



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 57

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 25, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

HON. J. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to inform the House that there is now on the way to Mr. Jamieson a message in connection with the situation at Goose Bay and a confirmation that the U.S.A.F. authorities are leaving Goose Bay on June 30, 1976 in which the Government of Newfoundland requested he arrange a meeting between himself and the Minister of Transport with myself and the Minister of Industrial Development and the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations so that we can discuss the progress the Goose Bay Task Force has made and decide on steps which both governments should now take to prepare for the confirmed departure of the U.S.A.F. to insure a smooth transition and employment for those who are going to be affected. The purpose of the message is to ask Mr. Jamieson to arrange a meeting so that we can develop a plan of action and review what the progress has been to date and decide what steps are going to be taken in the next year so that everything goes as smoothly as possible. Once a meeting is arranged, of course, we will advise the public generally of when the meeting is.

So that message has been sent in accordance with my statement yesterday that we are going to do that this week. In addition, Mr. Speaker, I have sent a message to Mr. MacEachen, Secretary of State for External Affairs in connection with the failure of the Law of the Sea Conference and the failure of the ICNAF meeting to achieve Canada's objectives in connection with the fishing situation on the East Coast of Canada asking Mr. MacEachen to convene a meeting as soon as possible of the representatives of the Provinces interested and other concerned parties to discuss the course of action that Canada now proposes to take to protect the fishing industry of the

East Coast of Canada. At a meeting in Geneva when both Mr. MacEachen and I were in Geneva, I think it was April at the Law of the Sea Conference, he agreed there should be such a meeting if the ICNAF Conference failed. So I telexed him on behalf of the government asking for him to arrange such a meeting and to advise us when such a meeting will be held so that Canada can discuss with us the plan of action that Canada should have now as to what action is going to be taken on this issue. I have advised him that we cannot over-emphasize the importance of this issue to the Province and all our people.

So, that message is going forth to MacEachen at the present time. Once he replies and advises such a meeting can be arranged, of course we will let the House know, if it is in session or the public know.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Harbour Grace.

MR. H. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to present a petition on behalf of some 800 residents in the area of Harbour Grace. Sir, this petition represents the people from Harbour Grace, Bryants Cove, Harbour Grace South, Riverhead and Bristol's Hope. Sir, the prayer of the petition is that a community pasture be provided to serve the area.

The petition reads, Sir, "We, the undersigned, hereby petition the Provincial Government of Newfoundland and Labrador for the establishment of a community pasture in the town of Harbour Grace. Cattle owners and all citizens strongly feel that this be done within a minimum of delay. The establishment of such a pasture would benefit owners of animals as well as all residents. This will help alleviate the problem of roaming cattle and will benefit farmers by giving them ample time to carry on other aspects of farming while cattle are being kept in pasture."

Sir, I strongly support this petition because of the large number of cattle in the area and the distance from neighbouring pastures.

June 25, 1975.

Tape 2697

RH - 3

Sir, in supporting this petition I also probably would speak of the problems of the farmers by having such large numbers of sheep and other animals destroyed by dogs. Sir, I respectfully submit this petition and ask that it be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, one good turn deserves another. The Member for Harbour Grace supported my petition the other day on the Bell Island Ferry, and I am delighted, Sir, to be able to support the petition presented by the member on behalf of his constituents in the District of Harbour Grace, Bryants Cove, Bristol's Hope area who just merely are asking the government to provide a community pasture so that they can have some place to put their cattle.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is a reasonable request. That particular part, Sir, of Conception Bay has always been noted for or the people have always been noted for their enterprise in growing their own vegetables, keeping their own cattle, raising of pigs or having a few sheep, raising their own beef cattle and so forth. And as a matter of fact I believe the Stadium in Harbour Grace, the Sy Moores Memorial Stadium was financed under an agricultural grant. And so, Sir, it gives me great pleasure to support the petition, and I certainly agree with the member that the dog menace in the area is a proper nuisance, not only in that area, Sir, but down around the Port de Grave area and in various other parts of Newfoundland. It is a problem that nobody seems to be able to do anything about. Not only this administration but the previous administration apparently could not do anything about it. I have heard more complaints about roaming dogs and the dog menace, I suppose, than any other problem in Newfoundland. And I do hope that the minister responsible will finally take the bull by the horns and do something about this particular dog situation.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Port de Grave.

MR. EVANS: Take the dog by the horns.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like support this petition which the Hon. Member from Harbour Grace has brought on the floor of the House of Assembly. And I do not think there is any pasture in Harbour Grace at the present time. Nearly all of the districts, I know the one which I represent there are a couple or three pastures in it, and I think it is a good thing for the community and the people who live there, because if they have cattle they cannot roam on the streets

any longer because they are a menace to the travelling public, Therefore there should be a space provided by the provincial government for these cattle to pasture in.

I would also like to make mention of the roaming dogs that have been spoken about by the Hon. Member from Harbour Grace and also the Hon. Member from Bell Island. I know my district is plagued with them, not only mine, every other district. And I think when one tries to get something to help them along in a livelihood such as sheep or cattle or what not and to find out that it is torned to pieces by dogs it is very discouraging. I do not know if a great lot can be done about it because we have an awful of people who are keeping these animals for pets, such as dogs, but not looking after them in the proper manner and when they have cause to roam they are caused to breed trouble. And I hope that in the future that probably our younger generation will get down to the place that they will learn and take hold of and look after these. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: I am pleased to have learned that we have in the galleries today from Stephenville Crossing the Mayor, Mr. Clifford Goodyear with Councillor Mr. Ron O'Keefe and the Town Clerk, Mr. White. On behalf of honourable members I welcome you here and trust that your visit is most interesting and informative.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

HON. E. M. ROBERTS (LEADER OF THE OPPOSITION): Mr. Speaker, in the absence of the Premier and of the Minister of Transportation and Communications who is the Acting Minister of Public Works and Services? I will have to direct my question, I think, to the Minister of Health. In view of the Premier's publicly expressed commitment to announce the location of the new Burin Peninsula Hospital by June 15, in view of the fact that today is June 25, could the minister tell us when the announcement will be made of the location of the hospital?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Health.

HON. R. WELLS (MINISTER OF HEALTH): I should think, Mr. Speaker, that announcement will be made within a week to ten days.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. I do not want to quarrel with words but am I to understand the minister - the people on the Peninsula are going on the Premier's commitment am I to understand the minister to say that there will be an announcement within the next week or ten days?

MR. WELLS: That is my understanding.

MR. ROBERTS: I take it that is the minister's understanding. Well that is far as we can go. I thank the honourable gentleman, Sir.

May I ask a question now in the absence of the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. I think possibly the gentleman from St. Barbe South, the Minister of Manpower might be in a position to help. I am told that the mill at Hawkes Bay has been closed for a period of some months and that furthermore the woods operations have closed since the 20th. day of March, in view of the fact there are about seventy-five or eighty jobs involved, could the minister indicate to us what steps the administration is taking to get the woods operations going again.

I understand there are 13,000 cords of wood in the woods to be hauled to the mill and that would provide seventy-five to eighty jobs if it could be activated. Could he bring us up to date please?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

HON. E. MAYNARD (MINISTER OF MANPOWER AND INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS): I will try to bring the honourable gentleman up to date on what procedures have been taken so far. I think everyone is aware that the company that was involved in the Hawkes Bay operation was owned by Bowaters and Lundrigans on a fifty - fifty basis. They have decided to dissolve the partnership, which is not causing any real problems but there have to be some legal technicalities worked out between the two parties. There is also the matter of the mortgage that government held and still holds on the property in Hawkes Bay which both companies had to negotiate with government to assume responsibility for parts of the mortgage. Most of the details have been ironed out at this time and I understand that the Department of Justice and Bowaters have come to an agreement in principle as far as the mortgage that is going to be assumed by Bowaters is concerned.

In talking to Bowaters on Monday in Corner Brook they indicated that they should be able to start reactivating the woods operation probably by the last of June. The mill as I understand it is ready to go and Lundrigans are ready to go as soon as some timber is delivered to the mill.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Health. Would the minister tell the House how many hospitals in Newfoundland have been forced to close down some of their beds in the last week or so or will have to close beds in the next week or two?

HON. R. WELLS (MINISTER OF HEALTH): To my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, no hospitals have been forced to close beds. There were some beds that were closed at the General Hospital, I understand, because

a shortage of nurses usually occurs at this time of the year. This has to do, I think, with married women taking holidays, this sort of thing. This has often happened. I understand that some beds at the General Hospital were closed but not to the real detriment in any sense of the service which is being provided. I have no report of other close downs or close down of beds elsewhere in the Province nor do I think any is contemplated. I think we have to be careful in considering this, that sometimes a hospital or part of the hospital board as part of its normal procedures might close beds or take some beds out of service for a variety of reasons. But that is part of the internal management of the hospital.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question. To the minister's knowledge, have any of the hospitals been forced to close beds, not because of shortage of nurses but for economic reasons that the minister might know of.

MR. WELLS: I have no knowledge of such closing for economic reasons.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the Minister of Fisheries, Sir. Would the Minister of Fisheries tell the House if he has received any requests from fishermen around Newfoundland, especially the trap fishermen in Little St. Lawrence, who have been unable to find a market for their fish due to the fact that the fish plants are glutted at the moment? If so, what action has the minister taken on such requests as the one from the six trapmen in Little St. Lawrence?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

HON. J.C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, the Department of Fisheries has heard from a number of fishermen today, particularly in Placentia Bay area and the South Coast where the fish have struck in, that they are not all able to sell their fish to the various plants in the area because of this glut of fish. So, as all members of the House know, it is either a feast or a famine. The plants will do what they can to take this fish. Some they may not be able to take. There is nothing that we can do about it immediately. As all members of the House know, it is not possible

MR. CROSBIE: to have plants of sufficient capacity to take all the fish that offers in the six or eight week trap season because then the plants would be too large for operating the rest of the year. So all you can do in a situation like this is make sure the plants take all the fish they can, that they divert trawlers if they can to other plants where they are not getting fish and of course these steps will be taken but there is no solving that problem today. But we have had a number of messages from fishermen to that effect and it is unfortunate but it is caused by the fact that they have now had a sudden influx of fish in the area.

MR. SPEAKER: Before I recognize another honourable member I have just been informed that there is another delegation in the galleries from the Town of Spaniards Bay, Deputy Mayor Vokey and Councillors Neal, Gosse and Peddle and on behalf of all the honourable members I certainly welcome you gentlemen to the galleries today.

The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Provincial Affairs, Sir, who is responsible for the environment would care to make a comment on a statement made by the Mayor of Bay Roberts that the minister is passing the buck in not making a decision on a dump for that community?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I had a meeting of all the municipalities in the area this morning, the Municipality of Bay Roberts, of Spaniard's Bay, of Cupids, North River (how am I doing) Clarke's Beach - anymore? - of all municipalities involved in the dump situation and we have resolved the -

MR. DOODY: South River, Tilton.

MR. PECKFORD: - South River, Tilton - right!

MR. ROBERTS: Roaches Line.

MR. PECKFORD: Bishop's Cove

MR. HOWARD: Upper Island Cove.

MR. MURPHY: Clearwater.

AN HON. MEMBER: Turks Gut.

MR. PECKFORD: On the whole dump problem and we have been able to

resolve the dump situation to the satisfaction of the municipalities concerned and action will be taken in the next day or two to put what we decided upon into reality in the next couple of days. And what was decided was the regional dump concept was eliminated and we have gone to a four dump situation where we have three or four municipalities sharing one dump until we have further surveys done on a more suitable site that would be more acceptable to all municipalities in the area. So the thing has been resolved to the satisfaction of everybody for the ensuing twelve to fifteen months.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Finance. He will recall his glee sometime ago in informing the House he had received a threatening letter on my letterhead as he was going to turn it over to the police, I am wondering if he has done so and if so what report he has had from the police?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, the letter in question was turned over to the Department of Justice, I have heard nothing from it since. I am not particularly worried, I might say.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not the least bit concerned, It was the minister who was worried, but I would like to ask the Minister of Justice then if he would bring us up-to-date. It was the Minister of Finance who felt impelled to raise this matter publicly, a great outrage, I think were his words.

