



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND AND LABRADOR

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

---

Volume 1

Number 58

5th Session

34th. General Assembly

---

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, MAY 19, 1971

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE GEORGE W. CLARKE

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

HON. G.A. FRECKER: (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS): Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the citizens of Mount Arlington Heights and Long Harbour. The burden of the petition have to do with shortening considerably the access for the citizens to the ERCO Plant. It would involve placing a causeway at the lower end of the harbour where the water is shallow, and not only would it shorten the distance but it would do away with a very dangerous section of the road that the people now have to negotiate going back and forth to the plant.

The burden of the petition, Mr. Speaker, reads as follows: "We the undersigned, the people of Long Harbour and Mount Arlington Heights, hereby petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to construct a causeway across the narrow east end of Long Harbour and to upgrade and pave the remaining section of highway to Long Harbour and Mount Arlington Heights."

I beg leave to table this petition presented and ask that it be referred to the proper authorities for their serious consideration, with my strong support.

MR. U. STRICKLAND: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to support the prayer of this petition, in doing so I would point out two facts: First of all, the hon. the Minister of Provincial Affairs, who is the member for that district, and I have a lot of things in common, because our districts adjoin each other and almost overlaps in certain areas. It was our privilege a couple of years ago to meet with the people of Long Harbour and Mount Arlington Heights. There were a number of the officials of the company there as well as the parish priest for that area. It came out very plainly in that meeting that the people of that area think that this is the greatest gift that ever they had come their way in all of the long years of their history. Seeing from the turn out of that meeting that they are determined to make that plant

MR. STRICKLAND: very worthwhile, they are prepared to put everything that they have into it to make it a huge success.

If there is anything that this House can do to help the people achieve this success and I am sure anybody whoever goes to that plant and can see the clouds of dust five o'clock in the evening, that is on that road leaving from the paved part up to Long Harbour and Mount Arlington Heights, they could be convinced that it is a dangerous section of road, with so much dust and so many cars. If we can do anything to help the people in their endeavours and their efforts to make this plant the success that it should be, then by all means, I for one would strongly support it.

On motion Petition received.

QUESTIONS:

HON. F.W. ROUE, (MINISTER OF EDUCATION AND YOUTH): Mr. Speaker, when the estimates for the Department of Education were being studied in committee some questions were asked, information was asked for that I could not supply at that time, some detailed information. I undertook to get that information for hon. members and I take it, it would be in order to have them tabled now. I will not of course attempt to read it or give any details, simply to say that there are three lots of information that I am supplying, one is the list of the recreational grants, community recreational grants as distinct from capital grants that were given out during the last financial year. It is a fairly long list, there are, I think, three pages, there are a hundred or more of them.

The others consist of the grants given out to provincewide governing bodies like, for example, Newfoundland Amateur Baseball Association, Newfoundland and Labrador Camping Association and Newfoundland Lawn Tennis Association, Newfoundland Amateur Swimming Association and so on. These are the grants given, these are the associations for the Province, as distinct from community.

The third piece of information consists of the regulations governing the capital grants, recreational programme, they are fairly lengthy as well. But hon. members I am sure are asked for information by their constituents, from time to time on this programme, and I would suggest it might be useful to keep this information in their files for reference when any of their

MR. ROWE, F.W. constituents will contact them, as I am sure they are doing and will do from time to time.

I will table this information. I have sufficient numbers of copies for all hon. members.

#### ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. CROSBIE: On Orders of the Day, Mr. Speaker, on the question to the hon. Minister of Education and Youth. Could the minister tell the House whether he has received an application from the Day Camp people, that is a summer project, to use the old premises out in Healey's Pond? The old sunshine camp is going to be used as a day care centre this summer, the summer day camp. I understand that an application has been made to the minister for a \$5,000 grant. They have received a grant or going to receive \$17,000 odd from the Federal Government, and an application has been made to the Province for a grant of \$5,000. Has the minister received that application and has he made any decision yet?

MR. ROWE, F.W. Mr. Chairman, I do not recall offhand, I do know that we have a very large number of applications not yet processed. Mr. Snow tells me he has, I would think, forty or fifty applications. It could well be that that particular application is in the list that he has, which have not yet come to my attention. I do not recall offhand that that particular one has been brought to me for consideration.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker a supplementary question. This is a project for summer employment, I imagine the minister already knows, made up of Memorial University students, as a Day Camp for underprivileged children, including recreation, so could the minister check, I think they need an answer quite soon, because you know the summer is just about on us.

MR. ROWE, F.W. I would be very glad, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CROSBIE: They have a grant from Ottawa, they need \$5,000 more.

MR. ROWE, F.W. I would be very glad to have that matter looked into as early as possible.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. Minister of

MR. COLLINS: Highways, I understand that he has received a report, on safety conditions on the Trans-Canada Highway, from the Newfoundland Safety Council. If this is so, could the minister indicate to the House when the report will be tabled?

HON. H. STARKES: (MINISTER OF HIGHWAYS): Mr. Speaker, we have received a report from the Safety Council some weeks ago. We held a meeting with them this morning and, unfortunately, I had to leave before the meeting was over and I have not had a chance since to confer with my Deputy and I have no report to make at this time.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. In view of the importance of this particular report, I understand it was a thorough-going study of the lack of proper safety and the causes on the Trans-Canada. Would the minister consider tabling the report in the House so that all members can have a look at it as quickly as possible.

MR. STARKES: I assume, Mr. Speaker, that the report will be public. There is nothing private or secret about the report. The report of Safety Council in fact, if they want to make it public they can have it published in the Telegram tomorrow. It is a report from them to us, we did not ask them for the report, it is one they make to us, and asked us to accept. There is nothing secret about it.

MR. COLLINS: There is nothing wrong with us requesting a report from the Safety Council.

MR. STARKES: What is that?

MR. COLLINS: There is nothing wrong with members requesting a copy of the report from the Safety Council.

MR. STARKES: Not that I know of.

MOTIONS:

On motion of the hon. the Premier a Bill, "An Act Further to amend the Election Act," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow:

On motion of the hon. the Premier, a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Act, 1966," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

On motion of the hon. the Premier a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the Local Government Elections Act, 1965," read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow:

On motion of the hon. the Premier, a Bill, "An Act Further to Amend the City of St John's Act, " read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow:

RESOLUTION (Hon. Member for St John's East.)

WHEREAS the Fishery is the basic most important natural resource of the Province of Newfoundland; AND WHEREAS the Fishing Industry has experienced grave and serious problems which have become critically aggravated over the past decade by reason of depletion of stocks caused primarily by the massive catches taken from time to time in the North Atlantic by ocean going vessels of foreign nations' AND WHEREAS the inshore fishermen of this Province have particularly suffered by reason of apparent over-fishing in the North Atlantic; AND WHEREAS the Prime Minister of our Nation, the Right Honourable Pierre Elliot Trudeau, is presently making a state visit to Russia for the expressed purpose, amongst other things, of discussing with Russian Leaders problems of mutual concern to Canada and Russia; AND WHEREAS it is vital to the interest of Newfoundland and particularly to the welfare of its inshore fishermen that immediate steps be taken to conserve the fishery in the North Atlantic; AND WHEREAS it would appear that effective steps towards improvement of the fishery could be realized by the Prime Minister discussing directly with Soviet Premier, Alexei Kosygin, or Communist Party Leader, Leonid Brezhnev, or both of them the problems experienced by the fishermen on the east coast of Canada and in particular depletion of fish stocks in the North Atlantic; AND WHEREAS the Members of Parliament for Newfoundland have initiated representation to the Prime Minister concerning the matters herein resolved:



AND WHEREAS it is desirable that all the elected Members of the people of Newfoundland join with Newfoundland's representatives in the House of Commons in urging the Prime Minister of our Nation to take up with the Leaders of the Russian peoples matters herein resolved;

THEREFORE be it resolved that this House of Assembly for the Province of Newfoundland hereby expresses its strong desire that Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau, discuss with the Russian Leaders the grave problem experienced by fishermen on the east coast of Canada and particularly the depletion of fish stocks in the North Atlantic and that the said Prime Minister initiate meaningful discussions with a view to conserving all species of fish in the North Atlantic in order to better assure the future of the fishing industry in this Province and particularly the inshore fishing industry;

And Be It Further Resolved that this House of Assembly urges the Prime Minister of Canada to invite Russia to join with Canada in convening an International Conference for Conservation of Fisheries in the North Atlantic comprising all Nations utilizing the fisheries of the North Atlantic Ocean and that such Conference be held as soon as possible and, if expedient to the Nations concerned, be held in the ancient port of St. John's:

And Be It Further Resolved that this House of Assembly directs that the contents of this resolution be communicated forthwith by telegram or otherwise to the Honourable Prime Minister while he is still visiting the U.S.S.R. and opportunity exists to take up the matters set forth herein with the said Leaders of the Russian peoples.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker at the outset with respect to this resolution, I might indicate that we would hope that this resolution will be accepted unanimously by this House because it touches on a matter of very vital and significant interest to the people of Newfoundland.

There is no need for me, Your Honour, to go into the plight of the fishery in this Province, in particularly the plight of the inshore fishery. This is well known, This is well known to all hon. members in this House and particularly to the fishermen of the Province of Newfoundland. Certainly over the past ten years it would appear that the inshore fish, that the catch of the inshore fish has been halved and that there are less people prosecuting the fishery in this Province than heretofore.

While there are certain points each year with which we can rejoice, the hon. the Premier has already pointed out that the price of fish is going up and this is a very, very good thing. The fish plants are now, some of them anyway, in the black and hopefully all of them will be this year and the price of fish this year augurs well for the fishermen.

But the price of fish, Your Honour, depends, as we all know, not only on the demand but on the supply as well. It is to the supply of fish in this Province, the supply of fish to the fishermen, that we must look and concern ourselves, because it concerns us very, very vitally. It has for centuries and it will for centuries to come. It has always got to be remembered that the basic greatest natural resource of this Province is the fishery itself.

Now the present plight of the inshore fishery, in the fishery of this Province, has been caused in part by depletion of stocks in the North Atlantic. This has been caused, by the same token, <sup>by</sup> the presence of the huge draggers of foreign nations, by the huge trawlers of foreign nations. We have heard great descriptions of factory ships and various devices like electronic suction devices that are sucking the fish up from the sea. The stocks of fish are fast depleting, with consequent results. One of the big results, as I say, has been the failure - one of the principal causes of the failure of the inshore fishery had been the depletion in the stocks.



MR. MARSHALL: The failure of the inshore fishery has to be viewed by everyone in Newfoundland with serious alarm, because there is no doubt it has brought serious consequences to this Province. It has meant, in effect, that people in the smaller villages, the smaller communities around the Province and in many of the smaller communities could no longer obtain a decent and adequate living for themselves in the places where they resided and they had to resettle. It has meant the failure of the inshore fishery, it has meant to many communities the death of the communities themselves and the quashing for many years to come of the hopes and aspirations of the hearty people who lived in these villages and communities and fish from them.

The Premier has indicated, in the debate on the estimates, that there are times when he himself and many other people on the Government side, indeed some people over here, have wondered and despaired about the future of the fisheries. It has its peaks and it has its valleys, as we all know. We on this side perhaps look to , probably a bit more than the Government side has in the past, look with great hope towards the fishery of this Province and realize that, this being our basic natural resource, this is what we should concentrate on. We should always concentrate on our natural resources. This is the only way to bring Newfoundland into the Twentieth Century.

The result of the inshore fishery has been directly related as well to the depletion of the stocks in the North Atlantic. It has been more directly related to the failure of the inshore fishery in Labrador. During remarks that I made during the Throne Speech, I mentioned certain items about the inshore fishery of Labrador, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries asked a question as to whether or not he was being blamed or his department for this failure? the answer is, of course, no. But, certainly we could expect the Minister of Fisheries, as a matter of fact all members of the Government, everybody in this House, to support this reasonable resolution, which is aimed to do the utmost in order to preserve the fishery of this Province.

