

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 23, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to inform members of this hon. House that our government proposes to investigate the feasibility of transferring the abattoirs owned by the Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation to private enterprise.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. GOUDIE: My department, in co-operation with the Department of Development, is preparing a divestiture package of information and data about the physical, financial, processing volumes, production capabilities and performance efficiencies of the Corporation. This will be made available to private enterprise for their evaluation and the submission of proposals to purchase and operate the abattoir facilities located in Pleasantville and Corner Brook. Over the past year two enquiries have been received from private enterprise about this possibility.

Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation was incorporated in 1963 as a Crown Corporation to process and sell some agricultural commodities. The chief function has been the operation of meat and chicken processing plants at Pleasantville and Corner Brook. The corporation annually purchases, kills, processes and markets approximately 3.5 million broiler chickens, which translates into 9 million pounds of chicken, and 33,000 hogs, representing 5 million pounds of pork and pork products. This produce comes from 48 Commercial farmers from across the Province.

MR. GOUDIE:

The growth of the broiler chicken industry has been rapid. In 1970 production was 500,000 birds whereas last year it had risen to 3.5 million birds. Production started in Eastern Newfoundland in the late sixties and later, in 1975, after construction of the Corner Brook plant, it spread to Western Newfoundland. The present production is divided approximately equally between the two areas of the Island.

MR. GOUDIE:

In 1981 the gross farm income for broiler chickens was \$7.4 million. The provincial producers are members of the recently formed Canadian Chicken Marketing Agency and, with the resulting stability, production in this Province has potential to expand even further. At present we only produce 45 per cent of the chicken consumed in the Province. Per capita consumption is increasing by about 3.5 per cent per annum and a ready market exists for an additional 5 million pounds of fresh chicken. A new chicken hatchery started operations in the Province last year ^{SO}, all in all, future industry prospects are good.

Our swine industry, characterized by a controlled breeding programme and a superior health status, started in the early sixties and last year 33,000 hogs were marketed through the Corporation. Production performance is equal or better than that in most parts of the country. The majority of production takes place in Eastern Newfoundland with smaller amounts in the Central and Western regions of the Province. Hog market prices nationally and internationally have been depressed for the past two to three years. Consequently, producers have not increased production during this period. Even so, gross farm income last year was \$3.8 million. Market prices have strengthened in 1982 and with local production only representing 15 per cent of consumption there appears to be a viable future for the industry. We know that our production costs are higher than elsewhere in Canada due to higher freight, feed and other farm input costs. The higher production costs are countered by the availability of fresh chicken and pork and the elimination of transportation costs to import the finished products. If our consumers are to get truly fresh, quality produce it has to be produced locally. The local non-frozen products can demand a higher

MR. GOUDIE: price than imported frozen products. This has been shown through recent consumer surveys and experience.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, private enterprise has some advantages and flexibility over that of a Crown Corporation. Mr. Speaker, with the information available to us now, it seems that the course of action to be followed could assist the chicken and hog industries to improve and expand. This, of course, would benefit both the farmers and the consumers in our Province. However, be assured that if a suitable buyer is not available, then Newfoundland Farm Products Corporation will continue to operate the plants.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Just before I recognize the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), it is a pleasure for me to welcome to the Speaker's gallery today Shiela Embury who is the MLA from the Alberta Legislature representing the District of Calgary Northwest. I welcome you to the gallery today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In response to this Ministerial Statement, at the beginning I would like to say just glancing through it that this could be a good move on the part of the government. However, I want to assure the hon. House that I want to approach this statement with caution as well as all members should. I am just wondering now when and if this is passed over to private enterprise, we are all talking about the cost of living, are we going to see an increase in the cost of living in this Province? Because we must realize now that Newfoundland Farm Products is subsidized by the provincial government and if this subsidization is taken away it is quite possible that we may see an increase in the cost of living.

However, again, Mr. Speaker, the minister has made this statement and he is trying to make it as positive possible, I am just wondering has there been any consultation with the hog producers and the poultry producers in the Province, has there been any consultation with those two groups of people before the minister made this decision to let it go out to private enterprise? And the last thing, Mr. Speaker, that concerns me is going out to private enterprise, is it going to be a selected group in the Province that will only have the opportunity to take over this operation? Or will the minister, be advertising through all the media, will there be an advertisement through all the media and give anyone in Newfoundland and Labrador the opportunity of taking over this operation -

MR. NEARY: Calling public tenders.

MR. WARREN: - or calling public tenders? So I am just concerned, Mr. Speaker, The minister said he is inviting proposals - proposals from whom? Is it from the general public

MR. WARREN: or is it just from a half a dozen or so influential people in the Province? That is my concern and I think it is the concern of the people of this Province.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): I would like to also welcome to the galleries today some senior citizens visiting with us from the Hoyles Home in the district of Pleasantville. I welcome you indeed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other Statements by Ministers?

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it would appear today, and I am not going out on a limb in saying that it might be a great day for Canada, but there seems to be a spirit of conciliation abroad in the land. First of all we have the news that the federal government intends to bring down a new budget on Monday -

MR. MORGAN: About time I would say.

MR. BARRETT: Six months too late.

MR. NEARY: - Mr. Speaker, and then we received the news from Maine that the Premier, who is down there attending a conference, is prepared to withhold his attack on our sister province of Quebec in his dealings with the New England States in selling power to New York. And finally we heard from Ottawa, also in the last twenty-four hours, that the Prime Minister emphasized the need for an negotiated settlement on the offshore rather than seeking a court decision and this was outlined in letters to both the Premier of this Province, to the heads of the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: Shut up over there, will you?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, can you keep the Muppet Show down for a little while until we get some questions? Letters have been sent to the Premier of the Province, to the heads of the denominations and various other people in connection with the offshore. Now to begin with, Mr. Speaker, could the Minister of Energy (Mr. Marshall) outline specifically what the administration's position is on the transmission of power to the New England States and then to the transmission of power to the Power Authority of the state of New York by Hydro Quebec? What precisely is the position of this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I had thought the preamble related to the question but I know that is probably too much to expect from the hon. Leader of the Opposition. The position with respect to the transmission of power to New England is as has been stated before, Mr. Speaker. At the present time the province

June 23,1982

Tape No. 1582

ah-2

MR.MARSHALL: of Quebec enjoys the benefit of some 5,000 megawatts of power from the Upper Churchill, this benefit that was conferred upon him by the hon. gentleman there opposite and his cronies and colleagues at the particular time. We have attempted assiduously for eight years to recall power to :

MR. MARSHALL: which we were entitled, which we felt we were entitled. Quebec has refused to do it, to respond to our request. Our current request was for 800 megawatts of power; it will exceed that now. Our current request, of course, is related to the Reversion Act that we were forced to pass. But it is a matter of record that this Province has requested 800 megawatts of power from the Province of Quebec. This being so, the Province of Quebec cannot take our power and make new contracts with the Power Authority State of New York, or the State of Maine for that matter. Because one of the criteria in the country of Canada, the nation of Canada, before there is export of energy it has to be surplus, and I underline the word 'surplus', if the hon. gentleman understands what the meaning of surplus is, to Canadian needs. The hon. gentleman will also recognize that we are Canadians, we have requested 800 megawatts of power, and our position is that the Province of Quebec should not be entitled to export power. Most of it they are able to export as a result of that contract, that unfavourable contract with the Province of Newfoundland, because, in fact, it is not surplus to Canadian needs, because the people of Newfoundland require it and the people of Newfoundland intend to get it. And one of the mechanisms under which we are going to see that it is obtained for the people of this Province is that we intend, as is our right, to oppose before the National Energy Board any attempt by the Province of Quebec to export power before the needs of this Province are satisfied. And I could indicate, Mr. Speaker, to the House that we have already been in contact with the National Energy Board, we have already established the fact that Quebec has no surplus approval already to export power, so in order to fulfill these

MR. MARSHALL: contracts that have been billed by the Province of Quebec they do in fact have to apply, in accordance with the rules and regulations under the applicable legislation, to the National Energy Board. And we, as is our right, and I would submit our duty to the people of this Province, will resist it on the basis that I have already outlined in my answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman did not address himself specifically to the question that I asked about why there is a difference in the two situations. At least the word coming from Maine is that the Premier will object to the sale of Quebec hydro power to one party and not object to the sale of hydro power to another party. In other words, the word that seems to be coming up is that maybe we have discovered a touch of diplomacy, I do not know, but what the Premier is

June 23, 1982

Tape No. 1584

MJ - 1

MR. S. NEARY: saying down in Maine is that the Province will not object to the sale of power to the State of New York but will object to the sale of power to the New England States. Why the difference?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the President fo the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to respond on important questions of this nature to second-hand reports, neither -and I have learned -will I respond to the impression that the hon. gentleman gets from certain facts from reports because I have found that ninety-nine per cent of the time the impression the hon. gentleman has is incorrect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Let us see if my impression of the letter that was written to the Premier of this Province by the Prime Minister was incorrect. The Prime Minister of Canada, in a recent letter to the Premier of this Province, stated that there was indeed a response to the Province's January 25th proposal on the offshore problems. That there was a response orally.

MR. BARRETT: Table the response.

MR. NEARY: Hold on now, Mr. Speaker.

There was a response and there was a promise of a written response. That is outlined in the most recent letter to the Premier of this Province. Now could the minister outline for the House the details of that response?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, there was no response - there has been no response - to that January 25th proposal. We have been

MR. W. MARSHALL: waiting and we still await such a proposal. If the hon. gentleman wants to indicate that there was a promise of a proposal, well the proposal was put in on January 25th and I would submit that quite adequate time has expired and one would expect as Canadian citizens that the federal government would respond to this "promise" that was allegedly made.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: The position is, Mr. Speaker, crystal clear, that this Province has received no response from the federal government to the Province's January 25th proposal which constitutes a proposal for settlement of the offshore. We are waiting for it, we have not received it, it is a matter of fact we have not received it, and any impression to the contrary from whatever quarter is not founded.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I understand from the answer given by the hon. gentleman that the information in the most recent letter from the Prime Minister to the Premier of this Province is not correct when the Prime Minister said that there was an oral response and a written response was promised. The hon. gentleman is now saying that there was a response of no kind, there was neither an oral response or a written response. Is that what I understand from the hon. gentleman?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I think that these issues are of too much import, I think, Mr. Speaker, to the interest and the welfare of the people of Newfoundland to be playing with words with respect to them. Also, Mr. Speaker, they are of too much import to the people of Newfoundland for members on any side of the House, through political allegiance or what have you, to be playing games with what might amount to be the future of the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: The answer is clear: there has been no response to our January 25 proposal. When the proposal of January 25 was put before the federal government, obviously it was a serious proposal and a response was expected. No response has been received. The history of the situation is well known. Instead of giving a response, what the federal government did was attempt to pursue a declaration of its own ownership through the Federal Court of Canada in the SIU case, and then ultimately directly into the Supreme Court of Canada. They were thwarted in this by the events that occurred, which I will not go into, as they are well known to this House. But, undaunted, what they did in unprecedented fashion was that instead of this they referred directly the issue to the Supreme Court of Canada in an uncustomary and unprecedented act that has never before occurred in the history of Canada.

And even more sorrowful to the people of this Province or more concern to the people of this Province, I say that the Supreme Court of Canada itself, in an unprecedented and an uncustomary action, accepted that reference and agreed to hear this matter prior to a decision being rendered by the Appellate Division of

MR. MARSHALL:
Newfoundland.

the Supreme Court of

Now that is the situation.

The hon. gentleman there opposite should understand that his colleagues in Ottawa have referred the issue to the Supreme Court of Canada. The hon. gentleman should also understand that this government would prefer a negotiated settlement. But in order to achieve a negotiated settlement, both sides have to be talking about the same thing. One side cannot be talking about apples and the other side talking about lemons on the guise that we are all talking about fruit so we are talking about the same thing.

MR. MARSHALL: They are talking about an entirely different thing when on the one side you say that ownership is to be set aside, because if you do not set it aside the agreement can be torn up, and on the other side they will not set ownership aside. Because on the one hand the provincial government is saying that we will not enter into an agreement that can subsequently be torn up, and the federal government is saying, 'We will only enter into an agreement if it can subsequently be torn up.' We also require the federal government to address itself to the joint management and revenue sharing proposals. These are contained in this proposal of January 25th. Notwithstanding the statement made by the Rt.Hon. the Prime Minister in his letter, I can say unequivocally, that we have not received a written response or any definitive response, orally or written, from our proposal of January 25th. and we earnestly seek that from the federal government together with their undertaking to set ownership aside during their period of the negotiations and permanently if an agreement is reached.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the administration have certainly shifted their position since back in 1977, I think it was, when they said that they had an iron-clad case and they were not worried about going to court. But now apparently they are worried about going to court and I would like to know what happened to the Province's case since then.

Well, Mr. Speaker, that little breath of fresh air that I spoke about in my opening question seems to be rapidly disappearing and we are getting that hard headed politics again on the part of the hon. gentleman instead of being a realist in this matter. The question I would like to ask the hon. gentleman is is it possible now

MR. NEARY: to get the warring parties back to the bargaining table, to appoint a conciliator, somebody -

MR. TULK: Get them into a war Cabinet.

MR. NEARY: No - appoint somebody to conciliate between the two parties with a view to ignoring the two court cases - it was the Province that first went to court and then the Government of Canada went to the Supreme Court - but is it possible to ignore that, to ignore these two court cases, and have somebody appointed as a conciliator to get both parties back to the bargaining table, the same as they do in labour disputes or when you are trying to settle a dispute between two countries over boundaries and that sort of thing? Is it possible to get somebody, some high-powered, respected individual to get in between the warring parties and conciliate this matter and get the parties back to the bargaining table?

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I have to refer to the preamble first and say what a disgrace for the hon. member as a Newfoundlander to get up and really impugn the strength of our very strong case that we have before the courts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, for the hon. gentleman

MR. MARSHALL: to give any public hint at all that this Province is worried about going to court is completely and absolutely unfounded, and there is another appellation that I could give to it which is outside the rules of this House.

We are not worried about going to court. We are not worried about any impartial adjudication of the issues before it. We have opinion from leading experts in the world, not just in Canada but in the world, to the effect that our case is extremely strong. It is very strong and it rests on a very strong foundation. And for any Newfoundlander to get up in the House of Assembly or in any public forum and insinuate otherwise is an absolute and complete disgrace.

Mr. Speaker, no, we think our case is strong. In an impartial court we feel that we would come on and we would come on very strongly with it and we have a very, very good chance. But we also do not feel, because we are part of Canada, Mr. Speaker, that our rights have to be constantly adjudicated in a court, that this is a dispute within a family and we do not believe that, as in any family, that any court can superimpose any particular decision as to how the parties are to live together in the future. That is just not the way it works. The Canadian way, the Newfoundland way, the Ontarian way, anyway that you want to put it, is a way that connotes that there be negotiations and that there be agreement through negotiations and that is what, Mr. Speaker, we want.