MR. HICKMAN: I will take that under advisement and ask for a report from the Chief of Police, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to ask my usual routine question of the President of Treasury Board, Sir, Would the President of Treasury Board, the Minister of Industrial Development tell us whether or not we are going to be able to get a drop of stuff for the weekend?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, it is very tempting with the Liberal Ball on the programme to say that it seems extremely unlikely that

there will be any available. It would be nice to see all these people having to tolerate each other without the help of alcohol. However, in the interest of humanity and Christian charity we are doing what we can to alleviate their problem. The union people I think are meeting today to discuss the appointment of an arbitrator to try to resolve the problem that they were having with one of the management people who refused to cross the picket line. That is the only hang-up right now. They have accepted government's offer. If they can get the arbitrator in place I think the situation will be resolved. So hopefully today or tomorrow or whenever that thing happens the stores will re-open.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Before you call Orders of the Day may I direct a question to the honourable Minister of Fisheries, Has the minister received any reply to his telegram to the honourable Mr. LeBlanc re assistance to the fishermen along the Northeast Coast?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not received any reply yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the honourable the Premier, Sir, In view of the Premier's interest in cable television some time ago, in view of the fact that the Government of Canada may turn this jurisdiction over to the provinces, would the Premier tell the House whether or not negotiations are going on with the Government of Canada to bring cable television into Newfoundland and can we expect cable television in Newfoundland in this calendar year?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the government is very anxious, I suppose, or desirous of having cable television in the province. We are not dealing with any individuals or group of individuals regarding the establishment of cable television here. As the honourable Member for Bell Island knows, CRTC is

the governing body, at least to date, on who gets such authority to bring in cable television. They are also the ones that dictate the terms of reference.

Now there has been a great deal of concern about provincial jurisdiction in this regard, particularly in the Province of Quebec, who I understand are insisting that the Province have the rights over cable television in their Province. I have not heard, as the honourable member said, that the federal government planned to pass over this authority to the provincial governments. As a matter of fact, I would be most amazed if that was the case, I think the case is quite the reverse.

But at the present time we have made representation to the C.R.T.C., not on behalf of anybody but rather that if possible at all, that cable television be allowed to come to our Province and that is basically as far as we as the Provincial Government at this time can take it unless we want to challenge the federal government as to the provincial versus federal rights of cable television. And as I say, the only province that I know of at this time who are actively challenging this concept is the Province of Quebec. We have obviously thought about it but we certainly have not done anything about it as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member from Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier another question, Sir. Would the Premier tell the House what is being done now, what action the government has taken on providing residences for the students of the College of Trades and Technology, and what provision the government has made to take care of the overflow of students, the number of applications that have been made that will not be able to be accommodated at the College of Trades and Technology this fall?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

MR. MOORES: I think, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Education who has been involved in this from the beginning should be the one to answer that in more detail than I would be able to.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, actually the government, the Department of Public Works in effect, is negotiating for the purchase of land which is contiguous to the College of Trades and Technology. There are different prices between what is offered: what is offered by the government, what is requested by the present owner. There has now been a move and the two sums are closer together. I would expect that within ten days or so either there be agreement upon price or the natural, logical course of procedure for the acquisition of property will be entered into.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Fogo.

MR. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, another question to the honourable the Minister of Fisheries. Is the Minister of Fisheries aware that because of lack of facilities, so The News says, the people - or the fishermen on the Port au Port area have to truck their fish to Sydney to dispose of it?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I am certainly aware that the fishermen of Port au Port Peninsula would like to have better facilities to help them in the catching and curing and sale of their fish. And despite our best effort we have not been able to get the Government of Canada to move very far in that direction. I am visiting the Port au Port Peninsula on Friday and spending the day there with the member for the district, the honourable the Member for Port au Port, and so I will have a first-hand look myself at exactly what the situation is and just what is happening there. But I certainly believe they have a problem there and something should be done to ameliorate it.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier. In view of the fact that we now have two vacancies in the House, the seat from White Bay South has been vacant for nearly twelve months, the seat for Labrador South has been vacant for over a month, could the

Premier indicate whether he will immediately take the steps to have the writs issued for the by-election necessary to fill these seats?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say, I suppose, that in the not too distant future all the seats in the House will be filled by the appropriate people.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I welcome that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: They were a little slow on the uptake there. They are not well trained. Would the Premier indicate how quickly we can expect that? Hopefully today?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

MR. MOORES: Speaking on behalf of the untrained as opposed to one who is very adequately trained,

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, the answer is in due course.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to this matter of residence over here at the College of Trades again. The Premier is aware, of course, that he made a commitment to the students that every effort would be made to provide the students with residences this coming September. There is also a commitment about the Polytech. What is happening in connection with the Polytech? Is it going ahead? Is it being shelved? Would the Premier care to answer, or the Minister of Education?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, actually there are two questions there. On the one with reference to the Polytech, the architectural firm of Horwood, Guihan and Cullum, I believe, Horwood, Cullum and Guihan, in some such order, have been appointed for the detailed planning of phase one and for the overall conceptual planning of the entire institute. That is with respect to that. That is the Polytech. The other with reference to the residences for the College of Trades, no commitment was made that there would be residences available in September. I mean that would have been literally impossible if land were there or were already vested in the government and everything else. If it was, work would begin as soon as feasible and as soon as possible. There have been a number of meetings with the College of Trades including a liaison group of students. The situation is with respect to the acquisition of the land as I mentioned a few minutes ago, There have been in these discussions between a representative group from the Students' Union and the Department of Education, one of the things that have gone into there is to have the student input from the point of view of the design of the residences, the type of accommodation because there are a number of possibilities in that connection.

With respect to the acquisition of the land, the situation is as I just outlined.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, another question in the continued absence of the Minister of Public Works to the Minister of Health. Would the minister indicate whether architects have as yet been appointed for the proposed new hospitals at Clarendville and on the Burin Peninsula?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Health.

MR. WELLS: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say at this time but I will contact the Department of Public Works and endeavour to find the answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Sir, would care to comment on a statement made by the Mayor of Mount Pearl that this may be the last year that Mount Pearl would function under a municipality, that it made be placed under a trusteeship? Would the minister care to comment on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

HON. B. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, in the last three or four months I have heard quite a municipalities who have indicated, or one of their spokesmen or mayor or councillor have indicated same. I have not seen those comments by - was it the mayor you said?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. PECKFORD: - by the mayor and I am not aware that the -

MR. NEARY: No, councillor, councillor as a matter of fact, Councillor Lidstone.

MR. PECKFORD: Okay. Oh, well!

MR. EVANS: Another Liberal candidate!

MR. PECKFORD: Right.

MR. NEARY: There it is, look.

MR. PECKFORD: My own reaction to that, Mr. Speaker, is simply that to my knowledge the town of Mount Pearl is not in the financial position or situation that would dictate that within a year or so that it would have to come under trusteeship. I do not know from whence he speaks.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a further question on the hospital decision. This time, I think the Premier would be the one who could answer it. Would the Premier confirm that the projects to build the hospitals at Clarendville and on the Burin Peninsula would be carried out by public tenders or will they be carried out by a, should I say, how to put it - I could use a lot of terms, a sweetheart deal, but let us say a management concept of some sort. I forget the exact term. But will we - project manager - will we do them by public tenders or will we have another Craig Dobbin situation, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: That is a ridiculous ending of what started out to be a sensible question, Mr. Speaker. The fact is I do not know of any hospitals that Mr. Dobbin built. I know of lots that Mr. Smallwood and friends built. But what I will say is that regarding the construction of hospital the Public Tendering Act or

the public proposal based on specific plans is something that has not been decided. The original college that was built in Corner Brook was a happy experience from the business of the time factor in construction and for the no overruns on cost. That did work well. But rather than have a blanket policy that would be that way, I think it is something that government has to look at and as has been illustrated on many occasions it will be public tendering - or public proposals but in the main public tendering for all government institutions and government building.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NFARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Fisheries Sir, would he tell the House if he has received a request from fishermen in Bryants Cove, Upper Island Cove and Heart's Desire in the Trinity Bay area for assistance for loss of gear and boats in a recent storm in that particular part of Conception Bay and Trinity Bay?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is an assiduous reader of the newspapers I notice. I believe there was a letter perhaps from one or all of those gentlemen mentioned in the paper who wrote about the boats they had lost - I think it was boats - and asked if the government had any programme to replace their boats. Well, the answer quite clearly is government has no programme to replace their boats, No government of Newfoundland ever did have a programme to replace boats lost by storm. And boats can be insured. We have a Fisheries Loan Board that will make loans to replace the boats but there is no government programme, federal, provincial or in any province which completely guarantees fishermen or anyone else against loss of their property such as boats. So I think there were some letters from the gentlemen you mentioned. The report in the paper asked the government to replace their boats and the answer quite clearly was and is that we have no programme to replace boats, We cannot replace boats, but that the Fisheries Loan Board has a generous programme of loans and so on for that purpose. So we were not able to replace their boats as they requested

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, as this may be the last opportunity, Sir, I will have to put this question to the Minister of Tourism. I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not the Norma and Gladys has had her trial runs and when she will be getting underway for Honolulu and Tokyo and points West?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HICKEY: She has not had any trials yet.

MR. NEARY: Well, would the minister care to give the House a progress report on what is happening now concerning this trip around the world by the Norma and Gladys?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. T. HICKEY (MINISTER OF TOURISM): Mr. Speaker, as Solomon said, there is nothing new under the sun.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the minister, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Will the minister tell the House whether she is going to be piggybacked to Honolulu and Tokyo or whether she is going to be carried in the swimming pool of the Queen E. II or will she go on her own steam?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have already reacted to the suggestion about piggybacking. As to what I would like to see piggybacked, it is not the Norma and Gladys.

MR. NEARY: The minister is rather nasty today, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I think it is only fair that I should ask the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations to bring us up to date on the strike situation in the Province, the number of work interruptions in the Province at the present time, and what is being done by the minister's department to try to bring about a settlement of these disputes?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

That question could require a rather lengthy answer. If the minister intends to make it brief, I shall permit him to answer.

MR. NEARY: Sure. Go ahead. Take all the time he wants.

MR. MAYNARD: I think, Mr. Speaker, the member is well aware of what is being done by the department to try to solve some of the labour disputes in the Province and therefore the question is an entirely stupid one and not worthy of an answer.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, perhaps I will have to take them individually, Sir. Would the minister tell us what is happening concerning this long-drawn-out dispute in Wabush? Is there any possibility of getting it settled and getting the men back to work down there? What is the minister's department doing about that strike?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. MAYNARD: We have had our department staff made available to both parties in Wabush since the negotiations started back in January. They have used the services of our conciliation officers. They have not come to an agreement at this point in time. There is no move being made by either party to try to resolve the dispute. There is nothing more that we can do except offer our services and make it available whenever it is needed or requested the parties.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, does the minister not think it would be worth his while for the minister to personally get involved in that

dispute because it is such a serious matter and is affecting the -

HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Member for Bell Island is proceeding to make a speech.

MR. NEARY: No. Does the minister think that he should not personally get involved in that dispute rather than just pawn it off on one of the conciliation officers?

HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the minister all of a sudden has become mute. Would the minister tell us then what is happening in St. Lawrence concerning that strike? Is there any effort being made to try and get the parties back to the bargaining table to resolve that dispute?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, we have something in the vicinity of fifty to sixty sets of negotiations on-going now or strikes in progress in the Province, and our department is involved in each and every one. I am involved personally to a certain extent in each and every one. We are doing what we can to bring the two parties together at all times, whether at St. Lawrence, Wabush, ERCO or wherever it is, if the honourable gentleman does not feel that is enough then maybe he will get this opportunity some time in the next twenty-five to thirty years to get back there and try to do something himself. But we are doing whatever is possible. We have a good, competent staff in the department. There is not many of them, but they are doing everything they can to bring about settlements to the labour dispute.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what about the plumbers and pipefitters strike that is tying up practically the whole construction industry? Does the minister think it is worth his while to get involved into that one that is affecting the economy of Newfoundland so greatly?

MR. MAYNARD: Mr. Speaker, I just said to the honourable member that we are involved, all of us, in every strike, every dispute that is going on in the Province. I do not know what the honourable gentleman is beating his gums about. We are being involved. We are involved already and have been from the day one when negotiations started.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister care to tell the House that he is personally involved in the Canadian Tire dispute on Elizabeth Avenue where scabs are being brought in -

MR. MAYNARD: Do not be so foolish.

MR. NEARY: - to the Canadian Tire operation down there on Elizabeth Avenue?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Could the minister tell us if he is involved in that one?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! This question should be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Health care to tell us if he is still optimistic that there will not be a strike in the hospitals or that the nurses will not go on strike. What is happening concerning negotiations? Has he received a report of the Conciliation Board yet? What is the outlook as far as the hospitals are concerned in their labour negotiations?

MR. WELLS: Yes, I would be very pleased to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Health.

MR. WELLS: As the House knows the Department of Health is not directly responsible for the negotiations, These are carried out by Treasury Board. The position is that the hospital workers have exercised restraint, they have elected to go by the proper process. The Conciliation Board Report is in the hands of both parties now and is being examined by them and there are various time periods set out in the report. At this stage both parties are considering the report and as far as I know they have yet to have any contact.

MR. NEARY: Is that the two groups of nurses or the hospital workers?

MR. WELLS: No, I am thinking of the hospital workers now, The nurses are not yet to that stage, as I understand. This is the hospital workers and Treasury Board. And, of course, the Department of Health in a sense is in the middle, Mr. Speaker, but we are hopeful that the Conciliation Board's Report can form the basis of a settlement to this matter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The thirty minutes allocated for the question period has expired.

MR. NEARY: Oh my God where did the time go?

ORDERS OF THE DAY

On motion, a bill, "An Act To Provide For The Reversion To The Province Of Certain Mineral Lands In Labrador," (Bill No. 86) read a third time and ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion that the House resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole on the said bill, and I invite the Hon. Member for Placentia East to take the Chair for Committee, please. Mr. Speaker, left the Chair.

COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Highway Traffic Act". (Bill No. 84).

On motion clauses 1 through 4, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 5 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Clause 5, Mr. Chairman. On page 7 which deals with the new clause 78(a), there should be added at the end a subclause 2, after Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council the words, "and each member of the Board shall hold office during good behaviour for the term prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council in the order appointing him, or in some later order, and is eligible for reappointment."

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, a question on that. I well remember the matter was debated on second reading but should there not be a length put on the term? I mean, in theory the Lieutenant-Governor could appoint a man for, say 100 years, and that is absurd, but should it not be a set term, not to exceed, say, three years? And then the first lot would be a one year and a two year and a three year so we would have the staggered principle coming into effect of which the minister spoke when he closed second reading, and then, you know, each three years either people could be reappointed or not. Surely there should be a limit placed on the term.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, I should like to respond to that. We had a very thorough check made of similar legislation passed by this Legislature where this amendment is included, and I am advised that in the one that has worked very effectively, in the Medicare Commission Act, the Act itself does not set the term. The Order-in-Council sets the term and staggers the term of those who are appointed. It is not part of the legislation. It is appropriate that the legislation provide that they shall hold office for the term prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council.

On motion, clause 5 as amended, carried.

On motion clauses 6 through 7, carried.

On motion, bill 84 with amendment, carried.

Bill No. 85, "An Act Further To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act."

On motion clauses 1 through 3, carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall clause 4 carry?

MR. CROSBIE: Clause 4, Mr. Chairman; in clause 2 of the new clause 45 you have to delete the words "office during pleasure" or whatever they say there and put after Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council "that each member of the Board shall hold office during good behaviour for the term prescribed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council in the order appointing him, or in some later order, and is eligible for reappointment.

On motion, clause 4 as amended, carried.

On motion clause 5, carried.

On motion bill No. 85 with amendment, carried.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole has considered the matters to them referred and have passed the following bills with some amendment. Bill No. 84 "An Act Further To Amend The Highway Traffic Act" and Bill No. 85 "An Act Further To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act," and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and report having passed bill No. 84 and Bill No. 85 with some amendment and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion read a first and second readings of amendments.

On motion bill No. 84 read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

On motion a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act," read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Revise Existing Legislation Respecting The Fishing Industry Advisory Board."

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I rise to move second reading of this bill. The House may recall that in 1971 there was a Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act passed by the House of Assembly to deal with collective bargaining in the fishing industry. There was a section in that legislation which provided for a Fishing Industry Advisory Board whose function was supposed to be to provide impartial information, I think the real purpose of it was, to parties in collective bargaining, the union representing the fishermen and the fish processors, I suppose, on the other side, an impartial source of information so that there would be some idea of what the marketing situation was and what fish plant costs were and processing costs and therefore what price the companies could afford to pay the fishermen for fish. This was the general principle or purpose of the board envisaged in that legislation.

Now, the legislation itself as proclaimed for the Fishing Industry Advisory Board was not appointed until last Fall. Mr. Rupert Prince was appointed chairman. There had been an attempt to appoint a chairman some months before that, Mr. Anderson, a former manager of the Royal Bank of Canada but he became discouraged by the possible task that lay before him before assuming office and thought better of it and did not want to accept appointment before that. Pat Antle was appointed a member of the board and Mr. Gar Pynn of the faculty of commerce at Memorial University.

MR. ROBERTS: Have they received any payments for their term?

MR. CROSBIE: No, but they are entitled now to receive whatever the persons appointed to boards receive. It is a per diem, so much for half a day, so much a day when the board meets.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Antle will be on the board then?

MR. CROSBIE: No, Mr. Antle has since resigned from the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, Mr. Speaker, because of his health. He is not in good health and could not - he resigned there, I do not know, I suppose it was, I think, three or four months ago.

Now, the previous legislation did not really provide any powers for the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, and they had no powers to subpoena information and there was very little said in the legislation about what their power should be or about what they should do. And as to whether or not they could ever perform an effective role in that role only, anyway, I think was open to some question.

Anyway the bill now before the House provides for the establishment of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board on a permanent basis and it contains provisions that will outline their powers and duties. The bill provides for the Fishing Industry Advisory Board with a membership of three or such greater number of members as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council prescribes. At the moment the intention is to have three. There will be confirmed as Chairman of the board if the legislation is passed Mr. Rupert Prince, former Deputy Minister of Fisheries, and as a member of the board Mr. Gar Pynn of the faculty of commerce of Memorial University, and a third will be appointed. There may be several other members appointed later but the intention at the moment is to have three members. The chairman of the board would be Mr. Rupert Prince who shall devote his whole time and attention to the business of the board and not engage in any other occupation. The other members of the board of course will be people who have other occupations and they will serve in a part-time capacity.

The secretary of the board will be Mr. F.A.J. Laws, the former managing director of NAFEL and who has since worked with the Department of Fisheries of the Province with several years as a special assistant

and who is an excellent and a most capable man. He has agreed to stay with the board, in fact he is working with the board now for several years. He is approaching retirement age but he has agreed to stay with the board I think it is for two years and he and Mr. Rupert Prince are now established in the offices of the board which is in the, I have not visited the offices but is somewhere near O'Leary Avenue or out in that direction but the board now has its own offices and Mr. Laws and Mr. Prince are working there in acquiring a staff and the like.

The board is to have the usual rights of perpetual succession, the common seal and so on. The legislation prescribes that a member of the board cannot have any interest in or be connected with any business or enterprise that is engaged or connected with the fishing industry, nor any interest in or connection with any person or associations of persons having an interest in or connected with the fishing industry. In other words they are not to be involved in the fishing industry or in a union that would have membership in the fishing industry to avoid any possibility of conflict of interest.

The functions of the board are described in section 7 and their main function is going to be to collect, compile and record information and statistics respecting the fishing industry, including information relating to catching, buying, selling, producing, processing, exporting, marketing, operational costs, labour costs and the pricing of fish and fish products and any other information relating to the fishing industry, whether the foregoing kinds or not and to institute and direct research and to analyse and evaluate agreements and contracts connected with the fishing industry, markets and marketing methods and federal provincial or joint federal provincial policies or programmes for the fishing industry and to report and advise the Minister of Fisheries on those matters and that information can be made available by publication or by exchange with departments of the Government of Canada or other provinces and it can be given to other people involved in the fishing industry.

Now the whole idea of the board will be to have an independent outside board whose task will be to get full information on what costs are on every aspect of the fishing industry in Newfoundland from the catching to every aspect of processing in all of the plants of the Island and to independently evaluate what the marketing situation is in the United States or anywhere else in the world so that when government is contemplating a programme, or when there is collective bargaining, collective bargaining dispute or whatever, there will be this independent source of information available, instantly available, that the board will be able to produce for the contesting parties or for government so that studies will not have to be initiated then to see what costs are or what is happening. This information will all be available and constantly reviewed, and constantly renewed by the members of the industry to the board. That is the purpose of the board. I will come back to that in a few minutes. Then I will finish surveying the legislation.

So this board is to have, and is to obtain and compile information on every aspect of the industry and the costs of every aspect of the industry, or any agreements entered into by the industry.

Section ten provides the right to obtain information and it applies to all businesses or enterprises in the fishing business except those who operate only as retail outlets, including buying, selling, catching process and so on and so forth.

The persons who have the control, custody or possession of the accounts, documents or records relating to the business at the written request of the Chairman have to provide copies or any other information that they request to the board and to the Chairman and grant access to them for purposes of an examination by an employee of the board. So that the act gives a board the right to obtain information on a compulsory basis if that is needed. It is not contemplated that it ever will be needed but there may be some cases where compulsory powers are necessary. The board is to keep individual returns secret except to the minister or persons authorized by him. In other words the individual return of any one company, or what the costs are of any one company or the profits or losses of that company or what its exact position is.

It is not intended that this information be given to the public at large. The information would be kept general and costs would be kept general, the costs of the industry, not the affairs of any particular company made public by the board. Then there are provisions here; the financial year of the board, they have to have their estimates voted by the House every year, submit a budget to the minister and all the usual clauses are there. A report is to be laid before the House of Assembly every year. Financial statements setting forth their assets and liabilities, their receipts and expenditures for the previous year, their report concerning the work of the board for the previous year is to be laid before the House within fifteen days after the House opens or fifteen days after they are submitted to the minister. They are to keep regular minutes, the Auditor General audits their books.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, these are the main provisions. Section (20) provides the penalties for anyone who refuses to comply with a request made under section (10). If they do they are liable on summary conviction to a fine not exceeding \$2,000 for every day that the offense continues and so on to insure that the information is forthcoming. So that is the general outline of the terms of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

Now, the board has been operating and has been getting itself organized and we have provided in the estimates this year an amount of \$214,000 for the operation of the board. The board is now getting its organization set up. They intend to have a marketing section. They have retained their own independent source of information in the Boston area for marketing so they will keep complete track of what is happening in the marketing situation in the United States. They are going to have a socio-economic branch which includes covering the marketing. The marketing unit and the socio-economic branch will keep track of what is happening

in the Newfoundland fishing industry from the time fish is caught to the time fish is marketed. The board has retained Mr. D.F. Lunnen, a chartered accountant with a lot of experience in the fishing business in Newfoundland to start the business of gathering and tabulating all data relating to cost of fish, production from all sectors of the industry. That business is now underway. Mr. Lunnen who has his own consulting firm, D.F. Lunnen Limited, is now carrying that out for the board. He is visiting every fish company in the Province and discussing with them their accounting systems and costing information. He is going to develop as a result of all of his visits and his own experience a standard set of reports and reporting forms that each firm is to make to the board periodically, so that when you get the information from fish company "X" you will be able to compare it with the information you got from fish company "Y". It will be all collected and analyzed on the same basis so that you are comparing the same kind of information.