Indeed, the failure of the inshore fishery, which I link and has been linked to the depletion of stocks in the North Atlantic, has also had disastrous

MR. MARSHALL: effects on the growth of this Province. It is a well known fact and the Gordon Commission has already pointed this out, that the growth and population in the Province of Newfoundland has not been commensurate with that in the rest of Canada. It certainly has not been commensurate with that which was expected when reasonable projections were made some years ago. Here again, we all well know that the reason for this was the failure of the fisheries.

So, I think that it is given that the fishery of this Province is in a dire, has been in times past and probably will be in the future, in a sorry situation and in a dire plight and this aggravated situation, this critical situation can be linked in the present day to the huge rape, as it were, of the fishery in the North Atlantic, by these huge foreign nations, these nations that send the many, many trawlers off our shores.

It is also a well known fact, Your Honour, that the Prime Minister of this country is presently in Russia. Now Russia itself is a nation which has reportedly the most of these huge trawlers and draggers off our coast and the North Atlantic. It is certainly one of the biggest interest that represents the interest on the other side. The interest, that is, of prosecuting the deep sea fishery in the manner that foreigners want to and do in the North Atlantic.

The Prime Minister, as I say, has gone to Russia to talk about certain matters of mutual concern to Russia and Canada. I mention here that the members of Parliament, our members of Parliament, have bought up quite strongly in the House of Commons and requested the Prime Minister to put this on his agenda and to give an assurance that it will be given some priority and talked over with the Leader of the Russian people.

Now I refer to the members of Parliament here, not as Tory, M.P.'s but as patriotic Newfoundlanders, I hope everybody in this House would see, this is an issue that is really above politics itself, it is an issue that transcends a link between Federal and Provincial parties. It is an issue that has to concern Newfoundlanders and is not in essence a political issue but is rather a patriotic one - if there is any distinction between the two.

MR. MARSHALL: We had all expected, we had all waited hoping that the Prime Minister would give the assurance that this urgent and vital subject of grave, grave concern to the East Coast of Canada would be taken up by the Prime Minister with the Leaders of the Russian people. Unfortunately we have no indication to this effect, certainly no public indication. It is not on the agenda. We do know that certain matters are on the agenda of the hon. the Prime Minister, such as NATO, which is important. The reduction of arms, obviously, it is very, very important. But these weapons are inert, they are not operational. Certainly the inertness, lack of mobility of the fishery, for the most depressed part of Canada, should bear a certain priority with the Leader of our Nation.

It is very necessary, Your Honour, I feel, that we pass a resolution, this resolution which has been placed before the House, because it is necessary that all elected people in this Province speak as one, speak as one to the Federal Government and inform the Federal Government that we expect and we would hope that the greatest possible action would be taken at all times to conserve the source of supply that was and that will always be the basic natural resource of this Province.

I think that the effect of passing a resolution of this nature by this House, by the elected representatives, Provincially, of the people of Newfoundland, coupled with the elected representatives, Federally, of the people of Newfoundland, ought to convince Ottawa quite forcefully of the situation with which we are faced, with which the tens of thousand of fishermen in this Province are faced and that we must have some action taken and taken very, very soon with respect to this very important matter of conservator of our fisheries, if we are to progress into the Twentieth Century and really realize the promises of Confederation.

We certainly have to focus attention on the fact that there are tens of thousands of people in Newfoundland who are not sharing the benefits of Confederation, not necessarily through any internal fault in Canada itself, but mainly because a source of supply, as I say, of fish, that had been available to them and their forefathers long before, is being disseminated to a frightening extent and there is promise, an awesome promise, of it being

MR. MARSHALL: decimated even more in the years to come.

So therefore the first part of this resolution, which I feel, is very, very reasonable, merely requests, it merely is a resolution of this House, the elected members of the people of Newfoundland, just merely requesting the Prime Minister of this nation to discuss, with Russian Leaders, depletion of our fish stocks in the North Atlantic, to better assure the future of the fisheries here, particularly, the inshore-fishing industry, which certainly needs to have an added impetus to it.

The other part of the resolution, which I also say, Your Honour, is well taken, is the fact that the Prime Minister, while he is over in Russia should invite Russian Leaders and the Russian peoples to jointly convene an International Conference for the Conservation of Fisheries in the North Atlantic. Now, I know we have various fishery commissions that are meeting from time to time and it is reported that the Atlantic Fisheries Commission is going to meet in Halifax shortly, but this is a Commission, and we are faced with a grave, serious and a very grave and weighty problem. and one that merits the attention of the Leaders of our Nation and one that requires a conference of leaders of the nations of the world concerned, in order to determine what is the correct balance, what correct balance can be maintained between the natural desires of these Nations to acquire as much fish as they possibly can and the right of our people to maintain an adequate standard of living.

Do not forget that here in Newfoundland, in this Province, we are much more vitally concerned with the fisheries of the North Atlantic than any other area in the world. Certainly these nations which would visit off our shores and take

MR. MARSHALL: huge catches of fish from time to time, when these stocks are depleted can relatively easily move their factory ships, their draggers and their trawlers, take them to other parts of the world, take up fish from other areas. But we here in this Province, on this Island and in Labrador itself, are left here with the source of supply in effect, this source of supply that has gone on for centuries and it has been in abundance for centuries, cut off for years and years to come. The economic effect on the people of Newfoundland will be very, very detrimental to put it very, very mildly.

I do not see why it could not be suggested to the Prime Minister when he is in Russia that the most appropriate place to hold this fisheries conference would be right here in this ancient sea port of St. John's. After all this Province stands out in the North Atlantic and it would certainly focus the attention of all the world, I feel, on the problems of this Province, that it is experiencing the growing pains that it is experiencing now, particularly in adjusting to the deep water fishery that has come to pass in recent years.

Of course there are other questions that will have to be thrashed out at such a conference as well. There are more problems I know. The major one, the major problem in the fishery I say is the depletion of the fish stocks. We have a situation where I believe it is the Danish Government is depleting the salmon stocks off Greenland. This has to be met as well as the depletion of the cod fishery to our inshore fishermen as such. This Party, and I would like to attempt to and I would hope that members on the other side would attempt to keep politics out of this resolution because this is a resolution that transcends political considerations altogether. I think it is worth mention that this Party has always stood for the development of our inshore fishery prior to the declaration of the twelve mile limit, the enforcement of which, by the way, is also another topic that should be brought up in this conference.

But prior to the declaration of the twelve mile limit, this Party had a policy, the people on this side of the House had always



MR. MARSHALL: promulgated that there should be inshore fishing zones, applicable throughout the Island, within which draggers should not come. So we are very, very interested and we always have been interested. But as I say I am not speaking on this resolution as a member of the Opposition, nor a member of the Tory Party, nor am I speaking of it because the members of Parliament, the Tory members of Parliament, who have done so much for the fisheries of this Province during their sojourn there since 1968, because they are political colleagues of mine.

But I make this resolution as a Newfoundlander. Many of us over here represent urban areas as well as rural areas. I feel quite certain that the member for St. John's West, the Leader of the Opposition and the member for Gander, who represent pretty well urban areas, have just as much right to be interested in the fisheries of this Province as the hon. the member for Burin, the hon. member for Fortune Bay or the Hon. member for St. Barbe South and indeed any member on the other side of the House are, because we are tied to it; our economic future and well-being.

Industrialization is good. We should have industrialization as much as we can, but it can never be forgotten that our basic natural resource is the fisheries and our future is tied to the fisheries. There is nothing. This resolution has been drafted in a manner, it deplores nothing, it does not deplore anything, nor criticize anything with respect to the Provincial Government. It does not criticize anything with respect to the actions of the Federal Government. It is not intended in any way to criticize the Prime Minister. It is purely there to bring to the attention of our Prime Minister, he is the Prime Minister of Newfoundland as well as Canada, our Federal chief officer of the Government, a matter of urgent public importance to the newest Province in Canada, requesting that we get what I feel we ought to be able to expect as Newfoundlanders, the full and complete support of the Prime Minister when he is in Russia.



MR. MARSHALL: We hear for instance, as I heard just yesterday on television, to the effect that amongst other things he was going to discuss NATO which is an International matter. But he is also going to discuss the matter of international trade as between central Canada or the bread baskets of Canada and Russia itself. I feel that, if this is so, that surely he can discuss the fishery of this Province as well, particularly since the Russian ships are doing such damage to the inshore fishery.

Finally, your Honour, of course there is no point in having these two resolutions set forth unless they are communicated. The final part of the resolution is that the contents, the desires, the people of this Province have expressed through their elected representatives in the House of Assembly, be communicated forthwith to the Prime Minister, while he is in Russia, to assure that this matter is brought to his attention.

I say in closing, as I began, we all look forward and expect to receive the unanimous support of the House on this resolution.

MR. SMALLWOOD (J.R.): Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of life and death urgency for us in Newfoundland that the stocks of fish be preserved and conserved. It will kill us in Newfoundland if these stocks of fish are not preserved. Newfoundland can scarcely live if these stocks are not protected from swift destruction and disappearance.

The hon. member who just sat down said, and I quote his words precisely, "it is very necessary for us to pass this resolution," Mr. Speaker, on the contrary, it is quite unnecessary. Before the Prime Minister went to Moscow it was agreed between Ottawa and Moscow that this very matter of conserving the stocks of fish in the North Atlantic would form a subject of discussion between Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Kosygin.

This was a part of the agenda for their discussions. It was agreed before Mr. Trudeau went to Moscow, it was agreed, it was part of their agenda so there is no need of this House passing a resolution asking

MR. SMALLWOOD: the Prime Minister to do what he had already agreed with Mr. Kosygin to do and had agreed before he went to Moscow. Secondly, yesterday in the House of Commons, yesterday, it was announced that this agreement had been made between the Prime Minister of Canada and the Premier of the Soviet Union.

It was announced in the House of Commons yesterday, I believe by the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Davis, or perhaps it was by the Acting Premier, Mr. Mitchell Sharp, it was announced in the House of Commons yesterday that this was one of the matters being discussed by the Premiers of the two Countries, the conservation of the stocks of fish in the North Atlantic.

One week from today, Wednesday, next week, one week from today, fourteen Nations, including Canada, including the Soviet Union, are meeting in the City of Halifax and on their agreed agenda for their meeting is a discussion of the fish stocks, the stocks of fish in the North Atlantic and the proper steps for the Nations to take to preserve and conserve these stocks of fish. Was there ever a resolution so completely unnecessary as this one here today? The resolution asks this House to send word to the Prime Minister that he should do something that he has already arranged to do and that he has done today in Moscow.

It is now, in Moscow, nine or ten o'clock tonight or whatever hour it may be and the second conference between our Premier and the Soviet Union's Premier has taken place and this discussion of a conference to conserve stocks of fish in the North Atlantic has already taken place. If we were to be so foolish, so foolish as to adopt this resolution and send a telegram to the Prime Minister in Moscow, he would receive it sometime tomorrow, Thursday, and his reply to us would be, "Thank you for your message, I have already taken up the matter with the Premier of the Soviet Union."

How foolish could we make ourselves look? How foolish? He would add perhaps that, next Wednesday, fourteen Nations, including Canada and the Soviet Union, are meeting for that very purpose.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, the Prime Minister of Canada is very vividly aware, he is not at all ignorant but very vividly aware of the need, of the dire need, the life and death need to conserve the stocks of fish in the North Atlantic. He is very conscious of the need. He does not need this House to inform him of that need. He is already thoroughly briefed, thoroughly briefed, He was briefed before he went to Moscow. It was agreed between the two Countries, long before he went, that one of the matters to be discussed between the two Premiers would be this very matter dealt with in today's resolution, and having agreed to a discussion of this matter, I would assume that the Premier of the Soviet Union, Mr. Kosygin, who is an engineer by trade and a man of thorough going knowledge, I myself was amazed, in the five hours I spent with him, to discover how wonderfully well informed he is and how wonderfully curious he is to learn everything he can learn.