Now I also note that the hon. gentleman makes his allusions to hard-headed politicians. And that is the other aspect that they are trying to get now, because they have been laced, and they were laced so much and so firmly by the people of Newfoundland on April 6th. It is a

MR. MARSHALL: wonder, Mr. Speaker, that they can walk around Newfoundland. They cannot hold their heads high so what they are trying to do now is they are trying to turn around and say that it is being caused by hard-headed small-minded politicians. Well, Mr. Speaker, I can tell the hon. gentlemen there opposite in contrast to them that the decisions that are made with respect to this are governmental decisions and they are motivated, by each and every member on this side of the House, purely and simply by what is best for the long term interest of the people of Newfoundland and they will continue to be done so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.MARSHALL: The hon. gentleman can cast his little innuendos all he wants to, he can impugn our court case, he can insinuate that we have not got a court case, he can join the five quite quislings up in Ottawa with their litany against the people of this Province, but we are not going to bend to them.

MR.SIMMS: Right on.

MR.MARSHALL: Now with respect to his quote again about the warring parties - the warring parties! - and this is the kind of psychology that the hon. gentleman wants to try to set the seeds of, can we ignore the court case and get a mediator. That is the question, the hon. gentleman has said. We are quite prepared, as we have always said, to negotiate, Mr. Speaker, and to sit down and negotiate, but before there is any negotiations obviously the two parties have to be on the same road, otherwise there will never be any meeting. If one is on one level and the other is on the other, and they are on parallel lines, they will never meet and this is what is happening with the federal government. We say that we want to negotiate a settlement but the matter has to be resolved through negotiation. You cannot have it both ways. You cannot negotiate and come up with a decision and at the same time go to court and try to get it all for yourself. So, Mr. Speaker, what the situation is is that certainly there are court cases ongoing. I have indicated that we hoped there would be negotiations, but in order for there to be any meaningful negotiations, any negotiations with any possibility of any success it, has to be on the basis, Mr. Speaker, of ownership being set aside during the period of the negotiations and permanently if an agreement is reached, and the federal government has

MR.MARSHALL: address itself to joint management and meaningful revenue sharing. And we mean joint management, Mr.Speaker, we do not mean what the right hon. the Prime Minister talks about, watered down ownership. Watered down ownership to him means not sharing.

MR.NEARY: Could we have a copy of that? Table that. Table that.

MR.MARSHALL: I am referring to the same telegram that the hon. gentleman referred to. I have no doubt from the way the federal has operated in the past that he had his telegram probably before the government did,so he is well aware of it.

So that is the situation, Mr. Speaker. We are prepared to negotiate, we are anxious to negotiate, we do not think the matter should be determined in court,but it has to be determined through court, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman there opposite should not be attempting,in the event it has to be determined by court,to weaken our court position by making the scandalous statement that he made in the preamble to his question.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member
for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, that was a lot of
bologna on that side that time.

I would like to ask a question, Mr.
Speaker, to the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question to
the hon. Minister of Transportation is I understand that
Eastern Provincial Airways has decided to discontinue
their Tuesday flight into Labrador, and I am just wondering
if the Minister of Transportation could advise us
when he met with officials of Eastern Provincial Airways,
who he met with with Eastern Provincial Airways, and what
was the outcome of the meeting concerning the discontinuation
of the Tuesday flight into Labrador?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of
the situation as it relates to the discontinuation of a
flight from Labrador but it is within the jurisdiction of
the Canadian Transport Commission, their Air Services
Division or their Air Transport Division, which approves
or disapproves flight changes and scheduling changes as
it relates to aircraft and air services in Canada. I would suggest
that the member refer his question to the appropriate -

MR. SIMMS: Mr. Rumpkey.

MR. DAWE: - Mr. Rumpkey

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. WARREN: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member
for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: I know, Mr. Speaker, it must be astonishing for the lady from Alberta to hear the hon. Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) just saying that because it is under the CTC, he, as the Minister of Transportation, is not going to even talk to EPA to see if they can keep the flight going. Not bad for the Minister of Transportation in this Province, Mr. Speaker!

Now I will ask the minister a simple point-blank question. Would the minister consider meeting with officials of EPA to discuss the discontinuation of this service?

MR. NEARY: A good question.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, my department and this government has never been lax in its responsibility of transportation requirements in this Province.

MR. WARREN: No, boy! No, boy!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, when certain flight schedule changes were proposed for areas of the Province, namely the closure of the EPA services to Deer Lake -

MR. SIMMS: Right on! Right on!

MR. DAWE: - this Province was front and foremost in supporting the town of Deer Lake -

MR. SIMMS: Right. Paid for it and everything.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE: - and preparing the necessary interventions. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, my department itself prepared a number of interventions and proceeded with them, and very successfully, I might add because the people of Deer Lake still have a service.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, this government and my department will intervene, will do all it can, to make sure that the level of service is not only maintained in this Province as it relates to air services, but as it relates to

MR. DAWE: ferry services, as it relates to coastal marine services, as it relates to road services.

MR. SIMMS: Everything.

MR. DAWE: We will continue to put forward the best possible position provincially and will continue to pressure the federal government where necessary to make sure that the level of service is not only maintained but improved.

MR. SIMMS: That a boy! That a boy!
A good answer. What a minister!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) but he has left.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is back.

MR. TULK: Oh, he is there, is here? Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the minister about a problem that has been with us for years and years in this Province with fishermen being unable to-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the muppets can be quite then I will ask the question. I want to ask the minister about a problem that has been with us for years and years and that is the problem of fishermen in this Province being unable to sell their catch at certain times of the year. That is a result, of course, of the lack of Tory action in processing and technological development and marketing.

Mr. Speaker, I refer specifically to the dumping of fish by fishermen on the Southern Avalon in the Province. And I want to ask the minister quite specifically what he is going to do so that tomorrow morning when the fishermen on the Southern Avalon wake up that they do not have to dump their fish over the

MR. TULK: side of the wharf, or have to give it away down on Water Street? Is he going to do anything or is he going back to Alberta with the member?

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all it is amazing how confused the Opposition party can be these days.

MR. YOUNG: Right on there! Right on!

MR. MORGAN: Because it was not too long ago, no longer than - What? -two weeks ago, we heard a policy that was put forward by the man who has most control over the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada, the Federal Minister of Fisheries(Mr.LeBlanc) saying there are too many fish plants in Newfoundland. There is too much expansion in the processing sector of the industry. There should be plants closed in Newfoundland. That is the reason why they are in trouble in Newfoundland. There are too many of them. There is too much competition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: That is what he said a little while ago. And now today we hear the Opposition here saying not enough plants. Mr. Speaker, the problem that came to light a couple of days ago on the Avalon Peninsula that has been referred to in the question, is a problem that - there are three factors to the problem. One is the fact that there is a good supply of fish by means of the cod trap fishery in the last few days. Secondly, unfortunately most of that fish is of small size, it is less than sixteen inches in length, which means that the processors do not want to buy that type of small fish because it produces bad quality. And thirdly, most of the plants on the Avalon Peninsula are presenting processing the caplin species and not the cod species.

June 23, 1982

Tape 1590

PK - 3

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN:

And therefore, Mr.

Speaker, the normal operations, or the companies

MR. J. MORGAN:

who would be normally buying codfish from these fisherman on the Avalon Peninsula in particular, are not buying as much codfish. Now it came to light yesterday afternoon, it came to our attention this morning at a meeting with fisherman - I was on the way back from my district and the Deputy Minister met with a delegation of, I think, thirty-five or forty fisherman-and we advised them that we will now, in fact as of 9:30 a.m. this morning, engage our fish distribution desk employees and our field service employees in the Field Services Division to contact every company throughout Newfoundland and as of noon today, Mr. Speaker, the employees had contacted all the companies on the Avalon Peninsula and all of the companies said, 'We have lots of fish, be it caplin or be it ground-fish, we have lots of fish. We do not need any more fish.' So now the employees, and the distribution desk employees in particular, are in contact with all other companies on the East coast of the Province in particular, and in fact all over the Province to let them know that there is a supply of fish in the Avalon Peninsula and that we will give the okay to them to move in and buy the fish from these fisherman and to transport it to their respective plants where they do not have a supply of fish. Now the fish distribution desks are set up for the very purpose of moving fish supplies to different plants. And to give you an example of that, if I recall the correct figure last year, we moved 1.3 million pounds of fish around the Province by means of our effort. In 1980, for example, when we had a good year in the fishery, we moved close to 7 million pounds that way, co-ordinating the supply of fish to different plants. The problem, hopefully, as of the efforts of the Newfoundland Government - and I see no sign, Mr. Speaker, I see

MR. J. MORGAN: no sign at all of any concern from Ottawa. and Ottawa has all of the control of our fishermen's activities. It controls where a fisherman will fish, how much he will fish, what kind of licence he will use, what size of boat he will use, how he will land the fish, that is all in the jurisdiction of the Federal Department of Fisheries - but whenever a problem arises in Newfoundland, whenever a problem arises in the fishing industry, it is not the government in Ottawa that has eighty-six per cent control over the fishing industry of our Province, our most important industry, that gets blamed for these problems, no, it is the Newfoundland Government. But, Mr. Speaker, we do take our responsibilities very serious and despite we only have fourteen per cent responsibility we will do everything possible to solve the problems of the fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: We have heard that Romeo may have said that there were too many fish plants, but the hon. gentleman is the man in this Province who closed them down. The people in Lewisporte and Jackson's Arm will tell him that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: But let me ask him another question.

In view of the fact that his distribution desks have already failed to find fish plant processing capacity for the fish that is being dumped - they failed to do that, otherwise they would have found it before the minister got involved - is the minister in favour of over the side sales in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, just to make it quite clear that the members of the House understand that what we have done the last three months, what we have done -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, can you control the hon. lip from over Burgeo way, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: Yes, April 6th. told you how slack I was.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: The hon. lip from LaPoile

Mr. Speaker, is out of control again.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKEY: There were no recounts or Court cases down my way.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will sit down. We need some order in the House.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has asked a question of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and it is very difficult I am sure for the hon. minister to provide an answer and for anyone else to hear it. I would ask that the hon. minister be given the right to be heard in silence.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is ironic that the member stands and asks a question and blames us for closing plants, and names two plants closed by Nickerson's, only two plants in the Province, Jackson's Arm and Lewisporte. Well how about the plants in Hant's Harbour, Salvage, Jackson's Arm, Greenspond, Cook's Harbour, Bonavista, Englee, Fermeuse, Gaultois, Grand Bank, Main Brook, Fortune, Brig Bay, Heart's Desire, Petty Harbour, Triton, Harbour Grace, Ramea, Burnt Islands, Codroy, Tors Cove, Petty Harbour, Witless Bay, St. Bride's, Branch.

MR. PATTERSON: Shame! Shame! Shame!

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I can go on in length naming the plants that are now open-by what means? By this government's efforts.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: We had to open these plants strictly on our own limited financial resources we have as a small Province.

MR. MORGAN: And what did it mean? It meant the re-employment of 7,000 Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: So, Mr. Speaker, we have 231 processing facilities in this Province, 231. Some people argue and say there are too many. Others say, 'Well, let us leave it for a while and review it'. Our position is we are not in favour, as long as there are facilities onshore that do not have an adequate supply of raw material for processing anywhere in this Province-be it over in Burgeo, be it over in Port aux Basques, Port au Choix, Cook's Harbour, Stephenville, Twillingate, Bonavista, Fogo Island, anywhere in the Province - if there is anywhere in the province where a company owning a fish plant does not have an adequate supply of fish, we are not in favour of having our raw material taken to a foreign ship, taken over the side and frozen and taken away to be processed in other countries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

The time for the Question Period has expired. Before we proceed I would like to welcome to the galleries Mayor Ralph Moss and two councillors, James Thomson and Herman Spurrell, and the town manager, Harry Harding, from the municipalities of Badger's Quay, Valleyfield and Pool's Island .

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members Day, we were on Motion No. 6. The debate was adjourned last day by the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CROSS:

Mr. Speaker, before I get into the few words that I have on this debate today. I fear of being ruled out of order and irrelevant, but I will add my personal word of welcome to the mayor and town manager and councillors of the municipalities of Badger's Quay, Valleyfield and Pool's Island.

The first thing that I want to say in this debate today is that I will not be supporting this motion. I simply do not believe what the motion states in its entirety to be true. I do believe that the fishery is and always will be the backbone of Newfoundland's economy, that it is the main thread of Newfoundland's social, cultural and economic fiber. I do know and understand that we are experiencing problems in the fishery, both in the offshore and inshore sectors.

MR. CROSS:

But to place the blame wholly and solely on the provincial government at this time is far from the truth and is only made by the Opposition at this time to try and score political points and nothing else.

I will say now without fear of contradiction that more thought has gone into trying to develop a sound fishery policy, and more dollars have been infused into the fishing industry over the last ten years than at any other period in our history.

The hon. the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the member who made this motion, said that the fishery should be number one. Well, I agree with him, and I also say, as I have already said, that it is the number one industry of this Province.

MR. TULK: How come you spent all that amount of money?

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, I have listened in this House quite a bit and I have never interjected, or very few times have I interjected when somebody was speaking. I would ask that I might be heard in silence for the few minutes that I have today.

MR. NEARY: Can you speak in silence?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I wish to remind hon. members to my right that the hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. CROSS: I would at this time, Mr. Speaker, draw attention to the fact that the last budget of the former Liberal Government in 1971, set aside only \$30 million for all natural resources, primary industries, trade and industrial development, and that the present

MR. CROSS: budget of 1982 budgets
\$171 million to be spent in our resources -

MR. TOBIN: In just eleven years?

MR. CROSS: - with upwards of \$22 million being spent on the fisheries. And although this fact may be irrelevant to this debate, it is interesting to note that in 1971, 14.3 per cent of the budget spent by the last Liberal Government was spent on social welfare, whereas in the budget of 1982 only 10 per cent is being spent on social welfare. This seems to indicate to me that the policies of the present administration in the development of our resources are better than we had in the past.

I would like just for a moment, Mr. Speaker, to go a little further back in history, back to 1948 and the fight for Confederation. During the referendum of 1948, Newfoundlanders were led to believe that Confederation would make us all rich overnight and would be the cure for all our ills.

MR. CROSS: The fishermen were led to believe that the cost of producing fish would come down, that the Government of Canada would stand on back of the fishery, that the Fish Prices Support Board backed by Canada's millions would protect the price of our fish. That was in 1948. What happened in 1971? The price of fish fell drastically and some 600 schooners that plied back and forth to the Labrador each Summer were hauled ashore, hauled ashore, Mr. Speaker, never to float again. The fishermen were told to forget about the fishery and were foresaken by both levels of government of the day, and both levels of government at that time were Liberal. And when the Liberals today say they are genuinely concerned about the fishery and the plight of the fishery, I am always a little bit skeptical as to what their intentions are. The fishery was in dire straits in 1951 and a callous federal and provincial government turned a blithe and blind eye to the plight of the fishermen.

Mr. Speaker, we have all heard the saying that we have too many fishermen chasing after too few fish and that you can only catch a fish once. The federal government officials who control licencing believe that to be the case, hence we have a freeze on licences to the Newfoundland fishermen while foreign boats are given quotas. 10,000 metric tons of caplin were given to Russia this year while our own fishermen who wanted caplin licences could not get them, 9,000 metric tons of squid to Japan, squid that our fishermen

MR. CROSS:

could catch themselves. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should strike a hard bargain with foreign countries. It should not be caplin for wheat or squid for coal, it should be a trade off of processed fish for the right to fish some of our raw fish stocks. This would help our market situation.

The hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) the other day, last Wednesday in his remarks in the debate on this motion, spoke of Mr. LeBlanc, Mr. Chretien and Mr. MacGuigan as the men to thank for the 200-mile limit. He forgot that it was messrs. McGrath, Carter and Lundrigan who taught the politicians in Ottawa how to say fish and state it, and started the fight for the 200 mile limit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. CROSS:

I personally, Mr. Speaker, can remember attending meetings that were held by these hon. gentlemen when they were preaching the gospel of resource development and the 200 mile limit. As I said, Mr. Speaker, when I stood to speak on this motion, that I will not support this resolution.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

We are all surprised that the hon. member is not going to support the resolution moved by my colleague the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). The hon. gentleman just gave us a little lecture in ancient history and told us nothing about what the administration intends to do about the miserable state of the fishery in this Province. The fishery in Newfoundland, which is the backbone of the Newfoundland economy, is in the worst state that it has ever been in, the worst state in our whole history.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. gentleman gets up and speaks like all other hon. members on the opposite side speak, as if they are still in Opposition. They have an Opposition syndrome, They are very concerned about what the government did back in the mid-1800s. Mr. Speaker, fine, we can all read history books and if we are interested in ancient history we can go down to the Legislative Library and thumb through the journals down there and the Hansards of the House and find out what happened back from the time that we had responsible government in this Province. The hon. gentleman should have gone back to the days when John Cabot arrived in Newfoundland, I mean, why stop back in 1949 or back in the middle 1800s? Why stop there? Why not go right back to John Cabot. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the people -

MR. TOBIN: He went back to when you were involved.

MR. NEARY: - the people in this Province, Mr. Speaker, are not interested in ancient history. They are interested in what

MR. NEARY: this administration intend to do about the chaotic state of the fishery in this Province at the present time.

MR. TOBIN: Who licenced the boats in Quebec?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who just came into the House the other day should spend the first year of this House being seen and not heard instead of getting himself all riled up and all flushed up and goggley eyed and glassey eyed about things that happened twenty or fifty years ago. The hon. gentleman should sit and listen for a while and the hon. member should go through the learning process in this House, Mr. Speaker. His constituents did not send him in here to make snide and snarkey remarks across the House. His constituents sent him in here to try and do a good job for them and for the people of this Province, and that is what the hon. gentleman should do. The hon. gentleman should buy a zipper for the opening and just keep quite, Mr. Speaker, for the first year and the hon. gentleman may learn something.

Mr. Speaker, today we heard about another situation that has been known about in the fishery of this Province for several years past, and that is around this time in the year when the caplin are coming in, when the trap fishery commences on the East Coast, on the Avalon Peninsula, we have a glut in the fishery. And the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) got up again today and sloughed it off on Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, does this administration have no responsibility for the fishery at all? Is the minister abdicating his complete authority in the fisheries to the Government of Canada? Well to listen to the hon. gentleman, Mr.

MR. NEARY: Speaker, you would swear that that is what is happening. They may as well put a sign on the door, 'gone fishing' or 'out to lunch' or 'on vacation.' Put the padlocks on her and close her down. They have not lifted a finger in ten years to do anything to improve the state of the fishery in this Province, and now we have this glut situation again. The fishermen down in Torbay, down in the district of St. John's East Extern, Pouch Cove, in Kilbride over on the Southern Shore, two Tory districts, Mr. Speaker, two Tory districts, last week they had to dump their fish and this morning they had to go down on Water Street and give the fish away. They gave away over 10,000 pounds of fresh cod on Water Street this morning. Mr. Speaker, that is shameful, it is absolutely shameful. And this is the same government that is asking for control of the offshore. They are asking for more jurisdiction, they are asking for control of the offshore resources, and they cannot even solve the glut problem in the fishery that occurs once a year for anywhere from ten days to two or three weeks,

MR. NEARY: a glut problem for about three weeks they cannot even solve that.

MR. TULK: If the fish does not come they blame it on the federal government.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WARREN: Like everything else.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

Mr. Speaker, as I say it is shameful.

MR. TULK: A most incompetent crowd.

MR. NEARY: That is right. It just proves the incompetence of this administration, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: It is a persistent crisis.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

All they have been doing so far is sticking their finger in the dike. The minister got up and he read off a list of all the plants that had been kept afloat in Newfoundland this year because of government guarantees and grants and loans from the taxpayers.

Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen should know, as if they do not know they should go and take a look at their history books, that the history of the fishery in this Province has been up and down. In the mid-1960s, back in the mid 1960s every fish plant in Newfoundland was bankrupt, every one of them was bankrupt and the administration of the day had to bail out every fish plant in Newfoundland in the form of a government grant or a loan or a guarantee. Every plant in Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker we are not proud of that. We should not be proud of it.

MR. NEARY: That was back in the mid-1960s, that was twenty years ago, every plant in Newfoundland was bankrupt. Big banner lines in The Evening Telegram, every fish plant in Newfoundland bankrupt. And I am sure the administration of the day was not proud of that, no more than the administration today should be proud of it.

MR. HICKEY: That is when all the boats were burned.

MR. NEARY: All they are doing, - they get up and talk about all the Newfoundlanders that are working - all they are doing is saving jobs; they are not creating any new jobs, Mr. Speaker. Not one new job has been created through the millions of dollars that have been flung out to try to save these fish plants and these companies from going into bankruptcy or going into receivership.

MR. STAGG: Tell us about your friends up in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am going to throw out a few suggestions to the administration of things that I think, direction that I think they should be taking in the Newfoundland fishery. And the first thing that I am going to suggest is something that we as a party stand for, we Liberals stand for -

MR. STAGG: Unclear! Unclear!

MR. NEARY: - We stand for, Mr. Speaker, either expanding the terms of reference of the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation to market all the produce of the sea, or alternatively a provincial Crown corporation to market the fresh fish.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman can screw up his mouth all he wants, it is a good idea. Everybody thinks it is a good idea except the administration because, Mr. Speaker, the real problem in the fishery in Newfoundland now, the real problem, Mr. Speaker, is marketing the product, is marketing the produce of the sea.

MR. HODDER: But Romco is doing a good job.

MR. STAGG: Romeo is doing a good job?

MR. HODDER: Yes. And if it were up to your fellows we would not have a fish left in the sea because you would be giving out licences -

MR. MORGAN: We would not be giving them to foreigners.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please! Order!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if you could just keep the muppets quiet for a few minutes, maybe I could carry on. I only have twenty minutes, Mr. Speaker, at my disposal. But I want to say this, that the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation is one of the rare, enormous successes in the history of the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the provincial Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) continuously questions its role and refuses to address himself to whether or not the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation should be expanded to market all the produce of the sea.

You see, Mr. Speaker, the real problem in the Newfoundland fishery, for 400 years, has been marketing. Marketing, Mr. Speaker, has been the problem and still is the problem. And, Mr. Speaker, the marketing, hon. gentlemen should have no doubt in their minds, that marketing is a provincial responsibility. You

MR. NEARY: can blame everything else on Ottawa, you can even blame the weather on Ottawa if you want to, but the marketing and the quality of our Newfoundland fish and the processing of fish in this Province is a provincial responsibility. Can anybody deny that? Can anybody on the opposite side get up and say, 'No, that is not true'? When the fish are in the water they are under federal jurisdiction. When they are landed onshore, put on the wharf, they come under the jurisdiction of the provincial government.

AN HON. MEMBER: There are very few left in the water.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: There are very few left in the water.

MR. NEARY: Oh, there are very few left in the water. Well whatever is left in the water, there may be a few sculpins left there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: All the sculpins are in the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to provide greater success in the fishery of this Province we have to face the fact that marketing is the problem. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has to acknowledge that, admit that that is the problem.

MR. MORGAN: It is part of the problem.

MR. NEARY: It is part of the problem! It is ninety per cent of the problem.

MR. MORGAN: Marketing is the key.

MR. NEARY: Marketing is the key? Then why does not the hon. gentleman, who has the jurisdiction to do something about marketing, why does he not do something about it?

MR. MORGAN: Every time I go to new markets you are always complaining I am travelling too much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, here is the extent of the hon. gentleman's marketing programme: A holiday in -

MR. MORGAN: If I go they are complaining, if I stay they are complaining.

MR. NEARY: - a holiday in Puerto Rico, a holiday in Puerto Rico, a trip to the Big Apple, New York.

MR. MORGAN: You ask your colleague, the Minister of External Affairs (Mr. MacGuigan) about my trip to Puerto Rico and how busy it was, ask him. He knows about it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman put out a news release before he left the Province saying he was going down to Boston and New York to look for fish markets that we already have, we do not need anybody to go down -

MR. MORGAN: We do not need any more markets?

MR. NEARY: - we got all the markets we want in the New England States and we have all the markets we want in California. I could show the hon. gentleman orders from

MR. NEARY: plants out in my own district. They will take the whole -

MR. MORGAN: That are now going bankrupt.

MR. NEARY: - the whole production of the plants.

MR. MORGAN: If the banks come in they are going to go bankrupt.

MR. WARREN: Because you are not going to help them. Right?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that the hon. gentleman has not addressed himself to the marketing problem except to take his holiday in Puerto Rico at public expense, and to go off on a few jaunts to investigate the possibility of Cancom. What the hon. gentleman did will do nothing to solve the problems of marketing the fish in this Province.

So for greater success, Mr. Speaker, in the fishery we need immediately, Mr. Speaker - we need this year, we cannot wait much longer -

MR. S. NEARY: if we only can get the hon.gentleman's mind off oil, if we can get their minds away from oil for five or ten minutes. All they can do is think about oil, they dream about it, they eat it. They have oil on the brain, If we can only just, Mr. Speaker, get them away from visions of becoming oil sheiks for a few minutes and pay a little attention to the fishery in this Province.

MR. TULK: The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) thought he was going to be a Hollywood star on television.

MR. NEARY: Oh,well,I know he used to strum the guitar and yodle at one time. What was it they used to call him? Chubby Charlie.

MR. WARREN: Yes, he is wearing his cowboy boots now.

MR. NEARY: Perhaps our hon. friend from Alberta will bring him down a Calgary hat next time.

Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation was brought in by a Liberal Government, the legislation had to be passed in the House of Commons and concurrent legislation in the provincial legislature in order to get the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation. Now in order to amend the terms of reference of the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation this government has to take the initiative. A piece of legislation has to be brought into this House and at the same time a piece of legislation brought into the House of Commons asking that the terms of reference of the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation be amended to include all the produce of the sea. It is either that or bring in a piece of legislation setting up a Provincial Marketing Corporation. And the longer we put it off, Mr. Speaker, the more serious the crisis in the fishery is going to get.

MR. TOBIN: Which one would you rather have?

MR. S. NEARY: Which would I rather have? It is six of one and half a dozen of the other as far as I am concerned.

MR. TOBIN: Which way would you rather go?

MR. NEARY: We have the machinery set up for the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation, we have the administrative ability to do it there in the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation, maybe that is the route to take. I am not sure, If I had the facts and figures at my fingertips I would be able to tell you. But certainly, Mr. Speaker, we have no choice. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) has to address himself to that problem soon and stop this gallavanting around the Bahamas and the West Indies and Western Canada, sipping on cocktails while the Newfoundland Fishery is going down the tube.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the other problem we have in the Newfoundland Fishery is quality of the product.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, again we are talking about provincial jurisdiction when we are talking about quality control. In recent years some of the plants, I know a lot of the plants out in my own district, have made great strides toward improving the quality of the product.

MR. HEARN: More quality control than fish.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they seem to want to make a joke out of everything. Everything seems to be a big joke to this administration. They have their forty-four seats and that, Mr. Speaker, was not a mandate to become arrogant and make a joke out of everything. The hon. gentleman is another one who should sit there for the next year and just listen and maybe he will learn something.

AN HON. MEMBER: From whom?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: I know all about wind.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there is a movement toward improving the quality of the Newfoundland fish. This will have a big bearing on whether or not we can sell our fish in the market place and whether or not the processors and the fishermen and the plant workers will get a fair return on their efforts.

This is crucial, Mr. Speaker, and very important to the future development of the fishery in this Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other points that I am sure my colleagues would want to make, especially the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution. When he winds up the debate, no doubt he will summarize all the matters, all the points that have been raised.

But I am going to support the resolution, Mr. Speaker, and I would encourage all

MR. NEARY: hon. gentlemen of this House, unless they want the fishery to be completely wiped out in this Province, they should all support this resolution and this kind of proposal put forward by the Opposition of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, there are so many other points that I could raise in connection with the fishery that I cannot do it in twenty minutes. But I would like to ask the hon. gentleman, who seems to be ready now to leap on his feet over there, to tell us what process, what procedure is used to dole out the crab licences in this Province.

We have a situation on the Southern Shore, Mr. Speaker, where a few years ago the owners of fish plants on the Southern Shore sold their plants to an American company, to American interests, and only a few weeks ago, a few months ago the Newfoundland Government had to take them over and pass them back to the previous owners as a gift, practically gave them to them. And one of the stipulations of giving them back their plant that they had sold and made millions of dollars off, to this American company, was that they get a crab licence. And the hon. gentleman caved in and gave them the crab licence,

MR. NEARY:

and now we have three crab licences on the Southern Shore. And we have another gentleman, another fish processing company, with four crab licences that are only using two out of the four. Mr. Speaker, are these licences passed out along political lines or how are they distributed? How does one go about getting a crab licence in this Province? Do you have to cosy up to the minister, cosy up to the administration? Is it another form of political patronage? Is that the kind of planning and development we are getting into the fishery of this Province? It would certainly seem that way, Mr. Speaker. In the meantime I think my time has just about expired. I only wish I had more time to talk about this matter, Mr. Speaker, because, as I said in the beginning, the fishery is still the backbone of the economy of this Province and it is the thing that has been neglected most by this administration.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please.

MR. NEARY: They can think of nothing else only oil, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: -I feel almost obligated to speak on a motion involving the most important industry we have, a renewable resource, the fishing industry and the fishery, and to have a few comments on what is happening in the industry today and what the future is for tomorrow and down the road. Now I find it rather ironic, to say the very least, that the Opposition would put a resolution of this nature on the Order Paper and refer to the fact that the Newfoundland government, the provincial government, has no policy on the fishery. Now the fact is that many members may be - and I recall some member today asking a question, what do the different governments have jurisdiction

MR. MORGAN: over in the fishing industry.
And there are many people out there, I know many fishermen are confused because in my travels I try to clarify it as much as possible to all the fishermen what the different responsibilities and jurisdictions are of the two governments. And let us make it quite clear that nowhere else in the country, I do not think, in the country of Canada is an industry that is so important to a province controlled so much by someone who does not even live in the Province and the base of operations is not in the Province, is located in Ottawa. Because the fact is everything that is

MR. MORGAN: done in the harvesting sector of the fishing industry is under the control of the federal level of government. Everything on the water, everything in the fishing boat, a licence for the fishermen, licence for the fishing boat, how much fish the fishermen will catch, what quotas will be allocated to the different types of species and for fishermen, what type of gear the fishermen will use to fish, how much fish they will bring in from all different species, all of these things are under the control of the federal government. We have no say whatsoever with regards to these important matters in the fishing industry. In other words, we have no say over the overall management of the resource itself. And the resource itself is the key. It is a renewable resource.

