

VOL. 2

NO. 12

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
WEDNESDAY, MARCH 23, 1983

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: I am pleased to announce that at noon today the newly constructed Bishop's Falls Correctional Centre was officially opened.

The Member of the House of Assembly for the District and I planned to be present for the ceremony. The aircraft, however, was unable to land at Gander and we were unavoidably absent. I know hon. colleagues will be delighted to learn that the Minister of Public Works and Services (Mr. Young) was in the area and officially opened the Centre on behalf of the Government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The new Correctional Centre is a 24-bed minimum security facility designed to accommodate minor offenders serving short sentences in a facility near their own communities.

It will employ a total of twelve staff. The new Assistant Superintendent and Officer-in-Charge at Bishop's Falls is Assistant Superintendent Gerald F. Cullen. Assistant Superintendent Cullen is thirty-nine years of age and was formerly Officer-in-Charge of the St. John's Lock-up. He joined the staff of H. M. Penitentiary in 1966, and on March 1, 1978, he was promoted to the rank of Head Warder and transferred to the West Coast Correctional Centre. He was appointed as Chief Warder and Officer-in-Charge of the St. John's Lock-up on February 1, 1982.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Over the last two years, as hon. members will recall, there have been many substantial in the correctional service of the Province. Last year a new Regional Correctional Centre was opened at Clarenville which is identical to the one at Bishop's Falls. Last February a new Newfoundland and Labrador Correctional Centre for Women located at Stephenville was opened and that marked the first time that there was a Correctional Centre for women in the Province. As well, a new institution in St. John's to replace the 130 year old Centre Block of H. M. Penitentiary was opened last year.

Construction is now well underway for the new Labrador Correctional Facility to be located in Happy Valley/Goose Bay. It is anticipated that this facility will be completed and ready for occupancy some time in 1984. With the completion of that facility in Labrador, I think that certainly for the foreseeable future we will have completed the work which was necessary in the development of the Correctional services.

I should point out that the new facility at Bishop's Falls, and also the one opened last year at Clarenville, were necessary in order

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

to replace what were absolute fire hazards in places that used to be called outport jails. These places have been condemned by the Fire Commissioner and they were absolute fire traps and they were in such old buildings that there was nothing could be done about them. So these new facilities certainly have remedied that situation.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: First of all, Mr. Speaker, I am rather surprised to hear the minister say that he is pleased to announce that a newly constructed correctional center was officially opened today. I cannot see how anybody would be pleased to announce the opening of a jail or a penitentiary or a correctional center but, obviously, Mr. Speaker, hon. ministers are so glad to be able to announce anything that they would be pleased about anything these days. Mr. Speaker, if there is one trademark that this administration has it is for building and opening jails. I do not know if it is a sign of the times. They close hospital beds, they cutting back -

MR. W. MARSHALL: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the President of the Council on a point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we might build the jails but it is hard to put people in it as witnessed. Mr. Speaker, what the hon. gentleman is doing is debating the statement made by the hon. minister. He is getting into the area of general debate with respect to matters he perceives as being in the Budget. His remarks are

MR. W. MARSHALL: not related to the statement which was the opening of the institution in Bishop Falls, and I suggest that he be called to order.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the President of the Council, I assume, is referring to the fact that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition was not being relevant to the Ministerial Statement. The rule of relevancy, as all members know, is a very difficult one to rule on. I will let the hon. the Leader of the Opposition continue and if he is not relevant I will call him to order.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, The point I was making was that the priority of this administration seems to be opening jails and penitentiaries and the like, Mr. Speaker. And I am glad the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young) was on hand for the opening because I can assure this House that no other minister on the other side of the House would feel more at home inside of a correctional institution than the Minister of Public Works and Services,

MR. NEARY: or any of the ministry for that matter, but I am glad at least one of them managed to get on the inside today to have a look at the facilities. I hope this is not an indication of coming events casting their shadows before them, Mr. Speaker, but it is a very serious matter. I guess it is a sign of the times, an indication of the difficult times that we are going through when the minister has to build jails and penitentiaries and correctional institutions for men and women all over the Province. It is just a sign of the terrible state that the Newfoundland economy, business seems not to be picking up, Mr. Speaker, and we are told by the social workers and by the experts that in a time of dire straits with the condition of the Newfoundland and Labrador economy that usually you have social unrest, and I would presume that is what is happening in the Province at the present time, that business is increasing as a result of the way that the administration have mismanaged the economy of this Province. It is unfortunate that the administration are making these announcements at a time when they are closing down hospital beds.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please! Order, please!
The time for the response to the Ministerial Statement has expired.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. House Leader could tell the House if the Premier will be in his seat this afternoon?

MR. MARSHALL: No, he will not be here this afternoon.

MR. NEARY: He will not be here this afternoon. Well, perhaps then I will have to put my question to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), the gentleman who is responsible

MR. NEARY: for the Petroleum Directorate.

Now , Mr. Speaker, since the Budget was handed down, and since the decision of the Newfoundland Appeals Court was made there a few weeks ago, the energy issue, the offshore resources issue seems to have been put on the back burner or swept under the carpet. I think it is time that we brought it back into the open again, Mr. Speaker, brought it back into the light of day again.

MR. NEARY:

I am going to ask the hon. gentleman in my first question what are the expectations regarding offshore exploration activity on the Grand Banks and off the Coast this Spring, Summer and Autumn? What kind of activity would be going on? And can the hon. gentleman tell the House how many rigs will be involved in the offshore drilling and exploration off the Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, especially on the Grand Banks, this Spring, Summer and Autumn?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the answer, as the hon. gentleman referred to the budget, was already in essence provided in the budget itself. But just to give him a run-down of the situation, it is our understanding that the same rate of activity off Labrador will occur this Summer. It is also our understanding that in the Hibernia area on the Grand Banks of Newfoundland there are two rigs; their present status is known, they are presently anchored somewhere in the North Atlantic. Eventually, after the ice and the wind conditions abate and it is appropriate for them to go back, and after all of the problems associated with search and rescue and the other things that have been rectified to the satisfaction of everyone, they will be going back. The John Shaw, which is presently drilling off Nova Scotia, is scheduled within a number of months to come to the Grand Banks. So we will have three; in other words, we will have an increase of one off the East Coast. And on the Northeast Coast, as the hon. gentleman is aware, British Petroleum is striving to arrange to put a drill rig out in that area which is going to mean a shot in the arm employment-wise for the Northeast Coast and Botwood

MR. MARSHALL: in particular. In that particular situation we are still awaiting word with respect to it. We certainly hope that the rig will be there, but whether or not the rigs will be there the rig will be on the Northeast Coast. British Petroleum is presently in consultation with the federal government with respect to it. I hasten to add that they are in consultation with the federal government not because of the jurisdictional matter, not because of the finding against Newfoundland by the Appellate Court that the hon. gentleman seems to revel and exult in, but because of the fact that they need two permits in order to operate up there. Our permit and everything was arranged by the end of November in plenty and adequate and ample time for them to go ahead, but unfortunately the federal government

MR. MARSHALL:

was not. So they are still waiting to see, and we certainly hope they will be off the Northeast Coast. So I hope that gives him a run-down. And also for the sake of the hon. gentleman, if he wishes to consult the Budget, on page four he will see that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) made reference to the offshore drilling activity in '83, where it is estimated the expenditures will be in the range of \$450 million to \$500 million in 1983, and it is pointed out too, Mr. Speaker, that in 1982 resident Newfoundlanders, the hon. gentleman might like to know, resident Newfoundlanders claimed 78 per cent of the jobs which peaked to 2,000 last Summer. Now they got that number of jobs, as the hon. gentleman will know, because of the regulations that have been brought in by this government. The hon. gentleman will also know that the effectiveness of these regulations is now called into question because of the court case that he seems to be so happy about, so I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman can really be so happy when he sees the prospect of 2,000 jobs being lost in this Province.

So I hope I have given the hon. gentleman both the run-down as to the situation, and also a description of the way that he might like to act if he wants to act in the interest of the people in Newfoundland.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the answer given by the hon. gentleman of course was totally unsatisfactory. It was so vague, and of such a general nature, that it is the first time in this House that I have seen the hon. gentleman struggle, really struggle to try to provide an answer. It is obvious to me that the hon. gentleman does not have the information. But he did say in the beginning -

MR. HODDER: He referred to the Budget.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and then he referred to the Budget and brought in a few more things that were irrelevant.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman said 'based on his information,' Now would the hon. gentleman care to disclose his source of information as to what activity will take place on the Grand Banks this year? Would the hon. gentleman care to identify the information to which he referred when he said 'based on his information'? Would the hon. gentleman tell the House what information he has?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, that information is obviously gained from information from the oil companies as to their intentions and to what they want to do. As to the sources of my information, Mr. Speaker, that was one source, but there is another source as well which is a document entitled A Reveiw of the Newfoundland Economy in 1982 , which was tabled by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) with his budget, that the hon. gentleman has equal access as well as I do, where it says there, if the hon. gentleman wanted to read, "three rigs", which I just said a moment ago, on the Grand Banks," It says off Labrador -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Now there you go, Mr. Speaker, He said he wanted to know. So, I mean, the answer is given. I can say I have several sources, one of which is common to myself and the hon. gentleman,

MR. MARSHALL: so I will ask the hon.

gentleman what he reads during the weekends.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. gentleman is bluffing but I have to pursue the matter because it is a very serious matter. The point of my questions has to do with studies that have been done by the Petroleum Directorate, which I assume are very competent studies, that indicate clearly that because of the complex geology structure of the Grand Bank fields a very large amount of exploration activity is going to be necessary to enable production companies to make meaningful decisions. Now could the hon. gentleman tell us in connection with permits that he mentioned there a few moments ago, could he tell the House how many applications for permits does the provincial government have from Mobil Oil? We will just take one company alone. How many permits are awaiting a decision of the provincial government or the Petroleum Directorate from Mobil Oil? That would give us an indication of how many rigs Mobil would have drilling and exploring on the Grand Banks this Spring, Summer and Autumn. How many applications are pending from Mobil Oil?

MR. MARSHALL: Applications for what, Mr. Speaker?

MR. NEARY: For permits to let rigs drill on the Grand Banks. I presume there is a permit for each rig.

MR. DINN: And you were talking about the House Leader (Mr. Marshall) struggling!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, how many permits have been submitted by Mobil Oil for permits to explore and drill on the Grand Banks this Spring, Summer and Autumn?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Permits, you know, are different. I mean, permits are permits for an area of land on which to drill. When they wish to drill a certain well then it is not a permit they get, but they operate within their license and they comply with the procedures that are in the regulations. And I can advise the hon. gentleman there are three. I have had three questions and I have told him three times there are three. Three threes, Mr. Speaker, do not make nine but they make three.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, let us establish what the hon. gentleman is stating here. Is the hon. gentleman saying that there will be three rigs

MR. NEARY:

drilling on the Grand Banks this Spring, Summer and Autumn? I just want to confirm that. A simple yes or no; is it three Mobil Oil rigs that will be operating on the Grand Banks this Spring, Summer and Autumn?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, a supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Let me ask the hon. gentleman then if that level of activity that will take place this year will meet the requirements of the companies in determining the information that is necessary. Taking into consideration the complex geology structure of the Grand Banks, will that level of activity give Mobil the information that they need to speed up the production of oil and gas off our coast?

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

MR. MARSHALL: It will certainly hasten it Mr. Speaker. They are in the nature of delineation wells.

DR. McNICHOLAS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. John's Centre.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I have recognized the hon. the member for St. John's Centre.

DR. McNICHOLAS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) in connection with Pippy Park. The proposed six-lane highway through our wilderness park will destroy many of its amenities for our

DR. McNICHOLAS: children and for generations unborn.

My question is, would the minister postpone a final decision on this highway until further representations are made to him?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, perhaps a little bit of history in connection with the proposed Outer Ring Road. In 1976, government, through the Department of Municipal Affairs, undertook through Proctor and Redfern -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DAWE: - undertook through the firm of Proctor and Redfern to do a study on the whole municipal concept for the St. John's area and took into consideration both the road networks and the potential for the future and the necessity for additional roads. It took into consideration various municipal services such as water and sewerage and also, of course, took into consideration some things as it related to various forms of municipal government. One of the areas identified was what is known as the Outer Ring Road and Mr. Alec Henley subsequently was a commission of one, I understand, that held public hearings and the whole matter -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HODDER: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the member for Port au Port on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: The Question Period is not for government backbenchers. They have access to the ministers within the department. What arrogance! What an abuse of power.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the minister knows that answers to questions should be as brief as possible, should deal with the matter raised and should not provoke debate. Now, not only is the minister reacting to a set-up question from a lackey on his own side of the House, but he is giving the history of the Ring Road during Question Period, which is our Question Period, and we only have a half an hour for it.

MR. W. MARSHALL: To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the President of the Council to that point of order.

MR. MARSHALL: Any member not being a member of the Cabinet is entitled to ask questions in this House. The hon. gentleman was asking a question of imperative public importance that the general public would be interested in. Now, I would also point out to the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker, and to Your Honour that the hon. gentleman is not allowed to use abusive language. And to refer to the hon. gentleman from St. John's Center (Dr. McNicholas) as a 'lackey' is totally unparliamentary and he should be asked to withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

To the point of order raised; on most occasions, of course, the Question Period time is allocated to the Opposition members to ask questions of Ministers of the Crown. However, there is no rule to my knowledge which forbids a government backbencher from asking a question of a minister. The Chair did recognize the hon. member for St. John's Center, and I think rightfully so, and the hon. the Minister of Transportation (Mr. R. Dawe)

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): was attempting to answer the question. It is also true that questions as well as answers should be very brief.

MR. R. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, the question specifically asked whether in fact government would allow some public discussion as it relates to this particular road. In answering that question, I think it is necessary to point out just what public participation has been involved in that particular road up to this point in time. And in so doing I am attempting as briefly as possible to answer the hon. member's question.

As I was saying, the Henley Commission had public hearings throughout the St. John's area and the whole matter was discussed. The Commission submitted recommendations through Municipal Affairs to Cabinet in ratification of where the Outer Ring Road is and as well a number of other roads and municipal services in the St. John's area was discussed and ratified, this being one of them. About a year ago, the Pippy Park Commission asked if the boundary of the park could be moved. The road initially was the Northern -

MR. NEARY: Are you going to allow this to go on, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMS: If you want to speak to the Speaker, stand up, boy. Do not be so ignorant.