I have no doubt that he is thoroughly well briefed by his Minister of Fisheries in the Soviet Union and I certainly know that our Premier, the Premier of Canada, Mr. Trudeau, is also thoroughly well briefed on the same matter by our Canadian Minister of Fisheries. So this resolution introduced in the House here, no doubt with good motives, is a work as the Westminster Confessions of the Presbyterian Church or is it the thirty-nine articles of Faith in the Anglican Church one of them, uses the term "this is a work of supererogation." Completely unnecessary, redundant, superfluous, unnecessary, and a waste of time because it would ask this House to send the Premier, in Moscow, a request to do what he had already decided to do. It has formed part of the formal agenda.

I discussed the matter this morning with the Minister of Fisheries of Canada, to confirm for my own satisfaction what I already knew, but knew from another source. Now I got it from the Minister himself, the Minister of Fisheries, that when Canada and the Soviet Union were arranging the matters that were to be discussed by the two Premiers in Moscow, the conservation of the stocks of fish in the North Atlantic was one of those matters and this fact was announced in the House of Commons yesterday. I must confess, Mr. Speaker, that I did not ask the Minister

MR. SMALLWOOD: whether the announcement had been made by him as Minister of Fisheries or by the Acting Premier of Canada, Mr. Mitchell Sharp. It matters not which of them made the announcement, what matters is that the announcement was made, that the very thing that this resolution would ask this House to do, that is to say, to ask Mr. Trudeau to do in Moscow what Mr. Trudeau had already arranged to do, This was yesterday and as of today he has done it. He has had his discussion, this very day, in Moscow, with the Premier of the Soviet Union.

So while we are all lost in admiration of the thoughtfulness and patriotism of the hon. gentlemen, we regret that it is totally superfluous. A work of supererogation. unnecessary, uncalled for and a mere waste of time. I therefore suggest to him that he withdraw the motion and let us get on with something that needs to be done. This does not need to be done. This is a work of supererogation. This is unnecessary. This asks the Premier of Canada to do something that he had already agreed to do and has now done and which indeed on Wednesday, a week from today, fourteen different Nations, including the Soviet Union and Canada, are meeting in Halifax to discuss for three days.

Now what can the adoption to this resolution add to that situation? Can it make it more likely that Mr. Trudeau will discuss the matter with Mr. Kosygin? No. No. That is already done. That has been done. It was done today before this House met. Hours before the House met here this afternoon it was done between the two Premiers.

So it is not going to get the Premier to do it. They have already done it. There was no need of this resolution to get them to do it. They had already decided to do it. They had already done it.

Will the adoption of this resolution make the matter of an International Conference more likely? No. The Conference has already been called. Will it make it more likely that the Conference will be called? No, because the Conference is being held one week from today in Halifax. Will the adoption of this resolution bring more Nations than was likely to go there? No. Because fourteen Nations have agreed to go there.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Will the adoption of this resolution get that Conference in Halifax to deal with this matter? No, because they have already put it on their agenda. What purpose will the adoption of this resolution accomplish? All it will do is to lay the House open to the acquisition, the just and justifiable acquisition, that we are sleeping. We are asleep. We are asleep. We are asleep at the switch. That we did not know that this matter was already set for discussion between the two Premiers. That this matter was already set for discussion amidst fourteen fishing nations. What would they be? They would be Canada. They would be the United States. They would be the United Kingdom. They would be France. They would be the Soviet Union. That is five. And five from fourteen - a lot of other Countries as well. Spain, Portugal, France, I think Poland, I am not sure, but all the Countries and I am not sure if it includes Japan, I am not sure if they are one of the fourteen nations but it certainly includes the overwhelming majority of the Countries that engage in the fisheries off this Coast and certainly, Sir, this Conference includes enough Nations to make it certain that what they agree on will be done. That what they agree on other nations, not attending, will have no choice but to respect and observe.

A week ago this resolution, a week ago today, Wednesday of last week, might have been justified, before we knew that the matter had already been set on the agenda for discussion between Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Kosygin, before we knew that this was going to be discussed this day, Wednesday, in Moscow, by the two Premiers. Before we knew perhaps that this was on the agenda, the principal item, the main item of the agenda of discussion of the fourteen nations in Halifax, meeting one week from today. There might have been some reason for it a week ago, Wednesday of last week, but there certainly is no reason for it today and I suggest that the hon. gentleman withdraw it, with the consent of the House. He will need the consent of the House to withdraw it, that he withdraw it and express his happiness to learn from me that the Prime Minister has already done the very thing that his resolution, if adopted, would ask him to do. He has already done it. The matter is well in hand. It cannot go any



MR. SMALLWOOD: higher in Canada than the Prime Minister of Canada. It cannot go any higher in the Soviet Union than the Premier of the Soviet Union. It cannot go any higher than the Conference of fourteen great fishing Nations meeting a week from today in Halifax. So if he would withdraw the motion, then he can bring forward some other matter. Any hon. member of the House who is not a member of the Government, any backbencher, any private member of the House, had the right to bring forward any business, as this happens to be private member's day.

So drop this unnecessary, this superfluous matter, drop it, It has already been taken care of. Let us not waste the time of the House any further. Please withdraw it, and take up some other matter.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, what we just heard, of course, is what we would expect to hear from the hon. the Premier in connection with this resolution. The Premier has just suggested that we should not waste the time of the House discussing this resolution, when he has just discussed the resolution himself for twenty-five minutes.



Hon. the Premier felt it worth discussing for twenty-five minutes, then I think it is worthwhile to have a few words on this Resolution, because there is nothing that the Hon. the Premier has said, nothing, not a word, not a scrap, not an iota of information he has given the House that takes anything away from this Resolution.

Now, the Hon. the Premier said; "it was announced in the House of Commons yesterday that the matter of the depletion of fish stocks in the North Atlantic is going to be discussed by the Prime Minister with the proper authorities in Russia." This Resolution was introduced, incidentally, Mr. Speaker, before any announcement was made in the House of Commons at Ottawa yesterday. It was introduced in this House yesterday afternoon at three of the clock, which would be half-past one, Ottawa time, which would be a half hour before the House of Commons at Ottawa met. But in any event, whether the author of the Resolution knew that this announcement had been made in the House of Commons at Ottawa or not is of no moment. This Resolution has nothing in it that can harm the discussions in Russia. All it does is demonstrate to the Prime Minister of Canada the concern of the members of this House of Assembly, not just the concern of the Premier, I presume he has some concern about it, nor the concern of the Government, but the concern of all members on both sides of this House about the serious situation affecting the fisheries, particularly of this Province, because of the depletion of fish stocks due to over-fishing by Russians and others in the North Atlantic. Does this Resolution do anything to deter Prime Minister Trudeau from pressing his point? No, it does not. Does it do anything to discourage his resolution, enthusiasm, courage and devotion to duty in pressing the point at Moscow? No, it does not. It encourages him. Because, if the Resolution is passed he will know that unanimously the members of this House of Assembly feel that this matter should be discussed; that we consider it to be a grave problem; that meaningful discussions are badly needed; that an international conference is badly needed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to leave to another member on this side of the House more capable than I or more fully briefed on this subject

to discuss the great point the Premier has made on the International Conference to be held in Halifax next week. He will deal with that. He will tell what kind of a great International Conference that is. It is certainly not the conference that is contemplated by this resolution, not at all. But I will leave that. The hon. member for Fortune Bay is fully familiar with that Conference, He has been at many of them. He will expound on that.

The Resolution asks th/s House to express our desire that Prime Minister Trudeau discuss with Russian Leaders the grave problem experienced by fishermen on the East Coast of Canada, particularly the depletion of fish stocks; that he urge them to join with Canada in convening an International Conference for Conservation of Fisheries in the North Atlantic, comprising all Nations utilizing the fisheries of the North Atlantic; that we communicate this forthwith by telegram to the Hon. the Prime Minister .

Now, Mr. Speaker, apparently the Government of Canada succumbed yesterday to the constant pressure that was put on the Government of Canada by the Conservative M.P's in Ottawa to include this on his agenda. This House well remembered, the people of this Province well remember that this item was not on Prime Minister Trudeau's agenda, was not to be discussed at Moscow, would not now be discussed at Moscow if Mr. John Lundrigan, Walter Carter, Jim McGrath, the other Conservative M.P's at Ottawa, representing Newfoundland, had not made an issue of it in the House of Commons. On two question periods they made an issue of this. Prime Minister Trudeau or his Government have agreed now to add that to the agenda. Does that show that the fact that this had to be brought up in the House of Commons two or three times and pressed by the Opposition Members, does that show a burning enthusiasm by Prime Minister Trudeau to discuss the matter? He is discussing it under pressure, because he was pressured by the Opposition at Ottawa to discuss it. What harm, Joey got her sunk! What harm can it do, Joey got her sunk even lower? What harm can it do, Mr. Speaker, for this House to pass a Resolution

saying that we unanimously desire this to be discussed; that we unanimously are concerned about it; that we unanimously feel there should be an International Conference, not this Conference of next week, an International Conference convened to discuss this whole topic and do something about it; what possible harm could there be? The only harm is this: That the motion is introduced not by the Government or by somebody on the Government side but by a member on the Opposition Side in the House. The Hon. the Premier just cannot bear that. Just cannot bear to think that the Government side should support anything suggested over here. It is a great pity that every feeling and thinking and every act of the Premier is dictated by such partisan consideration.

Mr. Speaker, there is no more serious problem for this Province. The House remembers the failure of the fishery in Labrador South last year. The House well remembers the failure of the fishery in Labrador South the year before. The House well remembers what has happened to the Labrador schooners that used to go down to Labrador to fish. How many went last year? They are no longer getting fish in along the Labrador Coast because it is all being caught off in International waters, off in the North Atlantic. What is the good of an inshore fisherman waiting for fish to come in to his nets, if they are all being caught outside? What is the good of the longliner man going out to fish, if all the fish is being caught by trawlers out in the North Atlantic? Russia is the country that is taking, I forget the percentage, but almost half the total catch. I have not the number of tons but it is stunning.

We all remember the general difficulty in catching fish inshore in Newfoundland any longer. What could be more serious to this Province? What difference will collective bargaining for fishermen make? What difference will a new marketing system for fresh frozen fish make? What difference will National Sea Products make, coming into St. John's here with their six new trawlers? What difference will any of that make, if in five or ten years time there is no fish out there to be caught? What difference will it be then? This is the central problem of the Newfoundland

fishery. There have been twenty-two years when no proper co-ordinated approach has been taken to it. There are some signs that a proper approach now is going to be taken to the organization of the industry in Newfoundland. Finally the Government is showing some initiative, we hope. But what is the good of that if, after the new system is instituted and improved upon in the next two or three years, there is no fish out there to be caught at all? What is the good of Newfoundland being on the fishing grounds of the North Atlantic, if there is no fish or very little on the fishing grounds? So, what could be more important to this House of Assembly? The Hon. Premier says that Mr. Trudeau has already discussed this item in Moscow. What is the source of his information? I saw a National T.V. interview with Mr. Trudeau before he left for Moscow. They asked him what was on the agenda. He mentioned, for example, the situation of the Jews in Russia, NATO, a number of other things. I never heard him mention, this was two days ago, when he left, I never heard him mention that very important question of the depletion of fish stocks on the east coast of Canada. He never mentioned that in his interview before he got on board of the plane. How much was that on his mind? How much was he seized with that question? What great importance did that have with the Prime Minister? He never mentioned it as one of the items, as they interviewed him waiting to go aboard the plane. Now the Hon. Premier says it was discussed yesterday. Who says? For how long, what fishery expert was there from Canada? Who is the fishery adviser with the Prime Minister? What fishery expert is with him? Who advised him yesterday in his talk with Mr. Kosygin on this question?

The Hon. Premier said he had a five hour chat with the Prime Minister. I am sure that must have been a great education for the Prime Minister. If the Premier did not give him some better sources than he gives this House for some of his statements, he is not very well informed in the fishery. We heard a difficult statement the other night. Ninety per cent of all the women working in Newfoundland, Premier said, were

working in fish plants, supermarkets and with the Government. Yet when he is asked to give the source of his statistics; was it DBS, what was it? No, No, I am not going to give the source, Never! No!