Back in 1977 when we saw the declaration of the 200 mile economic zone, I recall there was jubilation among the people in this Assembly because I was here as a member and I recall the jubilation of the Newfoundland fishermen. 'Now we are going to have a fishery. Finally we are going to get rid of all of those foreign fishermen who have been raping our fish stocks for years down to the point of almost depletion, the Russians taking as high as 200,000 metric tons a year of caplin. And the foreign fleets, Spanish, Portuguese, West Germany, the Russians and others taking as high as 250,000 or 300,000 metric tons of cod, raping our fish stocks.' We said, 'God bless the decision of Ottawa'. I recall Mr. Jamieson then was Minister of External Affairs. Mr. Carter was up there in Ottawa. Jim McGrath was there in Ottawa, John Lundriqan and I think Ambrose Peddle and they were all jubilant. 'Finally we are going to have an industry that is going to be managed properly and we are going to have the resource built up to become a very

MR.MORGAN: by the Prime Minister's office, by Kirby from the office, it has been denied by Mr.LeBlanc. But how did they deny it? They denied it by saying there is no signed agreement. But, Mr.Speaker, I can stand today and say that I know that a deal has been made. And where is the 5,000 tons going to come from? The Spanish fleet will be within our waters, my guess is a maximum of twenty-one days from now, coming over to take what? To take the 5,000 metric tons of Northern cod that is going to be taken from the inshore quota for our fishermen, from our inshore quota.Because all the foreign allocations are gone.

AN HON. MEMBER: You listen to that.

MR.MORGAN: All the offshore allocations of fish to foreign nations,there is a certain portion left from their quota to be allocated for foreign, so-called,trade agreements. So that portion of fish - there is nothing left in the offshore quota, it is all gone,so they have to find 5,000 tons for Spain. And a chap by the name of Tony Campbell,the chief negotiator for Mr. LeBlanc's office,sat down with a group of negotiators from Spain, with an official from our department as an observer , as an observer, Mr. Speaker, that is all the level he had at the meeting, to observe Mr. Campbell, an official, say to the Spanish people,'Yes, we will give you 5,000 tons'. And the official,an ADM from my department,posed a question,"Where will the 5,000 tons of cod come from,Mr. Campbell? "Oh", he says,"We know that the inshore fishermen are not going to catch their quota this year." And my ADM says, "Well,how do you know that Mr. Campbell?" "Oh, we know that. They are not

MR. MORGAN: going to catch the fish. They had a problem last year with cold water and there is no assurance at all that the fishermen of Newfoundland are going to catch their allocation, their allowance, so we will take 5,000 tons." They are going to take 5,000 tons of the fish allocated to our fishermen, our inshore fishermen and give it to the Spaniards. It has been denied but it is fact. That is the kind of management I am talking about, which is of concern to us, management of the resource.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a further problem in the management of the resource is the fact that we have what they call flags of convenience of the foreign countries. There are the Mexicans, there are the Argentines, there are the Cubans and from Peru as well fishing, and they are also using ships from the European fleet flying these flags, that are fishing out on the nose and tail of the Grand Banks. And I recall saying at a fisheries conference in Grand Bank, no longer than two years ago, that unless we have some control over the nose and tail of the Grand Banks we will have no fish to catch to put in the plants on the South Coast. Nobody listened to what I was saying. But the fact is now that there is no longer any fish out there, there is no longer any fish out there.

Mr. Speaker, only three minutes left. My goodness I did not even get on the topic.

MR. YOUNG: Twenty minutes. Twenty minutes is not up yet, is it?

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker. I am not going to question the Speaker. He says three minutes.

MR. MORGAN: But let me put in capsule form some of the problems, and let me say, Mr. Speaker, that within ten days time this government is going to make public, the Premier and myself, the most comprehensive document on the policies of this government on fisheries ever put forward before. It is comprehensive, involving the harvesting sector, the processing sector, and the marketing sector. I hope you made a mistake in my time, Mr. Speaker, hopefully!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please! The hon. Minister of Fisheries has thirteen minutes rather than three minutes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Now we will get on to the topic. Now, Mr. Speaker, I talked about management of the resource, now let us talk about some of the problems that I recognize that we have got to take and deal with. The fishermen themselves have got to be more diversified in what they are fishing for. Now I am hoping from hereon in to be at least non-partisan, non-political, talk about some serious problems we have in the fishing industry.

The fishermen have got to be more diversified in their harvesting activity. They have to be able to fish different species, more species, and that is where we are doing what we can as a government here. Despite the fact the federal government controls and has jurisdiction over responsibility for all the activities of fishermen, what do we do? Well, we supplied last year \$23 million, we gave out to fishermen in loans, and we gave out a further figure, I think it is of around \$3 million, last year in grants or bounties, outright grants to fishermen. What for? What for? To help them become more diversified, to help them get better boats, better equipment, to help them fish, as I say, more species.

MR. MORGAN: The licencing policy of the federal government right now is restrictive. It is too restrictive. It is preventing young fishermen getting involved in the fishing industry. We have young people today who want to be involved and carry on where their fathers have left off. Their fathers have been fishermen all their lives and the young people want to move in to take over the fishing boats of their fathers, etc., they cannot do it. There is no provision in the present licencing system to not only encourage but to enable, young fishermen to get involved in the fishing industry. These licencing policies of the federal government must be changed. They have to be more flexible.

Mr. Speaker, we have, I mentioned today, 231 processing plants around the Province. These plants last year processed a total amount of 470,000 metric tons of fish. That fish was sold in the market place valued at \$430 million.

MR. TULK: How much?

MR. MORGAN: \$430 million was the value of our export of fish, seafood from Newfoundland.

MR. TULK:

Was that 1981?

MR. MORGAN:

In 1981, which was down approximately 20,000 metric tons from the year before which was not too bad, because '81 was supposed to be a real bad year with regard to the total catch.

MR. TULK:

But the value was not down.

MR. MORGAN:

But the value was approximately the same, the value of the fish last year compared to 1980. Now, at the time that that fish was caught and processed, mostly during the inshore fishing season, we had fish plants which were only operating around 45 per cent to 48 per cent of their total capacity. In other words, they were only utilizing less than half of their capacity. So we have a problem which we are now dealing with, a problem whereby we have to find more fish for those inshore seasonal - we call them resource shore plants. Now how do we get that fish? The inshore fishermen fish, say, from the middle of May up until the end of October and then they quit fishing. Because of weather conditions and other reasons they just do not fish beyond these periods, nor outside these periods, on the Northeast coast in particular. So we have to find a supply of fish from other than the inshore to be landed and processed in these plants, for processing during what I would term the off season to the inshore season. And if we can do that - and we finally made some progress last year with the federal government. After hassle after hassle, meeting after meeting, we finally persuaded the federal minister to set aside an allocation of fish from the offshore waters, an offshore allocation to be set aside for what reason? To be caught and landed and processed in the inshore plants in Newfoundland.

MR. TULK: Whose quota was that?

MR. MORGAN: That came from the offshore quota, the total offshore quota for the Canadian fleet.

Mr. Speaker, that quota was allocated initially at 10,000 metric tons. And I have no hesitation in saying that that 10,000 metric tons would have been the answer to the problems of the inshore, resource shore plants. And I can name some of them off: Well, Ocean Harvesters have their own trawler now, but their is Job Brothers, and there is Quinlan Brothers, and there is E.P.Janes and this type of medium sized operators. And that was a firm allocation given at a meeting with the minister and the federal minister, the provincial ministers. But suddenly, and I have said it before, I think, I am not sure if I said it in the House of Assembly, because of the greed of the big four companies who wanted all that offshore quota, because there is an offshore quota for the dragger fleet, or the offshore deep-sea fleet, the pressure was put on Mr. Leblanc in Ottawa and he reduced it from 10,000 metric tons to 5,000 metric tons. So this year this is a figure out there now, a quota of 5,000 metric tons which is to be caught later on this Fall and landed and processed in the resource shore plants.

Now that is going to help a lot, it is a good beginning. It is not enough , but a good beginning.

MR. TULK: Who is going to do it?

MR. MORGAN: The question is who will do it? The question is that up until now these independent operators, through the Fish Trades Association in particular, have arranged to engage foreign vessels - foreign vessels would catch the fish and land it in the plants to be processed here in Newfoundland. That was

MR. MORGAN: done last year because the plants do not have trawlers themselves.

So that is a problem that is being overcome, not sufficiently, but there is a start being made.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we talked about plant expansion. I am not convinced that the federal government is not right when they say there has been too much expansion, and that is the reason why this government took the step last July and put a freeze on. That freeze is on right now, the freeze is on for no more new fish plants, no more additional licences, no more expansion. We did not have any control over the expansion of fish plants that took place by the Nickerson firm, for example, National Sea, to some extent, and others. They went to Ottawa. We gave them a licence to operate in a small facility.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: They had a licence to operate in a small facility, Mr. Speaker, and suddenly they go to Ottawa and ask for money from Ottawa, from DREE, and with the blessing of the Federal Minister (Mr. LeBlanc), who has been there for a good many years now, out came the funds. The funds just poured out the last five years from Ottawa to these fish companies to build big multipurpose fish plants all along the Northeast coast. Some of them today are closed.

So we said, 'Okay, if that is the way it is going to be, Ottawa is going to let all these expansions occur, we are going to stop it'. So we stopped it. Now a company cannot expand its plants:

AN HON. MEMBER: No way.

MR. MORGAN: They cannot expand their plants so-

AN HON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. MORGAN: You will take up my time. Maybe after my time is up, then if you want to ask questions

AN HON. MEMBER:

By leave! By leave!

MR. MORGAN:

If these companies are going to do that we are going to say, 'We are going to control your expansion'. So right now we have in place a regulation which prevents any company from expanding their operations without our approval. If a plant, for example, in Petty Harbour, if a plant in Harbour Grace wants to expand their operation with the existing licence they have, they now have to come to us for approval to do so.

MR. YOUNG:

Right on.

MR. MORGAN:

In the past they did not have to do that. So that is a new change with regard to plant capacity and expansion. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is so much on that part. The fish is now in the plant, in my line of thinking here, in my few notes I have, in the plant. Now what happens to the fish? And that is what is wrong with our fishing industry, Mr. Speaker. I do not think I have said it too much in the past, but the problem is when the fish gets from the boat to the plant, the processor has the fish in his plant, what is he going to do with it? That is the whole problem. And what has he been doing with it?

Most of the fish that we have been selling in Newfoundland have been going down to the Northeastern part of the U.S.A. in cod block form. Cod block is like a big block of raw material going down - and I went down last year and toured seven plants, I toured seven plants in New England and the Northeastern part of the U.S.A., seven large fish plants doing what? They were making fish sticks, battered fish pieces, all kinds of beautifully packaged fish pieces going into boxes, going out to the institutions, schools, hospitals

MR. J. MORGAN: and the jails etcetera all across the States, to the institutions and to the retail outlets. All our raw material and they putting it in these beautiful packages in the final processed form. When I came back the first thing I did was call together all the companies in a meeting down in Atlantic Place and I said, 'Fellows, for goodness sake stop dishing out the fish in raw form like that'. Down in the U.S.A. there is a good market for prime filets. Iceland and Norway are down there marketing the right way. They are marketing good quality product and they are marketing it in a very co-ordinated, consolidated way. They are not going out in different directions, different companies, they got their act together, they formed only two agencies it takes all the fish from Iceland, two agencies takes all the fish from Norway and they go into the States and they do a good marketing job with a good quality product, the same kind of product we can produce here. We have a good raw material. Our fish supply is coming from the coldest waters of North America, it has been determined by scientists. It is the best raw material anywhere in the fishing industry that you find right off Newfoundland, the Northern cod from cold waters. And we could provide good top quality product. Now, if we do not provide good top quality product, the other countries are going to take the market from us. And if we keep on providing cod block raw material and do not get more involved in - for example, back in 1979 the figure was 70 per cent of the fish produced in Newfoundland was going into the States. Yes, 70 per cent was going in cod blocks. As of last year, it was down to 55 per cent, and the objective of the Newfoundland government, working with the companies, is by 1984 to have that reversed the other way. We will have 70 per cent of the fish going into the U.S., in particular, going in cod filet, and

MR. J. MORGAN: only 30 per cent going in cod block. Because if that was done, we would get better prices, better returns to the processors and we would have a good constant market in the U.S.A.. Now, that is one of the key things, getting the quality and getting a good product.

Now, I want to add to that, Mr. Speaker. We have got to have a co-ordinated activity of the market. Unless the companies get their act together, the companies - look, a few days ago, Mr. Speaker, I was appalled to learn that the Lake Group were down in the States undercutting Fishery Products.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. MORGAN: Fishery Products were down undercutting the Lake Group in the Market place, undercutting them along came Nickerson/National Sea, which is now one firm, they go in and undercut the prices of Lakes. The Lakes undercut them. Now, who is laughing? I will tell you who is laughing in the market place, the people who are buying our fish. But when I say it, 'Oh' the companies say, 'there goes Morgan attacking us again.' But it is true and it is very, very unfortunate. We have got to have the companies co-ordinate and consolidate their marketing effort, if not the people down in the States who are

MR. MORGAN:

buying our fish are going to continue to laugh at us. So there has got to be a good quality produced, a good product and then the companies get their act together to make sure they are doing it all together in co-ordination, not in competition but in co-ordination, then we are going to have a good fishery and a good potential in the market place.

Now we have been advocating, the Premier and this government, for some time the need for a consortium of the other companies. I am talking about the big four. You know, I mentioned the big four - National Sea, Nickersons, the Lakes and Fishery Products. Then we have all kinds of small companies. We have something like seventy-odd small companies around the Province that are doing their own thing; they produce a bit of fish, buy a bit of fish, produce a bit of fish, try to market it, they have no marketing organization and they are depending on the big companies to market for them. So we said, 'Look, for goodness sake, form a consortium of companies and get together and you will be strong as one group', And I am very pleased to tell the House that a consortium called Sunsea, S-u-n-s-e-a, is a consortium of ten companies to date, ten small companies in Newfoundland. They have now formed a consortium to do what? - to market their product as one - one brand label, one company and marketing mostly in the USA. That is a good beginning as well. We are working with them to expand on that.

MR. NEARY: They all get together to market their goods.

MR. MORGAN: Just for marketing only.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish I could go on but my time is up, I have only one minute left.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. WARREN: No.

June 23, 1982

Tape No. 1610

SD - 2

MR. MORGAN: By leave for five minutes or so?

MR. WARREN: No, no.

MR. MORGAN: The hon. gentleman from Labrador says no, I guess he does not want -

MR. WARREN: Okay, five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER(Aylward): By leave?

MR. MORGAN: - five minutes, alright.

Mr. Speaker, so if we could have the co-operation of the companies -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: He has leave.

MR. NEARY: There is no leave.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I will clue up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Give us a few plans for the fishery and we will give you leave, but not for that rubbish.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman does not want to hear the plans of the government, that is his problem.

MR. NEARY: Oh, sit down, you are making a fool of yourself.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will clue up by saying in my one minute I have left -

MR. NEARY: Sit down, your time is up.

MR. MORGAN: - by saying, Mr. Speaker, that -

MR. NEARY: A point of order Mr. Speaker.

MR. MORGAN: Oh, look how childish the hon. gentleman is.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon.

Leader of the Opposition.

June 23, 1982

Tape No. 1610

SD - 3

MR. MORGAN: Here is a company from his district (inaudible).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MORGAN: Oh, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. Minister of Fisheries' time has elapsed.

