



Province of Newfoundland

FORTIETH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

Volume XL

Third Session

Number 63

---

***VERBATIM REPORT***  
***(Hansard)***

***Speaker: Honourable Patrick McNicholas***

Wednesday

17 June 1987

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):  
Order, please!

Yesterday there was a point of privilege brought up by the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick). I thought I would be able to speak more about that today, but I am having it researched to quite an extent and I hope that by tomorrow I will be able speak further on that point.

### Statements by Ministers

MS VERGE:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MS VERGE:  
Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to inform the House of Assembly that the Lieutenant-Governor in Council recently made appointments to the Newfoundland Law Reform Commission.

Derek Green was appointed Chairperson, succeeding Mr. Justice John O'Neill who served as chairperson from the beginning of the Commission in 1981 until his recent appointment to the Newfoundland Supreme Court, Court of Appeal. Mr. Green, who is a lawyer practising in St. John's, has been a member of the Commission for several years. Last year he took a leave of absence from his law practice and spent the year at Oxford University doing research and teaching in the area of commercial law.

Five other people who have been members of the Commission have been re-appointed: Carol Ann

Beson, a laboratory technologist in Grand Falls; Linda Black, a solicitor with the Department of Justice in St. John's; Madam Justice Margaret Cameron of the Newfoundland Supreme Court, Trial Division in St. John's; and Thomas Marshall, QC and Carl Thompson, both practising lawyers in Corner Brook.

A new appointment to the Law Reform Commission is John Roil, a St. John's lawyer.

Under The Newfoundland Law Reform Commission Act, the Commission has a broad mandate to inquire into and consider any matter relating to law reform, having regard to the statute law, the common law and judicial decisions. In addition, the Commission may consider judicial or quasi-judicial procedures, as well as any subject referred to it by the Minister of Justice.

Since it was established in 1981, the Commission has done comprehensive research and published high-quality papers on select areas of the law in need of rationalization and modernization. Limitation of actions, mechanics' liens, execution of judgments and powers of attorney are among the subjects the Commission has addressed. The Commission has completed a major project on limitation of actions and will soon conclude work on mechanics' liens and powers of attorney.

The Commission has a full-time Executive Director, Christopher Curran, who has a Masters Degree in philosophy and a law degree. The Commission's offices are in the Centre Building on Church Hill in St. John's.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the minister for making available a copy of her statement beforehand. We welcome the appointments embodied in the statement here today. In so doing, we would want to salute the work of now Mr. Justice John O'Neill during his time as the first Chairman of the Law Reform Commission. The appointment of Mr. Derek Green we believe to be a good one given his reputation in the law community, in the legal community, and his known academic depth in areas that will serve him well in his new appointment.

We note with pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in paragraph 3 of the minister's statement, a couple of names we recognize: Mrs. Linda Black and Mr. Carl Thompson, now of Corner Brook, both of whom have served us well in this House here at the table. We welcome the announcement, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

### Oral Questions

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, my question goes to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout). It concerns a statement the minister made following the recent Fisheries Ministers' meeting in the Province, which Mr. Siddon, the federal minister, attended.

The minister, Mr. Speaker is reported to have said that the Province supports the position that Ottawa will be taking at the June 24 - 25 Paris meeting when negotiators will meet to discuss the Canada - France Fisheries Agreement. Will the minister now tell the House, Mr. Speaker, what is that position?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. gentleman for his question. As the hon. gentleman correctly says, I did indicate in some interviews yesterday that the Province supports the strategy and the position that the Government of Canada will take to the negotiating table in Paris on the 24th and 25th of June in the next scheduled round of negotiations between Canada and France on the interim Fisheries Agreement and on the boundary dispute.

Obviously I cannot, with negotiations pending - it would send a great signal to the other side - go into detail of what that position is. But I think hon. gentlemen and the public in general know very well what the provincial position is in terms of access, in particular to 2J+3KL cod in terms of what the provincial position is on a quid

pro quo for overfishing in 3Ps and on quotas in that zone. So I can, Mr. Speaker, without contradiction repeat what I have said, that the strategy that has been devised between Canada and the provinces and the industry, the strategy that will be used at the bargaining table on 24th and 25th of June is a position and a strategy that is supportable and in line with the principles that have been articulated by this Province.

MR. W. CARTER:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, in light of the minister's strong objections to the proposed giveaway in 2J+3KL, which he is on public record about in many, many areas, since the Minister of Fisheries for Ottawa in a letter to the Mayor of Bonavista dated March 25, Mr. Speaker, clearly stated that A small amount of cod in the 2J+3KL area 'would be a small price to pay' - I am quoting from the letter - 'for the benefits of a boundary settlement which should resolve the current problem of French overfishing in the waters claimed by both Canada and France'

MR. MORGAN:

Joint councils.

MR. W. CARTER:

Joint councils.

- I wonder can the minister, Mr. Speaker, tell the House, as this is important enough - I can respect the need for confidentiality to a point but I

think this matter is sufficiently serious for the minister to tell the House - will there be any quotas given to France, as outlined in the minister's letter, in the areas 2JK+3KL, and will there be an increase in the quotas, for example, in the 2G+2GH area?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me tell the House and the hon. gentleman that I am aware of the letter of March 25 that he quotes from and refers to, and that I, in fact, on behalf of the Province, sent a detailed reply, dated April 1, to that letter to the Federal Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Siddon, and the Minister of External Affairs (Mr. Clark), Mr. Crosbie, and the Prime Minister and others, in which I took the same position that has been articulated by this Province since the infamous January 24 agreement, and stated that we are not in any way backing off from that position, that we are not doing it today, nor will we do it tomorrow, nor will we do it the day after.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that Canada made a commitment, and, as I said in this House and in other forums around the Province, this is where the federal people, the federal government, are trying to defend the indefensible, and cannot defend it, because the agreement is definitive. It does not say 'might', it does not say 'shall', it does not say 'will consider': The January 24 agreement says Canada will, w-i-l-l, offer on the table of sacrifice Northern cod. This Province is saying that we are not going to be part of that,

and the strategy worked out for the next round of negotiations is in line with the position of this Province.

We also have, Mr. Speaker, in writing, the Prime Minister of Canada and the Minister of Transport (Mr. Crosbie), who represents this Province in the Cabinet in Ottawa, saying that there will not be a deal unless it is a deal that is acceptable to Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:

And the conditions that have been outlined in the letter that the hon. gentleman refers to, which I have answered in spades, are in no way acceptable to the government or the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary.

MR. W. CARTER:

Mr. Speaker, do I take it, then, from the minister that there will be no giveaway, that the Canadian negotiators at that meeting will be instructed not to make any allocation of fish to France as originally promised in the 2J+3KL area?

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the hon. gentleman's question, and let me try to be as definitive in answering it as I can. A strategy for the June 24 - 25 meetings in Paris has been worked out between the various governments, the Government of Canada and the governments of the provinces involved in the industry. At that meeting which we will be participating in there will be no giveaway. If anybody changes strategy at that meeting and starts to move away from the strategy that we agreed upon just a few days ago, then the first people you will hear screaming will be us. We will not be willing partners in the giveaway of Northern cod from the people of Newfoundland and Labrador when we have just had to cut back our own resources by 10,000 tons, and when the inshore fishery - I hope I am wrong - looks like it could be a walking disaster again this year.

No, we will not be part of it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Very brave words, Mr. Speaker, from a minister who participated in the giveaway of the Northern cod stock in 2GH, very brave words indeed.

Mr. Speaker, I had a question for the Premier, but in his absence I wonder if I could get the attention of the Government House Leader, the Acting Premier, (Mr. Ottenheimer) and ask him. The Premier has talked from time to time, insofar as fisheries is

concerned, about the need for, in his phrase, 'legislative jurisdiction'. I wonder if the minister could be a bit more explicit as to what the Premier and the administration have in mind in terms of legislative jurisdiction?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, obviously the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is correct in that that has been a policy of this government for some time, and, of course, it has been given some added impetus now wherein, as a result of Meech Lake, there is an agreement that the matter will be discussed in a constitutional context - what will come of those discussions we will not know until after they have been held - based on the realization that, with our major resource being the fishery, as a coastal province we have no jurisdiction whatsoever. There is a full recognition of federal, if one wishes to so call them, imperatives in that area, but it is based on the philosophy that there must also be areas of provincial jurisdiction and provincial control. So it is a shared jurisdiction, with some matters federal, some matters provincial. Then the mechanisms could well be that in some areas perhaps it would be joint jurisdiction, both parties would have to agree, and there are numerous possibilities of working this out, but the purpose behind it, the objective - perhaps that is the best way I could answer - that the government would wish to achieve would be to have a meaningful say in questions of resource allocation and matters

related to that. There is a resource essential to our Province, but because it is in the water, not land based, we have no control, and in terms of resource allocation there should be significant provincial input and decision.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the minister talks about meaningful say. The House Commission suggests a federal/provincial board, which would be one way of having provincial say, of course. Could the minister indicate to the House - I have in mind, I should say first, a statement of recent days by the Premier of Nova Scotia in which he is quoted publicly as saying that he and his administration are not even prepared to discuss the matter of jurisdiction in a constitutional context - what indications of support the Premier and the administration have from other Premiers across Canada? He will realize he is going to need the support of several premiers, several provincial administrations, to have any changes embodied constitutionally. Could he indicate what indications of support the Premier and the administration have received from other premiers for the provincial government's point of view on this matter?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, if I may, just to give it a bit of an historical reference, some years ago, I believe around 1980 or so, this matter was also quite germane, and that was during the period of constitutional negotiations, patriation and amendments in general. There is sort of a chronology to it that I will just recall very briefly, but at one point all ten premiers at a Premiers' conference were in agreement with shared jurisdiction with respect to the fishery, and in federal/provincial constitutional discussions this was a matter which was discussed. The federal people were quite opposed, and Nova Scotia, which some months previously had been in agreement, then changed its opinion, and Nova Scotia still does oppose it. I am not aware that any other province is opposed to, number one, discussion in a constitutional context, and, if a consensus is reached, a constitutional reference to it. I am not aware that any other province is. Obviously it will be much more interesting to coastal provinces, I assume, than to central provinces. But I think, for example, the argument of a province having meaningful say in its major resource, and the fact that we are precluded from that because it is water adjacent rather than land - the reason people ever came to Newfoundland was because of that fishery resource, and you have all of that tied in with it - is one that has good support among non-coastal provinces conceptually. But in a sentence, the only province that I am aware of that is opposed to it is Nova Scotia.

MR. SIMMONS:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier has raised some expectations about what might be the outcome of those talks. I believe the minister would be the first to agree that all that has been achieved now is a consensus that the matter will be discussed. Indeed, to take it to its most ludicrous, it will be discussed year after year, even after the matter may well have been resolved.

The minister indicates he is aware, and so he should be because it is public information, that one Premier has gone on record as opposed. But in addition to that, I guess the real question is what homework has the Premier and the administration done in terms of canvassing the views, soliciting the support of Premiers across Canada, and, in that activity, what specific changes, relating to my first question - the minister said it in some generality - legislatively is it that the administration is looking for, and asking those premiers to agree to?

Finally, Mr. Speaker, and I believe this relates: What assurances do the Premier and the administration have from the Prime Minister that the kinds of legislative changes being sought will find favour with the Government of Canada? To what degree will the Prime Minister be receptive to those proposed legislative changes, and, therefore, constitutional changes?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, in terms of homework that the Premier or government have undertaken, that has been extensive. Over a period of years this has been up at practically, and perhaps all, Premiers' Conferences. I know that for the Premier, the Minister of Fisheries, and myself during the two years I was responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs, this was a matter that this government, the Premier, and ministers, and even the public service aspect when relevant, have pursued, lobbied, and endeavoured to sensitize other provinces on, especially non-coastal provinces, but coastal ones as well.

So this is a matter which the government has pursued for lack of a better term, in lobbying and endeavoured to convince and persuade for a period of years.

MR. SIMMONS:

Tell me something I do not have.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Well, the hon. gentleman asked the result.

MR. MORGAN:

One time we had ten out of ten.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Yes, the result at one time was that all ten provinces agreed. Then Nova Scotia changed its mind. To the best of my knowledge, as I said, Nova Scotia is the only one in disagreement on this.

Now the hon. gentleman asked what specific legislative provisions or changes would the Government of Newfoundland seek. I would suggest that it is better to approach this from the objective we wish to accomplish - I am not a

legislative draftsman - and the objective we wish to accomplish is for the Province to have a meaningful role in fisheries matters off our coast, with particular reference to resource allocation.