He is going to evaluate cost and information pertinent to the final production cost of a pound of fish, including raw material, cost, direct labour, overheads and so on. He is making a personal visit to each fish plant, to question the operator in detail with respect to their methods, a cost gathering reporting. A profile is going to be drawn up of each plant and its accounting capabilities and costing methods, evaluation of the information gathered including consideration of any suggestions or criticisms that the operators offer. He is to prepare costing models that would apply to the various species and packs in each plant, develop adequate reporting forms to be filled in by the operators and submitted to the board on a regular basis and recommend the permanent trained staff and how they will follow this up and keep it all accurate and up to date from time to time.

Now that work is already underway. I wrote all the fish

June 25, 1975.

Tape 2708

RH - 3

producers in the Province several weeks ago to request their co-operation. As far as I know they are all co-operating and there has not been any difficulty. Now, up to this stage, of course, the board has not had any legal power to force any of these concerns to give information, but they all have been doing it. I believe that the industry now sees that there is no point protesting about this. that the industry is in a position where it has to be assisted by government because it certainly does this year

7908

and it is going to have to be for the next three or four years at least, assuming we get the resource back in shape again. that they have to give full information to the governments who are involved, and they are going to do that. Now we are not the only government who is doing that. The federal government has their Audit Bureau, who have done the same kinds of studies in connection with the present subsidy programme, and I have also asked the Fishing Industry Advisory Board if they can handle the matter of auditing all of the Queen crab processing plants to whom we are offering the assistance that I described in the House last night, Mr. Speaker.

Just to mention that briefly, I said last night that in order to get the crab processing industry of Newfoundland operating, they have not been operating since the beginning of May, because the operators say they are only able to pay between eight and ten cents a pound for crab and the fishermen will not fish for that. We have told both parties that we, the government of Newfoundland will pay four cents a pound in addition as long as the plant operators pay ten cents a pound so that the fishermen will get fourteen cents a pound for crab for the next month.

While we are waiting to see what action if any the federal government takes in this situation, and I mentioned this last night to the House, we have informed the crab processors that as a part of our proposal for making this assistance available we are going to do an audit of each of the crab processing plants in the Province of which there are nine. Any of those who buy crab from the fishermen, who are assisted by us to pay an additional four cents to the fishermen will be audited so we can see whether or not they, in fact, cannot afford to pay any more than ten cents per pound to the crab fishermen or whether they can pay more than that. And we will be examining the market and we will be auditing their books to see just what their costs are and whether or not it is in fact true, that their contention is true that they cannot afford to pay any more. We are not just going to make the assistance available without this kind of check.

Now the federal government is doing exactly the same thing. They are auditing the Queen crab operators in New Brunswick who have requested federal assistance, which the federal government has not given as yet. And they are going to do an audit on two crab processing plants in Newfoundland as well as on the operating costs of crab fishing boats in Newfoundland. But we are going to go on and do an audit on the rest of them provided they open this year. And the assistance that we have offered is being paid to the fishermen. So the proper agency to do that would be the Fishing Industry Advisory Board. They should have the staff and the facilities to do that and we are asking them to see if they can do this audit for us on the crab processing plants.

It may turn out, Mr. Speaker, once that audit is done that the crab processors may be right when they say they cannot even now afford to pay ten cents per pound. But at least the facts will be established by an independent agency that should be beyond reproach or accusation by any party, and it should be independent. And we have an independent source of information. Can they afford to pay more or can they not? What is the cost of each aspect of the operation? Are the costs in the crab plant X the same as in crab plant Y and why are they different and so on? We will have all that information.

So the Board is already operating but it has not had legal teeth, you might call it, legal power to force anyone to give the information. But so far to date everybody has given the information voluntarily. Copies of the legislation were sent, Mr. Speaker, to the union and to the Fish Trades Association. I have not heard back in writing from them. They were given this about two weeks ago. But I have heard from Mr. Cashin and he did meet with Mr. Prince and the legislation has the general approval of the Newfoundland Fishermen Food And Allied Workers' Union. I have received no serious objection from the Fish Trades Association as yet, so I suppose they find it basically all right. There was some suggestion that the - I believe they did suggest that the Board should only have power to demand cost information when the companies were

June 25, 1975, Tape 2709, Page 3 -- aph

receiving assistance and not when they were not. But that was not a suggestion that we could accept, because whether the industry is receiving assistance or not, or whether they are good times or poor time, we now need accurate information on all these matters, at all times, good or bad, so that if the bad times come and government assistance is required we have all the information from an impartial source and there can be no dispute about what costs are and what the marketing prices are

and who is getting what or are there rip-offs or can fishermen be paid more or not or where the subsidy should go and the like.

So that is the purpose of the bill, Mr. Speaker. The legislation as it was passed in 1971 was defective. I think the board will be on much sounder footing if this legislation is passed.

I think they can do a very competent job and if they do their job competently and properly and the whole thing functions properly, any occasion, say next year once they are properly set up and we or the Government of Canada, for that matter, need accurate information on what costs are or prices in any aspect of the industry. It should all be there in the Fishing Industry Marketing Board for us.

Or if there is a need for its use in collective bargaining, it will be available for both sides in collective bargaining or anyone who has a proper interest in it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I am very happy to move second reading of the legislation.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in the late Winter and Spring of 1971 there arose in the Province what has turned out to be one of the most significant social and economic and possibly political movements that I think we have ever seen, a movement which, I think it is fair to say, will leave an even greater impact upon this Province than did the Fishermen's Protective Movement led by Sir William Coaker.

I am talking of course about the movement among our fishermen to become unionized, to form themselves into unions and to bargain collectively to take advantage of the adage that, you know, the union makes us strong and in union there is strength. When that movement began, and I think it is fair to say it came spontaneously from the fishermen, guided and led by men such as Father Desmond McGrath, who was then and is still the parish priest at Port Saunders on the North West Coast, the Northern part of the present St. Barbe South district; and Richard Cashin, a young St. John's man with very deep roots in the Province. These men and others

joined together to shape that movement and to guide it. Very quickly it became obvious that if the movement was to have any chance of success it would have to have a legislative framework within which it could operate, not legislation that would require collective bargaining but legislation that would permit collective bargaining and would lay down the ground rules.

The government of the day, the gentleman from Bell Island and myself among them, very quickly developed legislation. The late Austin Parsons did most of the drafting on it, and I think within the difficulties which were faced it was a good piece of legislation. The bill went through the House I think very quickly and I think it went through the House with the unanimous support of every member.

One of the most difficult provisions that was faced in developing the collective bargaining legislation for fishermen was the question of how we would be able to obtain information on what it really cost to operate in the fishing business in this Province and, in other words, from that could be drawn the information of just how much the companies could afford to pay. The unions, very highly responsible men and women with highly responsible leadership, realized full well that you cannot get blood from a turnip. But equally, Sir, they were determined to ensure that they got as much as they could get in a fair and a legitimate way.

Well, Sir, that conundrum was the genesis of the creation of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board as it existed, or as it exists in the legislation, the section 51 of the old legislation, the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act. The board was given no subpoena powers. I do not know why. I do not think the matter was subjected to any comment in the House by any honorable gentleman who spoke in that debate nor was it the subject of comment to my knowledge and recollection by any of the other bodies who were consulted including the Fishermen's Union and the trade as well.

In any event, Sir, whether it was for that reason or not the Fishing Industry Advisory Board emerged as a child without any teeth,

a board without any powers to enforce its enquiries and its power to try to obtain information it needed. The board was not appointed by the Liberal Administration. The act came into effect, I assume, late in July or early in August - I do not know the exact date - quite late that Summer. The election was held late in October, as Your Honour will

recall, and then there was the interesting interregnum period resulting in the resigning- resignation. I am sorry- of the Smallwood administration in January and the formation of the first administration led by the present Premier.

The government came into office in January 1972, and they too did not appoint a board for more than two years. I suspect nearly three years went by before any movement was made towards appointing a board under the provisions of the act. There were a number of statements made by ministers, presumably speaking in behalf of the ministry which said that the board would need subpoena power, but the fact remains that no legislation came in before the House. This is the first piece which we have had.

The minister is now taking a different tack and I think he is taking a better tack. The act before us now, or the bill before us now will in effect delete the old Fishing Industry Advisory Board from the statutes of this Province and will create an entirely new body, one which is a separate corporation and one which has the powers and the responsibilities spelled out in the bill which the minister just introduced.

My colleagues and I are quite willing to support it. It is a piece of enabling legislation. It could be a very valuable piece of legislation, because the big question that must be dealt with in any questioning of bargaining in the fishing industry is the old one of how much can we afford to pay. And then growing out of that equally great question, what is a fair return? As far as I know every part of the fishing industry in Newfoundland and Labrador is subsidized, some to a greater extent and others to a lesser extent. They have been subsidized almost continuously over the years, I suppose as long as there has been a fishing organization. That in itself gives us the right as a government and as a legislature to decide and to seek out the information as to what rate of profit they are making and as to what rate of return they are making on their invest and as to what their expenditures are and as to whether or not their expenditures are reasonable in all of the circumstances, precisely the type of information which this Board will obtain. It is not a matter of regulating an

industry, Sir, as with the utilities industry or with the automobile insurance industry, That is not what we are attempting to do here. It is not a matter of nationalizing an industry. That is a separate matter altogether. What we are doing here is setting up a legislative body with the power, and the power to carry out a duty, and the duty is to determine exactly what are the true economic facts with relation to the fishing industry. The powers are spelled out in the bill. I do not need to repeat them. The minister referred to them. And Section (7) is the important section in that sense because it sets forth the functions and duties of the board.

It could be an immensely valuable board, Sir. We are going to have collective bargaining in the industry, in the fishing industry for years to come, and so we should have, Indeed I suppose it is inconceivable that we will ever see a fishing industry now without collective bargaining. We have not as yet seen full collective bargaining. We have seen it in respect of the plants. We have seen it in respect of the trawler operators, and in each case, Sir, it was a titanic struggle and the union by sticking to their guns and because their cause was right won their day.

The third sector of the industry, Sir, only now are we beginning to see the evolution of meaningful collective bargaining, and that of course is the traditional inshore fishery. Within the past few months the NFFAWU under Mr. Caahin's leadership has been certified in respect of fishermen in large areas of the Province. As Your Honour is aware the certification procedure is geographic and that is really the only way it could be, An inshore fishermen is at liberty to sell his fish where he wishes and in many parts of the Province they sell to more than one purchaser. So to certify merely by employer would not in itself be meaningful. So the Labour Relations Board within the Collective Bargaining Act, and this was the way it was worked out originally in 1971, now certifies the union in respect of geographic units. There have been a number of representation votes held, and one sees reports of them in the newspapers, I think in each case the NFFAWU has overwhelmingly won the support of the fishermen eligible to

June 25, 1975

Tape 2711 (Afternoon)

PK - 3

vote in the area in which the vote is being held. So obviously, Sir, we are moving into collective bargaining in that final phase of the industry, the traditional inshore fishery and that in itself is a step forward and one to be welcomed.

