



**PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR**

**HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY**

---

**Volume 1**

**Number 55**

**5th Session**

**34th. General Assembly**

---

**VERBATIM REPORT**

**FRIDAY, MAY 14, 1971**

**SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE**

The House met at 11 a.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

HON. F.W. ROWE,

MINISTER OF EDUCATION: I should like to give the House what I might call a progress report on the matter of grants for recreational projects, physical education projects.

Several weeks ago I was able to announce that fifteen communities had received financial assistance for recreational projects under the Recreational Capital Grants Programme. I am now very pleased to announce that the following additional communities have qualified for assistance under this programme: Lumsden - a playing field, Norris Point - swimming pool, Corner Brook - an outdoor sports complex, Eddies Cove East - an outdoor hockey rink, Stag Harbour - a sports field, Fortune - a soccer field, Garnish - a soccer field, Cormack - an outdoor rink, Roddickton - a sports field, Hopedale - an outdoor rink, Nain - a sports field and outdoor rink, (without, I may add, any artificial ice They have not requested any artificial ice) and Makkovik - an outdoor rink.

Mr. Chairman, I am sure that there are other hon. members, or all hon. members are probably wondering what about this project or that project, this community and that community, This is a progress report, as I indicated, and there are other applications on hand, not perhaps tomorrow - well tomorrow, in the Parliamentary sense. Tomorrow may be two weeks time, if we are here, may be less than that, there will be others that I will be able to announce as well.

I might say, Mr. Speaker, these are very gratifying developments. This is an indication of something we are all recognizing now, namely that there is a tremendous increase all over this Province, in every part of this Province, in recreation, Of course the interest has been there perhaps, but nothing has been done about it, to any great extent.

MR. HICKEY: Do we have to send in coupons?

MR. NOLAN: No. We are giving green stamps.

MR. ROWE: My old friend got to be careful here. He has a district out there that we are trying to look after too. He has got to be nice to me.

MR. MURPHY: .....

MR. ROWE: As a matter of fact, at this very minute, our Director of Recreation, Mr. Snow, is meeting with officials of the Municipal Council of St. John's, at this very minute, in City Hall.

MR. MURPHY: I just asked a question and.....

MR. ROWE: Five minutes ago I had occasion to contact Mr. Snow on another matter and that is where I got him, in the Office of the City Engineer, at City Hall. There will be others, Mr. Speaker, and there will be, I stress that point because I am sure that hon. members will be receiving queries from various communities, 'What about our project, All these applications are under discussion and under examination and we hope will be processed, in most cases will be processed in the very near future. I will table copies of this for the press.

MR. MURPHY: You better hurry on because you never know when the election is going to be called. You had better get them all out in a hurry.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we go into the Orders of the Day, I would like, on behalf of all the members of the House, to extend a very cordial welcome to a number of students from the Fisheries College. They are second year Electronic students and they are accompanied by their Guidance Councillor, Mr. Bob LeMessurier.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Chairman, I have a number of answers to questions directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. 257, on the Order Paper of March 29, in the name of the hon. the Leader of the Opposition, although I notice here it is 29/3/71, would be March 29, would it not?

MR. CURTIS: It is already answered, Mr. Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It is already answered. It shows you see, it shows, service with a smile.

Question 254 on the Order Paper of March 29, in the name of the same hon. gentleman and directed to the Minister of Public Works, it ought to have been directed in fact to the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

The answer to the first part is ten, and the second part - Old Perlican, Placentia, Port aux Basques, Springdale, St. George's, Trepassay, Aguathuna, Burin, and the amounts are listed here. I will not bother to read them out. I will send the list over to the hon. gentleman.

There is also a house, not in that list, that was constructed at Harbour Breton. I cannot give the cost because they are not finalized.

The answer to the third part is that these were prefabricated houses. There is only one house prefabricating factory in the Province and it went to them - but except for two, one at Burin and the one at Port aux Basques. The one at Burin, by lowest tender was \$41,436.38, and the one at Port aux Basques, the lowest tender there was \$39,269.09, but the others were prefabricated and the tenders were called for the foundations. All of these were dwellings. It cost a lot less to buy the prefabricated houses and have them taken and put in place.

Question no. 256, directed to the Minister of Public Works in error, it ought to have been directed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. That is on the Order Paper of March 29. It is the same kind of information. The answer to the first part is eleven, to the second part - Bay L'Argent, Grand Bank, Springdale, Dunville, Grand Falls, Grand Falls, Grand Falls, (three) Port Saunders, Bay Roberts, Fogo.

MR. MURPHY: These are welfare officers, the other one medical officers.

MR. SMALLWOOD: All right. The one in Harbour Breton is not finalized. I notice that is the same in the other one - there must have been two at Harbour Breton and the costs are not finalized. I do not know why.

The same answer, they were done by, except several of them, they were done by prefabrication.

At Bay L'Argent there were seven quotations. At Grand Bank there were six. At Springdale there were four. At Dunville there were six. And in Grand Falls there were twelve quotations, tenders. At Port Saunders there were three, Bay Roberts - four, Harbour Breton - seven.

In Fogo, where there seems to be an urgent need for the house, it was ordered as a prefabricated house. I will send the list along.

Question no. 527, also directed to the Minister of Public Works, by someone, I do not know whom. It is question 527. Yes the member for Fortune Bay, The answer to part one is \$600, bought from George Lawrence; part two - foundations and preparatory work cost \$8,170.42, (c) delivered at the site \$14,925, roughly \$15,000. (d) this is included in (c) above included in the cost of the building, included the furnishings and fittings. The \$14,925 included the furnishings and fittings.

The total cost of the whole thing, everything including the surveying, was \$24,035.42. The answer to question "2" is \$79 a month, and the answer to the third question is ten for doctors, eighteen for welfare officers and one for a magistrate.

Question no. 258, on the Order Paper of March 29, in the name of the hon. the temporary Leader of the Opposition.

MR. MURPHY: Answered by the temporary Premier.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Permanent. The Tories have the feeling that the Premiership of Newfoundland is permanently held.... won six times.

Question 258, on the Order Paper of March 29, by the hon. gentleman and addressed to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. It is too long to read out. They are asking the places where property has been acquired for land banks, giving the acreage, cost to the Government and the detail of central mortgage and municipal participation. Well, the answer is that the places where land has been acquired for future development are Burin, Trepassey, Dunville, Harbour Breton, St. John's, Newtown; some industrial, some residential land, and Corner Brook, the new satellite town I suppose.

MR. MURPHY: Is that going to be called St. John's, Newtown?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No. That is what it is called here on this answer. There might be something to be said for that, calling it St. John's Newtown, however that will not be the name.

But I can promise the hon. gentleman that it will not be called after him. No.

MR. MURPHY: The hon. gentleman feels quite assured that while the present Government is in power there will be nothing called after him.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Corner Brook, St. Alban's, Milltown, Baie Verte, it is approximately 600 acres. Approximately 33 acres in Burin, 37 acres in Trepassey, 47 acres in Dunville, 29 acres in Harbour Breton, 480 acres St. John's industrial, and 13,090 acres residential, 300 acres Corner Brook, 24 acres St. Alban's, 56 acres Milltown, and Baie Verte 600 acres, the 600 was not the total of it all, That was just the amount for Baie Verte, so it is quite an acreage.

Then there is a column showing how much of it is already developed or being developed and then how much is left for future development and the cost to the Government. I see there is one lot that cost the Government nothing - Baie Verte 600 acres. In Milltown



MR. SMALLWOOD: It cost us \$10,000 and in St. Alban's \$13,000, Corner Brook, the land for future development is not yet acquired.

I do not see how they can say that it is acquired and then say it is not. St. John's, industrial and residential, is now under arbitration. Harbour Breton cost us \$5,500. Dunville is under arbitration. Trepassey cost us \$2,700 and Burin cost us \$2,500.

Federal participation in Burin, Trepassey, Dunville and Corner Brook is on a seventy-five - twenty-five per cent basis, that is, Central Mortgage and the Government of Canada put up seventy-five per cent of the cost and the Newfoundland Government twenty-five per cent.

In the case of St. John's, the industrial land, that is 480 acres, being financed by DREE, by a loan from DREE. The 850 acres of the St. John's, Newtown, residential, seventy-five per cent, twenty-five per cent Federal-Provincial and the rest of it, I assume, is all Provincial.

Question no. 431, on the Order Paper of April 13, in the name of the hon. member for Fortune Bay; He asks the Government to indicate for how many months each of the unoccupied houses of the subsidized and economic rental units in Marystown has been vacant. How long has each of the houses been vacant? It is presumed that this question relates to the vacancy report given in answer to the earlier question, when it was stated that the thirty-seven economic rental units were vacant on March 1, 1971. So apparently the answer has already been given.

I may say that, in my opinion, everyone of these houses will be occupied shortly and an awful lot more houses will be needed in Marystown.

MR. EARLE: Inaudible.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It seems to have been given. The answer to that question also explained that while two subsidized rental units were vacant at that time, this was normal turn-over vacancy and the project is in effect fully occupied. Apparently they are all now fully occupied.

The answer now given, therefore, relates to the economic rental units. No, the subsidized rental units are all occupied now.

With regard to the economic rental units which were vacant on March 1st., the answer is too long to read out, so I will send it over.

Incidentally these that are not rented at the moment, whether they be economic or uneconomic, subsidized or unsubsidized, every vacant house in Marystown should very shortly be occupied and with Marystown faced with dire need for many more houses to be built.

Question 472, on the Order Paper of April 14, in the name of the hon. gentleman and the member for St. John's West; There is a schedule attached, It is too long to read out, I will send it over.



MR. POWE: I have one question here for which I have the answer, Question 551, asked by the Leader of the Opposition. On the Order Paper of May 10. It relates to the use of our facilities at Torbay by a hockey school. The Director informs me that we rent out our facilities at Torbay Bay and have been doing it for some years, the gymnasium, the swimming pool, now the hostel facilities as well. In February I think, when it became known that we were going to have hostel facilities available, some three organizations approached us to negotiate the use, rent for the use of that. These negotiations were proceeding very well. Unfortunately our renovations and repairs to Torbay proved to be more extensive and more time-consuming than had been anticipated by the Department of Public Works and their engineers. The result was, we were forced to inform these three organizations that we could not have our hostel facilities available, for their rental use, on time.

In the case of one of the organizations this did not present a problem. In the case of two others, one the hockey training one, the other the Gymnastics training project, it did present a problem; they would not have had time to arrange any alternative facilities. They might have had either to postpone or to cancel their plans for the hockey school. I am very happy to say that our officials "took the bull by the horns" so to speak, on the matter, and said to them, in effect, "well look, we do not have our hostel arrangements, we do not want to, we realize this is not your fault, it is our fault. Actually it is nobody's fault but it was circumstances beyond our control, anybody's control. We would be very happy if it would be any use to you. We would be very happy to let your group, your trainees use our gym as a sort of a dormitory, at no cost at all." This is what they agreed to do. They brought in their own army cots, placed them in the gym, without, of course, with the floor properly covered, they use that gymnasium as a dormitory in place of the hostel facilities which would otherwise have been available to them. This was done in the case of two organizations. Of course the repairs and renovations there, I have not been down there for two weeks or so but I would think that by now they are pretty well completed and we do not anticipate this sort of emergency will arise any more. Again

I would point out that we do rent our facilities to recognized organizations and groups; swimming pool, gym and so on, on a standard rental charge. These facilities are available up to a maximum use, of course, as far as time is concerned, to any group wishing to take advantage of it.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted just one supplementary question. I am referring more to the accommodations, Will these accommodations, board, lodging, be available to recognized athletic groups, like visiting for tournaments etc.? They will be available?

MR. ROWE: Oh yes, that is the whole purpose. A group comes in from say, Corner Brook. Well, it is a gymnastics team, comes in for display. They cannot afford to go and pay fifteen dollars a day at a hotel here. If they did the project would be out. But, with a hostel, my hon. friend probably knows we have a cafeteria there as well. One of the reasons, by the way, we were anxious and very happy to oblige these groups at that time is that the cafeteria is a marginal operation, it is a private concession, marginal operation as far as profits are concerned. Any time we can create additional patronage for that cafeteria, it makes us all the happier because of course we want to keep that cafeteria there, as filling a very important need there. But these facilities are available to any recognized group, That includes, of course, the facilities, include the hostel accommodations as well as the gym, the swimming pool and other facilities as well. I am very happy to see, I am sure all hon. members will be, the degree to which these facilities are being used down there. The one group I am familiar with, the badminton group, the hundred and fifty members of the St. John's Badminton Association, using those facilities down there - I said to somebody one time; why do they not use it another night as well, three nights a week, so they can give better opportunity? the answer I got was, the gym is simply not available. The gym is being used so much by others the use is the maximum.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, some of the questions standing in my name on the Order Paper: First two questions asked by the hon. member for Burin, addressed to the Minister of Education, which I think more appropriately should be

answered by me. First of these, Sir, Question No. 79, Order Paper, March 25: I can only speak for the period from June of 1969. I think the member from Burin, if he searched his memory, would have some information before that point. But, since that time meetings have been held between me, and representatives of the University. The outcome of the meeting, in a very short form, Mr. Speaker, was no satisfactory result at all. Accordingly we have gone to the College of Trades & Technology to have a course put into effect.

Question No. 81. (1) There are no formal agreements. They are very well understood informal agreements, to the effect that a proportion of Newfoundland students in the medical and dental facilities at Dalhousie will decrease somewhat in the medical sense but remain unaltered or increased in the dental sense. The phasing in of the new medical school at Memorial University, obviously, is lessening the demand by Newfoundland students for places at Dalhousie. (2) We are now negotiating that point, Mr. Speaker, with a view towards reducing the number of students in respect of whom we contribute, in view of the fact the per capita contribution by the Government of all the Atlantic Provinces, for each medical or dental student, is increasing rapidly, our absolute contribution may remain the same, but it will buy fewer places.

Question No. 94: On the Order Paper March 25: I have them here and I will put them on the table of the House, Mr. Speaker, so that hon. members can read them at whatever leisure they wish. The hon. gentleman also asked if they have been changed, the terms of reference to the St. John's Advisory Council has been changed, with a view to making the Council a more effective coordinating force? While I am on that point, Sir, I may announce that the Government have appointed three new members to the St. John's Hospital Advisory Council. Mr. Ralph Moore of the General Hospital, Mr. Don Kelland of the Charles A Janeway Child Health Centre, Mr. David Sparkes of the Childrens Rehab. Centre. These are the chief executive officers of those hospitals.

Question No. 107: On the Order Paper March 25. It is fairly long so I will

lay a copy on the Table of the House, about the Janeway Apartments and the rents down there. Similarly, Question No. 142, on the Order Paper March 25. Tabled. Question No. 268: on the Order Paper of March 29, (1) Yes. March 16, 1971 (2) No. Because a review of potential needs for additional medical staff in the area throughout the Province, in respect of which the Government provide direct medical services, as indicated that has the need for the fourth doctor at Grand Bank is outweighed by the need for other doctors at several other points in the Province. We are going to put the other doctors in place first. (3) Yes. April 21, The matter is now receiving consideration from my officials.

Question No. 282: March 29, the Order Paper on which it will be found. There has been no revised budget submitted. The Commission's financial year is the same as that of the Government. The Commission began operation on April 1, 1969. The financial statement for that year will be found in the first annual report, which I think, Mr. Speaker, has been tabled since the hon gentleman asked the question. The budget for the 1970-71 financial year will be found in the estimates for the House, as approved by the House, on page 165. The financial statements for that year will be given as soon as I have received the Commission's annual report. I do not have it as yet.

Question No. 284. on the Order Paper March 29. (1) list tabled. the only thing that looks interesting on it is a padder. I asked my officials what a padder was, for the total of \$98.84. A padder is a machine which holds the separate sheets, in a bunch of forms, in place, while a strip of glue is being applied so that the separate sheets are made into pads. The Commission always buy on a call of tenders for anything in excess of \$500. Anything less than that is a matter of negotiations between the Commission and the sources of their supply.

Question No. 294. On the Order Paper of March 29. (1) I do not have the total but I have the two breakdowns. We paid Horwood, Campbell and Guihan \$95,466. We paid the firm of Deleuw Cather \$4, 093, approximately \$100,000.

I may add, Sir, that these plans are not completed but the Government has indicated we are now proceeding to have the plans completed. (2) We have investigated four: One near the cemetery in Carbonear, one near the tannery in Carbonear, site near the existing hospital, then a site near Noel's garage which was the site that has finally been selected. That is on Saddle Hill I believe. We have had reports from Horwood Campbell & Guihan from Deleuw Cather, from the Health Facilities Designs Division of the Government of Canada and from my own officials in the Department of Health. Question 486 on the Order Paper of April 16. I have nothing to add to the statement which I made in this House on April 17, 1970.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, in connection with Question 486, when the Minister answered last year I believe he said that there was no substance to the charges. The Minister means that this is still the same position, I gather.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I have nothing to add to my statement, what I said last year stands.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, in connection with part 2, of the question, did the hon. member for Placentia West supply the Minister with any further details?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I think my answer really was a complete one, I am not trying to evade it in any way. What I said a year ago or a little over, thirteen months ago, in the House, it is still a full and complete answer to the question raised by the hon. gentleman.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. CROSBIE: On Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, before we go into Orders of the Day, I have a question for the hon. minister of Finance. Could he advise the House whether the Government intends to give the Newfoundland Government Employees Association the right to strike, as has been suggested by the President of that Association, Mr. William Noseworthy? On the same topic could he advise the House whether or not he intends to bring in new legislation to replace the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, which legislation, the present should be scrapped and new legislation brought in.

MR. JONES: Mr. Speaker, I would be very happy to answer these questions but



I would like to have notice of them, have them on the Order Paper. They are two weighty questions involving the policy of Government.

Committee of Supply:

Heading 14, Fisheries.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, when I finally succeeded in putting everybody to sleep at eleven o'clock last night, by being deliberately monotonous on this particular discussion, I did so deliberately because I thought that the introduction of such an important subject as Fisheries, at seven or eight minutes to eleven o'clock at night, after literally a twelve hour day, it was a little bit too much and certainly did not indicate any great consideration on the part of the Government or those who call the order at that late hour, that the thing could be discussed intelligently, and so I, as I say, I was deliberately monotonous just to run out of time last night.

I was making a point which I think might bear repetition particularly in view of the fact that there are some students of the Fisheries College in the galleries this morning. I was giving a little of the background of the salt codfish industry with particular emphasis in which I deplored the drop-off of employment in that industry and the things which are associated with the auxiliary activities which at one time were so very great in this Province. I refer to such things as the making of packages, the cutting of staves and all of this sort of things that went into the preparation and export of salt fish. It is nothing at all to see, in the outports around the Province in various areas, two or three hundred men employed at these activities. Now that the fishery has become more streamlined, we like to think more modern, where most of the activities are concentrated in deep-sea druggers and deep-sea fishing, the shore fishery unfortunately is fast becoming a thing of the past. This has a very unsatisfactory result. Insofar, there are far less people getting gainful employment out of it.

Our young visitors today probably do not remember many of the things which happened in the past and perhaps some of them are better forgotten

because conditions in those days were far from satisfactory. But, it must be remembered that the several thousands of men who were working in those days at the fisheries were living on a scale which was comparable to everybody else in that day. Today, while the thing has advanced to a point where earnings are getting up somewhere near what we hope they will eventually be, they are still far from satisfactory, are still now considerably below the comparison of wages and earnings in other activities. So, while the industry is improving in a quick and logical sense, it has not yet by any means reached



MR. FARLE: the stage where it has reached the point of giving adequate earnings to those who participate in it, with a few exceptions. There are dragger skippers, of course, and deep sea draggers, men that do make very satisfactory wages, but the average fellow, who goes at the fisheries in a more or less casual way, does not earn an adequate living. I do not think he ever can, if he approaches it in that manner.

Mr. Chairman, the interest in fisheries has a peculiar cycle in this particular Province. It seems to revive very strongly in election years. Between election years there does not seem to be emphasis placed on the attention which should be paid to the fisheries. But all of a sudden in election years the fisheries become very, very important indeed.

I remember the first time I was elected as a member to this House, the whole manifesto in that election campaign was based on the fisheries, the development of the fisheries. I am very sorry and regretfully have to report that so many of the things that were in that manifesto have never been done and have not been accomplished. Now today, we see the same things being repeated, with a promise to the future. I think the people today are getting much wiser. They are becoming aware that they cannot accept promises nor pie in the sky theories. They want to get down to earth or get down to sea in this case, and see what will be done for the fisheries, not what will be promised for the fisheries.

The old-time industries in the fisheries, where they often, as I say, employed several hundred people, generally speaking did not get any great help by way of subsidy or certainly any grants or anything of that nature. When you come to make a comparison of those days with today, when an industry which may employ 300 or 400 people is guaranteed to the extent of perhaps \$150 million, we cannot but draw a conclusion as to why the fisheries of this Province did not proceed at the same pace as some other industry. Because none of these, none of this important industry was looked at in the light that it should have guarantees of substantial amounts of money, which would help it really to get on its feet.