MR SPEAKER: Order -

MR.CROSBIE: You think that is far away, Mr. Speaker? The hon. minister who just spoke is a non-person, did not hear him. Now, Mr. Speaker, we know of this concern at Ottawa for the west coast fishery, we know there is some concern at Ottawa for the east coast fishery. But, if we did not have the six Opposition M.P's at Ottawa now, or the five who are there (one is busy down in Newfoundland preparing for a change of Government. That is a very important public task and duty. Nothing more important to the interest of this Province than what that hon. gentleman is doing) if we did not have those five Opposition M.P's, in Ottawa what would we be hearing now in Canada on the problems of the fishery in Newfoundland? You would not hear a scrap, you would not hear a peep, there would not be a sound. Yet these five gentlemen, because of their activity and interest in the question, have made the fisheries one of the big issues in the House of Commons in Canada. They have forced the Prime Minister, because of their pressure, to include this on his agenda. No matter how hard he presses it -

MR.SMALLWOOD: Go away, - becomes a great Tory now-

MR.CROSBIE: Poor old Premier, poor old Premier! Expel me!

MR,SMALLWOOD: A Liberal Reformer -

MR.CROSBIE: There is the hon. premier; expelled me, now he is crying. Now he is crying, now he regrets it. He wants me back. He wants me back. What is the offer?

MR.SMALLWOOD: Tory now.

MR.CROSBIE: Who is Tory now, that is the question that is bothering the Premier - disguised as Liberals, all around the Province.

MR.SMALLWOOD: I am not bothered by it. I am not bothered by it

MR.CROSBIE: They are all around the Province. A Tory here a Tory there.

MR.SMALLWOOD: I am happy to see him go Tory.



MR.SPEAKER: Order please! I would like to remind visitors in the gallery that they are not supposed to make their presence known in the House by noise nor movement nor applause nor laughter nor anything of that nature. I would like to ask the hon. member who is speaking to get a little closer to the subject .

MR.CROSBIE: Yes, I think I was discussing Tories, but the Hon. Speaker says it is not. It is a topic that was introduced by the Hon. Premier. So, Mr. Speaker, this is one of the main problems and is going to be increasingly a main problem, the fishery in Newfoundland. Look at the problems we have had with foreign vessels and Canadian vessels coming within the three mile limit and the twelve mile limit. With what vigor has that been pressed? With what vigour is this question of conservation of fish stocks being pressed? I mentioned last week the herring yield, how the catch of herring, we were told, this year is a half of last year's catch. That is just one aspect, herring. I noticed in the paper the other/<sup>day</sup>that Russian fishing vessels off the coast of Massachusetts were sweeping up in their trawls lobster pots set by the American fishermen. They are not going to take that lying down. In fact they are out in their vessels now discussing it. So what possible harm, I say, if the Prime Minister of Canada has already discussed this with Mr. Kosygin, let us ask him to discuss it again. Let us ask him to discuss this with renewed vigour. Let us ask him to discuss this several more times before he leaves Moscow. He is there I think for eleven days. Let us express our strong desire for this to be discussed and fish to be conserved. Let us express our strong desire for a real international conference, comprising all nations utilizing the fisheries of the North Atlantic.

The fact that this is being discussed in Moscow or was discussed yesterday is a wonderful tribute to our five conservative M.P's, in Ottawa, a wonderful tribute to them.

MR.SMALLWOOD: How low! How low! How low!

MR.CROSBIE: If the Premier wants to heckle, I will stop while he heckles. Does the Premier want to heckle? Heckle away! The Hon. Premier says that



the Prime Minister does not need this House to remind him about this fisheries question. No, he does not need this House as long as he has those five Conservative M.P's. up in Ottawa to remind him. But, it will do no harm for this House to remind the hon. gentleman, the Hon. the Prime Minister, also that we are all very much concerned with this question, that we are all as concerned as the five Conservative M.P's, at Ottawa are. That is important to all sides of this House. That is not a partisan matter. That we want it discussed not just, not just; "there are fisheries Mr. Kosygin, I must mention fisheries in the North Atlantic. Premier Smallwood wants me to mention it. Conservative M.P's in the House want me to mention the fisheries." Premier Kosygin says; "Yes, Mr. Trudeau, there are fisheries in the North Atlantic, We can consider that discussed." That is not what we want. We want it discussed in depth. We want the Canadian-Newfoundland position put, that we want some conservation measures for fish in the North Atlantic. We want it stressed, we want it discussed again, what this Resolution asks. That the Resolution be passed and wired to Moscow can do no harm at all, can only do good in the interest of this subject, Mr. Speaker, at Ottawa. So I for one am certainly going to vote for it. I do not believe the hon. member for St. John's East is going to withdraw, in fact he will not have unanimous consent, if he does attempt that. It is an excellent Resolution. He is to be congratulated He is in the great tradition of those five Conservative M.P's, at Ottawa whom we all thank today, whom the Premier has to thank for having this matter on the agenda at Moscow.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, in spite of the Premier's assistance or suggestion that this Resolution be withdrawn, I think that without doubt it is about the most important Resolution that has come before this House in many a long day. It cannot be covered up or camouflaged by insisting that all of this has already been done and the Resolution is completely useless. It is a strange sequence of events, very strange that a few hours after this Resolution was brought before this House a statement was made in

Ottawa, saying that the matter was being taken care of and that the Prime Minister would be talking to the Russian authorities on the subject of the East Coast Fisheries. It is a very, very strange coincidence indeed. However, that is not half as strange as the fact is that, if our Government was aware of this, that this was one of the prime items on the agenda of the Prime Minister when he visited Russia, why did they not shout to the rooftops in support of what the Prime Minister of Canada was doing? Why did they wait for a Resolution of this type to be brought before our House? Certainly this is of vital interest to our Province. We are all behind the Prime Minister. The Government should be the first to lead the bandwagon and say the Prime Minister of Canada, the great Pierre Elliot Trudeau, is at last showing a great interest in the fisheries, he is going to Moscow to talk about our fisheries.

When do we hear about it? We do not hear about it, Mr. Speaker, until the Opposition in this House introduces a Resolution.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In addition to turning Tory, away from the local Liberals, has he also turned Tory against the Liberals in Ottawa? Is he gone completely Tory?

MR. EARLE: That is a silly remark.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Answer it. Answer it.

MR. EARLE: It does not dignify a reply, it is too silly.

MR. SMALLWOOD: It does. It does. Is he definitely gone whole-hog Tory?

MR. EARLE: Every word that I have said in support of the Tories in Ottawa and the Tories in Newfoundland. All of whom have been fighting with all of their ability and today is ample evidence of it, in support of the -

MR. SMALLWOOD: - A few sneers against Trudeau. Go ahead!

MR. EARLE: I am not sneering, I have praised the Hon. the Prime Minister of Canada. Do not try to cast such silliness, That is only worthy of the Minister of Social Services, This is the sort of thing we have been getting thrown at us from across the House. We hope we are not called upon to ignore the Premier at this Conference, as we have that gentleman. But

this is just a red herring. We are talking on fish. Here we go with the red herring again coming up, to try to divert me from what I am saying.

This is obvious, and should obviously have been a prime concern of the Government of Newfoundland to come out wholeheartedly, publicly and every means, of the way in their conversations with the Premier and every other means they could use, to say that at last the fisheries of Newfoundland are getting great attention. We are one hundred per cent behind the Prime Minister of Canada. We wish him well, We support him with all the resolutions he wants. This is the sort of thing we have been praying for in Newfoundland for years. But how does it come out in this House? It comes out because a Resolution was introduced by the Opposition on this side. This is sneered at, it has been all too late. Whose fault is it that it is too late? Why was not the Government of this Province making the people of Newfoundland aware of what the Prime Minister of Canada was going to do on our behalf? Certainly that would have been the greatest feather in the cap of the Prime Minister in his support by Newfoundlanders. I think this is a tremendous, unforgivable camouflage. It is a sort of thing that is just said to throw people off.

Anyhow, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to this Resolution I will try to confine my remarks to the suggestions that an International Conference is to be held in Halifax this time next week, is I presume the meeting of ICNAF (International Commission for the North west Atlantic Fisheries). This Commission consists not of fourteen nations but of fifteen nations. They are, if the House is interested, Canada, Denmark, France, Federal Republic of Germany, Iceland, Italy, Japan, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Roumania, Spain, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom, United States of America. These are the members of ICNAF. Now it so happens, Mr. Speaker, that ten years ago I was the Canadian Commissioner on that body, the same international body as exists today, with the same members, with the exception at that time, Japan. I do not think Japan was officially a member, when I was there. Meetings were held. The

term of a Commissioner is for two years. I served on that body for two years. Meetings were held, the first year of my office, in Washington, Washington, U.S.A., the second year in Moscow. We spent, I spent, in company with all members of these delegations from these various nations, nine days in Moscow, discussing the fisheries. Now I was by no means the first Canadian Commissioner on ICNAF. This organization had been going on for many years. I came in somewhere when the thing had been functioning and going on. But, the Premier has displayed amazing ignorance of what this body does.

Ever since this body was formed, this International body, the main item on its agenda, one of the principal items, has been the conservation of the fisheries. The fisheries of the North West Atlantic has been their prime motive. They have been talking about it now ever since the organization was formed. At the time I was in Washington and again in Moscow I would say that this subject took up about at least fifty per cent, perhaps seventy-five per cent of the time of the agenda of this Conference.

Let me tell the House how it was done, why it is so necessary that the Parliament of Newfoundland stir up the Government of Canada and stir up this International body to take a proper look at what is our basic problem, that is the conservation of fish stocks. The ICNAF Organization in those days, it is still true today, was largely governed and largely influenced by scientific people. There were very heavy delegations of scientists, from all the countries of the World, serving on that organization. When it came to a conservation measures these chaps, who were learned gentlemen of the highest educational quality, spent hours and hours talking about the scientific approach to the fisheries. They prepared papers. I remember in Moscow by the time we finished we had a stack of scientific documents on the fisheries. They talked from a scientist standpoint, from a scientists viewpoint, on the conservation of the fisheries. Even in those days the scientists were warning of the depletion of the fisheries of the North Atlantic, of the waters of the North West Atlantic. They were urging

caution, but where this organization fell down, where it is so necessary for the Newfoundland Government, if it is truly interested in the fisheries, to try to put some influence on that organization was that, while the thesis and the scientific approach was excellent, the practical approach to actually doing something was almost non-existent. Because, while I was in Moscow, I had a great opportunity to look at some of the fisheries, fishery operations over there. Now, it may seem strange to the House that the city of Moscow, which is 700 miles from the nearest sea, is one of the greatest fishing manufacturing ports of the world. Seven hundred miles from the sea, yet it is a great fish-producing area. How is it a fish-producing area? There are ringed around Moscow large, huge fish processing plants. I was in some of them. I was in one of them that had 3,000 workers, in which there were seventy-two items of fish being prepared. Where did that fish come from? I ate fish in that plant, for lunch, which came off the Grand Banks of Newfoundland. I ate fish which came from the Japanese Sea. I ate fish which came from the far north. I ate fish which came from every conceivable corner of the globe. That fish was taken into Moscow by river boat and barge, from the ports on the seacoast, and processed in Moscow. This is almost something which the House may find difficult to believe.

The quality of that fish that I ate in Moscow was far superior to much of the fish that you will get today in the supermarkets in St. John's, Newfoundland. Now that seems to be a wild statement but it is true. Some of the quality of that fish, which I ate in Moscow in 1961, was superior in quality and flavour to some of the fish which you or I can get in a supermarket in St. John's today.