The hon member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, in support of this motion that my colleague from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) put forward and I am surprised that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) did not support the motion, he did not say whether he would support the motion or not.

MR. WARREN:

But my colleague from Bonavista North (Mr. Cross), one of the most outstanding fishing districts in the Province, said he would not support the motion. So, therefore, I can gather from that that the member from Bonavista North does not care whether the fishery fails or survives. He will not support a motion that is calling for the survival of the fishery in this Province. I am surprised a man who comes from a family who have been noted as one of the outstanding fishing families in this Province could get up here and not support a motion that is asking for some action to help the survival of the fishery.

MR. TOBIN: He was your teacher, was he not?

MR. WARREN: That is right, he was my teacher and I must admit that he was one of the better teachers that I have had. He was a much better teacher than you were a welfare officer, I will tell you that.

However, Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to this very important motion. I can say now without any contradiction that the number one problem with the fishery in this Province is the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). That is the number one problem with the fishery in this Province at the present time. So I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker - and we have known, Mr. Speaker, at least I have known since 1979, when the former Minister of Fisheries, Walter Carter, resigned, that that was the downfall in the fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador. When Mr. Carter resigned or was sort of pushed into the background, when he lost the leadership and resigned, that was the beginning of the decline of the Newfoundland fishery. And who did we get in place of him? The present Minister of Fisheries, and we know, Mr. Speaker, what his record speaks for.

MR. WARREN:

The Minister of Fisheries is more interested in selling televisions than he is in looking after the fishery of this Province.

So, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) would pay more attention to the vital industry that we have in this Province, the fishery, instead of looking after pay television, then I would think, Mr. Speaker, that we would have a much better fishery in this Province today.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the minister answered a question from my hon. colleague from Fogo (Mr. Tulk) that there are 239 processing plants in this Province. Now, whether that is too many or not enough I will not argue with him. I have my reservations on the pros and the cons of it. However, let me - and the minister then all of the sudden got up and he started rhyming off the money that he gave to the different fish plants. Today, with the glut in the fishery because of the overlapping of the cod coming in and the abundance of the caplin, out on the isthmus of the Peninsula a fish plant,

MR. WARREN: a practically new fish plant in the member for Placentia's district, a practically new fish plant, the equipment is there ready to turn the button, away to go, and this fish plant has been closed down for the past two years.

MR. TULK: What?

MR. WARREN: It has been closed down. In the hon. member for Placentia's district it was closed down last year and has been closed down at least up until today.

MR. PATTERSON: Where is that?

MR. WARREN: In Little Harbour East.

MR. NEARY: Argentina.

MR. WARREN: It is in Little Harbour East.

MR. PATTERSON: Not the fish plant at Petite Forte.

MR. WARREN: No, in Little Harbour East. Yes.

And up until today it has been closed down, closed down all last year, took in -

MR. PATTERSON: Excuse me. Would you permit a question?

MR. WARREN: After my twenty minutes you have twenty minutes to talk. Okay?

MR. NEARY: And you can give us a lecture on resettlement after.

MR. WARREN: Okay.

MR. PATTERSON: A point of order.

Mr. Speaker (McNicholas): A point of order, the hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is possibly - he is as much familiar with Little Harbour as I am. He knows well - if you were an honest man you would come out and give the reason.

MR. WARREN: I am going to now.

MR. PATTERSON: Do it. Well, do not ask me. If you know the reason - never ask a question unless you want an answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is a point of order. If the member for Placentia was doing his homework the fish plant would be open. And that is the problem, the member for Placentia is not doing his homework. The reason the fish plant is not open is because this government does not want that fish plant open.

MR. NEARY:

Right on! Right on!

MR. WARREN:

That is the reason.

You have your twenty minutes afterwards to talk about it. The people out there on April 6th. gave that member a mandate, the first time ever that community voted - and they were expecting that that member would really fight for them to get that fish plant opened.

MR. PATTERSON:

And I thank them for it.

MR. SPEAKER(McNicholas):

Order, please!

MR. WARREN:

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have a new fish plant. And this is the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) talking about -

MR. PATTERSON:

Are you worried about

this?

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please! Order, please! To that point of order I think I have heard enough. It seems to be a difference of opinion as to whether the plant is open or closed. So there is no point of order.

MR. WARREN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a good ruling. However, Mr. Speaker, this is just an example, of the Minister of Fisheries, saying, 'Look, we opened up this plant, and we opened up that one',

MR. WARREN: and he still leaves a plant out there where there are something like 600 fishermen on that isthmus, in Trinity and Placentia Bays, and yesterday and today, and on Friday and Saturday they had to dump their fish. With a fish plant within a twelve mile radius, 900 fishermen had to dump their fish. Now, whose responsibility is that? The Minister of Fisheries federally (Mr. Leblanc) is that his responsibility, opening up provincial fish plants?

I remember during a by election - you talk about chaos in the fishery in this Province - the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) went into a town in the Bellevue district and sat down at a meeting in the Lion's Club and said, 'Look, I have a processors licence here for you to operate your fish plant'. This was during an election. He pulled out the processors licence for this individual company, while twelve miles away there was a large fish plant closed down. Now, this is what I am trying to say, Mr. Speaker, the chaos in the fishery is caused by the present minister.

But then again, Mr. Speaker, there are some things on which I have to agree with the Minister of Fisheries. I must admit that the freeze that is placed on the licences by the federal government is terrible. I would be the first - in fact, I have correspondence six inches thick, to the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, with requests for - just to give you an example, in my own district a fisherman there can only fish the char or the salmon fishery. Because he only had a small eighteen foot boat, and with only a two month fishing season he cannot afford to get a bigger boat, what does he do? He fishes the char or the salmon fishery.

MR. WARREN: Now his young fellow eighteen years of age wants to go fishing. He cannot get a salmon licence or a char licence so he is left with nothing to do but live off the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey).

And this is happening all along the Labrador coast. I think it is ridiculous. I told the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, person to person, that what he has done with the fishermen in these instances is just ridiculous. And I must admit, with the Minister of Fisheries in our Province, that this freeze has to be lifted in circumstances of this kind.

Mr. Speaker, I think catching caplin at this time of year means a good income for fishermen. But, and I said this last year in speaking on a resolution concerning the fishery and I will say it again,

MR. WARREN: part of the blame has to go on the fishermen themselves. Because what they are doing, they may not realize it, with the lackadaisical regulations that both governments have in place, if the fishermen continue to take the caplin and separate the male from the female, as they are doing now, I am pretty well convinced, Mr. Speaker, that in five years from now our caplin fishery may be destroyed. I have a feeling the federal biologists and the provincial people should work hand in hand in trying to preserve the caplin fishery, because the cod fishery depends on the caplin fishery. And if they continue to just take the female and sell them and then destroy the male - you can go out into any community now in Placentia Bay or Trinity Bay or Bonavista Bay or on the Southern Shore and you will see the shoreline, in about three or four feet of water, just completely white and silver, dead caplin all over the place.

And I think the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) will agree. The fishermen are partly to blame, but both governments have to take the blow, because they issued those caplin licences. And what is happening now is -

AN. HON. MEMBER: Who issues the caplin licences?

MR. WARREN: The caplin licence is issued by the federal government. But the Province has the plants in place, so you are processing them. And this is the problem, as I say, both governments could stop the issuing of caplin licences, and the processing licences. Therefore, what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that both governments aim is to destroy the caplin fishery. And if this happens, they are going to destroy the cod fishery.

MR. WARREN: I want to go to my district for a little while, Mr. Speaker, and discuss the involvement of this Province with the two provincially owned fish plants, two plants solely owned by the provincial government. Now my colleague, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) will agree with me now that if the government owns a fish plant at least they have some jurisdiction over that fish plant.

MR. NEARY: Right. That is so.

MR. WARREN: Now let me tell you something. The federal government has some \$3.5 million - now this is good news. The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) just gave us some good news, now I am going to give the House some good news. The federal government has some \$3.5 million to put into the two fish plants in Nain and Makkovik. Now, however, they cannot get an agreement from the Province because the Province owns the fish plants.

MR. WARREN: The Province owns the fish plants and they will not let the federal government spend money on those fish plants. So, you know, it is amazing to see a minister who is so anxious to see our fishery survive that he and his government will not give permission to use federal money in the reactivation and expansion and repairing of the fish plants that are owned by this government. This is what the fishermen along the Labrador Coast have to contend with.

MR. CARTER: No strings attached!

MR. WARREN: No strings attached. In fact, yes, there is a string attached. Oh yes, there is a string attached.

MR. NEARY: That they have to operate them.

MR. WARREN: No, that once the fish plants are brought up to par they will be turned over to the Co-op? That is the string that is attached.

MR. TULK: The Tornqat Co-op?

MR. WARREN: Yes, that is right. That is the string that is attached, and that is a very simple string, because that plant is turned over in the hands of the people.

MR. NEARY: They want to turn it over to their buddies.

MR. WARREN: That is right. That is right. They want to bring in a private company from somewhere on the Island to operate the fish plant.

MR. TULK: Let me tell the members. Why do they not go down to Fogo Island and learn that Co-ops are one of the best operators of fish plants in this Province.

MR. WARREN: Sure the Co-op is. In fact, a lot of credit has to go to Don Best on Fogo Island for

MR. WARREN: operating this Co-op.

MR. MORGAN: The minister bailed them out.

MR. NEARY: They would not be able to give it to their buddies then.

MR. TULK: You did not bail them out. You have never bailed them out. Through Rural Development you may have provided grants for expansion but that is it.

MR. MORGAN: We will leave it to that.

MR. WARREN: I am going to speak when some of you members - So, Mr. Speaker, only about a month ago we remember the Premier (Mr. Peckford) of this Province, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), 'Look, go in and stop the fishermen of St. Anthony'. Do you remember that? 'We are going to stop the fishermen of St. Anthony from fishing'. That was it.

MR. TULK: That is what the Premier said.

MR. WARREN: Yes. But, however, Mr. Speaker, I believe the people in St. Barbe, the people in St. Anthony have gotten the message. They said, 'Okay, Mr. Peckford or Mr. Morgan, you try to stop us from fishing'. And who bailed out St. Anthony? Them bad, bad boys from Ottawa. And, Mr. Speaker, let us give them credit where credit is due. The provincial government has bailed out fish plants throughout the Province. Why have they not opened up the fish plant in Little Harbour East? Maybe the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) might know the answer. I do not know.

MR. WARREN: The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) might know the answer. But I will tell you one of the answers. One of the answers is that the people in Little Harbour East cannot agree because this government has them so confused, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the minister said his department has given out some \$23 million in loans. That \$23 million, Mr. Speaker, has gone a long way to help alleviate the problems with people finding employment throughout the fishery, however, it has not gone far enough. The meat cleaver, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) brought down a Budget, brought down a Budget and what did he do? He raised the interest on fishermen's loans - remember that? - from 8 per cent to 12 per cent, you know, a 50 per cent increase to the fishermen of this Province, to the people of this Province, a 50 per cent increase on loan interest. Now, this is what the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) of this Province, the meat cleaver, has done. The Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in conjunction with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) said, 'Okay, here is a good chance now to get a few more dollars for the kitty, let us jack up the rates of interest on loans 50 per cent'. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that a good way, an encouraging way to keep fishermen fishing? Is that encouraging? I do not see where the encouragement is.

MR. SIMMS: Does the hon. member (inaudible).

MR. WARREN: I would like to advise the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) that I caught more cod fish in my day than the hon. member for Grand Falls ever saw. I would think that the member for Grand Falls would not know what a cod fish looked like. I caught more cod fish when the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) was trying to teach me - I would get up at four o'clock in the morning, before I would go to school, and

June 23, 1982

Tape No. 1616

ah - 2

MR. WARREN: go out and help my grandfather haul the codtrap and then I would come back and the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) would try to teach me. And he had a job, you know.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say that I support this resolution.

MR. G. WARREN: I want to read a letter that the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) wrote to me on June 7th concerning a problem that is within provincial jurisdiction.

MR. SIMMS: Can you table the letter?

MR. WARREN: Oh, yes I will table the letter, no problem.

And he says, 'This will acknowledge in fact, it is on behalf of the petition that was presented in the House.' And so he said, 'It seems to me that the Torngat Co-operative should refer this matter to the Department of Indian and Northern Affairs for possible assistance before coming to the Province.' Now, before coming to the Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, let me say that here is a problem that is in the provincial jurisdiction and he said, 'Refer it to the federal government'. Why refer a provincial matter to the federal government?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, you know, it is amazing that a fellow has, for twenty minutes gotten up and tried to let the hon. members on that side of the House know that there are problems in the fishery that they do not even realize. The hon. member from Grand Falls (Mr. L. Simms), he does not know what a codfish looks like, so how can he understand about the cod fishery?

MR. SIMMS: It looks like the hon. member.
SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: So, Mr. Speaker, let us take another member, for example.

MR. SIMMS: St. John's East there, a great fishing district.

MR. WARREN: No, I am not going to take St. John's East. We will take the member from -

June 23, 1982

Tape No. 1617

MJ - 2 /

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Deer Lake.

MR. G. WARREN:

Deer Lake, yes. There you go.

The hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House), for example, you know, he does not even know what a codfish looks like.

Mr. Speaker, in concluding I want to agree with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) on one thing - Mr. Speaker, I have about two minutes - and that is our fish leaving the Province in block form. I believe it is ridiculous, it should never be. But let us take that a little further. Look at what is happening to the char and the salmon on the Labrador Coast. As soon as the fisherman get it, all the people do with it up there is gut it open and take the insides out.

MR. WARREN:

That is all they do with it and it is brought out here. And they smoke about 1 per cent of what they catch. That is all that is smoked, about one per cent of it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. WARREN: One minute to clue up?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

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

MR. DINN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
First of all -

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: I would like to ask the Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) to go back to his own side, because I cannot sit at the same desk with him.

MR. SIMMS: There is no point of order there, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me say that if anyone -

MR. NEARY: Is Your Honour going to rule on the point of order?

MR. SPEAKER: I rule there is no point of order.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, first of all, I have to make it quite clear that I cannot support the resolution as proposed by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) for obvious reasons. And the hon. member for Fogo would not be serious if, indeed, he read a little. For example, if

MR. DINN: he read the report that the Fisheries Department presented to the Kirby Task Force, if he read the different publications that were put out by the Department of Fisheries provincially, the hon. member would not be serious about putting a resolution of this sort before this House of Assembly. I would like to look at this resolution and discuss it with respect to employment, because it is one of grave concern to me as Minister of Labour and Manpower, and reading the unemployment statistics in Newfoundland that have been getting a little bit worse in the past year or so, and attack it from the point of view of several aspects that hon. members have brought up with respect to marketing, with respect to how we are looking at the fishery, the processing sector, the catching sector and so on. And just to look at the marketing side of it, I wonder aloud why we are having some difficulties in marketing our fish. Mr. Speaker, I would like to look at it from that point of view

MR. DINN: and also from the point of view of why we are doing what we are doing. Last year, as an example - and the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) pointed this out just recently, and I believe the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) who led off the debate mentioned it last week, basically the giveaway of our raw resource to foreigners when there is absolutely, in my opinion, no need of it. And the hon. member for Stephenville went through it last week, where he found out and he informed the House that we gave away, in cod fish last year, 76,275 metric tons of fish. Now, Mr. Speaker, to me that is 1,370-odd man years of work and that is a lot of jobs in Newfoundland. I think, if you just look at the inshore sector, you can multiply that by three. Because the season for the inshore is so short, you know, you are talking about almost 4,000 jobs and that, to me, is a very serious situation.