MR. EARLE: There were some entrepreneurs and some active men who made valiant attempts to build up the industry to a certain extent. But, even in their case, I do not feel and I have never felt that the industry was given the proper attention and the proper importance that it deserved. When I was closely associated with it and went to Ottawa to meet the Federal Government on many occasions, I was continually preaching that gospel almost to ad nauseam. Some of the officials in Ottawa used to get, I think, tired of hearing me say that from a national standpoint the fisheries were of very, very little concern to Ottawa. This has been the basic reason and the real reason why the fisheries of Canada have not progressed. Unlike other countries, particular European countries where the fisheries are of dominant importance, in Canada the fisheries are just something to fill in the gaps or, if a fellow cannot get anything else to do, he goes there.

Now this has been degrading to the industry and it has been particularly degrading to the fishermen themselves, because to a great extent, over the years they lost faith in the industry. This was further emphasized deteriorated by the attitude of the time, of the Provincial Government, towards the fisheries. Because there was so much open criticism of fish merchants and fisheries generally that everybody got to the stage of feeling; well, the further we are away from this particular industry, the better it is for all concerned.

It is almost like politics, the Newfoundlanders came to the conclusion that it is so dirty to be associated with politics and it was even dirtier to be associated with the fisheries. Because the sort of remarks that were made against this industry at the time, and I well recall when I was closely associated with it, what terrible effects these remarks had in the marketing of our product. I was very actively associated with the marketing of the product and, time after time, in going to the markets, I would have it slapped up to me that your Government does not seem to think

MR. EARLE: very much of the fisheries, Look what they are saying about it."

I remember, on one occasion, a former Minister of Fisheries, who has now passed on to his reward, came to my home, with the Danish Minister of Fisheries and other European fisheries expert, and we sat down and we let our hair down over the evening and talked about fisheries until very late at night, early in the morning actually. When I was saying good-bye to the Minister at that time, from Denmark, he called me to one side and said, "Mr. Earle, I cannot be impolite. I am your guest," but he said, "did you introduce me to this gentleman, as the Minister of Fisheries?" I said, "yes, he is the Minister of Fisheries, a very fine gentleman, a close friend of mine." "Well," he said, "if he were the Minister of Fisheries in Denmark, he would be strung up." He said he would not live ten minutes, if he talked about the fisheries in that way. His whole attitude towards it was negative and this, I am afraid, permeated the whole Government at that time.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: There was a Minister from Denmark and there was another gentleman from Europe, I cannot recall his name at the time, He was a high official in the Fisheries at that particular time. I do not recall his name.

But, anyhow, they thought, and rightly so I think, we were taking a very, very dim view of the fisheries and the development of fisheries. They frankly could not understand it.

Now today we are once again finding a resurrection of interest in the fisheries and again rightly so. It is gradually being recognized, as being of vast importance to this Province. Whether it develops along entirely different lines, as I expect it must, it will still play a very important part indeed in the lives of a great many people around this Province and will for many, many years to come. It will, of course, have its ups and downs. The fishing business, being the nature that it is, will not always be prosperous, as we hope it will be this year and perhaps for the next few years, but it will have its swings back and forth.

MR. EARLE: But, if we can steadily make progress, in spite of these dips and hollows and these summits, we may eventually get somewhere, to the point that we hope we can in this Province, putting the fisheries into its rightful place and importance to the whole scheme of things. Important as other industries are in Newfoundland, because of our geographically position and the natural resource we have at our doorstep, the fisheries must always be regarded as one of the most important of our natural assets.

Now here today we have great cause for worry because of the depreciation of the stocks in the fisheries, which have been reported so constantly by the dragger and trawler fleet and by the operators of these boats. Again, to go back a little, I recall when I served as a member of ICNAF, that is, the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, That was back in 1961, I think, ten years ago. But even at that time, ten years ago, the scientists who are the advisers to that commission, were then telling the industry that something had to be done about it or the stocks of fish would disappear. They were not as firm in their remarks as they are today, because they had not collected sufficient evidence. They very often beclouded the issue by going into long treatise scientific aspect of fisheries, which might be intelligible to some of those there but certainly were not to most of us.

But the point behind all of this was they were worried then about the depletion of stocks, and I can well recall the attempts, that International Agreement on the size of nets, the mesh of nets and the control of the catching of fish, all received a run up against a blank wall. You might get one or two nations to agree, generally the ones who were not very much interested in the fisheries or at least interested in some of the others, but the big operators, the people who are coming over here in the thousands and taking the fish off of our very doorsteps, were the ones who were the least interested in conservating the stock. Now at last they are waking up to the fact that there maybe nothing left for them, if this carries on

MR. EARLE: There is a possibility at last, I think, that some International Agreements may be reached. But, in the meantime, we here in Newfoundland have a basic fishery which must be preserved and which must grow. We cannot wait for the interminable attempts to reach the international agreement. Canada must take a stronger approach to it than that, It has to be adamant about protecting its own interest in the fisheries. I think, the Federal Government in Ottawa, although it is showing more interest, has not yet wakened up to the fact that this is of such great importance to this particular part of Canada. They will only wake up to its importance, if Newfoundland and the Newfoundland Government is foremost in its protest and in its demands for the protection of the fisheries. It is no good in this particular case to leave everything to Uncle Ottawa, because Uncle Ottawa is not all that interested in fisheries. They have had to subsidize us for years and help us out in various ways, but they do not mind paying out a few million dollars, apparently. But when it comes to conservation and really building up a viable industry here, I do not think we can expect them to show the initiative. The initiative will have to come from Newfoundland and it will have to be spearheaded by the Government of Newfoundland. The Government of Newfoundland must not just talk, the Government of Newfoundland have to act, because this is a very substantial part of our life-blood, I suppose is what you would call the white corpuscles of our blood stream. We have to, whether we like it or not, we must, we have to, Mr. Chairman, protect what remaining stocks we have of our fisheries and hopefully, if the proper conservation measures are taken, to build these back into something like they were in the past.

Now, I think this also applies very dramatically today to the inshore fishery because what is happening, certain natural resources are being exploited at a terrific rate. I think particularly the area which I represent, the south coast of Fortune Bay and down around the area, the herring fishery, which is now been exploited by terrific machines - that is all you can call them, they are literally machines that go out and stick down a huge



MR. EARLE: net and bring in tons upon thousands of tons of these herring. They come in at night, with lights blazing, they clean up the whole business and they go on. The great worry of the fishermen in that area is that, in so doing, they are cleaning up everything else with it and they are destroying the bottom of the ocean and they are really wrecking haddock.

Now nobody in his right senses wants to discourage an industry such as we have on the South Coast, where a great many plant workers and a great many seamen find their livelihood from the operations of these herring seiners and in the plants. But in the particular herring business, where so much of it is going into meal and animal feed, the amount of employment is not very great, except on the seiners themselves and very often these are not, very often these are not all Newfoundland crews. The employment in the plants the dehydrating plants or a meal plant is very, very small indeed. But what has fortunately developed, over the last couple of years, is a greatly activated interest in herring for food. In all these places down there, the people are waking up to packing of herring once again for food purposes. This is bringing a great deal of badly needed money into a lot of small places.

The fact that a few thousand barrels of herring are packed in a little village, means a tremendous amount to the people in that particular village. They rightly get indignant and upset, if, while they are trying to do this some night, a fellow with a large seiner comes right in their harbour and cleans out the whole business - the next morning you could not catch a herring if you tried. The thing has been swept clean. I was very pleased that this winter we were successful in getting a section of Fortune Bay barred off to herring seiners. Now that had another disastrous effect. In this way, that the herring seiners that were fishing on that side of Fortune Bay immediately left and crowded in on the other side of the bay. The damage done on the other side of the bay was more concentrated than it ever was in the past. I do not know what the answer to this is, but it seems to me that there must be some mutual arrangement made between fishermen, shore fishermen, plant operators and the owners of these seiners and so on, that sensible restrictions limit them to certain areas must be arrived at.

MR. EARLE: I know that there have been meetings of the trade and the fishermen and so on, but I do not think that, at this stage, they have gotten very far with it. I hope that these meetings will be continued, certainly that they will be encouraged by our Provincial Government. I think the Provincial Government has to take a very active interest in it, although it seems to be largely left to the Federal Authorities, to see that sensible regulations are somehow drawn up to protect sufficient stocks of fish for the inshore fisherman who makes his livelihood from it.

I was interested at the time of the Development Conference in hearing the minister outlining plans for fishery service stations. I hope that when we get into this discussion on the particular item, that he will go into more detail on this, because I agree that it is a very worthwhile scheme and perhaps long overdue. But a caution that I might make here is that a fishing boat is not like a car nor a truck - that is pretty obvious to anybody, but a service station for boats is not a meager sort of thing or a very haphazard kind of a thing that can just do certain jobs. Generally, when fishing boats get into trouble, they get into real trouble. Their engines are complicated and need good service and need very efficient servicing. One of the problems over many parts of the Province, with the servicing of fishing boats, are depots for parts and well trained people to be able to service these machines and to do it properly.

Now I cannot visualize a service station of the nature what they do with a car, where you just drive in and get supplies or get gas or something of this sort. If that is all it is going to be, it will be not of any great use to the Province. It will be of some service, but not of any great use, It has to go much further than that. It has to develop along the lines of being able to give really adequate services to these fishing boats. I recall having seen in Europe and in the South of England, in particular, what they term over there as a Marina, I think, which are mainly for the servicing of pleasure yachts. You see hundreds, literally thousands of these boats drawn up in some of these harbours and coves, going in to get service of various kinds, but there is always or it seems invariable, to be associated with these places, machine shops, proper food establishments, supplies



MR. EARLE: of all the necessary lines and twines and everything that goes with the operation of a boat.

Now this is not a small undertaking, it is a very expensive and quite a big one. I do not think that we should again look at the fisheries as a casual sort of thing that we can treat lightly by making what may well be a bluff, by putting up what we call service stations, if they are not built in such a way and developed so that they can service the boats. And, of course, you cannot put these things all over the place. It may be all very well for political purposes to say you are going to put a service station here there or somewhere else, and this is a great interest to the voters particularly in an election year. They say; "we are going to get something." But that is not the answer to the fisheries. That is not the answer to the problem of the fisheries, just something put in there which only does a half-hearted job. What we want there is strategically located, proper servicing depots, which as I said, Mr. Chairman, will cost a considerable amount of money, certainly far more than we see provided in the estimates for this year.

Just commenting again on a few of the problems in the fishing industry; the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation has deservedly had a good many pats on the back this year. In its first year of operations, it has apparently done an excellent job. It was something that, although Government do not like to admit it, we in the trade, when we were in that business, were hammering away at for years and years and years, before the Government ever thought of it. I had interviews and discussions with the late C.D. Howe, back fifteen or more years ago, on the self same subject. We discussed it and talked about it and the answer used to be always - "if you can get the maritimes to come in on it, we will go along with you."

I remember coming back from Ottawa on one occasion, very enthusiastic that we could get together in a corporation that would really serve the fishery properly, not the NAFEL which was so malign in those days, NAFEL was used again as a political football, although it did untold good to the fishermen of this country, by standing behind prices. I think, when the full story is told of the operations of NAFEL, not only the merchants, who

May 14, 1971

Tape 649 (morning)

PK - 9

MR. EARLE: were always held up to scorn in those days, but the fishermen themselves have realized just what a good job that outfit did in marketing and holding up the price of fish. Now NAFEL was not the

MR. EARLE: complete answer and those of us who were directors and interested in it at the time knew it was not the complete answer. It was a stop-gap measure which developed out of the food control board in the last war and, as such, it served a purpose. But those of us who were directors on that tried interminably, with meetings such as I have described with Mr. Howe, with meetings among ourselves, day after day, night after night, we sat down and tried to work out a formula that would be acceptable to Government that the fishermen and the industry could get together in a proper organization.

I remember on an occasion I thought we had the answer and I rang up the Acting Minister of Fisheries at the time and he was most enthusiastic about it. He thought, if we had part of the answer we could get together with Government and we could work this out. We were all set to go the next day on a meeting. At mid-day that day the Minister called me and said it was all off. He had had consultation with his men in the Cabinet and the thing looked politically dangerous to the Government at that time, so they just called it all off. In other words, there was no effort at co-operation at all. As much as we tried there. I think the association of Government with industry at that time was considered to be something dangerous that Government could not afford to have, what might be considered the taint of industry rubbing off on them and therefore they preferred to go their own way and to play politics with the fisheries which, as I say, was one of the most detrimental things which ever happened in this Province of Newfoundland as far as the development of the fisheries is concerned.

Now the Canadian Salt Cod Fish Corporation has been born. It has had a very good year. It was launched at a particularly opportune time, they will never know how fortunate they were. Because of the declining stocks of salt fish, they had the markets wide open to them, to go in and get higher prices. I have seen in the past similar circumstances where even the trade, who were not as well controlled of course as the Salt Cod Fish Corporation, but I have seen the price

MR. EARLE: of salt fish vary as much as \$10 a quintal, from a low to a high, but there is no product, I think where you can take as much advantage of in a year of shortage, and there is a great shortage of salt fish.

The only question I ask on the Salt Cod Fish Corporation, and I wish them abundance success and every success, are they going to get the full co-operation of the fishermen? Because, without a product to sell, if they do not have anything to sell, the Corporation is virtually of no use, and the danger well may be that they will not have anything to sell. If the shore fishery or the inshore fishery is not encouraged to some extent in the production of salt fish is not encouraged, they may very well be an Organization with a very heavy overhead and, believe me, that Organization has a heavy overhead. If the criticisms, that were aimed at NAFEL in the old days, were aimed in the same direction at the Salt Cod Fish Corporation and a comparison of the overhead were made, I would not hesitate to bet a lot of money on where the expenses and the comparison expenses would be today, very much against the Salt Cod Fish Corporation, in comparison with what was done in the past. Because we were handling in those days upwards of a million quintals of dried fish and the cost per quintal was extremely low indeed. I remember sales efforts on this type of thing going through to their conclusion at far less than one per cent of the cost. Today, if you were to compare the cost of the Salt Cod Fish Corporation with what it is selling, I venture to bet that the cost per quintal would be extremely high.

It is only the fact that the Canadian Government I think are subsidizing, in some way or other, that a thing of this nature can possibly be a success. Anyhow, I wish it every success because it is of benefit to fishermen. But I do hope that, in the same breath, they just do not restrict their efforts to the marketing of fish. There has to be more than that. There has to be a real interest taken in the

MR. EARLE: development of the fisheries and the encouragement of the fisheries so that there will be something produced to sell. You cannot do one thing and the other, you just cannot have an efficient selling organization unless you have a vast quantity of goods to sell. The larger the quantity generally, the more efficient the organization, the smaller the quantity the less efficient. This may well be the fate of the Salt Cod Fish Corporation, unless the supply of salt fish does grow. I can see the Minister of Fisheries looking very puzzled as he is following me. This is a conundrum of the first order, how to get people to produce an item of this type. All the boasts about quality and everything else we hear today, we hear the Salt Cod Fish Corporation say the quality is going up, it may be in some respects, but the quality of the kind of fish that can get top prices is no longer there, because we are not producing it at all or in very, very small quantities. We are not producing the type of fish that used to compete with the Gaspé light, salted, cured. The amount of that is infinitesimal. This is where, in these markets that are prepared to pay really high prices, this is the type of thing that we have to produce and, along these lines, somehow, a scheme must be worked out to encourage our fishermen.

On the fresh and frozen fish industry, I think eventually that the trade will have to come to some sort of a marketing organization, there are inherent problems in that because of the protection of brands and the marketing organizations which they have set up in the markets and all this sort of thing. But you will only need another year or two. Sometime later on, which is bound to come, where there would be depressed conditions in the frozen fish market and the fishermen in the meantime, having been built up to expect reasonably high prices for their product, if it every goes back to the point that they suffer, I think the fishermen will be the first to demand that a proper marketing organization for fresh and frozen fish is also formed.

MR. EARLE: I for one would like to see that the preparations be made for that now, not wait until some calamity hits us. Always in an emergency it is too late to do these things sensibly. The time to think this out is when you are in good times not in poor times, When the markets are prosperous and when things are good, this is the time to make the preparations, because people have some money to spend on it. The case has always been in the past, when it is a depressed industry and everybody is going broke, they cannot talk about proper organizations or anything else because they do not have the money to promote it. They never have had it.

Then, when the thing starts to go up and things get good again, they turn around and say, "well, we do not need it now, everything is fine." But this is a silly way to look at the encouragement of the industry and it is now that we should be thinking about the development of the fresh fish industry, with proper marketing control. But just to finish off my remarks, Mr. Chairman, on the whole fishing industry, the basis of any success in Newfoundland is the encouragement of two things, a greater quantity, the production of a greater quantity, and the production of a better quality of fish. We can build our reputation in Newfoundland on quality so that we can be unsurpassed anywhere in the world, because we are so close to the natural fishing grounds. But this has to be controlled all the way along the line, right from the fishing boat and the fishermen's gear right to the time it gets on somebody's plate in New York or California. I just cannot tackle this fish meal. It is a big project and a big problem and it has to be followed all the way through.

But then, in the meantime, while all these plans are working out, it will take years and years to get to a sensible sort of programme in the fisheries. There is one thing which is distressing me greatly, at the present time, and that is the lack of encouragement to the fellow who just wants to go fishing. I know that the hon.



MR. EARLE: Minister of Social Services will have an answer for this and quite honestly I agree with a lot of his answers, I have to, because men must work to make a living. But people are caught now, as recipients of long-term assistance and short term assistance, some of these men are caught, expecting to go on where they could draw Government assistance and carry on with their earnings. Far too much of this has gone on all over the Province for years, Now the door has suddenly been closed and restrictions and regulations are being tightened up to the point that men in my District are saying to me; "well, we are all prepared to go fishing, but what is the point? We cannot earn any extra dollars, so the heck with it! I am not even going to budge, I am going to stay ashore or perhaps give my gear to my son or something, if he is interested, and let him go fishing."

MR. NEARY: That is not true. That is not true.

MR. EARLE: Well this is what they are saying. I am only repeating what some of them are saying. This is what a great many of them are saying, unfortunately.

MR. NEARY: That is untrue.

MR. EARLE: That is not untrue. I hope the Minister is right, because I think his motive is right. I am quite sure that what he is trying to do is right. But how will you attain that after so many years of *laissez faire*? Where there has not been a tightening up, it is going to be very difficult indeed. I wish him success in it. I know he is going to have a hard time with it. Actually a man must be encouraged to earn all he can then, if he cannot earn a decent living, let him seek welfare.

MR. NEARY: May I ask the hon. member a question? Is the hon. member talking about people who are employable or people who are unemployable? Which group is he talking about?

MR. EARLE: This is where the whole problem arises, as the Minister well knows. People claim to be unemployable or cannot work, medical certificate and all the rest of it, and very often.....



MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. EARLE: Well the Minister knows as well as I do now, standing on my feet, there are people in this Province today receiving long-term assistance and doing an enormous amount of work.

MR. NEARY: Do an enormous amount of work?

MR. EARLE: Doing an enormous amount of work.

MR. NEARY: Then either the doctor made out a false certificate or the man is a fraud.

MR. EARLE: Perhaps the Department is not checking accurately enough. Perhaps the Minister is not.....

MR. NEARY: But it is the doctor who issues the certificate. We can only base the long-term assistance on a medical certificate produced by the client.

MR. EARLE: The Minister knows, He is in the port folio that I once occupied and he knows how difficult this problem is, As I say, I wish him success in solving it.

MR. NEARY: You know the man is either a chisler or the doctor is a fraud, one thing or the other.

MR. EARLE: Well I am all for catching chislors.

MR. NEARY: As long as we agree.

MR. EARLE: All for catching chislors, indeed I am, But I also, and I have said this many times; there are just as many on the other side of the fence, who sometimes are neglected, where they really need help. I have seen this and I have brought it to the attention of the Department on many occasions. I am all for helping people who are ill or who cannot work or cannot help themselves but I agree whole heartedly that a man should try his best to earn his living, if the means for earning it is there. But there are all kinds of grey areas in this - you can talk on it for ages. You know sometimes officials, who are not sitting on the spot do not always see problems a man and his family face. Because I have seen it in many cases, where men are committed ahead, they cannot

MR. EARLE: get supplies and this sort of thing. They have had fish in their stages which they cannot sell immediately nor realize on. It takes them ages. Eventually they get it, it is true, but it takes them a long time. In the meantime they suffer before they can convince the welfare officer that they cannot dispose of this fish immediately and get help.

So in dealing with the Government, the wheels of Government turn exceedingly slow, as somebody said, and it is the unfortunate fellow, who is very often ignorant of regulations and is not in immediate touch with somebody who can advise him properly, that gets caught up in this whole mess. All I am saying to the Minister, this applies to the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Social Services, that somehow or other this thing has to be watched very carefully, that people are not further discouraged or disheartened in trying to make a living. If the objective is to help them to earn a living, I am all for it but, if it succeeds in any way in cutting off any ambition or any initiative.....