Now, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition suggested, more or less, that it has been agreed to discuss it, nothing might ever come of it, and all of that. Just let me say this: Who would have thought a fairly short while ago that it would have been possible to get the ten provinces and the federal government to agree with respect to measures which would see Quebec adhere to the constitution? If you had asked that question some months ago it would have looked like a pipe dream to be negotiated over periods of years. So, where there is a political will, where there is genuine understanding, I personally have enough confidence in the Canadian system to see it will work, and, if people see there is an inequity, people see there is unfairness, then the Canadian system will accommodate everybody being treated fairly. Sometimes it takes a bit longer, you got a lot of convincing to do, but it usually works.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Fisheries. It is in connection with the present fiasco we are seeing around the Province in the caplin fishery. As a bit of preamble, I understand the Japanese buyers have now



indicated a firm price to the processors, the processors in return have indicated a firm price of nine cents a pound to the fisherman, and I understand that many fishermen want to fish, many plant workers want to work on caplin processing, and many operators want to operate the plants. My question, Mr. Speaker, to the minister is this: Can the fishermen who want to fish fish, can the plant workers who want to work work, and can the operators who want to operate their plants operate, or are we going to leave the situation to Richard Cashin and his union to close the whole fishery down?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his question. I think all of us in this House and this Province are very concerned, and have been for the last several days now - stretching into, I guess, close to two weeks - with the view that there may be a much-reduced caplin fishery this year, if in fact there is any caplin fishery this year. I have been personally involved in it with both sides, over the last number of days, from daylight in the morning until almost midnight, trying to keep the two sides talking and moving it along. I can say that finally the Japanese have agreed to a price to the processors and the processors have offered a price to the union, but it does not meet the demands that the union made in terms of price, so it is my understanding the union and the processors are still at loggerheads.

In terms of the question of whether a fisherman can fish, I

suppose that is up to the individual fisherman. There is no role government can play in that and, if a fisherman fished and caplin were available, it would be up to the individual processor what he does, whether he buys or processes it. What the government and I as minister tried to do was keep the talks going, first of all to get a price from the Japanese, which has been achieved, and hopefully, secondly, even into the late hours of last night was to try to get the associations and the union to agree on a price which, as of the time I came to the House, still has not been worked out as far as I know.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

Can the minister inform the House whether or not it is a fact that what the union, on behalf of the fishermen - or at least some fishermen, because there is now a question mark as to which union represents the fishermen in many parts of the Province - was asking for in price, nine cents a pound, has now been offered by the processors? There was a deadlock the last two days, with the union asking for nine cents and the companies offering seven and three quarters.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

A supplementary!

MR. MORGAN:

Can he confirm that they now have been offered nine cents a pound? And, if that is correct, what is the present problem between the fishermen and the processors with

regards to pricing?

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the associations representing the processors have made public their latest offer, a final offer, a last offer to the union, so I do not mind commenting on it. My understanding is that the union, for fifty-one to fifty-five female count, were looking for nine cents; from fifty-five to fifty-nine female count were looking for nine-point-nine cents, and on the total category of fifty-one to fifty-nine, the processors have offered nine cents.

MR. TULK:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries, and I must say that we note with interest that there are still differences in 2J+3KL. But my question concerns another statement yesterday by the Federal Minister of Fisheries, when he said that extending the 200 mile limit to preserve fish stocks for Canadians would be taken only as a last resort, that extending the 200 mile limit, the management zone, to the edge of the Continental Shelf and the Tail and Nose of the Grand Banks, would be a situation of the last sort. The minister will know, of course, that it is the position of this House unanimously that that should

be done. And I would ask the minister to confirm once again, contrary to what the Federal Minister of Fisheries was indicating yesterday, that is this still the position of the government, that we should take in the Tail and Nose of the Grand Banks and that it should be done with some urgency?

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
It is the firm position of the Province that the only long-term solution to the management of stocks straddling the Nose and Tail of the Grand Bank in 3L and 3NO is an extension of jurisdiction. We have tried the NAFO process and it has not worked. We have tried the process of giving away fish for market access, as was done under the LTA with the European community, and that has not worked. We are prepared as a government to explore every and all options and possibilities, but there is no possibility that comes to mind or been suggested to us that has the finality of solving the problem as does extension of jurisdiction. And all provinces of Canada, Mr. Speaker, and all Atlantic Provinces in particular, are supporting us in that position.

MR. TULK:  
A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
The minister regards as a matter of some urgency that this be

done. The federal minister, from his statements yesterday, obviously does not. He seems to think that the NAFOL agreements are working. But, as the minister said, the real reason that they are working, and I agree with him on this, is that there is no fish out there to catch, and that is the reason there is nobody there.

Now I ask him is he going to press upon the federal minister the urgency of getting that agreement in place in the international courts? Among a group of foreign nations this has to be agreed upon, so I ask him is he going to impress upon him the urgency of getting this done, or is he going to allow the federal minister to make all kinds of statements, as he is doing with 2J+3KL cod and with the Canada-France Agreement, or are we going to see ourselves in a state of Limbo as they play political footsy?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, the federal minister can make any statement he likes and, if I do not like it, on behalf of the people and the government of this Province I will make another statement that is contrary to what he says.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
I am not married to the Government of Canada or the political party that happens to form the Government of Canada, or the person who happens at the moment to be the Minister of Fisheries for Canada. I will articulate a position that we think is in the best interest of the Province of

Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Now, let me also tell my friend from Fogo that as a result of the leadership of the Premier of this Province, the last First Ministers' Conference mandated a task force of senior officials in all the governments of Canada, provincial and federal, to look at the options we can consider for improvement of our management regime within the 200 mile limit and the straddling stocks, including an extension of jurisdiction.

The position of this Province, articulated without any dicing around and mincing of words by me yesterday, and supported by the rest of the Atlantic Ministers, which Mr. Siddon will have no choice but relay this to his First Minister, is stop telling us ways we cannot do it and get on with the job of providing us with the reasons why and the ways we should do it. That is the position of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. CALLAN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:  
Yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I asked the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) when he could meet with a representative group of independent truckers, of whom there are 160 on the Avalon and several hundred and perhaps thousands more around the

Province. The minister, in his answer yesterday, Mr. Speaker, said, "I am ready and willing to meet with them at any time." Now, I do not want to get into the details of their problems; amendments to The Motor Carriers Act are probably necessary, or perhaps changes in the motor carrier regulations could be done by Cabinet, which could cure some of the ills that exist.

Mr. Speaker, some of these independent truckers have been in my office over the last couple of days, and a representative group actually is in the gallery today. Could the minister possibly meet with them after Question Period today? If not, could he do so in the near future? I would be pleased to act as liaison between these independent truckers and the minister, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. DAWE:

Mr. Speaker, yesterday I did indeed answer the question and pointed out that I had on several occasions over the past number of years met with individuals and groups representing independent truckers, and that I would be willing to do so in the same context as I met with them before. I find it passing strange that the request for a meeting comes this route. The Legislature is an opportunity to ask questions of ministers relating to policy of the government. I would just like to point out to the member, as it relates to the Public Utilities Board and any problems that the truckers may have related to the Public Utilities Board, that that board answers to the Department of Justice, and it is under that

department that the regulations pertaining to the Public Utility Board rests. I think it is important, Mr. Speaker, that everyone realize that what the member for Bellevue is trying to do in this instance is make some kind of political hay. It was very easy for the member to have followed up yesterday with a phone call to my office if he had some people he wanted me to meet, which he has done in the past. Mr. Speaker, I have met with constituents of his and others on that kind of a request, but to stand up in the Legislature at 3:35 in the afternoon and ask a minister if he will have a meeting this afternoon is really out of line. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am certainly ready at any time to meet with people to hear their views relating to the trucking industry. There are in excess of 500 certificates issued for some 566 individual dump trucks around the Province, and one of the things that they have tried to do, and with some success at particular times, is form themselves into an established organization to deal with some of their ongoing problems. They have tried that. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, that has not been accomplished on a province-wide basis, only on a localized basis. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, as well that the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. R. Aylward) said he had an enquiry from truckers related to some problems with the PU Board, and he contacted them, as I understand it, and indicated to them that he would be very willing to assist them in setting up a meeting with the Minister of Justice (Mrs. Verge) or with the Commissioner of the Public Utilities Board to discuss their problems. I am not sure whether

they followed up with that suggestion or not. But to have it come before the House in this kind of an obviously political attempt on behalf of the member for Bellevue to play politics with constituents of his in the gallery is unfortunate. I would suggest if the member for Bellevue wishes an opportunity for me to sit down and meet with some of his constituents, I would be very pleased to do so, but certainly in the normal context.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:  
Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries. I wonder can the minister explain why it is that practically every year at the beginning of the fishing season, and in many cases well into the fishing season, fish prices are not established? Last year it was for codfish and other ground species, and other years it has been some other species of fish. Cannot the price which fishermen are to receive for fish be established before the beginning of the fishing season, thus eliminating a lot of anxiety and a lot of frustration? Can this not be done?

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker, I certainly appreciate the intensity and sincerity of the hon. gentleman's question. It is a good one. The fact of the matter is that fishermen are allowed to bargain collectively in this Province and

there is collective bargaining legislation for them to bargain with the representatives of the industry. In most cases it is done through FANL, the Fisheries Association of Newfoundland and Labrador. In the case of caplin there is also the Caplin Exporters Association.

So that mechanism is there, guaranteed by law. I think it is rather inappropriate for the Minister of Fisheries to speculate from year to year. Some years it may be later than others when the process gets underway. I think we all know the difficult changes that have been ongoing in fishermen's representation, this year in particular. That may have been a factor. There may have been others. In terms of caplin, FANL members did not know until yesterday or the day before what price they could get, so that was a complicating factor.

There is a collective bargaining procedure there in law for fishermen, and I think it would be kind of inappropriate for the Minister of Fisheries to try to speculate in any given season as to why they have not finished negotiations the last of March rather than the last of June, although I appreciate the context of the member's question.

MR. LUSH:  
A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. LUSH:  
Again, Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister is this an attainable or an achievable goal, that the prices be established before the fishing season begins? Are there

some unusual or unique circumstances about the fisheries which prevent this from happening, to have prices established before the fishing season begins? Are there unusual and unique circumstances, circumstances different from other businesses, that prevent this from happening in the fisheries?

MR. SPEAKER:

The Hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:

Mr. Speaker, whether it is an attainable goal or not I do not know, but I say to the hon. gentleman that it is certainly a laudable goal. That is the function of collective bargaining, and there is, for inshore fishermen and plant workers in this Province, a piece of legislation, about which I have heard no complaints, outlining their right to bargain collectively and so on. The time frames that they chose to bargain within, whether it is in March or in June, is a function of how they perceive the timing from their own strategic points of view, and it is not appropriate to have any additional points of view imposed on them by the Minister of Fisheries, or any other minister, I suppose, for that matter.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has elapsed.

### Petitions

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. K. AYLWARD:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to bring a petition to the House of Assembly concerning the cutbacks in the Social Services Department around the Province of thirty-five positions. The petition comes from the Bay St. George Foster Parents Association in the Bay St. George area. There are 850 names here from all over the West Coast.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is very indicative of the great interest and the great concern that has been expressed by many people from around the Province, especially the area which I serve. They have great concerns about the services being offered to the people of the Province in the social services field. We have, on numerous occasions in the past three weeks, since the announcement was brought forward, presented petitions that have been sent to us based on these concerns to the House of Assembly, hoping that the Minister of Social Services, the Cabinet and the provincial government would change the decision and review the cutbacks that they have decided to undertake.

I have numerous letters coming to me from the area that I serve, and also from around the West Coast, expressing again, in detail, the concerns of citizens of the area and of the Province as to why such cutbacks should occur and that, in essence, more services are needed and more social service workers are needed to deal with the

drastic problems that we have around the Province.

Mr. Speaker, as I was preparing to speak on the petition, I was looking at the annual report done by the Department of Social Services. In that report they indicate the different things and the different activities that they take on. For example, they take care of social assistance recipients; they take care of employment opportunities in their programme, child welfare, youth corrections, day care and homemaker services, rehabilitation, mental retardation services, staff development, and emergency social services. There is also an Assistance Appeals Board. There are a great variety of services here, Mr. Speaker, which the department undertakes to fulfill. They undertake to fulfill services that are crucial to people in the Province who are in need of them. As you look through the list, Mr. Speaker, youth corrections, day care, rehabilitation, child welfare, all of these are in the social sciences area where we are in need of more people and more resources, not less.

The decision by this government to save some salaries, \$700,000 worth, by cutting back thirty-five positions, I believe is a bad one. It is one that reflects badly on the administration and on the government, because it is showing a lack of conscience in dealing with the ferocious problems that are out there when it comes to social services recipients and when it comes to people in the mental retardation field who are trying to get improved services for these people, for youth corrections when you are trying to get young people

rehabilitated and so on, and when you look at child welfare where there were many stated cases of abuse and so on, where they are being documented and have now been coming to the forefront. When we see an increasing need for the resources and we see the government replying with a cutback in the positions, it goes contrary to what is needed, Mr. Speaker.

The 850 names on the petition that I have presented today are indicative of the support of the people who have presented these petitions, asking the government to change their decision and to review it. We ask again today, Mr. Speaker. We will try to impress upon this government that it is a crucial issue that they must deal with.

Thank you.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As was pointed out by the member for Stephenville (Mr. Aylward), 850 people have signed this petition from the West Coast concerning the thirty-five social workers laid off. He also pointed out the various programmes that are offered by the Department of Social Services. The Minister of Justice (Ms. Verge) spoke many times regarding the Transition House, battered wives, sexually abused children and ex-psychiatric patients, while the Minister of Health is aware of social workers in the various hospitals.

One of the things that each of the members pointed out as the reason why we have so many people on welfare, child abuse and juvenile problems, as the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Brett) said, is because of the chronic unemployment situation. We are seeing our social fabric deteriorating because of the low number of jobs that are being created by this government, despite what has been promised.

