

VOL. 3

NO. 85

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

10:00 a.m. - 1:00 p.m.

FRIDAY, JUNE 9, 1978

The House met at 10:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce that Magistrate Clement P. Scott, who is presently a member of the Provincial Court Bench in St. John's, has been promoted under the provisions of the Provincial Court Act, to the position of Magistrate in Charge of the St. John's Criminal Court.

Magistrate Scott was appointed to the Bench on May 1st., 1966 and he has served as a magistrate in St. Anthony, Clarenville, and St. John's. He graduated from Dalhousie Law School with a degree of LL.B. in May of 1972.

There will be four magistrates attached to the Provincial Court in St. John's, namely Chief Magistrate Cyril J. Goodyear, who also has responsibility for the magisterial service throughout the Province, Magistrate Clement P. Scott, Magistrate John Trahey, who is being transferred from Corner Brook, and Magistrate Donald Luther. In addition Magistrate Charles L. Roberts is responsible for the Family Court in St. John's, and Magistrate Jack A. White for the Traffic Court.

I know the efficiency of the St. John's Criminal Court will continue to improve under the leadership of Magistrate Clement P. Scott.

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

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, just a very brief word to welcome the news announced by the Minister of Justice this morning. Magistrate Scott or Judge Scott - what is the - I have talked to a dozen different magistrates, Mr. Speaker, and some of them

MR. W. ROWE: want to be called judge and some of them want to be called magistrate, but the correct designation is still magistrate.

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. member never even (inaudible) made last year.

MR. NEARY: When the Minister of Justice becomes a magistrate then they will change it to judge. He will think he is a judge.

MR. HICKMAN: In answering the request that they should be called judges he said, judge is so confusing because last night I heard it in a fight with Mohammed Ali, Judge So and So awarded so many points. But everyone knows a magistrate is a presiding judge.

MR. NEARY: Get yourself appointed magistrate and then we will change the title to judge, that is the closest you will get to becoming a judge.

MR. HICKMAN: But I am in line for Justice of the Peace.

MR. W. ROWE: A.J.P.

Mr. Speaker, I do welcome the news. I know Magistrate Scott personally, not exceedingly well but personally, and I have always found him to be a perfect gentleman and a good magistrate. So I welcome then the news that he is going in charge of this division in St. John's.

I believe Magistrate Scott, if the Minister of Justice can bear me out on this, Magistrate Scott was one of the first I believe to take advantage of this new programme brought in by the much maligned previous administration. As a matter of fact when the Minister of Justice was then the Minister of Justice of that administration, if I remember correctly -

MR. HICKMAN: It died in my absence and I revived it again. It is true.

MR. NEARY: And now you have created a monster. What about action? You have created a monster now.

MR. W. ROWE: It must be good, Sir, to know that the symmetry of the planetary systems depends entirely on your own existence, and your own ability.

MR. DOODY: It is a comforting feeling.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, Magistrate Clement Scott was one of the first to take advantage of that very liberal programme of the former administration, which allowed magistrates sitting on the Bench, career magistrates, to get law degrees so that they could go back and be a magistrate again as a lawyer with a law degree, and of course that much more equipped to deal with some of the thorny legal problems which magistrates have to deal with on a day to day basis.

Sir, we welcome this news and I wish Magistrate Scott all the best in his new job.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. W. ROWE: The question is directed to the hon. Minister of Manpower, Mr. Speaker, concerning the same subject as I asked him yesterday. He was going to undertake to give us today I believe, a statement as to the points of difference, what are the points of variance between the bargaining unit, the Lab and x-ray technicians, and the Treasury Board negotiators?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: First of all, Mr. Speaker, if I may, because when the question was asked yesterday I was not aware of the situation. I would like to say that in the Department of Labour's feeling that it was very - it was not in the best interest of the collective bargaining process that talks did not continue with the hospital support staff. Those talks should not have broken off because people did not legitimately cross the picket line, the picket line having been set up after the exhaustion of a collective bargaining process. I did not know the situation when I was asked

MR. ROUSSEAU: the questions yesterday. However, I did check because I have some very strong feelings on it, with my colleagues, the political aspect of Treasury Board and certainly the decision to break off the talks were not made with their knowledge or consent.

And the other point, the actual question that was asked by the hon. Leader, I mentioned that either today or on Monday, there is a meeting taking place this morning at ten o'clock between Mr. Locking, the General Manager of NAPE, and my Deputy Minister Ted Blanchard.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I said after that meeting I might be in a position to do so - if it were yesterday I would do it today and if it were today I would not be able to do it until Monday.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Sir, it would give you an uneasy feeling what the minister just mentioned to us. What happens - authority is delegated to the Treasury Board negotiators, but very difficult decisions having tremendous ramifications appear to be taken by people without any reference to the head of the Treasury Board, the minister or the deputy minister or the secretary in the case of Treasury Board and so on. Who makes a decision that talks are going to be broken off which may have the effect, Mr. Speaker, of throwing the health services in this Province in complete jeopardy? Who makes that kind of a decision without referring to the political heads of the government, the government, itself or the minister in charge of Treasury Board? I mean, do they have the authority to do that? If so, I for one would like to know, and if they do not have the authority, what caused the breakdown in the chain of command in this particular case?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: The only way I can answer that question is to reiterate what I said. As the Department of Labour I think that question would have to be directed to the President of Treasury Board. I presume it is a collective bargaining group. I think something that we have a problem with is the Department of Labour. You know, when you are dealing with government employees, always the government employees seem to feel that the Department of Labour is a part of government and therefore is not really an unbiased

MR. ROUSSEAU: conciliation or mediation process. We would like to dispel that. We try to do that insofar as possible in the department, and we would like to be as objective and as neutral as possible in either the private or the public sector in providing whatever services we have in the department. With regard to the specific question, I think it would have to be directed to the President of Treasury Board. All we know is that the decision was indeed made and I think it was rather a hasty decision as far as the Department of Labour was concerned.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. N. ROWE: I disagree with the minister, Mr. Speaker. The Department of Labour, as the minister says, has to remain above the battle, has to give the impression, even though it is difficult, because they are part of the government, when dealing with public employees that they are not siding with Treasury Board negotiators and so on. I think it would be the ideal situation - and I put this as a question to the minister, for the minister to be able to come in here and give us an objective statement as to what happened in this particular case, and not leave it to the minister in charge of Treasury Board, the President of Treasury Board, to come in here and give his side of the story. I think it would be a good thing if the Minister of Labour (Mr. Rousseau) showed his independence in this respect, Mr. Speaker - we are not talking politically or anything, we are talking in terms of what is in the best interests of the collective bargaining procedure - if he told us what happened in this particular case, where the breakdown was, where the decision making capacity lay, who made the decisions - I do not mean the names of the individuals - what group or individual or

MR. W. N. ROWE: person in a position made a decision to break off these negotiations which could have had and may still have very, very serious implications and ramifications for the health services in Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I have talked, like I say, to my colleagues, the political members of Treasury Board. They were not aware of it. As soon as the President of Treasury Board returns it would certainly be my intention to bring this to his attention, just find out where it is or who made the decision and why the decision was made, because as the hon. member says, the department has to appear at least to be above it. And this morning what I have said about Treasury Board is the same as I would say about a private company or vice versa. And I think that is as objective as I can be at the point until I find out from the President of Treasury Board on his return just where this decision was taken and why it was taken.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, would the minister undertake to give a statement to the House, I would say, Monday or Tuesday or at the earliest opportunity? This is now reaching serious proportions. We have a picket line outside this building now which is the right and duty, I would say, of the group involved; and we had a chat with them this morning coming in. I mean, it is now starting to - not reach the explosive level perhaps, but it is certainly starting to reach serious proportions.

MR. NEARY: The pot is boiling.

MR. W. N. ROWE: The pot is boiling, as my colleague says. And the hon. minister needs, I believe, Sir - I ask this by way of a question - to make himself more familiar with what is going on here and to keep a very close eye on what is going on, not only with regard to the negotiations

MR. W. N. ROWE: themselves between the bargaining unit and the negotiators, but how the government is looking at this and what the government is doing and the political decisions that are going to be made. Because the people of this Province, Mr. Speaker - and I would ask the minister to comment on this - Would he not agree that this could be one of the most serious strikes to hit Newfoundland this year if this becomes a full-fledged strike with people refusing to cross the picket lines and so on in other sectors of the public service as well? I mean, we have here the makings, would he not agree, of a very serious situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

Mr. Rousseau: Every strike I guess is serious. This is a serious strike because it involves of course the hospital situation undoubtedly. And as I said yesterday, I was going to say something following the meetings. You know, it is very obvious what I am trying to squirt around, you know, when both sides are not at the bargaining table obviously we have to make penetrations into each group be it Treasury Board and/or a Crown agency, and the public sector or the private sector, an attempt to extricate from either side whatever concessions are there in order to find whether we can get them back to the table for an agreement. We are in the process of doing that now. As I said yesterday we talked to or the officials in the department are talking to management on the one side, and this morning they will be talking to the general manager of NAPE and we will continue talking back and forth until we can find some common ground, because somewhere down the line obviously the strike is going to be settled we would hope by talking to both sides continuously which we will do, that we will find some common resolve to it.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister a couple of supplementaries on this rather important matter. The minister did not answer satisfactorily the question put to him by the Opposition Leader, he was thinking about a question yesterday and consequently did not answer either very well.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister can clarify the situation that happened yesterday at Burin which caused or gave rise to the NAPE General Manager say that the government was guilty of unfair labour practices, and that the labour relations with the government was in a state of chaos. Can the minister tell us precisely what happened? And how it effects both groups? Because there seems to be some misunderstanding here. My understanding is that the hospital support workers crossed the picket line, and then the government broke off negotiating with the x-ray and lab technicians. Could the minister tell precisely what happened and which group it is

Mr. Lush: affecting or whether it is effecting both groups?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour.

MR. ROUSSEAU: To the best of my ability with regard to the information the x-ray and lab technicians set up picket lines at various points across the Province in the past few days, one of the places that picket lines were set up yesterday, legitimately so after the exhaustion of the collective bargaining process was the hospital at Burin. Eight or nine of the hospital support staff workers did not cross the picket lines, would not cross the picket line. Obviously they are saying, unit, NAPE, and that they felt that it was their right not to cross the picket line. And as a result of this incident in Burin there was a meeting set up yesterday, I think, about 11:30 yesterday morning, as far as I understand between the two parties in another set of negotiations, support staff negotiations. And because of the incident in Burin, as I understand it, because eight or nine people did not cross the picket line the meetings were called off, and the reason negotiations were called off -

AN HON. MEMBER: With whom?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Between Treasury Board and the Hospital Association on the one side, and NAPE I presume, I do not think it was CUPE, I think, it is NAPE who represent the hospital support workers. And the reason given was because they had not crossed that picket line and until they went back to work there would be no further meetings.

MR. LUSH: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: The hon. Leader of the Opposition, as I say raised the question, but the minister did not answer it, and I will see if I can clarify the situation. The hon. Leader of the Opposition asked what were the points of variance between the x-ray, lab technicians and the government. To clarify this my understanding is that one of the points of difference have got to do with the scale, there is a scale of pay or steps, one to six. And they are saying there is no way you can get to number six, you stay on number one.

Mr. Lush: The other thing has to do with receiving equal pay. That in certain hospitals apparently, if the smaller hospital that the workers do not get the same pay as working in a larger hospital. So they have been saying it is equal pay for equal work. So can the minister clarify just precisely what are the points of variance in this dispute?

MR. NOLAN: Standby pay.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I mentioned them yesterday as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, to the Leader of the Opposition. In effect, what the hon. member says is correct. I said that the service credits which is really the step system as the teachers have it or so on, that there are a certain number of steps, and, you know, -

MR. LUSH: Only one that you can get to.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, but they are not given by progression, year to year by experience or qualifications, as I understand it. That was the one issue.

The other one was called back or standby where x-ray and lab technicians, as I understand it, you know, I am getting this secondhand from my people, so my accuracy has to depend on their accuracy. That

MR. ROUSSEAU: In small hospitals of four or less of the x-ray and lab units they get \$650 a year for stand by or call back. In larger hospitals they get I think it is \$5 a shift for a stand by or for call back. The union does not think there is enough on the table in these two issues and Treasury Board and the Hospital Association when they broke off were not prepared to go any further. And as I said, obviously what the Department of Labour's job is now to do is to talk to both side and attempt to get some concessions, and it does not have to be 50-50. It may be 90-10. It may be 100-0, and it may be 50-50. I do not know what it is going to be. Some concessions so that we feel it would be useful to get both sides back to the table in the hope of getting a resolve to the dispute. Obviously we are not going to call both sides back to the table until we feel there is something there for them to give and take with. Otherwise they would only sit down and say, "We are not going to move. We are not going to move," and then "Good-By". You do not set up a meeting just for the sake of meetings.

When we think that there is some common ground there that we can explore either individually with the parties or with both parties we will do that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile, following by the hon. gentleman for St. John's West.

MR. NEARY: A couple of questions for Public Works and Services, Sir, in connection with the rental of office space for the Public Service. Would the minister tell the House if there are any pressing problems in connection with the rental of office space, and if so identify the problems and inform the House what the minister is doing about these problems?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, there is no problem with renting office space for the Public Service or for government. I think there is plenty of space available to rent. What we are doing is identifying the various departments and agencies who are most desperately in need of space. Once that process has been clearly and completely finished then government will decide on which course of action it should take in fulfilling the legitimate needs of the various agencies and departments of government.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the minister indicate, Sir, to the House if there is any foundation to the reports that are making the rounds of the city of St. John's that Newfoundland Hydro is presently negotiating for the purchase, or have concluded negotiations for the purchase of the Philip Building over here on Philip Place?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOODY: My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that Newfoundland Hydro has been carrying on discussions with the owners of that building with an intention obviously to purchase it. It is not a Public Works function, it is a Hydro function. How far the discussions have progressed, if at all, if a meeting of the minds of a common denominator has been achieved between those two parties is really something that I am not familiar with. As for the foundation of the rumours, there are stories that are going around St. John's to that effect. I cannot obviously comment on that. I do not know who originates the rumours or stories. I can say that Hydro and the owners of Philip Place have been or are presently discussing the possibility of the purchase of that building.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate what will happen to the departments of government that are in that building? Like I think the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities are in that building, and Industrial Development, and a number of other branches, bits and pieces of departments of government in that building. What will happen if Newfoundland Hydro buys the building? Will they still continue to rent space to the government? Will they kick these people out and where will they go? And what is going to happen to the Workmen's Compensation Building when it is complete? Who will be occupying that building apart from the Workmen's Compensation Board?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works.