MR. NEARY: A man on short term assistance is allowed legitimate expenses, allowable income. If he does not earn enough to bring him up to his entitlement, we will pay him the difference. So there is a distinction here between long term and short term.

MR. EARLE: I think I am as familiar with it as the Minister is but this is, as I said, a very grey area, where there are so many individual cases which have to be looked at. Probably again, part of the problem has been that the Minister's staff is pretty well scattered. They are not always immediately in touch with the problems and this is where sometimes it falls down.

But the only reason for mentioning this, that the encouragement of the fisheries is so vital for so many reasons, particularly, as I said, in giving the Salt Cod Fish Corporation something to sell. But even more important than that is taking the young fellows and the men and the boys off the streets or having them sit around on the wharves or anything of this sort.

MR. EARLE: If a man can work, he gets a certain dignity out of work. He feels he is supporting himself and his family and that is the way in which he must be encouraged. So my words on the encouragement of the fisheries are not only vital from the standpoint of building up the industry, they are even more important in the building up of the character and stamina and the mental health and the general well-being of our people. This is all part and parcel of the same problem, and the Minister of Fisheries, coupled with the Minister of Social Services, has really a very, very big problem on his hands. I hope that he can work it out. I hope that they both can work it out.

But fisheries must take the dominant role in this respect that, if we have an industry which can employ a large number of people, we must bend over backwards, we must sometimes stretch beyond what we would normally do, stretch it far more than we stretch ourselves, to encourage entrepreneurs to come in here sometimes to create things which are of doubtful value. We must encourage an industry of which we know historically the value and which have every indication of being one of the real foundations and supports of our whole economy.

MR. SMALLWOOD (W.R.): It seems to me that at least in Newfoundland the cod fish is a Provincial creature and the salmon seems to be a Federal creature. I think we are entering now upon the twenty-third year of Confederation.

I was just wondering, Sir, what the Federal Government has done in the matter of clearing out obstacles on salmon rivers in Newfoundland, in the last twenty-two years? How many rivers I wonder have they cleaned out so that salmon can get up over obstacles? Most of these seem to be natural obstacles such as falls.

I know that back in 1956 there was quite a water fall on the Indian River, down by Springdale, but since that time a salmon ladder has been put on the River-undoubtedly there are more. I also know that some breeding grounds were made on the Indian River. I guess that

MR. SMALLWOOD: was done by the Federal Government. That happens to be in my district, but that is not the reason I knew of it. I read about that in the papers. I have not heard about any other rivers in Newfoundland where the Federal Government have made new breeding grounds by dredging out the gravel, as it did down around the Indian River.

As I say, we are now entering upon the twenty-third year of Confederation. Even if the Federal Government only took one river per year and cleared out the water falls, and that is much simpler than some people seems to believe it is. It is simply a matter, in my estimation, of bringing in some equipment to drill the necessary holes and put the dynamite in them and blow the falls down. It does not effect the flow of the river but it does make it much easier for the salmon to get up.

Yesterday I was reading, I think it was The "Montreal Gazette," or at least one of the Montreal newspapers, there seems to be a fisheries station somewhere in Nova Scotia, in Halifax I think, a fisheries breeding station, a salmon breeding.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No this was in Nova Scotia. I was reading this article and it said that they were taking several hundred thousands or possibly over one million young salmon and flying them in to certain rivers in the Province of New Brunswick, It must have been done, I would imagine, in water bombers because the new method seems to be that they just fly in with the planes, come down over the water, about two hundred feet, and drop the young salmon, together with about six or seven hundred gallons of water, all at the same time, and that seems to be a successful and cheap method of transplanting young salmon to the rivers.

Now I have not heard of anything like that in Newfoundland. The Federal Government may be planning to do that. As I say, I realize that the cod fish seems to be a Provincial creature and the salmon seems to be a Federal creature but nevertheless there should be communication between the Provincial Department of Fisheries and the Federal Department

MR. SMALLWOOD: of Fisheries. I realize that this is all in the hands of the Federal Department but nevertheless recommendation should be made, by the Provincial Department of Fisheries to the Federal Department of Fisheries, about cleaning out some of the rivers in Newfoundland and by that I mean, as I said before, blowing down some of the water falls so that salmon can get up.

I know that the one on the Indian River, it was quite an expensive rig they put there, but I think that is a counting station. They also count the salmon going up.

MR. SMALLWOOD: (W.R.): If the Department of Highways can put roads into some of the isolated communities in Newfoundland, where there is nothing but rock, and dynamite and drilling, then I am sure that it is no great problem for the Federal Government, to go on some of the rivers in Newfoundland, where the salmon are being blocked from getting up, and do a bit of drilling and put in a few plugs of dynamite and blow down some of the falls.

I would suggest that the minister, through his department, recommend to the Federal Government, as I said, if only one river per year had been cleaned out since 1949, at least we would have twenty-two rivers already cleaned out - and if one river per year had been restocked with salmon, in that period of time we would have had twenty-two rivers cleaned out and we would have had twenty-two rivers restocked.

Now I know that, a few years ago, the Federal Government restocked some river here on the Avalon Peninsula, I think it was out around Long Harbour, that is the only one that I personally have heard of, there may have been more, but one thing I am sure of, there could not have been many more, because I am sure that everytime they do something they put it on the radio and in the newspapers and we read about it. That is the only one I have heard about, where restocking have been done in the Province of Newfoundland, and that is out around Long Harbour somewhere on the Avalon. I know that possibly a few more rivers may have been stocked to a certain extent, and I guess, in the last twenty-two years, there have been more than the Indian River Falls, which has been rectified.

But there cannot be too many, because it would have been on the radio and it would have been in the newspapers and on the television. Personally, I think that the Federal Government is not doing its duty in this Province with respect to the salmon fishery. Sure, they make regulations once the salmon gets out in the waters, they seem to be left on their own, but once they get out into the salt water, they seem to be now coming up with their rules and regulations, if they can do this type of thing on the Mainland, it is time for them to do it down here in the Province of Newfoundland.



MR. SMALLWOOD: (W.R.): What really got me worked up was yesterday to see this article, where all these salmon were being transported from somewhere in Halifax, somewhere in Nova Scotia, to the best of my recollection, where they seem to have a salmon breeding station. I do not think there is one in the Province of Newfoundland. There could be, but I have not heard of it. They have them in Nova Scotia and they seem to have them up in New Brunswick, but none in Newfoundland. Why? Are we supposed to be not a salmon producing country?

I would say, Sir, that it is time for the Provincial Department of Fisheries, if necessary, to go out on their own and go and make surveys of the rivers, of the salmon fishing rivers in Newfoundland, and make recommendations as to what falls should be eliminated and what rivers should be stocked, and steps should be taken to get the Federal Government to do these things.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Chairman, just a few words, I cannot hope to expand on what was given by the hon. the member for Fortune Bay, but the few remarks to which I would like to refer, which were made by the hon. the Minister of Fisheries last night:

First of all, the references were made by the minister to a diversification of the Fisheries in this Province. Certainly, we are, this side are very, very delighted with this attitude by the Government. I would like for the minister to expand a little bit more on the plans of the department, with respect to the diversification of fisheries in this Province. This has long been a policy and a position taken by the people in the official opposition and certainly it is a programme which is most commendable and one which must be proceeded with.

The Minister mentioned the fact that eels were being taken from the Maritime Provinces, I think to Europe, for processing. It seems to me that I have also heard that eels were actually being taken from parts of the South Coast of Newfoundland, taken over to Germany and processed and sold in the markets of the United States. Which brings us to the topic of fish processing itself. There is certainly a great potential here for the processing of our fish, our great natural resource of this Province, our cod fish, and also potentially the scallops and mussels, shrimps, crab, which we have and we can have and we can develop.



MR. MARSHALL: It certainly would be a great impetus to the employment of this Province, where we have the situation now where the unemployment figures are so high. It is something that should be proceeded with, and proceeded with very great haste.

Another topic, Mr. Chairman, I would also agree with the hon. member for Green Bay with respect to the Minister of Fisheries and the Department of Fisheries taking a firmer hand with the Federal Department of Fisheries concerning the salmon fishery. Also, I should like to point out as well, I do not know what representations have really been made by the Provincial Department of Fisheries to the Federal Government, but certainly very strong ones ought to be made, ought to be made continually, and the public ought to be made aware of representations with respect to the old question of control of our fishing grounds.

Confederation is the great blessing of Newfoundland, we are told, with which we will agree. It is certainly one of the blessings to Newfoundland, has to be, 1968, when we got a core of people who went up from this Province advocated this position, got Mr. Davis, the Minister of Fisheries, to take the position that he has taken and are now calling for. We all should be calling for enforcement of control of our fishing grounds and the ultimate extension of these over the Continental Shelf.

We have a situation now, for instance, where the Prime Minister of our Nation is going to Russia to discuss the fishing situation, mainly with reference to the West Coast of this Province. Certainly, I feel that before he went, that it ought publicly to have been brought strongly to his attention that we expect, that this Province expects him at least to give the same attention to the Eastern portion of the Nation as to the Western portion.

Indeed, in addition to our members of Parliament, we as a Province should be fortifying their efforts by pressing the Federal Government to extend the control of the fishing areas, as far as one can extend them, as far as they can be extended, co-incidental with our obligations, Canada's obligations under her international treaties. But there is no doubt about it, there is no doubt about the fact that this is necessary for the full benefit

MR. MARSHALL: of this greatest natural resource which we have, which is the fishing industry.

The minister touched on many topics last night, But there are also a few other questions, which he did not talk about, that I would like to ask him questions about. This Province was promised by this Government such things as electronic and suction pump devices, which will be used to catch fish. Again, people of the Province were told that the deep sea fishery will be of very great size and there would be about 200 draggers and trawlers, each measuring about 500 gross tons, which would be engaged in the deep sea fisheries. Then, again we were told that large quantities of fish will be shipped away from Newfoundland, in fresh form, in great cargo planes. Most of the fish will be on the way to the markets within a day or so after being taken out of the water. That would have been a great help to the fishery, obviously.

Then, again we were told that all fishing boats, ships of 60 tons or more or even much smaller, will be built of steel. They will be much stronger and much more dependable than wooden boats or vessels. They will be built in Newfoundland shipyards. These were promises, Mr. Chairman, which were made by the Government of this Province, in 1966, to the people of the Province.

We see in these estimates, the reason I bring them up now, is, we see in the estimates which are provided, substantial total increases in the vote for the fisheries, which we would all welcome, which is going to be used for the purpose of implementing some of the programmes that were announced by the hon. Minister of Fisheries at the Development Conference earlier this year. I would hope that these promises will come to fruition, because it is quite obvious, when one looks at, and I have just taken a few of the promises that were made by this Government to the people of the Province, electronic suction pump devices, this type of thing, I would hope. There is an election coming up in this Province now and I would hope that the hopes and aspirations of our fishermen, the fishermen of this Province, will not be played with for the purpose of a political ploy, and I would commend -

MR. P. CANNING: Mr. Chairman, I mean this to be a question, I understood the hon. member to insinuate, I think, if not directly, accuse the Government

MR. CANNING: of making promises in 1966 regarding boats.

MR. WINSOR: Modern boats, modern equipment.

MR. CANNING: I think that is what he meant. Is he aware of the number of boats built in Newfoundland by fishermen or built for fishermen under Government aids, like the highest bounty ever paid in the history of Newfoundland or the history of Canada? Is he aware that we have been adapting the modern aids like fish loops, or even more sophisticated than the old fish loop? I mean, is he aware of what has been happening in the last four years? Is he aware we are becoming modernized, with modern equipment? Is he aware that the facilities are there and the bounties are there, the loans are there? Sizable loans! Is he aware that any fishermen in Newfoundland today, any fishing skipper can have say an inshore dragger or longliner or a multi-purpose ship built at a cost of \$70,000 or \$80,000? His only requirement is probably to come across with cash to the amount of one-seventh of that or less, maybe. That is taking advantage of loans, bounties and direct subsidy from the Federal Government. I mean is he aware of all of this? Does he know it is going on?

MR. MARSHALL: Certainly I am aware that things have been done for the fishermen of this Province, by the Government, I am not denying that, but what I am saying is this, that there were promises made, there were wild promises made, in 1966, to the fishermen of this Province.

MR. CANNING: Tell us what they were.

MR. MARSHALL: Electronic suction pump devices will be used to catch fish. We are talking about 200 deep sea trawlers, etc. The millennium was coming for the fishermen of this Province. We have not seen it. It has not arrived yet.

I am just appealing to this Government, at this stage of the game where we have the unemployment that we have, for the purpose of political ploy, please do not play with the fishermen, as the Government did in certain instances in 1966.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, when one comes to fisheries, it seems just about everyone in Newfoundland or every Newfoundlander is an expert on the fisheries. Possibly that is the cause of many of the troubles and the problems facing the industry today. Before I get to the few remarks I meant to make, I would

MR. COLLINS: like to draw attention to the fact that yesterday, when I asked the Minister of Fisheries what representation he had made to the Federal Authorities with regard to having the licencing restrictions on salmon fishermen removed, he indicated to me that he had made representation. I followed through with a supplementary question, asking him if he had made representation to the Federal members (Newfoundland Federal Members). He told me that he had gone to the horse's head and not to the other end of the horse. If there was anyone to be classified or to fall into a classification of the other end of the horse, then it must be the Minister of Fisheries, who permitted this very discriminatory regulation to be introduced in the first place.

I have also established <sup>in</sup> discussions with some of the Federal Members in Ottawa that the Minister of Fisheries knew nothing of this regulation. It received no representations from Newfoundland or otherwise, partly, I suppose, because he was out in Western Canada engaged in the Royal Tour. On his return to Ottawa, the day before yesterday, the Federal members brought this matter to his attention and, hopefully, the matter will be resolved.

MR. MURPHY: Did you say he had no representation at all?

MR. COLLINS: He had no representation, up until the day before yesterday, from anyone in Newfoundland, although we were told that representations were made and that they were made to the horse's head. As I said, when we refer to the horse's head, we know that a horse has two ends and if there is anyone to be classified as, witness any other end of the horse, then it must be the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa.

MR. MURPHY: "It is no trouble to make a horse's so and so," you say.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Chairman, much is being said about the problems of the fisheries in Newfoundland. I suppose the problems vary from area to area. The problems faced by fishermen on the North West Coast probably are different and they are different from many of the fishermen on the North East Coast. Some of the problems might be found in each of the areas, but generally fishermen are faced with different problems, in a different area certainly different problems in the different regions.

MR. COLLINS: I am very much concerned, as I know most people in Newfoundland are, with the fisheries problems on the North West Coast, those are far different and of greater magnitude than the problems which might face fishermen on the South Coast where it is just about a yearly operation, pretty organized, from a point of view of catching fish, reasonably well organized from a point of view of processing fish, although possibly there is something that can be said for further processing. But on the North East Coast, Mr. Chairman, where we had fishermen/loggers and fishermen/carpenters and fishermen/construction workers, those people are being faced with a real problem, it has been there for years and very little has been done to alleviate the situation. In fact the situation has become more serious down through the years, because, one time a fishermen in Notre Dame Bay or Bonavistia Bay or Trinity Bay or White Bay could go fishing for a month or two months or three months, depending on the season, the winds, the seas and what have you. If he had some success, all to the good, if the fishery was more of a failure then he could always wire to some contractor in Bishop's Falls or Rattling Brook or Badger or Millertown and come up with some work in the woods, which would supplement his earnings for that particular year. We all know that the woods work has been drastically reduced because of automation. We all know the problems facing the pulp and paper industry in Newfoundland. And of course, all of this then complicates the problems which the fishermen are faced with in terms of earning a livelihood.

I do not know what the minister has in mind for those people on that particular area of the coast. I believe the Government's policy, down through the years, mainly has been centered around resettlement. In other words, rather than take measures to help alleviate and in lieu of their problems facing the fishermen, the emphasis seem to have been on the moving of fishermen themselves, through the resettlement programme, which was the adopted policy of the Provincial and Federal Governments.

We have heard the Premier say on numerous occasions that, as far as the provision of jobs in Newfoundland through industrial development is concerned, I forget where he drew the line now, but the line was somewhere along from



MR. COLLINS: Port Aux Basques to Clarendville, which means that the rest of the Province has been left out in terms of industrial development. So if the people are not to find jobs around Gander, Grand Falls and Botwood, Lewisporte and Glovertown, if there is to be no industrial development in those areas, what happens to the fishermen who occupy the various communities around the coast. That was the source of employment for them in the off-season. Unless there is some greater efforts being made, some new development, strategies adopted, then the the fishermen are going to have a very difficult time indeed.

Mention has been made of some of the problems, I suppose one of the major problems in the fisheries is the fact that our resources are rapidly depleted by foreign draggers, foreign vessels,



MR. COLLINS: various types from different countries. Much has been said about this need for international conferences of different types, the need for a conference of the sea to be called. Nothing seems to have been done really. Certainly, if we are going to think in terms of the fishermen continuing to make a living from the sea, then we must protect the resource.

I realize that this is mainly a federal responsibility but certainly the Province must bring pressures to bear, both publicly and otherwise, on the proper authorities, to make the best arrangements they can with the international countries concerned, to insure that there is a supply of the raw material.

There is a Select Committee of the House now, as the Chairman knows, whose duty it is to look into the possibility of setting up some collective bargaining rights for fishermen. The Committee is still sitting. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, there is a need to improve the position of the fishermen, in terms of what they derive from the industry. I have always been of the opinion, and I still am, that the fishermen are not getting their just and due, in terms of cash dollars for their product. We have seen instances where fresh fish - cod blocks, for instance, on the American Market, were down as low as twenty-three, twenty-four cents a pound. We saw where the Federal Government stepped in with a subsidy of one cent - two cents per pound, to keep the industry going, to keep the fishermen fishing and to keep the fish plant workers processing.

We have also seen that while that was going on fishermen were getting anywhere from three to five cents per pound, for their product, from the processor. Last year, while cod blocks, the price of cod blocks, went to as high as forty cents per pound, which is a considerable increase, we find that the return to the fishermen was still around five and six cents per pound. Certainly, Mr. Chairman, when we have just about one hundred percent increase in the price at the market level, then if

there is any reason to be used at all, it is certainly plain to all of us that fishermen's price should be increased proportionately.

We know that many of the fishing firms might have had bad years and might have suffered financial losses and so on and so forth, but we must also consider that fishermen have bad years, in terms of low production and low prices, and they have also suffered losses. Certainly there is a case to be made for higher prices to fishermen. How it is going to be brought about, I do not know. I would be interested in hearing what the minister might have to say about it.

Something has to be done to increase the returns to the fishermen. Something has to be done to insure that the fishermen have a chance when they go to work. There are enough imponderables as it is. Ice conditions in the spring, winds and sea in the fall, competition from other sources. Something has to be done to try and improve the situation in terms of some guarantee for the fishermen around the coast. I am interested in hearing what the minister has in mind in this regard, and I will have something else to say as we get to the various headings.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, I do not profess to be any expert on the fisheries, but being a member of the House of Assembly I try to become as conversant as I can with what is happening. With reference to the fisheries generally, in the Province, we are told that twenty to twenty-five thousand people are touched either directly or indirectly with fisheries. I understand, and I may be a bit wrong here, that some twenty of the forty-one districts represented in this House are fishing areas.

In my eight years in this House, I have tried to assess to the best of my ability just how this Government regards the fishery. This year we are going to have a great upsurge in the vote to fisheries. It is going to be something over \$7 million. Whether it is coincidence or not that this is the year where we will all be out pounding the beat, looking for people to support us and our policies. When we compare '70 - '71 where the vote was \$2,292,000., and '69-'70 was \$3,400,000.

When we look back over the years, at the great fisheries conferences, the setting up of the great Fisheries Development Authority, we sometimes wonder, Sir, whether we are being perfectly honest with the fishermen with reference to their welfare.

Perhaps the main times we hear fisheries discussed are when the great fish merchants are being criticized, severely criticized for what they have done to the lot of the fishermen. I wonder if this is all truth, or is it just propaganda to try to turn a certain group of people against another group of people? It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that through the years this Government - the policy of this Government has been to use tactics to try to separate, if you like, various segments of our society, to try to set one against the other for political purposes. Perhaps this House of Assembly itself might be the best example of this type of bigotry and hate that is being carried on. I think we had a tremendous example of the same thing in 1949, where we had the toiling masses fighting to free themselves from the fabulously rich merchants.

I do not know where these toiling masses are today. There are many thousands not even given the chance to toil. "They are better off," someone says. Well, perhaps that is the attitude of Government. They would rather feed you with welfare than give you a job to do. I do not think the hon. member really means that. I think the natural instinct of any human being is to work and try to provide a livelihood for his family, to the best of his ability.

We are speaking of fisheries here. The hon. member for Gander has mentioned an incident that took place in this House yesterday, with reference to the salmon fishery. I was present on the phone when the call was made to Ottawa, and it was definitely stated, definitely, without any grey areas at all, that Mr. Davies had not been approached by this Government with reference to any salmon regulations.