If we do not get the economy on the go, you can have as many social workers as you like, you are still going to have the caseload increased all of the time. What this government has done, Mr. Speaker, not only has it not provided jobs for people in this Province, but when they are in need because of alcoholism or drug abuse or battered wives or poor housing conditions or there is a need for financial planning, when that is needed in the crunch, in the hard times, what does government do? It not only says there are no jobs and when there are jobs they are going to be done on a political patronage basis. Not only that, they basically say, 'Sorry, times are rough and, as a result, we have to cutback on social workers.' This is what I find most difficult, Mr. Speaker: They are getting hit both ways. They are getting hit by the mere fact that they cannot get jobs and they are getting hit in that they have to have some inside ministerial route or be a card-carrying PC Party member to get a job. If they do not have that, then now they do not have a chance of getting the extra counselling that they need.

Mr. Speaker, with this government, the largest development programme is the Department of Social

Services. It is not the Department of Development or the Department of Fisheries, it is the Department of Social Services. They are spending \$37 million on job creation, taking people off welfare and putting them on UIC because the federal government will have to then spend fifty cents on the dollar for the UIC they will get after. It would be better, Mr. Speaker, if we take that \$37 million and get involved with our private sector. We should also take some of this \$37 million and hire back these thirty-five social workers.

I also know and many members on this side, as well as the government side know, many of the social workers are in rural areas. They have large geographical areas to cover. I can think of Mary's Harbour. The Premier was a social worker down there. He likes quoting it. That person has to visit ten communities by boat or by skidoo and it is impossible for that person to do it justice. So it is always done by phone. Now in more urban larger areas, we are getting battered wives, sexual abuse, drug abuse and juvenile delinquents. Crime also is on the increase as a result of the social fabric deteriorating because of the simple fact that there are no jobs. This government should realize that creating jobs in this Province is the main social support. We can bring in all the social programmes we like but if we do not have the economy to support the social fabric, then, Mr. Speaker - and the Minister of Justice and the Minister of Health and the Minister of Education and the Minister of Social Services know this too well - you can bring in any programme you like but if the people have not got work, they



cannot have dignity and pay money into the economy.

So I again support the member for Stephenville (Mr. K. Aylward) and the people on the West Coast because they realize on the Port au Port Peninsula, down in Bay d'Espoir and other areas in our Province how much people are hurting and the cruelty that is going on behind the doors, not only financial cruelty, but physical and psychological cruelty.

What is needed in hard times is a government that shows compassion. One of the ways government can show compassion is admit, 'We cannot provide you with 40,000 jobs, but at least we can provide you with a little bit of counselling and we will rehire these thirty-five social workers.'

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

### Orders of the Day

MR. SPEAKER:

Today is Private Members' Day. I call on the hon. the member for Twillingate.

MR. W. CARTER:

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Somebody once asked a federal Cabinet Minister representing Newfoundland what he thought of the Newfoundland inshore fishery and the hon. gentleman said as far as he is concerned, the future of the Newfoundland inshore fishery is a thing of the past. I am not prepared to concede, Mr. Speaker, that the future of the Newfoundland fishery is a thing of the past. In fact, I think that given a chance the Newfoundland

fishery can have a good future and a bright future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. CARTER:

Historically the inshore fishery has always been the single largest employer of people. For example, a hundred years ago in this Province - country then - 55,000 people were employed in the Newfoundland fishing industry which accounted, at that time, for about 83 per cent of the total of the then Newfoundland labour force. As of the latest statistics that were available, I find that there are now over 26,000 licenced fishermen and approximately 25,000 fish plant workers, which gives a total of approximately 52,000 Newfoundlanders who are directly or indirectly earning a living from the Newfoundland fishing industry.

Mr. Speaker, today in Newfoundland we have some very, very serious problems in the inshore fishery. Many people have different opinions as to the cause of the absence of groundfish, for example, on the Province's Northeast Coast. I am inclined to believe the old Twillingate fishermen who say, 'You cannot catch a codfish twice.' If you catch it on the Funk Island Banks in February or March, then you are not going to catch that fish in Toogood Arm, Cobb's Arm or on Fogo Island in June month. My question to the minister today and his answer to my question, I must say, has only added to the confusion. Because we all know that when this controversy broke some months ago, when it was discovered that the federal negotiators had made certain commitments to France with

respect to the codfish in the area 2J+3KL, there was quite a furor. I do not have the pamphlet here now, but I think the provincial Minister of Fisheries is quoted as saying it was one of Newfoundland's darkest days, the day that the federal government would dare to arbitrarily give away cod from that very important stock.

Today, in reply to my question, Mr. Speaker, the minister in effect said that he opposes any giveaway of cod in that area to France under any conditions, and he inferred that the Minister of Fisheries for Canada will adopt that position, or at least his negotiators will adopt that position, at the forthcoming Canada-France meeting in Paris.

Now, therein, in my view, lies some confusion. We know that when the story broke and the controversy was at its height in the House of Commons in Ottawa the Prime Minister did, in fact, give an undertaking that there would be no such quotas and that before any such future quotas were even considered, there would be full and free discussion with Newfoundland's Cabinet Minister in the federal Cabinet, and with the Newfoundland Provincial Government.

Subsequent to that statement, we heard Mr. Crosbie make similar statements, we heard the minister make similar statements and then, lo and behold, in a letter - I do not have a copy here now, but I believe it was March 25 - written by the National Fisheries Minister to the Joint Councils, addressed to the Mayor of Bonavista, the hon. Minister of Fisheries for Canada left no doubt whatever, Mr. Speaker, that the allocation - and I think I am quoting him now - the

allocation of a small amount of cod from the area 2J+3KL would be a small price to pay in order for Canada to get an agreement with France with respect to the disputed zone, 3Ps, off the South Coast.

Now, that was on March 25. Today, the Minister of Fisheries certainly implied in what he said in the House that the Minister of Fisheries has now taken a different position, that today the decision is not to make any fish from the area 2J+3KL available to the French. I have no reason to disbelieve my hon. friend's opposition. I think he means well, and in terms of his position on the disposition of cod stocks in 2J+3KL I think he means well. But I suspect that his counterpart in Ottawa is a man whose word is not worth very much, because he appears to say one thing in the House of Commons, another thing at a fisheries conference, and another thing in private correspondence to community councils in this Province. So I suspect, Mr. Speaker, that we have not heard the last of the giveaway of Newfoundland cod to the French in the 2J+3KL area.

Mr. Speaker, when the 200 mile limit was negotiated and subsequently declared in 1977, there was a great deal of promise in that declaration. In fact, I had the privilege of being in the Provincial Cabinet as Minister of Fisheries and I think it was one of the most gratifying and most exciting and probably the happiest day of my life, the day we all heard the big announcement that come January 1 there would be a formal declaration of a 200 mile regime. I had a special interest in that announcement, because as a member of Parliament in 1974, I

was a member of the Canadian Delegation to the Law of the Sea Conference in Geneva. I did not have a big part to play, but certainly I listened a lot to what was being said by people from the other 133 member nations at that conference, listened to what they had to say about the importance of the fishery and how they felt about it. And I know what a struggle it was. I know the Canadian delegation was headed by a gentleman who, I think, later became an ambassador to Belgium. I forget his name now, but he was a very able negotiator, in fact a very impressive man. When it became known that the member nations were prepared to accept the 200 mile regime it was quite a victory, but, I am afraid, the full intent of that declaration and the terms of the 200 mile regime were not fully followed, were not adhered to. Because what we did, in effect, and I think this is where the problem started, and if the hon minister were here he would agree, was that in 1977 and in subsequent years we succeeded in gradually phasing out foreign fishing.

I know the first year the 200 mile limit regime was in place, for example, there was considerable foreign fishing within the Continental Shelf, but gradually, as time went on, with pressure, of course, from the fishing provinces and from others, the union, fishermen and other groups, the foreign effort was gradually phased out to the point now where there is very little. In fact, I am not sure there is any groundfish allocation to foreign nationals in the area commonly referred to as 2J+3KL. What we did, in effect, was replace foreign vessels with domestic vessels; we drove out the

foreigners and we allowed our vessels to converge on the area in great numbers and harvest the fish in very, very big quantities, to the point where now the entire stock, certainly the inshore fishery on the Northeast Coast, has been threatened by that very fact, by the fact that we have allowed overfishing in the 2J+3KL area, but this time not by foreign vessels but by our own domestic fleet.

Again, going back to my opening comments about the old fisherman on a wharf in Twillingate who gave us the reason for the absence of cod, you cannot catch it twice. We all know that up until last year - and it was only corrected then, I think, because there was quite a furor raised about it - the domestic vessels, the Canadian druggers, were concentrating their efforts on the Funk Island Banks and on the Northern Grand Banks. Fish that is caught in Bonavista Bay, Notre Dame Bay and other inland waters, these two areas are where that fish comes from.

It came to light last year, I believe, that in 1985, for example, 99 per cent of the total amount of fish harvested by the offshore effort came from those areas. Again, in 1986, for example, 99 per cent of the total amount of fish caught by our druggers were caught in those areas. Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that this year we are having a shortage of groundfish in Notre Dame Bay and on the Northeast Coast generally? You cannot kill the goose that lays the golden egg, and that is what has been happening. They have been raping the resource, raping the spawning grounds, raping the young fish: catching it and throwing it back. And that is

still going on, I am told, to the point where now the fish that would normally feed the inshore fishing grounds are all but destroyed. Mr. Speaker, I think the chicken has finally come home to roost.

We now have a situation on the Northeast Coast where, up until the present time, I do not think there has been any fish caught at all. I know that the fish plant in my district of Twillingate, which would normally be employing about 500 or 600 people at this time of the year, working two shifts, to date are employing twenty-two people working on a part-time shift, and that situation pretty well prevails all along the East and Northeast Coast, and, I believe, in Labrador as well. So we have allowed our own vessels to destroy the spawning grounds and to destroy the stocks that would normally supply fish to the inshore.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of work to be done if the inshore fishery is to survive. And sometimes you wonder! I am the world's greatest optimist when it comes to the potential of the Newfoundland fishery, but sometimes I wonder what is going to happen to it. I am not sure that the powers that be in Ottawa have the political will to do what has to be done. If something is not done, Mr. Speaker, to put a halt to this wholesale destruction of the cod stocks and the raping of the spawning grounds, then maybe the statement made by the federal Cabinet Minister, which I referred to when I commenced my few remarks, 'the future of the fishery is a thing of the past', might very well come to pass.

Mr. Speaker, today we heard

questions being asked in the House about the caplin fishery. Now, there is a story in itself. In a Province like Newfoundland, where we have so much unemployment, where we have a fishery that is literally going down for the third time because there are no groundfish, where we have all kinds of problems, we are seeing an industry with an input of some \$30 million or \$40 million into the economy literally being destroyed. I think the latest word from the two sides, from the union and the processors, is that unless there is a firm settlement within forty-eight hours, we can forget the caplin fishery for 1987. Of course, as I said, with that will go what would otherwise be a \$30 million or \$40 million input into the provincial economy.

AN HON. MEMBER:

\$60 million.

MR. W. CARTER:

I think it is \$30 million. My colleague says \$60 million. Maybe that would include the processing and the harvesting sectors.

Mr. Speaker, I think the time has come, Sir, for this government to start taking the fishing industry and the problems in the fishing industry seriously. I think the problems we are encountering today in the caplin fishery point out the need for a more centralized and a more organized marketing system within the Province. I believe that has been one of our problems in Newfoundland. I am not one to encourage too much government involvement in the fishery. In fact, I would like to see as little government involvement as possible. We all know that where government gets too heavily involved, then you have problems, but I think there

comes a time, certainly in terms of marketing, where some government intervention might be appropriate.

For example, the Dr. House Report on Employment and Unemployment, **Building on our Strengths**, recommends that there be a marketing agency established that would market all species and provide market information, information from the marketplace.

Now, I know that we have a Saltfish Corporation which I think has done a reasonably good job. Although sometimes I think that maybe the time has come now to say goodbye to the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, they did fill a very important need when they were first introduced in the Province and I believe a similar need is here now for some kind of a frozen fish marketing agency, one that would go out into the marketplace and make the best deal possible. Now you have a multiplicity of small processors, each going his own way trying to make a deal with some foreign buyer, being driven, in some case, by a bank where there is probably money owed or something, the end result being that in many cases these small processors are left to the mercy of very sharpe and very shrewd foreign buyers.

Mr. Speaker, there is a lot I could say on the inshore fishery, and, in fact, I could speak for hours on what I think should be done. I do not think there is much to be gained by dredging up the past unless we can learn from the past and our past problems. Certainly I think the fishing industry in this Province does have a future. I think the government should get on with the promised restructuring of the

inshore fishery. We all know that there has been a commitment made by the government, by members opposite, that there would be a restructuring pogramme put in place. In fact, I think the proceeds from the sale of Fisheries Products International, which amounted to around \$48 million, is being earmarked - at least we were told - to restructure the inshore fishery.