MR. DOODY: The hon. member raises a number of questions which are being addressed by the Property Management Division of the Department of Public Works at the present time. Obviously if Hydro are successful in acquiring that property on their terms and conditions which are acceptable then they will consolidate their own operations which are now scattered around various parts of the city. I believe they are in at least three buildings, maybe more. That, as the hon. member suggests, will give rise to a problem with

MR. DOODY: space for the Department of Industrial Development with the Public Utilities Board so that will have to be taken into consideration when the total requirements of government are being considered. Whether government goes to tender, public tender for all or part of the space requirements will be determined in the very near future. I think that that may very well be the course of action that government will take however whatever course of action is decided on the House will be kept informed and that is about all I can say for now.

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to make a final supplementary I have to include two or three questions in my final supplementary. Number one, what is happening now with regard to Atlantic Place? Are there any negotiations going on there? What about the select committee or the special committee of the House that the Premier has been promising members for the last three years? That a special committee or a select committee of the House would be set up to look at this whole matter of the rental of office space to house the public service. Is this going to go ahead before any major decisions are made in connection with office space before the government decides to rent space down at Atlantic Place? Put up a new building, make an extension to Confederation Building, move the House of Assembly over to the old Colonial Building. Before any major decisions are made what I am asking the minister, will the government agree, can the minister tell us whether the Premier now is in a position to set up this special committee and take a look at the office space problem before any major decisions are made by the minister or his department?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, the first part of the question is what is the present situation regarding Atlantic Place? From government's point of view we have not reached any conclusions with Atlantic Place. We have had discussions with them but we have not reached a point where

MR. DOODY: we feel that we can rent a sizable chunk of space from Atlantic Place at a price that is acceptable or reasonable to government and so the Atlantic Place people have been informed of this at this particular point. That does not necessarily exclude Atlantic Place or space in Atlantic Place from the future plans of government. I say at this particular point we are that impass.

With regard to the Select Committee of the House and whether or not the Premier is in a position to appoint such a committee I really have no idea at this point of what the Premier's plans are with regard to that particular committee. It has been suggested that the committee would be set up to study the space requirements of government before any major decisions are made. I would think that that would include the possibilities of erecting a new building, of a long-term lease, of a capital purchase of a building or of a leaseback arrangement of a building. I think that that is the sort of thing that the Select Committee when and if it is appointed would be considering and that would be what I would consider in the nature of a major decision. In the meantime there are short-term space problems which can probably be resolved on a short-term lease basis while these longer term issues are being looked at and examined. I would suggest that that is probably the solution or probably the route that we will follow. Obviously I cannot answer for the Premier as to when the Select Committee of the House will be established. It is not my prerogative nor would I presume to take that responsibility. The Premier has made such a comment, I think he said something to the effect that that could very well be the correct course to follow before any major decisions are made. What I am saying is that while these various courses of action are being decided upon and why these long-term solutions are being sought the immediate problems are still with us many of which were surfaced by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) earlier this morning when he discussed the possibility of a displacement of office people from Prince Philip Place. These things have got to be handled very quickly and as I said the House will be informed of the short-term

June 9, 1978

Tape No. 4193

AH-3

MR. DOODY: solutions and if the long-term solutions
are arrived at then certainly the House will also be informed of that,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize the hon. gentleman for St. John's West, followed by the hon. gentleman for Fogo.

DR. KITCHEN: Mr. Speaker, my question is directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. In view of the minister's indiscretion in prematurely designating the Chairman of the Regional Council under legislation not yet approved by this House, and in view of the minister's insistence that the books not be subject to review by the Auditor General, and in view of the mounting opposition throughout the region to this Bill 50 and the various provisions, is the minister now prepared to withdraw this bill to have its provisions studied thoroughly during the Summer recess and perhaps having achieved some measure of consensus to reintroduce a modified bill possibly in the Fall session of this Legislature?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. DINN: Mr. Chairman, I do not know what indiscretion the hon. member for St. John's West is referring to. The Chairman of Metro has been made the permanent Chairman of Metro. If and when the Regional Council legislation is passed in this House, I have indicated that the new Chairman of the Regional Council would be Mr. John R. O'Dea; if and when - I have never said in this House or in any other place that Mr. O'Dea is the Chairman of the Regional Council. I said that if and when it is passed by the House of Assembly, he would be the chairman. He is the Chairman of Metro Board, the permanent Chairman of Metro Board, until such time as the Regional Council comes into play.

With respect to the Auditor General, if the hon. the member for St. John's West would read the

MR. DINN: Local Government Act, read the City of St. John's Act, the Auditor General audits the accounts of municipalities -

AN HON. MEMBER: Only if so designated.

MR. DINN: - yes, if designated. And where, in a case where he is too busy and he does not seem to be able to do all the municipalities right now, an auditor can be set up by the Department of Municipal Affairs to go in and audit the accounts of the municipality, any municipality in Newfoundland, and the Regional Council is no exception.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the minister to answer the question that was posed by the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) with respect to whether or not the legislation will be forced through during the present sitting of the House, or whether in view of all the opposition to the bill, he is going to wait for two or three months in the Summer for sort of a reconsideration period. You know, for example, the City of St. John's is very concerned about it, and I wonder if the minister could tell us whether or not he is going to ease off on the pressure?

MR. SPEAKER: . The hon. minister.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. member is not aware that this Province is now in a democracy and not a dictatorship. There is no way that anybody is going to force anything through. It will be voted on, discussed, debated and voted on by the House of Assembly which is the right way to do it. The City of St. John's has had an opportunity to provide input to the Regional Council Bill since January, 1977.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. DINN:

The Council. They decided last year when the bill was introduced, at the eleventh hour, to come in with their recommendations. At that point in time I agreed to defer. I said, 'I will give you one year to provide any input that you would like to provide, to make any discussions, to meet with me at any time that you wish.' I was at their disposal, and, as a matter of fact, at the disposal of any concerned citizens' committee, any member of this House of Assembly, at the disposal of any town council, and they did come in. They met four times, twice as a council and twice as concerned councillors, and we had discussions. This bill, "An Act To Establish The Northeast Avalon Urban Region", has been the subject of discussion by all the interested people on this side of the House every two weeks just about since last June, and we think we have an excellent piece of legislation and we think that it should be passed. We think that it is the way to go. As a matter of fact, we have a request from

MR. DINN: the joint town and community councils of the Burin Peninsula to have a look at regional government with respect to the Burin Peninsula, and we will be doing that in the next year, and we will discuss with them, and hopefully reach some agreement as to whether they would like to get involved or not.

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

MR. NOLAN: If I may, Mr. Speaker, even in the bill itself there is provision for a plebescite on regional government, section 58, "Subject to the approval of the minister the regional council may, by order, authorize the holding of a plebescite in the region for the purpose of determining the views of the electors in the region on any matter relating to local government in the region." What not start on the right foot and call a plebescite now? Would the minister consider that?

MR. W. ROWE: No, boy. Too democratic.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, with regard to the provision in Bill 50, respecting plebescites, we feel that the regional government eventually will handle regional services only, would not even be responsible for unincorporated areas because we feel that all the areas within the region should be incorporated. So the provision here is, and I think the hon. member for Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) will remember last year when we talked about the possibility of Newtown becoming part of Mount Pearl. They requested that they have a plebescite and there was no provision in the Local Government Act for me, as minister, to hold that plebescite. So I had to negotiate with Metro Board and ask them if they would on behalf of the department hold a plebescite to find out the wishes of the people in Newtown. And the Metro Board consented to do that and the plebescite was held and the people made

MR. DIEN: a decision and I think that is the way it should go.

We also thought at that time that that was a very reasonable thing to have in Bill 50 because in the coming years you might get places like Kilbride deciding that they want to become part of Mount Pearl or the city of St. John's, or setting up a local government of themselves and we felt that in order to determine the wishes of the people we should have provision in the bill for the regional council to hold plebescites in different areas in the region to find the wishes of the people.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the hon. Minister of Fisheries. I am sure the Minister of Fisheries is aware that the price of lobster has dropped from \$1.60 or \$1.65 to \$1.50. Now I hear that there are fishermen who have been holding out for \$1.80. I think the minister gave the impression that he was familiar with some company on the Mainland that came in here and was offering \$1.80. Has the minister any information whether there are any fishermen who held their lobster over and now stand to lose thirty cents per pound if that is the price paid today?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, when the lobster season commenced there was a company called Harbour Fisheries I think, owned and operated by a chap named Dennis Snow, a resident of Nova Scotia. He came in the Province, I believe at the invitation of the union, I am not quite sure of that, but while here indicated that they would be paying \$1.80 a pound for lobster. Shortly after the lobster season started, doubt was being expressed by fishermen on the basis of the performance of that company, as to their ability to meet their commitment to the fishermen, that of paying \$1.80 a pound. At no time did I advise fishermen to hold their lobsters

June 9, 1978

Tape No. 4195

MP - 3

MR. W. CARTER: until this \$1.80 a pound was being paid. Because I must confess, Mr. Speaker, there were certain doubts expressed to me and to my officials with respect to the ability of that company to make good their commitment. In the interim other companies, including National Sea and I think the company, Hopkins Company and others, moved into the various areas and I believe paid a price, while not equal to the one offered by the other company, was certainly far above that paid last year.

I am not aware of any fishermen having held lobsters over pending the \$1.80 pound price promised by that company. That company, like I said, did not prove its ability to be able to pay the price promised.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: The Address in Reply?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling Order 1 I would like to welcome to the House of Assembly fifteen education students from Memorial University accompanied by Professor McCann. I know hon. members join me in welcoming these students.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order 1, the adjourned debate on subamendment to the Address in Reply.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Thank you, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief today, I expect to speak for about forty-five minutes or an hour or so to give other members of the House, on both sides, an opportunity to speak on some of the important matters affecting their districts and the general problems and policies of the Province before Tuesday night when we expect this debate to clue up.

I am going to restrict my remarks, Sir, aside from one or two preliminary remarks of a general nature, I am going to restrict my remarks to one aspect of the inshore and nearshore fishery which I am very concerned about, and the protection of the inshore and nearshore fishery.

But before doing so, Sir, I would like to say one or two words about a couple of other matters. One of them is the disappointing performance generally of the government during this session of the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: I believe we have some sixty or sixty-five bills before the House at the present time. Now the Minister of Justice will undoubtedly stand up at some point and say, Oh that is the most bills we have had during this period of time or in such a short period of time since the House opened or something along those lines. What I am talking about, Sir, is a session of the House of Assembly and the small

Mr. W. N. Rowe: amount of meaningful legislation which the government has yet brought into the House, a small amount, Sir, The Dog Act is perhaps the high point, the pinnacle, the peak of this government's performance during this session of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: There are one or two pieces of legislation which are important, but, Sir, the quantity of important legislation, Sir, has gone down miserably this year, and I would say, Sir, will continue to go down as long as this administration is in office because, Mr. Speaker, this government has run out of steam, this government has run out of fresh vibrant and new ideas for coping with the problems of this Province.

And I would like to make just that comment on that, Mr. Speaker. If the hon. member for the Bay of Island (Mr. Woodrow), Sir, could just resume his seat or leave the House altogether I would be very appreciative. The first Liberal, Sir, to announce in the 1975 election, the member for the Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: I remember my hon. colleague, the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Simmons) commissioned to go out, Sir, to meet with that hon. member, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. WOODROW: Oh, oh!

MR. W. N. ROWE: - that hon. member in order to gear him up, get him ready for his great campaign, Sir, he having announced he was going to be the Liberal candidate, Sir, and on the way from Deer Lake to Corner Brook, by car, he switched on the radio to hear that the hon. member had changed his allegiance from the Liberal Party to the Liberal Reform Party, and then, Sir, about an half an hour on, just before arriving at Corner Brook another announcement he was then running for the P.C. Party. And I understand now, Mr. Speaker, from people in the Bay of Islands district that I talked to a week or so ago when I had the pleasure of visiting the beautiful district of the hon. member, Mr. Speaker,

Mr. W. N. Rowe: I understand now that he is sniffing the wind once more perhaps looking for the Liberal nomination next time around, sensing of course the great victory, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: But that is that hon. member, Mr. Speaker. Very, very flexible in his political philosophy, which is perhaps a good way to be, who knows.

The hon. Minister of Justice has certainly shown, set the example by his political flexibility, Mr. Speaker, over the years. It is so flexible, Mr. Speaker, you can mistake him for what is it they used to say about Dean Martin? A plate of spaghetti. So relaxed and flexible about his political philosophy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. N. ROWE: The St. John's West member saw the light.

MR. MAYNARD: That is right.

MR. W. N. ROWE: He saw the light, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. N. ROWE: As a matter of fact somebody characterized not necessarily the St. John's West member, but leaving the P.C. Party and joining the Liberal Party in 1971 was characterized by somebody as, jumping off The Queen Elizabeth onto the deck of The Titanic a half an hour before she struck the iceberg. And that is

MR. W. N. ROWE: probably the way to -
but, Mr. Speaker, that is all changed now, and now other people including the hon. the member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) are sniffing the breeze, Sir - very acute sense of smell - sniffing the breeze, wondering where he should go and what he should do now within the next year or two. And, Mr. Speaker, 'while the light holds out to burn, the vilest sinner may return', as the hon. Joey used to say.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. N. ROWE: Oh, no. The hon. the member for St. John's West (Dr. Kitchen) is alright, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: I know the hon. Leader. I know he is only joking.

MR. W. N. ROWE: That is right.

MR. WOODROW: I feel he is only joking, but I never at any time said I would run for the Liberal Reform Party although I was asked. And I would like to see him, in fact - it is nice, for example, for people to respect a person so much. But I also had the feeling that I can win on my own name.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Young) The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.
(Inaudible) a point of order.

MR. W. N. ROWE: A blatant attempt by the member, Sir, to cut into my limited time. I guaranteed the Minister of Justice, Sir, that I would only be about forty-five or fifty minutes, Sir. I am afraid all deals are off now. I am going to have to carry on for the full hour and a half.

MR. HICKMAN: What deals?