So we will shortly be at the point where every fisherman in Newfoundland, Sir, is part of the collective bargaining process. On the other hand, on the other side, every purchaser of fish in Newfoundland will be part of the collective bargaining process. The act itself, the Fishing Industry Collective Bargaining Act is working well but I believe it could work better. Certainly there is a good case to be made for some legislation to revise some aspects of that. I would be very happy if the minister would make a commitment that he would have that looked into and that he would invite representations from the union and from the companies as to what changes they think should be made. The act is working but it is certainly not working as well as it should and as it could.

Sir, the more important hole in the entire scheme is the loophole which hopefully this bill and the board it creates will fill. That is the matter of getting accurate information. I hope that the board makes full use of its powers. I think it has sufficient powers. Indeed, if the Board chose to use its full powers I suspect it could get almost any information it wished because it has quite a broad grant of powers and it has the rights spelled forth in the bill to enforce those powers. I do not think it will be abused. Boards are made up of men and women and I have a very great deal of confidence in the man who has been designated to be Chairman of the board, Mr. Rupert Prince. I suppose Mr. Prince probably knows as much as anybody in Newfoundland about the fishery and about public policy with respect to the fishery. He has made a lifelong study of it and he has for many years been involved at different levels and different ways in forming public policy and I think always with success. Each case and each function has added to his reputation and to his achievements.

Sir, I think the board will serve a good purpose. I hope out of it will come a body of information which will be made available to the unions and to the companies and presumably publicly. I see

no reason why it should not be made public in the main. Competitive information, I suppose, is secret. But in an industry as small as the fishing industry, and it is small, Mr. Speaker, in the sense that there are relatively few companies involved. Indeed, if one looks at it there is a Fishery Products empire and there is the Lake empire which now includes the Russell enterprises, the Bonavista Cold Storage firm, and may or may not include the Marystown Fish Plant - the rumor is that the Lakes are going to try to buy that enterprise from its present owners, the Atlantic Sugar people - and then the B.C. Packers people. Really that is I suppose almost eighty or ninety per cent of the fish business in Newfoundland, those three or four large firms. Booth and B.C. Packers are both large firms. They are giant firms. They are both international, what is it called, multinational giants? But each of them in Newfoundland is relatively small. We have the Fishery Products organization, we have the Lake organization, both of them very large. I suppose those four bodies between them, Sir, or among them control eighty or eighty-five or ninety per cent of the fish produced in Newfoundland or the employment generated in the frozen fish end of the industry.

So it is very important that we get the information. It is very important, Sir, that the people have the information, the public have the information. As I have said, in an industry that small, Mr. Speaker, everybody knows what everybody else is doing and I do not think there are any real secrets in line with competitive costs or anything else. I could go further although these companies in the main are private companies and do not produce public financial statements, I would be willing to wager that anybody connected with the industry in Newfoundland, even without access to information that has been obtained in an official manner, that anybody connected with the industry, Mr. Speaker, has a pretty good indication, save to the nearest \$5,000 what the profit or loss position is of any company doing business in the fish business in Newfoundland in any given year.

So I think there is a case for having all of this information made public or if there is a great mass of it and perhaps too much to digest in the normal sense, certainly having summaries of it made public. After all, Sir, the fishery is of great concern to every Newfoundlander. It employs about 20,000 people directly. That in itself is of great significance. But then one adds on to that the fact that in a very real sense to date, Sir, we have a fish industry in Newfoundland only because it is being supported with public money, mainly Ottawa money, and maybe not enough Ottawa money, but if it were not for the Ottawa money that has been put in in the last few months I do not think we would have very much of a fish business going today in Newfoundland.

MR. CROSBIE: We would not have any fishing industry.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the Minister of Fisheries says we would not have any. I am glad he says it and I have no quarrel with that at all. I think he is right. If it were not for the Ottawa money there would be no fish plants operating in Newfoundland today. The only fish business we would have is a few men out jigging, probably cross-handed, and a few boys cutting their tails and then a few quintals of salt fish being made in the odd harbour on a bawn here or a bawn there and sold around door to door as it was at points in the thirties - for what

\$2.50 a quintal fishermen got in the thirties? And today fish is worth \$1 a pound from the fisherman. If anybody tries to buy a quintal of fish it is worth ninety-five cents to \$1 a pound for good, salt, shore cured, light salted fish.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think the information should be made public and I think the fact so much public money goes into it is a further justification for making the information public. I think the people of this province have a right to know what fish companies are doing. I am not concerned about their intimate profits. There must be some things sacred, and there must even be some things secret. But, Mr. Speaker, I think the people have a right to know what investment these companies have made in the industry and what investment the public are making in the industry and what rates of return are being enjoyed upon the capital used. That I believe is the most significant measure of economic success in this day and age, not the so-called profit that shows on a profit and loss statement, but rather the rate of return on the investment. I think we have a right to know that. Maybe we have a right to know it all the more because as the years go by this House will see a long succession of fisheries companies in one way or another, coming before the government and before the public looking for more and more money. The industry may not want that but I think that is what is going to happen and I think the fishery for many years yet to come will be a very heavily subsidized industry. Indeed the argument is not whether or not it should be subsidized. The argument will be by how much it should be subsidized and on what terms?

So I think, Mr. Speaker, the board can serve a very useful purpose. I think that Mr. Prince is an admirable choice to head the board. I feel quite confident that with him as Chairman the board will get off on the right foot and get off to a good start. The information it produces could be of great use. It is not going to set the price of fish. It is not going to set the price of labour in the fishery. But it will provide information on which those who are charged with negotiating the price of fish and those who are charged with negotiating the price of labour have the information at their disposal,

and the information to ensure that they arrive at the best possible decisions.

The only other point I would make, Sir, is that this act too has in it that nefarious and omnipresent clause, members of the board holding office during pleasure. I have objected to it every time I have seen it. It keeps cropping up. The minister is noting it down. I hope that it will be amended at committee stage. I really wish instructions could be given to the draftsmen. I am not in a position to do it, not at the present time, but the instructions could be given and unless the Cabinet specifically directs that in a draft bill a board shall be appointed to hold office during pleasure, that the norm in the absence of any direction of the contrary, the norm, the normal way of proceeding would be that members of boards hold office on good behaviour for certain terms or for terms certain.

This act here, and the minister did not put it in, all that happened was that the minister said to the draftsman, "Please prepare an act with the following purposes in mind," and the draftsman quite properly put in certain powers of the board and, lo and behold, one of the ones he puts in inevitably is each member of the board holds office during pleasure.

Sir, I do not think it should be there and I would hope the minister will agree with my request to take it out when we come to committee stage. We did that earlier today with the Automobile Insurance Bill and the Highway Traffic Bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I do not think there is anything more needs to be said on it. The board will prove its value in action. If it turns out not to have been valuable then we will have to take further steps, but I believe it will be of value. I am glad they are doing it now, the government are doing it now. It has taken them three and a half years to get to this point. It is an inexcusable delay. I do not blame the present minister for it. He has been in office only a relatively few months and I will give him the credit for getting it this far and getting it done now. But, Sir, his predecessors have a heavy burden to shoulder. There is no reason that this bill could not have

been brought before the House at any point in the last three or four sessions. We have asked for it on this side consistently and constantly. We stand ready to support it now as we would have then.

So you know with the comment that better late than never I say Sir, that we shall support the bill and we will do so with pleasure because we believe it will help the fishermen of this province.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my colleague has pretty well covered the remarks, I suppose, outlining the position that we on this side of

the House take in this particular bill. But, there are a few questions that I would like to raise and like to get the minister's reaction to these questions when he is winding up the debate.

Sir, first of all I want to say that I have been puzzled right from the beginning, Sir, of why it was necessary to include a provision in the collective bargaining for fishermen to set up a Fishing Industry Advisory Board. I could never understand, Sir, why that was necessary in the beginning. It seems to me that it started out as just a piece of window dressing. It was in my opinion just put in there and perhaps - you know, I never got a chance to discuss it. I was the acting Minister of Labour at the time and I never did get a chance to discuss it with the legal draftsmen on why it was necessary to have this there because once you give the fishing industry collective bargaining, then they have to go through all the process of negotiating across the table, a conciliation officer, a conciliation board and go through all the legal process that all the other unions and employers go through in their negotiations.

I would think, Mr. Speaker, that in this particular case that during hectic, during very sensitive negotiations, that this particular board would be walking the tightrope. They would be figure skating on very, very thin ice indeed because one side or the other is bound to try to use this board for their own benefit depending on the situation at the time, whether the fishing industry was making a big profit or whether it was in the red, if it was in the red or if they were just operating at a break even situation, the fishing industry would try to take advantage of the board and use the board to try to strengthen their case.

On the other hand, if they were making a substantial profit, the union would try to use the board. So they would have to be very careful in that kind of situation in my opinion because no matter what happens setting up this board is not going to put any more fish in the ocean neither is it going to settle the negotiations between the fishermen's union and various employers throughout the Province. It is just not going to settle them. They are going to still have to

go through the normal process that any union has to go through or any negotiations have to take. They have to follow their natural course. And so in that regard, Sir, you know the only thing the board can do is just collect the information, pass it on to the various groups if they can get permission from the minister. Will the minister authorize the board to release the information during very sensitive contract negotiations? If he did, would he not be influencing one side or the other? I would like for the minister to tell us how it is going to work in that regard because I think that is the area that we are going to have some difficulties, some problems.

One good thing that I could see the board accomplishing if they had the authority and I am not quite sure if they have or not - recently we heard the Minister of Fisheries and he could not wait to take to the airwaves and to get his phisog on television to tell us that he had carried out a study throughout the Province and compared lobster prices in Newfoundland to the price of lobsters in the other Atlantic Provinces. He came to the conclusion that lobster fishermen in Newfoundland were not being chiseled, they were not being gypped, that the lobster prices in Newfoundland were in line with the lobster prices being paid in Atlantic Canada and the other Atlantic Provinces.

This may or may not be so, Sir. I question the minister's figures, but nevertheless I have nothing to back it up apart from just some very, very mild research that I did myself. From what I can learn, Sir, and I did travel over to the Mainland to find this out, that the lobster fishermen in Nova Scotia were getting more for their lobsters than the fishermen here in Newfoundland despite what the minister and his officials said. But, Sir, that was not really the point. That was not the point at all. Let us say they were getting the same prices, \$1.20 a pound, I think, or roughly \$1.20 or \$1.30

and the minister was so proud and looked so cheerful on television telling us that the lobster fishermen in Newfoundland were getting the same as the mainland - over in New Brunswick, and Nova Scotia and P.E.I. they were getting about \$1.20 or \$1.30 a pound. But the minister did not tell us how much Bidgood's were getting for these lobsters, the spread between what was being paid to the lobster fishermen and what Bidgood's were charging the consumer. At that particular time when the minister made that statement the lobster fisherman may have been getting his \$1.20 or his \$1.30 a pound, but Bidgood's were charging about \$2.40 or \$2.50 a pound to the consumer, and they were making more off the lobster than the fisherman was and that is what the minister should have been looking at.

And the same thing, Sir, applies all the way down the line with all the fish products that are on sale in the supermarkets.

MR. DOODY: What about the fish markets?

MR. NEARY: No, I do not know. I would say their prices are very reasonable. I would say their prices are more reasonable than Bidgood's.

MR. DOODY: I am just asking your opinion. You seem to have done some research.

MR. NEARY: I certainly have done some research on them. But, Sir, this I think is where this board might come in handy. This Board might be able to find out, Sir, may be able to find out because I do not believe there is a person in Newfoundland today who can explain or who has been able to find out why you pay such high prices for salt fish, if you can get it, in the stores and in the supermarkets in Newfoundland, when you pay the fishermen six and eight and he would be lucky if he gets ten cents a pound.