MR. WALSH: Stop questioning the Speaker's authority.

MR. DAWE: The road was essentially the boundary of Pippy Park. The Pippy Park Commission made their representation to government about a year or so ago asking that their effective boundary be moved some distance North of their present boundary and this was subsequently granted.

MR. DAWE: So the park that we have now
is essentially about twice as large as the original.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition on a point of order.

MR. NEARY: This is a deliberate abuse
of power.

MR. NEARY:

It is a display of arrogance on the part of the administration. You have a minister trying to use up the Question Period so that the Opposition cannot ask meaningful questions. The next thing, Mr. Speaker, the backbenchers on the government side and the ministers will be waltzing around the House together.

MR. TOBIN:

We have a right to ask questions.

MR. NEARY:

No, you do not.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

You can get the answer in the Common Room.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

I can only repeat, as I said before, that it is in order for a backbencher on the government side to ask a question. I also want to repeat that the answers as well as the questions should be brief. Maybe the hon. Minister for Transportation (Mr. Dawe) would like to take another thirty seconds to finish his answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, it will be very difficult to answer. I would just like to point out that there has been a lot of public discussion as it relates to the Outer Ring Road, discussions from the Pippy Park Commission to government requesting some changes based on their extension of the boundary; a presentation made to Resource Policy of Cabinet, subsequently on to Cabinet from Resource Policy; a presentation made by the Pippy Park Commission to the city of St. John's, Subsequently, from all

MR. DAWE: that discussion, the decision was to put the road essentially where it is now, with some minor modifications based on getting around the existing camping grounds, was ratified by both the City Council, Municipal Affairs, and government in general.

There will continue to be, as there always is, Mr. Speaker, to be specific to the question -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. DAWE: - there will continue to be public input into all decisions that government makes, and if it is legitimately necessary to make adjustments, then this government is very willing to listen to all points of view and will make the changes as are legitimately necessary.

MR. SIMMS: A good answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: I would like to come back to this very serious matter of activity offshore, and I want to come back to the minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate. The Petroleum Directorate have established that the level of activity taking place off our shore falls far short of requirements and our needs to do the exploration and testing that is needed to get the well into production. Now, could the hon. gentleman tell the House if there was an agreement, if the dispute between the Government of Canada and between this Province had ended in January when negotiations were taking place, would there be increased activity this year? Would there be more drill rigs on the Grand Banks this Spring, this Summer and Autumn? And, Mr. Speaker, while the hon. gentleman is answering me, would he also tell the House if there is any foundation to the reports from the Atlantic Provinces Economic Council that Mobil and the other oil companies are threatening to withdraw rigs altogether

MR. NEARY:

from drilling off the Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador until such time as an agreement is reached between the provincial and federal governments?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am not aware that there would be any extra rigs out there. The point of the matter is that the drilling that is taking place out there, I think it has been demonstrated particularly in the past few week, has heretofore been conducted under the supervision of the provincial government which is really the only agency which has effectively had any type of supervision or direction to the companies themselves. As the federal government has indicated, they are prepared to even let such enormous concerns as safety be left to Mobil as to whether or not they are prepared to drill with ice coming down within reasonable proximity of the rigs.

As to the APEC statement or the statement made by the hon. gentleman, there have been no communications to that effect and I am not expecting any. It is the type of tactic that is used from time to time by certain people like the hon. gentleman there opposite who would see us sit down not to negotiate but to sit down with the federal government and in good faith they would say to us, 'Try to get what you can for Newfoundland but if you cannot get anything more than the federal government is now offering just take the crumbs that they are prepared to give'. And this is part of the psychology that unfortunately the hon. gentleman joins in from time to time. The situation with respect to the oil companies withdrawing, they will not withdraw, Mr. Speaker, because the fact of the matter is the most

MR. MARSHALL: prospective development bar none in Canada, if not in the Western World, lies off the shores of Newfoundland. People are going to drill and companies presumably are going to drill where there are prospects of return and the place where you have the greatest prospect of return is off Newfoundland.

So, Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman should take a little bit of confidence with that as well as the few people, the very, very few, diminishing few in this Province who would adopt the same kind of attitude as the hon. gentleman, would voice the same sentiments from the same sources and would give away the resource off the East Coast of this Province in the same way as the Upper Churchill was given away, and would deny Newfoundlanders the same right of equal Canadian citizenship as the people in the Western Provinces and all other nine provinces enjoy.

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 information we have, and this has been prepared by the Petroleum Directorate, is that with three rigs drilling offshore this year, if we continue at that pace, at that rate, it will take twenty years before they can prove whether or not it is realistic and feasible to start producing oil. So there should actually be this year stepped up activity, there should be at least ten rigs on the Grand Banks this year. Now obviously they are not going to be there because of the dispute. Now let me ask the hon. gentleman a final question - now I will come back later, sometime during the other debates, about the information that is available at the Petroleum Directorate - but how long does this administration propose to allow this dispute over jurisdiction and management, how long do they intend to allow that to carry on, which obviously, Mr. Speaker, from the information that we have at hand, is inhibiting industry exploration activity? How long more are they going to allow that to go on?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I could turn the question back to the hon. gentleman and say how long is the hon. gentleman not going to support the people of Newfoundland and this government's endeavour to get justice and equity in the Upper Churchill? Mr. Speaker, this dispute need not be going on at the present time. The situation was, Mr. Speaker, that in January of this year there had been an agreement in principle that had been arrived at between myself and the Federal Minister of Energy, Mines and Resources. That agreement was good for the Province of Newfoundland, it was good for all Canadians. It allowed, on the one hand, development up to energy self-sufficiency and security of supply; on the other hand, it allowed us to determine the 'how' of development.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it allowed as well a large portion of the revenues to be dedicated to Newfoundland until the people of Newfoundland achieved or approached an averaged earned income equal to the rest of Canada. Now instead of the hon. gentleman asking me questions like that, I invite the hon. gentleman and those few weak-kneed people around, there are very few of them around, who continue to say, 'Oh, you should do this, you should do that, you should do the other thing with respect - "

As to how long the dispute will go on, I invite him to address the principles of that agreement and to tell us what is wrong.

How long will that dispute go on, Mr. Speaker? That dispute will go on until such time as the people of Newfoundland attain the rights, attain equal Canadian citizenship

MR. MARSHALL:

with their fellow Canadians and until the government of Canada is prepared to reverse the flip-flop which occurred in Ottawa and are prepared to deliver that agreement that Mr. Chretien indicated was available to the people of this Province. Now, what happened after that agreement was almost completed? Make no mistake about it, the federal government walked away from it and they walked away from it for varying reasons, not the least of which is the type of individual and the type of philosophy as espoused from time to time by the Leader of the Opposition and the party that he represents.

The situation is, Mr. Speaker, this dispute will go on for so long as it is necessary for the people of this Province to obtain justice and equity from that resource. And this government is more committed today, if it could be more committed, than it was in the past to this goal and this aspiration. I remind the hon. gentleman when he talks about agreements that if he wanted to assist the people of Newfoundland, I would suggest that what he should do is contact his friends in Ottawa, ask them when they are going to respond to that letter with the seventeen points and, more importantly, when are they going to honour the agreement entered into by their federal representative with me. This government stands ready to honour our side of the agreement. So if the hon. gentleman wants to be helpful he should ask his cronies up in Ottawa -

MR. SIMMS:

Mr. 'Rumpkey'.

MR. MARSHALL:

- and Mr. 'Rumpkey' and the other people who are supposedly representing the people, when they are going to be prepared to honour the agreement that was arrived at in December and January of this year.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.CALLAN: I have a question for the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) that also concerns a ring road. It concerns the ring road development in Corner Brook. Let me ask the minister has the study into that ring road development at Quarry Hill, the Curling Street Road, has that study been completed and, if it has, does the minister intend to table this study in the legislature?

MR.HODDER: Short questions require short answers.

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR.DAWE: Mr. Speaker, there is a draft report from the consultants in the hands of the department and it has been for about a week or so. I understand that the final report with some minor modifications will be due in the next couple of days, or perhaps Monday. Some survey work is being done. There are a number of alternatives and recommendations made as it relates to that particular piece of road and government intends to carry out its mandate to complete that road as quickly as possible. The report itself is an engineering study and a soil study by a group of specialists. It seems that hon. members opposite from time to time have difficulty reading even very simple things that this government puts before them, so I doubt very much if they would understand a technical engineering report. However, if they would like to see it I have no objections. It is a fairly straightforward report.

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, may I ask the minister, then, would the minister confirm or deny that the report that has been completed, at least in draft form, has been discussed? Have his department or his officials discussed it with the Corner Brook city council?

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

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, since it was first discovered that there was a fault associated with some of the construction on that particular section of road, my department and I specifically and the member representing the area directly involved, have been meeting on a rather continuous basis with the city council and with their engineering staff and they are in, I will not say hourly contact, but certainly daily contact on the matter and everything is being fully discussed with the city officials in Corner Brook, as well, Mr. Speaker, as the Management Committee, which is made up of federal and provincial officials who oversee the construction of cost-shared roads, and it will be done as always, in full consultation with all the parties involved.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members Day, we shall proceed with Motion No. 7, to be moved by the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, again the Opposition seem to be on the move, When there is going to be

MR. TOBIN: something issued involving the fishery, where is their fishery spokesman, Mr. Speaker? The same place he was the last time we spoke on the fishery. Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and today they seem all tied up about the Question Period. Yesterday when we and people in the galleries from the Burin Peninsula expected to hear something about the fisheries, what took preference, Mr. Speaker, the fisheries or room for the judicial system in St. John's.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I will introduce this resolution today with a great deal of pride, and I can say, with a great deal of support for the people of Burin - Placentia West and certainly all the other places in this Province who are being affected by the fishing crisis that now exists. And I shall read into the record, Mr. Speaker, this resolution:

"WHEREAS the social and economic fabric of Newfoundland and Labrador has been and will continue to be interwoven with a viable fishing industry; and

WHEREAS the fishing industry during recent months has undergone severe economic adversity, threatening the very existence of many communities in our Province; and

WHEREAS an exhaustive study of the Atlantic fishery has been carried out by the Kirby Task Force requiring several months to complete; and

WHEREAS the federal government exercises most of the jurisdiction and control over our fisheries and therefore, is obligated to perform its constitutional duty such jurisdiction implies; and

WHEREAS it appears the restructuring of the industry may be necessary to ensure its future viability;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this House urge the Government of Canada to exercise without delay its

MR. TOBIN: responsibility for ensuring
the continued viability of the industry; and
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED

MR. TOBIN:

that such action be taken in co-operation and consultation with the Province and with a view to minimizing the negative social and economic impact on our fishing industry?

Mr. Speaker, when I spoke of the great honour to be chosen by the Premier of this Province to Second the Motion to the Throne Speech, I referred to the fishing industry in this province, particularly the area in my own riding, the town of Burin, which has been affected, and I spoke of the uncertainty that exists in the fisheries today.

Mr. Speaker, I also had the opportunity that day to say that I would stand up shortly after and introduce my own Resolution, the same Resolution that I just introduced to make Mr. Speaker, some of the people in this hon. House aware that there is a problem existing in the fishery, and I hope that these people will all see fit to support this Resolution that I put forth today.

Mr. Speaker, who cannot agree with it? The hon. member from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), I am sure he can agree with what has been said in that Resolution, as much as he wants to heckle, and it certainly does not bother me how much he heckles! But, there is nothing in that Resolution, Mr. Speaker that he cannot support, if he is sincere and genuine in representing the people of this province.

MR. WARREN: You will find out how I will vote in due course, so carry on.

MR. TOBIN: I know. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. member was elected to represent the people of this province and I know that the hon. member, Mr. Speaker, will not be a hypocrite, he will support the people who have elected

MR. TOBIN: him. Mr. Speaker, if I can go on, this is leading me again into the area which I represent and let me say that the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, off the Coast of this Province, have been no stranger to the people of the Burin Peninsula. The people of the Burin Peninsula are no strangers, Mr. Speaker to the Grand Banks of Newfoundland, and I can further state that it was the people of the Burin Peninsula who pioneered the deep-sea fishery in this province.

When we look at our forefathers, just the forefathers of the Burin Peninsula, the forefathers of the fishing industry in this province, Mr. Speaker, what can one say? We can only thank them for developing the very prosperous Province which we all live in today.

Mr. Speaker, it was the people of the Burin Peninsula, the courageous fishermen from the South coast of Newfoundland who travelled to the Grand Banks from these famous fishing communities, and it was also these same people who built and developed the prosperous fishing communities of the Burin Peninsula and certainly all of the South coast of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, when we get into the development of the deep-sea fishery and we talk about the pioneering of this great fishery, I happened to be reading from the Fishery Products News and Views that when Arthur Monroe purchased Hollett's Point in Burin from Mrs. Lillian Hodder, wife of Capt. Will Hodder, one of the best known vessel masters and owners, a small plant was constructed there and supplied by a new wooden trawler, The Mustang, built at the Head of Bay d'Espoir. That is what marked the beginning of the deep-sea fishery in this province, Mr. Speaker, where else but in that great town of Burin

MR. TOBIN: the great and historical town of
Burin, may I add. Now, Mr. Speaker, Burin, and indeed all
of the South coast of this province, and all of the fishing
communities of this province are now moving into a new era.
The new and higher level of prosperity in the fishing
industry was on the move, things were started, the deep-sea
fishery was pioneered and who could ever envisage the day
when this would no longer exist? Who could ever envisage
the day, Mr. Speaker, when there would be a shortage of
fish on the Grand Banks, plants closed down in such places
as Burin, Gaultois, Harbour Breton and other places?

MR. TOBIN: And who could envisage today that the most prolific fishing grounds in the world would have a shortage of fish species?

Mr. Speaker, as I stated, I think we know where the problems in the fisheries lie, so let us not kid ourselves. After the federal government in this country, Mr. Speaker, took over the fisheries off the Coast of Newfoundland, that was when the problems started.

MR. WARREN: When was that? What time was that?

MR. TOBIN: What time was that? That was the time when you were about fifty years old, in 1949.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, I am not exactly sure of the hon. member's birthday, but it is somewhere there around. However, Mr. Speaker, I am sure he was old enough to forget it and not young enough to think about it.

However, Mr. Speaker, what did we see happening after we lost control of our fisheries? We saw hordes of foreign vessels from Russia, Germany, Poland, Japan, Britain and other parts of the world coming to the Grand Banks and raping our stocks. That is what happened, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: The fisheries went down because of this government.