MR. W. N. ROWE: What deal? A deal to bail out the

MR. W. N. ROWE: government of this Province, that is what deal; a deal, Sir, to help the Government of this Province get through their Budget so the people of the Province can be paid their salaries, that is the kind of deal, Sir - a government that cannot even bring in a Budget Speech on time in enough time or bring in Interim Supply in time to make sure that the finances of the Province are adequately looked after, that is the deal, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Right.

MR. W. N. ROWE: - that we had to bail the government out on again this year. The hon. ministers asks about what deals. That is the deal, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Look, he is screwing up his face over there. Find out what he is talking about, will you?

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible) solemn agreements and impeccable arrangements.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Okay, we will change it from 'deals', Sir, to 'nefarious scheme'.

MR. NEARY: Do not involve me in any shade deals.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Oh, no, Sir. The hon. House Leader on the Opposition side would never be party to anything like that, I know, from long association and experience with him. As a matter of fact, Sir, he spends his time exposing nefarious and insidious deals that are going on in the Province with my full support and the full support of every member of this caucus, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: Five minutes left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Young) Order, please! I thank the hon. the Leader of the Opposition:

I would like to welcome on behalf of all the members of the House of Assembly to the galleries

MR. SPEAKER: (Young) eighty Grade III students from the Upper Gullies Elementary, Upper Gullies. They are accompanied by their teachers, Miss Brown, Mrs. McCarthy and Mrs. Halfyard. I trust you will have an enjoyable sitting.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. N. ROWE: (Inaudible) yield, Sir, for such a pleasant purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned a number of bills, the very low amount of meaningful legislation that this government has brought in during this session indicating the bankruptcy of the ideas which we have spoken about at some length already.

I would also like to reiterate a point I made about the hon. the Premier. Where is the Premier, by the way?

MR. NEARY: Toronto. He is up in Toronto.

MR. W. N. ROWE: He is supposed to be up in Halifax having a speaking engagement. Toronto?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, not in Toronto.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Not in Toronto.

MR. NEARY: He is gone to check the polls.

MR. W. N. ROWE: What is so attractive in Halifax or Toronto or wherever it might be, Mr. Speaker? Polls - there is a poll being done by the P.C. Party, Mr. Speaker, a poll supposedly independent. They are going to make it public, Sir, to try to bolster their image now. As a matter of fact, the Premier of the Province tried to go on NBC Television right in the middle of the poll, Sir, with a fifteen minute statement which was so slanderous, Mr. Speaker, that the lawyers for the NBC Television Station - CJON Television Station, Sir, would not allow it on the air. What kind of a Premier, Mr. Speaker, do we have in

MR. W. N. ROWE: this Province, where he goes out with public money, I understand, to buy fifteen minutes of prime time with a statement so utter scandalous and libelous that the NBC or CJON Television Station, Sir, which I would submit, Sir, has not been timid about putting out very close to the line statements on various things going on in this Province, that station, Sir, which has been bold and forthright about making information public, looked at the Premier's statement and had to ban it off the air because it was so libelous and scandalous.

MR. W. ROWE: the Premier's statement and had to bann it off the air because it was so scandalous. Seven or eight instances, Sir, of slanderous accusations made by the Premier of this Province using our money, Mr. Speaker, in order to do so. What kind of a Premier is he?

AN HON. MEMBER: They should sell it now as a stag movie.

MR. WHITE: He is trying to bolster the poll.

MR. W. ROWE: In a desperate attempt to try to get something out over the airways, Sir, at the time that the PC poll was being done.

MR. NEARY: Filth and pronography.

MR. W. ROWE: Well I would not go that far unless we are talking about sort of mental -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: It is for sale.

MR. NEARY: Gary Callahan signed the contract on behalf of the taxpayers so I do not see why we could not have a look at it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: No it has been sold.

MR. NEARY: Somebody the minister's leg.

MR. W. ROWE: Nobody has seen it. We can only go by what we have heard, Mr. Speaker, in the street. Since there is some talk as my hon. friend said, there is some talk of having the movie reproduced and sold for stag parties. It was that bad. Slanderous and libelous accusations and statements made by the Premier of this Province using public funds to do so, Mr. Speaker, at a time when the PC party is involved in doing a poll, Mr. Speaker, designed to try and bolster their image. And right at the time that the time that the questions are going to be asked, Sir, the Premier comes on with all this garbage.

MR. WHITE: He must have ambitions .

MR. W. ROWE: Yes he must.

MR. NEARY: He got one supporter last night in

MR. NEARY: the Keg. One member of the Newfoundland Constabulary supporting the hon. gentleman for leader in the Keg last night.

MR. DOODY: It has not been announced yet.

MR. NEARY: No that is right.

MR. W. ROWE: When he announces he will have two people in the Province supporting him as leader.

Mr. Speaker, - Ben Hawco - Mr. Speaker, now that I have the preliminaries over with I would like to say something which I consider to be a very serious problem involving the inshore and nearshore fishery of this Province, Sir, and the necessity, the absolutely imperative necessity of protecting the inshore and nearshore fishery of the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, what kind of ignorance has this place devolved to?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. ROWE: You cannot even make a speech here without four or five people getting involved in a loud conversation across the House. Discourtesy, Mr. Speaker, grousing ignorance of the worst order.

AN HON. MEMBR: You will get your pavement 'Bill' You will get your pavement.

MR. DOODY: I have it.

MR. NEARY: What about your sewer line?

You got that too but it does not work.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, I wish the Minister of Fisheries was in his seat, Sir, he sits in his seat for a half hour or so every day in order to stand up and make a Ministerial Statement and then he leaves. He did not do it today for some unknown reason then he leaves, Mr. Speaker. I wish he was here because I for one and I am sure people in this House and thousands of people outside the House

MR. W. ROWE: are extremely disappointed with the way that minister has been handling the portfolio of Fisheries. He is a gentleman, Sir, who appears to give every indication of doing no negotiation or talking with officials of the Government of Canada except through the media of this Province. He negotiates through the media, through either statements on TV or by Ministerial Statements in this House. As a matter of fact, Sir, he has been criticized severely over the last month or so particularly by the union and indeed by the industry itself for the haphazard and ad hoc way he has gone about trying to provide some leadership in the fishery of this Province and the lack of leadership that he has shown and the fact that he does negotiate through the media all the time. Apparently, Sir, as far as I can understand there is never any consultation of any kind with the union - perhaps there maybe some with the industry, the management of the fish plants - I do not know but there seems to be no consultation of any kind with the representatives, the elected representatives of the fishermen and processors or the great number thereof in this Province.

This shrimp stock controversy which arose over the last day or so, Mr. Speaker, is a prime example of where licenses were issued by Romeo LeBlanc up in Ottawa, wrongly I believe as we all believe on this side of the House - we made that position quite clear yesterday in response to the minister's statement, he so-called protest by telex up to the minister. But, Sir, it turns out that in spite of the pious platitudes uttered by the minister yesterday in his telex and in his protest, it turns out that all his efforts are after the fact. Nothing, Mr. Speaker,

MR. W.N. ROWE: nothing whatsoever was done by that minister, that minister himself personally, before the fact, in order to make sure we in Newfoundland got the lion's share or all of the benefit of those shrimp stocks, nothing, Mr. Speaker. Yet, the minister gets up in answer to questions by my hon. colleague the member for Trinity - Bay de Verde and indicates, Sir, that he himself had personally been in touch with or had written, or corresponded with the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, Romeo LeBlanc, personally, on a minister to minister level for a period of months in order to try to solve this problem of the shrimp stocks to make sure that we got our share here in this Province, or got the lion's share, or got all of it.

MR. F.B. ROWE: He would not go below the minister.

MR. W.N. ROWE: He would not go below the minister he says, Mr. Speaker. And it turns out, Sir, from our researchs that there is no record whatsoever, none, no record, Mr. Speaker, of any representation by that hon. minister to Romeo LeBlanc the Minister of Fisheries on the subject of shrimp licences being issued for those newly discovered shrimp beds off Labrador. No record at all, Mr. Speaker, nothing, none, by that hon. minister, nothing. And getting up in this House with platitudes, and cliches, and trying to give the impression, stating matters which turn out to be untrue, false, infactual. Mr. Speaker, I would say that is a very low level for a public figure in this Province to sink to, to be using the fishery as a political tool more or less heedless of what the actuality is, what the substance of these problems is, and making sure that he uses his power as a minister to try to get our fishery in this Province going in the best possible fashion. Saying that he has made

MR. W.N. ROWE: representations to the minister at the ministerial level and this turning out to be totally untrue, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F.B. ROWE: That is in the last eight months.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, in the last eight months as far as our researchers can go back, the last eight months not a representation on this subject. I am not saying there have not been representations made by deputy ministers, officials and so on with officials of the Government of Canada on other subjects, maybe even incidentally touching this one, what I am saying - or that the minister has not talked generally with the minister on licensing generally or other subjects, but what we are talking about, the question was specifically directed and addressed these shrimp stocks off Labrador, Mr. Speaker, and it was not until the die was cast by the federal minister in Ottawa in a manner which we do not agree with, that this hon. minister suddenly takes up the cudgel and goes to work protecting the interests of the Newfoundlanders. It turns out he did nothing whatsoever, Mr. Speaker.

 A minister, as a matter of fact, Sir, and I say this after due consideration - I must say I say it reluctantly, but I have to say it watching that minister in action over the last number of years - a minister who seems to welcome that kind of an opportunity, not to protect the interests of the Newfoundland fisherman or the Newfoundland fishing industry generally, Sir, but as an opportunity to launch another full-fledged attack, a political attack on Ottawa, to lash out again at Ottawa in an effort to bolster his own political image and make it look as if he is the protector and guardian of the Newfoundland fishery.

 The facts, Sir, do not bear that

MR. W.N. ROWE: impression out whatsoever.
My understanding is that between DREE and the Department of Public Works and the Department of Fisheries in Ottawa, Sir, in the year 1978-79 there will be some \$300 million spent by Ottawa regarding the fishing industry of this Province. Would that figure be correct?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. W.N. ROWE: \$300 million on the fisheries -

AN HON. MEMBER: Who?

MR. F.B. ROWE: DREE, Public Works, Environment and -

MR. W.N. ROWE: DREE, Public Works and Fisheries, I am told, by officials of the department.

MR. F.B. ROWE: You know, that is water lines and fish plants, superstructure and construction.

MR. PECKFORD: That is what they are building down here in the Environmental -

MR. F.B. ROWE: The whole works.

MR. W.N. ROWE: You know, things involved with the fishery. I am not talking about - I am not restricting it to dories, or punts or trapskiffs.

MR. HICKMAN: That would have nothing to do with the environmental -

MR. F.B. ROWE: It does.

MR. NEARY: It does, yes.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well, I mean, I am told - I do not know, right? I do not know, I have to go by what I am told - I am told by the officials of the Department of Fisheries that directly and indirectly matters associated with the fisheries \$300 million.

MR. NEARY: That is right. That is correct.

MR. W.N. ROWE: That is the figure I am quoted.

MR. NEARY: Right.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Now, that may be wrong.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Because how can I know?

Mr. Speaker, I did not count the number of dollars on the table.

MR. F.B. ROWE: It came from an official of the department.

MR. W.N. ROWE: This is from the officials. This would involve all matters leading towards the

MR. W.N. ROWE: increasing, the benefiting of the fishing industry in this Province. I would include also, of course, the subsidies and so on which are now the subject of grave problems now between Canada and the United States. \$300 million I am told. It seems to me to be an astounding amount of money, but I am told with a straight face. I do not know what the average over a year might be. Maybe this has some large capital works involved in it, new building and so on.

MR. DOODY: Is that the harbour, the new harbour -

MR. NEARY: No, that is Public Works.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Yes, but it is fisheries and everything directly related to it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: It does not include Port au Basques harbour, that has nothing to do with the fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER (Young): Order, please!

DR. J. COLLINS: Would the hon. member have any comparable figure in the agricultural field? Just by way of comparison, just to try to get an idea of how the federal government regards the fisheries. They have \$300 million they are giving to the fisheries. Is this just Newfoundland or is all fisheries? And how would that compare with the agricultural thrust?

MR. MORGAN: About one-third.

MR. W.N. ROWE: How does it compare with what?

AN HON. MEMBER: Agriculture.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well, I do not know, Mr. Speaker.

All I am talking about is the amount of money being spent in this Province directly and indirectly on matters which tend to benefit the fisheries of this Province, as I am told by honest, I would assume, respectable officials of the Department of Fisheries of Canada.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Now what they spend on agriculture I do not know. There are some awful, I would say, some awful things going on in agriculture. Because in the United States and in Canada, because of the need to pay people not to grow certain things and so on, it is a very strange, weird, untenable, in many ways, position with regard to agriculture in North America generally. I do not pretend to be an expert on it. But I am talking about the fisheries.

Compared with, Sir, \$18.5 million net being spent by the Newfoundland Government this year on the fisheries by this tremendous protector of the Newfoundland fishery. I just want to put that in perspective, Mr. Speaker. Let us know what we are talking about. I am glad there is \$18.5 million. There probably should be an awful lot more. I was going to give the House the benefit of a table I have here showing the net estimated expenditures over the last number of years in this Province here with the increases 5 per cent, 5.4 per cent and so on over the years but, Sir, I will not bother the House with that now. But suffice it to say that a minister who lashes out at every opportunity at Ottawa, showing no leadership himself, seizing every difficult situation as an opportunity to criticize Ottawa for political purposes, Sir, a minister who does that should know that other people in this Province know that there is a great, tremendous disparity between the attention being paid to the Newfoundland fishery by the Government of Canada and the attention being paid to the Newfoundland fishery by the Government of Newfoundland.

I am not saying that the Government of Canada is doing enough, I am not saying that they are taking the right approaches on many subjects, I am not saying that at all. As a matter of fact, they are taking a wrong approach but that is all in many subjects

MR. W.N. ROWE: that has not been allowed to come up, which the government could allow to come up by having the debate on it on a government day by merely calling the order, that has not been allowed to come up, Sir. No major debate has been provided or allowed by the Newfoundland and Labrador Government on the subject which is of the most crucial importance to our development, namely the fishery.

And that fact should be known, Mr. Speaker, that while this government and members like the member for Grand Falls district (Mr. Lundrigan) in his generally hypocritical way, I would submit, Sir,

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: What is wrong.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is unparliamentary.