MR. DOODY: Salted.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not salted.

MR. DOODY: How much does the fishermen get for salting it?

MR. NEARY: And you go into the - or fresh for that matter - and you go into the supermarket and you probably pay about \$1.75 or \$1.85 a pound for it.

MR. DOODY: Why is that?

MR. NEARY: That is what I would like to know. That is what I hope this Board will find out. Because everybody in Newfoundland has been asking that question for years and years. Now the Minister of Industrial Development -

MR. DOODY: Surely you got some connections with them to get that information.

MR. NEARY: - the Minister of Industrial Development who has had a little bit of experience in the supermarket business.

MR. DOODY: A little background.

MR. NEARY: - a little background perhaps the minister can participate in this debate and he might be able to -

MR. DOODY: I got out of it. I could not stand it.

MR. NEARY: Could not stand it? No, he used it as a stepping stone to get into politics. And you go from Duff's Supermarket to Minister of Industrial Development. Out of the pickle barrel into the fire. But anyway, Sir, it is an interesting situation. People have been asking that question for years: How come the fishermen get such a low price for his fish and the stores and the supermarkets and the fish merchants clean her on it? Why is it? Why are not the benefits passed on to the fishermen?

MR. DOODY: Ask Mike.

MR. NEARY: Ah! He pays a pretty good price. And that is something, Sir, I hope that this fishing industry - I will not get any supper this evening.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the functions and duties of the Board include; it has the power to collect, compile and record information and statistics respecting the fishing industry, including information relating to catching, buying, selling, producing, processing, exporting, marketing, operational costs, labour costs and pricing of fish.

Now I do not know, Sir, how far the minister intends for this Board to go in the field of marketing. Will it just be -

MR. DOODY: There is no doubt they will get full information.

MR. NEARY: Full information? But will they be blazing new trails? Will they be looking for new markets? Will they be a marketing board?

MR. DOODY: Yes, they will -

MR. NEARY: Ah well! Now, Sir, that was not the impression -

MR. CROSBIE: They cannot market fish. They can look for new markets.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, if they do, then I would say that could be a very good thing, providing, Mr. Speaker, the Board just does not take off and make trips around the world at public expense just for the sake of getting away from our cold, damp climate here in Newfoundland.

If they are genuinely authorized to go out and try and find new markets I would say that could be a good thing, But I hope they do not end up every time you get on a plane you find somebody from (what is it they call it?) the St. John's Recreation - (what do they call that recreation group)? - Newfoundland Amateur Sports Federation. Every time you get on a plane you see somebody from the Newfoundland Amateur Sports Federation going off on a jaunt somewhere at public expense. I hope this crowd do not wind up doing the same thing.

HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: It is about time that somebody went down and audited their books.

MR. MURPHY: I hope you mention it.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I will mention it because it is true.

HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: But I hope that this crowd do not end up doing the same thing.

MR. DOODY: I hope this is not the Cabot Street Floor Hockey team that you are talking about.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

MR. DOODY: I hope that is not the Cabot Street Floor Hockey team you are talking about.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. No, Mr. Speaker, This is only a handful of people I am talking about. I am not talking about all of the members of the Newfoundland Sports Federation, just a handful.

MR. SIMMONS: Going to university extension courses!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair fails to see the relevance between the Fishery Advisory Board and the Newfoundland Sport Federation.

MR. DOODY: They are all sports minded.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, apart from that I do not have anything else to say except that I would be interested to hear what the minister has to say about this Board giving out information during a period

of negotiations between the Fishermen's Unions and the Advisory Board, because it could influence, Sir, one party or the other. And I, you know, maybe I am stund, and perhaps I am and I am sure the Minister of Social Services would agree.

MR. MURPHY: Yes. I second that.

MR. NEARY: Yes, the minister would second that. But I cannot see, Sir, what benefit this Board can be to either side, all it could do is cause trouble, It could get itself in a bad situation, it could get itself in a real jam if they did not watch themselves during negotiations. I do not think this Board was set up to take the place of the conciliation officer or the Conciliation Board, I am sure it was not. But I hope it is not designed to try and settle any dispute that may arise between an employer and the union. I do not think it can because as my colleague pointed out the fishing industry for a long time to come will have to be subsidized and this Board is not the one, it is up to the elected representatives of the people to decide the subsidy that will be necessary to carry on the fishing industry and to settle the agreements with the workers, the fish plant workers and the trawlermen and the fishermen of this Province. It will not be up to this Board it will be up to the elected representatives of the people. And I believe, Sir, the day is not too far distant in this Province when there will be provincial-wide negotiations carried on in behalf of the fishing industry. It will be Province-wide, that one union will negotiate for all of the fishermen of this Province, and I would say that would be a very good thing.

Well, Mr. Speaker, why have just an Advisory Board for the fishing industry? Why only for the fishing industry? Why not for the mining industry? Why not have provincial-wide bargaining for the mining industry? Why not have provincial-wide bargaining for the construction industry? Why not have an advisory board, Sir, for all of the various categories of industries that we have in this Province? Why limit it to the fishing industry, Sir? Any particular reason?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, ah!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Why not have an advisory board for the Members of the House of Assembly?

MR. EVANS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Why has it just been restricted, Mr. Speaker, to the fishing industry.

As I said when I started off my few remarks, Sir, I have always been puzzled to know why this Board was being established. I believe myself, Sir, it started out to be nothing but window dressing and it started out to try and leave the appearance to the fishermen of this Province that at long last somebody was going to come to their rescue and try to get the information that was being hidden supposedly for so long out into the open, and I believe, Sir, that was probably the main reason behind it. You know, like the Leader of the Opposition says only time will tell whether it works or not. And I will be interested in hearing what the minister has to say about the information that will be in hands of this Board during the period of negotiations between the various groups, whether they be fish plant workers, fishermen and the various employers, the fish merchants throughout this Province.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Placentia East.

MR. AYLWARD: I would just like to rise to support this legislation and I think myself it is an extremely important piece of legislation. I think it will go a long way if the Board fulfills the objective set out in this act to allay a lot of suspicion on the part of the fishermen themselves as to

the capacities of the companies to pay higher prices than they pay. Everywhere the inshore fishery committee travelled throughout Newfoundland, we heard the fishermen express great discontent and dissatisfaction at the price paid for fish, and the fishermen always felt that the companies and the buyers and the processors and everybody who paid them for their catch could and should be able to pay more than they actually paid.

As I see the purpose of this Advisory Board, it is to act as an agency, an independent board, that could look into the operations of these various fish companies and after making a proper audit ascertain whether in fact the companies could pay more than they are paying or whether the financial position of the company was as bad as the company held it out to be.

Now, Mr. Speaker, a lot of course will depend upon how effective this board really is. If the board fulfills the mandate envisaged by this legislation I think it will do an excellent job because, as I have said before, it will have the capacity to restore faith, the faith of the fishermen in the people who buy their products. If you look at the section which sets out the power of the board, the board will have power to collect, compile and record information in statistics representing the fishing industry including information relating to catching, buying, selling, producing, processing, exporting, marketing, operational costs, labour costs, price of fish and fish product. So, you see, Mr. Speaker, this legislation is indeed exceptionally broad and as I see it, and the minister in answer to a question raised by the honourable Member for Bell Island indicated with respect to marketing, for example, that the board has the authority to go out and even try to obtain new markets for the product.

Now, if the board can do that, Mr. Speaker, and undoubtedly it can if it has the resources, this will be a wonderful function and a very, very necessary one because it is something that we did not have time ourselves to look into and undoubtedly the unions and the government to a great extent has had to rely upon the

information which they received from the companies as to what the market conditions were like. Now this independent board with their economists and with their own contacts in the various markets of the world could and should be able to satisfy the minister as to what the market conditions really are. This, Mr. Speaker, I said, is an extremely important piece of legislation if the board can and does fulfill that function.

Also I think the honourable Member from Bell Island raised a very good question, and that was just how this information could and would be used. I certainly agree, Mr. Speaker, I can see that the government has a right to ascertain this information and the reason why, of course, is because there is so much public funds involved in the fishery. But now when this information is made available to the minister, I mean is he at liberty to disclose this to the union? And if so, of course, this will affect the negotiations between the union and the companies as to the price of fish.

And as I see it my own feeling on it is that this is the whole purpose of it so that the government can, the government itself can be satisfied that the money that is being put into the fishery is well spent and that if the company says they cannot afford to pay, that after the government's audit they are satisfied themselves that they could not. Now, if they have the capacity to pay, how much more should the company pay? I suppose that is a question which certainly would have to be negotiated between the union representing the fishermen and the fish processors or buyers. But that is a very, very important area. This is where, of course, this information is going to be of great value and of great value to the industry.

Practically every fisherman in Newfoundland, inshore fishermen with whom we have met to a man, every fisherman to a man felt that he was not getting enough for his fish and that the buyer could and should pay more, and that the government keeps pouring money into the industry to help the processors, to help the

trawler operations and to help every segment of the industry and that they are not passing that money on to the fishermen themselves. Of course, the great debate and the great matter of principle that was settled in the recent dispute, of course, one of them in addition to being paid for their efforts, that any subsidies through government would be passed on to the fishermen. I was pleased to learn from the statement made by the Minister of Fisheries, our own, that the Government of Newfoundland has agreed to assist the crab industry by paying four cents more per pound but that four was paid on the condition that the industry itself pay ten, so that the crab fishermen would and should receive fourteen cents per pound. Now this information, Mr. Speaker, as to what the crab industry can themselves pay can only be determined after the government has had an opportunity to assess the financial statements of these companies. As I understand it now this Advisory Board will be able to obtain the books of these companies and all the financial records, look at the markets and then advise government just what the financial position of the company is. Of course, after the government determines what their profit or loss is, this should be evidence as to whether the fishermen can and should receive more from the processor or buyer and whether the government's contribution is being passed on to the fishermen and whether that amount is necessary.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the inshore fishermen of Newfoundland are concerned this will be a blessing. This piece of legislation is a godsend. But again it will depend upon how this Board functions. I heard great confidence expressed by members of both sides in the Chairman and the composition of this Board. I am sure every inshore fisherman in Newfoundland will anxiously await the reports which the Advisory Board will make to the minister and, of course, pass on in some way to the fishermen because this information compiled by an independent Board should once and for all satisfy, or if they will not satisfy the fishermen, at least

explain to the fishermen that this is the financial position of this particular company or of this particular segment of the industry and this is what can or cannot be paid by the buyer without government assistance for the particular species in question. I think it is a very, very important piece of legislation. As I said before, if properly carried out, it will restore faith by the fishermen in the buyer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we conducted our hearings we accepted a brief from the Fishermen Food and Allied Workers and one suggestion that they made and we included in our recommendations to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations and that was this. They complained of certain legal obstacles, so to speak, which they were encountering with respect to collective bargaining because of certain provisions in the original act, a great deal of time was required before they could obtain certification. We recommended that the minister look into the situation and if the submissions of the union were found to be in order, that appropriate changes in the legislation should be brought in.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I think this is an excellent piece of legislation. I sincerely trust that the Board will carry out the mandate entrusted to it and that it will provide this very valuable information and restore the faces of fishermen in the processors and the buyers.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Fogo.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to dwell at length on the setting up of the Fishery Industry Advisory Board. It is regrettable but I suppose it is better late than never. I recall, and I am sure all members of the honourable House will recall that the first Throne Speech that this present government brought in, they advocated the setting up of this Fishing Industry Advisory Board. Now, as the Leader of the Opposition said, three years and more have passed by and it is only today that we find that a bill, legislation is being introduced into this House to get this Board

in action. Mr. Speaker, there has always been a mistrust among our fishermen, rightly or wrongly, that stigma has always been there that the merchant or the fish processor or the buyer has been gypping the fishermen. And if they go to the supermarket, having received ten and eleven and twelve cents per pound for fish and go to the supermarket to buy that same fish back they find a price tag of anywhere from eighty-five to \$1.00 to \$1.25 per pound. And it is no wonder, it is no wonder, Mr. Speaker, that the fishermen would not ask himself the question, "Who is getting the rip off? Is it the producer? Is it not the fisherman who has got to rise early in the morning, very often stormy and face the North Atlantic to drag a few fish out of the water and come in and receive ten and twelve cents a pound - he is lucky if he receives that - to find himself faced, or his wife who will usually do the grocery buying for the week, face the same product in the supermarket with a price tag of anywhere from eighty-five to one dollar and odd cents per pound.