MR. TOBIN: That is what happened, Mr. Speaker, the fishery was mismanaged. And one of the greatest neglects was by the federal government, who failed to take action against these foreigners I just mentioned, Mr. Speaker, the people who came here and depleted our fish stocks. That is where the problem lies, Mr. Speaker. Now let me say that had the federal government heeded the warnings and acted upon the requests of the people of Newfoundland years before this happened, or even ten years before it happened, many of today's problems would not exist.

MR. TOBIN: What happened when Ottawa did finally wake up to the problem? What happened, Mr. Speaker? Did they treat it in a sensible and businesslike manner? No, they most certainly did not, Mr. Speaker. They treated it as a trade-off tool with foreign countries, to use foreign countries, Mr. Speaker, for the car industry and the manufacturing industry in Central Canada. That is what the federal government did with the Newfoundland fishery and that is what they are continuing to do with the Newfoundland fishery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said, I think we should be honest with ourselves. And the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) got up in the House of Assembly yesterday and tried to say that the great problems in the fishing industry, the great problems that exist in this industry were created by the provincial government, the provincial government have all the responsibilities for the fishing industry. And then, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) took to his feet in this hon. House and he told us, Mr. Speaker, that what the federal government had accepted from the Kirby Task Force Report was a resettlement programme for Gaultois. The same, Mr. Speaker, resettlement programme that I spoke of in this hon. House when I seconded the motion on the Speech from the Throne, when I told this House, Mr. Speaker, that was what was being proposed to the people of Burin, a resettlement programme, people being forced to leave their homes, their birthplaces, because of the greed of the multi-national corporations. Mr. Speaker, some people in this House do not like the word 'resettlement' nor should they. I spent ten years travelling the South Coast of this Province as a social worker and I can certainly tell the hon. gentleman how well the Liberal Party and their philosophy of resettlement

MR. TOBIN: has been accepted in this Province. However, Mr. Speaker, let us be honest with ourselves. Where is the problem in the fisheries? Who has control of the problem in the fisheries? It is the federal government, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Both governments.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) said the Premier of the Province had no input into what was going on in Burin, never made any representation to what was taking place in Burin. Mr. Speaker, I have here in my possession a copy of a telex sent to De Bane December 9th, 1982, by the Premier of this Province. Mr. Speaker, I will not go into the full contents of the statement but it said, "as it relates to the people of Burin requesting that their plant stay open, I

MR. G. TOBIN: believe this request is a fair and reasonable one and therefore I am requesting that you inform the company to remove their deadline on Burin. It is unfortunate that Fishery Products Limited are now, while their position is being assessed, making announcements about plant closures before assessment is complete. It is, in my view, inappropriate and if continued will cause the whole process of examination now underway to lose credibility."

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is where the Premier of this Province stood on Burin before the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and his colleagues knew there was a problem in Burin. What government is responsible, Federal or Provincial?

Mr. Speaker, there is no one who shall ever come out from under the code of who is responsible for the fish plants. We heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) yesterday taking his place. What did he say? That over the last three or four years the provincial government of this tiny little Province has pumped something like \$100 million into the processing sector. What has the federal government put into it, Mr. Speaker? Thirteen million dollars in loan guarantees, Mr. Speaker. Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is what they put into it in Newfoundland. But let us look at what they put into it in Canada, Mr. Speaker. May 10, 1980, Chrysler Company, federal investment \$200 million in loan guarantees. Dome Petroleum, an agreement between the federal government and the bank, \$1 billion, Mr. Speaker. Yet, how does that compare to \$13 million in loan guarantees, for the fisheries in Newfoundland? Mr. Speaker, on October 28, Bill C-134, government lent \$216 million for farm credits, farm loans, interest loans in Western Canada. Mr. Speaker, what about the subsidy to that great airport

MR. G. TOBIN: in Quebec? What about that? Seven hundred million dollars versus \$13 million in loan guarantees in the Province of Newfoundland. That is right Mr. Speaker. What about \$235 million in a propaganda advertising and information budget? What about that, Mr. Speaker? Put the \$235 million into the fishery of this Province, Mr. Speaker, and people, such as the people in Burin, will have something to exist on. I can continue if the hon. gentlemen want me to. What about the Crow's Nest Passport agreement announced by Jean-Luc Pepin in the House of Commons on February 1, 1983? What about that, Mr. Speaker? Six hundred and fifty-one point six million dollars annual payments coming in 1983 divided equally between the grain producers. They put \$13 million into loan guarantees for the fisheries of this Province then, Mr. Speaker, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) and his colleagues support the fickle five in Ottawa who have done nothing only desert Newfoundland since they got elected.

MR. STAGG: You must mean \$130 million?

MR. TOBIN: Not \$130 million, \$13 million.

MR. G. WARREN: Is that not shameful, boy.

MR. TOBIN: Yes, and if you were to perform your duties as an elected representative of the people of this Province, you would tell Mr. Rompkey who represents the same riding as you, that there are people in this Province who deserve to be treated the same as the rest of Canada, Mr. Speaker, but yet you will stand with your guardian angel, the Leader of the Opposition, and what happens? 'Do not offend Mr. Rompkey because, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Rompkey is their source of information.' The little bit that Mr. Rompkey does know about what is going on in Ottawa, goes back to the Leader of the Opposition. That is how he knew, Mr. Speaker, about the oil

MR. TOBIN: . . . rigs not going to Marystown, from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary).

Now, Mr. Speaker, we want to talk about trawler replacement. On May 29th, 1977, Romeo LeBlanc wrote a letter to the President of the Canadian Shipbuilding Association, What did he say? "My department is now -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN: Wait now, Mr. Speaker. "My department is now commencing a study with respect to fishing fleet development in which there will be full consultation with all interested parties. This study will result in definition of fishing vessel needs in Canada in the longer terms and will focus, amongst other things, on the financing arrangements involved and where the various types of vessels can be obtained.

Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Romeo LeBlanc on May 29th., 1977 - in another few days it will be six years ago. Where is the policy, Mr. Speaker? Where is the policy that Mr. LeBlanc writes about, and that Mr. LeBlanc says is going to be put in place? I can tell you where it is, Mr. Speaker, it is contained in this, that is where it is. It is contained in the Kirby Report. What does it say? Recommendation 46, "Do not provide direct special assistance for vessel acquisition or replacement but ensure that the vessel can be purchased from the most economical source, unhindered by tarriffs and other barriers."

Mr. Speaker, I will say what I said the other day in the House, Mr. Kirby can go straight to hell as it relates to that. We know, Mr. Speaker, where the fishermen of this Province, and the fishermen of this country got their support; it was in 1961 when John Diefendbaker's Government, Mr. Speaker, a good Conservative government, introduced

MR. TOBIN: the Canadian shipbuilding subsidy programme that Newfoundland fish companies received any assistance.

Mr. Speaker, do you know what this programme did? I am sure the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) does not want to know what the programme did.

MR. STAGG: No. No. It is too positive.

MR. TOBIN: I will tell you what it did. It made it possible for trawlers and plant operators to construct new vessels in order to compete with the foreigners, Mr. Speaker. Thanks to that great Newfoundlander, and I said it before, thank God we had in Ottawa Don Jamieson when the 200 mile limit was declared, and not Mr. Rompkey.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if Mr. Rompkey could go just one step further and include the Tail and Nose of the Bank and the Flemish Cap, we would know where we stand, Mr. Speaker, in the fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, something else, this statistic on the subsidy programme; 50 per cent of the capital cost of new trawlers was paid in the form of subsidies by Ottawa. Shipyards which had been experiencing hard times began to flourish. The steel industry in Canada benefitted as did the manufacturing industry. Manufacturing the equipment necessary to equip these vessels created hundreds of jobs, Mr. Speaker, thousands of jobs, and a very large portion of the subsidy was returned to the Treasury through the income and other taxes generated by the employment and business which resulted from the programme.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, as my time is running out I want to say that we need -

MR. NEARY: Your time is running out in Burin.

MR. TOBIN: My time is not running out in Burin. I will tell the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that when I have to run from Burin -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TOBIN: - like you ran for LaPoile, I will run with a clean record and a clear conscience.

MR. NEARY: Not true!

MR. TOBIN: If I have to run it will be with a clean record and a clear conscience.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) was running out on Bell Island.

MR. TOBIN: That is right.
And, Mr. Speaker, if the Leader of the Opposition wants to run again I will challenge him to come to the Burin Peninsula, Burin-Placentia West.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: And we will show him where he can run, Mr. Speaker. The people of Burin, Mr. Speaker, know where I stand.

Mr. Speaker, I want to reiterate in this hon. House once again - Mr. Speaker, I would like to welcome to the galleries, as a matter of fact, one of the greatest fighting Newfoundlanders that we have today, the Mayor of Burin, Bill Bailey, along with his Town Manger, Mr. Warren, and his Town Clerk, Mrs. Tizzard. I want to say, Mr. Speaker, in this hon. House, in their presence, that I stand behind them, Mr. Speaker, as I have stood behind them before. And I will not flirt the issue, Mr. Speaker, I will not squirm the issue like the Opposition

MR. TOBIN: has been trying to do in this hon. House, trying to say, Mr. Speaker, that the thing is a total federal responsibility. Let them justify, Mr. Speaker, why the federal government could put \$13 million into fisheries. Let them justify that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN: How much did the Province put in Burin?

MR. TOBIN: Well, Mr. Speaker - what is that?

MR. WARREN: How much did the Province put in Burin?

MR. TOBIN: The Province put in Burin?

MR. WARREN: Yes.

MR. TOBIN: The Province does not have to put anything in Burin because Burin is a proven plant, Mr. Speaker. Again, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member does not know what is taking place in Burin, which is typical of the Opposition. But I can tell the hon. Opposition, Mr. Speaker, each and every member over there, that Burin is a profitable plant, has always been, and will continue to be. I know the Opposition do not understand. I know they are not familiar with the problems of Burin and this is why I am here to let you people know what is going on in Burin.

Mr. Speaker, the people of Burin will forgive them for not understanding the problems.

MR. CALLAN: What a friend we have in Tobin.

MR. TOBIN:

will continue.

However, Mr. Speaker, Burin

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. TOBIN:

By leave, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No.

MR. SPEAKER:

Leave is not granted.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to welcome to the gallery today the Mayor of Burin, and the Town Clerk, and the lady from Burin. I am glad they are here to -

MR. SIMMS:

What is her name?

MR. NEARY:

Miss Fizzard or Tizzard, Tizzard is it?

MR. SIMMS:

You are not sure, are you?

MR. NEARY:

I am not sure if it is Fizzard or Tizzard. But, Mr. Speaker, I am glad they are here because the resolution that is under debate today does not specifically zero in on Burin, but it does have a very large bearing on what the outcome will be of the problem in Burin. Now, the hon. gentleman who introduced the resolution, Mr. Speaker, appeared to me to be on the defensive. During his whole twenty minute speech he apparently was on the defensive and was more political, really, than he was in expressing some common sense. I am sure that the people of Burin would have preferred their member, today, to stand in this House and tell the people what plan the administration has, the administration which he is supporting, what plan they have to reopen the plant in Burin. Now that is what they would have preferred.

MR. NEARY: The hon. member who introduced the resolution was negative in every respect. He did not put forward one suggestion or one idea as to how that plant in Burin should reopen. The gentleman who introduced the resolution did not tell this House what option, for instance, what option he favoured, or what option the administration favoured to get the plant in Burin reopened. I understand there are a number of options.

I have heard the mayor, who I consider also to be a good Newfoundlander and a good fighter, I have heard the Mayor of Burin at public meetings say what he thought the options were. The options were, I think, he said you can lay back and do nothing, you can bail out the plant in Burin, or you can nationalize it. Now where does the hon. gentleman stand on these options or any other options that may be open? I did not hear the member, this afternoon, tell the House. If the poor old Opposition is struggling and groping in the dark, we are not the government. If we were the government that plant would be opened and operating, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Our policy is to reopen all these plants, starting with Fermeuse.

MR. BAIRD: The same as Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Bell Island was a different matter. But starting with Fermeuse and going right on up to Ramea, every plant that is now closed, if we had our way, would be reopened, Mr. Speaker. That is where we stand. And the solution to reopening these plants may not be the same for every community. For instance, the solution to the plant in St. Lawrence may not be the same as the solution to the problem in Burin. I believe the plant in St. Lawrence is ideal for - apart from the fresh fish operation - is an idea setup for the Saltfish Corporation to move in.

MR. NEARY: It is an ideal situation for a co-op of some kind, similar to the one on Fogo Island, I believe that is the answer to St. Lawrence. But, Mr. Speaker, what needs to be done is that somebody has to show the lead, somebody has to take the lead. And I am amazed, Mr. Speaker, that the member for the district would stand in this House and say, Yes, I am supporting the people of Burin, I am supporting the Committee, but he does not say how far he is prepared to go with that support. Is he prepared to resign from the party? Is he prepared to cross the House? What kind of a stand is he prepared to take? Is it a political stand he is prepared to take, as he just took? Is that the kind of a stand he is talking about? Is he only prepared to keep attacking Ottawa, to keep attacking Mr. Rompkey, and offer no solutions of his own? Is that the kind of courage, is that the kind of a stand he is talking about? Because if he continues on that trend of thought it will get him nowhere. It will not get the plant in Burin reopened.

What we need, Mr. Speaker, is somebody on that side, and they are the government we are not the government and they can criticize us all they like. We are not in a decision-making role, if we were we would have the plant reopened. I was a member of a government, back in 1968, when every plant in Newfoundland was bankrupt, but they were all kept open. So I say the onus of responsibility is on that side of the House not up in Ottawa. Ottawa is looking at Newfoundland and Atlantic Canada from the vantage point of Wellington Street. Mr. Speaker, it is right here in this Province, on the eighth floor of Confederation Building, that a decision has to be taken to keep Burin open.

MR. STAGG: Ottawa has no responsibility?

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. STAGG: Ottawa has no responsibility?

MR. NEARY: Ottawa does have a responsibility,

and that is why I am going to, Mr. Speaker, while I have the opportunity, move an amendment to this resolution that was just introduced by the member, seconded by my colleague the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan). That all of the words after the second WHEREAS be stricken out and replaced by adding the following:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House urges the Governments of Newfoundland and Labrador and Canada to exercise without delay their responsibilities for ensuring the continued viability of the industry."

MR. WARREN: It is a good amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: And the reason I move that amendment, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

Could I have time to rule on the amendment before we continue.