Mr. Speaker, I think the government has to get on with the business of restructuring the fishery. If we want to save the fishery and give it a chance to become the industry that it can become and, in fact, as far as we are concerned, must become, then I believe the industry must be restructured. I think Canadian fisheries generally, for example, Newfoundland and Labrador, must lessen its dependency on the U.S. market. Of course, we appreciate the fact that our neighbour to the South is a very important market - for what? - 80 per cent of our fish products, but I think we must diversify, we must involve ourselves in further processing and thereby make ourselves attractive to markets other than just the U.S. market. That, of course, is another problem that I think will have to be addressed another day.

But it is a very unhealthy state, Mr. Speaker. I do not know what can be done about this, because you cannot force people in Indo-China, or the Far East, or in China to buy caplin, but the unfortunate part about it is that we have but one market for caplin. I think therein lies most of the problem, that we only have one marketplace. And almost to the same extent we now find ourselves in the same position,

for example, with respect to all other species, especially groundfish, where 80 per cent of our Newfoundland and Labrador output of fish goes into the U.S. marketplace. As I said, that is a very unhealthy situation and one which I think will have to be addressed if the fishery is ever to come into its own.

Mr. Speaker, we need in this Province to tackle the problem. First of all, working with the national government we must seek solutions to what is happening in the waters to allow fish to regenerate, allow the stocks to rehabilitate, and then we have to find ways of reducing the seasonality of inshore fish plants. We all know that on the Northeast Coast, especially, seasonality is one of the curses of the fish processing industry. I think ways can be found, and maybe when I adjourn this debate later this afternoon I will give some of my thoughts on how we can go about extending the work period in most of our inshore plants.

Mr. Speaker, I know that I have been given leave to continue, but I do not want to abuse that privilege. I will take my seat now, and maybe before the debate adjourns I will have a chance to respond further on certain other ideas.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

I think this matter of the inshore fishery, which was brought forward in a resolution by the member for Twillingate, is, indeed, a very important resolution because the inshore fishery is so important to the overall economy of Newfoundland, rural Newfoundland in particular.

The resolution, without going into detail, where we are recognizing the inshore, I want to talk about what I see happening in the inshore fishery and then I want to indicate whether I can support the resolution or not, and what action I would like to see taken from there.

First of all, there is no question that the inshore fishery is in a major crisis. It has been in a major crisis for three years and the time has come for some people, especially the bureaucrats in Ottawa, to stop pussyfooting around and to listen to what is being said by the fishermen, by the organizations and by the provincial government in particular.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

Because if they keep on pussyfooting around, we will not have a Fogo, we will not have a Twillingate, we will not have a Bonavista, we will not have a Valleyfield, and we will not have many other communities along the coastline. We will not have any backbone for their economy if the inshore fishery continues to fail any further. As I said briefly a few weeks ago, if it fails any further, or gets any worse or further deteriorates, we are going to see a very major crisis in

rural Newfoundland.

I talked to a fisherman today in Bonavista who has been out every day from four-thirty in the morning until four o'clock in the afternoon. He got ten pounds yesterday, five pounds the day before, and today he came in with only two fish.

Mr. Speaker, can you imagine what that means to the inshore fishery and the inshore fishermen? It is not only humiliating to them, not only totally discouraging, but the fact is they are now in despair. I had calls from Bonavista today and those people were asking, "What is this man Siddon talking about, going to give extra quotas to the inshore fishery? Sure, we have 120,000 tons now!" And we do. As the member for Twillingate is quite aware, we have an allocation of 120,000 tons to the inshore fishery of Newfoundland. What is the good of having an allocation of that kind if there is no fish to be caught? It is like having a barrel of apples and you cannot get the barrel open. It is no good. Absolutely no good!

The time has come, Mr. Speaker, for those bureaucrats advising Mr. Siddon, the Prime Minister, and Mr. Crosbie and others in Ottawa, to stop pussyfooting around with the inshore fishery and to deal with it in the proper way. Then the minister comes to Newfoundland from Ottawa and has the audacity to make silly stupid statements like he made yesterday, "We are going to give additional allocations to the inshore fishermen", when he cannot even catch a fish to eat, not enough to make a meal of fish and brewis. The fishermen in my district called me today and they were laughing at him.

On top of that, to add insult to injury, he says, "We may have to make a modest allocation" - I repeat - "a modest allocation to the French in order to resolve the dispute we have with them."

MR. MORGAN:

That same gentleman stood in the House of Commons no longer than two or three months ago and said, 'We will have no allocations given to the French if Newfoundland does not want it given away to them.' The Prime Minister stood in the House of Commons and said the same thing. 'There will be no allocations given away, there are none now and there will not be, if Newfoundland industry and the Newfoundland Government opposes it.' The Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) is indeed opposing it on behalf of the Government of Newfoundland. There is not one person around Newfoundland - including, I would hope, all parties, I am sure that the Liberal Party stands firm - that is going to agree to any more allocations taken out of 2J+3KL at a time when we last year cut back on the total quota for the offshore.

Now I made a statement a little while ago which raised the ire of a couple of my colleagues in the Caucus because I said the day may have to come to save the inshore fishery when we may have to temporarily close down the offshore. I am convinced, and I therefore can agree with the first part of the resolution with regards to overfishing, that there has been overfishing.

In the years before 1977 we blamed it on the foreigners, before a 200 mile economic zone was declared. Now we still see overfishing. The minister today was right. We have

said it for years. The only way to control the overfishing on the Nose and Tail of the Grand Bank where the fish swims into our own trawlers, which they catch in the Grand Bank area, is to extend the jurisdiction up to the end of the Continental Shelf, to take in the Nose and Tail of the Grand Bank, to take in that part of the Continental Shelf under our jurisdiction. Without that, you will always have foreigners there with so-called flags of convenience on their ships from various countries in the world continuing to overfish. They can bring all the SWAT teams in they want. I saw Mr. Siddon talking about a SWAT team. They can bring in hundreds of SWAT teams, it does not mean a row of beans.

I tell you that if the fishermen are as irate as I am, this Fall you are going to see a major upheaval in this Province. I grew up in a fishing boat with my father in Flat Islands many years ago. Fishermen are not going to tolerate any more nonsense from Ottawa, the kind that we heard yesterday. There has got to be a stop put to the overfishing! There has got to be a stop to the activity of the offshore trawlers adversely affecting the inshore fishery because without it we are not going to have communities in my district. I will tell you what you will have. You will have welfare ghettos or you will have centralization or resettlement indirectly.

MR. TULK:

Through the backdoor, right on!

MR. MORGAN:

I have always advocated for years that certain bureaucrats in Ottawa when the Liberals were in power and some of them, unfortunately,

are still there today, feel that there is nothing they would like to see better. They feel that the inshore fishery is a sinkhole for subsidies. I have heard that comment made. The inshore is a sinkhole of federal government dollars.

'It never will be economically viable,' I have heard them say, 'so why have it? Let us have the offshore fishery which can be economically viable,' as is now proven through FPI, National Sea and others who are in it in a smaller way. The offshore fishery is indeed economically viable and making money, making a profit. They would love to see that because it strengthens their argument to further downgrade and move out and, if at all possible, remove the inshore fishery. That is going to be a major battle for this minister here, this government and all of us as politicians to be able to effectively fight that kind of attitude that we see in Ottawa today towards the inshore fishery.

Now I want to comment briefly on what the fishermen talked about last year which they thought was going to save the inshore this year. The fishermen said, 'Stop the concentrated fishing effort on the Funk Island Bank. Stop the heavy concentration of fishing on the Northern part of the Grand Banks and move the vessels further North to the Hamilton Bank area and the Belle Isle Bank area.'

Mr. Siddon says that was done. I am inclined to agree with him on that point, that maybe it was done. They removed the one fishing concentrated effort on Funk Island and spread it out sort of evenly. But that has not



solved the problem.

Now, I do not know. Maybe we are all wet as Newfoundlanders. Maybe there is some little cold water barrier preventing the fish from coming in. Maybe it is a problem where the caplin stays offshore and the codfish have lots of bait so why follow the caplin inshore. Scientists are saying that and others are saying that, trying to find a reason for the inshore fishery failures, making it sound like scientific reasons why there is a failure in the inshore fishery. Bull, Mr. Speaker! Absolute, total bull! There are no fish can get in when the fish is caught offshore. Unless someone can prove to this government, to the minister and all of us in this House that that is the reason, there is only one obvious conclusion to draw. The fish is caught offshore so it cannot be caught inshore.

So it is down to a point where we have got to draw the major line. Do we say, 'Yes we agree with the attitude and the bureaucrats that in the inshore fishery has too much subsidization, too much money going into it from government, and the Unemployment Insurance Programme is like a social programme?' Do we accept that and say, 'Yes, let us all have factory freezer trawlers, let us all have trawlers to catch offshore and let the inshore fishery die?'

It is either that or we see a major upheaval in this Province. Last year we almost saw it. I attended some meetings last Fall and there is no question the fishermen were pretty irate, but they are pretty decent human beings as well. They do not believe in violence and that kind of thing. They dealt with the

problem last year in a reasonable fashion by having organized meeting, by having meeting at Clarendville, meetings up in Kilbride, meetings up in Twillingate, meetings in Fogo, and all along the coast, so they could make some reasonable suggestions to Ottawa.

MR. TULK:  
And they did.

MR. MORGAN:  
And they did, but that is not the answer and the problem is still there. In fact, the problem, I would say at this time right now - a few weeks ago I almost laughed at my friend from Port de Grave (Mr. Efford) because it was too early. I hope he is not a prophet but he was right at the time. At the time he was prophesying a bit because he was speculating it was going to be a failure. But right now the words he said are so true, because right now, along the Bonavista Bay Coast, it is worse than this time last year, and last year was a total disaster and here we are coming into the end of June, which is the prime time for the codtrap inshore fishing season in Twillingate, Fogo and these places.

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that, the resolution to me is a bit too political. The hon. gentleman who made the resolution is a knowledgeable man in the fisheries. But I cannot support a statement that it is because of neglect and mismanagement by both governments. I cannot support that.

So I am going to move an amendment to the resolution because I want to tie in a part which I think is very, very important, and that is the part I just mentioned, the

overfishing. I think I said enough on that for today. I also want to tie in the lack of an appropriate jurisdiction by this Province.

I hope the Leader of the Liberal Party is listening because I tell you I am going to take strong issue, as one member of this House, and I think all of us on this side should and all of that side should as well, who believe in the inshore fishery, that the Liberal Leader is totally either misinformed or he is totally wrong in this case, when he says there is no need for the Province to have jurisdiction or any part of jurisdiction over the fishing industry. We are asking for shared jurisdiction. He is a brilliant lawyer and surely he must understand what we are saying.

Without shared jurisdiction - the members for Fogo and Twillingate and Bonavista North I am sure will agree that if we do not have a say - I heard the hon. gentleman on the media say that he was not in favour of the Province getting any additional jurisdiction over the fisheries. That is his quote. When asked why he said, 'Well, it is like a cat chasing a car and when he catches the car, he does not know what to do.'

AN HON. MEMBER:

A dog.

MR. MORGAN:

A cat or a dog. In this case, it is a poor example of either one.

Mr. Speaker, that is going to come back to haunt that man as leader of the party, because I am sure members of his caucus do not believe in that. I have heard them speak in the House over and

over. They do not believe in that. My goodness gracious! The member for Twillingate or Fogo do not believe they should not have a say if one of these days they became a Minister of Fisheries. They do not believe that he should, as minister for the Province, have no say over licensing of inshore fishermen and their boats. That is all we are saying that we want. That is one matter we want to have jurisdiction over it.

So is the Leader of the Liberal Party saying that we should not, as a government and as a Province, have any say over the licensing of fishermen and the licensing of inshore fishing boats? If he is, he is wrong.

Now, is he also saying that we should have not say over the setting of local quotas in our bays and certain sections of our Province? Because if he is saying that, he is saying the Province should have no say over what happens to the herring fishery, the mackerel fishery, or any other quotas in our bays.

How can we properly develop an inshore fishery if we have no say over these two major issues, how many licenses can be issued, who gets a license, what kind of boat they can go fishing in and what kind of fishing gear they are going to use?

Is he also saying that we should have nothing more to say than what we have now over fisheries? Because if he is saying that, he is believing in the demise of the inshore fishery and he is falling right into the hands of the federal bureaucrats who have been saying it for years.

Now, I would say, Mr. Speaker, and I say it in all sincerity, that the Leader of the Liberal Party has done this Province a major injustice by even commenting on that issue. It is so important now under the constitutional talks that we get on side with us other provinces so they agree with us having shared jurisdiction over our most important industry, the inshore fishery. Because right now, unless his colleagues today who speak in this debate explain what the Liberal Party's position is - I think that the member for Fogo, I do in all sincerity believe, cannot support that. He wants to have this Province have more say. That party could be in government one of these days. Who knows! Are you going to tell me you are going to let the bureaucrats in Ottawa, and you agree that the bureaucrats in Ottawa and others, make all these important decisions? No.

Mr. Speaker, that is one of the problems of the inshore fishery. It is managed and controlled too much by people in Ottawa who do not understand, the underlining word is understand. They do not understand our way of life. They do not understand our fishing industry. They do not understand where the community of Plate Cove is, versus Flatrock. They do not understand what it is all about! Why should they in Ottawa control our destiny in the inshore fishery?