MR. HICKMAN: Oh yes it is.

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Not it is not. No-it-is-not.

MR. W.N. ROWE: It is unparliamentary to call a member of the House a hypocrite, it is not unparliamentary to characterize a member's actions as hypocritical, Mr. Speaker, that is clearly distinguished in Beausheue. I have never called a member of this House a hypocrite nor shall I, Mr. Speaker. But I do characterize actions of members and ministers in certain cases as appearing to be and, in fact, as being hypocritical. We may have to change Beausheue. I know hon. members opposite would like to change it to disallow all debate in the House they have gotten such a pasting during this session on nearly every matter that has come up.

Mr. Speaker, even if one is prepared to admit that the lion's share of the jurisdiction over the fisheries comes or is under the auspices and control of the Government at Ottawa, even if you are prepared to admit that, and that would appear to be the

MR. W.N. ROWE: case, that is no excuse for this government abdicating its responsibility to provide leadership in the field of the Newfoundland fisheries. They have to provide the leadership, Sir, to make sure that our interest is protected. And if this means taking on Ottawa, confronting Ottawa, Sir, on important matters, head on at the official and ministerial level, then I say so be it. But, Sir, leadership in the fisheries area is not provided if the Government of Newfoundland is taking on Ottawa for political purposes on every single little thing that ever emerges, every single little thing that ever comes up, Sir, because when an important matter comes up like this shrimp stock matter we are now involved in, Sir, this government has cried wolf so often that nobody pays any attention to it anymore, nobody knows if it is important or not, nobody has any idea, Sir, whether this is important or whether this is just another matter where the Government of this Province as represented by the Minister of Fisheries, is using this instance to try to gain for himself a little bit of political advancement, you might say.

What we need, Sir, is consultation and negotiation between Ottawa and Newfoundland with the leadership shown by this government here as far as the Newfoundland fishery is concerned, consultation and negotiation; not head on confrontation day in and day out every five minutes. Confrontation if necessary, Mr. Speaker, on important matters, but remember you can only declare war once, and if you are going to declare war, then let us make sure you are declaring it, Sir, on a matter of great principle not on some political expediency that may arise every fifteen or twenty minutes.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we will talk, I hope, on Wednesday about the Nordsee proposal but I have no assurance of that. The government has tried

MR. W.N. ROWE: to keep that debate from coming up in this House ever since the House opened several months ago. I hope that the Nordsee proposed takeover will come up for debate on Wednesday, but we have no guarantee. It has to, Mr. Speaker. The House might be closed by Tuesday for all I know.

MR. PECKFORD: No, Siree!

MR. W.N. ROWE: No, Siree, eh?

MR. PECKFORD: No, Siree!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Well I hope it comes up, Mr. Speaker.

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible) we have too many things to do here to close the House on Tuesday.

MR. F.B. ROWE: The minister and his statements on Wednesday.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Oh yes, lots of things to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Lot of things to do. The government is likely to close the House, Sir, it is so punch drunk over there as a result of the last three months. I hope they keep it open until next September. Let us close when the Queen comes, for a day or two.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Maybe we can have her close the House and then open it again before she leaves - for the new session. Let her prorogue the House and then open it again, read the Speech from the Throne. Not a bad idea.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not a bad idea.

MR. HICKMAN: I can tell you that bank managers (inaudible) last week.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Many bank managers?

MR. HICKMAN: Yes.

MR. W.N. ROWE: The minister's sophisticated illusion, Sir, has passed right over my head. I do not -

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: The hon. the member for
Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) knows. With the high fiancée, we
are on the same wave-length.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. HICKMAN: That is right.

MR. W.N. ROWE: What is he talking about?

MR. PECKFORD: I think you should put the
hon. Minister of Finance and the hon. member for Terra
Nova -

MR. W.N. ROWE: Oh yes! Okay! I am not so
preoccupied, Sir, as some members, obviously, with the
fact that I am starving to death.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W.N. ROWE: It does bother me every now
and then, I get a little pinch in the stomach here.

MR. DOODY:

You were on more serious matters.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

That is right, I was on the starvation of the Province as a whole, Mr. Speaker, rather than my personal survival.

Mr. Speaker, the Nordsee proposal; what kind of leadership has this government shown in that area? Now I will be saying a few more detailed remarks on Wednesday, if the government ever get the courage to keep the House open and have that matter debated, I will be having a few more remarks to say, but there is one aspect of that, Sir, which is so pervasive, and I feel so important to talk about that I cannot risk waiting until Wednesday to talk about it. If we have the debate on Wednesday I will go into it again, other aspects of it, but let me touch on it in any event.

I want to touch on one or two aspects of the Nordsee proposed takeover which is being pushed down the throats of Newfoundland by this government for some obscure reason and I have my suspicions, and I will give a full account of my suspicions on Wednesday coming. The excuse now, Mr. Speaker, given by the government over the last number of months, is access to European markets as if giving licences to a West German company to utilize its five old trawlers that it cannot use, they are redundant because of our declaration of the 200 mile limit, as if that, Sir, in some way is necessary in order to get access to the European markets.

Mr. Speaker, there has never been a greater red herring dragged over a matter than that red herring concerning these five old trawlers that the West Germans are now trying to utilize because they have no use for them unless they use them over here. A red herring, Sir, and, as I say, I will get into that on

MR. W.N. ROWE: Wednesday, I hope, if the matter ever comes up for debate. It is not necessary at all in order for us to get access to the European markets, Mr. Speaker, to have that company come in here and fish in the Northern cod stocks, get licences and fish in the Northern cod stocks, Sir.

What I want to talk about today, Mr. Speaker, for the next half hour or so, is this idea that there is in the Northern groundfish stock a surplus, this mythical surplus that is often referred to that has to be taken in 1978 and in 1979 and in the succeeding years, this surplus, this codfish which is surplus to the needs of the inshore and nearshore fishery as far as this government is concerned and as far as the Government in Ottawa is concerned, and as far as certain, I believe, unthinking or unconcerned people are concerned in this Province.

There are two aspects, of course, Mr. Speaker, to the Nordsee proposed takeover. One is the takeover of the plant itself by the injection of foreign capital as a processing plant. That is something we will get into on Wednesday. Fish processing at the plant. The other aspect, which is much more important, and this is where the granting of the licences come into the picture. Remember FIRA, F-I-R-A, the agency in Ottawa which approves foreign takeovers or not is only concerned, Mr. Speaker, not with the granting of the licences to allow trawlers to fish out of the Northern cod stocks, it is merely concerned as to whether or not a foreign company should be allowed to buy a majority shareholding in Ocean Harvesters Limited in Harbour Grace. That is the only thing they are concerned with. We can lay that to one side, Mr. Speaker, because that is a different problem altogether and one, I would submit, which has been blown completely out of proportion and is not as important as

MR. W.N. ROWE: the wind and gas which we have heard over the last number of months would seem to indicate.

What is important, Mr. Speaker, is the other aspect, not the fish processing and whether that is owned by Nordsee or whether it is owned by a Canadian company, that is important but not half as important or quarter as important, Mr. Speaker, as the fish catching aspect of this whole proposal.

Mr. Speaker, the fish catching aspect of the proposal involves the granting of fishing licences to allow these trawlers to go out and catch fish in the Northern cod stock for processing in Harbour Grace or elsewhere. Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, on Wednesday I will get into some of the details of this a little further, but just to brush over it until I can get into the meat of the question of the surplus in that Northern cod stock, or those areas, Mr. Speaker, just let me

MR. W. ROWE: mention one or two points very briefly.

First of all we should realize, Sir, that this is not the first attempt by a foreign company, or the last attempt by a foreign company to gain access to our Canadian fish resources. We should keep that in mind, Mr. Speaker. Resources, Sir, which they are unable to get through allocations. They are unable to get it through foreign allocations. They are unable to get it because of the 200 mile limit having been proclaimed and they are now, Sir, trying to get it by way - get the benefits of our extended jurisdictions through the back door. We should keep that in mind, Mr. Speaker, and as I say we will talk a little more about that on Wednesday.

I believe myself, Sir, that it is highly undesirable to have one company, especially a large foreign owned company, catch such a large quantity of fish, Mr. Speaker, of the Northern groundfish stocks, very highly undesirable to have one company in there and have our future or be locked into a long term commitment to one large company. I believe, Sir, that if there is a surplus there, and we will come to that question, if there is a surplus in the Northern cod stock, Mr. Speaker, it should be caught by vessels chartered for that purpose on a seasonable basis, for as long as, and to the extent that Canadian owned vessels are not available to take it. I think we should concentrate on Canadian owned vessels if there is a surplus and not get locked into foreign deals on the catching of fish in the Northern cod stock. Then, Sir, I believe that we would not have this question of a sell out to foreign interests, and Sir, there would be employment created in other plants, in addition to the Harbour Grace plant, because that is important too. There is no reason as important as the Harbour Grace plant is concerned, it is not all important. There are other plants, plants in my hon. colleague's district that could use access or could use fish from the Northern cod stock caught by way of trawlers in order

MR. W. ROWE: to provide fresh employment, other employment, onshore in the processing, Sir.

I do not think, Sir, there is any need to find resources for these large vessels that catch in the Southern areas during the Northern area off season. But in any event, Mr. Speaker, just to skip quickly over this and to get to the most important point that I would like to make today, this question of capital in the Nordsee proposed takeover, Mr. Speaker, and that the only capital available is somehow foreign capital can be shot full of holes, Mr. Speaker, in five minutes. Fishery Products does not have any difficulty raising capital either through the help of this government or without it. Other companies, Sir, do not have any difficulty raising capital in Canada, outside Canada, guaranteed by the government or otherwise, Mr. Speaker. So let us not talk about the need for capital in the Harbour Grace plant, \$3 million, Mr. Speaker, as being outside the ability of the company over there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the most important point regarding this proposed takeover, regards this distinction between the near shore fishery on the one hand, and the offshore fishery on the other. That is the most important point I believe that has to be gone into as far as the debate on the granting of licences to fish in the Northern cod stock is concerned. The question we have to ask ourselves, Mr. Speaker, is whether we should allow the Government of Canada, or the Government of Newfoundland, pressing the Government of Canada, to disallow it. Whether we should allow as a people the catching of fish at all in this Northern cod stock. We have to ask ourselves whether in fact a genuine surplus, surplus to the needs of the inshore and the near shore fishery exists.

Mr. Speaker, before launching into the burden of those remarks, I understand you would like to welcome some students who are here.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): I thank the hon. member for his courtesy.

I would like to welcome on behalf of hon. members twenty-seven students from the Charisma Pentecostal Academy, Little Bay Road, Springdale, who are in grade six, and they are accompanied by their teachers Ralph Rowsell and Wanda Hobbs. I am sure hon. members would like to welcome them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. W. ROWE: We have to determine, Mr. Speaker, because it is the most important point, and if we do not determine it in a sensible, rational way and come to the right conclusion, then we

Mr. W. N. Rowe: jeopardize the most important aspect of the fishery in this Province on the Northeast Coast, the inshore and nearshore fishery, whether a genuine surplus exists in the Northern cod stock or not.

In December of 1977, Mr. Speaker, there was a two day conference on the Newfoundland Fishery held at Marystown, I do not know if my hon. friend, I believe, my hon. friend the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Canning) was there, the hon. Don Jamieson was there, other people where there political figures and, of course, the industry and the union were adequately represented. There were representatives of government, fish trade unions, fishermen, there were a lot of people there, Mr. Speaker, and the conference went on, and a very productive conference it was, and I have read several reports of what went on at that conference.

It was determined, Mr. Speaker, at that conference as a result of the discussions and the statistics that were presented by various officials of the two governments, it was clear from the statistics and the discussions that with the 200 mile limit now in place, Mr. Speaker, and with good management practices, with good management practices, not what we have had over the last number of years, but with good management practices it will take five to ten years to rebuild the fish stocks in this Province, which are important to this Province. That is what came out of that conference, Sir, I believe, the single most important point that came out of the conference.

Another point that came out, Sir, which was not a misconception to many people in the Province, but was a misconception to others, and it was cleared up I believe and I hope it was cleared up finally for everybody, especially those involved in the fishing industry, a misconception that was finally cleared up was that there are two independent unrelated fisheries going on in this Province, the inshore fishery and the offshore fishery, that these are in some way mutually exclusive and independent one from the other.

It was cleared up at that conference, Sir, if it ever existed as a doubt in anybody's mind, and I believe it did from

Mr. W. N. Rowe: my discussions beforehand, what is done in the offshore fishery, Mr. Speaker, drastically affects the future of the inshore fishery as well and thousands of people involved in the inshore fishery. That the two fisheries are not mutually exclusive, and that if you catch too many or catch too much fish offshore that you will destroy the inshore fishery in this Province. Now if anyone ever had any doubts about that, Mr. Speaker, the statistics and the expert opinion delivered at the conference cleared it up forever, Mr. Speaker. There are not two independent fisheries, the inshore fishery and the nearshore fishery which is of great importance to this Province, a vast importance to this Province now and in the future, Sir, depends completely and directly on what care is taken and what is done with regard to the offshore fishery.

And, Sir, I believe at that conference that members of the industry and members of the union and public figures, and certainly I believe this, and I believe I am speaking for all of my colleagues on this matter that the inshore fishery must come first. I do not think that anybody in this House would deny that, anybody who has a fishing district, that the inshore fishery, the nearshore, when I say, inshore, I am talking about the inshore, nearshore fishery, Mr. Speaker, as opposed to the offshore with the trawlers and so on. That the inshore, nearshore fishery must come first.