AN. NON. MEMBER: (inaudible)

MR. FARLE: There were all types. I said there were seventy-two varieties there. I tried my best to eat all seventy-two. I am very fond of fish so I sampled just about everything that was there. I wanted to get an insight into the types of fish that they were preparing. The strange thing about the way they prepared this fish, this is where a nation such as Russia, I

have no great brief for the way the Russians do their business, or the way the Russians do their international affairs or anything of that sort but, when it comes to the fundamental facts of supporting their people with food, they are in many instances head and shoulders over us, particularly in the fisheries. Because in this particular plant, which I mentioned, of 3,000 workers, which was governed by a lady, who was a scientist of the highest degree, she controlled that plant and she ran it. Believe me, she was a good fish plant manager. I wish we



MR. EARLE: had a dozen of them in Newfoundland, But that woman ran this huge organization and they produced all of this fish and the strange thing about it was that the equipment in that plant largely came from Holland, from West Germany, from Belgium and from Canada. The conveyer belts and all of the equipment used for conveying the fish was made in Canada.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman yield a moment? The late John T. Cheeseman, when he was Minister of Fisheries in Newfoundland, and I were in Paris together, We went to the famous Paris market, which then was in the heart of Paris, It is now built out near Orly Airport, right along side of the airport. But we saw more fish and John Cheeseman, who knew fish, admittedly knew fish, John Cheeseman said to me; "look, I am ashamed to go back to Newfoundland, We do not know anything about fish." We saw more fish there in the fish part of the market, we went there about four o'clock in the morning, five o'clock, when the stuff was coming in from all over France, pouring into the market, starting about three o'clock, By five o'clock in the morning. it was pretty well full. We saw more fish in the fish part of the Paris market, that morning at five o'clock, than you would see in Newfoundland in a whole year. That morning and every morning was the same thing, Like - it must have been similar to what the hon gentleman saw in Moscow.

MR. EARLE: What the hon. the Premier says is very correct indeed In fact it is true. It is true of so many places in the world that I have been that the fish available to the public in these cities and the variety and species and even the quality is so greatly superior to some of the stuff we get in North America that we wonder if we have been asleep for generations. The miracle which I was pointing out, that Moscow is 700 miles from the sea. It is 700 miles from the ocean and yet they were able to produce this fine quality and they are doing some of it with Canadian equipment. This is the point I was making.

Now they have developed tremendous techniques of smoking and processing fish. I think there is a greater variety of smoked fish in Russia than you will get anywhere else in the world. Very, very delicious fish, delightful

MR. FARLE: to eat. They go in for smoking very heavily. But strangely enough, certain species which are available on our Grand Banks they throw over board. For instance, you cannot get a scallop in Russia. They do not like scallops. They do not think they are fit to eat. For some reason or other, they will not eat them and certain other species which they will not eat. In spite of that they are preparing, in this particular plant and probably the others are like it, they had seventy-odd varieties of fish products, of excellent kinds.

Now what I am leading up to, Mr. Speaker, is this; that the lady who ran that plant spoke very fluent English and over lunch I sat down and talked to her. One of the most frightening observations, which amazed me at that time, was the statement that if the people of Moscow could not get fish to eat at least three or four times a week, there would be danger of another revolution in Russia. They are such tremendous fish eaters, it is so much apart of their daily diet that they eat fish practically everyday of the week. They are great fish consumers. By the way, herring is one of the biggest items that they consume, tremendous quantities of herring. They are very, very fond of it.

Now this all pin-points that the fisheries are of such great importance to the Russian and the feeding of their people and there are so many millions upon millions of their people that they are not just going to sit down and have a small country like Canada dictate to them. Canada is not in a position, Canada cannot wage gunbolt warfare, over the fisheries, with Russia. So it must be done by International agreement. The point which I made about ICNAF will be meeting in Halifax next week, that for years and years of that organization's operation and functioning, it concentrated so heavily on the exchange of scientific information, By the way, I am very proud to say that Canada is quite foremost in the provision of scientific information, Some of our scientists who operate here out of St. John's have world famous names, as far as the science of the fishing is concerned, and we have every reason to be proud of it. But, when it came to items on the agenda, such as restricting of fishing, the inspection of fishing gear, the conservation

MR. EARLE: and restriction of fishing of any sort, then you came up with a complete blank wall. There was no co-operation, no desire to get on with the job and certainly no indication at that time that these nations were willing to listen to Canada at all.

So I predict, unless things have changed very, very tremendously over the past ten years, the Prime Minister of Canada, if he discusses fisheries, is going to have a very difficult task on his hands indeed. Because, whereas in Canada, apparently, Canada gives the impression that they can sometimes live without their fishery, Newfoundland may not be able to, but certainly the impression one gets Federally is that the fishery are not too important. But Russia cannot live without the fisheries. Russia is very dependent on the feeding of its people upon the fisheries of the world and they are going to exploit them to the greatest extent they possibly can.

So, Mr. Speaker, I think, the hon. the Premier's remarks as to why we should withdraw this Resolution and not get behind it are completely out of place and unwarranted at this time. Because, whether it is too late or too early, there is nothing, nothing, absolutely nothing of more importance to Newfoundland than this House's support, in every conceivable way, of any efforts which can be made to preserve and conserve our fisheries. Now I would, I think, have gone along with the Government if they had been men enough, instead of trying to ridicule my hon. friend from St. John's East, when he came out with one of the most sensible resolutions that has ever been presented in this House, instead of trying to ridicule him and make him look small, if the Government had been men enough to up and say; well, the Prime Minister has already got this well in hand and it would look foolish for us to go back to him now. But cannot the House jointly have this resolution amended to support the efforts of the Prime Minister over there? Now I doubt that, if we can only go along with that at this late date, but this whole argument has been brought up and brought to fruition by the action of this side of the House, which surely, if nothing else, must indicate to the people of Newfoundland where the real interest in the fishery of Newfoundland lies. It is not a post facto statement by this side

MR. EARLE: of the House. The only post facto statements that have been made are from the other side of the House.

These statements, that were made by the Premier today, should have had been made a week ago, not today. This is where the whole thing has been thrown completely out of gear. So he has in his own words condemned his Government for showing a lack of interest and publicity on the sort of thing which he contends that the Prime Minister of Canada is now doing.

Mr. Speaker, unless this House uses all its influence on the Federal Government of Canada to make it, in its turn, use its strongest influence on the International body of ICNAF and through every other means it possible can on business of its officials to various countries interested in the fisheries, I am afraid that the Federal Government of Canada may say to itself, and rightly so, "where is the interest of the people of Newfoundland, where this item is vital, This is the very life-blood of their existence and what are we hearing from them?" The only thing that we are hearing from at the moment, Mr. Speaker, is a very loud appeal for the co-operation of both sides of the House on a subject which is of the utmost importance to the future benefit and welfare of this Province.

MR. T. A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, in supporting the Resolution, I think, there are certain facts that we should take note of, when deciding whether or not the Prime Minister of Canada had gone to Russia just bubbling with enthusiasm for the discussions and in anticipation of the discussions of conservation methods in the North Atlantic.

The history of the Prime Minister, with respect to conservation in the North Atlantic, even up to three days ago, should indicate to this House very clearly that there is not any fierce loyal enthusiasm for the alledged discussion on conservation of fish and marine species in the North Atlantic at the present Conference in Moscow. Last week there was a very lengthy and detailed briefing of the Prime Minister preparatory to his trip to Moscow, The significant thing is that at that briefing the subject of fish conservation, the subject of fisheries, fish generally, was not mentioned. There was no reference to it. It was not on the agenda. The Prime Minister was not briefed. The reason that was given, Mr. Speaker,

MR. NICKMAN: following the briefing, as to why that was not discussed, why there was no briefing, was that the Government of Canada and the Government of the U.S.S.R. had already settled the importance difference and the important problem that existed between them, namely that of conservation of Canadian fish stocks in Canadian territorial waters in the Pacific.

Now what was the next step that was taken? The next step was taken was on Friday morning. That was the day following the briefing of last week. The six Opposition Members of Parliament, all six, from Newfoundland wrote a formal letter to the Prime Minister asking that this be included on the agenda. This was on Friday of last week. Setting forth very clearly to the Prime Minister why in their opinion this should be included on the agenda, why it is a vital importance to the people of Newfoundland and to the Canadian fishermen, and strongly urged that this be done. Yesterday, Tuesday, just yesterday there was an acknowledgement of the letter written by the six Opposition Members, not from the Prime Minister, but from his office. That letter simply said; "The Prime Minister had been made formally aware of your representation." He did not go on to say that conservation measures and conservation discussions will be included on the agenda. Today, this morning, there was a question asked of the Minister of External Affairs, in the House of Commons, by Mr. John Lundrigan, M.P., one of the Opposition representatives from this Province. The question asked was; "May I ask the minister whether the question of conservation of marine resources will be discussed during the Prime Minister's current visit to the Soviet Union?" The hon. Mr. Sharpe in reply said; "yes, Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding and it has been confirmed by the Minister of Fisheries that this is one of the items on the agenda."

Now let us consider the efforts that had to be made. The Ottawa news papers referred to the efforts of the six Newfoundland Members of Parliament as an eleventh hour appeal to Prime Minister Trudeau to include the over exploitation of fish stocks of the North Atlantic on his agenda for discussions in the Soviet Union. An eleventh hour appeal? Why would there need to be an eleventh hour appeal to the Prime Minister, if he left here just



MR. HICIMAN: bubbling over with enthusiasm for the conservation of our fishery stocks in the North Atlantic? No, Mr. Speaker, the evidence points up very clearly that the most that we can expect from any discussion that may take place in Moscow is simply a preliminary talk may be a warming up to the item, so that it can be said at the end; "yes, we did mention the fishery."

Well, Mr. Speaker, the whole history and the attitude of the Government of Canada towards fisheries have been put, not only by this side of the House, it was put in a debate last week by the Leader of the Government, that he fears that there is very little concern on the part of parliamentarians for food producers in Canada. This is a very correct and factual statement. We have tried, representatives in the House of Commons during the past two or three years, from this Province, have tired and tried to get Canada to assert some of its rights insofar as fish conservation is concerned particularly in the North Atlantic, but to no avail.

But let me direct this House's attention to the Convention that was entered into in 1958, at the Law of the Sea Conference. At that Conference, Mr. Speaker, it was unanimously agreed that any marine nation such as Canada had the right to unilaterally impose conservation and management controls over the waters adjacent to its territorial waters (in the convention, by definition, this is our Continental Shelf) if the country in question was unsuccessful, during a six month period, of eliciting multi-lateral agreements. Now that was agreed at the Law of the Sea Conference in 1958. Canada has been woefully unsuccessful in exercising any conservation rights over its fish stocks in our territorial waters.

Indeed, not only has it been woefully unsuccessful, it has been woefully disinterested in protecting and conserving and managing the fish stocks in our territorial waters. This has been raised during the past two or three years, time and time again, by the Newfoundlanders of Parliament. Until up to about eight months ago, the reply always was, "we are going to take this up again at the next Law of the Sea Conference, which we hope will be held in 1971. Now the faint hope has been expressed, by the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa, that the Conference will be held in 1973. But there is a recent

MR. HICKMAN: statement emanating from the United Nations which indicates (1) there will be no Law of the Sea Conference in 1973. The agenda is not even been close to being finalized. That this takes years of negotiations amongst representatives of the participating nations and that the optimistic members of the United Nations anticipate that maybe in 1975 this Law of the Sea Conference will be held.

But there has been an indication from the United Nations, Mr. Speaker, as to where conservation will rank in order of importance at the Law of the Sea Conference. There has been some agreement as to the priorities of this Conference. Priority (1) pollution of the waters. Priority (2) mineral rights underneath the waters. Priority (3) territorial rights. Priority (4) air corridor rights. There has been no indication at all yet where conservation or management will fit in the Law of the Sea Conference, if and when it is held in 1975.

But what good is it going to do? Canada was given rights at the last Convention, in the Convention that I just referred to, that were approved at the Law of the Sea Conference in 1958 and Canada has done nothing about it. No, Mr. Speaker, the evidence points up very, very clearly that the Premier's statement, that in the House of Commons there is very little concern for the food producers of this nation and that includes fishermen, is quite correct. Canada is most reluctant and most unconcerned to take any action which may help the fishermen, on the Eastern Sea Board in particular.