This is what has created the doubt in the minds of our inshore fishermen and it has always been there. And on this board, and I would suggest to the minister, I would suggest that a fisherman should be a member of this board. We have some very young intelligent fishermen today and I think it would satisfy the fishing industry as a whole, especially the inshore fishermen, that if one of their colleagues or one of their members, one of the fishermen whom they have some respect for, and there are quite a lot of them around here today, were to serve on that board it would mean a lot to the success of the functioning of this board.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the board expand into the grading of fish because here again we find the fishermen very disgruntled in the way their fish is graded. They claim they are not getting the best price for the best grade and vice versa. So if they could include the grading of this fish and convince the fishermen that they are getting the best price for the best grade, or the best price for that particular grade, then I certainly think it will go a long way to eliminate a lot of the mistrust that we find among our inshore fishermen today.

So, Mr. Speaker, as the Leader of the Opposition stated, we support this legislation. I commend the present minister for bringing it in at this particular time. I believe too that if this board had been functioning last winter when we had the trawlermen's strike, perhaps that strike would not have dragged on as long. I think this board could have gone a long way to settle that strike.

So, Mr. Speaker, these are just a few remarks in agreeing with my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition and my colleague the Member for Bell Island, and the Member for Placentia East, that unfortunately of course there is nothing we can do about the past now. The fishermen have been looking for this legislation. They thought they were going to get it the first six months after the present government were elected and I believe that they had all hopes abandoned of ever getting it. But I am very happy now to see that it will get past this Legislature today, we hope, and they will regain their confidence in the government, regain the confidence that the present government do have an interest in the way they make a living and let us get the board functioning as quickly as possible. No secrets, Mr. Speaker, this board must operate over and beyond any means of

secretary. If they find the companies will not make available to them their books for auditing, then the minister will have to be requested to use some other means of obtaining the information pertaining to the price of fish paid to the fishermen and the spread between the fishermen and the consumer.

So with those few remarks, Mr. Speaker, I commend the Minister of Fisheries and wish him well.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Twillingate.

MR. GILLETT: Mr. Speaker, I shall be very brief in this and like the other speakers on this side of the House, in fact, on both sides of the House, Mr. Speaker, I support this bill. The functions of the Committee are varied, they are great. Their responsibility is great and I can certainly see where the Committee will be working full time, and not only full time but overtime if they have to cover all the ground and carry out all the functions which are required of them.

My colleague from Fogo said that the mistrust has always been present and I think it still will remain present. I fear very much that regardless of what results this Committee comes up with and with what recommendations and findings they present to the Minister of Fisheries, it still will not satisfy the fishermen because their costs are so much greater today than they were years ago. The entire industry has changed, Mr. Speaker, changed dramatically.

I recall in the days of the Commission of Government a gentleman walked into our office one day in Twillingate. He introduced himself as Bruce Feather. I believe he was an Englishman. And I asked him what he was there for and he said, "I have been sent out by the government, the Commission of Government, to see if we cannot widen the gap in the returns in the fishing industry." And I said, "Exactly what do you mean, Mr. Feather?" He said, "You stand a chance of losing twenty-five cents or fifty cents a quintal on fish, and you stand a chance of making twenty-five cents or fifty cents a quintal, on an investment that is costing you something in the vicinity of \$17.00." He said, "That margin is too narrow." "Well," I said, "What do you hope to do about it?" He said, "Well, I hope

we can manage to widen it." I said, "I hope you do." But the only way that we could survive, we did survive, and I explained this to Mr. Feather, is that fish was the fisherman's cash and it was also ours - the only cash we had and it was not cash. And for that reason we were doing a barter business with, usually, a twenty-two to twenty-five per cent markup on our goods, out of which the transportation had to come.

As I say, the industry has changed, changed dramatically. And I can certainly understand the fishermen because I feel it myself - when he goes in a local supermarket and sees, if he is fortunate to see his Newfoundland fish, light salted, hard cured, sundried cod, the most delicious food, I believe, on earth, at least to me, he sees that fish selling here in Newfoundland for \$1.00 and \$1.20 a pound. He can think nothing other than somebody is ripping him off.

So therefore, Mr. Speaker, if this Committee does nothing else but reveal to the fishermen, never mind the trade, but reveal to the fishermen where that so-called, alleged rip-off is taking place, then I think if they do nothing else they will have accomplished their task and accomplished it to the fullest.

I am very happy to know that the Chairman

will be Mr. Prince. I can think of no other man in Newfoundland really who is quite as qualified to carry out these functions because he has a knowledge of the entire industry from the catching to the marketing. I congratulate the minister on his appointing Mr. Prince as the chairman of that committee. I would support my colleague from Fogo when I say that I too suggest very strongly that if the committee can be increased in number, that a fisherman, perhaps two fishermen, from the inshore and the offshore, would be members of that committee. That I think would go a long, long way towards satisfying the doubts of the fishermen if they had two of their colleagues on that committee.

As the hour is getting late, Mr. Chairman, and we know the House Leader has more business to transact, so I just want to say but very firmly that I wholeheartedly support this bill and I trust that the committee will accomplish the task which is set before it.

MR. SPEAKER (AYLWARD): If the minister speaks, he closes the debate.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank all members who have spoken on the bill. I will just touch briefly on some of the points that have been raised. It is certainly the intention to have other members appointed to the board and it is certainly the intention to ask the fishermen's union to suggest several names of people who may be appointed and certainly there will be representatives of the fishermen on this Fishing Industry Advisory Board.

The other member in addition to Mr. Prince, Mr. Pynn, is not representing any particular interest group. He is just a very, very intelligent and capable man who is the head of the faculty of commerce at Memorial University. So there will be other members appointed including representatives of the fishermen.

MR. NEARY: Does he have his Come From Away degree?

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know whether - I think Mr. Pynn is a native Newfoundlander, but I would not care if he came from Ethiopia if he was the right man to do the job.

Now, just some of the points that were mentioned: Several gentlemen mentioned the legislation is late, that it should have been brought in a year ago or two years ago. Well, Mr. Speaker, you may or may not believe it but I remember a dozen cabinet meetings of which my predecessor as Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Labour brought up this question of who could we recommend to get as chairman of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board, and dozens upon dozens of names were suggested, and they would be contacted and turn it down or refuse it. But that is the only reason why this legislation is late. We could not find a person in the Province to take over, to accept appointment as chairman who was capable of doing it because they were afraid of the job. They felt they would be in between the union and the employers and they were going to be shot at by all sides, and it would be too unpleasant a job.

We finally had to dragoon the then Deputy Minister of Fisheries Rupert Prince, who was a Deputy Minister of Fisheries, we had to dragoon him and practically stone him into the position of chairman of the Fishing Industry Advisory Board. That is the reason for the lateness, if there is any lateness, in the legislation. Well, better late than never. It would have been before this House long ago had we been able to find a chairman until finally we had to take one of our own deputy ministers and ask him to, persuade him to become chairman of the board. That is the reason for the lateness.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not like to categorize classes of people as being good or bad. I find there are good merchants and bad merchants. There are good businessmen and bad businessmen. There are good politicians and ones that I consider to be inferior or bad. There are good union men and others I have no regard for at all, that I think are reprobates or irresponsible. You know, you cannot say that merchants are this or union people are that. You know, this categorization is neither fair nor accurate. I therefore do not accept general condemnations of the fish merchants

of Newfoundland, so-called, or that the present fish processors or companies, that they are all scoundrels and rogues, and I do not think they are. I think that the great majority of them are hard working, attempting to do a job in very difficult circumstances. But the board, one of the prime functions of the board will be to have at last an impartial source of verification as to whether the industry can afford or not afford to do this, that or the other or what level of subsidy they need.

Now in collective bargaining I do not know how much of a role the Member for Bell Island touched on this - the board can play in collective bargaining. Because, if it, you know, presents to the two contending parties - let us say they were negotiating with X company and it verifies that X company is losing money,

hopelessly losing money and therefore cannot afford to pay the fish plant workers or the fishermen another cent, the union is not going to pay any attention to that. They are going to say that they want an increase anyway and if they are not earning money they should get a subsidy, that they are not going to work at slave labour rates and so on and so forth, the cost of living is gone up. And I mean that is not going to persuade a union not to look for an increase simply because you can show from an impartial source the company is at the moment losing money and -

MR. NEARY: The Board is not going to be used as the big stick.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. So I think that its value in a collective bargaining sense in any particular negotiation is not going to be a great one. Its greatest value is as the bill now presents it, impartial source of information to governments, to the industry, to the unions or to groups of fishermen or to whoever is interested in the industry and just what the costs are and what the factors are and what the marketing is and so on and so forth and what they think of prices with all the information they have got that will be available whenever it is needed, and available for collective bargaining also.

Now the Member for Placentia East mentioned his Select Committee recommended that they were favourably impressed with the submission Mr. Cashin's union made about collective bargaining changes they would like to see in connection with the inshore fishermen or the general fishermen of the province. And I noted that and I have gotten a copy of their submission and we are going to look at that, the Department of Labour and ourselves and, you know if it is a sensible thing to make the changes the union suggests then we will proceed to do that. But in any event because of the Select Committee's recommendation we will be reviewing that during the summer and see whether these changes can be brought before the House by way of legislation.

The Leader of the Opposition mentioned that it was mostly federal money in the fisheries. That is not correct, Mr. Speaker. There is federal money in the fishery. No one is denying that and the present

subsidy programme of course is federal, It is going to cost them \$60 million or \$80 million this year.

But there is a tremendous amount of provincial money in the fishery. We are getting various facilities about the province. There are provincial grants made to fish companies and the fishery generally. There are guarantees of loans. You know in addition to the \$17 million that is in the budget this year for direct spending by the province, there are all kinds of other monies in the province going in by way of guarantee, by way of loan, by way of the Fisheries Loan Board and cheap interest rates and the like, and I am afraid there is going to have to be more, Mr. Speaker. I would not have any doubt whatsoever that before this year is over we will have to substantially assist all the seasonal operators in the fishing business. They are not going to be able to survive unless we do. The federal government will not do it. The federal government has got this general assistance plan, so it will have to be the provincial government. So I suspect there will be a lot more provincial money in the fishery industry before the present year is out.

Lobster prices, what did Bidgood's get for lobster? All I reported on, Mr. Speaker, at that time was it had been alleged that Newfoundland fishermen will be paid less for their lobster than Nova Scotia and P.E.I. fishermen. We checked this out and it was not the case and I reported it. If we found they were getting less and there was no reason for it we would have reported that. Now what do Bidgood's get for lobsters? Bidgood's get for lobsters what the traffic will bear, I assume that is what they get for lobsters. I know that Bidgood's do a darn good job in selling Newfoundland food and products, whether Bidgood's get too much or too little I do not know. They are in business to make a profit and -

MR. EVANS: Perhaps Mike could check that out.