So, Mr. Speaker, having said that I want to amend the resolution, seconded by my colleague for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons), who is quite a knowledgeable man in the fishery, so that after the word 'stocks' in the third paragraph, that all words be deleted and the following be added. Okay, after the word

'stocks' in the third WHEREAS of the resolution, the following will be added and that is 'overfishing', in other words, we are seeing depleted fish stocks because of overfishing and the lack of an appropriate jurisdiction by the Province.

'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador assert its faith in the inshore fishery', which we all agree, okay on that? But how are we going to do that? We are going to add in 'by continuing to pursue a comprehensive program of revitalization and development such as the Inshore Fisheries Agreement, debt restructuring, and an appropriate jurisdictional role for the Province to play.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, just for a few minutes on the amendment, as I was saying, and maybe the page could take this -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN:  
Okay. My friend the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) has now arranged for all members to get a copy of that amendment.

I have to say in sincerity that if you look at it, that is the major problem we are having in the inshore fishery. It is because of two issues. Overfishing, we all agree, overfishing in the offshore and not enough fish for our inshore.

The other major problem, and I think the Liberal Party will agree on this one because there are so many of them from the rural parts of the Province that depend on the fishery, and that is we have very little of an appropriate

jurisdictional role to play.

MR. SPEAKER (Greening):  
Order, please!

The hon. the minister's time is up.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker, could I speak on the amendment?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
For a couple of minutes.

MR. MORGAN:  
Okay. If these two problems were dealt with, the overfishing no question is a major one. But the lack of a jurisdictional role to play is just as vitally important to the inshore fishery.

We have to have a say over how we can manage and how we can control and how we can properly develop the most important industry. The key is control. We have never asked for any control over the policies to licence foreign fleets. That is federal. Leave it there. We have never asked to be involved in international fisheries negotiations. That is federal, international matters. Leave it there. We never asked to become involved in the research programme and researching the stocks etc. in the offshore. That is a federal responsibility. Let it stay there. We never asked to be involved in setting the total allowable catch for conservation purposes. Let that remain federal. We never asked to take over the inspection and quality control efforts on fish for export to foreign countries.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
(Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN:  
I can table my notes, yes. What I

am saying are the things that we think the federal government should have jurisdiction over, I have listed six of them and I have listed six where we should have, as a Province, should have jurisdiction in, and I will read them out for the record.

MR. TULK:  
Will you table them?

MR. MORGAN:  
Yes, I will table both for my friend for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

The Province, we feel, should have jurisdiction over: (1) The licensing of inshore fishermen and boats; (2) Negotiating the sharing of the total allowable catch among provinces. If something happens, for example, that the provinces like Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, which could be at odds, cannot agree, let it then go to -

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the member would permit a question?

MR. MORGAN:  
Well, as long as it does not take my time, you can carry on.

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

MR. TULK:  
Are you saying that in allocating the quotas between provinces that we should have the final say or just sit on a board?

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:  
I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that the provinces should have the right to decide the total allowable catch to be divided among provinces.

But if it came to a point where the provinces could not agree, then it would go to arbitration and the federal government could then be involved in the arbitrating of that matter. Now, that is number two under jurisdiction. (3) The setting of local quotas for our bays and certain sections of our Province, local quotas specified; (4) Of course, as we have now, the licensing of our fish plants; (5) Approving of harvesting plans for our own Newfoundland companies. Why should the federal government approve the harvesting plan for FPI? Why should the federal government approve the harvesting plan for the Harbour Grace plant and their trawlers? The Province should have a say over that. Anything to do with National Sea in Newfoundland, Newfoundland should have a say as well. The third one, which is motherhood, the Province should have all say over aquaculture, fish farming.

If we had those matters now mostly under federal jurisdiction passed over to the Province, and we had these under our jurisdiction, at the same time, we had those I mentioned earlier still left with the federal government, we would have more control over the destiny of the inshore fishery in our Province.

Mr. Speaker, having said that I want to move the amendment and I am hoping that the Liberal Party will agree. Indeed, I will be so co-operative that I will arrange to table my notes, if they can be read by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), as to what I am saying about jurisdiction.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. GILBERT:

When I listened to the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) I was a little shocked when the first thing he said was he wanted to close down the offshore fishery for five years. I am sure he did not mean that but he said it.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, to a point of order. I am sorry to interrupt the hon. gentleman but there was an amendment made and there has not been a decision made as to whether it was in order or not.

MR. SPEAKER:

The amendment is in order.

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, we heard the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) when he started and some of his comments seemed reasonable. I am sure we could agree with him over here as he identified some of the problems, but the closing down of the offshore for five years would seem a little radical to me. Maybe he did not mean to say that. He will get a chance to change it.

Now, what he has done is taken the resolution put forward by my colleague for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter), which is a good one and identified the problems, and they have decided they want to become a little political with this resolution. They quoted the Leader of the Liberal Party saying that he was not for jurisdiction.

Constitutional jurisdiction means that also we would have to be financially responsible for the

fisheries. Now, this, I think, is where the Leader of the Liberal Party in his statement is concerned when talking about the control of the fishery.

Management and control of the fishery are things that we in this party agree we should have and the only way that the inshore fishery is going to function is if we do have the management and control function here. But, once we get to the constitutional jurisdiction, then we have a financial responsibility, then we take on things like surveillance. Where then would this government get the money?

We have heard the Premier in recent months talk about the fact that the Province was virtually bankrupt and would have a serious problem unless the federal government kicked in money to keep it going or we would have a situation like we had in 1935. He was hoping maybe we should get there so then we would embarrass Canada into giving us some money to keep on our operating of the Province. So that is where we as Liberals differ with the members opposite when it comes to this resolution.

We have no trouble at all with the management and control thing. We think that the House Royal Commission made a very good recommendation when they said that there should be a provincial/federal committee set up to study and control the fishery in Newfoundland and not continue on, as it is right now, with two autonomous bodies at odds with each other. So, we have no problem, as I said, with management and control, but with jurisdiction comes financial responsibility. We do have some

problems because we do not think the Newfoundland Government is capable of the responsible financial control of the fisheries.

Now to get to the motion in fact, the first WHEREAS says, "WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador entered into an agreement with the Government of Canada for the restructuring of the offshore fishery." This is certainly there but why was the offshore fishery restructured? It was not because of anything the government and government members opposite did. It was because it was forced upon them by the fact that the fishing companies themselves were in no position to carry on with the fishery in Newfoundland. So really, the government and members opposite cannot take any responsibility for what happened in the offshore.

We heard the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) say that right now the offshore fishery should be closed down for five years. So we wonder if this was really as successful as far as they are concerned. When you have backbenchers over there saying that it should be closed down there is obviously a problem.

MR. MORGAN:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:  
When members are quoted in the House, and I am not saying there is any vicious point in this -

MR. SPEAKER:  
Is this a point of order?

MR. MORGAN:

A point of order, yes. I did not say close the offshore fishery for five years. I said it may come about that the fishermen will demand the closure of the offshore.

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order.

The hon. the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

I knew that, Mr. Speaker. The problem is that the member intimated that the offshore would have to be closed down for five years. If that is the solution he has to offer for the settling of the inshore fishery problems, I do not think he has given it too much thought.

MR. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

The record has to be straight in this House about what members say because Hansard publishes what is being said. I want to repeat this again. The hon. gentleman should not try to put words in my mouth. I did not say that the offshore fishery should be closed for five years, at no time did I say it should be closed for any period. But I said the fishermen may very well demand it be closed for a period of time. Now, let us get the record straight please. This is very important.

MR. TULK:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I am not going to comment on what the hon. gentleman is saying over there but, if I could, to Your Honour let me say that a point of order, as the hon. gentleman should know, has to do with rules of procedure. I do not see my friend breaking any rule of procedure. I would ask the hon. gentleman and the Speaker if he would protect my friend and see that the member for Bonavista South waits until some person on this side has an opportunity to make some points in debate.

MR. MORGAN:

To that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

To that point of order, the hon. the member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN:

If we are not going to be acting like juveniles in this House, as the Liberal Leader said last week, and act like a kindergarten in here, we must tell the truth and tell the facts! My colleague and friend is not giving the facts in this debate!

MR. SPEAKER:

There is no point of order, just a difference of opinion between two hon. gentlemen.

The hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. GILBERT:

Mr. Speaker, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) intimated that the offshore was going to have to be closed down. I do not think this is a way to solve the problems of the inshore

fishery.

Now, we have heard government members and the Cabinet promise that there was going to be a restructuring agreement put in place for the inshore fishery. We wonder why it has taken so long to sit down and start to put this agreement in place. We have had a crisis in the inshore fishery in Newfoundland for the last three years. We have just heard the member for Bonavista South admit that the inshore fishery on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland was going through its worst year to date. What has the government done to solve this problem?

They have promised they are going to sit down and negotiate a deal with the federal government, but we really have not seen anything constructive coming out of this. We wonder on this side if they are waiting. We hear the Premier every once and a while talking about an election. We are wondering now if they are waiting to use a restructuring of the inshore fishery as a policy or a reason to kick off an election.

Why is it that the fishermen of Newfoundland must be made to suffer like they have over the last three years while we find the government again posturing and playing political games with the lives of the inshore fishermen of Newfoundland and waiting to start to negotiate a restructured inshore fishery agreement with the federal government?

Is the government waiting for the inshore fishermen to reach the stage where my friend from Bonavista South said they would be this year when they would go to civil unrest and be led to starvation? This seems to be the

policy of this government. They drive people to the point where they have to be involved in some sort of a confrontation before any action is taken. The Premier seems to think that the only way to handle the situation is to let the inshore fishery reach the same stage in this Province that he indicated a short while ago he was going to do with the economy.

He wants to make sure the inshore fishery becomes a total failure. This seems to be the policy that the Premier has adopted. The inshore fishery must become a total failure and then, if he can hold Canada up to shame because they let the Province of Newfoundland go bankrupt and their inshore fishery fail, maybe somebody will kick in or help the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) in his kick-start budget to get the economy going again.

It seems to me we have a government over there that are not only going bankrupt in the economic sense, but they are bankrupt of ideas on how to provide sound government for this Province. You can see right now a concrete example of this with the current situation we have with the caplin fishery in Newfoundland. Caplin, I believe, was the third largest species caught last year, and cash wise it was as well. Everybody knows that the caplin fishery is one part of the fishery that makes the inshore fishery a very vital industry, particularly along the Northeast Coast where we only have a fishing season that, at the best, is four months long, maybe five if we get extremely good weather. Caplin was a new crop that we got involved with within the last few years. We found a market for some of the caplin and it was the third



largest product that was caught last year, cash crop, shall we say.

Now we find, right at a time when the fishermen should be out there catching these fish and bringing new dollars into Newfoundland, the unions and the processors are sitting down trying to work out a deal. We have lost the caplin fishery in St. Mary's Bay. We heard the union people say today that unless this is settled now, the fishery is gone for this year.

That, to me, would be another example that this government did not take the proper steps to ensure that the settlements were made. I am sure that if the provincial Department of Fisheries were doing the job when it was there, they would not have to wait until the union and the processors sat down to negotiate last week. They must have known there was an overcatch last year and that there was a surplus in Japan. They did not have to wait until now find this out.

Somewhere along the line, if the government were setting the policy that it should be setting, it would seem to me that they would have sat down and brought those people together earlier and made the arrangements that had to be made to ensure that there was a caplin season this year, and there would be fish caught this year in that sector of the market. But no, it was not done.

It proves again the point that I and members of this side have made. This is a government by crisis. Once it gets to the point where people have to go to civil disobedience or hunger strikes, then this government reacts. Not

until then will we find that this government will take action.

I heard the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) today say, 'How he was going to get the unions and the fish processors together?' His department must have known last year that there was an overcatch and something should have been done. Otherwise, we would be faced with the crisis that we have right now. We are into a knee-jerk situation again. Somebody has got to do something, otherwise we have lost the caplin fishery, a very vital part of the inshore fishery for this year.

Now, the House Royal Commission talked about a multiple species inshore fishery section. Fishermen that I have talked to along this coast have talked about the fact that since the licensing system has been in, the fishermen on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland cannot exist with a ground fish license. It has to be expanded. As I said, the caplin fishery was one that could have helped along the Northeast Coast.

In the district that I represent, of course, the fishermen there are more fortunate than their brothers along the Northeast Coast because they fish from ten to eleven months a year and have access to groundfish to make sure that they do make a living in the fishery in Newfoundland. So one of the things, I think, that should be looked at is increasing the licenses for different species of fish to the full-time fishermen of Newfoundland. It is a recommendation of the House Royal Commission and I think it should be looked at.

When we talk about restructuring the inshore fishery, one of the

other things we must talk about and think about, Mr. Speaker, is the scientific input. We just heard the member for Bonavista South make fun of the scientific input. Maybe he was right. Yet, there is no doubt about it in this day and age, we have to look at some of the problems scientifically. No doubt we are a lot better off. We have scientists now who are a lot better informed than they were when my father had boats fishing on the Grand Banks. We went out then, got their fish and came back, or they did not get them. But I think this is one field where we have not done very much with and I think it is one that we should.