MR. WINSOR: I think, in fairness, that this is not correct. I have the copy of the telegram that the hon. the Premier sent to the hon. Mr. Davies

as early as the fourteenth of February. This is not correct. I would not want this to get about, that I actually told a lie as far as our communication with the hon. Minister of Fisheries is concerned. It is entirely wrong, I am sorry.

MR. MURPHY: Well, if it is wrong, I apologize, I withdraw. If I am wrong, I withdraw. I am man enough to <sup>do</sup> that, but when I am informed by a Member of Parliament that the four P.C. members had held a meeting with Mr. Davies, on his return from the West Coast, and he informed them that...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. MURPHY: Very good! Very good!

MR. SMALLWOOD: Who are you going to believe, the hon. minister or four Opposition members? A Minister of the Crown, speaking as a minister, not to be believed?

MR. MURPHY: All right! The matter was brought up to me. I am only speaking of members, Newfoundlanders, who are sent to Ottawa to represent this Province - various areas of this Province who are, I might say (I do not know if I can use the word "despised") but they are certainly not recognized by this Government here, who absolutely refuse to cooperate to any degree with these same members, These men, since 1968, have fought the battle, not only for the fishermen.

Mr. Jack Marshall, on the Northwest Coast, is the only one I have heard mention the rape of our fishery, from this House.

MR. BARBOUR: I have been fighting for the fishermen since 1949. I have been fighting the battle for the fishermen since 1949, continuously.

MR. MURPHY: That is the type of Newfoundlander we want. That is what we want. That is one from the other side. I have heard the hon. member for Burgeo-LaPoile...

MR. BARBOUR: And I have achieved many things for the welfare of the fishermen and their families in Newfoundland, all the way to Labrador as well as Newfoundland.

MR. MURPHY: What else could you expect from a resident of St. John's

Centre, that great district that I have the honour to represent.

MR. BARFOUR: I am still a Foravistonian.

MR. MURPHY: And still a great supporter of the present city member.

MR. BARFOUR: I might be in your district, but I do not vote for you.

MR. MURPHY: During the years, since 1968 particularly, it has been brought to the attention of the people all over Canada just what has been happening. As I said; the hon. member for Burgeo-Lapolle on many occasions stood in this House and spoke of the night scene when he would look out from Port aux Basques and it was like a city, where these foreign trawlers were out raping our fishing areas. We have Mr. Marshall, as I said, on the West Coast and the rest of his colleagues in the House of Commons bringing before the people of Canada just what an injustice is being done to our Newfoundland fishermen.

These are the ones who fought the battle to try to retain the seal fishery. No one can deny that. I will repeat it again, I have said in this House many times, when this incident arose, that Mr. Davies, Brian Davies, in this same House, the hon. Minister of Fisheries, who sat right there next to the Minister of Finance, and I stood on my feet about six days in a row and addressed it to the Minister of Fisheries, who was the hon. Mr. Lane at the time; was this Government going to take any action? I was treated with silent contempt. Not worthy of an answer until one day the hon. minister stood up, I presumed to answer me, and the Premier looked over and he said 'sit down Max,' and Max sat down.

A few short weeks ago, five years too late or four years too late, the Premier puts on a great extravaganza, goes to the icefields - and now he is going to fight for the seal fishery. Locking the barn door after the horse is gone. They have babies on this one. It is very important to have babies on the back of the Bulletin. But did you notice the edition before? We did not have the poor children up for adoption, we had the Premier up for election. Pictures of the Premier at the icefields.

You know Mr. Chairman, let us be very, very serious on this



matter. When we talk of the fisheries, we talk of an industry that affects most people in this Province. We talk of the fishery, fishery products. Even in this past month I had occasion, travelling outside the City of St. John's, at one large hotel in Conception Bay, where we dropped in to have some lunch and ordered fish. "Sorry!" There was no fish there. We had chicken legs, chips, so on and so forth.

In the town of Bonavista, three weeks ago, I picked up a menu and I ordered something that I thought I might like. It was breaded cod fillets. Now this hotel is about three miles from Bonavista, on one side.

MR. BARBOUR: Two and a-half.

MR. MURPHY: We had the correct measurement, two and a-half.

MR. BARBOUR: Including the Barbour Room.

MR. MURPHY: Including the Barbour Room, and on the other side, Catalina.

MR. BARBOUR: Mr. Chairman...

MR. MURPHY: Just a moment, I am sure that the hon. member is going to give us a speech of about two hours and a-half on the fisheries, when I am finished.

MR. BARBOUR: Would the hon. member yield for a moment? Would the hon. member yield for one tiny, weenie moment?

MR. MURPHY: For my favourite constituent, I would yield for a month.

MR. BARBOUR: Mr. Chairman, I only wish the hon. Leader, one of the hon. Leaders. There are so many of them over there that I have lost count of them now.

MR. MURPHY: You have been led astray.

MR. BARBOUR: I only wish that the hon. Leader, the member for St. John's Centre, could have been in the Barbour Room on Saturday night, at seven o'clock. I only wish then that he could have accompanied me to the Orange Hall, in Bonavista, when I addressed 350 fishermen. If the hon. member wants cod fish, cod tongues, caplin, lumps, queen crab, he can have it on the menu in the motel, next to the Barbour Room, at Bonavista.



MR. MURPHY: There you are, everything is straightened up. I ordered this breaded cod fillet. There was a group of us at the table. I tasted it and I did not like the taste, there was something about it, so I asked, perhaps the most expert gentleman on fisheries in this Province, the next Premier of the Province, as a matter of fact, Mr. Frank Moores about this bit of fish. He said, 'I will demonstrate now to you about this. He went into the kitchen and he brought in a carton...

MR. BARBOUR: No one is allowed in the kitchen, only the staff.

MR. MURPHY: And the Premier - the next Premier has a priority to go into the kitchen. He brought in the carton...

MR. BARBOUR: That will be the foggy Monday or foggy Friday, when the next Premier - he will never, never be Premier. I doubt if he will ever get elected to sit in the hon. House.

MR. MURPHY: There you go now. There you go. There is a statement. I hope that has been duly noted by the press.

MR. BARBOUR: If the hon. member only knew what I know about the support that the outdoor leader, I call him. We have three of four inside. He is the outdoor leader.

MR. MURPHY: A great team. A great team.

MR. BARBOUR: If he only knew what I know so far as the elections in the Bonavista - Trinity - Conception ridings are concerned, Mr. Moores had better go to some other district. Do not go in either of these districts, and there are seven districts in the riding which he represents. We have not seen him. He has not sat in the House of Commons since January month.

MR. MURPHY: Are we finished with the Electoral Office vote now, Sir? It is one o'clock, Mr. Chairman, if I may draw your attention to the fact. I may get a chance to get a word in sometime during the afternoon.

MR. CHAIRMAN: It being one o'clock, I do now leave the Chair until 3:00 p.m.

The House resumed at 3:00 P.M.:

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY:

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, In my view there is no co-operation between our elected parliament here and our elected representatives in Ottawa. It sort of grieves me to see a wedge being driven between our federal members of parliament and the government here in Newfoundland, just for the sake of political expediency.

As I said earlier, I think this Province has had its fair share and perhaps more than a fair share of bigotry, hatred, ill-feeling, whatever you may want to call it, over the past twenty-two years. Those here on this side of the House, and I have been here eight years, sort of feel that if we stand to speak at all, if we offer a suggestion, we are being somewhat less than loyal Newfoundlanders. I do not know just how far this feeling prevails in other provinces. From my experience, I think there is an on-going feeling of co-operation between Ottawa and the Provincial Parliaments, notwithstanding the political creed one wishes to support. I do not know if it is just common here in this Province and I might add in this City. Personally, I feel that there should be co-operation between not only the Provincial body and the Federal but also between municipal. I just state this now for the record that when I was first elected to this House of Assembly in 1962 as a sitting St. John's member, I contacted the St. John's Municipal Council suggesting that we should get together regularly, the six St. John's members, (at the time there were three Liberals and three Conservatives - but that did not bother me) with council. I have written three other letters since that time. I am just talking about the feeling of co-operation, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: What does this have to do with the item under discussion?

MR. MURPHY: Perhaps if I may be permitted one second. The feeling of the down-town establishment, of Confederation Building, getting the feeling that is happening in this House of Assembly. That is the only point that I wanted to make - but, Sir, if this Province is to develop. On this

Mr. Murphy.

On this Fisheries vote, we are lead to believe, we do believe quite sincerely that if Newfoundland is not only to prosper but to maintain what it has, our fishery must be a success not only in the total amount of fish that is caught but also the benefits that accrue to those who catch the fish.

This year and last year, the latter part of last year, in fishery matters, I think we have attained, you could almost say, a crisis stage. I am referring now to the upsurge of fishermen's associations or fishermen's unions. I do not wish to go into it too fully but I know that the new union has applied to Government for legislation. There is a select committee on it. When that committee is ready to make its report, then it is up to us members in this House to deal with this legislation. It is the House of Assembly that will pass that legislation. But I think it is a growing feeling, Sir, that has been spread abroad through this Province, that no matter what manner of work you are engaged in, whether it is fisheries, whatever it is, it is the great, big merchant on top that is trying to destroy the workmen.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it is my feeling that no industry, no business, as a matter of fact, no House of Assembly can function while there is a wedge driven between two sides. In the fishery, we must have the fishermen, we must have the merchant, working harmoniously. As far as our fishery is concerned, Sir, and particularly the fresh fish plants, I would say that the great majority of these people are carrying on through monies loaned through this House of Assembly. For that reason, Sir, I feel that we, when I say we I refer to the House of Assembly or the Government, should be in a position to let not only the fishermen but the whole Province know, if the fish plants are making millions at the expense of the fishermen. Because, Sir, it is my feeling, right or wrong, that if we are pumping money into fish plants we have the moral, if not the legal right, to step in there. If you are going to use our money, you are going to use it for the benefit of

Mr. Murphy

the whole community, not only for the plant operator himself."

But, Mr. Chairman, quite honestly I do not feel that that is the full story. I think everybody or everyone has his problems to maintain a plant to the best of his ability, to make that plant as productive as he can. He deserves, I would say, a profit for his efforts, not exorbitant profits but a profit. I have not seen all the fish plants in this Province. I have seen a great many of them. Here I am going to get back to the story that I was trying to tell before we adjourned. Several members have asked me privately what happened at that famous lunch I had in the hotel in Bonavista.

Well the story is this, Sir: I ordered this fillet and I did not like the taste of it so, as I have said, Mr. Moores, who is perhaps one of the greatest experts on fish in this Province, said, "I will check it out." So he checked it out. I was right between two huge fish plants, Bonavista Cold Storage on one side and Mifflin's, I think, on the other side, in Catalina. I was between the two.

MR. BARBOUR: They are very important fish plants. They employ anywhere from 700 to 1,000 people.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, sir. If everybody eats the fish that I had, they will not be employed very long. This fish came from National Food Products, in Nova Scotia. I ordered fish and when the package was produced, of the fish that I had eaten, it was National Food Products. I believe it is Halifax. I am not sure. So the hon. member has enlightened me as to how many people are working in the plants at the present moment. I would say that if we all ate..

MR. BARBOUR: What time was this? What year?

MR. MURPHY: What year? What year is this?

MR. BARBOUR: What year? I am asking you what year you visited the place?

MR. MURPHY: I am just getting some information.

MR. BARBOUR: I asked you what year?

MR. MURPHY: It was 1971. It was just four weekends ago.

MR. BARBOUR: Sir, just for one moment.

MR. MURPHY: Let us follow..

MR. BARBOUR: Just a moment.

MR. MURPHY: Let us follow procedure.

MR. BARBOUR: Just a moment. Just a moment. Just a moment. I want to explain something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, please.

MR. BARBOUR: I want to explain something.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. BARBOUR: Order please!

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, the hon. member professed to be perhaps one of the greatest experts on fish. I am sure he will keep us occupied this afternoon, for about an hour and half after I finish, talking about the fishery. But, Mr. Chairman, the point I was making is that here I was - I thought I was between two fish plants but I was between three. There is another one at Charlottetown.

MR. BARBOUR: Four. There is also..

MR. MURPHY: Would the hon. member make some notes for me. He can pass them over and I can carry on.

MR. BARBOUR: Let me just say this. There is one at Charlottetown. There is a fish plant in Bonavista. There is a Queen Crab Plant in Bonavista.

I imagine you were referring to the fishery products in Catalina.

I know the geography.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, ..

MR. BARBOUR: I am getting a lot of help, do you see that?

MR. MURPHY: I have been taken on a guided tour. I just hope that I am not being derailed from the point that I am trying to make and that is, how can we keep our own fishermen working when we are using products from another province? It would not happen with eggs down there. I checked the eggs. They were from the Egg Marketing Board here in Newfoundland.

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, when we looked at the vote this year, coincidentally it being election year, of something over \$7 million for fisheries,



Mr. Murphy:

we look back to 1970-1971, \$2,290,000. We look back to 1969-1970, \$3,400,000. It is rather more, I think, than suggested. Perhaps we are looking for the fishermen's vote again in this present election.

Mr. Chairman, in this House on a couple of occasions I brought up problems facing the fish plants, not as far as capital is concerned but as far as trying to get enough employees to man their plants and their trawlers, due mostly to the fact of the lack of housing. I refer particularly to the plant at Fermeuse, where they could employ eighty or ninety more people if housing were supplied. Now we all know that housing is not the cheapest commodity that we can get today, but it is an absolute necessity and I feel that this Government, her Majesty's Government, should go overboard to satisfy the needs in these particular areas. In most cases, and I speak again particularly of the Southern Shore, the Ferryland District where the road beyond Capy Broyle is almost impassible, where these fish plants have to truck all their supplies over very rough road and, as a consequence, doing great damage to vehicles and adding considerably to the overhead of these plants. If we are indeed, Sir, going to consolidate our efforts towards the fishery, we could at least, Sir, appoint a Minister of Fisheries. Do not treat the Department of Fisheries as just an adjunct, a branch of a department, but as a department. In this Province today, with all the talk of Fisheries, what it means to the economy of our Province, we have a minister in this Province today that is only acting as Minister of Fisheries. Our budget, as I said earlier, is perhaps the smallest of all departments. Our loans in various areas do not compare anywhere near loans under Farm Development or other areas of Government. In this building, I would say that this Fisheries Department should be one of the largest, with members, representatives of the fishermen themselves, with some part of that department where they can meet regularly. I would say, Sir, that the Department of Fisheries should be decentralized to some extent where in our great fishing areas, like the North West Coast, Burin Peninsula, other parts of the Province, where there should be established some sort of a



Mr. Murphy.

permanent fishery installation, with officers there that can advise on the many matters that turn up very frequently. I believe, Sir, that this Provincial Government should be more actively participating with Federal Government. The Federal Government have jurisdiction over a great, great part of our fisheries. I believe, Sir, that if the Government in Ottawa, at this moment or during the past few years, were anything but Liberal, I am sure that the storm and the flak that we hear raised on the floors of the House of Commons, by our outstanding P. C. members there, would be nothing compared to what would be happening in this Chamber. This has been the attitude, Sir, of this Government, not only towards Fisheries in Ottawa but every other department. "We are deal quietly; we hear. "We are dealing very quietly. That is how we are getting the work done.. We are dealing very quietly." But, Mr. Chairman, again, when we hear what is happening around this Province - the hon. member for Fortune Bay was talking about the herring fishery. I was in Bay L'Argent one evening and the gentleman's home I was in was telling me that at night time the draggers came right in to the wharf opposite his premises. How can our Newfoundland fishermen survive, if fishermen from all over the world could come almost

Mr. Murphy.

in on the rocks, in on the beaches off our Island home and take not the bread out of our mouths but the fish out of our nets. So, Mr. Chairman, to finish my few brief remarks, I certainly hope that this great fisheries programme that was founded at the great Disarmament Conference, as my hon. friend from St. John's West describes it, that all these things that were promised in this, Sir, will be carried into effect as soon as possible. And not only for the benefit of the Liberal Party in this upcoming election, Sir, but for the benefit of these people, these fishermen, (I said this morning that, I think, twenty-eight of our forty-one districts consist of fishermen of some kind) that they may receive, Sir, the benefits and the protection that we, as elected members, are obliged to give them and to fight for their rights as well as the rights of anybody else. It is a moral obligation, Sir, on our part. I am sure that in this department that it will be one debate that the silent twenty-seven or the silent twenty-eight would like to say a few words upon. We heard over the years many fisheries programmes expounded. But, Mr. Chairman, in all truth and honesty, what great programmes could have been carried out? Over the past five, six, seven, eight, nine years, our average budget has been something in the area of \$2.5 million. I believe, Sir, that the fishermen themselves will be the judges, when the time rolls around for this Government to give an account of its stewardship to these people who, as I said earlier, represent 20,000 or 25,000 of our working population.

MR. BARBOUR: Mr. Chairman, I am just going to say one or two words. The hon. member and Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition referred to twenty-eight members on this side of the House, silent members who, he said, would no doubt have something to say in this debate. Mr. Chairman, I hope he does not include me, because I have been, Sir, fighting for the fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador for over twenty years, night and day, around the clock. Even before I became a member of this hon. House of Assembly, at my own expense, I sent many telegrams to Ottawa, many letters

MR. BARBOUR:

to Ottawa, made many telephone calls and paid for them out of my own pocket.

MR. MURPHY: You were a P. C. then.

MR. BARBOUR: Oh, no I was not a P. C. Oh! no. When I was a P. C., I was blinded. I could not see the light. But I see the light now. I see the light now. Now then how in God's name he can include me in the twenty-eight is beyond me! I feel a little bit hurt over that. The hon. member knows that no man has tried to do so much as I have in uplifting the lot of the fishermen in the field of Unemployment Insurance, which because of my White Paper to Ottawa is playing an important part. You will see that on the first of July this year.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to say something else. He refers to the National Food Products, which was the kind of food that he says was not fit to eat. If it was four weeks ago, Mr. Chairman, I can assure this hon. House that all the longliners, eleven or twelve of them in Bonavista South, were bringing in great catches every day, from 1,000 pounds to 26,000 pounds per boat. If he could not get fresh fish, well then he could have gone to the management. I am sure they would have gotten it for you, because there are plenty of codfish in Bonavista which has to be brought in fresh every day.

Now just let me say this in closing: I think that this Government has a great fishery policy. I do not think there is any honest, hard-working, fisherman who comes before the Loan Board, if he has a case, a gentleman's case, who cannot get assistance from the Government, that is the fishermen of Newfoundland, so far as the Fishery Authority and Loan Board are concerned I know whereof I speak, because I have had many, many fishermen come to me. I have gone to them, on the fourth floor of this building. They have gone away with a smile, because they have gotten what they had come to get. Surely then, how can you say that very little has been done for the fishermen of Newfoundland? I am referring to the six. There is no six in Ottawa. There are only five Tories in Ottawa. How can you get six? Where has the sixth

MR. BARBOUR.

man been? Where has he been?

AN HON. MEMBER: "The Shadow."

MR. BARBOUR: He has been trying to drum up support. But the support he is going to drum up is going to be very little. I challenge him now to oppose me in the historic district of Bonavista South. When the votes are counted, I will bring back the bacon.

MR. MURPHY: It will be announced tomorrow that Moores and Barbour will be running in Bonavista South.

MR. BARBOUR: I would love that very, very much. When the ballots are all counted, I will win. He will lose. Because when it comes to ability and capability and experience and intelligence, I am way ahead of him. Because I have had to do what the fishermen have had to do. I have had to do what the working people of Newfoundland have had to do. Let me tell you this, Mr. Chairman, that the people from all over Newfoundland and Labrador, when I was fighting for the cause of the fishermen, which I am doing at the present moment, I am getting their support. Why? Because they know I came from a family who fished all their lives. I know what it is to fish offshore. I know what it is to go to the Labrador. I know what it is to fish off the Funk Islands. I know what it is to cut the throat of a fish and to split a fish and to spread it on the flake. I know what a water horse is? . I doubt if you know that.

I have been elected twelve years and I can assure every hon. member of this House that when I visited my district on the weekend past, the reception I received, both in the Barbour Room, and in the Orange Hall, was so exciting, was so great that my heart was gladdened, was so much that when I went to Musgrave Town to speak to the Salvation Army, the Seventy-Fifth Anniversary, words flew out of me. I did not get up with a piece of paper, "mum, mum, mum, mum." I do not talk that way.

Mr. Chairman, I just had to say this: I think, Sir, that this is a real Government that is trying to be real good to the fishermen of Newfoundland.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, this is certainly a hard act to follow. I will say this, Mr. Chairman, that when the hon. member for Bonavista South and I were candidates

Mr. Crosbie.

together in the Liberal Leadership Convention, I can testify to the fact that he could really heave it out of him. The words then were on wing. But the hon. gentleman got on wings, too, when his Leader re-entered the race, he quickly flew out of the race. He left me all by myself, without a travelling companion. There were only two of us first, the two fearless ones, then the hon. minister over there.