And because the inshore, nearshore fishery must come first, Sir, we must move exceedingly slowly with the slowness of a snail, Mr. Speaker, and with exceeding caution regarding any concession granted by Canada to foreign companies or foreign countries regarding our fish stocks offshore or in the prosecuting of the offshore fishery generally. And if we are going to make mistakes, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to make errors let us err, let us make a mistake on the side of protecting the inshore, nearshore fishery. And, Sir, let us not lock ourselves into any arrangements with any companies foreign or domestic, but especially foreign companies, Sir, because then you are getting involved into treaty making, and perhaps, tariffs, and a number of other things, Mr. Speaker. Let us make sure that any concessions

MR. W. N. ROWE: are given on the basis of exceeding caution in the protection of the inshore fishery which means watching scrupulously and carefully the offshore fishery, and that we should not lock ourselves into long-term or permanent arrangements, Mr. Speaker, with companies regarding the prosecution of the Northern cod stock. We must, Mr. Speaker - I believe this as fervently as I believed anything in my life, that we must take time to see where we are going in the fishery in this Province. We need to take time to see how well the stocks offshore are recovering around this Province, and we must take the time to see how our own inshore and near shore fishermen are doing over the next number of years around this Province. We must take the time to see where we are going in all these respects, Mr. Speaker, before entering into any foreign deals whatsoever. We must, Mr. Speaker, for the protection of the inshore fishery. Because, as was mentioned in this conference and substantiated and confirmed by the best expert opinion in the Province, if you catch a codfish in a Northern groundfish stock in March, then that is a fish that you will not catch, Mr. Speaker, in July inshore. I believe, Sir, that statement is one believed implicitly by anyone with any expert knowledge practical or theory, any expert knowledge of the fishery.

MR. NEARY: Long established.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Long established, Mr. Speaker, long known by the fishermen - I have heard it for ten years that I have been involved in politics, but now, Sir, I believe, firmly established in the minds of scientists and theoretical people, people with some philosophy of the fishery or some theories of the fishery, Sir - now established clearly in their minds as well -

MR. NEARY: Dr. Art May.

MR. W. N. ROWE: Dr. Art May is a name, for example - that if you catch a fish in the Northern cod stock in March then that is a fish that you will not catch, Mr. Speaker, inshore on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland in July. And as simple a statement, Sir, as that may be, it is a basic one, and one, Sir, that may determine the complete future of the cod fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Sir, let us get to this question of a surplus and whether or not a surplus exists in the Northern cod stock. My own view, Mr. Speaker, based on the best opinion that I can seek out and read and talk to over the last number of months and years, my own view is that no surplus exists in the Northern cod stock in this Province. Mr. Speaker, the quota set by the Government of Canada for cod caught in ICNAF areas 2J-3KL in 1978 has been set at 135,000 metric tons. This area 2J-3KL, is, of course, becoming a familiar figure - a familiar sort of combination of figures and numbers now, Mr. Speaker. That area, of course, is the area that includes the Labrador and Northeast Coast of Newfoundland down to the Southern tip of the Avalon Peninsula - that is what is referred to as 2J-3KL; and the quota for cod caught in that ICNAF area in 1978 has been set at 135,000 metric tons for 1978. Of that quota, Sir, 135,000 metric tons, 35,000 metric tons have already been allocated to foreign countries. That has been allocated and that will be taken and that is gone - 35,000 metric tons have been allocated under the deal, of course, where the 200 mile limit was first proclaimed.

Oh, the Minister of Fisheries is back. I am glad to see he is back.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is trite, of course, and well known to everyone that if the West German

June 9, 1978

Tape 4205

EC - 3

MR. W. N. ROWE: company, Nordsee, wishes to catch
Northern cod out of this area that it must come from the

MR. W.N. ROWE:

Canadian quota of 100,000 metric tons, that is where they must get the fish that they want to catch. But Sir, as I said earlier and as I will hopefully demonstrate, personally I do not believe and I would like to hear the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter) on this, I do not believe that we have any fish to give away out of that 100,000 tons in those ICNAF areas. In 1971, and if I am incorrect in any of these figures I hope the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Carter) will correct me because they are based on what I have been told by so called experts and what I have read in my researches and so on. In 1977 the inshore nearshore fishermen landed 75,000 tons of cod and Canadian trawlers landed 6,000 tons of cod in that 2J3KL area, the northern cod stock, I believe that is correct.

MR. F.B. ROWE:

That is the 1977 quota there.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

Right.

MR. F.B. ROWE:

(inaudible) and then they had

the joint ventures.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

That is the -

MR. F.B. ROWE:

That is just quotas.

MR. W.N. ROWE:

That is right, 350,000. The foreign effort was 90,000 tons in 1977. I was not referring to the foreign effort in 1977 merely the domestic effort. Of course, Mr. Speaker, nobody knows, perhaps the Minister does I do not, nobody knows how many more tons could have been taken in if the trap fishermen had been given fair play in 1977, that is if there had been enough processing and freezing capacity in order to take into account the glut during the trap season. Nobody knows how much was dumped, Mr. Speaker I do not suppose unless the Minister has some figures on this.

MR. CARTER:

It was not all that was dumped it was the amount of fish the fishermen could not catch because they could not haul their gear.

This page is missing from the original copy.

June 9, 1978

Tape No. 4206

CW - 3

MR. W.N. ROWE:

in the year 1978, I do not believe for one second Mr. Speaker that we should lock ourselves in, as a province, to a long term deal with a foreign company regarding our Canadian quota. I believe Mr. Speaker, I may be wrong but I do believe sincerely and I know lots of people in the province who believe sincerely as well that in 1979 and in the early 1980's

MR. W. ROWE:

with the inshore, near shore fishing effort increasing, Mr. Speaker, and with better catches per boat in the inshore and nearshore fishery and with , as I mentioned earlier, the glut problem alleviated if that can be alleviated. The inshore and the nearshore fishery should be able, I believe, should be able to take the full Canadian quota for at least the next few years of fishing in this Province. I would like to hear the Minister of Fisheries talk about that aspect of the problem regarding the Nordsee proposal or any proposal to give away part of our quota to a foreign fishing effort.

We have to remember all the time, Sir, that in 1955 and I believe these figures are correct, 1955, twenty-three years ago with more limited technology - I will make this point and then the hon. minister can ask a question. Wait until I make this point. We should remember, Sir, that in 1955, twenty-three years ago with even more limited technology than we have now in the inshore fishery and with fishermen, Sir, spending much more time in other aspects of the fishery in those days, salting and drying fish, we should remember that the figures that I have and the minister may be able to confirm or deny this, our inshore fishery had landings of 167,000 tons of cod in 2J3KL, the Northern cod stock, 67,000 tons more in 1955 if my figures are correct and I believe they are, more than the Canadian quota of 100,000 metric tons. Now the minister wanted to ask me a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member of course is talking about the allocation of surplus quotas. He talked about the Nordsee proposals that would have the affect maybe of having an additional pressure applied on the Canadian inshore effort in 1978 and the offshore and beyond. I wonder would the hon. member then not agree that maybe recent actions on the part of the federal government, and again I say this at the expense of being accused of picking a fight with Ottawa, but I wonder would he not agree that the recent action on the part of Ottawa whereby they gave 5,000 tons of cod fish from the areas outlined by the hon. member, 2J3KL, to Spain without any economic

This page is missing from the original copy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER: And that if there is a surplus it be held in abeyance until such time as we are satisfied that some -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. W. CARTER: - economic return comes to this Province -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I would like the hon. minister to give us his point of order.

MR. W. CARTER: - for these quotas.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel it is not a point of order just more or less a point of explanation and I ask the hon. member to continue.

MR. W. ROWE: The minister, Sir, is very touchy on this issue.

MR. W. ROWE:

and I do not blame him for being very touchy, for having to present himself in a ridiculous light, attacking something publicly after the fact.

MR. W. CARTER: (Inaudible) has not been established yet.

MR. W. ROWE: We are talking about the shrimp stocks now.

MR. W. CARTER: (Inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: I am talking about the shrimp stocks now, Mr.

Speaker. I do not know what he is talking about at all. I am saying that this hon. minister as usual put himself in the ridiculous position. I say ridiculous, that is the wrong word because ridiculous means it is sort of laughable and it is not laughable, it is serious. - of not having presented adequately this Province's views before the fact to the minister in Ottawa, the minister in Ottawa taking a position which he probably thought was in the best interests of Canada as a whole but which may not be in the best interests of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker, which is the minister's job. To put himself in that kind of a position, Sir, of protesting by a strongly worded cliché ridden telex after the fact, that is the point I am making, that this needs to be done before the fact. But I did not want to get into a personal dispute on this matter with the minister. I am trying to make a more important point.

That is that in 1955, twenty-three years ago, with more limited technology, with I would submit, less fish per boat and with more time spent on other activities involved in the fishery by fishermen, Mr. Speaker, our inshore had landings of 167,000 tons of cod in 2J3KL, ICNAF area. And we are now saying that with an allocation or a quota rather of 100,000 metric tons that there is a surplus capacity, surplus beyond the capacity of our inshore and nearshore fishery. Mr. Speaker, the whole thing is totally ridiculous and something which may have the effect of seriously damaging the inshore and nearshore fishery in this Province and something which we in Newfoundland should be fighting against. I know it is the Government of Canada's that is doing it but let us fight against it in the best possible way by making sure that our

MR. W. ROWE:

views are known and that there is constant, continuous discussion, consultation, negotiations, pressure brought to bear on Ottawa, not by getting the back of the minister up or the back of all the officials in Ottawa up because we are constantly smacking them across the face or kicking them in the shins here in this Province. What kind of a way is that to carry on? A bunch of children, Mr. Speaker.

Let us consult, negotiate, press our view and make sure that our interest is protected. And if this government was protecting our interests as far as the inshore fishery and nearshore fishery is concerned they would not with unseemly haste be trying to enter into some kind of a very, very suspicious deal, Mr. Speaker, pushing a deal between the Nordsee interests and Ocean Harvesters to take offshore so called surplus capacity out of 100,000 metric tons of fish in the Northern ground fish stocks.

MR. F. ROWE: They still have not got their policy straightened up.

MR. W. ROWE: There is no policy, Mr. Speaker, over there. Every week-like the spruce budworm, Mr. Speaker, and like everything else that has ever been mentioned, like the hospital commitments, there is no policy over there. You get the president of the P.C. Party saying one thing one day and something else the next. You get ministers who are going to resign, Mr. Speaker, unless such and such is done with regard to the Nordsee fishery. The whole thing is totally unsavoury, Mr. Speaker, in my mind, suspicious and smacks of some kind of a sellout of the best interests of the inshore and nearshore fishery in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER: At least we are not talking about burning their boats.

MR. W. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, that is sensible what he is saying there now.

MR. F. ROWE: Bring up Dr. Valdmanis now and the rubber plant.

MR. W. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Let us talk about how John Cabot should not have put the baskets over the boats. You know, terrible

MR. W. ROWE:

should not have put the baskets over the boats. You know, terrible environmental pollution. He should not have put the baskets over, Sir, and hauled them up full of codfish. God knows what irreparable damage he did in 1497 to our cod stocks. If I can get my few notes here, Mr. Speaker, I will carry on. God knows what John Cabot did to our fishery, Sir, with those baskets. And now we are talking about Vald Manis are we or what is it? Burn your boats? Or what is it? A yellow dog can get elected down here if he had a Liberal tag. What are we going to hear next?

MR. W. ROWE:

We are trying, Mr. Speaker, to talk about a serious subject.

MR. W. CARTER: It hurts does it not?

MR. W. ROWE: It hurts? Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister was one of those yellow dogs.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: No, Sir, he had the guts to go to a Tory district and get elected, not like the hon. minister in one of the safest Liberal seats at that time.

So, Sir, we are talking about -

MR. W. CARTER: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: Oh, Mr. Speaker -

MR. F. ROWE: Listen to it now.

MR. W. ROWE: Mr. Speaker -

MR. F. ROWE: Put up the (inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: What is it now. What is this now, Sir, a man cannot -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. ROWE: Okay. Mr. Speaker, Your Honour -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. W. ROWE: That is all right. That is all right. Mr. Speaker, Your Honour I hope is taking due notice of the fact that you are also basking in the light of these insults flung across the House. The Speaker of the House having also in an effort, in a desire to improve his knowledge and his learning decided to go over to Cambridge University while he was a member of the House of Assembly. I would be the last one to criticize. I admire Your Honour for the gumption, the aggressiveness shown, the intellectual curiosity shown to go over and improve the state of his mind a little bit with more learning, more knowledge. I did the same thing, Mr. Speaker, and there is something suspicious about this all of the sudden. And I am glad Your Honour did it and I am glad I did it and four or five or seven or ten years from now I will take another sabbatical in an effort,

This page is missing from the original copy.

MR. W. ROWE:

Speaker, when we are talking about the most important aspect of our life in this Province with the possible exception of getting our fair share of the value of Labrador power as far as the economy is concerned. The actual input of money into the economy, with the possible exception of that - I am not saying it is an exception, possible exception, Sir, the proper development of the inshore and nearshore fishery in this Province is the most important subject to come before this House ever. And what do we hear? Testy remarks are thrown across the House, Sir, no attempt to address the issue. No debate put on the Order Paper by the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, to try to help out in this issue. No, Sir. The odd ministerial statement, adhocery, Mr. Speaker, put her in slings, no comprehensive plan or anything like that, Mr. Speaker.

Now, Sir, to continue. As I said twenty-three years ago, 167,000 tons of cod in that area in the Northern cod stocks, were taken by the inshore and nearshore fishermen in this Province. And we talk about 100,000 tons now with new technology, with new people going into the fishery, with I hope increasing facilities and capacity for processing and we talk about there being a surplus to the needs of the inshore and nearshore fishermen. The whole thing is laughable, Sir, laughable.

MR. F. ROWE: Within the realm of error.

MR. W. ROWE: Certainly within the realm of error, that is the point, that even if there is some perceived surplus there the margin of error would be greater as seen by any reasonable person, Sir, would be greater than that perceived surplus. And that is why we should not give any so called surplus to any foreign fleet or to any other company in an offshore effort, Mr. Speaker. WE should err, we should make mistakes if mistakes are going to be made on the side of caution, on the side of protecting

MR. W. ROWE:

the inshore and nearshore fishery. Now, Mr. Speaker, if at some time several years away the inshore and nearshore fishery has reached a natural peak and then levels off and then there is a plateau and the best advice from the fishermen and their representatives and by other experts in the field of the fishery is that the inshore fishery has reached this plateau and is going to remain there or with a very gradual increase over the foreseeable future, when in other words, Mr. Speaker, we are absolutely certain that the inshore and nearshore fishery is taken care of in this Province as far as resource allocations are concerned to that fishery and, Sir, if then by careful management of that stock, the Northern cod stock, Mr. Speaker, there is fish left over that is really surplus to the needs of the inshore and nearshore fishery then, Mr. Speaker, and only then and not before then should we look at the possibility of an offshore effort regarding these Northern cod stocks. And then if and only if it can be caught without adversely affecting the inshore and nearshore fishery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what can be a more reasonable and a more sensible statement of policy than what I just uttered here today regarding the protection and encouragement and fostering and development of our inshore and nearshore fishery. I ask my colleagues on this side of the House, is there any way they can disagree with what I have said here today concerning the protection of the inshore and nearshore fishery which is, I believe, one of the prongs or one of the arrows I should say, one of the economic arrows which will lead I hope to the economic salvation of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, there is another very important point which will be made on Wednesday if I have an opportunity to speak on the Nordsee fishery, that the inshore fishery, Mr. Speaker, is much more labour intensive than the offshore fishery and that more men are involved in the catching of these fish, more men and less capital has to be employed and it is at least as efficient and perhaps more efficient; the inshore fishery and the nearshore fishery.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. W. ROWE: What point is the hon. member saying. I am saying that when we get the inshore and nearshore fishery fully developed with enough capacity and with enough facilities and with the utilization of the technology that we have including this new development now from the Government of Canada, this ice tank and these things, Mr. Speaker, other things like that, other things that have to be done, I am saying that the inshore and nearshore fishery-even now it can compete successfully with an offshore effort in the Northern cod stock. Remember what we are talking about now. We are talking about ICNAF are which is described as the Northern cod stock from Cape Chidley down to the tip of the Avalon Peninsula. We are not talking about the South Coast.