MR. NEARY: Yes. Sure!

MR. SPEAKER: If I could recess for about two minutes. I have done some research, so I will not take too long.

RECESS

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

I rule that the amendment is
in order.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR.NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the reason I
moved the amendment is because - I should not have to say
this but I am going to repeat it again. I know the time
that Your Honour was out of the Chair was not taken out
of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the fishery of
Newfoundland is a shared jurisdiction , a joint jurisdiction.
The processing sector comes under the provincial government,
provincial jurisdiction, the fish while it is in the water,
the harvesting and until it is landed on the wharf, the
trawlers, etc., are under federal jurisdiction. But once the fish
is put onshore, on the wharf, it comes under the jurisdiction
of the provincial government, so we have shared jurisdiction.
And the reason why I move this amendment, Mr. Speaker, is
that I think it is about time for members who represent
districts where all the problems are taking place, and
for all of this House for that matter, to show a united front,
to be statesmen. Instead of criticizing and squabbling
and laying the groundwork for another argument with Ottawa,
another confrontation , another major confrontation with
Ottawa, what they should be doing is laying out plans and
ideas and suggestions and recommendations to this House
as to how we can deal with the problems in these communities,
the problem in Fermeuse and the problems in Burin and Grand
Bank and St. Lawrence, and Gaultois, and Ramea , and Harbour
Breton and all these other communities where fish plants
are closed or in the process of closing. We have to show
a united front. If there is going to be division , Mr.
Speaker -

MR.WARREN:

involved.

There should be no politics

MR.NEARY:

There should be no politics in this. It is too urgent and too serious a matter and too fragile. The problem in Burin will not be solved by squabbling and fighting and arguing.

MR. S. NEARY: I wonder, does the member for Burin (Mr. Tobin) not realize that? He stood in this House this afternoon, he had twenty minutes to tell the people of this Province how we should solve the problem in Burin, what option he approved of, what the provincial government was going to do about it, what plan they had to deal with the problem, and did he tell us?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, he did not. And I am disgusted that he did not. And if he is a man of courage, as he says he is, then he would demand that the administration here move on Burin or threaten to resign, or cross the House, disassociate himself from an administration who are laying back and waiting for Ottawa to make decisions when the jurisdiction is right here on the eighth floor of Confederation Building. They have kidded and coddled and duped the people now long enough and it is time to get down to brass tacks. And, Mr. Speaker, I repeat again what I just said, the main reason I moved this amendment to the hon. gentleman's resolution is in the hope that we can go out of here with a united front, that we can lay partisan politics aside, that we will hear no more attacks on Ottawa and on Mr. Rompkey and the Opposition.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman who just spoke to introduce his resolution can attack the Opposition all he wants, I mean, so where is it going to get him? We happen to believe the plants should be open, so why attack us? He should be attacking the gentleman who sits right opposite me, the man who heads up the administration, not the Opposition. We are not in a decision-making role. We can only express our views and our feelings, and we have already done that. We have said there should be secondary processing in this Province and

MR. S. NEARY: not done down in the United States. That we should have holding units to hold the fish in the glut season so that the plants can work a longer time during the year, we have said that. The finished product should be processed here in this Province and not in Boston. We have argued and put forward the suggestion that the trawler fleet be nationalized. We have put the idea on the table that some plants may have to be taken over by the provincial government, some may have to be operated by co-ops and some may have to be operated by private enterprise. Mr. Speaker, we have also stated categorically that the terms of reference of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation should be expanded to market all the produce of the sea. If there is one success story in Newfoundland since Confederation, it is the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, but it only markets salt fish. One of the big problems in our fishery has been marketing.

MR. NEARY: And we have been saying for years in this House that the Terms of Reference of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation should be expanded to include the marketing of all the produce of the sea. Then we would have orderly marketing. Then all our fish would be marketed under one label. The government, the administration keeps resisting that. We do not understand why. If it is going to be done there has to be a bill, a piece of legislation brought into this House to do it. But somehow or other, Mr. Speaker, for the last three or four years, all they have been thinking about is oil. They have neglected the fishery, they have mismanaged all the other natural resources in this Province, they have put all their eggs in one basket, the oil basket, which is pretty leaky at the present time, and they have completely ignored the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery which is our most basic industry, always has and always will be. And now, Mr. Speaker, the chickens are coming home to roost and what do we see? Do we see plans? We are in this House now a week and a half, one and one-half weeks. Have we seen any plan put forward? We have had a Throne Speech and we have had a Budget Speech and they are both supposed to be good news for the people, especially the Budget Speech. The Budget Speech is an opportunity in the House when the government lays out its plans, good news for the people. Was there any good news in the Throne Speech or the Budget Speech? No, Mr. Speaker. We have been here a week and a half and we on this side are waiting for plans from the administration to tell us how they are going to prop up the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery, how they are going to reopen the plants in Burin and Gaultois and Ramea and Harbour Breton and St. Lawrence and Fermeuse.

MR. CARTER: We are going to cut down the Opposition vote. That will do it.

MR. NEARY: Oh, yes, that will solve the Burin problem, cut down the Opposition vote. I would suggest if the hon. gentleman wants to cut something out that he cut out the apartment in Tiffany Place and get away from throwing away the taxpayers' money on foolish, obsolete tracking stations in Shoe Cove. I am sure the people of Burin must be happy to know - the people in Burin are happy to know that the administration that the hon. gentleman is supporting is throwing away a million dollars to take over an obsolete tracking station in Shoe Cove while their fish plant remains closed - 600, 700, 800 jobs. How many jobs down at that silly tracking station compared to Burin? How far would a million dollars go to help Burin get back on its feet?

MR. TOBIN: How many jobs would be created if you had the \$235 million for the propaḡanda campaign?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman had his twenty minutes and he did not say anything. Thirty times in one day he had to be brought to order by the Chair. I hope we do not see a repeat of that today.

Mr. Speaker, this problem is very, very serious. And I have moved this amendment and I hope members on the government benches will support my amendment. Because what we

MR. NEARY: need is a united front. Forget the partisan politics, forget the attacks and the squabbling, forget the political rhetoric, forget the one-upmanship, put aside partisan politics and let us go out of this House statesmanlike, united in one thing, that we are going to see to it that the crisis in the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery ends quickly and that the plants that are now closed will be reopened. My understanding is that Ottawa is going to put \$.5 billion, \$500 million, into the fishery in Atlantic Canada to help save the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada. What I would like to know from the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) is, is he in there fighting with his Cabinet because they will have a say, He is a colleague of the Premier. The Cabinet will have a large say in how part of the money will be proportioned in Newfoundland, how it will be spent. The hon. gentleman has a say in it. Why does he not come out man fashion and tell the people in Ramea that, 'Boy, I am in there and, by God, I will tell you this, that I am going to get a share of that money to get the plant opened down in Ramea'.

AN HON. MEMBER: They know that.

MR. NEARY: They do not know because I happened to be down there and all I saw was a telegram on the wall from the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) saying, 'Boys, everything will be all right when the Kirby Task Force makes its recommendations'. The hon. gentleman told the people down there that knowing it was not true. Mr. Speaker, I have to say this, I am not accusing the administration but I have a feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier and his ministers and members who represent these misery communities know now and they have known for weeks and months what is involved in the restructuring that we have been hearing so much about. They know the answers now.

MR. NEARY: They are covering up the information, they are sitting on it. They will not tell the people, they do not have the courage. The hon. gentleman, the member for Ramea, knows the answer, knows how restructuring is going to affect Ramea.

MR. ANDREWS: By whom?

MR. NEARY: By whom? As far as I know restructuring is a joint effort now because the provincial government have abrogated their jurisdiction to Ottawa. Fish processing is a provincial jurisdiction.

MR. MARSHALL: I wish the hon. gentleman would stop shouting, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: I have to shout, Mr. Speaker, because it is the only way I can get the message through. They are so dense that you have to talk loud to make sure they understand what you are saying.

MR. MARSHALL: Take your tranquilizer.

MR. NEARY: No, that is the Premier. The Premier is the tranquilizer man. We know all about that but that is another story.

Mr. Speaker, I will read the amendment again; 'NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House urges the Governments of Newfoundland and Labrador and of Canada to exercise without delay their responsibilities for ensuring the continued viability of the industry'.

MR. S. NEARY: Now, Mr. Speaker, is the provincial government, if they vote for this amendment, and I believe they will - I cannot see how they can vote against it - if they vote in favour of it, for the amendment, then they know what the consequences are; they know they will have to work hand in glove with the Government of Canada and with the union and with the industry to save the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery and to get these fish plants that are now closed reopened. Now, perhaps they do not want that. If they do not vote for this amendment then I can only assume they do not want a united front, they do not want to see the problem solved. And, you know, as I said the other day, Mr. Speaker, I think this government was greatly relieved when the Newfoundland Appeals Court ruled in favour of the Government of Canada, the people of Canada, on the offshore. I believe they were greatly relieved because then they did not have to do anything and then they could continue to blame things on others. And I believe they would be relieved -

MR. W. MARSHALL: Are you happy?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not happy. I am sad about that. I think that it is one of the biggest blunders in Newfoundland's history and, as I said, the Premier's name will go down in the history books as the worst Premier, as the Premier who made the biggest blunder in our history. And, Mr. Speaker, we are headed for another blunder unless they vote in favour of this resolution, put up a united front, let us all be statesman and let us try to solve the problem in the Newfoundland and Labrador fishery, together, and forget partisan politics.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. the Minister of the Environment.

MR. NEARY: Now we will hear something about the fishery.

MR.H.ANDREWS:

Thank you, Mr.Speaker.

It seems like the member for LaPoile thinks I know everything. I do not know everything. I know quite a bit. A little bit about what is going on in Ramea. Much to his chagrin, I think, he found out that when he was there a few weeks ago.

Mr. Speaker, I think everybody in the Government of Newfoundland has some idea of what might be in this so called restructuring. It has been leaked pretty well -

MR.NEARY:

So why do you not tell us?

MR.ANDREWS:

- including people on the other side of the House who, apparently, have had some input into what is going on. Mr.Speaker, whatever comes out of that report, the major element is somebody is going to have to put up one heck of a lot of money.

MR.J.HODDER:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER (Dr.McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR.HODDER:

There is no quorum in the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR.SPEAKER:

We will have a quorum call.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas): I think a quorum is present.

The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking to this motion, and the amendment on the motion, I think it should be pointed out that the major issue here, or the issue is just not the reopening of fish plants, the major issue here and the issue is the fishing industry, the total industry as we see it. And this motion that we are discussing not only regards the offshore fishery and the deep-sea plants. We have a lot of problems here in the total fishing industry: We have the problem of fish allocations both for the inshore and the deep-sea, and then, when we get to the deep-sea, we have the problem of fish allocations for each individual plant and geographic area within Newfoundland and , of course, indeed the Atlantic Provinces. And when I speak to that point I refer directly to the Northern cod. It is the claim of this government , of course, that the Northern cod belongs to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and that no Northern cod should go West of the Cabot Strait. And I think that is an issue that will be debated by one of my colleagues on this side of the House at a later point in time.

Mr. Speaker, there are numerous problems. It is not just, as the Leader of the Opposition says, getting Ramea open, getting Burin open, getting Grand Bank open. These are very serious problems but these are the tips of the icebergs as we see them. Deep down below these tips are very many grave and serious matters that must be debated. The restructuring of the industry must address these matters, Mr. Speaker, they must address them very quickly. We have the problem

MR. ANDREWS: of the trawler fleet. We have the problem of the inshore fleet. Many of our trawlers, as we all know, anyone who knows the deep-sea fishery, are becoming aged and they will need to be replaced. We are talking in terms of hundreds of millions of dollars for that segment of the industry alone and that is not counting the monies that are going to be required just to open the fish plants.

MR. ANDREWS: Then we have the problem of the resource short plants, as we call them, the so-called seasonal inshore plants along the Northeast Coast. And I would like to make the point that there is a direct relationship, whether inshore fishermen, or deep-sea fishermen, or inshore plant workers, or deep-sea fish plant workers like it, there is an intimate relationship between all aspects of the industry, the inshore fishermen, so-called inshore fishermen, and seasonal plants and the trawler fleet, and the deep-sea plants. There is room for an inter - and it is happening of course, it has happened for a long time, pretty well all the deep-sea fish plants in Newfoundland buy inshore fish. A lot of the so-called inshore plants are now in the process of extending the season and buying fish from the offshore, both from Newfoundland boats and from foreign leased boats which extend their season and makes them as a whole industry become more viable, because many of the companies that own the deep sea trawler plants also own inshore seasonal fish plants along the Northeast Coast and the Northwest Coast of the Province.

So these are the issues that must be addressed. These are the issues that cannot only be addressed by the provincial government. Just because the Province has the right to licence fish plants does not mean that that is the panacea, the panacea for the problems of the industry. You can open a fish plant. We can issue licences. All these fish plants have licences now. But they also have to have fish. They also have to have trawlers. And they also have to have a firm foundation on which to stand.

The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) a little earlier this afternoon in one of his more sarcastic, or probably more of his usual moments, mentioned that the fishing industry in Newfoundland went down in 1971,

MR. ANDREWS: began to go down in 1971/72
with the arrival on the scene of the PC Government in Newfoundland.
But I say, Mr. Speaker, it is since 1949, when our
Premier Premier past for twenty-three years ran this country
with an iron fist and decided that the fishing industry
was no good for Newfoundland because all he could perceive
out of it was poverty. Certainly there was poverty in the

MR. ANDREWS:

fishery for numbers of years, Mr. Speaker, but there were days that we always forget now. There were eras in the fishery when economic times were good throughout the world, when there were good economic times in Newfoundland. And we have seen this in the past; I have seen it in my short period of time, two or three periods where there have been good times in the fishery, good times in the inshore fishery and the deep-sea fishery.

These are poor times. There are poor economic times all over the world. But what did we do in 1949? We turned our backs on the fishery and attempted to, so-called, industrialize the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, industries like the battery plant and the chocolate factories and the rubber plants. All equalled one side of an equation. The other side was abandon the fishery which means 'burn your boats', of which we heard so much.

I say that the fishing industry from 1949 to 1971 survived despite what the provincial and federal governments did to help it, survived despite what they did to try to kill it with the resettlement programmes that were carried on in Newfoundland and so little attention paid, where resources and our mines were taken to other avenues which did not succeed, Mr. Speaker. And we say, as a government, whatever wealth we would gain from any new industries, from hydro development or offshore gas and oil should be directed at our renewable industries, of course, the major one being the fishery.