When you talk to the inshore fishermen there is no doubt about the knowledge that they have through their years of experience. They have a certain knowledge about the fishery and they make good sense when they say that if this fish is going to be caught offshore, it is not going to be caught in the traps along the coast or on the trawls inshore. Maybe there is, and I think everybody admitted, there is overfishing on the offshore by the foreigners in the offshore. There are problems with the by-catch which has not been controlled. These are things we feel we should have control over and be able to take a stand as to what really is going on. We realize that the inshore fishermen when they talk about it, they are serious and concerned about the fact that the last two years have been a colossal failure in the inshore ground fishery in Newfoundland.

We heard this year great shouting and screaming again from the Premier and members opposite when

the situation arose concerning the overfishing on the St. Pierre Bank and when the federal government were going to give away Northern cod. I feel again that this was political posturing on the part of the Premier. I am sure that he knew before this year that there was very serious overfishing in that St. Pierre Bank area. All he had to do was talk to any of the people or the processors on the South Coast of Newfoundland. They would have told him that over the last three to four years the average size of cod that is landed into those plants along the South Coast has decreased. I think it used to be thirty-eight fish last year for a hundred pounds, right now it is forty-eight. So this to me is the example that he needed. He did not have to wait until he heard that they were trying to settle this. He could have asked any people in Newfoundland, if his government were there to govern, instead of respond to knee-jerk situations. He could have found out exactly what the problem was in the fishing industry of Newfoundland. To me we have serious problems in the fishing industry.

One of the other parts of the inshore fishery which I think we have started to touch on would be aquaculture. When we talk about aquaculture, world production of fish products through aquaculture over fifteen years ago was about 2.6 million tons. Right now, it is 10 million tons.

In Newfoundland we made a start on it. I suppose our first visible start was down in Bay d'Espoir, the district I represent, with the salmon hatchery. The federal government put most of the money into the salmon hatchery. We find right now it is to the point that

the aquaculture project in Bay d'Espoir is about ready to go. The smelts have been taken from the hatchery and are now out in the bay.

The only thing about it is the provincial government again postured and went through the situation that they were going to support the salmon growers in Bay d'Espoir. We find now that they would need about \$250,000 for start-up money, and we find that the provincial government are now backtracking and are not prepared to put this in.

This is the same provincial government, Mr. Speaker, that are prepared to put \$12 million into a Sprung greenhouse here in Mount Pearl when the technology is unproven. No one knows for sure if the taxpayers money is going to be wasted. Yet, in Bay d'Espoir, an aquaculture programme that is a proven technology, we find that the provincial government is unable to provide the funding to ensure that at least this project in Bay d'Espoir has a fighting chance of survival.

Yes, we find that they are prepared to commit \$12 million of Newfoundland taxpayers' money to a hydroponics industry, a glorified greenhouse, which technology has not yet been proven. This, Mr. Speaker, is the type of planning we see from the government and members opposite. That is what has happened all the way down as far as the inshore fishery in Newfoundland is concerned, it just has been by crisis, not by any plan that was put in place.

Mr. Speaker, if I had time I could go into the infrastructure of the inshore fishery in Newfoundland. Along the South Coast we have some

serious problems with fishing stages. In one of the communities in my district, Grey River, they have been told by Fishery Products International that unless there is water installed at the community stage, they will not be buying their fish after September.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. GILBERT:  
In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I feel the government has not done anything worthwhile for the inshore fishery, and what they have done was just a knee-jerk reaction.

MR. PARSONS:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. PARSONS:  
Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

It is with pleasure that I rise today to second the amendment. I believe, myself, that it deals with the problem in a more direct way and would be more beneficial to Newfoundlanders and Labradorians. Mr. Speaker, being involved in a tangible way with a group of fishermen on the Northeast Coast, I agree with the hon. member for Twillingate. I would like to add here that since I came to this hon. House, the questions asked by that hon. member and his remarks were always, to me, sensible and sincere. I must say that I always looked at him knowing that the gentleman did have the experience, and I always felt that he had the

feelings and the aspirations of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians at heart.

MR. TOBIN:

Say something (inaudible).

MR. PARSONS:

You have to tell the truth. At any rate, I agree with what the hon. member says about the situation in Newfoundland as it pertains to the fishery. I have seen it. I have been out in the mornings and I have talked to a number of fishermen. And when you see them coming in and their catches are so low, it is pitiful. It is alarming to say the least. It goes back to something that happened last year when a number of people on the Northeast Coast saw the need, saw the dilemma that the fishery was in and were inspired to form an association. When NIFA was formed, these were the reasons: We felt that the inshore fishery along the Northeast Coast was in trouble. Thankfully, Mr. Speaker, our feelings at that time were not completely true. We had biologists engaged, and it took them, I think, about eight weeks to come up with a paper as it pertained to the inshore fishery, and their feelings were in agreement with what we had thought all along, that there was overfishing in 2J+3KL.

Mr. Speaker, at that time we presented a ten point plan - when I say we, I was a member of the inshore NIFA, Newfoundland Inshore Fisheries Association - and all those ten points were agreed upon and put into practice by the federal government. We were aided and abetted completely by the provincial government. Mr. Speaker, it is not really too late in this part of the country. I

have seen years myself, my own experience, when the fish was late coming in. Hopefully, this is the situation we are into today, that the fish is late coming in and perhaps by the end of the month we will see plenty of cod. I hope, for the sake of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians, that that will be the case.

Mr. Speaker, I can remember when years ago Peter and Paul's Day was the day, really, that the fishery started, and that was June 29. Taking that into account, we still have time for the fishery to be a success. I know I repeat myself, but it is so important to me and, I think, so important to every Newfoundlander that our hopes and aspirations will prevail.

Mr. Speaker, we talk about depleted fish stocks, and we always said that a fish can only be caught once. I was surprised when the effort was spread out over 2J+3KL. For a number of years we were led to believe that 2J was almost impossible to fish, and they found it much easier, much more beneficial to fish in the 3KL. Now, this year, they were forced to take one third of their catch from 2J, and I am talking about the offshore plants. In that respect, they caught their catch in record time.

We deal pretty well to a maximum point on biologists' reports and scientific references, scientific knowledge of what transpires out in our fishing zones. But I knew there was a discrepancy as far as fish sizes were concerned in different zones, when I was told that fish 2J were really small compared to fish from 3K and 3L; as you come South the fish got much larger. So you can see there was a point of contention when

those trawlers wanted to catch the fish in the Southern most parts of that area. As I have said, the further South you come the larger the fish, and the larger the fish the better price you get for it. It is as simple as that.

MR. TOBIN:

The further South you go the better everything gets.

MR. PARSONS:

I have been told by the hon. member next to me that the further South you go the better everything gets. I think that is debatable. That is debatable, to say the least.

Mr. Speaker, with the effort that was extended to the DFO last year by Newfoundlanders, by the Premier, by the Minister of Fisheries, by all organizations interested in the inshore fishery, hopefully this year, because of the spreading out of the areas to do 2J+3KL - another recommendation had to do with discards. Last year discards were not counted. This year, no matter what comes over the end of a trawler, it is counted. Taking everything into consideration, NIFA recommended that the DFO reduce its catch to about 185,000 metric tons. But they did not, they reduced it by 10,000 tons.

Mr. Speaker, when you take everything into consideration, the discards and the spreading out of the overall catch by those offshore trawlers, it is more than 10,000 metric tons. In fact, Mr. Speaker, it could almost be somewhere in the vicinity of 200,000 metric tons.

Mr. Speaker, I heard one of the members from the Opposition say that the Minister of Fisheries did

not do what he should do, because in 2GH he had already given away fish. Mr. Speaker, there is an allocation of 12,000 tons in 2GH and the most that was ever taken by Canadian fishermen is 500 tons. In essence, if he gave something away it certainly was not anything that we were cultivating ourselves. We were not involved in that fishery to any extent. If we had to put something on the table, if we had to be good samaritans, good Canadians and we had something to barter with, then I do not see anything wrong with bartering in that area to a point - to a point. Right now it is known that we do not have the vessels to go into that area, but I do not think that is a problem down the road. I think, science being what it is, we can come up with the technology to produce ships capable of performance in that area.

Mr. Speaker, in talking about the Canada/France deal, I heard the Minister of Fisheries today - and he was quite explicit - reiterate to the House in no uncertain terms that Newfoundland stood now as it stood then. We are not about to place any Northern cod on the table. We would be less than true Newfoundlanders and Labradorians if we did. As far as this government is concerned, there will be no Northern cod on the table at any time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have had the Prime Minister of Canada tell the Minister of Fisheries in writing that nothing will happen as far as this agreement is concerned without Newfoundland's input. Mr. Speaker, we have that input in the hon. John Crosbie, in Ottawa, and we certainly have the input in Newfoundland with, I think the whole House will agree, one of the

finest Newfoundland Ministers of Fisheries we have ever had. In saying that, I look at the caplin fishery. I have been trying to keep up-to-date on the caplin fishery and I have talked to a lot of people. All last week, even on Sunday, the Minister of Fisheries met with the caplin producers from seven o'clock in the morning until eleven o'clock that night to try to bring the parties together.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries cannot get involved. Let us be fair about it. We all talk about unions. They have their own union, and the producers have their association. The Japanese are out there and they are the masterminds of the whole thing. You could not set a caplin price three months ago when the Japanese will not even talk about a price until about the first of June. So it is like any other agreement.

The point remains that we have to be sensible and logical about it. The Japanese sort of have us over a barrel. They had so much caplin from last year, and because they are good businessmen - and I think everyone will agree - they saw a way to improve upon their lot and they kept everyone in abeyance until today. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say to the House now that things are not all lost as far as the caplin fishery is concerned and there still could be an agreement. Certainly, Mr. Speaker, there could be a lot lost, and there is a lot lost at this present moment, but if an agreement could come, there is still perhaps a week or two weeks left in Conception Bay, Trinity Bay, Bonavista Bay, White Bay and Notre Dame Bay. An agreement coming today could still play a major role.

I was speaking to one of the processors at noon and there was a reluctance on his part to say whether an agreement was forthcoming, but he did say there was a chance.

Mr. Speaker, in going away a bit from the caplin, the thing that worries me is that in Newfoundland, sometimes, everything seems to be against the fishermen. A few years ago, in my area at least, the salmon fishery was of great benefit to the majority of the people. At one time, they were allowed to set nets May 1. At one time they could set them ad hocly, whenever they liked. Now they are down to June 5. Mr. Speaker, on June 5 this year there was a man in Torbay who put out one fifty fathom net. That evening he went out to that net and he took out ninety salmon. On his way back he just happened to look and he picked out another seven. He had ninety-seven salmon in one net. But that was the end of it. The next morning he only had five or six, because the salmon had passed. You know, fishermen are not stupid. They know, as well as we all know, that that was not just something that happened; the salmon had passed and the season was practically over.

Mr. Speaker, there is nothing we can do about the fish out there. We cannot go out and get the fish to swim in. It is not really a resource that you can rely on. But, Mr. Speaker, I feel, and I really feel this from in here, in my heart, that if we had more jurisdiction over our own resource, then we would make this fishery better for Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

Mr. Speaker, I never met the man

until a few days ago, but I was surprised at the new Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Wells). Perhaps he was misquoted, or whatever, but I read somewhere that he felt that jurisdictional resolutions as far as this government was concerned were not apropos to what the Liberal Party felt. I do not know if the gentleman was misquoted but, if he was not, I just cannot understand his rationale. Because I feel that is where our biggest problem is. I am not fool enough to say that we need complete jurisdiction, but we need jurisdiction that amounts to our own housekeeping, our own motherhood values as far as it pertains to the fishery, and we certainly do not have it.

MR. W. CARTER:

We need improved jurisdiction.

MR. PARSONS:

Yes, we need improved jurisdiction. I am not foolhardy enough to think that we can have complete jurisdiction and surveillance, because we just do not have the dollars to do it. We are not in the position to do it. That is a federal thing but, I think, we need better jurisdiction and more jurisdiction in our own field of endeavor.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this amendment to the resolution passes, and I hope that in bringing in this resolution we will make people aware of the dilemma the fishery has faced and is facing this present year. Again I want to emphasize to this House, Mr. Speaker, that I do not care what field of endeavour a person is in, if he is a school teacher, if he is a doctor, if he is a lawyer, if he is a dentist, if he is a businessman, or whatever, he

cannot say he is not affected in a tangible way. Every Newfoundlander and Labradorian is affected by the fishery in one way or the other, and I hope that through this resolution more people will become aware of that. I believe we sometimes get lost, pertaining to things that involve us in a great way, and the fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador is our prime industry and has been since Newfoundland's inception. I hope again, Mr. Speaker, that this amendment passes and I fully support it.

Thank you, very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all congratulate my good friend for Twillingate (Mr. W. Carter) on having the foresight to put before us a resolution which is so vital and so appropriate for us to be discussing at this time. It is even made more appropriate by the fact that we are witnessing once again in the Province perhaps what is going to be, and I do not want to sound negative, because I am sure nobody in this Legislature does, what is perhaps going to be the worse year in our history for sometime for the inshore fishery.