Redfish, we gave away 56,600 metric tons; Flounder, 10,560 metric tons; Halibut, 16,000 metric tons. In total, just in catch capability, you are talking about 2,869 approximate man years of employment. You can add into that the processing of it and so on. That, to me, is a very serious situation and it then makes me think, why are we having difficulty then in selling? Are we selling any fish to the Russians? Well, Mr. Speaker, I do not see why we would sell fish to the Russians if they are being given free, the raw resource. The same way with the Japanese with the squid and so on. We had our fishermen go out last year to catch squid and a lot of it was rejected because the main market for our squid is the Japanese market and they were given the raw resource, I think the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) outlined something like 17,000 metric tons of fish.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, just in this past weekend we have heard fishermen complain about not being able to sell their fish to the plants. I think if we look at that seriously and not just run off at the mouth, and think about what the problem is - a lot of the fish was small, could not be processed by our plants profitably and, of course, that is what plants are in business for, to make a profit. One has to wonder why so many small fish. I mean, is it because the mesh size in the trap is too small now? And the same way, of course, when you get

MR. DINN: the gillnet fishery is the mesh size too small and thus we are catching this small fish that in a few years time would be usable and capable of being sold and processed by the plants at a profit and, therefore, we would not have the problem?

So there are many more problems with the fishery than just making a blanket statement that, for example, the provincial government is at fault, the federal government is at fault or the processors are at fault or the fishermen are at fault. It seems to me that there are so many problems in the fishery - I mean, it is not just one of marketing, although that is a problem - there are so many problems in the fishery that I think if one looked at just the proposal set forward to the Kirby Task Force by the provincial government there is a lot of material in there that makes a lot of sense. And I recommend that to all hon. members and I think they would get a deeper appreciation of the fishery.

Now, my knowledge of the fishery is not that great, but I have fished. I fished out of the Battery, and went out several Summers with people down there, the Piercey family and so on. So I did some fishing. But I am not in any way, shape or form an expert on the fishery, although I know something about the inshore fishery.

Mr. Speaker, when you give away a raw resource it affects everything. The fact that if you can get something for nothing, you are not going to buy it, so you are not going to buy fish -

MR. NEARY: Like the Baie Verts mines, for instance.

MR. DINN: The Baie Verts mine, the hon. member brings up, is a very serious situation and he should not just throw comments across the House as is his wont to do, throw wild comments across the House. The Baie Verte mine has a very distinct possibility of being successful if certain things happen, and, Mr. Speaker, there will yet another time and another place

MR. DINN: for me to get into the Baie Verts mine. There are a lot of problems there, not just one or two little problems. So, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: There were none on Bell Island at the time that is what -

MR. DINN: There was no contract for Bell Island. We still have not been able to find a contract for Bell Island, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is interrupting, he should spend a little more time in Panama, where is his wont to go.

MR. NEARY: or down with my hand out to the Telephone Company.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I do not have to go with my hand out to anyone. I never genuflected to anyone in my life, and certainly not to the hon. member. The hon. member would do well to read the Mifflin report; it is a report in how a minister should not operate when he is in office. And, Mr. Speaker, before I became a minister I became very well acquainted with the Mifflin report so that when I became a minister of government I would not do like the hon. member did. A complete disgrace, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member was a complete disgrace. The only time he had an opportunity to do anything for the people of this Province, he blew it when he was Minister of Social Services. And, Mr. Speaker, they wrote a report on the hon. gentleman from which I, every once in a while, take a few pages and read, how the minister abused his office when he was

MR. DINN: a minister of government, Mr. Speaker. And that is not idle gossip or anything like that, Mr. Speaker, that was a report done by a very good Newfoundlander, the Mifflin Report.

MR. NEARY: Down with your hand out.

MR. DINN: The hon. member should be quiet or go down to Panama with his friend, Mr. Doyle. The hon. member is interrupting and breaking the rules of the House.

We are speaking today, Mr. Speaker, on the fishery, a very important resource and if the hon. member was concerned at all he would allow other people to speak and stay there in silence. But, Mr. Speaker, he has been in the House, he is one of the longest sitting members of the House and obviously does not want to observe the rules of the House. Mr. Speaker, that member, above all members in this House, should be the last to interrupt people, the last to speak in this House or interrupt people or talk about different ministers of the Crown, Mr. Speaker, because there was a report done on the hon. gentleman that indicated the hon. gentleman was a disgrace when he was in office.

Now, Mr. Speaker, getting back to the fishery, a very important -

MR. NEARY: Both salaries.

MR. DINN: Go down and see your friend Mr. Doyle. A very important resolution is before the House today. There are things in the resolution that one would look at and have to agree with. The preamble, for example, you know, is just not accurate, just not proper, just not right, that the provincial government does not have a policy on the fishery.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman is again interrupting in the debate. He has not got the guts to go outside and say what he is saying in the House because,

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, I would have him in irons where he should have been about ten years ago.

MR. NEARY: Do you want to fight now? Are you in a fighting mood?

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman wants that, I mean, outside anytime at all.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please! Order!

MR. NEARY: I would not waste my time.

MR. DINN: It would not take much.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have a resolution by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and it is an important resolution because it talks about the fishery. But, Mr. Speaker, there are inaccuracies obviously in the preamble, "WHEREAS there is no coherent or cohesive policy being pursued by the present provincial government". Obviously, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman read anything at all, if he read anything about the fishery that is put out by the provincial Department of Fisheries the hon. gentleman would know that that statement is just totally inaccurate, incorrect and he should not even have the courage to bring it into the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, hon. gentlemen today in Question Period asked the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), does he agree, for example, with over-the-side sales. Well, Mr. Speaker, there may be times when over-the-side sales are good things. If processing plants cannot handle fish in this Province, then maybe we can do some over-the-side sales. But, Mr. Speaker, I recall several instances of over-the-side sales where it had a very detrimental effect on the people of this Province. Just to use one example, I believe, and do not agree with, for example, what happened in over-the-side sales last year in Black Tickle, in Labrador,

MR. DINN: we had a ship in there that bought fish from the fishermen over-the-side and as a result of that the plant in Black Tickle closed. Ninety people were out of work. And to me that is not a good way to utilize our resource, take fish from fishermen, put it into a foreign trawler and have it carted away and as a result of that lose ninety jobs in a fish plant. I do not think that is good management of our resources.

I think it is well also to listen to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) when he talks about the fact that we only have about 14 per cent of the say in the fishery. Now, Mr. Speaker -

MR. TULK: A likely tale.

MR. DINN: The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) had his opportunity to speak in the debate and he will have an opportunity to close the debate. So I would appreciate it if he would listen to a few words that I have to say as I did when he spoke and will, Mr. Speaker, be waiting for his words of wisdom when he speaks up to conclude the debate on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, over-the-side sales, to me, are no good.

MR. NEARY: Why do you not stick to telephones?

MR. DINN: Your hon. colleague who was very well acquainted with telephones is not here anymore. You should speak to him about that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: How low can you go.

MR. NEARY: How low and scummy can you get?

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, over-the-side sales -

MR. TULK: Withdraw that remark, be a gentleman and withdraw that remark.

MR. DINN: - when the fish cannot be processed in the -

MR. NEARY:

Scum of the earth. (inaudible).

MR. TULK:

Yes.

MR. DINN:

- Province, I agree with. The

fishermen should be allowed to sell their fish -

MR. TULK:

What a remark to make about a former member of this House.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD):

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member - on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD):

A point of order, the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN:

The hon. member is not allowed, even from his seat, is not allowed to refer to another hon.

member but by the name of his district. And I ask the hon.

member to withdraw 'scum'. I do not particularly appreciate

that tone.

MR. TULK:

I did not use the word.

MR. NEARY:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

As I understand it my hon. colleague was not on his feet speaking. So, therefore, I would submit that Hansard will show that my hon. colleague did not use any unparliamentary language. The hon. gentleman certainly did. He did not have the courage to withdraw the remark that he made about a former member of this House. And I would submit, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman has been very cowardly in his remarks. I challenge the hon. gentleman to make the statement he just made outside of the House.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, I will make any statement that I made -

Mr. Speaker, I will make any statement

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order?

MR. DINN:

There is no point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member is interrupting my -

There is no point of order,

MR. SPEAKER:

As I did not hear the member make the comment as referred to in the point of order, I will reserve judgement and check with Hansard.

The hon. Minister of Manpower and Labour.

MR. DINN:

Right. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To the hon. member, I will make any statement outside

MR. DINN:

this House that I make inside this House, unlike the hon. gentleman or the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary). Any time at all, any time I make a statement inside this House I will make the same statement outside this House.

MR. NEARY:

Do not be so low, boy, do not be so low and scummy.

MR. DINN:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) continues to interrupt in debate when he should be the last person in this House to interrupt debate.

MR. NEARY:

Go down with your hand out.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Mifflin dealt quite adequately with the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Go down with your hand out and get your palms greased.

MR. DINN:

Mr. Speaker, with respect to the resolution, obviously one

MR. DINN: cannot support this resolution because there is no truth to the preambles with respect to a coherent or cohesive policy, obviously that is in place. Because there is only 14 per cent or there about control of the fishery by the provincial government, that policy cannot be implemented.

MR. TULK: That is a figment of your imagination.

MR. DINN: And, Mr. Speaker, "WHEREAS it seems apparent that the present Provincial Government has neither the desire nor the ability" - I mean, obviously the people of Newfoundland disagree, as they indicated on April 6th. Unfortunately, the hon. member made it back into the House, but if he continues to speak in this House the way he has been speaking, he has another couple of years, at the most, left, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: What are you going to do, take him out and shoot him?

MR. DINN: So, Mr. Speaker, it says, "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House immediately set as its top priority the development of a comprehensive long-term policy for the Newfoundland fishery".

Well, Mr. Speaker, that policy is in place. And with respect to the last, BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to ensure that this policy becomes a reality." Mr. Speaker, the policy of the Opposition, the only policy that I have heard come forth from the Opposition on the fishery is 'Burn your boats'. Our policy is to 'Build the boats'. Mr. Speaker, if you had a Select Committee of the House discuss the fishery and come forward with a policy, obviously you would have a dichotomy there, you would have one group on the Select Committee saying 'Burn your boats', and another group on that Select Committee saying 'Build boats'.

MR. NEARY: You are right beside yourself now. You better go down and see Mr. Templeton.

MR. DINN: Catch fish, Mr. Speaker, sell fish, and prosper and do not give it away, Mr. Speaker, as has been done over the years by the federal government. And, Mr. Speaker, anyone who is from a fishing district should be four square behind the Newfoundland government opposing this one hundred and sixty-odd thousand metric tons of fish being given away to foreigners with no reason at all. There is no advantage to giving away 160,000 metric tons of fish neither to Newfoundland, which is part of Canada, thanks be to God, nor to any other part of Canada. They maybe trading off for cutting down on imports of some Japanese car, or they maybe trading off for some reason, but, Mr. Speaker, that is not the way to handle a resource.

MR. NEARY: Will you say, I am a proud Canadian?

MR. DINN: You do not trade off your natural resources, your jobs, your future for a few promises from foreign governments that in -

MR. CALLAN: Are you driving a foreign car?

MR. DINN: No, I am not, I am driving a Chrysler car.

MR. CALLAN: Well, the Minister for Social Services is.

MR. DINN: Well, that is up to the Minister of Social Services. I, as a matter of fact, would not buy a K-car because it had a mitshubishi engine in it, you know, I had to buy a Detroit car. And one of the reasons for that is that most of our pellets from Western Labrador go to the market, the American market. And so, to help the people in Western Labrador continue to be employed, I always buy North American cars. So, Mr. Speaker, I will conclude by saying that with respect to over-the-side sales, when that cuts down on employment in this Province, I have to be opposed to that as minister of Labrador and Manpower, and I am sure that hon. members opposite agree with that. With respect to giving away a raw resource, I am totally opposed to that. I think there are a lot more problems in the fishery than we tend to come up with. I think, for example, in the cod traps and in the gill nets the mesh size is too small and thus we are catching a lot of small fish and we have to dump it overboard, because there is no profit in processing the small fish. There are a lot of problems that I think, in this House, we should be discussing, we should be debating so that we can get some resolution. But certainly you will not get resolutions passed in this House if you start of your resolutions with inaccuracies

MR. DINN: and inanities as presented
by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). As a result of that,
Mr. Speaker, I started out the debate by saying I do not
agree with the resolution and I cannot vote for it, and
I will conclude my debate by saying the same thing. I
conclude my debate also by saying that the hon. member
for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren)

MR. DINN: wondered what a codfish looked like.

It looks something like the hon. member for the Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren)

MR. NEARY: Why do you not say - I am a proud Canadian.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, for the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, since my time is not up - I am a proud Canadian. I have lived in other parts of Canada, unlike the hon. Leader of the Opposition, for some ten years and loved every bit of it, Mr. Speaker, I am a Canadian, I will always be a Canadian and Pierre Trudeau will make me other than a Canadian. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it gives me a great privilege to speak to and support this superbly well-thought-out, this superbly well-worded resolution, It meets every requirement, Mr. Speaker, of a resolution. I have on many occasions chastised hon. members opposite for not making good resolutions and I will not go through that today, but this resolution meets every requirement of a resolution. In its language it is precise, it is emphatic, it gives direction, There is nothing vague about it, there is nothing clumsy about it, there is nothing awkward about, there is nothing there to urge the government to do anything-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. DINN: - there is nothing there urge the government, Mr. Speaker, it is very clear, very, very, clear, it states very, very emphatically its intent, its result, Its intended action is stated very, very precisely and very emphatically when it says, THEREFORE BE IT

MR. DINN: RESOLVED that this hon. House" -
not urge, not request, but "immediately set as its top
priority the development of a comprehensive long-term policy
for the Newfoundland fishery". Now, Mr. Speaker, how anybody
could find it in their - how any hon. members could find it in
their heads, how any hon. members could find it in their
hearts, how any hon. members could find it in their bowels to,
Mr. Speaker, not support, to not support this resolution, to
not

MR. LUSH: come out and support the fishermen of this Province. Mr. Speaker; to hear hon. members speak you would not know but the fisheries was in top-notch form. You would not know, Mr. Speaker, but there was not a another thing that could be done, and here we are in a crisis in the fisheries. It has been there, Mr. Speaker, for the last couple of years and hon. members will not support this resolution. Why, Mr. Speaker? Why is it that they do not want to do something for the fishermen of this Province? Why is it that they do not want to do something for the industry that is the backbone of this Province? Mr. Speaker, with fishing plants that have to close down around us, a glut experienced in the last couple of days and people just sitting idly by and condemning the federal government. Mr. Speaker, this resolution is not about ancient history, this resolution is not about ancient history, it is not about burning your boats, it is not about the federal jurisdiction -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! A point of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are times, Mr. Speaker, when the Muppet Show on the other side is amusing, but when my hon. colleague is making a serious speech, I would submit that the rules be enforced and hon. members be asked, Mr. Speaker, to restrain themselves and let my hon. colleague carry on with his speech.