We have very little room for expansion in other renewable industries. Our forest industry is probably as far as it can go right now. It probably will not get much bigger unless there are

MR. ANDREWS: new scientific techniques invented. Our agriculture, as we all know, is very limited. The only other renewable resource that we have in Newfoundland and Labrador is the fishery and I do not believe that we have even touched the tip of the iceberg yet. We have not applied the proper science and technology. We certainly have not applied the

MR. ANDREWS: proper business management techniques, modern business management techniques to the industry, but I believe the industry is going to be forced now, both by the federal government and by the provincial government, to take up the challenge. They are going to be forced because there is an outstanding bill to be paid of several hundred million dollars, and the industry does not seem capable of paying it the way it operates now. There is going to have to be some drastic changes in the structure of the industry. Mr. Kirby has said that. Whether you agree with everything that he said is immaterial. I think we all agree that there has to be some major structural changes. Whether you go to the left or to the right in your economic and political philosophy, I think we all agree that there are major changes needed.

Mr. Speaker, we have done our share I believe as a provincial government, more than our share over the past two years. We have assisted over eighteen fish companies in Newfoundland representing thirty fish plants. We are now as a provincial government exposed to the tune of some \$65 million, the federal government some \$13 million. Two-thirds - Mr. Speaker, here is the mentality right now of the federal government regarding the fishing industry in Atlantic Canada and, in particular, Newfoundland: two-thirds of all the fishing effort in Atlantic Canada is here in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador and mainly on the Island of Newfoundland. And this bears repeating, there are approximately 1,600 federal employees of the Federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, and two-thirds of them are in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, and one-third stationed in Newfoundland, even though we produce here in this

MR. ANDREWS:

province two-thirds of the fish. I am wondering, as the Premier said, which also need repeating, What will happen when the Federal Government as it claims it will, and if the final Court rules in their favour, get control of the offshore oil? How many of the Petroleum involved people from the Federal Government will live in Newfoundland? Where will the decisions be made for Search and Rescue and for the environment issues and the day to day issues that have to be addressed? Ottawa has the financial control in their hands right now to do what is needed to be done -

MR. NEARY: Take the candy out of your gob, boy when you are speaking.

MR. ANDREWS: It is a piece of ice, Sir. It is called frozen water. Whatever the Opposition may say about what the Province is trying to do here to help the fishing industry, we have helped, we have helped a lot. We now say that we cannot spend anymore money, we do not have the vast amounts of money to spend, the hundreds and hundreds of millions of dollars that are necessary. It is up to Ottawa now.

MR. NEARY: We are talking about plants.

MR. ANDREWS: It is up to Ottawa now. If you had been here a few minutes ago we explained to the hon. House why it was not just a matter of opening fish plants. It is an intricately complicated problem that we have on our hands, Mr. Speaker, to repeat, a problem of fish allocations, a problem of trawler replacement, a problem of financing a trawler fleet and a problem of resource short plants.

MR. NEARY: Could you tell us how much is required.

MR. ANDREWS: How much fish is required? There is a potential increase of about 150 million tons, as

MR. ANDREWS: far as I know.

MR. NEARY: There is, eh?

MR. ANDREWS: Yes, when the stock is rebuilt. This is the other thing, Mr. Speaker, that we must demand, that we have always done since 1979-80, that the Northern cod belongs to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and when that stock increases that it does not go under any so-called rationalization of the fishery, that it does not go to Nova Scotia or Prince Edward Island or New Brunswick, that it stays in this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. And whatever the Federal Government is going to do in restructuring, we will demand that that fish will stay in this province.

MR. TULK: How much more fish is required to keep all the fish plants open?

MR. ANDREWS: The fish do not go up in the Gulf. The fish do not swim close to Prince Edward Island. That fish can be taken from the Northeast coast of Newfoundland and taken to Ramea by trawler and taken to LaPoile by trawler and taken to Grand Bruit by trawler, if there was a fish plant there and I would like to see some of it go to LaPoile, the great people of LaPoile.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the hon. minister would permit a question.

MR. ANDREWS: I am not the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, if he is asking a technical question.

MR. TULK: I do not know if you know the answer, I am just asking.

MR. ANDREWS: I will listen to the question.

MR. TULK: How much more fish would be required to make the plants along the South Coast of this Province, everyone of them, viable? I mean, I am asking you a serious question.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS: I do not know the answer, Mr. Speaker, but I would say you would certainly need - instead of 150,000 tons, probably if you had another 50,000 tons, 60,000 tons - that is a ball park figure - into the South Coast plants, the Burin Peninsula plants, Ramea, Burgeo - Burgeo is fine right now.

MR. TOBIN: The 83,000 tons that the federal government gave to the EEC countries, if we had had that last year there would be no plants closed.

MR. ANDREWS: Yes, that would certainly be sufficient.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, on that point - I am glad the hon. member brought that up, because on that point, in this paper here that the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador presented to the Kirby Task Force, we addressed that problem of foreign allocations. And it is the government's policy that the so-called commensurate benefits policy, that is a trade off of fish quotas for lower tariffs of fish into the EEC, has not been successful. And our position is that we have no more foreign allocations at all, especially now, considering the EEC's position on the annual seal hunt. And, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) has so rightly stated,

MR. ANDREWS: if that fish was landed here in Newfoundland and Labrador, even at this point in time, it would greatly ease the situation. But that in itself, I do not think, Mr. Speaker, is the whole answer as I come back to it again. I mean, the cost of catching this fish has become phenomenal now. This is a major issue. Once again you have to come back to the whole problem of marketing, one which I have not addressed, producing a product that the consumer wants not what they think they should have. And we have been doing that for so long in Newfoundland; we have been doing it for hundreds of years in the salt fish industry and it is a hangover now into the fresh frozen industry - buy what is caught, freeze it as quickly as we can and sell it. And the bigger the volume, you think, the more money you are going to have. And that is not the case at all. Sometimes, I would say, for half the production at a third more in price would double your profit. And I think this is a problem that has to be seriously addressed. We saw last Winter the problem that the draggers ran into, or the Winter before last, the mad dash to the Northern cod stocks, vessels out of Ramea and Burgeo. I saw seven vessels fully loaded in Burgeo, but there was no way that that fish could ever be produced as a quality product and sold into any market in the world. Certainly the people in Burgeo were not going to eat it, I will tell you that, and they are no different than the people in the United States of America or England.

Mr. Speaker, this government's policy is that there are no surpluses anymore.

MR. ANDREWS: There are no surpluses. And as the surpluses arise, temporary surpluses, we keep them to increase the stock, to increase the base from which we can increase the stock even further. And as that stock increases then we can build more trawlers, then we can hire more people on in our fish plants, put on longer shifts, more shifts, and increase our production of a good quality product.

MR. TULK: Is it feasible to fish the Northern cod from South Coast fish plants?

MR. ANDREWS: Yes, it is quite feasible to fish the Northern cod from South Coast fish plant, a lot more feasible than it is to fish the Northern cod from the Lunenburg plants. Even then the Nova Scotian companies want to get their hands on that fish, because they can load very quickly and get back home very quickly.

MR. TULK: How does it compare with fishing out of Catalina?

MR. ANDREWS: Well, it is quite obvious, Mr. Speaker, the closer the fish plant would be to the fish stock - the closer the plant is to the stock the better quality of fish you are going to have landed. St. Anthony or Catalina or Twillingate would have a better opportunity to have a better quality product delivered. But I would say this, that at the time of the year when this fish is being caught it is quite cold and there should be no difficulty in delivering the fish to a South Coast fish plant, and it is being done right now all of the time. We need, of course - this comes back once again to the problem of the trawler fleet. We have to have a trawler fleet that is ice equipped, that is enforced for ice, that is capable of high power to maneuver and drag in ice; a lot of our trawlers are not, more of our newer ones are. But the older ones are not and as they need to be replaced they are going to very expensive propositions.

MR. ANDREWS: You are talking today, I guess, of \$5 million, \$6 million, \$10 million per unit, depending on what kind of a vessel and size of a vessel you are going to have. This is money that the companies do not have. This is money that I do not think even the Kirby Task Force that we have been talking about in this Legislature for the last week or so, when we toss out the figures of \$2 million or \$3 million, these are figures I do not think that are even included in that. There is a lot of money needed, Mr. Speaker. The money has to come from Ottawa. This is why I cannot vote in favour of the amendment, because the Province of Newfoundland has done its share, the federal government has not. But I do support the motion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas): The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I want to make a few remarks in connection with the amendment put by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to the motion on the Order Paper today by the member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). Now, Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, Private Members' Day, when we were also on a Private Member's Bill which dealt with the fishery this is the third Wednesday now

MR. W. CALLAN:

and we are still on Private Members' bills that are discussing the fishery. I was not here last Wednesday, Mr. Speaker, but I did read last Wednesday's Hansard. Some of it I read twice, because some of the speakers who spoke last Wednesday referred to what I had to say the Wednesday before that, and talked about the fact that I had made a political speech. It was not a speech on the fishery, it was a political speech. But, Mr. Speaker, that member or any member on either side of the Legislature must realize that one cannot help but make a political speech on this matter because, let us face it, it is totally political. Everything about it is political. If one does not realize that, then you do not expect very much. And, as a matter of fact, the person who criticized my speech as being political - I read Hansard and I read what that lady had to say about it in her speech, I read it twice - nothing that she said offered any suggestions, offered any solutions to the crisis in the fishery today. Now, Mr. Speaker, last Wednesday, as I have said, I was not here. As a matter of fact, I was out in my district. I spent about an hour and a half or two hours out in a high school, right out in Don Jamieson country, out in Swift Current which is, we hear, the tail end of the district of Bellevue.

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible) I bet.

MR. CALLAN: Excellent. I was glad to get back in the classroom of course, having been a teacher for a dozen years or so before becoming involved in this survival of the fittest again.

MR. SIMMS: And you have been in and out of here.

MR. CALLAN: No, I have not actually. Not that much.

MR. W. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, speaking about Don Jamieson country, I heard today the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) talking about the hon. Don Jamieson in glowing terms, talking about how great a Newfoundlander he was and all the good he did for the Province when, of course, he was sort of the federal Cabinet in Ottawa. I was glad to hear that because, Mr. Speaker, it was only last week that I heard the Premier saying almost the same thing. He talked about Don Jamieson - the Premier - talked about Don Jamieson in glowing terms. Now, actually what he was doing was comparing him and his performance with Newfoundland's present Minister, Rompkey, but he was talking about Don Jamieson in glowing terms. And after I finished my two hours at the school in Swift Current last Wednesday, I had occasion to drop in and see several constituents, friends and supporters and so on, and one of the gentleman whose house I visited also made a comment about Don Jamieson, and his comment was to the effect that certainly by now Newfoundlanders, especially the Newfoundlanders who voted against Don Jamieson for Premier in 1979, and, of course, the Newfoundlanders who again last Spring voted in the same man as Premier - he said, 'Certainly Newfoundlanders must be beginning now to realize what a terrible mistake they not only made in last Spring's general election but the foolish mistake that they made in 1979.' And, of course, hindsight is a wonderful thing and the Premier in everything that he does and says is hindsight. He talks about the Upper Churchill and he talks about things -

MR. CALLAN: when the Supreme Court of Newfoundland unanimously, three judges said that we had no jurisdiction over the offshore, the Premier went back as far as, 'Well, it was a mistake that the Commission of Government made.' You know, it was not bad enough for the Premier to say that Frank Moores was no good - and he said it, because I heard him.'

MR. NEARY: He even jumped over Joey Smallwood.

MR. CALLAN: Yes. It was not enough for him to say that Frank Moores was not a good Premier and Joey Smallwood was no good, now the Premier in his desperation is going back and blaming the Commissioners.

MR. TOBIN: What about the fishery?

MR. CALLAN: I am talking about the fishery. I am going to talk about the fishery. The gentleman who just took his seat was talking about the Northern cod and that gives me some arguments to prove that this is a political matter. Because, Mr. Speaker, what is happening in this Province right now - I do not know how many Newfoundlanders are aware of it, but this Province, which has been drifting, according to the Premier, and has been suffering and has been a 'have not' Province for all those number of years - what the Premier is doing, the Premier, for political expediency and for his own will is prepared to let the Province drift on with no offshore agreement or anything else. He is prepared to let all that happen for another two years. He is prepared to let all of these Newfoundlanders out there who have no employment - he is prepared to let it go on for two more years until, he expects, there will be a change of government in Ottawa and, of course, then he will get his offshore agreement, then he will get all that he has been talking about from the new federal government in Ottawa.

MR. TOBIN: On a point of order,
Mr. Speaker.

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

The hon. the member for
Burin - Placentia West on a point of order.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, the hon.
member is not being relevant to the discussion.(inaudible).

MR. WARREN: Oh, sit down, boy, you do not
even know what the resolution is!

MR. CALLAN: Aha! - A new parliamentarian!

MR. TOBIN: I do not think, Mr. Speaker, the offshore
is part of the resolution nor the amendment to the resolution.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to that point of
order.

MR. SPEAKER: To that point of order, the hon.
the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that same hon.
gentleman who just made the point of order spent twenty
minutes this afternoon completely irrelevant to the motion
that obviously was written for him.

MR. HODDER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: Somebody wrote the resolution
for him and he put it on the Order Paper. He obviously
did not understand it. He was completely irrelevant to
the motion that was on the Order Paper. I would submit
this is not a point of order, Mr. Speaker. As Your Honour
knows, the rule of relevancy is very difficult to -

MR. DINN: To define.

MR. NEARY: No, to make a judgement on
or to define, yes.

So I would say that it is merely
a difference of opinion between two hon. members, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

This point of order raised by the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) was indeed not a very valid point of order and the rule of relevancy is difficult to rule on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, now that I have been interrupted by the learned parliamentarian - the expert, because he is out of order more times himself than anybody else in the legislature with his shouting across the House. But the point that I was about to make is this, when he interrupted, that the Premier may be fooling some Newfoundlanders but I do not think he is fooling very many when he tries to pretend to us that when we have a change of government in Ottawa in a couple of years time, as he expects and hopes, then we will get what we want for this Province. Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker, I hope, have not forgotten the on-running and the continual battle that the Premier, the same Premier, had with the Tory government in Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. CALLAN: Now, the minister who just took his seat talked about Northern cod and he said, 'Our position has been, ever since 1980, that we feel that we should have all the Northern cod'. Now, then, let us look at 1980.