As the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) said and as the member for Twillingate said, there is absolutely no doubt that the inshore fishery, particularly the cod fishery, is on the decline, particularly along the Northeast

Coast of the Province. I can say to the member for Twillingate, as he well knows, and the member for Bonavista South that without the fishery in the lump roe this year, I think we will be looking at practical starvation in terms of the fishery along the Northeast Coast.

Let me say to my friend for Bonavista South as well that he does not have to preach to this side of the House about protection of the inshore fishery. Let me say to my friend for Bonavista South that it was this party in 1985, when the now Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout) messed around in July, August and September of 1985, when he sat back and talked to the federal minister, and as we say on this side, we believe that sometimes he had tea and crumpets with him, we went up and down this coast and sought and the advice of fishermen. We brought into this Legislature the very recommendations that the member for Bonavista South this afternoon stood up and proposed that we should put forward in this Legislature.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Let me say to the credit of members on this side who sat on that Committee that they paid for their twenty-two meetings that they held around this Province out of their own pockets.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

So let there be no doubt -

AN HON. MEMBER:

That was two years ago.

MR. TULK:

That was two years ago in 1985.

Let there be no doubt in anybody's mind, in the member for Bonavista South's mind, of the commitment of members on this side to the inshore fishery. To do otherwise on our part would make us traders to our own people, the people we represent.

Let me also say to him, and let me say to this Minister of Fisheries that they, and by they I mean his government and the Premier of this Province, made a commitment to the people of this Province in 1983 and 1984 that when we got a P.C. Government in Ottawa most of our problems would be solved. Let me say that that is a commitment that this Minister of Fisheries and that this Premier will not be allowed to forget.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

The infliction and prosperity has not come with Hibernia or the Atlantic Accord and the infliction of prosperity is certainly not taking place in the inshore fishery. We find our fishermen along this coast in the same mess they were in in 1985.

Let me say to the Minister of Fisheries that it is not good enough for the Premier last Fall to stand in this - no, not in this Legislature because he would not open it - to stand before the cameras and the microphones of this Province and have the biggest kind of fuss about the fishing of 2J+3KL cod. It is not good enough for him to go on a little trip yesterday with the Federal



Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Siddon) and not give any commitment as to whether the Federal Minister of Fisheries was still going to put 2J+3KL cod on the table, and not give any commitment as to what stand he would take if the Minister of Fisheries did that. It is not good enough, I say to the Minister of Fisheries and to the government, to put words on paper. It is not good enough to have your fuss, if I can call it that, and then want to try and skip out from under it. That is not the way the fishery of this Province has to be run.

I say to the Minister of Fisheries, it is not good enough either for him to put in a policy paper that we do not fish the Tail and Nose of the Grand Banks and that we try to get jurisdiction, a word which has been misused by this government in the most outlandish form, that it is not good enough for them to put that in as a policy statement and then to allow his political party compatriots, and that is what they are, he cannot deny that, to come into this Province and say that it is not a matter of vital concern to him as to whether we get control of the Tail and Nose of the Grand Banks and the Flemish Cap. That is not good enough either.

In other words, what I am saying to the Minister of Fisheries is this: If you are going to develop a sound plan, if you are going to put forward - and I say this to the member for Bonavista South as well, who does not seem to understand what he means when he talks about jurisdiction, and who has made a career of attacking a Federal Liberal Party when they were in power. They cannot get out from under the commitments

that they have made. It is not good enough, I say to the Minister of Fisheries, because I know he is concerned. I do not doubt his sincerity. I know he is concerned about what happens to the inshore fishery because he comes from a part of this coast where the inshore fishery is very important. But I say to him that it is just not good enough for his Premier to spout off at the mouth, that is what he is doing, for the member for Bonavista South to try to move the provincial government out from under what their commitments were to the people of this Province, all in the name of politics. That is not good enough.

Mr. Speaker, we saw the member for Bonavista South this evening rise in his place and, it has been his fashion since I sat in that gallery and watch him performed under a former Premier of this Province, Mr. Moores, to stand up and talk against his own government and then to try and move them out from under in the last part of his speech.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Bravado.

MR. TULK:

It is bravado and it is not worth anything.

When he moved an amendment this evening, and I am sorry to see the member for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Parsons) perhaps falling into the same kind of trap, being led into that trap by the member for Bonavista South. When he stood in his place this evening he tried to get everybody in the Legislature on his side to say, 'Oh, I know that the member for Fogo, I know that the member for Twillingate, I know that the member for Bonavista North agrees with me. I know they

agree with me that we have to have an inshore fishery in this Province.' He is absolutely right. We agree that you have to have a viable inshore fishery in this Province and we agree that this Province has to have a major say in how this fishery is run.

But we will not agree, I say to the hon. gentleman, to him trying to arouse our patriotism or nationalism that exists in all of us, we will not agree to that and then walk away from this Legislature with nothing in place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
And that, Mr. Speaker, is exactly what the government has done.

For example, if you look through policy statements of the provincial government over the last number of years you will see a matter that arises which my friend from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Simmons), the Leader of the Opposition tried to clarify this evening in the House to the Government House Leader (Mr. Ottenheimer), when he did not answer his questions, and it should be noted that he did not answer his questions. You will see them say they want legislative jurisdiction. Mr. Speaker, that is a broad sweeping terms. Just what does it mean to have legislative jurisdiction?

It means, of course, that you come into this House, the government proposes laws and, with their majority, they pass them regardless of what they are, and they become the laws of this Province. As such, it follows from that, if you make laws in this Province, as the Minister of

Finance (Dr. Collins) well knows, you have to enforce them.

A question has to be asked, and I know that the Premier must have asked it. I am not sure what the answer was in his own mind, as anybody else in this Province is not sure of what the Premier talks about when he talks about legislative jurisdiction. Just what is it he is talking about? Has he considered whether he has the means, whether he has the resources in terms of dollars, manpower and so on to enforce it? Has he considered whether in fact, if he spends the money to enforce his so-called legislative jurisdiction, whether the cost outweighs the benefit. I suggest to you the answer is he has not and it is not important to the Premier as to whether as to whether he does or not.

Mr. Speaker, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) proposed an amendment to the resolution which says that this Province must have an appropriate jurisdictional role in the management for the fishery. That is all he said. I say to him that says nothing. That says nothing. It says absolutely nothing. What is appropriate?

MR. MORGAN:  
It is more than we got now.

MR. TULK:  
It is more than we got now. Now, that is the typical kind of analytical answer that you get from the member for Bonavista South, 'more than we have got now.' How much more? A little bit more? A lot more?

MR. MORGAN:  
I told you in my debate.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

MR. TULK:  
Do we have complete control? That is the kind of politics that is beneath the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) whom I know feels sincerely about the inshore fishery. There is no doubt about that. I say to him, Mr. Speaker, that we will not accept that kind of thing from him. It is too vague. It does not outline what we want.

MR. MORGAN:  
Make it shared jurisdiction.

MR. TULK:  
Jurisdiction, I say to him, implies that you have a responsibility to do certain things as well. I say to him that we, on this side, believe quite sincerely that this Province must have an involvement in the management of the fishery in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
Accordingly, Mr. Speaker, I am going to move a sub-amendment to his amended resolution which reads, and I will read it so that the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) can hear it quite clearly. It reads, and it is seconded by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock), 'All of the words in the third WHEREAS be struck after the word, and, and insert: the lack of an appropriate provision for provincial involvement in the management of the fishery.' That is after your third WHEREAS because it is lacking. 'All of the words from the THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED be struck after the word,

restructuring, and insert: an appropriate provision for provincial involvement in management of the fisheries.'

The resolution would now read, Mr. Speaker:

'WHEREAS the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador entered into an agreement with the Government of Canada for the restructuring of the offshore fishery;

'AND WHEREAS the inshore fishery is undergoing difficult times because of the depleted fish stocks, overfishing, and the lack of an appropriate provision for provincial involvement in management of the fisheries;

'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador assert its faith in the inshore fishery by continuing to pursue a comprehensive programme of revitalization and development such as the Inshore Fisheries Agreement, debt restructuring, and an appropriate provision for provincial involvement in management of the fishery.'

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:  
Now, Mr. Speaker, let me say to the hon. gentlemen that I do not know -

AN HON. MEMBER:  
A copy?

MR. TULK:  
Yes, it is gone to the table. You will get a copy.

Let me say to the hon. gentleman, I do not know where he has been for a while, Mr. Speaker, but the

truth of the matter is, if we are going to have an effective - and I agree with everything that he said about the bureaucrats in Ottawa, I agree with everything that he said. I would ask him though to go a step further and say that his own minister in Ottawa has to control those bureaucrats and point them in the right direction. That is what he is there for. To try to take the blame away from the federal minister is not good enough.

That minister has it in his power to implement a recommendation of the House Royal Commission which recommends the setting up of a Provincial/Federal Management Board for the fishery. I do not know whether the hon. minister has read it or not, but Mr. Speaker, that would be the kind of lines that we would talk about. When he hears the Leader of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador standing in his place and saying he is against some of the things that the Premier of this Province is saying, let me say to him, Mr. Speaker, that I would tell him and tell him quite sincerely that it is not because the Leader of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland and Labrador is against the inshore fishery, but he has an understanding and an appreciation of saying what you mean rather than what you want people to think you mean. That is the difference.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

That, Mr. Speaker, is the kind of approach that we need, not only to fisheries problems in this Province, but to problems in other parts of our economy as well.

Mr. Speaker, having said that, let

me conclude by saying to the former Minister of Fisheries - and I trust that sub-amendment is in order - that I never again want to see him play the cheap kind of politics which will not serve his fishermen and his plant workers in Bonavista South, mine in Fogo, those in Twillingate, those in Labrador, the cheap kind of politics that says, 'Oh at one point the Liberal Party is for this and then the Liberal Party is against that.' I say to the hon. gentleman that he should get an understanding of just what it is that goes through the mind of a man like the Leader of the Liberal Party and then he will be better off.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) the party is forcing him to back and fill, and rightly so.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, let me once again say to you and let me say to the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan) and the Minister of Fisheries that this party - and let there never be any doubt - that this party stands foursquare behind the inshore fishery of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Let me say this to him: I will put the record of the Liberal Party of Canada in front of the present record of the present administration in Ottawa.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Let me say to him that it was a federal Liberal Government, led by a good son, a former son of this Province, that put the 200 mile limit in place for us in the beginning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

If I can say to him, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps gave him something to quarrel about. If we could have the same kind of initiative, the same kind of leadership from the present federal minister, then I say to the provincial Minister of Fisheries he would not have to stand in this Legislature and say, 'I am going to oppose the federal Minister of Fisheries about the Tail and Nose of the Grand Banks' because that kind of gentleman would see the importance of the Tail and the Nose of the Grand Banks to the people of this Province.

Let me say to the former Minister of Fisheries, the member for Bonavista South (Mr. Morgan), it was a federal Liberal Government who put the necessary funds in place of the restructuring of the deep-sea fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Let me say to the hon. gentleman that it was one Jack Pickersgill, a Liberal minister from Newfoundland, who steered the UIC regulations for the fisheries through the House of Commons.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Let me say to him that one William Rompkey was the gentleman who looked after women's unemployment and helped give unemployment benefits for women in the fishery in this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN:

He was no friend.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

MR. TULK:

Let me say to the hon. gentleman, only time will evaluate where the present federal government comes down on the side of. We have sat in this Legislature for the past two years, I say to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Rideout), and we have asked that a restructuring programme be put in place for the inshore fishery. It has not happened yet.

While we hear the Minister of Fisheries, in a confused fashion, I believe, getting on and talking about a new fisheries agreement for the building of wharves and breakwaters and so on, we do not hear him talking too much about getting federal involvement in terms of the debt restructuring of fishermen in this Province, the inshore fishermen.

The truth of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that I believe, and I want the former Minister of Fisheries to listen to this, I believe sincerely at this point that the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Siddon, is being run by one Mr. Mayboon. Now I would ask him to consider that. If he is not

being run, if a policy direction of the Department of Fisheries in Ottawa, if that is not the real problem here, rather than whether the Province has jurisdiction or the federal government has jurisdiction, if it is not a problem of a federal Minister of Fisheries being told by bureaucrats what to do, and whether, indeed, that Minister of Fisheries has not succumb - and I say this is a tragedy if he has - has not succumb to allowing that administrator, that bureaucrat to close down the inshore fishery, which will be, Mr. Speaker, the end of rural Newfoundland as we know it.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER:  
Order, please! Just before the hon. minister starts, the sub-amendment is in order. So we are debating the three, the sub-amendment, the amendment, and the main resolution.

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Before I get in full flight, I notice something here and I think it is probably a typographical error. Let me first of all say that I do not think we have any difficulty with the sub-amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
I do not think it derogates in any way the intent of the amendment that we submitted and perhaps adds to it in some way. So I do not think we have any difficulty with it.

There is perhaps a typo or error, unintentionally a word or two left out of the second WHEREAS. AND WHEREAS the inshore fishery is undergoing difficult times because of the depleted fish stocks, overfishing.' Your sub-amendment says 'and an appropriate provision...'

MR. TULK:  
The lack of.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
The lack of. That is not here on the type of paper.

MR. TULK:  
No, I read it in.

MR. RIDEOUT:  
So, by consent then, that will be the official resolution with 'and the lack of.' We have no difficulty with that.