MR. MURPHY: When did the hon. Minister of Education come in?

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, he came in and dropped out at the same time.

Mr. Chairman, there is no question about it that when Unemployment Insurance in Newfoundland is written up in the history books, the name of Pickersgill and Barbour are going to be together.

AN HON. MEMBER Barbour and Pickersgill.

MR. CROSBIE: Pickersgill up in the main chapter of the book and Barbour down as asterisk at the bottom, to describe the support that you gave that concept in your district. I said, an asterisk. The hon. minister does not know what an asterisk is? In fact the hon. member for Bonavista South is so persuasive I have almost forgotten what I was going to say. The fish that the hon. Leader of the Opposition had down in the hon. member's district was not a happy sight, as he has told the hon. member. If the hon. member is really going to do something about his district, the hon. member should chastise the hotel there for not serving fresh fish. That is the point. Mr. Wilbur Rideout used to run it. The hon. gentleman knows about him. That is the gentleman who is going to get the nomination, yes.

MR. BARBOUR: I am not afraid.

MR. CROSBIE: The hon. member..

MR. BARBOUR: I am not afraid of anyone in Bonavista South.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order please!

MR. BARBOUR: He is putting words in my mouth, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, just to bring up a point that the hon. Leader of the Opposition made: He caused me to look at the estimates, Sir, to see how many employees the Department of Fisheries have. The hon.

Mr. Crosbie.

Leader did not say how many. The Department of Fisheries has thirty employees. It is the second smallest department. The Department of Labrador Affairs has nineteen. So out of 7,100, (whether it is relevant or not, it is just an interesting statistic ) government employees, only 30 are in the Department of Fisheries. Now that does not mean to say, of course, that the department is understaffed, but it is something that would make you wonder, that in a fishing Province like ours, of 7,100 Government employees only 30 work in the Department of Fisheries— the second smallest department. The largest, of course, is Health, 2,669. Of course the responsibility is shared with the Government of Ottawa.

Now, Mr . Chairman, a few general remarks on the fisheries. I think it is only fair, as an impartial observer, for me to congratulate the M. P.'s that this Province has at Ottawa, on the job that they are doing in bringing to the attention of the people of Canada the fishery problems of Newfoundland. I can be quite impartial about this. I am not a Conservative. I am not an official Loyal Liberal. I am an expelled Liberal, an expulsed Liberal. In fact, I am an eighteen foot beef Liberal. So I can quite impartially say that we have M. P.'s in Ottawa who in the last two or three years have brought to the fore in Canada the needs of the fishing industry, not only of Newfoundland but at least of Eastern Canada. They are still doing it today. It is stupid to say otherwise. It is stupid to say that they are just a noisy five or six. They are five now, because one is the Provincial Leader of the Conservative Party. It is silly to say that they are accomplishing nothing. They are accomplishing a great deal. They are keeping the pressure on the Cabinet, the ministers at Ottawa, on Mr. Davis, on the Prime Minister. They are keeping before their eyes the fishery problems of Newfoundland, the problems in the seal fishery. Just yesterday I noticed in the paper that they were questioning the Prime Minister on whether he was going to discuss in Russia the question of the depletion of the fishery resource



Mr. Crosbie

of the North Atlantic. I am no expert on this but the papers say that, it must be true that the Russian Fishing Fleet is taking, I think, half the fish that is taken now in the North Atlantic. The minister can correct me, if I am wrong. If it is not half the fish, certainly it is a tremendous quantity of fish. Yet the Prime Minister of Canada does not have on his agenda to discuss with the Russian leaders, when he is in Russia, the problems of the fishery on the East Coast of Canada. So, Mr. Lundrigan and Mr. McGrath, Walter Carter and the representatives in Ottawa are questioning them in the House of Commons. They questioned them in the House of Commons yesterday. They are going to today, to try to force Mr. Trudeau to put this on his agenda. Now is there anything wrong with that?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, they are Tories, dirty Tories. They are not allowed to do that.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not care what kind of Tories there are. There are clean Tories. There are dirty Liberals. There are loyal Liberals. There are real Liberals. So the adjectives do not matter. The point is that they are doing a valuable service. We have a minister in Ottawa too. He is one of our M.P.'s, a minister. Everybody agrees that he is doing a very credible job too. So I see nothing wrong with saying that we have M.P.'s in Ottawa who are doing an excellent job in Opposition. We have an M. P. in Ottawa who is doing a good job in the Cabinet. But I do not agree at all with this criticism of the Federal M. P.'s we have in Ottawa, that they are too noisy. What is there job to be? Is not there job to bring to the attention of the Canadian Government the problems in their districts, the problems of Newfoundland, to press that they be solved, to put the pressure on? It is the same as the Opposition's job here in Newfoundland. I certainly think that they have done a tremendous and are doing a terrific job. If they can get Prime Minister Trudeau to bring up the question of the East Coast Fisheries when he is in -- Russia, that is all to the good. It should be on his agenda now. I do not know why he needs to be pressed to have it on his agenda. He has on his agenda the question of the West Coast fisheries, which Mr. Davis is particularly

Mr. Crosbie

interested in, I suppose. He comes from there. But the East Coast fisheries are certainly more important to us and to a lot of other people. So, I think they are doing a terrific job and deserve our congratulations. I cannot see any reason, Mr. Chairman, why our Minister of Fisheries would not be in touch with them just as much as he is in touch with the Minister of Fisheries of Ottawa. What is wrong with that? They are putting the pressure on the Minister of Fisheries at Ottawa to check into salmon regulations that he is imposing this year. Our Government are trying to do the same. They both have the same end in view. What difference does it do, if they co-operate. There is no reason at all why they should not. To suggest that he contact the Minister of Fisheries is to contact the head of the horse, and to contact our Federal M.P.'s is to contact the other end of the horse. It is a pretty stupid statement, in my view. So I think they are to be vastly congratulated. I do not know whether the minister has spoken on this problem. If he has not, he might; and that is the business of the depletion of the herring resources in Newfoundland. I was not here last night, for a few minutes, when the minister was speaking. But he is doubtlessly familiar with the report that Mr. V. M. Hodder made, of the St. John's Biological Station, recently. I do not have the date on this clipping. "The optimum sustainable yield of herring in Newfoundland waters may level off within the next few years to about half of last year's record catch of 169,000 tons." Catches were 70,000 in 1966-1967. Catches were 120,000 in 1967-1968. Catches were 163,000 tons in 1968-1969 and another increase of just over 4,000 tons last year. That is 1970-1971. But it is expected to be about half as much this year. Mr. Hodder said that the decrease in landings this year can be attributed to one of two things, either the extremely severe winter that kept seiners storm-bound for much of the time or a general decline in herring stock. Now we all know what has happened to the herring fishery off the Norwegian Coast, the banks of Norway, how the yield went down because so much of it was caught. The same thing seems bound to happen off the coast of Newfoundland. I believe the Government agrees that it is now necessary to prevent any more herring reduction

Mr. Crosbie.

on the South Coast I think that was said here last year, that we cannot afford to have any more large reduction plants. The minister might speak on that, when he gets a chance, or give us his view as to whether this is really a serious problem or not. One other point, Mr. Chairman, that is of great importance to this Province, is this; that you would have to be foolish to stand up in this House and say that the Government had done nothing for the fishery during the last twenty-two years. Obviously the Government have done a lot and has tried to help the fisheries. It has done a lot for the fishermen also. But the main weakness seems to me that the Government, after twenty-two years, still does not have an overall development plan for the fisheries. It appears that we are now approaching one. In fact I would say that with the emergence of the new union, which is bringing this matter to prominence, that the Government are now being forced to consider an overall development approach to fisheries. The Salt Codfish Marketing Board has been a revolutionary change in our fisheries. Now we are left with the problem of fresh fish and frozen fishery of Newfoundland. A revolutionary change is coming in that. It is a great pity, Mr. Chairman, that this is coming to a crunch in an election year. All members of the House are aware, as is Mr. Cashin, and others are aware and the Premier is certainly aware, because we have heard him say it many times, how crucial the fishermen's vote is in a certain number of districts. In ten or twelve districts it may be vital and twenty it is influential. So this is a poor year to have this tremendous problem up to be settled and perhaps it will not be settled this year. But what has always amazed me, Mr. Chairman, is that whereas Norway seems to have evolved an overall approach to the fishery and Denmark and Iceland, this Province so far has not. Of course jurisdiction is divided with the Government of Canada. It seems to me, we have to wait for the select committee to report, but it seems to me certainly that we should have a system whereby prices for the fishery are fixed between representatives of the fishermen, the fish plants

MR. CROSMIE: fish plant owners and operators and other who have an interest in the fishery. Certainly there should be some kind of arbitration system, perhaps some kind of Government body that sets prices if these groups cannot agree. That has to come. Certainly we have to have legislation that gives fishermen bargaining rights. I do not think we have to have legislation that gives any one particular union a monopoly on bargaining rights. That is where the rub is going to come. All this is necessary. All that is happening now is necessary, but it is very important how it is all brought about.

It has always amazed me why our Government permits the plants that we subsidize and guarantee loans for, to engage in cut-throat competition with one another, down in the United States of America. The Government helped to finance nearly all fish plants in the country, with the exception of maybe one or two. There are one or two exceptions. Even National Sea Products coming in here now, the Government is going to subsidize or assist them financially by guaranteeing, advancing money on their trawlers and guaranteeing loans for them.

Even without legislation being passed, the Government can have a tremendous say in what these various fish companies do. Why the Government have been satisfied for years to allow them to go down competing against one another, engaging in cut-throat competition on prices and the rest of it, is a bit beyond me. At the very least there should be an association that can close the marketing of Newfoundland fish, fresh frozen fish. Certainly I have never had anyone show me that I was wrong. Certainly the whole industry should have, down in the United States, a processing plant to produce or take the cod blocks and produce fish fingers and all the rest of the finished products down there. There is not any one company in our fishery here in Newfoundland that has the money to do that. They have to put a processing plant there. All of them assisted by the Government could certainly do it. As I remember, I

believe Iceland has a processing plant, inside the United States tariff barrier, to process their raw product. I am not sure whether Norway does or not. There is no reason why the Newfoundland industry could not have it too. The big money is surely made when it is processed from the cod blocks into the finished product. If we could make money down in the States that way, the profit would come back to Newfoundland and could be used in Newfoundland. Instead of that we are selling the cod blocks and that type of product down there, which gets a much lower price because their tariff barriers dictate that they have to do that.

There are all kinds of things, as I see it, Mr. Chairman, if the Government provides leadership, that can be done to help the fresh and frozen fish industry. Once there is an organization to negotiate prices and set them, there is no reason why, in a good year when some of the prices go quite high, that part of that high price cannot be put aside in a fund to even it out in a year when prices are low. I mean, to keep the price of the fishermen up in a year when it is low, there are all kinds of devices like that that can be worked, once the industry is organized overall. I assume that that is where we are heading now. I also assume that the select Committee is considering this kind of thing.

I am on record, long ago, as being in favour of this kind of approach. If other countries have had to do it, and if it has resulted in a higher standard of living for the fishermen in those countries, it will do the same here in Newfoundland. There is a danger this year that this new approach might get caught up in other issues such as collective bargaining and what union is to be recognized and whether there will be a check-off of union dues and the rest of it. We have to be very careful when this legislation comes before the House, if it does, to separate that controversial aspect of it from the rest of it. I have my own views as to whether there should be a compulsory check-off from every fisherman in the Province, of union dues. I cannot <sup>see</sup> any way in the world where



that can be done. I just do not see any way that it could be done. If a union gets a contract and the employer agrees to deduct the dues of the workers of that plant, that is an entirely different matter. But to say that every fisherman in a country or in an area has to have dues, for a union, deducted from the price he gets for his fish, there would be a revolution on your hands.

In any event, on those questions we have to wait for the Select Committee. I think that we should have some indication from the Government, in the next week or two weeks, as to what the time table is going to be for this legislation. Because, Mr. Chairman, I think that we should have our work done here, the work we have to do will certainly be done by the end of May, that is the estimates and the Budget Speech. The legislation we have before us is minor and there should be some indication from the Government, in the next week or two, as to just what they intend to do about this Select Committee's report and legislation that arises out of it.

I would like the Minister of Fisheries also, Mr. Chairman, to give us his comments on this point. This is a report in the 'Evening Telegram,' December 1970, where the Harbour Breton plant workers express concern about the future plans which E.C. Packers Limited had for processing operations at Harbour Breton. This was just last December. The union representative there, of the plant workers, said that the plant workers were losing two to three days pay per week, that fall, and that E.C. Packers had declared its intention to renounce earlier verbal promises to the union, that it would purchase additional trawlers to increase the supply of fish, and therefore the work load at the plant. The union contended that the company intended to reduce the number of plant employees, all of which problems have been compounded, he said, by the resettlement programme, which has meant that 500 additional people have moved to Harbour Breton.

In the same article the company officials said they had



not decided whether to invest more money in this operation or not. They had not decided whether to get two trawlers or not, and that they were waiting to see how a new incentive programme worked out. The union official, Mr. Mahoney, said the 220 in-plant workers are taking home an average of thirty to forty dollars a week. Because they are only working three or four days a week, they are only making thirty to forty dollars a week, and it would be better for them to be on welfare if that is all they are going to receive in the average weekly wages. That is a good point. What is the point of working for thirty or forty dollars a week, if you can get forty or fifty from the Welfare Department, not working?

MR. NEARY: It is bad for their morale.

MR. GROSBIE: Yes, but it is bad for your morale to work all week and only make thirty or forty dollars a week also.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. GROSBIE: I am not trying to make the point whether he is better off or not, but just to point out that because of this situation they are only making thirty to forty dollars a week.

The minister may have information since then. This is five months later, practically. Could the minister tell us what the situation is at Harbour Breton plant? Are they working the full week down there now? Has the company decided to get more trawlers to bring in more fish, or what the position is at Harbour Breton? Obviously the whole economy of Harbour Breton depends on this B.C. Packers Plant. The B.C. Packers Plant, of course, one of its main purposes is the herring fishery, meal and oil. The other of course was to process fish. If it is to do much in the way of producing fresh frozen fish, more trawlers are needed. Perhaps the minister has some information on that.

There is one other point I would like to hear the minister on, Mr. Chairman, that I think would be of interest to the people of the Province, and that is the International Fisheries, Fish Meal Plant, out

at Stephenville. The minister knows that the Government of Newfoundland, or the people of Newfoundland, have invested in that plant, or at least in the plant and the two herring seiners that the plant is operating, about one and a-half million dollars. I have the exact figures here somewhere. Anyway, it is close enough. It was nine hundred and some odd thousand dollars for the two vessels, the herring vessels and one-half million dollars in the plant. That was done in 1966 at which time Litton Industries, California, and W.F. Grace and Company were said to be the owners of this plant.

The Newfoundland Government put up all the money to buy the two herring vessels. They put up all the money to build the plant and paid all their expenses. The purpose of the plant was to experiment with the device called the resojet. Anyone who remembers 1966 and the election that followed will remember about the resojet, because this was the whole purpose of putting the plant there. The resojet was going to be revolutionary in changing fish, herring and so on, into oil and meal. Well, the resojet did not apparently work out. The Minister of Fisheries last year said that, in one year, only 150 tons of meal and sixteen tons of oil had been processed. Seventy-five percent of what had gone through the plant had been cured for food and only twenty-five percent in meal and oil, but there had not been any operating deficit on the plant, except for the two vessels. The number of people working out there was pretty sad.

In the calendar year 1969, twelve men. At the end of February 1970, eighty-two men were then employed. That was because, (and that included men on the vessels) that was because they had started an operation out there processing herring and fish for human consumption and had dropped the meal and oil operation.

The House will also remember, Mr. Chairman, that in March, as a matter of fact, March 1971, the Premier announced that there was going to be established at Stephenville a million dollar herring

canning plant. The yearly production is ten million cans of herring fillet sticks. The plant is to be completed by the end of this year. The Premier said that the International Fisheries and Fish Meal Limited are going to build and operate the new plant and market the product in the United States. The plant is not to cost the Government one cent, no Government guarantees or loans.

It will be supplied by three vessels. The Government have chartered the 'Harmon I' and the 'Harmon II' to International Fisheries and the company will operate a vessel of its own. I think he said that Dr. Frank Lane, of New York, is the owner now of this company, International Fisheries and Fish Meal Limited. I would like to ask the minister to tell the Committee, Mr. Chairman, whether the plans for that plant are being carried out and whether or not Dr. Lane and International Fisheries and Fish Meal Limited are going to repay to the Government the million and a half dollars the Government have invested in the two vessels, 'Harmon I' and 'Harmon II,' and in the plant that is already out in Stephenville? Is it part of the agreement that eventually this investment is to be paid off?

They are chartering the two vessels. Are they paying rent now for the building they are using? Rent to the Government? Because, Mr. Chairman, every cent, as far as I know, that was invested in that plant in Stephenville, was invested by the Government for a total of a million and a-half dollars. Therefore, I think the House should be told now whether this is going to be repaid to the Government or whether it is a Government investment that we are going to receive interest or rent on, or just what the situation is. Apparently there is to be an extension built on to the plant, but what happens to the investment that we have out there now, that Dr. Lane has taken over?

I think those are the only points that I want to make at this stage, Mr. Chairman. I would like to hear from the minister, when he gets a chance, on Harbour Breton and on the plant in Stephenville. Of course, I would be interested in hearing anything else that he has to say also, and

whether he can indicate or whether the Premier can indicate what the position is on fisheries legislation, particularly in view of the fact that we may be finished our work by the end of May.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.P.): Mr. Chairman, we will not finish our work in this session of the House until we deal with the report of the Select Committee that the House ordered to be appointed to deal with the matter of collective bargaining and the procedures for the setting of prices of fish. When the report comes in to the House from the Select Committee, which I hope will be soon. I have a hint that it might be Monday or Tuesday. No? Anyhow, I hope it will be soon. I have no control whatsoever over the Select Committee, of course. The Select Committee insofar as it is insofar as the House controls it, is its own master, and it will make its report and its recommendations, if any, in due course.

The House will receive them, the Government will consider them and the Government will draft legislation and bring it before the House, for the consideration of the House. I cannot say any more than that. It is a frightfully important matter. We are convinced in the Government that there must be collective bargaining for fishermen. We are absolutely convinced of that. Absolutely convinced! If we were not, there would have been no reference to it, no favourable reference to it in the Speech from the Throne. It was outlined in the Speech as one of the matters that the Government would bring before the House in the present session. We brought it before the House in the present session, and it was at our recommendation and our request, our suggestion, that the Select Committee be appointed to hear evidence, to examine witnesses and to make a report.

We believe very strongly, in the Government, in collective bargaining for fishermen. I will tell you why, Mr. Chairman, I will tell you why. After a struggle, of many, many years, we did succeed at last, at long last, at painfully long last, in getting the Government of Canada to agree with this Government that there should be a Salt Codfish Marketing Board that would take over the marketing of all salt codfish produced in

the Province. At long, painfully long last, we got the Government of Canada to agree and this is now being done. This takes care of the substantial proportion of the fish production of our fishermen but not all, only a substantial proportion and there remains, Mr. Chairman, there remains the problem of the remainder of the fish production of our fishermen.

Today they know that there is not a haul-off by merchants or anyone else in the Province on the fish that they salt. They know that now. Every dollar that their salt fish that they produce brings back from the market in Jamaica, Porto Rico, in the West Indies or wherever the fish goes, every dollar that comes back into Newfoundland today, for the salt codfish produced by the fishermen, goes straight into the pockets of the fishermen of Newfoundland. Every dollar and every nickel that comes back from the foreign markets for the fish shipped away comes back, with the deduction only of the cost of doing it. That is all that is deducted. Every dollar that comes back into the Province, for the salt codfish exported, goes into the pockets of the fishermen, after they have deducted the cost of doing it.

That Sir, deals only with a portion of their production. So far as that proportion is concerned, the fishermen now have a satisfaction that they have not had for nearly five hundred years. I do not think that there is any doubt that the fishermen have been exploited down through these centuries. I do not think there is any doubt about it. They have been exploited in their salt codfish. Admittedly, the exploiters themselves failed more frequently than not. They went bankrupt more often than they did not, because, if you read off a long, long list of the names of the salt codfish firms in our history, what you are reading off is a list of names of companies that failed, that went broke, that went out of business. Practically every great name that was ever in the salt codfish business, the business of supplying fishermen, taking their fish, packaging it,

shipping it away to the foreign markets, practically every great name in the salt codfish industry, after exploiting the fishermen, ended up bankrupt anyhow. It is an astounding fact. Astounding! This does not justify their exploitation of the fishermen. They did exploit the fishermen. Do not make any mistake about that, they did for centuries. But, one by one they all went down, in spite of the exploitation. This was, if anything, a very mournful satisfaction to the fishermen, to see their exploiters go broke. This was a mournful satisfaction to Newfoundland, to see the exploiters go bankrupt. But there is no doubt that there was exploitation.