MR. WARREN: Who was in power then?

MR. CALLAN: If my colleague here would let me continue. Let us look at 1980. Let us look at what he says. And I will table this if I have to. I am quoting from a newspaper. It says, "The Premier said again yesterday," and this is December 13, 1979, "Peckford said again yesterday that Newfoundland wants 85 per cent of the catch reserved for its inshore fishermen and the other 15 per cent allocated to Newfoundland trawlers, if any trawlers at all are to be allowed into the area. In any event, Mainland and foreign trawlers should be barred." Here is what Jim McGrath, the Federal Fisheries Minister

MR. CALLAN: of the same political stripe, had to say, "Federal Fisheries Minister James McGrath, the first Newfoundlander to hold that portfolio, also mentioned national unity in a speech Tuesday in St. John's that reaffirmed Ottawa's position." Now here it is, here is the Tory Federal Fisheries Minister, here is what he said, "How could I expect that Newfoundland would be taking a position which could lead to Balkanization at a time when it has more to gain from Canadian unity and concerted political action than ever before in our history."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN: So, Mr. McGrath as Federal Fisheries Minister was saying to the Premier, "No, you cannot have 100 per cent of the Northern cod". Here is how it was divided by that Federal Fisheries Minister, the Tory one. "Despite Newfoundland's protest the 1979 Total Allowable Catch of 180,000 tons for Northern cod would be divided in line with federal policy," McGrath said.

MR. STAGG: What did we say about it?

MR. CALLAN: Newfoundland inshore fishermen would be allowed 110,000 tons; Canadian offshore trawlers 45,000 tons; and foreign vessels 25,000 tons. The figures are metric tons.

~So you see, Mr. Speaker, this is just one quote and I have several quotes, some of them from the national papers and, of course, also the Premier's own statement which he made here to the Legislature, you see. So if the Premier thinks he is conning Newfoundlanders into believing that we cannot get anything out of this present federal government but we will get something out of the next one, then what he is doing is asking Newfoundlanders to forget the facts, forget the fact that during the nine month period that Joe Clark, John Crosbie, Finance Minister; Jim McGrath, Federal Fisheries Minister; during the nine months that they were in power there was a running fight between the Premier and Joe Clark, embarrassing Joe Clark over the offshore. He did not get an agreement on the offshore and did not get the sorts of things that they were looking for from the Federal Fisheries Minister of their own political stripe.

So that is why, Mr. Speaker, that I say that anybody who does not see that this whole issue of the fisheries, if they do not see and do not realize that it is a political fight all the way down the line and it is a political

MR. CALLAN: matter, then, of course, they have short memories or convenient memories, that they do not remember what had transpired in earlier times.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the people who spoke last week, the member for Twillingate (Mrs. Reid) - the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) spoke last week. I read what he had to say, and again, all that our Provincial Fisheries Minister had to say, Mr. Speaker, was condemning Ottawa, blaming the fisheries problems in this Province on Ottawa, no solutions! Our present Minister of Fisheries was saying in essence the same thing that the Premier is saying, that there are no solutions, everything is the fault of the Federal Government in Ottawa and the only solution is to wait a year or two until we have another federal election and hopefully elect a Tory government. But forget the fact now that we had them there, we had them there from May of 1979 until February of 1980, forget all that. Forget all that. Do not blame us for not being able to negotiate with our colleagues, colleagues of the same political stripe when they were in power. Forget that. It is a point that has to be made and has to be stressed.

MR. SIMMS: Wrong point. Wrong point.

MR. CALLAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, here we have the former Speaker whose picture was hung yesterday, or whenever, today, and here he is, he is not even in his own seat. He should know the rules of the Legislature, at least as well as his colleagues to his right there, another former Speaker. At least that former Speaker is in his own seat but he is not hassling and -

MR. SIMMS: I cannot hear you back there.

MR. TULK: Go back and sit down, boy.

MR. W. CALLAN: You see, Mr. Speaker, at least you would expect him not to be setting the bad example that he is setting for the member for Burin (Mr. Tobin) who does a good job at it himself, Burin - Placentia West. Mr. Speaker, the problem in the fisheries in this Province and the way we have so many fish plants closing in this Province, the problem is obvious to everybody. In my own district, in the district of Bellevue, in Arnold's Cove at the National Sea Plant, that plant is running at capacity, the same as it was last Summer, last Fall. Down in Southport, Mr. Speaker, the fish plant is operating at capacity with fish that is being trucked in from places like Ramea and elsewhere. Last Summer, Mr. Speaker, when the fish plants were closing like the one in Burin, there was one fish plant in the district of Bellevue that closed, it was the Arctic Fisheries fish plant in South Dildo. Why did it have to close? The reason, Mr. Speaker, was plain to everybody in the town. You had Fred Woodman's fish plant in New Harbour, you had Ron Higdon's fish plant in New Harbour, you had Newfoundland Quick Freeze and you had what used to be the Fur Farmers Plant, there were too many plants. Why are there too many plants, Mr. Speaker? I will tell you why, Mr. Speaker, and they know why, because when the bottom went out of the economy in this Province, when the oil refinery in Come By Chance and other industries closed, what happened? Walter Carter, the Minister of Fisheries and his colleagues in Cabinet decided that the answer to Newfoundland's problems was to issue as many processing licences as they could and even though the Premier - and here again is when the Premier only tells half of something - even though the Premier said publicly that the reason we have so many fish plants is because they were built by federal money - the Premier said that but he knew he

MR. W. CALLAN: was wrong, because the Premier knows that many of the fish plants, and some that I just mentioned in the district of Bellevue, were not built with federal dollars, they were built through private enterprise and they were built with provincial dollars,

MR. CALLAN: And the processing licences, obviously, were issued by this Province. Now the problems, Mr. Speaker, are easy to see; the solution, hopefully, we will have in the very near future. The Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) know what the solution is now. They know what the results of the Kirby Task Force will be and what the implementations are going to be. But they are being very quite on it, Mr. Speaker, because they want the federal government to come down and say, 'Here is the answer. We think that the plant in Burin has to remain closed.' Then the provincial government, after the fact and after the deed is done, even though they know about it now, will be able to say to the people in Burin or Ramea or Trepassey or anywhere else, they will be able to say, Mr. Speaker, 'Here is bad old Ottawa again, blame them. They were the ones who decided that your fish plant has to remain closed.' That is what they are doing, they are sitting on the fence.

MR. TOBIN: You are saying there are too many plants around. Which ones should be closed.

MR. CALLAN: Now, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin), who is not in his seat, as usual, and who is bawling across the Legislature, as usual, should know and must remember that he had twenty minutes earlier and I did not hassle him.

MR. TOBIN: You never stopped.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I listened attentively and the member said very little. He spoke, of course, using the sort of philosophical language and the adjectives that Tories use. John Lundrigan was a master at it when he was here in the Legislature. I remember talking about rural development and he shouted out philosophical stuff that meant nothing. It sounded good, talking about the courageous fishermen in Burin and

MR. CALLAN: the courageous fishermen here; Fishermen are courageous everywhere. And the people who lost their lives on the Ocean Ranger a year ago were courageous, some of them from my own hometown. Mr. Speaker, I hope to resume when the hon. gentleman from Stephenville has spoken.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the first time I have been able to out-manoeuve the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins). He is usually very quick on his feet and, it being Private Members' Day, I thank the Chair for recognizing me.

Mr. Speaker, again the amendment that is proposed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) is probably symptomatic of the problems that have been encountered by the Liberal Party in this Province for a long time - in both the pre-Moores' government and the post-Smallwood period.

MR. STAGG: The Liberal Party in this Province has not recognized that the fishery is a vital part of the electoral and political process of this country. They are gradually coming around to recognizing that Newfoundland will never be the Rhur Valley of North America and that the resource that is most basic to the lives of Newfoundlanders is one that they should hitch their wagon to. They have come to it very recently, As a matter of fact, really for the first time probably a month or so ago I heard something rational come from the Opposition concerning the seal fishery.

MR. SIMMS: Rational?

MR. STAGG: Yes, it was actually rational. It was proposed by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), not really proposed by him but he got a lot of play in the press concerning the seal hunt, the seal fishery, advocating that we have processing of it in Newfoundland. And, certainly, I thought they were on the right track there. It is something that we had proposed previously and certainly it is nice to know that they associate themselves with these initiatives taken by the government.

MR. TULK: When did you propose that?

MR. STAGG: But I do encourage them that in the long process of political science in understanding the political psyche of Newfoundlanders, they are finally coming around to recognizing that political power in this Province is directly related to how much you are committed to the fishery. So I commend them in that regard, Give them another fifteen years or so and they may sneak back into power.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the amendment that was proposed by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) urges both governments, that is both the Government of

MR. STAGG: Newfoundland and the Government of Canada, to exercise without delay their responsibilities for ensuring the contingent viability of the fishing industry. Now, Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House, and our predecessors before us on this side of the House, have always advocated that the fishery of this Province is a vital part of the cultural and economic fabric of the Province. I recall being here from 1971 to 1975 and continuously on Private Members' Days we debated the 200 mile limit. I recall the hon. members opposite who said, 'If you get the 200 mile limit and Newfoundland has any jurisdiction over it, it will be a disaster. You will not be able to look after it.

MR. ANDREWS: They said that?

MR. STAGG: They said that. Yes, they said it. I do not know if any hon. member opposite were there.

MR. NEARY: I was.

MR. STAGG: I was here, but none of them were here because they are Johnnies-Come-Lately to the political process.

MR. CALLAN : The Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) was here.

MR. STAGG: The Leader of the Opposition was here and the former, former, former Leader of the Opposition was here.

MR. ANDREWS: Which one was that?

MR. STAGG: That is the former, former, former Leader of the Opposition. That is the Leader of the Opposition we wiped out in March of 1972. Then the present Leader of the Opposition wiped him out in 1977.

MR. SIMMS: Acting leader.

MR. STAGG: He is the present acting leader of the Opposition.

MR. STAGG: In any event, the fishery was debated by us on every occasion that it presented itself, and certainly the positions that have been put forward by this side of the House on numerous occasions are well known. They basically say that we want more say in the fishery, that we recognize it as a vital area in the economic and social fabric of the Province, and we want more control.

MR. STAGG: Now we have had some problems. We had some problems during the brief period when Mr. McGrath was Minister of Fisheries. It was not something that we arrived at lightly, but we did come into the House and we indicated that we disagreed violently with his position. Now if Mr. McGrath had been there much longer I am sure that we would have gotten through to him and he would have changed his mind.

MR. SIMMS: They would never do that.

MR. STAGG: Oh, they would never do that, of course. No. They would never do it because they are the people who of course slavishly follow Mr. Chretien and Mr. Lalonde and all of their federal colleagues to whom they might have to go and look for a job some day. That is the kind of people we are dealing with over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: So I suggest, Mr. Speaker, I am going to vote against this amendment which calls upon the Government of Newfoundland to exercise without delay their responsibilities.

MR. SIMMS: Tell us about the Japanese caplin. Hurry up.

MR. STAGG: The first part of the amendment, I must say I agree with that, urging the Government of Canada to exercise its responsibilities. I am going to deal with something that is maybe a little bit technical, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: No. Deal with the rents on the Harmon Complex deal. You know all about that.

MR. STAGG: I am going to deal with the constitutional position of the -

MR. SIMMS: Deal with the Japanese caplin.

MR. STAGG: The Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) wants me to talk about the Japanese caplin. Well, I will give you a few minutes on the caplin for the Japanese.

This is another one of the short-sighted economic thrusts of the federal government. You see, the Japanese - I have been called upon many times to repeat this - the Japanese are people who are prone to aphrodisiacs. Now aphrodisiacs are well known to hon. gentlemen opposite.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SIMMS: They are one.

MR. STAGG: It has to deal with one's libido. The Japanese think that they get certain sex drive stimulus from the roe of the female caplin. And, lo and behold, in 1980 or thereabouts we had a problem with the automobile industry in Canada, too many Japanese cars coming into the country, so Mr. MacEachen, I guess it was, and whoever, Mr. Tanaka or Mr. Yomato -

MR. SIMMS: Tanaka.

MR. STAGG: - whoever happened to be the Japanese Prime Minister at the time, made an agreement. The Japanese were in dire straits with regard their supply of roe and we were in dire straits because there were too many Japanese cars coming over to our shores. So there was a trade-off, and the trade-off was we gave 25,000 metric tons of caplin from the offshore Newfoundland to the Japanese; they could come over and catch them themselves and export it to Japan and they would never see the light of day in Newfoundland, so

MR. STAGG: off they went. Off went our Newfoundland caplin to the Japanese and in return we got a verbal agreement that the Japanese would not ship as many cars into Canada. Well, the Japanese did not stick by their verbal agreement. It was not worth the paper it was written on, unlike the agreement that Mr. Chretien was try to perpetrate on us on the offshore. And that is the kind of policy that the federal government has exercised with regard to the fishing industry in Newfoundland. They have used it as trade bait. The Newfoundland fish has been used as bait in the industrial strategy that perpetrates the unfairness of the Canadian system, the golden triangle, the Hamilton, Oshawa, Toronto golden triangle and that area. If somebody needs some of the raw natural resource from one of the extremities of Canada, be it in

MR. F. STAGG: the Northern extremities, that is in the Beaufort Sea area or that area, or in the East, which they have now grandiosely styled as the Canada's Lands. The Province of Newfoundland, by the way, has diminished at least in the eyes of the Government of Canada. The geographical definition of the Province of Newfoundland is now diminished in size and there is a vast area of Canada, that is almost like another province of Canada or a territory, known as the Canada Lands, which commences either three or twelve miles offshore and is Canadian territory. That is not Newfoundland territory, that is Canadian territory. This unfortunately given a certain amount of credibility by the recent decision of the Supreme Court of Newfoundland - I shall not call it our Supreme Court of Newfoundland at this stage.

So, we have some difficulty with that and we do not accept that the geographical area of the Province of Newfoundland has been restricted in that manner. However, the legal process is giving us a certain amount of difficulty at this time. It will be solved through the political process, gentlemen, and the political process is rapidly gaining momentum in this Province. We know who the next Prime Minister of Canada is going to be: A man who sat in this House, who was once the Minister of Fisheries for the Province of Newfoundland, who enunciated in the most articulate way just where Newfoundland stood.

MR. TULK: Wishful thinking.

MR. STAGG: Wishful thinking.

You mark my words, it will be solved through the political process, gentlemen.