MR. HICKMAN: There is no question that the efficiency of the offshore effort on the South Coast is by far the best we have had.

MR. W. ROWE: I do not know. The minister can say that but I do not know what the point is.

The point I am making, Sir, is that the inshore and nearshore fishery on the Northeast Coast compares inefficiency with an offshore effort on the Northeast Coast and, Sir, employs far more men in doing so. That is the point I am making.

MR. F. ROWE: With less capital.

MR. W. ROWE: And with less capital input necessary and with more men employed in the catching of the fish. Now therefore, Sir, if we have an option and we have to make a choice or a decision we have to opt for the inshore fishery and the nearshore fishery on those grounds alone. But that is not the only ground. There are other cultural, social, traditional, historical reasons why we in this Province have to stand four square behind the encouragement and the development of the inshore and nearshore fishery on the Northeast Coast in this Province.

MR. F. ROWE: Hear, hear!

MR. W. ROWE: Even if it was somewhat less economically efficient and viable than the offshore fishery using gigantic trawlers with fewer

MR. W. ROWE:

men. I mean that is a reasonable point too, is it not? Nothing wrong with that?

MR. HICKMAN: I am not saying it is not a reasonable point but every mention that has been made in this House and I am sure the hon. for Burin-Placentia (Mr. Canning) agrees with me, everybody glosses over the South Coast fishery. I have never heard it debated in this House since 1966.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F.B. ROWE: Yes, I mean, that is quite
a -

MR. HICKMAN: It is a real knowledgeable
debate on the offshore fisheries.

MR. NOLAN: (Inaudible) today either,
on that side.

MR. HICKMAN: We should -

MR. NOLAN: Why do you not get the Leader
of the Opposition (Inaudible) surplus
that he asked for months ago? Is the Minister of Finance
still (inaudible)?

MR. HICKMAN: I gave it - the hon. member
for St. John's East tabled it two weeks ago.

MR. W.N. ROWE: I did not mean to use up ninety,
Mr. Speaker, but I got sidetracked by the Minister of
Fisheries and so on and I cut into more time than I intended.
Let me try to clue it up rather quickly. Something I
commend, Mr. Speaker, to all members of the House, if they
have not seen it, you can get it from the Department of
Fisheries as well, but if any member would not mind looking
up the February edition of the Union Forum, which is the
magazine, the periodical put out by the union, the
Fishermen's Union, they will see on the back a graph called
the Northern cod stocks which shows, Mr. Speaker, by means
of columns, it shows the Canadian catch and the foreign
catch since 1970. You can see, Mr. Speaker, what was going
on there. Look, way over 500,000 metric tons by the Canadian
and foreign catch alone, back in 1970 and that gradually
diminished year, by year, by year, by year because of the
depletion of the stocks. It got down to 1978, this year,
Mr. Speaker, where we are at the 135,000 metric ton level
that I talked about with the Canadian catch, I believe for
the first time, larger than the foreign allocation. Yes, it
would be. Then, of course, the succeeding years are not

MR. W.N. ROWE: allocated because that depends on what happens on the year to year basis.

But there is a line going across there, Sir, which shows 1955, inshore catch 167,000 metric tons. And it shows us below that there now, obviously, because we are not catching that much and it shows, with management, correct management and so on, the catch gradually going up again. What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, to sum up my point is that before we give away any perceived surplus which may not in fact be a surplus, I do not think there is, let us make sure that the cod stocks in that area respond and carry on and grow and that the natural level of the inshore and near-shore fishery is reached over the next number of years, reaches a peak then levels off and gradually grows again in a sort of a gradually sloping plateau, Mr. Speaker. Let us reach that point and make sure that we have the resources and that there is a genuine surplus left before we talk in terms of giving away some mythical surplus to either domestic or foreign fishing fleets of trawlers. Let us make sure that our inshore fishermen are protected, Mr. Speaker, because that is where the future on the North-east coast of this Province is.

I will get into a few other matters, Sir, when we come to debate the Nordsee proposal which I think will be on Wednesday. But let me conclude with these few remarks, Mr. Speaker.

MR. HICKMAN: What was the name of that book you had there?

MR. PECKFORD: That was the Union Forum.

MR. W.N. ROWE: That was the Union Forum, yes. It just happens to have that on the back of it. You can get it from the Department of Fisheries as well. It is for February of 1978. There are some excellent comments contained in that. It is one of the great periodicals of

MR. W.N. ROWE: this Province, the Union Forum.

MR. PECKFORD: (Inaudible)

MR. W.N. ROWE: Facts and opinions, Mr. Speaker, expressed there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Well prepared.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, that is right. Well written, Sir, and what is good about it I find, is that he is dealing with fishermen, rough and ready fishermen, men who spend their lives in the boats, Sir, or on the stages and so on. And the writing, Sir, is at a high, a very high intellectual level, there is no talking down to anybody in this writing. That is what I find so good, Sir about this periodical, no talking down, no condescension, no patronizing.

AN HON. MEMBER: No socialism.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, a little bit further in that centre in many respects than I would care to go.

AN HON. MEMBER: Heavy peaks of socialism.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Yes, a few. But the facts and the figures and opinions are expressed in an excellent, a forthright manner, Mr. Speaker, and you can agree or you can disagree with it, but at least you know where this magazine stands. There is no doubt about that, you know where.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right. One of the issues was Tory blue.

MR. W.N. ROWE: This may be this one here, is it?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. WHITE: That one you had there was pretty red.

MR. W.N. ROWE: This one here is Liberal red. What is the NDP colour anyway?

AN HON. MEMBER: Green.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: They are green. Very green.

MR. W.N. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, let me conclude.

MR. F.B. ROWE: Very green in name and -

AN HON. MEMBER: Order!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sorry! Sorry!

MR. W.N. ROWE: Let me conclude my few
remarks, Sir, by saying this, let us not as a House or
as a government use the possibility of the

MR. W.N. POWE: renegotiation of tariffs in the United States which may be going on now, which has been pushed by Teddy Kennedy and the people in Massachusetts trying to raise the U.S.A. tariffs to account for what they have discovered to be a subsidy by the Canadian government of the fishing industry in Canada. Let us not use that probable negotiation upward of the tariffs, Mr. Speaker, as an excuse to sell out the inshore and nearshore fishery of this province by saying by entering into the Nordsee proposal we can open up ourselves to new European markets, let us not do that Sir. That would be a complete and utter sellout, it would be wrong, it would be proceeding on a premise that does not exist. We do not have to sell out to Nordsee or any other foreign company in order to get access to markets in Europe. It is irrelevant Mr. Speaker, it is a real hearing of the worst order and it should be stated as such. We do not have to do it. The markets are either there or they are not there and the utilization or the granting of licences to five old trawlers to fish offshore in the northern cod stocks is irrelevant to entry into that market and I ask my friends who have done research in this subject to confirm that. It is irrelevant Mr. Speaker and anyone who is thinking about it and reading about it knows that it is irrelevant. It is not necessary for us to sell out to a foreign interest in order for us to gain markets in Europe or elsewhere. As a matter of fact sir the way things are done we can gain the markets. There was a crowd over here in January, I believe, they came over from West Germany looking for fish. The only problem they had and I believe, my friend, the member for Lewisporte district (Mr. White) may make this point when he speaks in the Nordsee

MR. W.N. ROWE: takeover debate, the only problem they had is that they were a little bit worried about assured supply and it may be true that if they got these five trawlers over here fishing that they would have a more assured supply than if they are depending on other people. That is not something that is beyond the wit of man, if that cannot be looked after and if we cannot assure our markets in Europe good quality and an assured supply Mr. Speaker, what are we doing in it at all? That is a problem that can be looked after. Mr. Speaker, I do not like, as a public figure in this province, any attempt or I would say low opportunistic attempt, Mr. Speaker, to confuse the dispute between Canada and the United States, which is presently going on, on purely territorial jurisdiction grounds, it does not even affect this province because we are not involved in these disputes with the U.S.A. To confuse that dispute, that territorial dispute, a dispute regarding territorial jurisdiction sir, to confuse that and the need to get a treaty to solve that problem, to confuse that area on the one hand with efforts by American politicians to raise tariffs on fish imported from Canada into the United States. Two different and distinct issues Mr. Speaker and to see John Crosbie up in Ottawa trying to muddy the waters in that regard, trying to haul a read hearing right across that is to my mind sir, a little bit politically opportunistic and serves only to confuse the issues and confuse people who are trying to genuinely think about these problems and come up with solutions. Mr. Speaker, let me close very briefly by saying let us protect the inshore nearshore fishery, let us make sure that before we talk in terms of any surpluses in the offshore effort in the northern cod stock, there is a surplus and it is my view that there will not be a surplus until such time

MR. W.N. ROWE: when we are sure, in the next four, five, or six years, maybe more, that the inshore nearshore fishery has reached its natural peak and has leveled off. When we are sure that they are protected, that they have their resource that can be allocated let us then get into the offshore effort and Mr. Speaker, let us quit kicking out at Ottawa for purely political points. Let us negotiate with them, talk with them, press our views on them because they may be wrong as often as they are right from the point of view of our province, let us show the leadership in this province with regard to our fishery, not the west coast of Canada fishery, our fishery, the Newfoundland and Labrador Fishery.

MR. W. ROWE:

Let us not use tariff problems between Canada and the United States or jurisdictional problems between Canada and the United States as a red herring to try to effect a sellout of our best interests to a foreign interest regarding the Northern cod stocks or less us protect the fishery, the inshore and nearshore fishery on which the future of this Province depends.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Ferryland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, I am going to be peaceful today so I am watching hoping that nothing I say becomes overly controversial that we get involved in all points of orders and things. Before I begin my few remarks which will be to a large degree district remarks I think I should congratulate the Leader of the Opposition for getting involved in a true and serious debate which I know will come up on Wednesdays from now on, the Nordsee debate which we may not have time to discuss in full. But certainly the Leader of the Opposition's remarks at least he deals with some very serious issues within the Province. Although it is within the Opposition folds to discuss scandal and to bring out government misuse and abuse of funds if there are some-that is certainly part of their responsibility - it is also part of their responsibility to express some very serious debate on serious issues which face our Province and certainly the fishery at least from my point of view representing an inshore fishing district for the most part, I was very much delighted with the Opposition. I do not agree with many of the things he said but I am at least delighted with the fact that he has taken some serious debate into this House which is where it should be. And I will say even though I do not agree I certainly agree with that fact that that is what should be done.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the district part of my speech I have been a little bit discouraged as of late with the

MR. POWER:

rather doomy and gloomy atmosphere that has been taking place in our Province and in our country for that matter not caused by any group. I certainly am not here to lay blame on anybody opposite, anybody within the community as such or anybody on our side or even in Ottawa for that matter. I am just saying that in this country in which we live it seems that we are losing track of what we should be doing. I really feel sorry sometimes for some of the young students who come to our light, the Springdale group who were here this morning and some groups from my district and others who come to our galleries sometimes and hear both from this side of the House and the other side the very sorry and sad state of our world, of our economy here in Newfoundland, of the things which relate to us most. And although I am realistic enough to know that we do have very serious problems of unemployment, education, we have serious problems with roads in many districts, we have serious problems with mining and with our forestry industry, the spruce budworm - certainly they are very, very serious problems, problems which our government is trying to deal with as best we can. Maybe not successfully in some cases but at least trying as best it can which is all you can expect from any human being. And I just feel sorry for some of those young students some days because I am sure they leave this House with a pessimistic view of what is going to take place in our Province.

Certainly if there is one thing that a young person in Newfoundland should not be burdened with or saddened with is a pessimistic outlook of our future. I honestly do not believe that there is a better of this world to live in, a part of the world where there is greater opportunity, a part of the world where a young person has a chance to fit into a very balanced type of social, economic system, a system in our Province of Newfoundland where we may not be as affluent as we like. We have not got the oil and the monies of Saudi Arabia and some other places. Also we do not have their problems. We in Newfoundland have what is very often considered

MR. POWER:

at least the best of both worlds or a good average of both worlds.

I read recently, Mr. Speaker, a thing that leads me to bring this up today in the beginning of my comments and I read from just a magazine put out by one of Canada's larger insurance companies and it says in a title that they have put in, it says, "Canadians Gloomy". It says, "An international gallop poll printed in the London_England Sunday Telegraph placed Canada among the most pessimistic of nineteen nations surveyed with the most optimistic countries at the top. Canada ranked seventh from the bottom of that chart. Only 29 per cent of Canadians polled thought that 1978 would be better than 1977, only 29 per cent looked at 1978 as being possibly a good year. Thirty-four per cent thought it would be worse. A majority of Canadian polled thought that 1978 would be a year marked by strikes, industrial disputes and growing economic difficulties."

MR. POWER: What a sad, sad commentary of a country which has such great potential, and Newfoundland being a part of that country! To think that Canadians honestly believe -

MR. SPEAKER: (Young) Order, please! A point of order has been raised.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I think it is a little bit unfair to the gentlemen on that side of the House. The president of their party is speaking and there they are - I think we should have a quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER: A quorum call.
I will ask the Clerk to count the House, please.

We have a quorum.

The hon. the member for Ferryland.