Now there will never be exploitation again, in Newfoundland, of the salt codfish fishermen, of the fishermen who produce salt cod.



MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Exploitation is ended. Every dollar that comes back into the Province, in return for the salt cod fish that is shipped out, goes right into the pockets of the men who produced it, the fishermen, after deducting only the cost of doing it, the cost of packaging it, shipping it, insuring it, delivering it, and so on to the customers in the foreign market.

This is an astounding fact. This I would say is the first time in nearly five hundred years of history in Newfoundland when a large number of primary producers have been emancipated from the curse of exploitation within the Province. I am not saying they are still not being exploited and will not continue to be exploited in the countries where the fish is shipped to. There may still be exploitation there, but here in Newfoundland exploitation of the salt cod fishermen is gone. It is ended. The long night is over.

But Sir, the salt cod fish portion of their production is only a substantial portion, it is not even half, and there remains more than half of their production which they market now as fresh. I am speaking at the moment of cod fish, The same observation, of course, could be made of salmon, of herring, of lobsters, of queen crab and of other species of fish.

Here exploitation is still possible and the least that this House can do, the very least, there is nothing less, nothing smaller that the Government can do, that the House can do for the fishermen of Newfoundland, who are producing fish other than salted fish, the very least we can do is arm them, put the armament in their hands, arm them, arm them to fight their own battles, give them the armament. Give them the tools and they can do the job. What tool? What is their principal tool? Collective bargaining. They have got to be given the right of collective bargaining. If this House were to adjourn, and this will be the last Session of the present Parliament, if this House were to adjourn without passing a law

MR. SMALLWOOD: to give the fishermen of our Province that weapon, that necessary tool, collective bargaining, we should, all of us here in this Chamber, go down to ignominy and disgrace forever. Our names should stink in the nostrils of the people. Our names, all of our names, all of us hear, should stink in the nostrils of the fishermen and all Newfoundlanders who prize justice.

I am not going to make any suggestions to the Select Committee. It would be an inpertinence. It would be an inpertinence and I think quite unparliamentary for this Committee or the whole House, for that matter, to discuss the pros and cons of collective bargaining, once the matter has been referred to a Select Committee. Your Honour would rap me down and Your Honour would be right not to allow any detailed discussion of it. To say that in principle we must have it is, I think, quite in order.

I want to deal with another theme. The theme is this, Mr. Chairman, a man was in my house the night before last, until midnight, and we talked and talked till midnight, the night before last. This man is a Mainlander and in his own field one of the most able men in the whole of Canada. He has occupied extraordinarily high governmental positions. He has never been in elective politics. He has been the Civil Service type, but not really Civil Service. For eighteen months past he has been making a very special survey of Newfoundland's economy and of the prospects, the future of Newfoundland. "Has she got a future?" He has just completed that survey. It is now completed, this week. He completed it this week, this present week. — eighteen months.

One of the things that he studied was our fishery, the fishery of this Province. I have not been so happy about anything in a long time as I was to hear from him, the night before last, that after an intensive study on his part, of eighteen months, he is convinced that there

MR. SMALLWOOD: is a great future yet for the fisheries of this Province.

We have, I think all of us in this House, fluctuated between high optimism and low pessimism about the future of the fishery. You get down very low in spirit, very low, when you remember that there are this afternoon, while I am speaking here and the hon. members are listening, right now at this moment there are a thousand great, modern streamlined efficient fishing vessels in what we always call our waters but which are not in fact our waters at all but the waters surrounding our shore. A thousand. We have, right on the Island here, we have fairly good, pretty good, pretty modern, fairly reasonably modern fishing ships. What have we got? We would not have one hundred. Monroe's Fishery Products would have what? Twenty, no. What? A dozen? Twenty, I would say. Well we will take them all as they are. Twenty for the biggest firm we have in the Province. Twenty. Marystown has eight, ten - thirty. Bonavista Cold Storage twelve. Sixty-seven? The Minister of Fisheries tells me sixty-seven draggers. Sixty-seven in the whole Province. Taking them all, sixty-seven draggers. All right make it seventy-seven or eighty-seven, the whole point is, make it one hundred if you like and there are not one hundred, nothing like one hundred, out of one thousand, that vast fleet, if we were to see that fleet of one thousand ships, two things would strike us; that the Newfoundland ships were the smallest the slowest, the least powerful, with a few exceptions now, There are a few larger and more powerful draggers but speaking generally, our sixty, seventy, eighty draggers, stacked up against the great fleet of one thousand, would be the smallest, the slowest, the weakest, and the other nine hundred and something would be, all of them, faster, bigger, more efficient and some of them vast factory ships (with a crew of what) with two hundred men aboard, men and women, great floating factories, served by a small fleet of their own catchers, and carriers, catching, dragging

MR. SMALLWOOD: bringing in the fish to the factories, not taking it back home to the Soviet Union, not taking it home to Japan, not taking it home to Poland, not taking it home to East Germany, not taking it home to West Germany, not taking it home to Scotland, not taking it home to England, not taking it home to Spain or Portugal or Italy, not taking it home to the United States but right there out on the water processing the fish, doing the same thing that our plants are doing on dry land in here. Great floating factories, when you think of that, Mr. Chairman, and when you think of the vast quantities of fish they are taking, Mr. Chairman, and when you think of the way the stocks of fish are dwindling, the vast volumes, the thousands, the hundreds of thousands of tons that they are taking, when you see that, it reduces you to a mood of dark pessimism and you say to yourself; "how long can that last?" And you say to yourself, "our poor devils, our poor devils were poking two or three miles off from the landwash. Our poor fellows, with their little boats poking off-two, three, five miles is half way across the Atlantic-in their small inshore, sedentary fishing boats." What is going to happen to them? You feel very, very, dark and gloomy indeed and I have had my moments of dark gloom, as a Newfoundlander, not as a politician just as a man, my moments of dark gloom, as I thought of the future of our fishing industry.

On the other hand, on the other hand, Sir, I cannot help wondering whether a modern fish plant here on our shore, equipped by six, eight, ten, twenty, draggers, with a turn-around of a week at the most, seven days. How many? Eleven day turn-around. No, but I do not mean counting the days they are in port, I am talking about the time they go out until they are back with a load. How many days? All right, from the time they are loaded, depending upon where they are, if they are down off the coast of Labrador it takes longer, but generally speaking from the time a dragger is ready to come back to port, how long does it take her to get back? A day? It depends upon where she is.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I cannot help wondering if modern plants here in Newfoundland, equipped by draggers with a ten or eleven day turn-around, could not compete successfully with ships that come three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nine, ten, eleven, twelve, thirteen, fourteen thousand miles each way. Have we not advantages over them? Must we always be inferior to them?

Of course one of the troubles is the fact that in the Councils of our Nation, Canada, the whole of Newfoundland is only half a million souls, the whole Province. And in that Province of half a million souls, the fishermen and their families, their wives and children, their sons and daughters, the fishermen, all together, number one hundred and fifty thousand, two hundred thousand, men, women and children. In the Councils of our Nation, in the Councils of the land, I can imagine, I can well imagine a Cabinet, a harassed Cabinet, wrestling and dealing daily with problems of the most tormenting character and of the most momentous character, matters so profoundly vital and fundamental to the life and the future of all Canada, I can imagine that Government not being able, even in good faith, to find the time that is needed to be devoted to thorough-going consideration of the fishing industry, which is one per cent of the Canadian economy, a little more than one per cent. That is one of the difficulties. That is one of the troubles. One of the troubles is that.

Mr. Chairman, the Government of Canada are about to spend \$1,000 million, a billion dollars, on two airports. They are going to put a great new airport in Montreal and another great new airport in Toronto. One thousand million or a bit more than that, the way things escalate I would say that, if they figure it is going to be \$1,000 million it will be \$1,100 million or \$1,200 million. \$500 million, or \$600 million for each of two airports. A Government that can spend money like that thinks they are being wonderfully generous, wonderfully generous, wonderfully daring and imaginative, when they fling \$ 5 million,



MR. SMALLWOOD: \$6 million, \$8 million, \$10 million, \$20 million, to the fishery, to the development of the fishery. That is one of the discouraging elements in this picture. When we look at the future of the fisheries in Newfoundland, we cannot really depend, no matter what Government are in office now, what administration at Ottawa, Liberal or Tory.

Indeed Sir, I find an increasing tendency at Ottawa, in all parties, to down grade the production and processing of all kinds of food, and perhaps there is a logical reason for that. If it is correct, as I am told it is, that the Government of Canada, for countless years have been lashing out some hundreds of millions of dollars each year to subsidize the dairy farmers, producers of milk and cheese and butter, hundreds of millions of dollars a year and that there was a suggestion that they would buy out all the dairy farmers of Canada, buy them out, lock, stock and barrel, and pay generously for their property and put them out of business, leaving the production of dairy products in the hands of a relatively small number of very large factory-like farms and that they could do this across Canada and it would cost them, to do it, perhaps the amount of the subsidy for one year. And that, thereafter there would be no subsidy, because it would not be needed by these vast factory-like, vertical, farm industries, farm industrial establishments.

I also find an increasing tendency in Ottawa and indeed it is to be found all over North America, an increasing tendency to .....

God in Heaven, Mr. Chairman, I do not see it! I just cannot see it. I just cannot see it. To take the attitude that service industries are important, hotels, motels, all kinds of things, beauty parlors, barber shops, gas stations, garages, services industries they call them.

To begin with, they should not be called service industries. They are not industries. Call them service establishments, service



MR. SMALLWOOD: ventures but not industries. There is nothing industrial about them.

We are told that increasingly the people of Canada and the people of the United States will be employed more and more, increasingly, ever more and more, on a higher and higher proportion all the time, in a service industry.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

That sounds to me like living or trying to live by taking in each others washing. Does there not have to be basic production? Now I know, I know, I am afraid, all too well, that the development of agriculture has been such that one man, one single individual man today can produce as much farm produce as one hundred used to do say fifty years ago, one man. The same thing is happening there as is happening in industry itself. The productivity of one man in the United States in a factory is as the productivity of say two hundred or three hundred men fifty years ago. The ruthless and the relentless scrapping of machinery, no matter how new it is, if there is a newer one and a better one, throw them out, bring them in, the latest thing there is. This policy has given the productivity to each individual industrial worker. One worker today, with that kind of backup, industrial backup, can produce as much footwear, clothes, neckties, carpet, furniture, anything you would like to mention, motor cars, as much today as two hundred men produced fifty or sixty years ago.

MR. NEARY: It has been forecast that by the year 1985 fifteen per-cent of the population in the United States will be able to produce all the goods that are now produced by eighty per-cent.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In 1985, fifteen years from now, fifteen persons out of one hundred in the United States will be able to produce all that is now produced by say eighty per-cent or whatever the number is today.

MR. NEARY: Three days.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Three days. What in God's name is three days. At that rate of productivity, in three days work they would produce a years needs. In six months, a days work a year, not three days, and half a day in the end.

MR. NEARY: They tell us in Canada that by the year 2000 only seventy-five per-cent -

MR. SMALLWOOD: But in the meantime, while that psychology is occupying the minds and filling the souls of statesmen, what are we doing down here? We

MR. SMALLWOOD:

are just a poor little backwoods with a crowd of fishermen. It is going to be awfully tough to get Ottawa and the great statesmen of Canada to take a lively, a really lively interest in an industry that they probably feel is doomed anyhow. But, Sir, if it is doomed, and I am not going to say it is not, I am not convinced that it is not doomed. Is the hon. gentleman?

AN HON. MEMBER: Not fully.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Not fully convinced that it is not doomed and not convinced that it is doomed. There is a big question mark, is there not? There is a great, big question mark that fills the sky over Newfoundland today, a great question mark. That question mark is more vital for us than it is for anyone else in Canada, and that is; "what is the future of the fisheries?" But even if you assume that it is doomed, it is not going to be doomed next week, next year, next decade, next twenty-five years. I would venture to say that the youngest grandchild I have will have grandchildren and there will still be a fishing industry in this Province. Now I say that, but it is going to be a terribly uphill fight all the way. terribly uphill fight. I am convinced that long after I am dead there will still be a fishing industry in Newfoundland. Therefore it behooves all of us, who are the law makers of the land and especially the Government, to do everything in our power to advance the fishery and in doing that do not look upon the fishery as a sort of abstract something, as a sort of detached something standing off at a distance. The fishery is the fishermen. That is what the fishery is. It is a crowd of men who have wives and children. They are family men. They are our citizens. They are the voters. They are the people of Newfoundland. That is what the fishery is. It is a crowd of men, fishermen who have their living to make. That is why we must never, never begrudge time or attention or money or anything else we have that we can put behind them.

Mr. Chairman, there is one other thing left for me to say and that is in connection with International Fisheries. Dr. Frank Lane was the President

MR. SMALLWOOD:

and General Manager of the Grace Fish Empire in South America, Chile and Peru, They have a vast enterprise down there, making fish meal and fish oil from anchovies, taken in the fantastic Humboldt Current. They set up these great plants and put in these great fleets of ships and they took the fish out of that current in thousands upon thousands of tons and brought the fish ashore and made fish meal and oil of them. Sir, the sales of fish meal skyrocketed. The increase for fifteen years, the increase percentage increase in the sale of fish meal in Europe was eighteen per-cent a year compounded. Just think of that. Why would this be? Why would Europe be buying every year eighteen per-cent more fish meal than they did the year before for fifteen years? Why? I will tell you why. Because the eating habits of the entire population of Europe changed from being eaters of potatos and cereals and they were the world's greatest consumers of cereals and vegetables, a very low protein food. They turned since the war and the war had something to do with causing it. I would say that United States servicemen stationed in Europe had an awful lot to do with starting it but the people of Europe began to eat meat, pork and chicken and the population of hogs, beef cattle and sheep and chicken, broilers in Europe, the population skyrocketed phenomenally.

But, Sir, you cannot do that without having fish meal or meat meal. You have to have a high protein concentrate and as the people of Europe ate more meats, the population of the animals and birds increased phenomenally and the consumption of fish meal increased phenomenally. I have already said how phenomenally - eighteen per-cent compounded each year for fifteen years. The result was that down in Peru and in Chile the manufacture of fish meal skyrocketed as well until the inevitable happened. What was the inevitable? The inevitable was a sharp decline in the bodies of fish in the water, the stocks of fish, with the result that W.R. Grace decided to go out of that business altogether and to concentrate more heavily than ever

MR. SMALLWOOD:

on petro-chemicals, petro and other chemicals. They have now become one of the great firms in the world manufacturing chemicals and they have gone out of fish altogether. What happened to their company? Their company, Sir, was bought by Dr. Frank Lane, their general manager.

Now when Litton Industries of California and W.R. Grace came to Newfoundland, with the backing, at the invitation of the Newfoundland Government and with the Government's backing, and engaged in the building and operation of a pilot plant, and that is all it was a pilot plant which, if the the pilot experiment had succeeded would have been followed by a big plant. It has turned out to be a pretty lucky thing that it did not succeed because, if it had succeeded, that process, the resojet process, they would now have had a huge plant and right now at this time all of us in Newfoundland are thinking very hard about the idea of taking any more herring out of the water, even taking as many as we are taking out, and reducing them to animal and poultry feed. This is only because there suddenly had cropped up, a couple of years ago, a big market for direct human consumption herring. It is all for human consumption. There are two ways to feed herring to human beings: you can reduce the herring to meal, you can feed the meal to animals, to cattle, to sheep, to hogs, to poultry and you eat the poultry and the hogs so you are eating the fish meal, but you are eating it in the form of flesh or eggs or pork chops, or you can feed the herring direct to the human being.

So I object when I hear people say that the herring production that is going on now is for human consumption. All the herring that is produced today is for human consumption. The herring that goes into the great reduction plants or the herring that goes into the packing plants is all for human consumption. Some of it is direct and some of it is indirect. We do not want to see any more, for the time being, any more direct reduction plants. We would rather see more, more jobs, more employment, smaller men catching herring and making a living out of it, more men and women employed on land

MR. SMALLWOOD:

doing the packing. This gets better returns for us.

But, Sir, let me remind the Committee of this, that that market that has suddenly risen up for direct consumption of herring, that market is not a permanent market, it is not permanently established. It arose suddenly out of nothing, out of nothing. Today it was not here and tomorrow they were flocking over here from Europe begging and coaxing people in Newfoundland to sell herring to them. That was only three years ago. That market is not permanent, unfortunately. I wish it were. Perhaps it could be made permanent, perhaps. Perhaps customers can be found all over Europe, over the world, in the near East, in the middle East, in the far East perhaps. Perhaps that can be done and if it can be done, Mr. Chairman, it is going to be done by the kind of enterprise that Dr. Lane is now starting in Stephenville. Now what is that?

Dr. Lane bought out the Grace Fishing Empire in South America and then he bought out Litton and Grace at Stephenville. He also bought out that fascinating operation in Cape Breton. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what is wrong with us here in Newfoundland. I do not know what is wrong with us. In some ways we are a crowd of ignoramuses. Do you know that ninety miles away or about ninety miles away from Port aux Basques, just across the gulf in Cape Breton, do you know that there is a great fish farm which is producing salmon and trout, Atlantic salmon in captivity and trout in millions of dollars worth each year? I never knew it until Dr. Lane was in and brought me in a whole raft of large photographs. He has bought this place now and he is putting two or three million dollars into it and he is enlarging it enormously. Photographs of the ponds, the ponds are heated in the winter and they are raising enormous quantities of salmon and trout. What in the name of God is wrong with us in Newfoundland? Why were we not doing that?

I looked reproachfully at him and I said, "Do not keep coming in



MR. SMALLWOOD:

to me, to my office, and telling me about your enterprises in Peru and Chile and Cape Breton. If you want co-operation from the Newfoundland Government, you get cracking and do that kind of thing here." Well, he said, "Premier do not worry when we have begun to make money out of it in Cape Breton we will do the same thing in Newfoundland." This Dr. Lane is a typical American go-getter, not quite typical because he is a doctor of science I think or a doctor of philosophy or a doctor of something. He is a highly educated university man and a man of tremendous drive and energy.

Now he is starting a plant out there, the Minister of Economic Development can tell me, it is going to be completed when, the building?

MR. NOLAN: In October.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In October. It is what, two or three hundred feet long by fifty or eighty feet wide and they are going to employ a couple of hundred people in it. This is a plant that will be as modern as anything in this Continent of North America and they have a magnificent brand "King Oscar," the King Oscar, King Oscar brand of canned food of various kinds. This is what I would like to see. I would like to see more of that and we can use our herring to supply plants like that rather than reduction plants, The amount of employment it can create is terrific, it is enormous. You might end up by having a thousand or a couple of thousand people working in a few plants like that, and God knows you have three billion people in the world who have to eat, three thousand million people and they have to have food and it is getting to be an awful problem to feed the people of the earth, a terrible problem.

Now I do not know how many members of the Committee have read that book that came out about a year ago saying that by 1978 or 1980 mankind would begin to drop off like flies, from hunger, as there would not be enough food on the earth to keep them alive. Then they say, "Oh but these two authors, these are two men with the Department of Agriculture, in the Government of

MR. SMALLWOOD:

the United States at Washington. These are two of the world's two great experts and each one of them has an enormous amount of experience because each one of them has been stationed in half a dozen countries for the United States Government and they are two of the world's great experts." They say in reply to anyone who says, "Oh, what are you talking about?" "Look at all the land, look at all the land, the arable land there is around that can be used to produce food." They take the figures and they would turn your blood cold. The amount of land that is in the, there is no land left in India, none left, hardly an acre and they have six hundred million people there, six hundred million stomachs.

AN HON. MEMBER: About two-thirds of them starving.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Maybe not two-thirds but millions of them starving, and no more land. China, every inch of land in China, which is one quarter of the land surface of the globe, containing one quarter of mankind, there is not another acre to be got in all of China. As you go over the continent of Europe, do you know what they do in the continent of Europe? Do you know what they do in West Germany? As you drive along through the country roads in West German, believe it or not, believe it or not, outside the fence, toward the road on both sides of the road, they plant along the sides and they lease, it is public land, they lease it from the nearest Governmental authority and they lease it for so many years and they cultivate the land along the side of the road. It is incredible the amount of land that has been taken under cultivation and with the population, we have gone from two billion to three billion. There are a thousand million more people living on the earth, in spite of two world wars, a thousand million more in the last thirty years and, with the growth of population and the exhaustion of the amount of available land to produce food, obviously food must come from the ocean.

There would be no trouble to sell herring, if we can get people with

MR. SMALLWOOD:

the guts and the know-how and the drive and the ambition and the experience to establish places like that. However, there has never been a year in this House since I was Premier when I did not discuss the fisheries. One year I spent five days, but I am not going to do it this year. I spent five days, every day for five days, every sitting of the House for five days I spoke on the fisheries. Do you think I exhausted the subject then? By no means and I am not going to take five days or five hours or anymore than another three minutes discussing the fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Are you going to answer the question before you sit down?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What was the question?

MR. CROSBIE: The question was about our million and one half dollar investment on that plant.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, the investment is still there.

