in Ottawa?

MR. STRACHAN: It is started. We already discussed this with the Minister of Fisheries, the Federal Minister of Fisheries in Goose Bay, and he was told in no uncertain terms that as far as the fishermen are concerned and by the fishermen -

MR. W. CARTER: I am for motherhood too. yes.

MR. STRACHAN: - that as far as we were concerned that fishery should be banned.

MR. W. CARTER: Of course it should.

MR. STRACHAN: And we feel that therefore if all fishermen, and if the Department of Fisheries and the minister takes the lead, well and good, I will support him immediately, take the lead.

MR. W. CARTER: We have a telegram gone off to the minister.

MR. STRACHAN: The telegram waffles, the telegram waffles, it is full of waffles. It does not state in clear, uncertain terms leading the fishermen, it is a waffle telegram.

MR. W. CARTER: Why do you not table your communications you have there?

MR. STRACHAN: Clearly!

MR. W. CARTER: Table your communication.

MR. MORGAN: He has not had any.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. CARTER: Show us what you have written.

AN HON. MEMBER: Here you go.

MR. W. CARTER: We have tabled ours, you table yours.

MR. DINN: Nothing to table.

MR. STRACHAN: What we are stating is that that fishery should be banned, and we believe it should be banned. The minister is getting very touchy, we are getting very close the truth, you know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. member allow me another question?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If it develops ultimately that the one authority in the world that can say, yes or no, that is to say that the Government of Canada says, No we are not going to bar fishing there, who the hon. member then be satisfied, in fact, would he not demand to see Canadian, and preferably Newfoundland Canadian ships go there and not leave it exclusively to the foreign bottoms?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STRACHAN: I still and insist on the fact that as long as we are prepared to get into deals like this, we therefore cannot pressure Ottawa. If you turn around and say that the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa turns around and categorically says that it will not be banned

MR. SMALLWOOD: There is only the one deal, and that is finished.

AN HON. MEMBER: You only got ten minutes.

MR. STRACHAN: I still say that I do not care, You can rationalize it whatever way you like, You can bring in the economics of it. The whole thing is if we believe that it should be the huge outcry, we should go after them because many of the biologists in the minister's department agree with the statement that we are putting forward and that many of the fishermen have put forward to ban that fishery. And

Mr. Strachan:

as long as we are prepared to be in bed with this kind of operation then how can we put pressure on Ottawa, how can we put pressure on the Federal Minister of Fisheries, and if it needs to be pressured well and good we will join and put the pressure on the Federal Minister of Fisheries. And I agree with that totally.

I think that what it needs very severely, in the loudest sense of the word, is a total and absolute ban of that kind of fishery. To obtain and charter foreign vessels -

MR. SMALLWOOD: For five or six years.

MR. STRACHAN: Or each year as you go along if you wish.

MR. FLIGHT: However long it takes to build the stock up.

MR. STRACHAN: But I believe however long it takes to build that stock up, to build that stock up, not in paper statistics, not in maximum sustainable yields, but build that stock up, and results shown by Newfoundland and Labrador fishermen bringing the fish ashore.

There are a number of other points that I wish to raise here, Mr. Speaker, on the tariff agreements, and with the EEC countries and so on, but at the moment seeing it is 6:00 o'clock I might as well adjourn the debate. I will not be here next week.

MR. SPEAKER: It being 6:00 o'clock the House is adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 P.M.