MR. POWER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) for possibly making a very sincere point of order. I do not think, because he did not leave the House - sometimes when a quorum call is called the person who calls the quorum gets up and runs out because then he does not want to be part of it. At least in the case of the member for Bellevue he did not get up and run out, he did maintain part of the quorum. And I suppose in all cases in the House our attendance is not what it should be sometimes, but I guess we all have a thousand things to do and most persons who are not in the House are certainly within earshot to the microphone system that we have. And I am sure my good fellows on this side of the House paid attention to my very humble comments.

Again, Mr. Speaker, if I just summarized a little international Gallup poll that I read from. It says 29 per cent of Canadians polled thought that 1978 would be better than 1977. The majority of Canadians

MR. POWER: thought it would be a worse year, a year with economic problems of strikes, industrial problems and the like, and I think, Mr. Speaker, that is an extremely sad commentary on our country. To think that in Newfoundland and in other parts of Canada where we have so much, where we do not have so many of the problems of the other parts of the world - I read this from one magazine, and I open up an international magazine and all you can see is pictures of death, of pestilence, of plague, of destruction, and you wonder sometimes if we in Canada and in Newfoundland have not really lost track of all the benefits that we have. And I, as one young Newfoundlander, sincerely and honestly believe that our country may have certain very serious problems of unemployment and economics, but certainly they are not to the degree that we sometimes lead our young people to believe. And I would certainly, in my case, hope that the young people in the district of Ferryland do not become burdened with a negative, pessimistic view as to the future of Newfoundland. Newfoundland will flourish and develop whether it be under this administration or an administration formed by the members opposite. The economy of Newfoundland and the Province of Newfoundland and the country of Canada is certainly going to flourish, and individuals who happen to be in charge may not be a significant factor.

MR. POWER:

Mr. Speaker I have travelled around Newfoundland a little bit since I became president of our association. I have gone to Springdale where the young students were from today and found it to be a thriving, active community. I have gone to Gander and found all kinds of work at the airport and in the Gander area and down at the C.N. dockyard here in St. John's. When I get up in my home in Mobile and I drive to St. John's all I see is activity. In Witless Bay major extensions to a fish plant and a meal plant, a paving contract going down to a small road in Witless Bay that is not an economic road, there are probably only twenty or thirty families there and which the good Minister of Transportation (Mr. Doody) even the other day did me a very great service in allowing this contract to go on a couple of hundred feet at the cost of about \$20,000. to the government to service a few more families. But it is activity, in Bay Bulls, a major community, major, major expansions to the fish plant, fishermen getting their equipment ready. Optimism to the hilt, I would say that if anybody has lost faith in Newfoundland or lost faith in Canada, who thinks our country is in a really deplorable condition and thinks that our people are frustrated and depressed and saddened by the condition, come up to Ferryland. Get in your car this afternoon or tomorrow morning or the weekend when you get a minute and drive the road from Waterfordbridge Road in through the Goulds and up through the Southern Shore and you will find people that do not have everything they need, Mr. Speaker, and they probably will never have, but you will also find a group of people who believe in the fishery to an awfully great degree and you will find people who are working, active and who are optimistic, who are hoping for a good year in the fishery. You will find businessmen who expand their businesses in almost community in our shore, very

MR. POWER: often through the assistance of the Liberal Free Grants that come out of Ottawa and greatly acknowledged and greatly accepted, very often being used by the rural development loans of this government, but all being used to improve and develop our communities. As I say that in our district you may not find all the things that people would like to have but you will certainly find to a large degree people who are positive, people who are aggressive, people who are improving their communities because of their own activity. I think, Mr. Speaker, that is what the province needs a great deal of, a little bit more belief in ourselves. I do not say that to criticize the Opposition because it is their function to bring out those things that I mentioned earlier but it is also our function sometimes as a government and as a people, whether they be elected or otherwise, to give the real image of what is taking place in our province to all the people in the province and sometimes people get the wrong impression. I sometimes wonder, especially when the leader of the Opposition was speaking, of the roles that we play sometimes of how they are not the more we unlike the more we are the same. When we talk about Nordsee, which I will speak about later on in my comments when I talk about the fishery in some detail in my area, when we talk about our role as a government, as a minister who has to try and get Ottawa to proceed rapidly sometimes, which they cannot do, to do the things for the development of our fishery that we want and hope for, that if that is not exactly the same role that Opposition plays sometimes by trying to get the Newfoundland government irregardless of political labels and move more quickly to do the things that have to be done and everyone hoping for the same objective, the same goals, the same ends, greater prosperity for the province of Newfoundland and in this case where I am mentioning our fishermen and fisheries

MR. POWER: people. But I am not saying, Mr. Speaker that the role should be reversed and I say that very often we argue for the same things. In the case of Nordsee, as an example, we are talking about allowing Nordsee who are a find company to come in and fish or catch 20,000 metric tons that we think might be surplus. The Federal Government is allowing 35,000 metric tons to be caught and processed by offshore or on the offshore by foreign fleets and which we are really talking about the same thing but us here, the Opposition, and the people in Ottawa when we are saying that all that fish should be used for the good and benifet of the Newfoundland people. I will say this and I do not mean to sound overly dzamatic and I do not mean to cause controversy, but I will say that in the future of Newfoundland that unless this problem of offshore licencing to foreign fleets is securely adhered to here to the desent that Newfoundland gets the benifits of offshore that you will find within Newfoundland a group of people maybe our fishing people, who will say unequibicavly that unless Newfoundland gets its benifets from the offshore that we should maybe break away from the government in Ottawa and that maybe we should become a dominion or a country on to our own right. I say it with the greatest degree of seriousness having great respect and great afiliation to the country of Canada. I will say that unless we, as Newfoundlanders, get full benifet from the resources which are ours, and as the leader of the Opposition said earlier, that maybe it is possible that the

Mr. Power: Canadian interest of keeping on terms with many foreign countries. That the Canadian interest is not the same as the Newfoundland interest. That when that happens sometimes and when for the sake of tariffs and the sake of international trade the federal government in Ottawa can giveaway something which is Newfoundland's that maybe, Mr. Speaker, we are not too far from a direct confrontation as to where as a Province go, and as to who controls our destiny.

Mr. Speaker, I say those things and I reaffirm my great belief that the country of Canada, the Province of Newfoundland has a very great future irregardless of the political parties whether they be in Ottawa or in Newfoundland of who runs those countries but we have a very great future, and I think it is ashame sometimes that we as young people, as a young country lose track of what the great things are going to take place and sometimes get involved in the negative things which have taken place in the past, and which may take place again sometimes, but I do not think that should be our problem.

Mr. Speaker, one of the big issues in this recent session of the House of Assembly has been education. I would like to mention education as it relates to my district in the Throne Speech which brought out certain little things. We in Ferryland district being a very, very small educational community, a part of the educational system having only a very small number of students about 2,300 from Bay Bulls to Trepassey that we are doing and achieving great things in education. Only very recently I attended, the first time I ever attended an opening of a school, even though I lived in an area where schools were being opened, but since I entered politics I had never seen a school open because this was the first one in our district, and I have to say I was moved by the intensity of feeling of the parents and young students and the people who live in our community, the people who really felt and thought that because of having a new school in their community their community had made a gigantic step forward. It was attended by 300 or 400 people, citizens, parents, students from the community of Bay Bulls. That these people

Mr. Power: really had a great belief in the future of their community in our shore and in the Province.

To counteract that I suppose, and I suppose there is always one good thing comes in on one hand and goes out on the other, we had a really tragic fire in Ferryland very recently where we lost one of our three large central high schools, Baltimore Moore High School. That has caused us untold problems, and will cause us untold problems in the educational year of 1978-1979. It is only through the great assistance of the Minister of Education and the Minister of Public Works that the students in Ferryland have actually had now a decent chance to study up for their exams because of the great amount of notes that we copied off, about 40,000 pages for them, and that type of thing. It seems that although we do have a new school opening one day and do very well -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. POWER: Where? Well what happened, of course, was that one or two of the more diligent students had brought their notes home on the weekend, and because there was a prom, an athletic affair over the weekend, of course, there was no study assigned so most of the kids left their notes in school, and as a result they were burnt out, so through the Minister of Education, and through Public Works, and through Mr. Dawe down in P and P, the printing people who brought back much of his staff after the evening and on the weekend past we printed off, and one student would have a notebook maybe of 120 pages of biology that had to be copied off for sixty students, another class maybe had seventy-five pages of geography which was needed for fifteen students. It was very time consuming work, and I must say the people down in P and P really worked very hard over the weekend to get the work done because of the time element knowing that they would be no value to the students in a week's time or ten days time because the time to study them would be gone. Well it was a very good thing on government, and it showed me that at least government could function very efficiently when some emergency arose.

MR. POWER: But again -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. POWER: Well I am sure that will eventually come I would hope.

But again in our district we have a very serious problem of spacing us for September of 1978-1979 or the school year, as the member can imagine. That, Mr. Speaker, when you have a large school burnt down with no other alternate facility available it makes it very, very difficult to try and place your 230 or 240 students in different schools, a few in a Kindergarten school, a few in a hall, a few in a school gymnasium here or some place else. It is going to be a horrendous year for the School Board and for the teachers involved, and I only wish them well and I know that I as one person and the minister as another will certainly co-operate to the fullest with them.

We have another really bad educational problem, but in my district, in the district of St. Mary's-The Capes which we presented a petition on, the minister and I just a few weeks ago on the problem of trade schools, the fact that we need a great deal more done in the trade school area that our students are finding it very difficult to compete with the great mass of students who are coming to the trades schools here in St. John's, and because we have nothing in our area it makes it very difficult for the Minister of Fisheries who represents St. Mary's-The Capes and myself up in that area where we do not have a trade school to get our people into trade schools where they can have a better chance.

Again there is a whole problem here - I am not at all too sure that there should not be some kind of a compulsory education even in excess of the Grade XII that is often mentioned by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and by other persons. But I am not sure that we should not have some kind of compulsory education or some kind of an incentive programme to actually get our

June 9, 1978

Tape 4216 (Morning)

PK - 4

Mr. Power: university to expand and to develop, and get the university involved in the type of development of a community that suits Newfoundland, that keeps our students in school a little bit longer, keeps them out of the work force a little bit longer, I seem to remember.

MR. POWER: way back that some of the countries of the world, like Sweden, which has compulsory education I think up to age twenty-one, that their unemployment rate is only down around two or three per cent. And maybe there is a correlation between the two. Maybe by having compulsory education up to age twenty-one, maybe by having people more educated and in many different field, maybe it could solve your employment problems, which is certainly one of the most serious ones. I am not saying that it would, but I am saying certainly that it may be something that a task force on education would be set up maybe after this minor one that is there now could actually get into that type of development and find out those things for us.

In education we are working difficult and very long to solve the difficult problems that we have. But certainly through the teachers that we have, and the parents that we have then we are certainly doing as best we can.

Another very serious subject which has come up recently is the regional government problem.

MR. LUSH: (Inaudible) compulsory retirement in certain professions which helps both ways.

MR. POWER: My own humble reaction or as one member says, the problems that we have in Newfoundland, the employment problem in particular where you are talking about seventeen or twenty per cent, or twenty-five cent unemployed, that you have to take some kind of a radical approach, whether it be compulsory retirement, compulsory education to stay in school for a longer period of time, but something of an unordinary nature, call it radical if you will, has got to be done to solve that problem. It will not be solved by ordinary job creation things. It has to be done by something different.

That may not be accepted by a majority of the population. I think that something like that

MR. POWER: something like that is going to have to be done whether it be done by this administration in the next five or ten or twenty year, but something eventually will have to be done on that part.

On the subject of regional government which takes in four major communities in my district, two which are incorporated, Petty Harbour and the Goulds, two which are not, Witless Bay and Bay Bulls. I for one am very strongly, having studied very closely with the minister the Regional Government Bill, and of course on a selfish tone I say it works or seems to work very well from my section of that regional government. There are problems which are of a regional nature, water and sewer, recreation, fire fighting, which can only be solved by a regional body. The government for too long has allowed little small communities to act as almost a palace unto themselves, where you can have eight or nine volunteer fire brigades within a distance of thirty miles, and then you can have distances of sixty, seventy miles with no fire fighting. I think that the government has got to step in and say, "Look, boy, for regional government, for the sake of money which we do not very often have, you have got to try and do things on a regional level, that one volunteer fire brigade is sufficient for the Goulds and Petty Harbour and maybe another small fire station is sufficient for Bay Bulls, Witless Bay and other areas of the shore. But not necessarily that each community should develop unto itself and have one in each place, which causes the government a great deal of money, causes a lot of fund raising to be sort of having to be raised in their own communities when maybe they should not have to do that much at all.

ALL HON. MEMBER: And inadequate protection.

MR. POWER: And inadequate protection very often because of that because the service is diluted so much that it just

MR. POWER:

does not do the things we have.

We need an arena in our end of the shore which many members have, especially the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan), have heard me talk about so often. But how can a community of 1,000 people, whether it be incorporated or otherwise, build an arena on its own. The government has got to allow regional arenas which take in from Witless Bay and Bay Bulls and out to Petty Harbour and takes in 30,000 or 40,000 people in both unincorporated and corporated areas. You cannot make an arena programme available to every corporated community and expect that service to be functional, and expect each arena to make a profit, and not be sort of a millstone around government's neck. They have got to be done on a regional level, and it is for those reasons, because there are certain services which are regional, like the waste disposal committee that the minister set up in our area which functions really, really well, which takes in all those communities that I am mentioning. And services our communities very well, whereas before that they had two small dumps, neither one working, garbage going everywhere. Most of it on the side of the road, and through every dump and pit you could find. And now you have something that works well. Because it is a regional service performed under a regional governing body, in this case a waste disposal committee. And it is for those reasons I support regional government.