Now, I want to quote from the

MR. F. STAGG: Constitution, the Constitution Act, 1982. There are two sections in the Constitution, Section 6, which deals with mobility rights, and I am going to read from it, says, "Every citizen of Canada has the right to enter, remain and leave Canada"; Subsection 2, "Every citizen of Canada and every person who has the status of a permanent resident in Canada has the right to pursue the gaining of a livelihood in any province." Do hon. gentlemen have that? Where is the Province of Newfoundland, gentlemen? Is the Province of Newfoundland merely that portion of Canada which is above water or does the Province of Newfoundland extend offshore?

MR. TULK: Are you questioning the Supreme Court judges?

MR. STAGG: Am I questioning the Supreme Court judges? The Supreme Court judges decision is under appeal. That is the ultimate in disputing the judgement of judges.

MR. NEARY: You have no respect for anything.

MR. STAGG: If a provincial court judge had decided in a certain way, hon. gentleman opposite, in their slavish obedience to the law - now hon. gentleman opposite I know are great law abiders who never break the law - they would say, 'Well, that is it, the court has decided a certain way.' One court has decided it, and that judgment is under appeal.

So quoting from the Constitution again, it says, "Every citizen of Canada and every person who has the status of a permanent residence in Canada has the right to pursue the gaining of a livelihood in any province." However, that is subject to Subsection (4) of Section 6, which deals with affirmative action programmes.

MR. STAGG: It says, "Subsections (2) and (3) do not preclude any law, program or activity that has as its object the amelioration" - that is a good word, gentlemen, you should learn that one - "the amelioration in a province of conditions of individuals in that province who are socially or economically disadvantaged if the rate of employment in that province is below the rate of employment in Canada."

Now, gentlemen, I would suggest, if the Dominion of Canada and the Department of Fisheries and Oceans for Canada are not pursuing or do not pursue affirmative action programmes for the Province of Newfoundland, then they are in violation of the Constitution.

I will go on to one other section that gives more credibility to this argument. It deals with Section 36 (1) Equalization and Regional Disparities, not a term with which we are unfamiliar. Section 36 (1): "Without altering the legislative authority of Parliament or the provincial Legislatures or the rights of any of them with respect to the exercise of their legislative authority, Parliament and the Legislatures, together with the Government of Canada and the provincial governments, are committed to" - I will just read that portion of it again: "Parliament and the Legislatures, together with the Government of Canada and the provincial governments, are committed to (a) promoting equal opportunities for the well-being of Canadians" - "equal opportunity for the well-being of Canadians", this is in the Constitution. This is what they are committed to, and anything diverging from that, I would submit, is unconstitutional.

Subsection (b), they are committed to "furthering economic development to reduce disparity in opportunities." That is in the Constitution.

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that the policies that have been followed by the Government of Canada, as they have been a predator upon the resource that we brought into this country in 1949 - they have developed predatory tactics - their activities have been in violation of the Constitution and their activities are unconstitutional.

Now, we have not yet framed a position whereby they will be forced to do the things that are consistent with Subsections (a) and (b) of Section 36, but I think that it is going to come under extreme scrutiny, and it will assure, or should assure that when we have a government in place that is well-meaning and that has the philosophy that strong regions make up a strong Canada, strong regions make up a strong country, only then will this Constitution be lived up to.

One of the main problems we have in this world - in some respects, Canada is a microcosm of the world - is that the greatest constitutions in the world are sometimes written in the nations which are least willing to carry out proper human rights activities and so on, Russia, of course, being a classic example. To read the Russian Constitution, one would think that they were in Sir Thomas More's Utopia.

MR. STAGG: Unfortunately, as we all know, life in Russia is very cruel, and all of the things that are in their constitution are honoured in the breach. So what we have here, gentlemen, is a document, the 1982 Canada Act, which forms the basis for some hope for the future of this Province whereby the Government of Canada can eventually be forced to do the things that are consistent with the proper development of our fishery and not continue to be the predator that they have been on our resource for so long.

Now, my colleague for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) gave some very interesting statistics earlier. I do not know where he got his statistics, but it certainly showed a great deal of research and they certainly bear repeating.

MR. CALLAN: Probably fabricated.

MR. STAGG: The hon. gentleman for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) says they are fabricated. Obviously he does not like the truth because they deal with his soul mates in Ottawa, the Liberals in Ottawa. My friend from Burin-Placentia West indicated that May 10, 1980 the federal government put \$200 million into Chrysler. They had already invested 25,000 tons of our caplin, but they also put \$200 million into it as well. The Dome Petroleum - we all heard of Smiling Jack Gallagher. Well no wonder Smiling Jack was smiling - the federal government, hand in hand with the big banks of the country, put \$1 billion into Dome Petroleum, \$1 billion.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is not fabrication.

MR. STAGG: Bill C-134, the Government of Canada made \$260 million of credit available to farmers for low interest loans. Mirabel Airport - where is Mirabel Airport? - only \$700 million into that white elephant. Mirabel

MR. STAGG: Airport, \$700 million. Advertising and information, \$235 million. Now we come down to last year, this great crisis we had in the Newfoundland fishery last year, a tremendous crisis we had in the fishery where this government, strapped as it was for money, had to put how much money into it? Over \$20 million into the fishery.

DR. COLLINS: \$26 million

MR. STAGG: \$26 million. What was our deficit last year? Our deficit last year was up around forty-something million dollars. And who came to the rescue of the Newfoundland fishery? We put \$26 million into the Newfoundland fishery. What did the federal government put into it, these people who would put \$700 million into Mirabel Airport, \$235 million into advertising and propaganda for themselves - remember the geese flying across the screen, the advertisement, the Canada Act and so on? - and \$200 million into Chrysler and \$1 billion into Dome, what did they put into it? We put \$26 million. I have got about \$3 billion here that they have put into other things. \$13 million they put into the Newfoundland fishery last year. So that is some indication of the kind of people that we are dealing with and the difficulties that we have in this Province. It is not an easy job being a politician in this Province when your objectives are long range, when your objectives are those which are principled objectives, and when you know that you have to go home on the weekends and face the electorate and when you are the person who is closest to the electorate, when you are the only government that the people can defeat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Order, please!

MR. STAGG: The only government that the people of Newfoundland can elect and defeat is the provincial government. They cannot elect and defeat the

MR. STAGG: federal government. So consequently we are closer to them and we react to them and we are right. Even more importantly, we are right.

MR. STAGG:

There is the spokesman for fisheries over there, gentlemen, there he is with his hand up, he does not want to hear any of these things. He does not believe in the things that we believe in on this side. The hon. gentleman does not believe that he is from a great fishing district. The hon. gentleman is a disgrace.

I believe my time is up, Mr.

Speaker, I wish I could go on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No leave.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am obliged to enter into this debate by just listening to the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg). He told us pretty well everything except about the rent increases in Stephenville on the Harnum Complex, and about his resignation in The Western Star. Those are the only things he did not tell us about.

Mr. Speaker, I was just looking across the House there and I noticed the hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde (Mr. Reid) and I have not heard the hon. member speak so far in this debate and he is from one of those fishery district in the Province. And I would only be too glad to take my seat and let the hon. member go ahead and speak for twenty minutes.

MR. REID: I would rather listen to your hot air.

MR. WARREN: Now I can understand, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member represents a fishery district, he has been in this House now, has been elected since April 6th, and yet he has failed to enter into any debate

MR. WARREN: in this hon. House on the fishery. He has not yet opened his mouth. And so, Mr. Speaker, you can see, they have somebody from Stephenville, somebody from the Harnum Complex speaking on the fishery, and there is a member who represents a fishing district and he has not yet said one word about the fishery, any yet we have the fishery on the Southern Shore of Trinity Bay in worse shape than it is in any other place in the Province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us look at this. You know, I do not know if the resolution, Mr. Speaker, is a waste of time. Honestly, I do not know, Mr. Speaker. Do you know why? Last week my hon. colleague for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) brought a resolution into this House. The resolution was sound and in good taste, and the second day into the debate the hon. member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn) brought in an amendment to the resolution which the hon. Speaker accepted as in order and, therefore, Mr. Speaker, all of a sudden the contents of the resolution was changed 360 degrees. In fact, Mr. Speaker, you were in the Chair when that change was to have taken place. And again today, Mr. Speaker, we have the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) bringing in a resolution and the second speaker in the debate, the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), bring in an amendment and again it is in order. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not challenging your ruling in any way at all, but

MR. WARREN: I would think, Mr. Speaker, that something has to be said about resolutions that are brought into this hon. House. If we are bringing them in as Private Members' resolutions, I think the Speaker should take every avenue possible to see that the resolution is not changed. As far as I am concerned, the contents of the last resolution that was brought into this House and the one brought in today have been changed and have been accepted and therefore, we will have to debate them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, speaking of the amendment, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) has intestinal fortitude, which is more than I can say for the hon. the member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin). The Leader of the Opposition did not say it was the problem of the provincial government or the problem of the federal government. What did the Leader of the Opposition say in his amendment? He said it is the problem of both governments.

MR. TULK: He wants it read. Read it to him.

MR. WARREN: Okay. In fact, to take up part of my twenty minutes, I will gladly read it to the hon. the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) who probably does not know a fish from a bird.

Mr. Speaker, herewith is the resolution in its totality:

WHEREAS the social and economic fabric of Newfoundland and Labrador has been and will continue to be interwoven with a viable fishing industry; and

WHEREAS the fishing industry during recent months has undergone severe economic adversity threatening the very existence of many communities in our Province; and

MR. WARREN:

WHEREAS an exhaustive study of the Atlantic fishery has been carried out by the Kirby Task Force requiring several months to complete; and

WHEREAS the Federal Government exercises most of the jurisdiction and control over our fishing and therefore is obligated to perform its constitutional duty such jurisdiction implies; and

WHEREAS it appears that re-structuring of the industry may be necessary to ensure future viability;

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House urges the Government of Canada to exercise without delay its responsibility for ensuring the continued viability of the industry; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that such action be taken in co-operation and consultation with the Province and with a view to minimizing the negative social and economic impact on our fishing industry."

What is wrong with it,

Mr. Speaker, is that all of a sudden the hon. rookie member from Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) comes into the House and he talks for half an hour just condemning Ottawa. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, as a Canadian and as a member of this House who likes to see unity in this Province, and taking on the fishery, trying to have a fishery in this Province which will be beneficial for all, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) -

MR. YOUNG: (Inaudible) a year ago.

MR. WARREN: Would the hon. the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) go back to his morgue?

MR. TULK: Send him back to the correctional Centre in Bishop's Falls.

MR. WARREN: Maybe the hon. member should go back to the morgue where he came from.

MR. WARREN:

The amendment, Mr. Speaker, reads that we strike out all the words - and it is very simple. Even the member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) can understand how simple the amendment is.

"NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House" - which includes the fifty-two members, "urge the Governments

MR. G. WARREN:

Newfoundland and Labrador and Canada - now, it says both governments - 'to exercise without delay their responsibility'.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is a resolution that asks all members of this House to realize the importance of the fishery in this Province. I understand the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) does not understand the fishery. So, Mr. Speaker, it is only natural for the former Speaker to be interrupting this House.

MR. TULK: You are making a show of him now.

MR. WARREN: I am making a show of him! He should have a little more common decency.

All we are saying is let us get together. This is the third week that we have been debating the fishery on Private Member's Day, so it must be important. The first two resolutions brought in by both sides of the House were on the fishery, so it is important and let us face that fact.

So, Mr. Speaker, all we are saying in this resolution in the heck with blaming Ottawa one day and the next week blaming the provincial government. Let us stop blaming each other and let us call upon both governments. Did not the minister say yesterday or the day before in answer did he not - to a question from the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that he is not going to tell the Opposition what they are going to do about the fishery?

MR. TULK: There is a good reason for that.

MR. WARREN: What is the reason?

MR. TULK: He did not know.

MR. WARREN: Is that anyway for us, as members elected by the people of this Province, to act? We have to

MR. G. WARREN: try to help the fishery that is in turmoil in this Province. Is that any way for the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to act, to get up and say, 'Look, we are not going to tell the Opposition about the fisheries.' Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? The hon. the Minister of Fisheries does not even know what is wrong with the fishery.

DR. J. COLLINS: Do you actually like fish?

MR. WARREN: Do I actually like fish? Yes. I would like to advise the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) that I really like fish. And furthermore, I would also advise him that if the hon. minister has seen as much fish in his lifetime as I have eaten he would be okay.

For the hon. member from St. John's South (Dr. Collins) to ask do I know anything about fish, he definitely asked the wrong person.

MR. TULK: He needs a lot of fish. They say it creates brains.

MR. COLLINS: I thought fish was good for you.

MR. WARREN: Why do you not tell us about your four flat tires Christmas?

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to get sidetracked.

Let us all get together, and maybe if we work together we can revive the fishery. We can revive the fishery.

MR. WARREN: The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) today spoke about the 400 year history of the fishery, and about the draggers and the captains of foreign boats coming to Newfoundland and fishing in our water and all of those kinds of things, okay, that is fine and dandy. That is history. As of today, from now on is the future. Maybe we will not have those people who were around Newfoundland for the past 400 years, we will not have those people back anymore. The people we have to worry about are those people in the galleries and young children. They are the people we have to worry about, our future generation. Therefore we should do everything possible to make sure that we can revive the fishery that has been in complete chaos for the last several years.

MR. TULK: Do you know what one fellow said to me? "Why does not Peckford give the oil a spell and get onto the fishery?"

MR. WARREN: A good idea. A good idea.

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible) me too.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Grand Falls (Mr. Simms) is continuously trying to interrupt me. Mr. Speaker, I am trying to make some sense - I may not be making any, but I am trying - and I would like to advise the hon. member that there is a serious problem with the fishery in my district. There is a most serious problem in my district and it is more the federal government's fault than the Province's.

MR.DINN:

What is it?

MR.WARREN:

I am going to tell the hon.member for Pleasantville (Mr. Dinn)- and there are not too many fish plants down in Pleasantville.

MR.DINN:

Not a lot. No.

MR.WARREN:

No. I will tell the hon.member what is wrong in my district and why the federal government are to blame.

SOME HON.MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR.WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Pleasantville would like to know what the problem is in my district. Now I will be only too glad to tell him if the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr.Hodder) would be quiet for a few minutes.

MR.STAGG:

There you go.