Now let us take a look at this ICNAF Conference that is coming up. We had one here last year or in 1969-70 and that Conference too dealt with conservation and certain resolutions were passed. Did it have any effect? Did it improve the situation of the Newfoundland fishermen or the Canadian fishermen? Not on your life, Mr. Speaker. If anything it was totally ignored. Just listen, Mr. Speaker, to some of the resolutions that were passed, that each contracting Government, and this includes Canada and the other fourteen countries who attended, which had participated in the fishery for Atlantic salmon, take appropriate action to limit the aggregate tonnage of vessels employed or catch taken by its nationals. Did Denmark pay any attention to that Convention? Not on your life, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NICKMAN: There is another one, the conservation of herring in the convention area. The urge and the restraint of the further expansion of the herring fishery be restricted. Any action taken to conserve herring as a result of the ICNAF resolutions? No, Mr. Speaker. So are we going to sit back, are we going to use this as an excuse for not passing this resolution? That next week in the City of Halifax we will find a meeting of the fourteen participating nations, going all the way from the U.S.S.R. with their master production, to Japan which is a great producer, Romania and all the others. Did Iceland pay the slightest bit of attention to ICNAF resolutions and ICNAF conventions when it extended its territorial waters some years ago and arrested British trawlers? Did Iceland pay the slightest bit of attention to the protest from the participating nations? They did not. And they still continue to operate in the same manner and exercise the same jurisdiction as they did before ICNAF passed the resolution.

The ICNAF meeting is not an answer to a vote against this resolution, Mr. Speaker.

To give this House just some indication as to where our Newfoundland people sit on this resolution and what over fishing is doing to our stocks, let me quote from an article which appeared in the March 18, 1971 of the "Burin Peninsula Post" - "Apprehension is mounting concerning the lack of effective conservation in the waters off Newfoundland. Fishermen are concerned that cod and flounder may soon become as scarce as haddock and that the entire region may become fished out within a very short period." Then Mr. Harvey Major, a very experienced Newfoundlander who spent his -

MR. SMALLWOOD: a staunch Liberal.

MR. NICKMAN: A staunch Liberal, but he puts loyalty to Newfoundland ahead of Liberalism. That makes him rather peculiar, rather different, but he is a first class, loyal, patriotic Newfoundlander, very knowledgeable of the frozen fish industry. Now listen to Mr. Major, an employee, on the Russian policy: Mr. Major said that, they, the Russians, had predetermined the sustainable yields of fish on the grounds close to their homeland and had established a system of restriction to prevent over-fishing. Their vessels have merely left the Russian fishing grounds and now concentrate their

MR. HICEMAN: efforts in the waters which most fishermen believe are rightfully Canadian. This is what is happening. There is no nation in the world more conservation conscious than is the Russian Nation, when it comes to its marine stocks and its fish stocks that lie within and off their territorial waters. They enforce it very rigidly. You do not hear of Canadian or Danish or Norwegian or any ICNAF country ships invading the Russian territorial waters and fishing in their conservation, their conserved areas. So the Russians move out here. They cleaned us out of haddock. That is a scientific, factual statement. They dragged the spawning grounds. Haddock which used to be, even in 1960, the early 60's, the greatest landing of any species that the offshore fishery brought into the South Coast of Newfoundland, It has now become a luxury item. They do not fish for it any more, they cannot find it. We have statements from our Newfoundland fish producers that the cod and the rose fish may have passed the point of sustainable yield, and that these two species will follow in the footsteps of the haddock.

Again, Mr. Major, in that same article, expressed the opinion that the twelve mile limit, which is imposed by the Federal Government, is a step in the right direction and is essential to the preservation of the inshore fishery. He feels, however, that is insufficient and that the limit should be extended to the entire continental shelf. Now this continental shelf theory, Mr. Speaker, is not new. The Americans are exercising it. Chile has exercised it. Other South American countries have exercised it. They have unilaterally imposed a two hundred mile limit, under the guise of the theory of their territorial rights, over the continental shelf off their shores.

Now apparently we are not going to do that. Apparently it is going to have to be done by negotiation. ICNAF will not be the source nor the implement nor the instrument by which that kind of negotiation, whenever it comes to fruition. If it is going to be done at all, it is going to have to be at the ministerial level, an International Conference of the marine

Mr. Hickman.

three nations. Then, Mr. Speaker, maybe we will find some results. Mr. Speaker that is why this House should unanimously reflect the feelings of the people of Newfoundland and make no mistake of what the feelings of the people of Newfoundland are on this issue. Regardless of partisanship, regardless of where a man sits in the House of Assembly, that we want this conservation item not to be an appendix to the Prime Minister's agenda but at the top of the list. It certainly is not at the top of the list right now. The whole evidence of compulsion that was necessary in order to get it on at all would indicate that it is not in that place.

Mr. Speaker, if we want any indication as to what the Russians are doing right now, (The Russians seem to be the greatest - I do not know if offender is the word) they are spending more effort and using more advanced techniques than any other nation fishing in the North Atlantic. They are having a more serious affect on the fish stocks of our North Atlantic than any other fishing nation. To give you an idea, Mr. Speaker, what they are doing and the kind of planning and the kind of technology that they are using in their assault upon our traditional fishing grounds, may I remind the House once again of the new 43,000 tons ship, "Vostok," which recently went into action off our shores. This ship, hon. members will recall, carries on board a whole flotilla of small draggers, 56 feet, 5 inches in length. To give you some idea of the size of the boat, her ship's company is 594 persons. That is almost half the dragger fishermen of this Province, on one boat - 594, the complement of the "Vostok". Every possible modern technique is used so that that ship and the flotilla operating from that ship will catch every fish that is swimming in our territorial waters. So are we going to wait until next year or the year after and then come into this House and wring our hands and lament the fact that the cod and the rose fish and sole have now disappeared and talk about the good old days when we use to have lots of fish off our shores and say: 'You know, it did happen to the haddock in 1961 or in 1962? We really did not think it was going to happen to all species. Maybe we should have paid attention. Maybe we should have listened to that Resolution



Mr. Hickman

that was brought before this hon. House on May 19, 1971 by the hon. member for St. John's East. At least we would have shown the people of Newfoundland that we were alert to the dangers and that we would leave no stone unturned. We did not care who we embarrassed to make our position abundantly clear." That Mr. Speaker is what this Resolution is all about. To even suggest that we would look ridiculous in the eyes - I do not know who - of the Prime Minister, to send this on now, to send off this Resolution, to unanimously pass this Resolution, just does not make any sense. To suggest that the meeting of ICNAF in Halifax will discuss this problem and that this again is an answer to this Resolution, is not in accord with the facts and the results that did not flow from previous ICNAF meetings.

According, Mr. Speaker, to the statistics of the Department of Fisheries and Forestry, the Federal Department of Fisheries and Forestry; in the Province of Newfoundland, in 1968, there were 24,000 people directly employed in the fishing industry, out of a total work force of 130,000. In the three Maritime Provinces, excluding Newfoundland, there were 31,000 people directly employed, out of a total work force of 466,000. All told, in the four Atlantic Provinces, in that year, there were 55,000 Canadians directly employed in the fishing industry. In the other provinces, in the other Atlantic Provinces, Mr. Speaker, the fishery, whilst it is an important segment of industry in all four, yet the diversification of industry in these provinces does not make them as dependent on the fishery as we are in Newfoundland. Whilst the fishery is most important to them, and they have made their wishes known from time to time, it is even more important to this House. If we have to pass a Resolution every day and if we have to look silly, we still should do it, because there has yet to come from this House of Assembly, since 1949, a unanimous Resolution directing our concern and bringing our concern for the depletion of our fish stock to the Government of Canada. If you were Prime Minister of Canada, concerned with all the problems that he has to face and if you were faced with powerful lobbies from practically every industry and every area in Canada and you heard nothing from the House of Assembly of

Mr. Hickman.

Newfoundland, would you not logically come to the conclusion that we have no problems insofar as the fishery is concerned, that we are not really concerned about the depletion of the stock, that when people write about this in the paper they really do not know what they are talking about. It is only to make good reading? But if this Resolution is passed, Mr. Speaker, it will not be denounced. Of course it will not be denounced and nothing close to it. But it will be the first step to indicate to the Prime Minister of this nation that the House of Assembly is reflective of the views of our people and that we believe that conservation of our fishery stock is a most important issue facing Newfoundlanders today. Newfoundlanders will accept no compromise, no slick interpretation of the wording of the Resolution. They will not accept the statement that ICNAF is going to deal with it next week and say; "therefore, it is a silly resolution." They most assuredly will not accept the statement that this is going to get the priority it deserves at the meetings in Moscow.

Mr. Speaker, I furnished to this House the statistics as to the number of people directly employed in the fishery in our area. I think this House should be once again reminded that for every man who goes out on a trawler, he keeps three employed on shore. You can multiply that figure by three. Then you will get a true picture of the impact the fishery has on the work force of this Province and why we should not be cute and slick and partisan and vote against this Resolution. I would like to hear the hon. the member for Burgeo- LaPoile stand in his place and say: "I will not support this Resolution,

I am satisfied with what the Prime Minister is doing and it is sufficient." I would love to hear the hon. the member for Hermitage or the hon. the member for St. Barbe North, St. Barbe South or Placentia West - the hon. member for St. Barbe North is satisfied - or Labrador South - yet when he goes down there in his district, he hears of destruction of the gear and fishing nets of his people and there are threats to call to arms. He hears all about it but he does not think or he is satisfied that this little appendix to an agenda will be sufficient at this time to satisfy his people and to satisfy

Mr. Hickman

Newfoundlanders that this has been taken care of.

MR. CROSBIE: What about Labrador South?

MR. HICKMAN: I mentioned Labrador South.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, but there is not a fish up there.

There is no snow clearing equipment. There is no fish.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker there is not much doubt that the Canadian nation, during the last twenty-one years, and the Government of Canada have sat idly by and watched our fishery resources be depleted, watch the haddock disappear, watch the rose fish crisis, the cod fish crisis. It is significant that the catch in quantity of our inshore fishermen in Newfoundland has dropped roughly by one-half over the last ten to fifteen years. The average catch of the small inshore fishermen in Newfoundland is down to about fifty per cent of what it was in the mid 50's. It is equally significant, Mr. Speaker, that at the same time the total catch in the North West Atlantic, by members of the International Commission of the North Atlantic Fishery, increased by 2 million tons in 1958 to 4 million tons in 1968. It is equally significant that the Soviet catch in this same area increased from 117,000 tons in 1958 to 741,000 in 1968. It is significant, too, that the cod fish catch of the member nations increased from 880,000 tons to 1,860,000 tons. On the other hand, in the same period, from 1963 to 1969, Newfoundland's total cod catch dropped from 450 million pounds to 300 million pounds, despite the fact that Newfoundland fishermen had been operating at their efficiency peak and were better equipped than they were ever before. This happened during a period after the stern draggers had been introduced. They are a far more efficient operation than the side dragger. But when you look at these statistics Mr. Speaker, they leave very little room for doubt that the fishery of this Province, as far as conservation is concerned and as far as stocks are concerned, is in a state of crisis and quote Mr. Gus Etchegary, "in a state of collapse."

Look, at the statistics on haddock. In 1965 the total catch in the North West Atlantic was 249,000 tons, of which the Russians took

Mr. Hickman.