Mr. Speaker, let me first of all compliment the hon. gentleman for Twillingate (Mr. Carter) in bringing in this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT:  
The hon. gentleman has as good a

feel, probably a better feel than a lot of us, for the heart and soul of the inshore fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador. I think that is generally reflected in the sincerity, the wording and the articulation of the resolution by the hon. member.

Obviously, as a politician, he strayed a little bit and the resolution as originally put forth could conceivably allow one to get into a fairly heavy political debate. I think we have probably corrected that now with the amendment and with the sub-amendment and I believe that perhaps all of us, certainly the Official Opposition and ourselves, are generally, with the terminology of the wording of the resolution, in agreement.

The hon. gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), of course, could not resist from trying to turn the debate rather partisan. But we can let that go because I think the issue, the nuts and bolts of the resolution that we are dealing with is too important for us to get bogged down in what one administration did versus another administration, or what was accomplished twenty years ago vis-a-vis what should be accomplished today.

I think the goal, the objective or the aim ought to be a genuine debate on the content and the intent of this resolution because it is so important to so many Newfoundlanders and Labradorians in so many communities around the Province. That does not mean to say, I suppose, from time to time we might stray a little bit and become a little bit partisan, but the intent of the debate ought to be to address the seriousness of the situation that we face and, I

think, the resolution is very well worded in that regard.

Let me begin first of all by saying to the gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), I have no particular axe to grind about Dr. Mayboon, who is the present Deputy Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa. I never met the man before until he became Deputy Minister. I had known the former Deputy, Dr. May, who was there. I had a lot of respect for him and got along well with him. But, deputies come and deputies go, as ministers come and ministers go. Let me say this about Dr. Mayboon having dealt with him for two or two and a half years in rebuttal to the point made by the gentleman for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

It is not, in my considered opinion, the Dr. Mayboons of Ottawa who are the problem when you talk about shared jurisdiction or extended jurisdiction, or when you talk about strategies for Canada/France negotiations. It is not the Dr. Mayboons of the bureaucracy of Ottawa who are the problem. In fact, they are very, very helpful and very, very supportive. The bureaucrats of External Affairs are where the problem is and that has not changed, Mr. Speaker, from the former administration to this administration, back to the days of Lester Pearson, as far as I can see, when Canada wanted to be that great power that was diplomatically acceptable to everybody in the world and not shake the boat, not rock the boat, not stand politically strong as a nation on some issues. That mentality has not changed. I am sorry to say it. It has not changed.

The bureaucratic advice on

international issues that are so important to the fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador has not changed with the change of government because they do not understand and they have a mind set about how you deal in the diplomatic community with a thorny issue like extended jurisdiction. Nobody wants to touch it because the only other country in the world that has a continental shelf that goes outside of 200 miles is Argentina. Nobody thinks Argentina is the right one to ally yourself with in the diplomatic circles of Europe and the diplomatic circles of everywhere else and win a diplomatic argument. That is the mind set in External Affairs. I have been involved in it for a couple of years and that is the mind set.

Dr. Mayboon, on the other hand, has done tremendous service for this country in taking the Europeans on head to head on the LTA and taking them on head to head on the Canada/France matter, but there is another hierarchy up there in another department that is not conducive to taking the ball and rolling with it on a number of those major issues. I want to make that clear. That is my opinion. That is where, I think, the problem has been in the past. It is where, I think, the problem is at the moment in terms of taking this and developing it any further.

Let it not be thought either, Mr. Speaker, that from day to night you are going to win international approval to extend your jurisdiction. Let it not be assumed that things are so simple as that. What we have to do is a deliberate, thought out, plot by plot, strategy so that at the end of the strategy, Canada will have

functionally extended its jurisdiction and it right to manage stocks beyond the present 200 mile limit.

If you look at 63 (2) of the International Convention on the Law of the Sea, there are both implicit and explicit movements that a sovereign state can take so that it can make the case internationally. In fact, there are legal thinkers in the world who believe that there is a legal functional way to extend jurisdiction without grabbing more of the sea bed, or without getting into other international politics, but that takes a political will to do, it takes political strategy and political will by a sovereign state. No other state out there has the problem, no other state out there except Canada and Argentina. So, we are alone. We are cutting new ground and the people in External Affairs do not like that, and that is where the problem is, Mr. Speaker. That is the problem. We can take our marbles and go home and say that is the end of it, but we have to collectively keep at it so that the political will, hopefully, will arrive so that Canada can do those things.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman, as well, made some reference to the inshore fisheries agreement and debt restructuring. These are two very important components, but they will not put fish in the boat; jurisdiction and proper management will hopefully put fish in the boat. Infrastructure agreements will not put fish in the boat and, therefore, dollars in the pockets and food on the table, but they are important components of a comprehensive fisheries programme for revitalization of the inshore



fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador. I make no apologies for that, and I make no bones about that.

We did everything proper, and I suppose there would be those who would argue we did a lot of things improper, to get the Government of Canada to commit itself to putting in place an inshore fisheries agreement in 1987. That process, Mr. Speaker, is well along the road to finalization: negotiations have been going on now for the last several weeks quite amicably, quite friendly, progress has been made and that commitment by both governments will be kept this year, as was indicated.

Now, the hon. gentleman said building more wharves or putting in more ice making facilities or expanding marine service centers is not necessarily what is needed. But that is only one component, Mr. Speaker, of this comprehensive inshore agreement that we are putting together. There is a facilities component in it, there is an aquaculture component in it, there is a harvesting component in it, there is a processing component in it: You take them all and put them together, and you have a comprehensive package that will be important for several dozens of communities in rural Newfoundland and Labrador.

Also, Mr. Speaker, there was some criticism to the effect that I have not engaged the federal government in terms of debt restructuring for inshore fishermen. I have made it abundantly clear on more than one occasion, in fact on numerous occasions, that we are, as a Province which has the responsibility for and carries the

guarantees on the debt of the Fisheries Loan Board, moving on that ourselves. In fact, we have concluded as a government the options that we are prepared to go forth with and, in the spirit of cooperation and consultation that is so evident among us, we committed to have those options reviewed by the representatives of the fishermen of this Province. It has been given to them, Mr. Speaker, but it is not yet back to me, Mr. Speaker. I hope there will probably be some amendments made to it as a result of that consultative process, but I am not yet in a position to take a definitive document for government approval because I have not yet received the feedback from the representatives of the fishermen. Because if we are going to do a comprehensive debt restructuring programme for the inshore fishery, it has to be a programme that is generally equitable, it has to be a programme that is generally acceptable, it has to be a programme that is generally defensible by the people who are most directly concerned, the fishermen. If it is brought in from on high by me or some other person in the government and it is lodged on their shoulders and they do not agree with it and they have not had input into it and all the things of that nature, then, of course, there is going to be more and more difficulty and it is not going to work.

I want to bring forth a programme and a package that will be generally acceptable, and generally supportable and supportive of the fishermen in general, and we are now 99.9 per cent through that maze and it is almost completed. Mr. Speaker, I think the proof of the pudding is in the eating. We have, in fact,

an overall comprehensive policy and plan to revitalize and save and enhance the inshore fishery of this Province. It has many components to it, one no more important than the other, but collectively a policy and a programme that will be beneficial and will ensure that there will always be, as there must be if there is going to be a Newfoundland and Labrador, an inshore fishery.

Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate, or move the amendment, whatever the wording is.

MR. TULK:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A point of order, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, according to our Standing Orders we have two Wednesdays to debate this resolution, but I think there is, as a result of the debate in the Legislature this afternoon, a feeling which, perhaps, you do not witness too often in this Legislature. I am not sure where the people from the NDP stand, but at least on the government side and on the official Opposition side there is unanimous agreement on a resolution which would be, I suggest, very encouraging to a group of people who today are perhaps suffering economically. As the House may not be in session next Wednesday, I think it would perhaps be appropriate at this point if, in the interest of the fishery in Newfoundland, we had the vote at this point.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. TULK:

Then, all parties in the Legislature would be on record as showing the inshore fishermen of Newfoundland that we do have a common interest and a common goal in seeing their prosperity.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I certainly concur with the expressions of the hon. Opposition House Leader and, if we are all in agreement, we can vote on the resolution. Those who have not spoken it can be noted, if that indeed is the case, that it was passed unanimously and we could, by agreement, instead of going through three processes, the sub-amendment, the amendment, and then the resolution, vote on the final document -

MR. SIMMS:

The resolution is the final document.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

- which is the resolution in its final form.

MR. TULK:

Yes.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

We could do that. We will proceed then, Mr. Speaker, with that.

MR. SPEAKER:

By agreement then we will vote on the main resolution.

All those in favour please say 'aye'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Aye.

MR. SPEAKER:  
All those again 'nay".

The resolution is carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
If we are in agreement, we could come back from eight and sit no later than eleven and conduct public business. It will help all of us out.

MR. TULK:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. TULK:  
Let me say to the Government House Leader that we on this side certainly have no objection to that. All we in the Opposition are requesting is that the business of the House be done in a reasonable manner. If we work tonight, it is immaterial to us. We are prepared to work at night as well by day.

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:  
My understanding of the point of order was that the vote would be taken immediately and that we would be in a position to adjourn at six o'clock as is normally the practice. I was not giving agreement to come in and sit this evening.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

No, let me clarify. Nobody is assuming that. There are two different issues. There was agreement that the resolution be voted on, and it was voted on. I then asked whether there was agreement that we can sit from eight to no later than eleven in order to conduct public business so that there will be adequate time with legislation, the financial resolutions and all of that. We will probably be sitting tomorrow night, as well. We do not know how long we do have to sit, but it will be long enough for everybody to adequately say what they wish to say. That is what I am asking.

I would point out, as it is the hon. gentleman's first time here, that it is not unusual. As the session has a fair history behind it, nobody knows when it is going to adjourn - even with a ouija board one would be hard pressed - and it is not unusual, then, to sit a few hours in the evening.

MR. LONG:  
Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LONG:  
Well, if that is the second point of order we are now dealing with, the question of sitting this evening, I am not prepared to give leave for that because I am unable to, my leader is not here. I was ready to go for an immediate vote on the resolution so we could unanimously pass it.

MR. SPEAKER:  
That is done.

MR. LONG:  
But, no, there is no leave to sit

this evening.

MR. MORGAN:

That is ridiculous. A new member comes into the House and disrupts everything.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I would just say to the hon. the member of the Socialist Party who represents, or purports to represent - purports to represent - workers' interests, is it unreasonable to ask to come back - we have sat from three to six - for another two or three hours? I mean, what is this going to be, the three hour work week?

Anyway, it is time to adjourn, I suppose.

MR. LONG:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for St. John's East.

MR. LONG:

I would simply submit that it would not have been unreasonable to ask us in advance whether we were prepared to do that and we would have perhaps been able to make arrangements. But we are simply unprepared to sit this evening. The Government House Leader may not like it, but there it is.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

I would make two points to the hon. gentleman. First of all, it is not unreasonable for the Government House Leader to request that this be done. Secondly, I would question as to why the hon. gentleman is not prepared? Surely he recognizes that the place of the member for Menihek is in this Legislature. And surely he recognizes that we as legislators in this Province have a public duty to see that whatever time is needed to debate legislation is taken. So I would ask him to reconsider and perhaps give the hon. gentleman the leave that is required.

MR. LONG:

There is no leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

What is the wish of hon. members in this matter?

MR. SIMMONS:

Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. SIMMONS:

Let me speak briefly to the request. My colleague for Fogo has covered the essential points, but as a member of the House I just wanted to record my concern. I think the government's request is reasonable. I heard about it for the first time a few minutes ago, so nobody should be particularly affronted that he did not get a letter a week ago, or whatever the case might be. The second point, and this is the one I rise on, I heard the gentleman from St. John's East give as his reason for not being able to decide that his leader was not here. Mr. Speaker, there is a

well-founded tradition in parliament that anybody who is under the influence of anybody else in making his decisions in this House is in serious breach of his responsibilities. I would hope that the gentleman for St. John's East would make his own decisions in his leader's absence or presence. I am not under any illusions, I am sure they consult each other, but to suggest to the House that the reason we cannot come back and do some public business tonight is because he does not have the permission of somebody who is absent from the House, that is unfortunate. Mr. Speaker, I would appeal to him to not withhold the leave. This is a trade-off system and he will probably need a favour himself one of those days. In the meantime, I would ask him to indulge the agenda of a lot of people by agreeing to a night sitting.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:  
The hon. the Government House Leader.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
It appears the hon. gentleman is shaking his head. I would just point out that fortunately there are some of us here who can exercise some independent judgment. We all have leaders: the hon. gentleman to my left is the leader over here, and if I had to go telephone him every time I had to make a decision it would be rather difficult. And to a certain extent the hon. the Leader of the Opposition is the leader in the House, yes, and the House only recognizes the leader in the House. To a certain extent there is a leader outside the House, not very far outside, outside the bar.

AN HON. MEMBER:  
Say it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
No, it is not fair to say.

MR. SIMMS:  
No, do not say it.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:  
If the hon. gentleman feels he has to consult with his leader for everything, then that is all I can do about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:  
Come on, Gene, boy. Come on!

MR. SPEAKER:  
The House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 18, 1987 at 3:00 p.m.