MR. CROSBIE: Are they going to give it back to us?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The investment is there and we will get every dollar of it back. There was one million one hundred thousand

Mr. Smallwood.

dollars of it, I think it was. It was \$1.1 million or \$1 million something that we paid to buy those ships. Those ships are worth more money now than we paid for them. They are there. We rented them, which is a good thing for us to do. We have rented them to Dr. Lane. He has bought one. He has now got three. These are manned with Newfoundlanders, I believe. I think he has a couple of Norwegian captains, if I am not mistaken. He did have, I think he may still have. These are manned by Newfoundlanders - three ships. These three ships, with Newfoundlanders, will supply the plant with 200 people, with jobs for 200 Newfoundlanders. So I do not think we could do much better than rent those ships to that company, to Dr. Lane's Company. I think that is a good, wise thing for us to do.

MR. CROSBIE: What about the building?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The building is going to be entirely new. He is putting up a new building.

MR. CROSBIE: He is not going to use the old one at all?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Oh, I daresay he will use the old one as well. Yes, I have no doubt he will. In fact, if I am not mistaken, I really have not been out there. The minister who represents that district is on his way out there. He is not in the Chamber at the moment. If I could turn to him and ask if the new building is going to be attached to the present building, I do not know. I cannot answer that. But I would say this, that we will get our money back, every dollar of it. But I would be willing to lose, for the Treasury of this Province, to lose that \$1.5 million and never see another cent of it on earth, provided it resulted in 200 jobs. That is pretty cheap. I mean 200 jobs for \$1.5 million. That is very, very cheap. That would be one of the cheapest things ever done across Canada today. It takes an awful lot of capital per man, per job to produce jobs. It is frightening. It is utterly frightening. It gets worse every year and every day, because all industry today is getting capital intensive and labour light. Loads and loads of capital is needed and employing fewer and fewer people. What the end of it all is going to be, I do not know. I think that is all I wanted to say

MR. SMALLWOOD.

about the fisheries, but do not forget the one essential thing, Mr. Chairman, that this House has to do before it closes, we have to bring in Collective Bargaining Legislation for the fishermen of Newfoundland. If we do not, our names will deserve to stink in the nostrils of the people.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make a few comments, before this vote passes. I listened with interest to the Premier when he says that Newfoundland fishermen were bled. I suppose he refers to the fish merchants when he makes that statement. I think, Sir, something else has to be said. There is no group of people in the Province that have not been bluffed more than the Newfoundland fishermen. There is no group of people Mr. Chairman that are not batted about more than the Newfoundland fishermen, especially in an election year. One would hope, Sir, that we are not going to embark on something of that nature this year. One would hope, Mr. Chairman, that this year, instead of just paying lip service to the Newfoundland fishery, we are going to see some action. One would hope that we will see more than we have seen in the past.

One of the things, Mr. Chairman, which I would like to comment on especially is the salmon fishery and the changes that have been made in the regulations pertaining to that fishery. There appears, Mr. Chairman, to be little or no co-operation or co-ordination between this Province and the Federal Government, as it relates to the salmon fishery at least. Whatever about the fishing industry as a whole, there certainly does not appear to be much liaison as it applies to the salmon fishery. The reason I say that, Mr. Chairman, is because of the changes that have been made. A little while ago the Federal Fisheries Minister introduced a Bill in the House of Commons, changing the regulations pertaining to the salmon fishery. The big reason Mr. Chairman was for conservation purposes. One of the sections of that Bill, one of the requirements for a licence, that a fisherman had to prove that he was a bona fide fisherman. Now, Mr. Chairman, if there had been the proper kind of liaison between this Province and Mr. Davis, there certainly would have been some changes in that regulation, in that section of that Bill



Mr. Hickey.

because any one who knows anything about the Newfoundland fishery as it relates to the salmon realizes only too well that the number of salmon fishermen or the number of people fishing for salmon who are bona fide, under that regulation, meaning that they depend on it solely and wholly for a livelihood, are few and far between, if there are any. But, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Davis does not worry about that. No, Mr. Chairman, Mr. Davis is concerned with British Columbia, his home province, and rightly so. Why should he not be, if he can get away with it? He all but got away with it. British Columbia, as everyone knows, they are full-time salmon fishermen but, as I said, how many are there in Newfoundland? Mr. Chairman, people who fished last year as part of the crew, as a member of the crew, this year cannot get a licence. They probably will get one before it is finished, but I know several who do not have one yet. What kind of representation was made by the Provincial Government, or was there any consultation with this Government before this Bill was introduced in the House of Commons? If there was not, one obviously has to ask why? Is there such a poor relationship existing between Federal Cabinet Ministers and this Government that they do not even bother to let us know what their plans are, to let us know when they are going to bring in new Acts, new legislation that is going to affect the very lives of our people? Is this the kind of relationship that exists? It is nothing short of shameful, Mr. Chairman, when the real truth comes out, as it applies to this Bill. The whole purpose of it, as I have said, is for conservation. The whole reason for it is because of the Danish Fleet and others who have been fishing for salmon. But, Mr. Chairman, are there any changes that effect those people? I can certainly say there are not. As I understand it, negotiations have not even begun. The Dains are still free to come into our waters and fish for salmon and deplete the stock. Who bears the brunt of it, Mr. Chairman? Our own fishermen, either part-time or full-time. Our own people who depend heartily on the salmon fishery for a livelihood. This is what we are having rammed down our throats. This was the "Just Society" that Mr. Trudeau refers to.

One group of people are responsible for the destruction of our salmon stocks. We let them go scot free and we nail the Newfoundland



Mr. Hickey.

fishermen and all the other fishermen in the Atlantic Provinces. We tell them to go to hell, if they want to fish for salmon. The remarks by the Premier with regards to this doctor are very interesting indeed. I can assure him, Mr. Chariman, that the only place that some of our fishermen, who normally fish for salmon this year, would get salmon, would be in one of those ponds that the Premier referred to. I am afraid that they would have to raise them. They certainly will not get them in nets anymore, as they did in the past.

It is all but amazing, Sir, to sit in this hon. House and not hear one word uttered by hon. members with regards to this particular problem.

MR. BARBOUR: No!

MR. HICKEY: How many hon. members are in this House, Mr. Chairman, who do not have a fair number of people who depend either partly or wholly on the salmon fishery?

MR. SMALLWOOD: What the hon. gentleman has to say about me, say it to my face now.

MR. HICKEY: I have already said it, Mr. Chairman. I am well aware of the fact that while I speak here and if the Premier is out of the Chamber, he hears what I say. He is also well aware..

MR. SMALLWOOD: I did not.

MR. HICKEY: He is also well aware that I do not talk behind anybody's back. He is also well aware of that.

I was just saying how the Newfoundland fishermen are being bluffed down through the years.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What did the hon. gentleman say about me?

MR. HICKEY: The Premier is head of the Government, so if they are being bluffed by the Government, I guess they must be being bluffed by the Premier. Does the Premier admit that?

MR. SMALLWOOD: That is right. If one is true the other one is - but is one true?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, I would like for the minister to..

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is that all?

MR. HICKEY: I would like for the minister to inform the House as to just what his department plans to do with regards to those new regulations. I know there are some changes, temporary changes, but what about next year? Those people who are given licences this year, who could not get them three weeks ago, two weeks ago, because of the new legislation, have been given those licences, have been issued those licences, Mr. Chairman ( I am sure the minister is well aware of this just as well as I am ) just to cool off the situation, just to take the heat off. There are no definite changes being made, as far as I can determine. Next year we will have this same problem again.

Now, Mr. Chairman, if the Premier wishes to do something for the Newfoundland fishermen, and one is lead to believe that he would like to, why does he not camp on the doorstep of Mr. Davis and remind him that there is another part of the country besides British Columbia? Why does he not do that? He has gone to the seal hunt. Now let him go to the Federal Department of Fisheries at Ottawa. Let him go and remind Mr Davis that we too are Canadian citizens down here. We are not about to stand for this foolishness, this kind of injustice, this infringement upon our right which was enjoyed for so many years. Let him bring all of this back and drive it home to the Federal Fisheries Minister. He might also remind Mr. Trudeau that when he comes to the people again for a mandate, he may not find them so quick to even give him what they got the last time, much less elect any M.P.'s.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Come on! Come on! The hon. gentleman does not have to worry about Trudeau, let him worry about himself.

MR. HICKEY: I am not a bit concerned about myself, Mr. Chairman.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No? Are you giving up altogether? Have you lost all hope?

MR. HICKEY: The Premier might be interested in one thing. I did a little investigating on what he told me about this ..

MR. NEARY: You better watch "Howdy Doody."

MR. HICKEY: Do you know what I found?

MR. SMALLWOOD: No!

MR. HICKEY: I found a whole pack and they were all Liberals. Is not that something?

MR. NEARY: Keep your eye on "Howdy Doody."

MR. HICKEY: They were all Liberals, Mr. Chairman. That should answer that question.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In that case, the hon. gentleman better go Liberal.

MR. HICKEY: It is no good, Mr. Chairman, for the Premier to try to smoothen this off by talking politics. It is really no joke. I will issue him an invitation right now that he can attend a meeting that is on tonight with regards to salmon net licences.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Is it going to be a monster?

MR. HICKEY: It will be a meeting Mr. Chairman. It is unfortunate, you know, that there are sections in my district that are not compared to the great metropolis that the Premier might represent. They are not all capital cities.

MR. NEARY: What about the moonlighters?

MR. HICKEY: There are some small communities.

MR. NEARY: Tell us about the moonlighters?

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Chairman, they are all part of this Province that the Premier supposedly loves so much. They are all very important people. He has a standing invitation from me right now to come to this meeting tonight and use the kind of humour that he uses with me, relative to this subject. I would like to have Mr. Davis there also. I imagine they would have some plans for him. He would know all about the Atlantic Salmon. He might run into a few. You do not...

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKEY: Never mind the hon. member, he is well able to take care of himself and in due course he will probably let the hon. minister and everyone else know how he plans on doing just that. One just does not slap people in the face

MR. HICKEY.

Mr. Chairman, as those people or fishermen have been, and get away with it. The Premier is about to go to the people of Newfoundland this year in an election. One thing should be foremost in his mind. I will make the prediction that never before will there be as many fishermen vote against the Government, as this year. They are now well aware that they have been used. They have been bluffed. Really, Mr. Chairman, the Newfoundland fishery requires a little more than lip service. It is not enough, as the Premier said a few minutes ago, to talk for five days in this hon. House. That does not put any money into people's pockets. We want some action for the Newfoundland fishery, not talk. There has been too much of that. I think it is about time that we had some action. There is no better year, Mr. Chairman, for this Government to start than this one.

MR. HICKMAN: I must be allowed to speak, too, everyone else has been allowed.

Mr. Chairman, in the - it is not as nice as the tie that the hon. member got down in Louisiana but I do my best. In talking about the fishery, I am in complete concurrence with the remarks that the Premier made concerning the decline or the dismay that has faced all legislatures, on this Island, whenever we discuss the fisheries. I do not know - it is always a very easy thing to criticize fishery policy and fishery planning. Part of it is obviously true. Part of it, I suggest, in the history of this Province, has been out of desperation if for no other reason. When you try one plan and it does not work, you try another but always you are under the control of the consumer in foreign markets. The other is the natural reluctance that we have had to cope with in Newfoundland, on the part of many of our fishermen, to change.

In my opinion we must place emphasis on the inshore fishery. It is only lately that we have been shifting

MR. HICKMAN: the emphasis in a planned concentrated effort, on the offshore fishery, which is now landing certainly half of the total fish landing in this Province. Mr. Chairman, when we are looking at the fishery, there are some facts which come from DBS, which may be rather interesting. This is the value of the product for the fishing industry in relation to that of other export oriented industries in Newfoundland, from the period 1955 to 1967. Each year it has been declining and in 1967 only 15.3 percent of the value of the export products from this Province was fishing, as opposed to 66.3 percent mining and 18.3 percent pulp and paper.

Now obviously, Mr. Chairman, with the number of fishermen declining each year that, if the fishery is going to maintain even the present 15.3 percentage of the total export product, that we are going to have some massive infusion right now into our offshore and mid-water fishing.

Mr. Chairman, when we talk about the few draggers that we have out fishing off our shores now, let me remind this committee that we have remained in a pretty much static position with respect to draggers since the fleet for the Marystown plant went into operation about four or five years ago. There are no real signs that there will be any substantial addition or replacement to the fleet this year. I know of only two new draggers coming into the fleet this year and in effect these draggers are to replace old worn out ships.

If we are going to maintain the productivity, the fish landings, from the offshore fishery next year and the year after and the year after that, we have had during the past two or three years, and they have been in decline during that period, we are going to need anywhere from twenty-seven to forty new stern draggers, costing well in excess of \$1 million, added to our fleet during this time. This is where we need some overall policy on the part of Government and on the part of the Department of Fisheries. We just cannot sit back and wait until the price of fish suddenly escalates and then go in and bring in National Food or National Sea Products and say that our troubles are all over. Our troubles have not even started, and we may not be able to contemplate or



MR. HICKMAN: take care of the troubles that one has to meet with a fluctuating market. But the troubles, as far as production are concerned, are quite predictable. Everyone knows and I know the hon. the Minister of Fisheries could predict this to his officials as well as anyone else, they can predict what the requirements of the offshore fleet will be in the next two years. But nothing is happening. I would like the hon. the minister, we have not heard from the hon. minister yet, and I still submit that it is the minister putting through the estimates should make the answers.

I would like to hear the hon. minister give us a report as to what is happening on the two National sea trawlers to be built in Marystown. There is an article carried in today's, (not today's) but the one that arrived today "Toronto Globe and Mail," Thursday, May 13, confirming that national sea products of Halifax have now placed orders with three east coast shipyards for six, 150 ft stern trawlers, costing a total of \$12 million, two at Halifax, two at Pictou, and two at Newfoundland Marine Works. I realize that, but what I would like to hear is, because a month and a-half ago, when we were debating the Marystown Bill, the Marystown Shipyard Bill or the National Sea Products Bill, I was under the impression that the word was "go" then. But, if now we are in a position where the orders have just been firmed up, the word is not going to be "go" for a while yet. Because as the hon. the member for Placentia West knows, there is a great deal of recruitment has to go on to bring in the skilled supervisory personnel that are necessary to make this yard not just viable for two draggers but viable for the continuing viable and competitive, insofar as world fleets are concerned.

I subscribed to a magazine called "World Fishing," when you thumb through this magazine, Mr. Chairman, you know you would almost get frightened to death, when you look at the new draggers, the stern draggers that are being built in European yards, and when you find now that every European yard is and has been for the past six months to twelve months booked to capacity insofar as building ships are concerned, of all sizes and draggers, and you name it.



MR. HICKMAN: I am wondering, you know, how much longer can we allow this magnificent plant at Marystown to remain as a repair yard, as it has for the last couple of years? There is something more to it than simply saying we are going to expand it. My goodness, surely people should have been scrambling off, beating all over Europe and all over Canada this last year and a-half, trying to sell the product of that yard, trying to sell draggers. You just cannot sit there and wait until the orders come to you. You cannot sit and wait until somebody comes along to buy Ross Steers and say we are going to build a couple of draggers this year. It is totally inexcusable that eighteen months have expired since the fish trades made known, and it was made known in this House, starting last year they required twenty-seven new draggers, and not one order has been placed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, the hon. the Premier in his comments said that he has grave fears that the Federal Government and that the parliamentarians in Ottawa are not too concerned about Newfoundland fishermen and are not too concerned about food producers in Canada generally. This may very well be, that the majority of the voters are urban rather than rural. But, whatever it is, I think this points up very clearly the absolute responsibility that is placed on the few Newfoundlanders we have up in Ottawa, to scream night and day to bring to the attention of the Government of Canada and Parliament the needs of our few fishermen in this Province, when you compare them to the total population or even the total producing population of Canada. It ill-behooves anyone in this House or anyone in this Province to fault any member, I do not care what side of the House he sits on, for making the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa uncomfortable. Because, if he does not do it, then the Premier's worst fears are bound to come to fruition. We have seen it over the years, in 1953 there was a little activity on the part of the Federal Government, following the Walsh Commission. In 1962, or whenever it was that Mr. Pearson became Prime Minister, there again was some activity for a little while, and again it declined. Now we have a Government that is very economy minded, oriented, that look primarily at any investment they made in

MR. HICKMAN: industry, as to what the returns are going to be. As Mr. Kieran's says; seems to lost sight of the benefits that accrue from a job or a labour intensive industry.

The fact is, Mr. Chairman, that for every fishermen on the deck of a dragger sailing out of a Newfoundland port today, three men and women, three persons are working on shore in the fish plant. It is slightly in excess of three, the ratio is. Now that the Kennedy tariffs have been implemented, that ratio can very easily and very quickly go to five, if not six persons for every man, for every primary producer that is operating on board a trawler.

There use to be an excuse, there used to be some justification in saying that we had to sell our product in cod block or blocks, or some other way, to the American market, because the great lobby in New England would not allow it otherwise. But, the fact now is that obstacle has been removed. There has been some effort on the part of Fishery Products in Burin, to set up the breadding and cooking plant that is now required. But what is so unreasonable for us to insist, if you want to make money available, if the Government wants to find an industry in which to put money, if it wants to find a labour intensive industry that will provide far more jobs than any of the industries - presently on the planning board, then I suggest one way to do it is make money available to our fish companies to get into the final processing of their product in this Province and on this shore, now that they have no more impediment insofar as exporting to the United States is concerned.

Mr. Chairman, again, when we are talking about the income that Nova Scotians, not talking about the fish farms of Cape Britian but the income that Nova Scotia fishermen make, as compared to ours - and there is a difference. People will often ask, why is it a big difference? I suggest to this committee that one of the reasons that the Nova Scotian fishermen had been able to get into the fresh fish market of Upper Canada and the Eastern States and we have not, with the exception of the Port Aux Basques area, there we get back to one of the key factors in the development of this Province and that is transportation.

I believe that we can get into the fresh fish market in the United States and Upper Canada with a bit more imaginative transportation policy on the part

MR. HICKMAN: of the Canadian National Railways. Two years ago or less, the present Minister of Transport set up a Transportation Commission or a Transport Committee, headed by a Newfoundlander and comprised mostly of Newfoundlanders, to take a look at the C.N. operations on the South Coast. A little over a year ago, about sixteen months ago, when this House was in session anyway, there were several briefs and submissions made to this commission and one was made by the Joint Councils of the Burin Peninsula. That brief set forth, I thought, a very imaginative and realistic recommendation. That was that the ferry service that now operates between North Sydney and Argentia, the "Ambrose Shea," should make a port, on the Burin Peninsula one of its regular ports of call. When this was first mooted, the emphasis was on convenience to the travelling public and to the tourist industry on the Peninsula, and the impact there would be very substantial.

But there is another impact that would far out-weigh the benefit that the tourist trade will have in that area. That is, if that ship will call into a port on the Burin Peninsula, and it would have to be most likely either Burin or Marystown, maybe St. Lawrence but most likely Burin or Marystown, twice a week, we can get into the fresh fish market in Upper Canada and in Eastern United States, the same way as the Harding plant and the other plant in Port aux Basques are availing of the Carson and the ferry service across the Gulf. We can do it by way of reaper trucks. This makes a fantastic difference-

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: That recommendation has been made and, as I say, it is contained in the brief of the Joint Council of the Burin Peninsula to this Committee. The hon. the senior member for Harbour Main last year suggested that the appointment of that committee was a great forward step and he expected great things. What none of us anticipated is that the committee would finish its

MR. HICKMAN: report last September or earlier and we have not heard a word about it since. There has been an attempt to have it tabled in the House of Commons, unsuccessfully. The only recommendation that we have heard from were some recommendations, interim recommendations made in June of last year, concerning the schedule of the coastal boats between Terrenceville and Port aux Basques.

If we believe what we say, and if we mean what we say, that the efforts to improve the fishery of this Province transcend political party, and if we accept what the Premier says, that any man worth his salt, standing in this House should be groping for ways and means to help the fisheries of this Province, then obviously something should be heard from this legislature and from the Government on the question of transportation of our fishery products out of this Province. We just cannot sit by and let this continue year after year and eventually enough pressure builds up and somebody in Ottawa says, "now, we better do something down there on the South Coast and see if we can put on another boat. That will keep them quite for another couple of years."

We are not asking for hand outs. This is not a question of going up and saying; "give us more social assistance. Give us more (whatever you call it)" regional disparity grant." This is simply saying; "give us an opportunity where we can contribute to your Treasury, as well as to our own." Mr. Chairman, I do not want, I do not intend to go over the various debates that we had in this House insofar as conservation of our fisheries are concerned. We suffered for the longest time under the excuse from Ottawa that it was not in the best interest of Newfoundland fishermen for Ottawa to embark on a course of gunboat diplomacy. But, it has been made abundantly clear now, events have made it abundantly clear to all of us that, whether it is going to be gunboat diplomacy or not, slow, tortuous, international negotiations will not solve the problem of the fishermen of this Province and will not protect our traditional fishing area.