MR. MORGAN: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, my memory cannot be failing me that badly, I am not getting that old. I just spoke no longer than an hour ago, and while I was speaking there were numerous interruptions from the other side, numerous interruptions. I could not get a word out for a while, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: No, not that bad.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! I am sure hon. members are all aware that a member does have the right to be heard in silence, and I would ask them to adhere to that rule.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

They have interrupted my trend of thought, now I have to go back again, get back there, Mr. Speaker, on that line. I was saying this resolution is not about ancient history, it is not about burning your boats, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: It is not about burning your boats.

It is not about giveaways, it is not about federal jurisdiction, it is about the future of our fisheries, Mr. Speaker, it is about the future of our fisheries. Mr. Speaker, hon. members opposite, they do not want shared jurisdiction of the fisheries, they do not want to be given control of the fisheries. They would die from heart failure, if the federal government said you can have full control of the fisheries, They would not know what to do with it, they would not know what to do with it, they would die from heart failure, they would die from shock. They are as happy as can be, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government controls part of it, because this gives them the opportunity to carry on their squabbling, to carry on their fighting, to carry on their rowing, to carry on their prating, their prattling and their sabre rattling.

MR. T. LUSH: They are proud of their lives that the federal government has some control over it, because if the federal government did not have any control, that would remove the fighting, they would have no reason to fight. And, Mr. Speaker, they do not want shared jurisdiction, they do not want control, because if they did they would go about it the right way and get it. But, Mr. Speaker, here is the chance. We have been asking for action, positive action, Mr. Speaker, over those areas over which we have control. This is what this resolution is directing itself too, asking for action, immediate action over those areas over which we have control, marketing and quality control. This is what we have been talking about, but every speaker on the other side rose in his place and started talking about - they have the control now worked out to the percentages, Mr. Speaker, they have the control worked out to the percentages.

The fish that was given away in St. John's today, under whose responsibility did that come, the federal governments?

SOME HON . MEMBERS: Yes. Yes.

MR. TULK: Oh, yes? Since when, since noon today?

MR. LUSH: The glut that we have today - we have been complaining that we do not get enough fish, today and yesterday we had to dump the fish, Mr. Speaker. That is not a federal responsibility. And that shows what is happening over that part of the fishery, over that segment of the fishery over which we have control, Mr. Speaker, having to dump fish. And hon. members opposite find it within their bowels, find it within their hearts, find it within their heads to vote against this resolution, a resolution that is asking for concrete, positive and emphatic action with respect to the fisheries, over these segments over

MR. LUSH: which we have control. We are not talking about, Mr. Speaker, the quotas, we are talking about the areas over which we have control. We are asking for positive action, we are asking for something to be done in those areas and hon. members have the audacity and the affrontry to tell the Newfoundland fishermen, to tell the Newfoundland people that they do not support this resolution, a resolution asking for action to be taken so that we can improve the fishery, so that we can improve the lot, so that we can improve the standard of living of the fishermen in this Province and all the people in all the other industries associated with it. And hon. members are saying no to it, hon. members are saying no to the fishermen of this Province. That is what they are saying. Despite their lip service, Mr. Speaker, we have now exposed them, we have now exposed them for what they are. We have given them a chance to vote for a resolution that would help the fishermen of this Province and all the other associated industries, and hon. members have said that they are not voting for it, and when the vote is taken today, Mr. Speaker, I would expect that there will be eight

MR. T. LUSH: people on this side of the House standing up for the fishermen of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: I'am not going over there.

MR. HODDER: You can say that again, you are not coming over. You can say that again, you are not coming over.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it is incredible.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, it is incredible, it is beyond comprehension that members on the other side will not support this resolution, will not stand in their place to support this resolution. One would have thought, Mr. Speaker, that every person who rose to speak would have come up with some ideas of how we can improve the fisheries in this Province. No, Mr. Speaker, what was it? It was just a litany of complaints against the the federal government, nothing can be done because the federal government controls now, we have it worked out to a percentage, 86 per cent - is it? - 86 per cent of the fisheries is under the control of the federal government. But, Mr. Speaker, we are asking that action be taken with the 14 per cent which resulted in thousands and thousands of fish being thrown away yesterday and today in Newfoundland. That is what we are asking, Mr. Speaker. We are asking to remedy that situation, we are asking to improve upon that 14 per cent over which the government has control. That is what we are asking, to improve upon that 14 per cent. Is there not room for improvement? Are we performing 100 per cent maximum performance with that 14 per cent? That is what hon. members are

MR. LUSH: saying. It is incredible, Mr. Speaker, it is ludicrous how hon. members could sit in their place when they are talking about the resolution -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I used to always tell my students that when I smile it is the maddest time I am. That is the maddest time I am, when I smile. When I smile I used to tell them, they have to be afraid. When I was glum looking and grum looking they had no worries. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely incredible, beyond comprehension, as I have said before, how hon. members could sit in their places today debating this most important resolution, a resolution affecting the industry that is the backbone of this Province, and to find them, Mr. Speaker, voting against it. It is incredible and beyond comprehension, Mr. Speaker -

MR. BAIRD: You are pre-judging this side.

MR. LUSH: It is incredible, it is incredible. Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope that my speech will force hon. members, will convince them, will persuade them, Mr. Speaker, to take a second look at this and to stand up for the fishermen of this Province.

MR. LUSH: To stand up, Mr. Speaker, and support this most noble and this most magnanimous resolution, one of the best resolutions ever presented, I would suggest, in this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: A tremendous resolution, a tremendous resolution and, as I have said before, Mr. Speaker, I would hope that hon. members, if it has not been decided, we have had - I thought every hon. gentleman who rose today said they were not supporting the resolution.

MR. WARREN: I do not know what the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) said.

MR. LUSH: The Minister, he was walking the tightrope, was he not?

MR. MORGAN: No.

MR. LUSH: The Minister of Fisheries was walking the tightrope. Maybe he has convinced them to support the resolution. Because I do not think the hon. minister would want to vote against this particular resolution. Oh, Mr. Speaker, the nonsense, the nonsense that hon. members get up and talk about 'Burning your boats' and 'giveaways' and ancient history. Mr. Speaker, this is a resolution about the future of the fisheries. And hon. members on this side do not engage, Mr. Speaker, in that kind of foolish debate. talking about ancient history. We are talking about the present and we are talking about the future. We want to shore up the fisheries of this Province, Mr. Speaker. It is time that hon. members got down to business, it is time they got down to brass tacks and did something, took some concrete and positive action to show the fishermen of this Province.

MR. MORGAN: The fisherman voted 71 per cent. That is what won the last election for us, they believed in our policies. 71 per cent of the fishermen voted for the P.C. Party. Why? They believe in our policies, they believe in our programmes, that is why.

MR. WARREN: In my district about 90 per cent voted against you.

MR. LUSH: It is absolutely fantastic, Mr. Speaker, absolutely fantastic.

MR. NEARY: That is what you call a mad-hatter administration.

MR. LUSH: It is absolutely fantastic, the generalizations that hon. members draw from the last election. Absolutely fantastic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: It is absolutely, very difficult.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order please.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, I find it amazing and incredible the generalizations that hon. members opposite draw from the last election. The conclusions and generalizations they are making, ranging from getting elected on their own to the people agreeing with the fisheries policies.

MR. TUIK: Yes, everything under the sun.

MR. LUSH: And neither is the appropriate generalization or the right conclusions. All hon. members know why the last election was won. It had nothing to do with the fisheries, nothing to do with it at all. Indeed, if it did, the hon. member would be looking for a job today, if it had anything to do with the fisheries. But, Mr. Speaker,

MR. DAVE: It is probably the reason the hon. member (inaudible).

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, he would not dare,

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, talking about the resource development, the resource development, this tells the priority of this particular government with fisheries. But I understand it the last in priority - is it? - in terms of expenditures. In terms of expenditures in resource development it comes number five. I believe that is the fifth, the last position. In last position, this is where we have placed fisheries in this Province. This is the emphasis that we have given to developing new technology for the fisheries so that we will have no surplus of stock, Mr. Speaker. That is the emphasis they are giving, putting it number five, last in the resource areas. Last in resource areas, Mr. Speaker,

MR. TULK: They spend half the budget in marketing. Just imagine, and today look at the problems we have in marketing.

MR. NEARY: Tom, it is number eight on the list of government spending.

MR. LUSH: Number eight the -

MR TULK: It is the last one in the resource sector.

MR. LUSH: - the industry that is the backbone, that is the backbone of this Province. And all hon. members did today was get up and complain and blame it all on Ottawa again, blame everything on Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, it is absolutely amazing how hon. members can twist every debate into a fight with Ottawa. Just about everything that we bring up in this House, hon. members opposite can twist it around and say it is the fault of Ottawa. Mr. Speaker, the time, I think, has come when the Newfoundland people are beginning to realize it, the time

MR. LUSH: has come for this government to demonstrate that they can do something with the matters over which they have control.

MR. TULK: That is right.

MR. LUSH: The Newfoundland people are getting tired, they are getting frustrated with this squabbling and fighting with Ottawa all the time, blaming everything on Ottawa. The Newfoundland people are now beginning to ask the important question, what is this government responsible for? What will this government do with the resources and the segments of our resources that come directly under our control. Ah, Mr. Speaker, the people are becoming wise, the people are becoming wise. Mr. Speaker, the people are becoming wise to the ways of this government, Mr. Speaker. They are not going to get away with it, they are not going to get away with this

MR. LUSH: shifting the blame, and shifting of responsibility, they are not going to get away it. And today, I think, might be the straw that will break the camels back, today might be the straw that will break the camels back, when the fishermen of this Province know that the government would not vote on a resolution that was designed to improve their lot. When the people and the fishermen of Newfoundland hear that today, when the word goes out that the government members did not support, that they rejected a resolution, a resolution brought in by the Opposition, a resolution brought in by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), a gentleman who knows fisheries inside out, Mr. Speaker, a gentleman who walks the road with fishermen day in and day out, a man who talks with fishermen day in and day out, a man who knows their feelings, a man who knows their sensitivities, a man that knows their intimate needs and desires, and because of that, because of that he prepared this resolution, this well-thought-out resolution - I have no doubt but that it was prepared

MR. TULK: I wish that I was shadowing you.

MR. LUSH: I have no doubt that it was prepared in conjunction with fishermen from his district, and fishermen from around the Province. I have no doubt, Mr. Speaker, I have no doubt but he consulted with those fishermen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. YOUNG: Sit down, boy, you are making a fool of yourself.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen of Newfoundland would be proud of the speech that I am making here today, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen in Terra Nova, Cow Head, Eastport, fishermen in Fogo, fishermen in Wesleyville, right throughout this Province, would be proud to hear me standing up here for them today, and supporting this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I am proud that I am going to support the resolution, and I only wish that hon. members opposite would re-think, re-evaluate their positions, so that we can together, so that

MR. LUSH: co-operatively and in a spirit of harmony and co-operation we can try and do something for the fisheries of this Province, that we can improve the fisheries, and by so doing improve the standard of living of fishermen throughout this Province, the great Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is unfortunate, it is indeed unfortunate, it is a sad day for the fishermen that the government are going to vote against this resolution, or that is the only indication we have had. We have not had any indication of support from anybody. Well, I hope, Mr. Speaker, those members coming from fishing districts,

MR. T. LUSH: I hope they will not let the word go out across the Province today that they rejected this resolution, that they rejected this well-thought-out, this well-worded resolution.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. LUSH: And, Mr. Speaker, we would hope that it would go beyond words.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would like to inform the hon. member that his time has expired.

MR. LUSH: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon member for Burin-Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, representing that great fishing district of Burin-Placentia West, may I say that great PC fishing district of Burin-Placentia West -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: -I feel an obligation to these great fisherman from Placentia Bay to add my few words to this debate. May I say that I believe that my friend from Fogo was probably on the right track when he started to word his motion. However, as he advanced his motion I believe he became mixed up in which government lacks coherent or cohesive policies. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that he is indeed very much aware of the amount of monies that this government has advanced to fish companies that has helped keep fish plants open has given people the opportunity to sell their fish catches. This was done, Mr. Speaker, when the federal government, who I believe have no coherent or cohesive policy on the fishery, when they would not get involved. We have seen their piecemeal, ad hoc policy implemented in the St. Anthony situation, without any connection or consultation with the Province or the Minister of Fisheries

MR. TOBIN:

(Mr. Morgan) or the

government whatsoever. When this government came to the rescue, I believe it was something like thirty-seven fish plants around the Province, rescued them from high interest policies set by the federal government. Now that they have moved on the St. Anthony situation, Mr. Speaker, now that the federal government has moved on the St. Anthony situation, I am wondering, is this their policy? And if so, when can we expect to hear the announcements on the other fish plants around the Province that might not necessarily be in the district of Grand Falls- White Bay - Labrador? Mr. Speaker, the licencing system is another issue which I would like to address. In the district that I represent there are some isolated communities, in Placentia Bay, and I am sure that my friend from Bellevue is very familiar with that area as well, where people grow up, Mr. Speaker, basically cut off from all links to the Burin Peninsula or Argentina, and we have just seen the discriminatory action that was taken by CN Marine to try to shaft them even further. When they grew up, Mr. Speaker, families were large with five and six boys growing up fishing in the boats with their father. When they went to graduate into their own fishing boats, when they want to have their own lobster licence in these isolated communities

MR. TOBIN: where there is no means of any other employment, no means of any other income in their families, what is said to them, Sir? 'I am sorry, you cannot have a licence'. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, some day we will get the same treatment that the Province of Quebec has who obviously instituted the licences for the people, the fishermen in that Province. And I wonder, Sir, why we cannot have the same say and the same direction in the fishing industry in this Province:

MR. STAGG: In 1926 they had it.

MR. TOBIN: In 1926 they had it. Why is it taking so long for the Province of Newfoundland to get it? I wonder, Sir, if we had seventy-two seats in Ottawa, would it make any difference?

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible).

MR. TOBIN: Do you know the difference?

I think we -

MR. NEARY: He does not know what he is talking about.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I certainly do know what I am talking about. And if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was as vocal with his colleagues in Ottawa, the silent five, the petty five in Ottawa, as he is in this House, probably things would change.

MR. STAGG: Right on!

MR. TOBIN: What is going on in your district now regarding the fishery? What is going on in your district right now regarding the fish plants? I heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) advise you this afternoon what is taking place. I think you should be more concerned -

MR. STAGG: He does not plan to run there any more. He is being chased out of there too.

MR. TOBIN: He is being chased out of there, yes. He is being chased out of there.

MR. NEARY: Let him babble like an idiot.

MR. STAGG: He is going to get the nomination down in Torngat Mountains next time.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, this government, besides its millions of dollars to open the fish plants, assisted some 32,000 full-time and part-time fishermen. The industry, Mr. Speaker, which has ninety-odd thousand plant workers, this government, Sir, has and is continuing to undertake marketing ventures in the U.S., in Europe and the Carribean, and now in Western Canada.

MR. NEARY: Parrot! Parrot!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am not a parrot. The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) knows what it is like to be a parrot. He served in the Cabinet of a previous administration where they were told to do what they wanted them to do.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: He served under the leadership that reigned in this Province, Mr. Speaker, for twenty-two years. He knows what a parrot is all about.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the newer members are familiar with the rules of the House or not, but I believe at twenty minutes to six Your Honour has to give the floor back to my colleague, the member who moved the resolution.