MR.WARREN:

And the same thing goes for the member for Stephenville (Mr.Stagg). I would gladly tell what the federal government is doing to practically drive the Makkovik fishermen out of their boats. That is practically what the federal government is doing, let me tell you

In 1980 there were three longliners from the Province that went North to Makkovik to fish. They had such a good voyage that the following year, 1981-1982 : there were twenty-two longliners from the Island fishing off Makkovik. So the fishermen's union all of a sudden got into it and said, "Look, we have to do something about it. The longliners are up there on the Labrador Coast fishing and getting lots of fish."

MR. DINN: How many the second year?

MR. WARREN: Twenty-two. The union said that they had to do something about it. So what did they do? The union went to the federal government and said, 'Look, we want over-the-side sales. We want to send a boat up to Labrador for over-the-side sales.' Meanwhile, there is a fish plant in Black Tickle, there is one in Makkovik, there is one in Nain and one in Cartwright, and none of these four fish plants processed any of the fish - and two of them were operated by the provincial government, by the way. The provincial government was asked to take species from these longliners, but they said, 'No, we have to keep at the salmon; we will not do anything with the cod'. So what happened?

MR. TULK: Were you with the department then?

MR. WARREN: No, this was after I came into the House here. So what happened was that over-the-side sales started to develop and the fish taken out of the water about a mile and a half from the fish plant in Makkovik and not only was it not shipped back here to the Island - my goodness, only fifteen minutes left! - but it was shipped to Portugal and Spain. And, Mr. Speaker, let us look at what happened last year. Last year there were not twenty-two but thirty-nine longliners fishing off Makkovik, and not one over-the-side sale arrangement but three! In the latter part of the year there was an extra one, so there were four foreign ships outside of the narrows in Makkovik Harbour collecting fish from thirty-nine longliners. And what happened to the fish? It went over to Portugal or Spain, that is what happened.

We had the Makkovik fish plant there, so I sent a telegram to the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) saying, 'Look, there is lots of fish here. Can we process some of the cod here at the fish plant? All that was required was a total investment of \$40,000 to get the shed ready.

MR. WARREN: So the minister sent me back a telegram and he said, 'We have not got time to get the money'.

MR. TULK: Have not got what?

MR. WARREN: 'Have not got the time to get the money.' And that was the answer the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) sent. Now it was the federal government's fault the boats were up there in the first place, but all the provincial government had to say was, 'Yes, boy, we will not let that fish go across the seas, we will process the fish here'. But the minister said, 'No, we cannot find \$40,000, Mr. Speaker.

Now, what is going to happen this year? Now there is talk that we will have anywhere from sixty-five to seventy longliners in Makkovik this year rather than just thirty-nine. What is going to happen is the inshore fishery in Makkovik in the next two years will be

MR. WARREN: completely wiped out because the longliners are there and they are going to take the fish before it comes ashore.

MR. DINN: (Inaudible) taking their fish or is it all coming ashore?

MR. WARREN: No, no!
There are only two local longliners and their fish is being processed in the plant.

MR. DINN: Are you objecting to the number of longliners or are you objecting to over-the-side sales?

MR. WARREN: I am objecting to the two things: The number of longliners, number one, because there are too many fishing, too close to the shore. If you are in a boat forty-five or fifty feet long, the least thing the operators of those longliners could do is to move two miles offshore. The federal government should definitely set up a zone for longliner fishermen. These are my objections against longliners. They are not against individual longliner operators, but against the policy the federal government has instituted for longliners which is unfair to the inshore fishermen.

Mr. Speaker, this is what is happening. God help us, I say, this year. If only the Saltfish Corporation would get out of bed with the union - because they are both in bed together - and if only the union would realize that, number one, the Labrador fishermen do not want to be part of the union, and, number two, they want as much fish as possible from the Newfoundland longliner fleet that comes up to Labrador instead of

MR. WARREN: selling that fish in over-the-side sales going to Portugal or Spain when it should be processed in Makkovik. They have a new salt shed there now, Mr. Speaker, built by the federal government.

MR. TULK: By whom?

MR. WARREN: By the federal government. The new salt shed has just been completed there over the Winter by the federal government, so now we can accommodate a lot of that fish. The only thing I would say to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) if he were in his place now -

MR. DINN: He is in Ottawa.

MR. WARREN: Then I hope the hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower (Mr. Dinn) will pass it along to the Minister of Fisheries that the least he can do is stand up for the fishermen along the Labrador Coast and say to Ottawa, 'Keep over-the-side sales away from Makkovik. The Makkovik people do not want them, I do not want them and neither do the Newfoundland longliners want them if they have a place to sell their fish, and there are facilities to sell their fish to up there now'.

MR. TOBIN: Who owns the facilities up there?

MR. WARREN: Who owns the facilities up there? The facilities up there, the fresh fish processing part of it is the provincial government's, but the salt part of it is the federal government's. It is too bad the hon. member was not here just now. It is too bad, you know. Only \$40,000 was needed last Summer for the completed shed and the Minister of Fisheries could not come up with it because the Premier wanted to live in Mount Scio.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

The hon. member's time has elapsed.

MR. WARREN: Oh, my gracious. Mr. Speaker, I was doing so good. Does anyone else want to speak?

MR. TULK: By leave! By leave!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No. No.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): Leave is not granted.

MR. WARREN: And by the way, Mr. Speaker, in response to the hon. minister -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WARREN: In response to the hon. minister -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
Does the hon. member have

leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Leave is not granted.

MR. WARREN: Ah, too bad.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I was at the University today and there was about one hundred students there and when I came in they cheered and they clapped and they shouted 'Hurrah'. Then I spoke to them for about half an hour and there was silence throughout the thing, they hung on every word. Then I said, 'Now I am going to have another whole half an hour for questions, and they asked the most cogent questions and they listened attentively to the answers I gave them and we went on for a whole half an hour. At the end of the thing I was congratulated profusely and people rushed up to shake my hand, they came up and asked me other questions on a private basis, and I could hardly tear myself away.

MR. HISCOCK: Did you have a chat with Dr. Montgomery.

DR. COLLINS: I am thinking about running for President of the University next year I am so popular up there.

MR. HODDER: I wish you would. At least it would get you out of here.

DR. COLLINS: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, there were some very brilliant speeches here today on the fishery, some very, very brilliant speeches, and I think other members of the House have learned a lot and the people in the gallery they learned a lot too. Unfortunately, none of the brilliant speeches came from the other side of the House. I do have to be accurate in my statements, but the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) gave a very incisive speech; he is obviously very familiar with the industry, he offered suggestions, he put his finger on where the faults were. Then we had the hon. Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) who, in his career as a journalist, as a media person had done extensive studies on the fisheries and had

DR. COLLINS: imbued the whole spirit of the fisheries into his being and he gave us the benefit of his experience today.

DR. COLLINS: Who else spoke?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: The member for Stephenville.

DR. COLLINS: Oh, the member for Stephenville!

An absolutely brilliant speech, wide-ranging. He covered the waterfront all the way from Tokoyo, I seem to remember, I think he mentioned Russia along the way, and he went all across the whole globe and even covered the constitution. And I forget any other subjects. There was so many points he covered, there was so much meat in his address that it was difficult to take it all in. Unfortunately, on the other side there was a lot of blundering and a lot of noise, inconsequential debating points. I do have to say, though, that I have to agree with one member on the opposite side, The gentleman for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) made a very good point -

MR. MARSHALL: The first point he ever made.

DR. COLLINS: - but it was a good point. He said that the fishery is, amongst other things, a political issue. And it is a political issue, because if it was not a political issue we would not be dealing with it here in this House - presumably the people in this House are politicians. The cure to the problems in the fishery ultimately will be through the political process and, as hon. members know, the Premier today and the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) are in Ottawa at this present time, I believe - I think they have now arrived there - and they are going to engage in political debate which we hope will do very much to cure the problems in the fishery.

DR. COLLINS: So it is a political issue. Unfortunately, the politicians on the other side do not seem to understand how to look at the problems in the fishery and put them into political terms. Now it was done brilliantly by many people on this side of the House, and all I can do is just summarize for the House, because it is getting near the end of this day, just summarize the points, the very incisive points made by members on this side of the House as to the problems of the fisheries.

Now, the first point, of course, is this, that there is no excess of processing plants in this Province. That is not the problem. It has been stated by some people that it is the problem, and unfortunately the hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) even fell into that trap along the way. It is not the problem. It has been stated by federal ministers that the problems of the Newfoundland fishery are too many processing plants. That is not so. What is the problem is that there are resource short, deep sea trawler processing fish plants. There are fish plants, on the South coast in particular, that do not have enough product to process. It is not that the communities that were based on the fishery, whose main activity is related to the fishery, whose people are trained in dealing with the fishery, both in the harvesting sector and in the processing sector, it is not that they are wrong- they should not be doing this and they should not have the plants there- it is that there is not enough fish going into these plants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why is this so essentially? And, of course, the main problem is that there are not enough trawlers feeding the deep sea processing plants in this Province. If we cannot say there are too few in number, at least they are not

DR. COLLINS: any longer efficient in doing it. Many of them are obsolete and there should be an improved trawler fleet. Now, Mr. Speaker, why is there not an improved trawler fleet? The reason why there is not an improved trawler fleet is it is too expensive in this country to build trawlers. Now in many countries of the world it is not too expensive. Trawlers can be built in Korea, they can be built in Poland, they can be built in Spain.

MR. SIMMS: In St. John's.

DR. COLLINS: No, they cannot be built in St. John's South but they could certainly be built along the Burin Peninsula. But they are not being built along the Burin Peninsula whereas they are being built in foreign lands, and indeed some of these foreign lands can build trawlers that come over and take our fish here. And, of course, as I just mentioned, we need the resource to go into our plants.

Now, Mr. Speaker, why do we not build more trawlers in this Province? The reason is we do not have in place federal policies for ship building in this Province to compare with the policies in other foreign lands. And that is a very, very serious defect in our whole approach to the fishery in Canada. And that is a crucial reason

DR. COLLINS: why there is not enough product going through our resource-short deep sea trawler processing plants. Now, Mr. Speaker, is that the only problem? Are there only two problems? Is it that there are not enough fish going into the plants? We know that there is not an excess of plants. Is it just that there are not enough fish going into the plants? And is it only that there are not enough trawlers being built in this country because of the absence of federal policies that do not give rise to that? No, Mr. Speaker, that is not the total answer.

The other answer is that we do not have in place a good marketing strategy. Our main market, as most people know - and I am sure every member of this House knows - our main market is in the United States and it probably always will be in the United States. We have a very, very small market on mainland Canada. What markets there are there have been developed essentially by Nova Scotia based companies. Our Newfoundland based companies have not developed the markets on mainland Canada. Why? The reason why they have not developed the markets on mainland Canada is the very reason why they have not adequately developed markets in our main market area, that is the United States: In other words, the companies themselves have a lot of blame to carry. They have not been good businessmen when it comes to developing a good, aggressive marketing structure and a good marketing strategy. They have tended to be inefficient in their approaches. They have not penetrated deeply enough into the U.S. market. They have tended to overcompete with one another. They have tended to dump their product. They have tended not to develop the product that is demanded by the market. In other words, the companies

DR. COLLINS: themselves have much
of the blame to carry for the difficulties the deep
sea fishery is in in this Province.

MR.SIMMS: There is a fisheries
presence in St. John's South.

DR. COLLINS: Oh, in St. John's South
there is a tremendous fisheries presence. For many
years I thought we were the largest fishing district
in the Province , but a former member of this House
corrected me, and I certainly accept his correction. He
said, 'No, St. John's South is not the largest fishing
district in this Province, it is only the second largest
fishing district in this Province'.

MR.SIMMS: A lot of people do not know that.

DR. COLLINS: Yes. I am glad you brought
up that point because I wanted the people to be educated
and informed about these things.

MR. NEARY: And they have a good member.

DR. COLLINS: An extremely good member,
very knowledgeable in the fisheries too.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, are those the only problems, that, firstly, we have resource-short deep sea plants, not too many plants but it is just that there is not enough resource going into them, that we do not have the trawlers to catch the resource, that the fishing companies themselves have been deficient in their marketing aggressiveness and strategy? No, Mr. Speaker, those are not all the problems either. Some of the problem is that we have not produced a good quality product always and sometimes that quality has been deficient from the minute the fish comes out of the water. So there is a certain element there that has to be corrected too. And, of course, this is an area that this government in particular is paying particular attention to now. My colleague, the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), has spoken on this many times and is very anxious to get in place an enhanced quality programme for the fishery in this Province. This is a priority that our government is very much behind. We feel it will do a great deal of good in the fisheries and we are sure that it will be accepted after the usual run-in problems, after the usual bugs are worked out of the system. We are sure it will be accepted by the harvesters in this Province and that their approach at improving the quality of the caught fish will also be picked up by the processors, the workers in the processing plant, and they will carry forward this emphasis on quality so that when we do get good aggressive marketing techniques in place we will have a good product to sell.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am just summarizing, as I say, the points that were brought out by the members on this side of the House. I am sorry that the members on the other side of the House did not really add too much to the debate in terms of

DR. COLLINS: making cogent points, but nevertheless I am sure they did their best. As the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) said, he was attempting to make a good speech and we have to give him a good 'E' for Effort. But I think that I have now summarized the points that have been made by members on this side of the House. And in doing so I have to say that I do vote against the amendment. I will cast my vote for the original motion and I would propose that we vote on the amendment and then the main motion very shortly.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before you -

MR. SIMMS: Keep it short now.

MR. MARSHALL: I am not getting up to speak.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Oh, well, why not? There is a lot of fish in Rennies River.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before you leave the Chair, I want to give notification as to the Estimates Committees.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Ah!

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, will you discipline the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). He is not in his seat and he is not supposed to speak. The Social Services Committee, Mr. Speaker, will meet at nine-thirty a.m. in the Colonial Building. For the benefit of the members of the Opposition that is in the morning. If the Committee concludes its review of the estimates of the Department of Education this evening, it will review the Social Services Estimates tomorrow. If not, it will continue its review of the Education Estimates. So in other words, this hard-working Committee will be meeting tonight to consider the Education Estimates, and tomorrow morning they will be considering Education if it is not passed, and if it is passed they will be doing Social Services.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Either/or.

MR. MARSHALL: The Resource Committee, Mr. Speaker, will meet in the House of Assembly at nine a.m. - that is tomorrow morning, not nine thirty - to continue its review of the estimates of the Department of Forest Resources and Lands.

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Member's Day we will now call it six of the clock and leave the Chair until tomorrow Thursday at three of the clock.