MR. HICKMAN: I suggest, and I know I have suggested it before, but again I suggest it, in the same light and the same vein as I made the other suggests, that this should be an non-partisan approach. That it is time that the Government of Canada was made aware, by the Government of this Province and by this legislature, that we believe that conservation action has to be taken unilaterally by the Government of Canada at this time. Now the reply may very well come back that you cannot do that sort of thing Under international law, That is not playing the game. But, obviously, the United States decided to play the game with respect to the haddock fishery on Brown's Bank and George's Bank.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: The Government of Canada has the right to do on the East Coast what it is attempting to do on the West Coast, that is, to accept the doctrine that is extolled in the United States and implemented in the United States as a Continental Shelf Doctrine, distinguish it from the Freedom of the Seas. You see this is where the United States, the Americans have gotten around it. They say George's Bank and Brown's Bank are part of our continental shelf. Whether we have the right to stop a boat from going over the sea per se, we do have the right to say to the nations of the world; we are implementing conservation measures on our continental shelf and we are doing that unilaterally.

Now when you pick up the magazines like, "World Fishing" and others you will find that the action of the United States and the results that they hope that will be forthcoming begin to meet with the approval of INAF. Now I say we have learned our lesson from haddock, it has virtually disappeared as a Newfoundland product. We have the danger signals with respect to other species like rose fish and cod. You have gentlemen like Mr. Etchegary saying, that we may have past the sustainable yield in cod and in rose fish.

We just cannot sit back and say, "let us wait and see, He may be wrong, maybe it is water temperature." It is not water temperature, Mr. Chairman, it is over-fishing and the same applies. let me refer this, to the Labrador



MR. HICKMAN: fishery. Let me refer this committee to the findings of the Fishery Research Board as reported on December 12, 1970. The Labrador Fisheries is failing because of the massive catches by the foreign fleets in offshore waters. This is the finding of a team of scientists from the Fisheries Research Board, which carried out an investigation of the declining Labrador Inshore Fishery this summer.

Fishery Minister, Jack Davis, commenting on the finding, said, that he is more determine than ever to try to get the other nations involved to see sweet reason and to protect the resource from serious over harvesting. If that happens they will suffer to.

But, Mr. Chairman, this is not working, Mr. Davis must realize by now that the success in using sweet reason to the European nations



MR. HICKMAN: with respect to our off-shore rights is not going to succeed. This is why I say there has to be unilateral action insofar as conservation measures are concerned and I believe that then the other nations will follow suit. You are not talking about a great confrontation between the Canadian Navy and the fleet of the Navy of the Soviet Union. You are simply talking about some conservation measures, unilateral conservation measures which in the final analysis will be to our benefit but also to the benefit of the other countries.

There may be another reason why the fears of the Premier are well founded, in my opinion, in that Canada really does not regard itself as a fishing nation. We now rank... Where do we rank? Fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth? I think, this includes all fishing, of all kinds, fresh water fish, both the Atlantic and the Pacific. You know we are behind Nations like South Africa, Spain. We are slightly ahead of Denmark and Thailand. We are not in the same league as Peru nor Japan nor the U.S.S.R. The U.S.S.R., in 1968, produced 649 million tons of fish, China - 6 million tons of fish. If the U.S.S.R. produced 649 million tons of fish in 1968, my guess is that it has gone up considerably since that time.

But poor little Canada! In the United States (this is a matter of interest and maybe it...). I do not have the facts but I suggest that it may be not that good. I think we may be ahead of Japan because Japan seems to concentrate on labour-intensive industries.

Insofar as our off-shore fleet are concerned, a comparison between the factory ship, the catcher fleet and our fleet is relevant but I believe that we can get very close to per-man production insofar as hauling the fish out of the sea is concerned.

I think too that we have things going for us. Geography - of course we have geography going for us. It seems to me again that, in these European countries, they are not at all cost conscious, they are not too concerned about competing in the American market and making a profit. The Poles are far more interested in getting their

MR. HICKMAN: hands on dollars than they are in making a profit. The East Germans are far more interested in getting their hands on hard currency than they are in making profit whereas the Nations such as, you know, the fishing Nations such as Canada in particular, the whole operation is profit motivated.

Mr. Chairman, again, when the hon. Minister speaks I would like to hear from him whether or not any representation has been made to Ottawa, by him, in his capacity as Minister of Fisheries, concerning the protective measures - this has to be International in one sense but National in another - that have been taken by Canada to control Canadian shipping, with respect to pollution of our seas. Some Nations are beginning to take a very strong stand on this, Mr. Chairman.

Let me give you one example contained in the April issue of the "Nautical Magazine" and it is headed "Imprisonment for Pollution", "Master of the Norwegian tank "Polly Commander" was sentenced to three months imprisonment and the First Officer to one month and one day, plus a total fine on both Officers of £126,700, by a Spanish Court, for spilling oil after running aground near Vigo Harbour entrance."

Now that is a pretty severe penalty. Then in the same issue there is a letter to the editor, and he makes the suggestion that is contained in a paper that was prepared last year by Captain John Whelan of this City with respect to oil tankers, and he refers to the strandings and the oil spillage that has been caused as a result of damage to ships plates underneath the water line, and I quote; "In any case, if the leakage is under the water line and the tankers automatically shut, no fuel will leak out. This is a physical law. Probably tanks must have connections to the open air, through pipe lines, and it should be possible, in case of emergency, to shut them immediately."

What Dr. Whelan pointed out and is significant in the context of the fishery and is significant in the context of the Come By Chance Development, that oil tankers, when they are built today, have what they call

MR. HICKMAN: a single bottom. So that if an oil tanker grounds and she is going at any speed at all or if there is any sea, one little slit in a plate and pollution starts forthwith.

If the recommendation that is contained in the report of Captain Whelan (and he did it, it was a magnificent report) is that our shipping laws should provide Canadian registered tankers, operating in Canadian waters, and maybe you can extend it to tankers coming into our waters, must be double bottomed. The same as this gentleman is suggesting in this report. It is going to have to come because we were told in this report and it is going to have to come because we were told here, for instance during the Shaheen hearings, about the tremendous oil pollution that is occurring in the North Atlantic now, just by ordinary emptying of tanks and other spillage that comes out of ships under normal operation when they take up their ballast, the discharge from their engine room all combine and makes a very unhealthy and not a very pretty picture insofar as the North Atlantic is concerned.

Now Canada may very well say we cannot do too much about it because we are not a shipping Nation. Canada does have some control though over the ships that operate out of its refineries and refineries placed on the Eastern and Western Seaports. It does have some control over ships coming in and obviously, as other Nations are beginning to express the same concern over the general pollution of the Atlantic, then they should be ripe for some form of international negotiation.

But they are entitled to hear from us. They hear from the Government of Saskatchewan, The first minute you see a pesticide turned loose out there which may damage their crops, they will come screaming in and they do not care who they embarrass until they get some action.

I think sometimes we are far too sensitive in our dealings with Ottawa as far as resource industries in the Province are concerned.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Chairman, one thing that I would like to draw to the attention of this Committee and that is in the Estimates there is provision for certain shore facilities to be installed. Maybe some of this is more related to the DREE Resettlement Programme, when we come to it. But to give you some indication as to what a lack of policy has cost us in the last two or three years, the three settlements in the district of Hermitage called Parsons Harbour, Recontre West and Pushthrough, these settlements have been regarded as sending communities and they have been resettled mostly in Grand Bank and Fortune. Parsons Harbour was a fairly sizeable, prosperous little harbour. Most people have moved out but there are not sixteen families left, for the three places all told.

One of the reasons why they left was that they had been making all sorts of representation for a bait unit, for a doctor and they had no teachers. But they could not get them and the indication was that these public services were not justified. Would you like to know what has happened now since they moved out? No. But guess what is going in Parsons Harbour now.- a bait depot, a bait unit.

Now there are sixteen families left, and they are also going to get electricity now. Of the sixteen, there are nine fishermen and, before they started moving and when the request was made for the bait holding plant, there were thirty-five fishermen. On that part of the coast they operate pretty well year around. Now there are nine left. I do not know what they have but now they are going to have electricity, so they must have a good Provincial member too. I realize that. But my goodness! when you talk about planning and policy, what kind of a policy is it that would allow or permit this sort of thing to happen?

Then again when we come to the Estimates of the hon. Minister of Social and Community Development, in the Lamaline area you have a trap fishery which is generally fairly prosperous during six to eight weeks and after that the practice has been that the fishermen

MR. HICKMAN: give up the trap fishery, because they have no choice, and they do a bit of fishing, dory fishing, enough to make a few hundred dollars, when the weather is good, and keep a few men working on shore.

Now apparently they have been told that if they earn any money after the trap fishery, this is going to affect their assistance. I am sure they have been told it because they have made representation on their right to long term assistance, or whatever type of assistance they are getting.

I know, but it relates to the fishery. I know it is not limited to Lamaline, it is related to the fishery in this respect. You hear a bunch of men who, even though they are inshore fishermen and that their great thrust is in the trap fishery, with respect to the trap fishery, they can make another \$300 to \$1200 a year by being allowed to prosecute the fishery and supplement their welfare payments.

I do not believe that this will take away any of their initiative, by allowing them to continue this. I do not believe that it is good welfare policy to prohibit them from doing it.

AN HON. MEMBER: The welfare system is wrong.

MR. HICKMAN: Right. It is wrong. I do not believe that it saves the taxpayer any money, and that is one of the reasons it was given to them.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, let me reiterate what has been said on both sides of this House today and said in this House, starting this morning.

That the most important task facing this House of Assembly right now and one that we cannot conclude our sittings without implementing is bringing before this House and passing the legislation which we hope will be recommended by the Select Committee with respect to granting collective bargaining to the fishermen. Whether it will solve all their problems may be questionable. But one thing we are



MR. HICKMAN: certain of is that they are entitled to be given the opportunity to try.

MR. EARLE: Could the hon. Minister tell us what is the present status of the Fisheries Development Authority? Who are the members now and are their activities confined completely to the Fisheries Development Authority or is it a sort of a mixed up Authority? Who is there? There is an increase in the vote this year.

MR. WINSOR: There are three, Mr. Prince, Mr. Dustan and Mr. Russell.

MR. HODDER: Shall 02-01, -02, -03 carry?

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Chairman, Professional Fees - this has gone up \$13,000 Is this the hiring of lawyers and that type of thing?

MR. WINSOR: It is the hiring of engineers and professional people that we have to engage from time to time.

MR. HODDER: Shall 03-01 carry?

MR. EARLE: General Expenses - are these schools which go around the Country training officials included in this Vote?

MR. WINSOR: No.

MR. HODDER: Shall 03-02 carry?

MR. WINSOR: That Vote is to take care of any loss that we might have on the two boats fishing out of Stephenville. Last year we had a Vote of \$60,000 I think it was, but we were not called upon to pay any of the expenses. As a matter of fact the boats were very successful last year.

MR. MURPHY: There was no Vote last year according to this.

MR. WINSOR: No, we did have it somewhere.

MR. HODDER: Shall 04-01 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: 04-01 on LaScie, would the hon. Minister indicate to the Committee the status of the LaScie operation now? I presume it is still seasonal. I notice that the estimated loses from LaScie this year - approximately \$100,000 less than that last year, Would the Minister indicate to the Committee how that projection has been arrived at?

MR. WINSOR: The loss of course is incurred by the increase in the



MR. WINSOR: expense of operating the plant in general and the added expense in collection. The Company operating that plant last year were called upon to expand their collection facilities, therefore increasing the cost of the plant, which I think accounts for the losses.

MR. HICKMAN: It was down this year.

MR. WINSOR: Yes but it might be underestimated.

MR. HODDER: Shall 02 carry? Shall 1412-05-01 carry?

MR. EARLE: Now this one, Mr. Minister could you give us some information? What does the Lewisporte Haulout do? How many boats were serviced there last year? Do you have any figures on it?

MR. WINSOR: I do not know exactly last year, but since the Haulout has been installed there have been about fifty-eight boats hauled up there and serviced, about fifty-eight.

MR. EARLE: What type of boats were they?

MR. WINSOR: They range from small tuna boats to the longliner type of boat.

MR. EARLE: Does that include passenger boats.

MR. WINSOR: Yes, if they so desire, they can take up a small passenger boat.

MR. EARLE: It is not just fishing boats.

MR. WINSOR: No.

MR. HODDER: Shall -03, 05 carry?

MR. MURPHY: What is the significance of having the Ramea ferry service?

MR. WINSOR: That is a good question. I wish the Department of Transport would take it over. We made a strong request to them to take it over but so far they have decided against it. That service is very essential to that area. For the last two and a-half years they have transported about twelve thousand passengers. Last month I think there were five hundred and eighty-five passengers transported by that ferry.

You may recall that the original ferry was lost last year and they had to make a replacement. I think the "Senator Penney" is

MR. WINSOR: operating there now.

Your question as to why should it be in the Department of Fisheries is a good one, but when it was originated it fell under the Department of Fisheries and it has not been changed.

MR. MURPHY: I thought it significant, because the ferry to St. Brendan's is D.O.T. or Department of Transport and Fogo I presume is operating, but still we have the Ramea one.

MR. WINSOR: I can assure you we are trying to impress upon the Department of Transport to take it over. Whether we will be successful or not is a question.

MR. MURPHY: Are any of the M.P.'s in Ottawa fighting the case or are we just going to...

MR. WINSOR: Well they all know about it.

MR. MURPHY: Yes that is what I am just wondering; is this the weakness in it.

MR. WINSOR: Could be.

MR. HICKMAN: You are a very honest Minister.

MR. MURPHY: Very diplomatic.

MR. HODDER: Shall 06-02 carry?

MR. HICKMAN: On 06-02 Mr. Chairman, this is the Marystown Shipyard, the projected operating loses. Last year the operating loses at the yard were \$406,000, which is down, as I recall, from the previous years. My recollection is that we were told last year that the reason why these loses were down in Marystown is that Marystown has had a little work during that period and the hon. member for Placentia West nods his head in agreement, and it is true. After the two boats were built, the two draggers, it has been a repair yard and as the loses decline, the work declines and the employment unfortunately declines along side it.

Now we see another decline of \$100,000 projected for this year. Would the hon. minister indicate to the Committee the basis for this projection.

MR. SMALLWOOD:

This amount is an amount that was estimated months ago. I do not think it is realistic myself. It could be very much more than that or very much less. Since this was estimated and inserted in the estimates, developments have been occurring and continue to occur. The latest development was today and there is another one tomorrow and no one in the Government is in the position at the moment to say anymore than that. I think this should be taken with a grain of salt. The amount could be much larger or very much smaller, time will tell, but we do not know today, we just do not know.

MR. MURPHY: On that it is rather significant, in 1969-70 projected loss was \$540,000, in 1970-71 it was reduced to \$258,000, in the estimate, but the actual turned out to be \$406,000. So conceivably, gathering that it would be another half million this year and it seems to be, it makes the Budget look very good, of course. That is another \$150,000 less but, according to the Premier's statement, it is not realistic and just looks good in the Budget - that is all I can see.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, in answer to a question this morning, the hon. the Premier gave me some figures on the occupancy of houses at Marystown. There is rather a long list and some of them have been vacant up to eighteen or twenty months. I am wondering, in view of the increased activity or anticipated increased activity at Marystown, how is the recruiting getting on down there? Have there been many men recruited yet and if not, when is the recruiting expected to pick up?

MR. SMALLWOOD: The general manager of the yard was in my office this morning and the general manager of the top operating company was in my office this morning, from Montreal, and I am not in a position to say anything at the moment. I am far more anxious to say something about it than the hon. gentleman is to hear it, far more, but I am not in a position to do it. Men will have to be recruited. They will have to be recruited from distances. There will have to be employed at least as many men as were employed before and

MR. SMALLWOOD:

more and recruiting will have to be done. But at the moment I am not able to say anything more than that and no one in the Government is. We are not in a position to say what we know, not yet, as we do not have the authority, we do not have consent and we just have to ask the Committee to accept this as our best estimate as of the moment of what money will be needed. As for the houses, they will all be occupied and far more than that number will be occupied because far more than that number will have to be built.

Not to put too great a mystery on it, we are negotiating for a substantial enlargement at Marystown.

MR. HICKMAN: I appreciate that it is most desirable that the hon. Premier not say anything on the negotiations with respect to enlarging the plant, but could he give us some indication as to the status of implementing the orders for the druggers of National Sea Products?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Yes, they have the orders.

MR. HICKMAN: Right.

MR. SMALLWOOD: If they are going to be building two druggers together, what they will have to do obviously is recruit men and get a whole shift of men assembled and that shift will acquire speed and efficiency in building. Then, if there are other orders, as I believe there will be, there will have to be more than one shift. I think the thing that was originally intended to happen at Marystown is about to happen and it will become a large ship building enterprise and repair as well.

MR. MURPHY: Now, Mr. Chairman, before we get off this vote, and it is \$300,000 here but we feel that it will be more like half a million. How many people on the average have been employed in the shipyard during 1970?

MR. SMALLWOOD: I think it is something roughly around 100, I think. Right, now I believe they are quite busy at repair work, but all that is a shadow, only a shade of what it was intended to be and what I believe it is about to become. The handful of men working there at repair work, ship overhaul,

MR. SMALLWOOD:

under the CSI, is a mere token of what it was meant to be and what I think it is about to become.

MR. MURPHY: An average of 100 men.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Around there.

On motion, Clauses 1412(02), (08), 1413(01), (02)(01), (02) carried.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Chairman, on (03)(01) - Fishing Gear Bountry, does this vote take in the replacement of damaged nets and so on, that is nets which were destroyed and have all these claims been settled as yet?

MR. WINSOR: No, Mr. Chairman, it does not take in nets that were destroyed. It is a bounty on all new gear not nets that are damaged. It would be almost utterly impossible to arrive at a figure.

MR. EARLE: What does that come under? "Other?"

MR. WINSOR: Pardon?

MR. EARLE: What does that come under? The next one "Other."

MR. HICKMAN: Storm Damage (Token).

MR. WINSOR: Yes, it could be.

MR. MURPHY: This bounty, Mr. Chairman, may I ask what percentage of equipment would it be, like on the nets and so on and so forth?

MR. WINSOR: On nets and trawl lines.

MR. MURPHY: Yes, what percentage?

MR. WINSOR: It is about twenty-five dollars per gill net.

MR. MURPHY: What is a gill net worth? About seventy-five dollars?

MR. WINSOR: Around that, yes. That is right.

On motion, Clauses 03(01), (03); 04(01), (02); 05; Total: Subhead 1413; 1421(01): 02(01), (02), (03); 03(01), (02), (03); 1431(01), (02), (03), (04); Total: Subhead 1431: Block Provision: Canada Pension Plan; Block Provision: Salary Adjustments: TOTAL: DEPARTMENT OF FISHERIES estimates, carried.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have passed estimates of expenditure under the following headings: XIV - Fisheries, all items with some amendments and ask leave to sit again on tomorrow.

On motion, report received and adopted.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday at 11:00 A.M. of the clock and that the House do now adjourn. In making the motion, which I do for the purpose of saying what I am about to say, I would like to inform the House that as of today 408 persons are on the payroll at Come by Chance, the number is 408. I would like to inform the House also that the latest report I have from Churchill Falls says that the hourly paid employees working at Churchill Falls are now 72.4 per-cent Newfoundlanders - of all the hourly paid employees seventy-two and one half, 72.4 per-cent are Newfoundlanders.

MR. SPEAKER(NOFL): The motion is that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Monday at 11 o'clock.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, I would move that the House on its rising do adjourn until 3 o'clock Monday afternoon. I feel that we are getting ahead very good with everything and I believe it is becoming quite a chore for the Government to try to maintain a quorum. In fairness to the Government, Mr. Speaker, I would move that we adjourn until 3 o'clock, because it is rather difficult for us here, I am not making a speech but it is an actual fact, to try to maintain a quorum with the Government on this. We have a lot of things to do that we just cannot do and we are forced to stay in here in the House to maintain a quorum. So I move that we adjourn until Monday afternoon at 3 o'clock.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, a little bit on the irregular side, I would be quite happy to accept that amendment. Indeed, if the hon. gentleman would withdraw his amendment, I would withdraw my motion and make a new motion along



MR. SMALLWOOD:

the line as he wants. In fact we would not even need it because, without it we would meet normally at 3 o'clock, but I would be willing to do it experimentally. I am sure that privately, in his heart, every member in this House wants to get the business of the House finished and get the House closed without any undue delay. If we can do that with two sittings a day rather than three, well then that is just fine - that is just fine. So let us just try it on Monday - Monday afternoon and night instead of Monday morning. I know that it will give the members of the Cabinet some badly needed time to do some Cabinet work, which has to be done, House or no House, Cabinet work has to go on.

So with Your Honour's consent, I would withdraw my motion and make no motion except that the House do now adjourn, in which case Your Honour would adjourn it until 3 o'clock Monday.

On motion, the House stands adjourned until Monday, May 17, 1971 at 3 of the clock.