129,000 tons. In 1968 the total catch of haddock by all North Atlantic nations was 97,000 tons even though some nations had quadrupled their effort. The decline in red fish was from 325,000 tons in 1958 to 182,000 in 1968. Now, according to Mr. Harvey Maugher and Mr. Etchegary and Mr. Russel and those knowledgeable Newfoundlanders who were engaged in prosecuting the deep sea fishery off our shores, this decline, since the period that I just referred to, has become even more pronounced. Yet we sit in this House and we hear today that the Leader of the Government, in concluding his speech, said; "let us not waste the time of the House discussing this Resolution." That, Mr. Speaker, in six words sets forth so clearly and so unmistakably the attitude of the present administration, the present Government, towards the fishery of this Province. "Let us not waste the time of this House." Let us not waste the time, indeed! When you read these statistics, when you realize that we need at least twenty-seven to thirty modern, large draggers, just to maintain the present production and even then there is no assurance or guarantee that we will - all we are told is that the Prime Minister mentioned it this morning. We do not know what he said. We do know that he did not want to talk about it in the beginning. We do know that he was shamed into talking about it. We do know that it is an appendix to his agenda.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the time for the members who represent this Province and in particular the members who represent the fishing districts of this Province to put their money where their mouths are and stand up and vote for this Resolution and put silly, party politics out of it. Even though it will not bring the great results that we must have, the dramatic result that we must have, the dramatic steps that we must have in conservation forthwith, Yet for the first time, May 19, 1971, for the first time we would be able to say that this Legislature reflected the views of all Newfoundlanders and we were prepared to stand up and be counted. We do not care who we embarrass, because we have a message to give and that message has to be loud. It has to be

Mr. Hickman

clear. It has to be repeated. It has to be embarrassing. That message is that we want action now. If you can do it by way of negotiating, start negotiating today. If you cannot do it by way of negotiating, then have the courage to exercise some of the rights that were conferred on you under the convention, in the Law of The Sea Conference that was held a few years ago and which I referred to earlier. None of this has been happening. The suspicion is that some members of this House will vote against this Resolution. I am glad that they are going to have to face the electorate and explain why. It is unexplainable and it is inexcusable.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there are a few words I would like to say on this particular Resolution. We believe that the fishery is among the most important natural resources in this Province. It becomes mandatory that every hon. member in this House, regardless of what side he might be sitting on, is obliged to stand up and support it. He is obliged to stand up and vote for it. The hon. member for Burin, who just resumed his seat, announced very well the problems of the fishery, over-fishing on the part of the European countries. He used a lot of statistics, which I have already used in this House and was about to use again. However, they cannot be used too often because the statistics do point out the very serious nature of the problem of fish depletion. He referred to hon. members opposite who are representing fishing districts in Newfoundland. He referred to the two members from Labrador, St. Barbe. He also included White Bay North, Twillingate and Fogo, Bonavista Bay, Trinity Bay and Conception Bay districts. Certainly those people who are representing fishermen in this House will stand up and support this Resolution and, as I said, will stand up and vote for it.

It is all very well, Mr. Speaker, for the Premier to say that he has had a conversation with the Prime Minister to the effect that he is taking the matter up with Mr. Kosygin during his visit to Moscow. Information which



Mr. Collins.

we received from our members in Ottawa would indicate that not even lip service has been paid to the drastic problems facing the fishery, by any one up there, with the exception of the Conservative M.P.'s. Certainly we have seen very little evidence of support coming from the Government benchers in this House. This is not a problem that came up on us last week or yesterday or today. It is a problem which has been growing on us for years and nothing has been done to try and prevent it.

What the Premier has told us today, Mr. Speaker, is nothing more than an afterthought. He has realized the impact of the efforts of the Conservatives in Ottawa. He has realized the impact of this particular motion, which has been brought in by the Opposition on this side of the House. He is just trying now to become identified again with the fishermen of this Province. That is not enough, because the fishermen of this Province deserve better treatment. They deserved better treatment for years and they certainly deserve it now.

Mr. Speaker I remember reading a while ago that similar problems existed in the North Sea prior to the last war. It was only because the war was started and fought for several years that the fishery recovered, the fish resources recovered in the North Sea. Unless we can come up with an international arrangement which is going to enforce quota systems, quota restrictions, unless we can do that, then I would say that following a war and goodness knows no one wants another war, following a war, then we can just about forget the fish stocks on the East Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. I urge all hon. members opposite - I am representing the district of Gander and people might wonder why should I support a Resolution such as this. I can say, Mr. Speaker, that a good fishery in Fogo means a good year for Gander and a good fishery in Musgrave Harbour means a good year for Gander. A good fishery anywhere in Notre Dame Bay is a good fishery for all Newfoundland and St. John's and the whole Province because the success of it or the failure of it is reflected all over the Province. Certainly let us forget petty partisan politics and all members rise up and speak and support this motion.

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, first of all I might state that I think it is quite obvious that I absolutely have no intention of withdrawing this Resolution. It would take a lot more eloquence than was shown by the hon. the Premier and certainly a lot less sarcasim and cynicism to make me do that.

The hon. the Premier mentioned a few points and obviously his supporters on the other side are not going to say and they cannot say that they did not have a chance. They had a chance and they did not say anything with respect to this Resolution. The first thing that the hon. the Premier said was that this was unnecessary. Yes this is very, very unnecessary. The fact remains, Mr. Speaker, that the fisheries on the East Coast of Canada ought to have being at the top of the agenda of the Prime Minister of Canada before he went to Russia, before there were any questions raised, had to be raised by representatives of Newfoundland, the Federal M.P's in Ottawa, or before there had been any representations, which apparently there were none until yesterday, from the Provinc'al Government. This thing, this matter, this aspect of the conservation of the fisheries in the North Atlantic ought to be on his agenda. After all, there was a problem on the West Coast with respect to the conservation of fish stock. That was put mighty high on the agenda of the Prime Minister of this nation. It was subsequently removed, when the difficulty was resolved. There was nothing about the fisheries on the East Coast. There was absolutely nothing until he got pressured. I say (the Premier says it is very unnecessary) the very fact that this item was not on the agenda and indeed at the top of the agenda of the Prime Minister before he was pressured to do it, before the Government of Canada was pressured to do so, and this is a very vital reason which shows a very vital necessity of why it should be there.

Another question, arising out of the remarks of the hon. the Premier, the Leader of this Government, the Leader of this fishing Province,

Mr. Marshall.

that I would like to question and question very seriously and that is: Why were we not informed, why were not the people of this Province, specifically the people of this House, informed before today that there were representations made to the Prime Minister of our country with respect to the conservation of our basic natural resource? I had hoped myself to put this on a plane above politics. The hon. the Premier, in his usual fashion, made this completely impossible. So now I ask the question: Why were we not informed? Why were not the people of Newfoundland informed before? The reason is quite obvious. The Prime Minister of this country was catering to the interests in Central Canada and Western Canada. We have seen this to the

MR. MARSHALL: detriment of the east and particularly to the detriment of Newfoundland. Through the pressure, the interest and the intellectual probing of the members of Parliament, the Tory Members of Parliament, he was forced then to put it on the agenda. I do not know, I really suspect the fact that not having been placed there in the first place, not having taken its rightful position in the first place, I wonder just how seriously the Prime Minister is going to talk this over with Communist Leaders in Russia.

Certainly, the presence of the telegram containing this resolution ought to draw it, bring it forcefully to his attention, that we in Newfoundland stand behind the fishermen, not as Liberals, not as Tories, not as socialists or what have you, or Federal M.P.'s or Provincial M.P.'s, but as Newfoundlanders. As Newfoundlanders we demand that the basic natural resource of our Province, that steps be taken to protect the basic natural resource of our Province.

The hon. the Premier also said, the hon. the Premier also pointed out then, yesterday, all of a sudden, yesterday, this announcement was made in the House of Commons. That must needs be corrected. The hon. the member for Burin, while this debate was going on, was in contact with one of the effective, most effective members of Parliament that Newfoundland has ever sent to Ottawa, Mr. John Lundrigan and Mr. Frank Moores, Mr. Jim McGrath and so on, all six of them.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. MARSHALL: We certainly heard an awful lot more about Newfoundland in Ottawa as a result of 1968. The hon. the Premier said that yesterday that was announced. Now that has to be corrected. Today the question was asked, and today we were informed that it is the understanding, Mr. Sharpe, the Acting Prime Minister, said it in response to the question; 'it is my understanding, and it has been confirmed by the Minister of Fisheries, that this, being the marine resource of the North Atlantic Conservation, is one of the items on the agenda.' So it was today not yesterday, for accuracy sake.

We did not receive this news, you will notice, through the medium of the newspapers, or radio, or television, through electronic media. All I can say is the telephone wires were pretty hot yesterday after this resolution was introduced.

Of course, the good members of Parliament from Newfoundland were doing their duty, as usual, and as a result this is being placed on the agenda. We have to bring it, I say, forcibly to the attention of the Prime Minister of this country, that we require him to take steps to protect the diminishing economy of the most depressed part of Canada.

When you get on to the business, great scoffing was made with respect to the conference, the International Conference on Fisheries. The hon. the member for Fortune Bay, who has more knowledge of the fisheries than all members of this House put together. and then some, has already dealt effectively with this.

MR. STRICKLAND: Oh yeah!

MR. MARSHALL: The hon. member for Trinity South had his opportunity to speak, and I would ask Your Honour's ruling that the hon. the member for Trinity South and the others, unless they are going to raise to a Point of Order, keep quiet.

MR. SPEAKER: I request all hon. members to allow the hon. member for St. John's East to continue uninterrupted, please.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When we get on to this business of the International Conference, and it is going to be dealt with in a few weeks time, this great conference, this continuing conference, this commission actually that is meeting in Halifax, has been meeting for a number of years, you tell the tens of thousands of inshore fishermen of this Province, you tell them that their fate is going to be suddenly secured by the meeting of this commission. What we need Mr. Speaker, is a fresh, new International Conference for the purpose of the conservation of fisheries in the North Atlantic, for the purpose of conserving the fisheries of this Province.

We are told, by the hon. the Premier, the only person on the



Government side to speak, that it would be foolish to send it. I say this; "it would be foolish to send it because, the Prime Minister has already taken the matter up." I point this out, this Government ought to have sent a communication of this nature, without the necessity of a resolution, before it became necessary, as soon as it became apparent that the Prime Minister of this country was prepared to put the economic welfare of the people of Central Canada, the economic welfare of the people of Western Canada, to advance their interests, which was proper, and to forget the economic welfare of the citizens of Eastern Canada and particularly the poor oppressed fishermen of this Province.

He is aware, we are told. The Prime Minister is aware of the life and death need of this topic being discussed. Well, if he was so aware of the life and death need, Mr. Speaker, I say again, why was it not on the agenda in the first place? Why did it have to wait the probing of the Tory M.P.'s in the House of commons to do it? To them should go the credit, should certainly go the credit of bringing any kind of approach that may be made. Albeit, it may be weak, it probably will be weak by the Prime Minister to the Leaders of the Russian people. No, Mr. Speaker, it is very important that all elected members, all elected members of this House and all elected members in the Province of Newfoundland, indeed, all Newfoundlanders, bring very forcibly to the attention of our Prime Minister that we want to hear that he is advancing the interests of the fishermen on the East Coast. A vote of this nature on this resolution would show that this Legislature and all of its members stand four square behind it.

The hon. the Premier said that if we send this resolution we will appear as if we are asleep. The issue Mr. Speaker, is to make sure that the Federal Government does not remain asleep to the needs of conservation in the North Atlantic and the protection of the fisheries of this Province. Indeed, thanks again, I should say, emphasize again, have to go to the Federal M.P.'s in Ottawa for making any kind of an inroad in this area. I would love to see the reaction, if I could speculate for a moment,

Mr. Speaker, I would love to see the reaction if the Prime Minister of our country happened to be the hon. R.L. Stanfield, or the hon. John Diefenbaker. I would love to see the reaction of the hon. the Premier and the members of the Government. They would be biting carpets between here and Roache's Line in their vehemence to get at the Prime Minister of the day. We would not hear the last of it for the year, ten years. We would be reminded of it again and again and again. Unfortunately, it would appear that this Government is not prepared to put the interests of Newfoundland above partisan politics.

There are two issues facing Newfoundland, two very important issues, Mr. Speaker. First, there is the state of the fisheries. Secondly; there is the state of the Government. We have five Tory M.P.'s who are dealing effectively with the state of the fisheries. We have one Tory M.P. who is dealing effectively with the state of this Government. The five Tory M.P.'s are doing all they can to solve the problems in our fisheries. The one Tory M.P., Mr. Moores, will soon be solving the problem in this Government.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that it was necessary to bring politics into this, but the hon. the Premier could not resist from bringing it in. He invited me to withdraw this Resolution, when he stood up in his usual eloquent style of 1920. I now invite him to withdraw his objections and stand like the Newfoundlander we know he is. or certainly was and put Newfoundland first and his partisan politics second.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour of the Resolution please say "aye" contrary "nay," In my opinion, the "nays" have it.