MR. BAIRD: He is wasting time, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not wasting time. I am just -

MR. BAIRD: He has been wasting time since he got elected.

June 23, 1982

Tape No. 1633

IB-3

MR. NEARY: And another rule of this House, Mr. Speaker, you are not allowed to speak, you are not allowed to open your mouth unless you are in your own seat. That is another rule. I will submit that the rules for the other side should be strictly enforced, Mr. Speaker. As far as their

MR. S. NEARY: interrupting and lowering the decorum of the House, I have never seen the likes of it in my twenty years in this House. I have never seen the likes of the behaviour of hon. members on the other side of the House. I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention that it is twenty minutes to six and my hon. colleague has the right now to wind up the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Order, please! Our Standing Order does say that at twenty minutes to six the hon. member who introduced the resolution does have a right to close it at the time when the hon. Leader of the Opposition rose on the point of order it was not twenty minutes to six. It is now, so I will recognize the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, between everybody I am going to get a chance to close the debate. Mr. Speaker, now there are a few surprises that have come from the other side regarding this resolution. One of them though is not one of the surprises is not that they are going to vote against the resolution. Unlike the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), I do not expect the government to vote for this resolution because, as he said it looks at some of the areas that are under our own jurisdiction, and it looks at some of the areas that we can have some input into. Before I get into that, Mr. Speaker, before I get into replying to what some of the people on the other side have said about the resolution, I want to first of all say that I hear that the present Deputy Minister of Fisheries in this Province is about to leave the Department of Fisheries. Now, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: Who? The Deputy Minister?

MR. TULK: The Deputy Minister.

MR. NEARY:

They are bailing out.

MR. TULK:

I understand that -

MR. MORGAN:

No, they are not bailing out.

MR. TULK:

- Mr. Gordon Slade is taking a position with the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh. oh!

MR. TULK:

I understand that Mr. Gordon Slade has decided that he is going to work with the federal government, become an economic development co-ordinator.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, I might say that I think that Mr. Slade is one of the most knowledgeable people in the fisheries in Newfoundland. It is too bad that he has to leave the department. I would not doubt but part of his reason for leaving is some of the policies of that department. Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to look at some of the things that people have said in talking to this resolution.

MR. TULK: The minister again, I expected the minister to come in and take the resolution and tear it to bits, shred by shred. But no, the minister wanted to use one of his favourite tactics. He has got two, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has two tactics if he does not want to discuss something. He is either going to come in and attack the federal government, you can predict that he will do that. I could have predicted today, I suppose, what he was going to do. He came in and lambasted the federal government for about, - I think it was about fifteen minutes of his speech.

Now, if that fails for the Minister of Fisheries, to cover up his own shortcomings, if that fails, then the Minister of Fisheries will come in and attack the media. That is his second tactic. Well, he did not get to that one this evening. It was amusing. The Minister of Fisheries is amusing. In the Estimates Committee the minister absolutely refused to - well, he did not openly refuse, he refused in his actions - answer any questions on his estimates. Every question that you asked him he attacked the federal government on the allocation of the Northern cod stocks, or he attacked CBC sitting across from him. That is the substance of the Minister of Fisheries in this Province. He will not be serious about the issues in his department. He spent five minutes - the last five minutes of his speech he was serious. And what did he tell us? On this side we must be getting to the minister. I hope we are getting to the minister. He told us that the minister, himself and the Premier, were going to unveil a comprehensive plan for the fisheries.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say it is about time. I say it is about time. It is too bad that the Minister of Fisheries and his colleagues on the other side are going to vote against this resolution, but we are

MR. TULK: glad to know that by putting this kind of resolution on the Order Paper, by saying some of the things that we have said about fisheries, we are glad to know that we finally goaded them into some action, into doing something.

MR. NEARY: But you know what they are going to do, they are going to ask the Kirby Royal Commission to do something.

MR. TULK: I would venture a guess that the first thing in that comprehensive plan will be a condemnation of the federal government, a condemnation of the federal government, and then, towards the end of it, I would predict that they will ask the federal government for money to develop the fisheries. That is what they are likely to do.

In any case, the minister is going to release a comprehensive plan and he beat the Premier to a press release by going through all the things, I think, that he is going to announce in that comprehensive plan. The Premier, last Friday, would not let the minister make any announcements, he made them himself. So, that is good.

MR. MORGAN: I was in Alberta selling fish.

MR. NEARY: Yes, you were selling fish alright.

MR. TULK: That is good. In Alberta selling fish. Mr. Speaker, if the minister sold ten pounds of fish for every trip that he has taken around the world, then, Mr. Speaker, we would not have that dumping down on Water Street today, and over the side.

MR. MORGAN: Lots of fish being sold.

MR. TULK: Yes! I would say that he has not sold one pound of fish in all of his trips. The minister

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, we did get the minister to admit that perhaps there has been - perhaps, he said, he could only go that far - perhaps there has been an overexpansion in the processing sector of the Province. He did say that perhaps that was true. But then he went on to say, 'Well, we did not have any control of that'. He said, 'We did not have any control of that, that was all the federal government, they gave out DREE grants and so on: Well, Mr. Speaker, let me ask him a question - he could have held back the licences. He has now, finally, after the horse is gone through the gate, he has now finally closed the gate by saying that if you expand a fish processing plant in this Province, then you have to get a licence from us, you have to get our okay. Well, he could have done that four years ago. So, Mr. Speaker, that is nonsense, absolute nonsense. He went on to talk about the marketing problem and he said 'We market a great many cod blocks in this Province'. Now, you can not disagree with that. He said, 'It is not processed! He went on to say that we do not process fish to the extent that we should. Well, Mr. Speaker, you have to come back to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and say, surely God in 1982 you are not just realizing that that is a problem in Newfoundland? It has been a problem since the fresh fish industry got under way, a least, and even with the salt fish industry. And here we have in 1982 - I suppose it must be the Fishermen down on Water Street today who are convincing the Minister of Fisheries that indeed he does have a problem with Marketing in this Province. And they must, by going to Atlantic Place today, have convinced him that marketing is his problem, it is his problem.

MR. MORGAN: What is wrong with salting their fish? Did anyone think of that today. I wonder.

MR. TULK: Well, Mr. Speaker, that brings us to another point. The minister went on to talk about market consolidation, he now asks us what is wrong with them salting their fish.

MR. NEARY: They cannot switch that easily.

MR. TULK: Definitely not. They cannot switch that easily. But the one organization in this Province that has done a good job of marketing has nothing to do with that Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) it is the Canadian Saltfish Corporation.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. TULK: What did we hear him do last year? What did he do, Mr. Speaker? What did he do, Mr. Speaker? He stood it the - no he did not have the gumption to come into the House, he pumped out one of those press releases that he is famous for, condemning the Canadian Saltfish Corporation and saying that they were gypping the fishermen. In other words, spewing out his poison to try to do that under, to perhaps, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, get it back into the hands of some of the fish companies in this Province that originally put the Salt Fish Market in the condition that it was in. Now, Mr. Speaker, if we want to stay with marketing - when the minister was out of the House the other day, in opening the debate on this resolution, I said that one of the chief problems in the fishing industry was marketing, and that this government was doing nothing. I went through, Mr. Speaker, and I pointed out that last year the Department of Fisheries budgeted in its estimates \$ 19,447,000 and its actual expenditure was \$16,335,000. In other words, they, Mr. Speaker-

MR. MORGAN: We spent \$45 million last year, and the feds would not-

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, if he wanted to get up and attack the federal government, that is his business. But now, when I am giving some facts, would you ask the hon. gentlemen to be quiet? They spent some \$3 million less than they budgeted in marketing, market development. What did he do in market development? Last year he budgeted for marketing \$517,800, and what did he spend? He spent -

MR. MORGAN: You are always complaining that I keep travelling, that I am going down to Rio de Janeiro.

MR. TULK: We will get to his travelling now, Mr. Speaker, in a minute. He spent \$275,300. In other words, he spent about 55 per cent of what he budgeted.

MR. MORGAN: Anytime I travelled anywhere you always criticized. I could not move.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) -

MR. MORGAN: I will do it this year though -

MR. NEARY: Go on now and look after Cancom.

MR. MORGAN: Japan, Hong Kong and Europe, all the Far East.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Do not forget Bangkok. You are going to the places where they make pay television. The latest in technology in television.

MR. TULK: The Minister of Fisheries -

MR. MORGAN: Rompkey made (inaudible).

MR. NEARY: You arranged a trip to Japan to look at the latest technology.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: The Minister of Fisheries may think -

MR. MORGAN: I will not drink the water.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, are you are going to let this gentleman go on like this?

MR. MORGAN: I am sorry. I am sorry.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) may indeed believe that he, by travelling around the world, becoming a Harlem Globe Trotter, he may indeed think that he can solve the marketing problem in the fishery. He may think he is an expert in marketing. But I would tell the minister this, that he would be far better off to stay at home himself and manage the shop and send somebody like the Deputy Minister of Fisheries who is now leaving his department, send him and let him do the selling rather than this playboy Minister of Fisheries.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have got a problem in this Province now, as the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) aptly pointed out. And one of the big problems is, again, the glut that is in this Province. We have been assured in this Province,

MR. TULK: we have been assured for the past three years that I have sat in this House and heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) go on about his distribution desk - how they could solve any glut problem in Newfoundland, his distribution desk. He comes in the house this evening and he tells us that he has now called, after a week of fishermen experiencing glut problems in this Province, he has come in the House today and told us that he has now asked his distribution desk to go to work.

MR. MORGAN: I told you that we have moved 1.2 million pounds in last three weeks, as well.

MR. TULK: And he said, 'I have now put them on to the problem, they are on to the problem! Now, Mr. Speaker, he is not in favour - I asked him, I said 'Are you that in favour of over-the-side sales'?

MR. MORGAN: You are what I would call a negative nosy from Fogo.

MR. TULK: How about cowboy chubby from Bonavista?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Chubby Charlie from Bonavista.

MR. NEARY: How about chubby Charlie?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. TULK: Cowboy chubby from Bonavista.

Mr. Speaker, I then went on to ask him, I said, 'Well, if we cannot process the fish in Newfoundland, are you in favour of over-the-side sales'? Well, now he would be in favour of over-the-side sales if he was sure that we could not process the fish in Newfoundland. That is perfectly laudable. But the Minister of Fisheries in this Province does not know at this point whether we are processing to our capacity, does not know, does not have a clue as to whether we are processing to our capacity in this Province. Yet, Mr. Speaker, this is the gentleman who allowed a fish plant in Lewisporte - they have taken all of the equipment out of the fish plant I understand.

MR. TULK: The Speaker would perhaps know more about that than I would, but I understand that they are starting to move the equipment out of Lewisporte - yet, he allows Lewisporte and Jackson's Arm to shut down. Mr. Speaker, the truth is, while the minister is in Alberta, the fishing industry in this Province is falling around his ears. While Rome burns Nero fiddles.

MR. MORGAN: Do you want markets for your fish or do you not?

MR. TULK: I would like to see some markets, Mr. Speaker, but I have no confidence in that minister and his globe trotting to develop them.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. MORGAN: Put in someone like 'Tom Lush' as the Opposition spokesman on Fisheries paper, this man is a loss on fishery matters.

MR. TULK: I have now joined the selected group that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is a member off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the member for Bonavista North, he referred to Liberal expenditures in 1971. Now, Mr. Speaker, in 1971, I think the member was probably out doing a bit of teaching like myself. I would like to ask the member, 'Why does he not go back'? It is amusing to hear the government of the day go back to the Smallwood era, or the Frank Moores era, or whatever era was around. Why does not the member why does he not go on back to the 19th century, trace it all down through? Mr. Speaker, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) stood

MR. TULK: afterward and he gave him some history. In other words, what he was saying, Mr. Speaker, was utter garbage. It made no sense at all whatsoever.

MR. TOBIN: That is because of his age. You should get the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) to try it.

MR. WARREN: I would do a better job than you would.

MR. TULK: Well, that is the only job that I can credit the member with doing. He did a good job of that.

MR. NEARY: Do you think we like to hear you standing in the doorway, shouting in the House with a cigarette in your hand? That is what goes on down in the clubs not in this House.

MR. MORGAN: Romeo, Romeo, where art thou Romeo? We need you Romeo.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) in his speech. It was an excellent speech on this resolution and it pointed out very clearly -

MR. STAGG: Which one was that, eh?

MR. TULK: I happened to look at all the speeches and I am going to come to the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) - it pointed out very clearly the problems that are associated with the 200 mile management zone. I think if you look at that speech, the member for Eagle River exposed this government and its simplistic attitude, its political propaganda for what it is. And, Mr. Speaker, he showed us that indeed it was complete nonsense.

Mr. Speaker, I want to come to the member for Stephenville. There are several members here that I could comment on their remarks, but I want to come to the member for Stephenville.

MR. STAGG: Oh please do. Please do.

MR. TULK: I know he has been waiting patiently over there for it, so I have got to do it. Last week when he was speaking, and Hansard will show this, I made a commitment to the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), and the commitment was this: I told him that since I found his presentation so garbled in the way he was putting it, that I would read it. Now, Mr. Speaker, I did. I wanted to make sense of his speech, wanted to make some sense. That, Mr. Speaker, proved to be practically impossible but I did find -

MR. MORGAN: That was a good speech.

MR. TULK: You would not recognize a good speech if you saw it, or if you heard it. No, you would not recognize it if you saw it, because you cannot read. I found one item where the member for Stephenville used some reason and logic and it was this:

MR. STAGG: I hope I did not hang myself.

MR. TULK: You probably hung yourself in several places but in this one you did not. When prompted by the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) the member for Stephenville said, 'I would give up Aeroflot going into Stephenville, Mr. Speaker, if we could get the Russians off the Grand Banks and we could start exporting the fish resources and catch them all ourselves'. Now, Mr. Speaker, that makes a great deal of sense. But what the member did not realize is that he is in total agreement with this side. He did not realize that, but he is.

MR. STAGG: I was the first one to say it actually.

MR. TULK: I do not believe he was, Mr. Speaker. I hope that the member will recall a Ministerial Statement made by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) on the 10,000 metric tons allocation of caplin to the Russians.

MR. TULK: I hope he will remember that, because when I replied to the minister on that occasion I said, 'We will agree with you unanimously, and we do not believe that there should be a fish go out of Canadian waters'.

MR. NEARY: That is right. Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to sum up and let members on the other side vote against this resolution. But, let me make this point to the members on the other side. The reason that we used any logical person who goes through the material that is around, who looks at some of the speeches that are around, any logical minded person will tell you the reason that there are surplus stocks in Canadian waters today, in Newfoundland waters, is because this government, along with this Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), have not developed technologically in the way that they should and they have not developed markets. And they are afraid of their own little political enclaves they are afraid of that, unlike the member from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). So, Mr. Speaker, that was the one thing that the member from Stephenville said. I see that my time has just about expired and those people are anxious to vote against this resolution, so, Mr. Speaker, I will close on that point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Is the House ready for the question?

June 23, 1982

Tape No. 1640

RA - 2

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Those in favour of the
motion 'Aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: 'Aye'.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the motion.
'Nay'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Nay'.

MR. SPEAKER: The 'nays' have it. The motion
has been defeated.

It now being six of the clock,
I leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 p.m.