MR. CROSBIE: - yes, Mike Maher could check that out for us. And there are all kinds of calculations. But when you look at the fishing industry

June 25, 1975

Tape NO. 2722

NM - 3

today - and you forget the retail stores at the moment. They are going to make a profit the retail stores no matter what happens, no matter how bad things get in Newfoundland the retail stores will boom. The Unemployment Insurance and the transfer payments and the welfare payments - if you are in the rag business you have got it made, you know, unless you are stupid, and, you know, you cannot add one hundred per cent on top of one hundred per cent.

to get what you should charge for an item then you are always going to make money in the retail business. But in the fishing business of the Province it is quite obvious from all the studies and all that was done in the last nine months they are not making money. I doubt whether any of them are going to make any money this year. They certainly will not cover their depreciation. So, I do not think there are any great profits being made in the fishing industry at this time. But this Board, in any event, will be able to check on that and keep us advised on what the situation is.

The honourable Minister of Industrial Development would like to see the bill carried. I think that I have touched on most of the points. Now it is 5:15. It has to go to Committee. So, anyway we appreciate the support of honourable gentlemen opposite and we should not expect the Board, you know, that it is going to be able to perform miracles. But if it functions properly we will have by the end of this year accurate information on all financial aspects of the fishing industry available to interested parties and monitored from time to time, and able to do special studies when we need it, such as the present one, the Queen crab processors industry. I think the Board will have a very valuable function to play. I therefore move second reading.

On motion second reading of a bill, "An Act To Revise Existing Legislation Respecting The Fishing Industry Advisory Board," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker asked the Member for Placentia East to act as Chairman of Committees. Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

A bill, "An Act To Revise Existing Legislation Respecting The Fishing Industry Advisory Board."

On motion, Clause (1) through (6) carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Clause (7) carry?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall Clause (7) carry?

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, (7)2, subsection 2: I move that the first word "to" be eliminated and there be substituted "the Board shall". Then, subsection (3), that after the word "act" there be inserted, "the Board may." Then the words, "to" in subclause (a) and subclause (b) will have to be deleted.

On motion clause(7) as amended carried.

MR. CHAIRMAN: You have no amendments to clause (8). Are there amendments to clause (8).

MR. HICKMAN: Yes, the word "advice" should go before ministers.

On motion, clause (8) as amended carried.

On motion clauses (9) through (30) carried.

MR. CROSBIE: There is a change?

MR. HICKMAN: You are full right, yes.

MR. CROSBIE: (30)a, second (51)

On motion clause (30) as amended carried.

On motion that the Committee report the bill without amendment, carried.

On motion that the Committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again, Mr. Speaker returned to the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of the Whole have considered the matters to them referred and have passed bill No. 88, "An Act To Revise Existing Legislation Respecting The Fishing Industry Advisory Board" with some amendment and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and report having passed bill No. 88 with some amendments.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion amendments read a first and second time.

On motion bill No. 88 read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.

A bill, "An Act To Revise Existing Legislation Respecting The Fishing Industry Advisory Board", read a third time, ordered passed and title be as on the Order Paper.

MR. CROSBIE: One last item of business, Under Bill No. 74 which was An Act To - it was called the "Bowater's Newfoundland Amendment Act, 1975," under Standing Order 66 (a) we would like to have third reading rescinded and the bill recommitted, and the reason for that is that through some kind of slip up this bill was not perused by Bowater Company before we passed it, and there have to be several changes made in it. And the best thing to do at this date is just to leave it until the next session of the House, and I would move that we rescind Bill No. 74 so that-or rescind third reading of Bill No. 74.

MR. NEARY: We agree to allow the bill to be rescinded, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that the third reading be rescinded, those in favour "Aye", those against "Nay" carried.

MR. NEARY: You really got hammered on that one.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh yes, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Are they threatening to close down or what?

MR. CROSBIE: No, no, I think there is some internal problem, a communications gap. Mr. Speaker, might we adjourn say for -

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, carry on and do some business.

MR. CROSBIE: - about nine minutes until - we are expecting a visit from His Honour, and if we could reassemble about 5:29.

MR. SPEAKER: The House will recess for some nine or ten minutes until the arrival of His Honour.

SERGEANT-AT-ARMS: His Honour the Lieutenant Governor has arrived.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Admit His Honour, the Lieutenant-Governor.

May it please Your Honour, the General Assembly of the Province has at its present session passed certain bills, to which, in the name and on behalf of the General Assembly, I respectfully request Your Honour's assent.

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Local Authority Guarantee Act, 1957."

A bill, "An Act Further to Amend The Loan And Guarantee Act 1957."

A bill, "An Act Respecting A Plan Of Legal Aid For The Province."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Workmen's Compensation Act."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Transfer Of Certain Lands From The Reid Newfoundland Company Limited And Mines And Forest Newfoundland Limited To Her Majesty In Right Of Newfoundland."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Provision Of Funeral Services."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Constabulary Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Registration Of Needs Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Retail Sales Tax Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Tobacco Tax Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Wildlife Act."

A bill, "An Act To Establish Gander Development Corporation."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The City of St. John's Act."

A bill, "An Act To Impose Taxes On Income From Mining Operations Within The Province And On Income Obtained or Derived From Persons Holding Rights To Mine."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Local Government Act, 1972."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Department Of Municipal Affairs And Housing Act, 1973."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Regulation Of Mines Act."

A bill, "An Act To Ratify, Confirm, and Adopt A Guarantee Agreement Made Between RoyMarine Leasing Limited And The Government And Fishery Products Limited.

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Fire Prevention Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Motorized Snow Vehicles And All Terrain Vehicles Act."

A bill, "An Act To Limit The Financial Responsibility Which May Be Incurred By The Province In Respect Of Newfoundland And Labrador Hydro Without Further Reference To The Legislature."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Engineering Profession Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Tourist Establishments Act."

A bill, "An Act To Provide For Livestock Insurance And To Create A Livestock Owners Compensation Board."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Welfare Institutions Licensing Act."

A bill, "An Act Respecting Day Care And Homemaker Services."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Teacher (Collective Bargaining) Act, 1973."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Memorial University (Pensions) Act."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Public Libraries Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Stamp Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Highway Traffic Act."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act."

A bill, "An Act To Provide For The Reversion To The Province Of Certain Mineral Lands In Labrador."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Memorial University Act."

A bill, "An Act To Revise Existing Legislation Respecting The Fishing Industry Advisory Board."

A bill, "An Act Respecting The Awarding Of An Increase Of Pensions To Or In Respect Of Certain Employees Of The Government Of Newfoundland, Certain Teachers And Certain Members Of The House Of Assembly."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Community Councils Act, 1972."

A bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Local Government Act, 1972."

A bill, "An Act To Amend The Conveyancing Act."

HONOURABLE GORDON A WINTER (Lieutenant Governor): In her Majesty's name, I assent to these bills.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the Premier has asked me to tell members that he is going down to Government House immediately.

Mr. Speaker, before moving the adjournment I would like to thank honourable gentlemen for whatever co-operation they did exhibit. I think that in the last few days that everything has gone remarkably well. I hope we will see you all again the next date that

we adjourn to, unless there is an event happens in the meantime. So, Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and the following motion: Resolved that when this House adjourns today it stand adjourned until Wednesday, January 21, 1976, at three of the clock, provided always that if it appears to the satisfaction of Mr. Speaker, or, in the case of his absence from the Province, the Chairman of Committees, after consultation with Her Majesty's Government, that the public interest require that the House should meet at an earlier time than the adjournment, Mr. Speaker, or in his absence, the Chairman of Committees may give notice that he is so satisfied and thereupon the House shall meet at the time stated by such notice and shall transact its business as if it had been duly adjourned to that time, and that the House do adjourn accordingly.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the motion is not debatable I know and I do not propose to debate it. I simply wish to say that in response to the Minister of Fisheries remarks about co-operation, we are on our side happy to respond to what ever leadership has been shown by the government in this matter.

On motion, the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow Wednesday, January 21, 1976 at 3:00 p.m.

CONTENTS

June 25, 1975	Page
Statements by Ministers	
Mr. Crosbie informed the House of action planned now that the U.S.A.F. has formally announced that the lease on Goose Bay will not be renewed.	7777
Mr. Crosbie informed the House that the Government of Canada has been asked to convene a meeting of Provinces interested in the East Coast fishery because of the failure of the Law of the Sea Conference and ICNAF to deal with issues of interest to the industry.	7777
Presenting Petitions	
By Mr. Young on behalf of some 800 residents of the Harbour Grace area asking that a community pasture be established. Supported by Mr. Neary and Mr. Wilson.	7779
Oral Questions	
Location of the proposed Burin Peninsula Hospital. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Wells.	7781
Hawkes Bay forest industry. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Maynard.	7782
Closing of hospital beds. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	7783
Closing of hospital beds for economic reasons. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	7784
Markets for the catches of trap fishermen. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	7784
Bay Roberts town dump. Mr. Neary, Mr. Peckford.	7785
Police report sought on threatening letter written on the letterhead of the Leader of the Opposition and directed to Minister of Finance. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Earle.	7786
The same report sought from the Minister of Justice. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Hickman.	7786
The strike of liquor store employees. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	7786
Federal assistance for Northeast Coast fishermen. Mr. Winsor, Mr. Crosbie.	7787
Cable television. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	7787
Residences for students of the College of Trades and Technology. Mr. Neary, Mr. Ottenheimer.	7788
Port au Port fishermen trucking their catches to Sydney. Mr. Winsor, Mr. Crosbie.	7789
Vacancies in the districts of White Bay South and Labrador South. Mr. Roberts, Premier Moores.	7789
Query as to when the vacancies will be filled. Mr. Roberts, Premier Moores.	7790
Proposed Polytechnical Institute. Mr. Neary, Mr. Ottenheimer.	7791
Architects for the proposed new hospitals at Clarendville and on the Burin Peninsula. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Wells.	7792
Trusteeship for Mount Pearl. Mr. Neary, Mr. Peckford.	7792

CONTENTS - 2

Oral Questions (continued)	Page
Public tenders for hospital construction. Mr. Roberts, Premier Moores.	7793
Requests for assistance to replace destroyed fishing gear. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	7794
The <u>Norma and Gladys</u> . Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	7795
Method of getting the ship to Tokyo. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickey.	7795
Report sought on the strike situation in the Province. Mr. Neary, Mr. Maynard.	7795
The strike at Wabush. Mr. Neary, Mr. Maynard.	7796
The strike at St. Lawrence. Mr. Neary, Mr. Maynard.	7797
The strike of plumbers and pipefitters. Mr. Neary, Mr. Maynard.	7797
Labour negotiations with nurses. Mr. Neary, Mr. Wells.	7798
 Orders of the Day	
On motion Bill No. 86 read a third time, ordered passed and its title be as on the Order Paper.	7799
On motion Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 84 and Bill No. 85.	7799
The Committee rose, reported having passed the bills with some amendment and asked leave to sit again.	7801
On motion the report was received and adopted and Bills Nos. 84 and 85 ordered passed and their titles to be as on the Order Paper.	7802
On motion second reading of Bill No. 88.	7802
Mr. Crosbie	7802
Mr. Roberts	7812
Mr. Neary	7823
Mr. Aylward	7831
Mr. Winsor	7835
Mr. Gillett	7838
Mr. Crosbie	7840
Bill No. 88 read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House presently by leave.	7846
Committee of the Whole on Bill No. 88	7846
The Committee rose, reported having passed Bill No. 88 with amendment and asked leave to sit again.	7847
The report was received and adopted, Bill No. 88 read a third time, ordered passed and its title to be as on the Order Paper.	7847
Under Standing Order 66(a) leave was sought and received to rescind third reading of Bill No. 74.	7848
His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor granted Royal Assent to Bills Nos. 22, 35, 42, 44, 50, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 58, 60, 62, 63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 71, 72, 73, 76, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92.	7849
Adjournment	7852