Water and sewer is a serious project. I can even announce now, which has not been announced to the public, that in the community of Petty Harbour - Maddox Cove, \$500,000, \$1.5 million is being made available to them today or tomorrow, or today I suppose when they are notified, for water and sewer. In Petty Harbour you have only got about 1,000 people, but the government is spending in excess of \$3 million or \$4 million, a vast amount of money to get water and sewer into the community of

June 9, 1978

Tape No. 4217

NM - 4

MR. POWER: Petty Harbour. Now anybody who has travelled through Petty Harbour knows why that is so expensive, because it is almost solid rock, almost solid rock, and it costing a vast amount of money, and it cannot all be done the one year, every house cannot expect to be hooked up tomorrow. But at least over a three or four year period - and there is something else which I find happens in our community sometimes, is that

MR. POWER: Sometimes our communities will say, 'Look, either you give it to us all or you do not give us any.' In Witless Bay and in certain communities where we do a little bit of paving we had a tender out and all the roads in Witless Bay were not being paved. And I had one guy say to me, 'Look, if you are not going to pave my road do not pave any in Witless Bay.' And it is that type of attitude sometimes that keeps our small communities down. Because you have to be willing to develop gradually - do someone else's road this year, my road this year, some water and sewer this year, some next year. No government, not even I suppose in Saudi Arabia, has all the things to do all it wants within a very small amount of time.

In the field of recreation I suppose I am as active as any member and more active than an awful lot with the exception of a couple on this side and the other.

I do not think, Sir, you can now talk about recreation in Newfoundland without talking about Canada Works. The two things have become so inter-joined in the last two or three years that one goes along with the other. And I have heard great and vast criticisms of Canada Works, but very often in our small communities the things that we have, we have because Canada Works and the provincial government have co-operated in spending some monies together.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. POWER: It is quite possible that Canada Works would be lost because - there is wastage, obviously there is wastage when you spend many hundreds of millions of dollars over a country as broad and as extensive as Canada. There has to be wastage. But if you

MR. POWER: look at our shore from the
Goulds, which built a softball field on Canada Works,
Petty Harbour did the same - great recreational facilities
never had, you could never, never have - a softball field
in Ferryland which is one of the most active softball
communities in the Province, which keeps hundreds of
youngsters off the road for many Sundays and afternoons,
keeps them out of vandalism, keeps them out of drugs.
You could never, never, never have it without Canada
Works and also without our provincial Department of
Recreation which gives them a few dollars to buy sods
or to put up fencing or whatever. It is a good case of
where our government co-operates with the federal government.
My only argument sometimes has been that there should be
more money made available by a provincial government to
co-operate with the federal monies that are available,
because the big problem with Canada Works is that you
have lots of labour money but no material money, and that
sometimes produces the ineffectiveness and wastage that
often comes.

In the case of Mobile, a small
community where I live, we only have probably seventy
or eighty voters - there are probably only thirty or forty
families - this government have made some money available,
Canada Works has made \$37,000 available, and because of
those two sums we now in Mobile will have a swimming pool
- not that I am going to swim in, but that my little girl
will or my children will, or the other small children in
Mobile can go swimming in - where in Mobile there simply
was not anything other than a dirty old river that ran
down through the community which was totally unsafe and
which would have eventually led to a fatal loss of life.

But certainly that type of
co-operation between federal and provincial is, in my

MR. POWER: way of thinking, a case of where two governments can co-operate, and where you may not get all the desired results, but certainly many of the results are effective and can be used by our communities.

Again, another area where our provincial government has helped me greatly and where the minister, who also wanted to speak at this time, yielded to me, we have made something like \$80,000 available as a provincial government, as a provincial parks division, to expand what has to be one of the most beautiful, most scenic sights on our part of the Shore, which is Chance Cove Park on the upper end of our district, an area that is famed for its sea trout, for its duck hunting in the Wintertime and for its general scenic beauty in the Summertime. Eighty thousand dollars to put a road down to Chance Cove Park or to improve the road - it is a lot of money considering the fact of how many people you will get down there. I argued with the minister, I pushed him, I did everything I could to try to get him to put another \$80,000 down there to build a house or headquarters for the park and to put in some major campsites but it could not be done. And I commend the minister for doing as much as was humanly possible with the budget that he had to do that work in Chance Cove Park this year. I commend him. I know that next year we will get a little bit more, but again it is an example of how we have to progress somewhat slowly because of the economics of our Province which will, I suppose, maybe always be like that.

In the area of road construction on our Shore - this might seem strange, seems we do not have a by-election up there this year - but we are getting more pavement in our district this year than we did in the last three years combined. Through the services of the Minister of Transportation and Communications and the Premier and

MR. POWER: the former Minister of Transportation and Communications who co-operated very closely, the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. W. Carter), this year will see the culmination of an activity which many persons thought would never happen in our area - the connecting up of the main Southern Shore Highway from St. John's to Trepassey just about, with paved road - eighteen miles of pavement in our district this year going from Renew's right up past Chance Cove Park and out to about a two or three mile stretch which has to be upgraded and reconstructed, which is being done now.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is Bay Bulls to the Trans-Canada?

MR. POWER: Bay Bulls to the Trans-Canada pretty well. I am going to mention that. A real economic road of which I have had some problems in convincing my colleagues of its importance, is the Witless Bay Line which connects up the Bay Bulls road with the Trans-Canada Highway, a road

MR. POWER: which I think is of great economic importance, but this year as a member I had a choice I suppose of pushing the government for some pavement for the Witless Bay Line, or for the main highway that is used by people every day. What does a member do? I sat down with some people and I said, "Look, obviously the road through Trepassey that is used by people every day for their livelihood, twelve months of the year, is more important than a road that is only used by certain economic companies for -

AN HON. MEMBER: Ten or fifteen years ago by - they started sure did they not?

MR. POWER: Well again they started but we have to finish I suppose what they started.

We have a lot of small road problems in Bay Bulls and again this year in Bay Bulls and Witless Bay and Cape Broyle, places where our roads are not up to par on a sort of community level, but what do you do first? Do you do the main road or do you try and do community small roads? Obviously we do a little bit at a time. This year we are connecting up the main road. Maybe next year I will be able to convince the minister to give us some money to do either some of our side roads or that main highway, the Witless Bay Line, from our highway to others.

Before my time runs out certainly I have got to spend a certain amount of time speaking about the fishery. No district in Newfoundland is as tied up in the fishery as is Ferryland. We only have about 5,000 voters if you look at the adult population. Of those about 3,000 people are directly or indirectly employed by the fishery. About 1,200 fishermen, or so, and about another 1,200 or maybe I guess close to 2,000 people working in the fish plants on a seasonal operation. And here is where the Nordsee problem causes me some great concern.

I know that in one community in my district, in the community of Fermeuse, they use both offshore fish

MR. POWER: and inshore. That they are a year round operation and because of that the community of Formeuse is a very active, progressive and very well-off community.

I also know that the Tors Cove, where the former member sat who represented the district for a year or so, who has a very major business where he has expanded, spent about \$400,000 expanding his plant in Tors Cove, that I know that the people in the Tors Cove area will never really become economically secure until you get a year round supply of fish.

Now on our coastline the only year round supply of fish has got to come from offshore. You cannot fish our coastline in the Wintertime. Now also you cannot fish the same stock twice I suppose, but in my case the reason I supported Nordsee when I speak on it in the weeks coming, I have to say that what we need on our shore, on the Northeast Coast, or at least our section of the Northeast Coast, is a year round supply of fish. When that happens you will have a section of our country which is so well off that it will be absolutely unbelievable, a section of our country which has no health and safety problems as you have in our mining industries sometimes, a section of our country which is affluent to the point of being almost over affluent.

How does it happen? One of my real arguments with the federal government, and the Federal Fisheries people, as the minister says, is that when you allow 500 foreign licences off our coastline, a 200 mile limit which was supposed to be primarily for the benefit of Newfoundland, and then you have to worry about an over surplus and you have to worry about a plant problem in Harbour Grace, and a plant problem in Bay Bulls, that that is a very, very serious problem.

The inshore fishery, which is the main part of our district has certainly got to be the foundation on

MR. POWER:

which you build, but it is a foundation on which something has got to be laid, not just left by itself, because as it stands now we have the foundation, but we have not put any structure on top of it which is the offshore supply.

Again, Mr. Speaker, in my district we have a very serious problem with processing. We have a glut problem for two weeks or so. Because of that glut problem, because the plants at least last year could not process all the fish that could have been caught, or the fish that came in, then you found that many trap men lost \$500 each, \$1,000 each because of the glut problem. That is absolutely horrible when you think of a man who gets up at three o'clock in the morning, a man who works as hard as any human being on this earth works, and finds that he cannot haul his traps in the evening, knowing that there is fish in them, when for so long he has looked for fish and could not find it.

Mr. Speaker, that is a horrible situation to have. How do you solve it? As I say we have major private entrepreneurial expansions to the plants in Tors Cove, Bay Bulls, Calvert now spending about \$100,000 to expand their premises. Aquafort a small plant which is also expanding. But you still have not got enough. Now do you give more processing licences in Ferryland where there is a need for it? In Cape Broyle where there is a need for it, so that they can handle that glut problem and possibly cause the other plants to be less efficient, to be less productive for the other three or four or five months that they work, and extremely difficult problem. Refrigeration may be a solution to it, but certainly it is not going to be a satisfactory one for the years, or at least for the immediate future.

June 9, 1973

Tape No. 4219

MM - 4

MR. POWER:

All I can say is that on our coastline we have nine plants from Fermeuse to Petty Harbour. They are the economic basis of our community, and it is only when they become more year round, when they become more stable, that our economy will really flourish the way it should. And

9734

Mr. Power: sometimes, I think, in order to do that we may have to have control of our offshore resources, a more direct control, or at least a more direct input in what happens to them.

I speak about fishermen who are by far the most important part of the economic fish part of our community, they are the producers, you do not have a plant, you do not have a truck driver, you do not have a storekeeper making money from the fishery unless first of all you have got the fishermen to produce them. And I say that, Mr. Speaker, that the fishermen of our coastline are now as optimistic and is as productive and as energetic as they are anywhere on our coastline. The vast amounts of money that have gone up our shore have absolutely amazed me through the Fisheries Loan Board this year for gear, for boats, for engines, it is absolutely unbelievable the number of young people and others that we have going into the fisheries these days.

Again it is an example on our coastline where
Canada Works -

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, it is very, very difficult with the meeting being held - would they go to the Common Room and hold their meeting over there, please?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is apparently finding it difficult to hear the hon. gentleman to his left.

MR. POWER: How much time do I have left?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY: He is the best speaker all year.

MR. POWER: Mr. Speaker, in the case of our fisheries our fishermen are getting vast amounts of money from the Fisheries Loan Board through the co-operation of this government. I am sure that this we have had at least \$1 million go up our shore so new young people can join our fisheries in Witless Bay, neighbours and friends of mine who apply to the Fisheries Loan Board and getting money very easily, not the bureaucratic red tape that is often associated with government programmes but the Fisheries Loan Board, I commend them to the hilt. I do not know all the gentlemen who are involved,

Mr. Power: but the Fisheries Loan Board to me are one of the most effective groups that I find in government. They do not hassle a fisherman if he is not eligible for money they tell him, if he is eligible then he gets his approval in very quick order. I think that is very important. I think we need sort of a twin sister or a twin brother for the Fisheries Loan Board in getting gear, as it stands now the fisherman has to get gear, I suppose, through the guaranteed improvement loans, going through a bank and having a down payment, and sometimes that is very, very difficult for a fisherman to get 20 per cent of \$1,000 in May. The fisherman does not have his \$200, it is a very small amount of money, but most of our fishermen who rear families through our long Winters, and on unemployment insurance for the most part, our Canada Works jobs, simply do not have that money.

I will give you another example in our fishery where our Department of Rural Development, our Department of Fisheries here, Provincially, and the Federal Canada Works people are co-operating to the hilt, Tors Cove, the community where I was born, a very small community, maybe 250 people, last year had neither fisherman for the first time in its history, I suppose, going out to Tors Cove fishing, probably because of the poor state of the fishery, also because the simple fact that they had no facilities there. This year our Provincial Government through Rural Development put something like \$37,000 into Tors Cove along with a Canada Works programme to give them the money to upgrade the wages a little bit and to buy materials. Now in Tors Cove you have five trap crews fishing out of Tors Cove this year, the most they have had in the last ten years.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. POWER: They do. It will not change the economic history of this Province, but in Tors Cove for those five men who now have a chance to make a decent living in the fishery, who have a decent wharf to work with it makes a great deal of difference for them, Mr. Speaker, and all I can say is that I sincerely hope that this

Mr. Power: co-operation between Canada Works now and our Rural Development people continues on.

I have got some grave problems with the federal government on the Bay Bulls development, the offshore surveillance where they were suppose to spend \$2.5 million this year in Bay Bulls and have decided not to do so, and \$7 million over three or four years and the thing does not seem to be getting off the ground. I sincerely wonder as one individual as to whether the federal government has changed its proposed site or whether they just changed their mind about setting up that offshore surveillance port which they talked about in Bay Bulls which would have been a major, major expansion for our area of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude I suppose I should go back and say that our area of the shore is growing, expanding because of the Federal DREE people who are putting money into our district, Rural Development, Canada Works, which is federal, Fisheries which is Provincial, we are developing it because we have learned to co-operate with both federal and provincial levels of government. We are co-operating because our people in Ferryland district are not afraid to invest their time and their energies in our future, because they are optimistic about what is taking place in our section of the Province at least, in Bay Bulls you have got major expansions because of the Department of DREE, a big business going up there. You have rural development, small business starting up in many places. The rural development loans only the other day the minister came down to me and said, Look here is two more rural development businesses or rural development loans that had been approved for small business. Almost every week it seems that we are expanding and moving ahead up the shore. As I say, we have not got all of the things that we would like to have, we have our problem with seasonal employment, and unemployment during our Winter months, but we are certainly making a great stab at securing our future a little bit.

Mr. Power: All I say, Mr. Speaker, in concluding is that sometimes when we get depressed , and when we see, and we think we are living in a place that does not have a future I sometimes think of a saying that I used to hear around my own home when I was a child.

MR. POWER:

and when you wanted something that you could not have, because either your parents could not afford it or whatever, I often heard my mother say, "Thank God for the ten you have and not the eleventh you have not got." And, Mr. Speaker, that I think applies very appropriately to my district.

Thank you very kindly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

CAPTAIN WINSOR:

Mr. Speaker, as the time is drawing close to one o'clock, and if it is agreeable to the Acting House Leader, I would adjourn the debate.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member has moved the adjournment of the debate.

MR. PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I move that we call it one o'clock, and that this House adjourn until Monday, at two o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

It has been moved that the House adjourn until Monday next at 2:00 P.M. Those in favour "Aye", contrary "Nay", carried.

This House stands adjourned until Monday next at 2:00 P.M.