DIVISION:

Those in favour: Mr. Marshall; Mr. Collins; Mr. Earle; Mr. Hickman; Mr. Crosbie; Mr. Myrden.

Those Against: The hon. the Premier; the hon. President of the Council; the hon. Minister of Highways; Mr. Dawe; Mr. Noel; Mr. Smallwood; the hon. Minister of Labrador Affairs; Mr. Hodder; Mr. Strickland; the hon. Minister of Education and Youth; the hon. Minister of Public Works; the hon. Minister

of Finance; the hon. Minister of Community and Social Development; the hon. the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation; Mr. Barbour; the hon. the Minister of Health; the hon. Mr. Hill; the hon. Minister of Supply and Services; Mr. Moores.

MR. SPEAKER: I declare the motion lost.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, could we possibly call order (4)?

Second reading of a Bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Public Enquiries Act." (No. 51).

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this is a very simple Bill that one would not have really thought, in the first instance, it was necessary to introduce before this House. It is a Bill to amend the Public Enquiries Act, and quite simply would require that all public enquiries be held in public. The wording is very short. It says, "the commission or commissions to which this Act applies shall not refuse to allow the public or any portion of the public to any proceedings of the commission."

The reason for this Bill, introducing this Bill, Mr. Speaker, that was introduced some time ago at the beginning of the session, is the fact that a public enquiry was held into the affairs of the Town of Bay Roberts, and probably there were more besides, where the commissioner, acting under his authority, as he was allowed to under the Act of the time, decreed and declared that the holding of the enquiry should be held entirely in private, the evidence would be held in private and all matters relating to the enquiry would be held in private.

In effect, we had a public-private enquiry, which is really a contradiction. It would certainly appear to me that if one has the machinery set up where one is to have a public enquiry, it should be public. It should be open to the public, there should always be the procedure set down in an Act whereby the matter under consideration is going to be aired in public, evidence taken in public, questions asked in public, and the machinery should be set up for this purpose. When a Government of the day turns around and says; "we are going to have a public enquiry into a certain issue, we all know that the matters are going to be - everybody is going to know what goes on

in that enquiry and that is only fair.

If the Government wishes to have, I might point out, an enquiry of a private nature, they can have it by means other than through a public enquiry as such. I think it is only fair to the persons involved in the enquiry, and there are always going to be people involved in enquiries of this nature, and certainly to the public themselves, that when this procedure is brought into effect, the whole matter should be aired in public as such and justification referred to everybody. As I say, if one wants to have a private one, you can have a private investigation without the necessity of calling in the Public Enquiries Act.

Now, in going over the Acts of the other Provinces in relation to this matter, one finds that most of the Acts are silent with respect to this particular item, but they are all styled Public Enquiries Acts, and I think most people, in Provinces outside of ours, would expect that when a public enquiry is called it is going to be held in public. In other words, there is no need; because of the description, the adjective qualifying what is going to take place, that it is so going to be public.

One looks at the Acts in England, and one has to remember that the British Government would have jurisdiction with respect to a wider number of matters than this Government does, because, we are in a Federal Country. In that Act, it provides that enquiries will be public except when matters of, in effect, issues of treason arise, affecting the overall welfare and safety of the state. In that event, the commissioners can hold the enquiry in private, but otherwise, it is to be public.

Of course, that qualification is unnecessary here, because such matters come entirely, matters of treason and the overall danger to the state, the defence of the country, rests with the Federal Government as such. That would be an appropriate qualification in any Federal Act. Certainly, in the Provincial Acts, I feel that we ought to have a public enquiry and open enquiry. I hope this Bill would pass, and I would respectfully suggest that the first public enquiry of a nature, real public enquiry that we should have afterwards, would be an enquiry into who

is behind and who owns the liquor licenses or liquor leases.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question?

HON. L.R.CURTIS: I would move that this Bill be read a second time six months hence. You will not get anybody to sit as a public enquiry commissioner if you put this clause in the Bill. Under this Bill, every enquiry has to be public. Everybody knows that there are enquiries which should be public and there enquiries which should not be public.

The object of this Bill is to make all enquiries public, without exception. Of course, that would be unacceptable, completely unacceptable. Nobody would accept such a commission and there is no alternative but to ask that the Bill be read a second time six months hence.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to support the second reading of the Bill and the speech against the amendment suggested by the hon. minister.

I do not know what the hon. minister means when he says that everybody knows this and everybody knows that and everybody knows the other thing. Who is everybody? Who is the everybody that the hon. minister is talking about? If he means himself, then he should say, "I know this." The minister cannot speak for everybody. He does not speak for me. He does not speak for the hon. gentleman who moved the Bill. He does not speak for hundreds and thousands of others.

The minister should have said, when he was on his feet, "the Public Enquires Act." The name of the Act is, "The Public Enquiries Act." It is chapter (24) of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1952. The Act has not been amended since. What does the Act say? "Whenever the Lieutenant Governor in Council, deems it expedient to cause enquiry to be made into and concerning any matter connected with the peace, order and good Government of this Province. or the conduct of any part of the public business thereof or the administration of justice therein. or into any of the industries of this Province or into any other matter as to which he deems it to be for the public good that there should be an enquiry, the



Lieutenant Governor may, by commission under the Great Seal, appoint such person or persons hereinafter called a commissioner or commissioners as he may select to hold such enquiries, and may by such commission indicate to him or them the scope of such enquiries and may confer upon him or them the power to summon before him or them any witness or witnesses and to require such witness or witnesses to give evidence orally or in writing upon oath or upon solemn acclamation, and to produce such documents and things as may be deemed requisite for the full investigation of the matters referred to in such commission."

That is the purpose of the Act. It is to enquire into matters of public concern, public business, peace, order and good Government, the administration of justice or other matters which the Government deems it in the public good to have investigated. It is the Public Enquiries Act. It is not entitled the "Star Chamber Act." It is not the "Private Enquiries Act." It is not the "Secret Investigations Act." It is not the "Seventeenth Century Star Chamber Legislation." It is the "Public Enquiries Act of the Province."

Let us suppose that there is some matter that should just be investigated privately. Let the Government investigate it privately. Let the Government not have a public enquiry, not appoint a commissioner under the Public Enquiries Act, do it in some other way. Let them say that they are going to have a private enquiry and pass a "Private Enquiries Act," or use some other power and have a secret, private investigation, or have the police investigate. You do not have to have a public enquiry. Suppose it is some matter of outrage, that because of the morals involved there are some features of the business like that, and you do not want publicity, you do not want people present. Well, then you can have the R.C.M.P. investigate, you can have the police investigate, you can have a private enquiry, but this Public Enquiries Act is supposed to be for something entirely different. It is to look into matters of public interest, affecting the public good.

Why should a commissioner be entitled to decide himself whether it is going to be a public or a private enquiry? It seems to me that it is

quite improper. For example; in connection with the investigation of irregularities in the accounts of the Town Council of Bay Roberts, the commissioner felt for some reason that that should be a private enquiry. I do not know why. How was it in the public good to have that a private enquiry? I cannot see that that served the public purpose in any way at all.

We have our courts. The courts are public courts. The courts are open to the public. It is only on an extraordinary occasion that a judge will order the court closed, and that the public be requested to leave the court. Then it is usually in some matter of morals. It might be some sexual offence or it maybe involving children. The court then directs that there be no reporters present, and that there be no spectators present, and it not be reported. The person is still entitled to be there with his solicitor, with his lawyer, with his counsel. If you are going to have a Public Enquiries Act, then obviously, the enquiries should be conducted in public, so the public can, if there is any public interest, follow the evidence, so that having followed the evidence, you can decide whether or not the commissioner made a sensible finding, whether his report is sensible, is it based on the evidence?

If a commissioner holds a private enquiry, and then makes a report which is then published, you have no standards to judge his decision by. You are not familiar at all with what evidence was given. You have only his report to go by. When the hon. minister says that everybody knows or everybody should know, or anybody should know that no commissioner would accept a commission in those circumstances, why not? Why would the commissioner not accept it in those circumstances? Do not judges accept appointments to the District Courts, and the Supreme Court? Magistrates accept appointments to Magistrate's Court knowing they have to conduct proceedings in public, in the view of the public. Why should a commissioner be any different? It would not affect one person, except in a commission

MR. CROSBIE: to have this amendment passed by the House.

We have a Commission just appointed. Mr. Gordon Stirling appointed to investigate, not to investigate the matter that should be investigated, that is the matter of the sale of land, by Lundrigan's Limited to Holiday Inn here in St. John's, which is a Crown Corporation, as to whether or not too much was paid for the land or what the circumstances are, but appointed to investigate statements made in the House by the hon. member for St. John's East.

The terms of reference on all these enquiries are drafted by the Government and as section (111) of the Act says; "The Government can indicate the scope of such enquiry, The Government can confer power to summon witnesses or not summon witnesses to require witnesses to give evidence on oath or to produce documents."

The Government decides all that when it issues a Commission. The Commissioner is just unable to go wild. He has to follow the directives given in the Commission. The Commission, in section (111), can compel people to give evidence and if you make a false statement that is perjury. A witness is not excused from answering any questions on grounds that they may tend to incriminate him. But if he does answer them, he has the protection of "The Canada Evidence Act" so he is protected in that respect.

The Lieutenant-Governor in Council can engage the services of lawyers, accountants, engineers to help the Commissioner. The Commissioner can have these experts enquire into any matter he directs.

But when the Commissioner is conducting his public enquiry himself, when he is summoning witnesses and examining, surely the public has the right and the people who are giving evidence have the right to have their evidence heard in public.

A Commissioner, under this system, can be entirely unfair in the way he handles a Commission. He can be unfair in his treatment of the witnesses. His report may or may not stand up to the scrutiny in accordance

MR. CROSBIE: with the evidence but the public will never know, because his enquiry is being conducted in private. Is it right, Mr. Speaker, to have the report of a private enquiry made public? I do not think that is right. Any enquiry appointed under this Act, the report should be made public but, if the report is made public then the enquiry itself should have been made public also. Not a private enquiry and then the report made public. I do not believe that that is proper. I do not think it is fair to the people who are being investigated. I do not think it is fair to the people who give evidence. If the wording of this is too extreme, then there is qualification can be used. The language can read; "on what circumstances, the Commissioner can decide not to have the Session open."

For example it might say; "where there are children under the age of sixteen involved (or something of that nature), the Commissioner will not have the part of the enquiry that pertains to them open to the public."

If that is a concern of the House, that can be done. But to say, for the Government to say; "No, you cannot require these enquires to be made public" is not convincing, particularly when the Minister did not give any reasons for that.

We have the Stirling Commission now going to investigate this land transaction. We do not know if that is going to be a public enquiry or a private enquiry. Apparently Mr. Stirling is going to decide that himself. Why? Why should he have the power to decide that himself? Why should Mr. Adams have had the power to decide himself whether his enquiry was private or public?

It does not make sense. Surely we should set down, in the legislation, the decision that either it is going to be public or private and if it is to be private, in what circumstances it is to be private.

The present legislation does not do that at all. It just leaves it up to the Commissioner himself, entirely. Mr. Speaker. when it is a one man Commission, a one man or one woman, it is even giving more power, at least

MR. CROSBIE: if you have a three-man Commission or a five-man Commission, or two, then you have got two, three or five people who can agree or disagree on whether this should be public or private. If they can disagree, they can make their views known.

So I feel myself that this amendment is badly needed. I do not believe this is the occasion to discuss The Adams Report. It is probably best done on the Estimates of the Department of Municipal Affairs.

But there are other public enquiries needed, Mr. Speaker. There is one badly needed into the circumstances surrounding the leasing of these liquor buildings in Grand Bank, Placentia, Marystown, and St. Lawrence, those four.

We had the silliest of excuses given in this House as to why they are not being investigated by a public enquiry. We have had it suggested that the Newfoundland Liquor Commission was going to renegotiate the rents charged, with the owners. Well if they are going to renegotiate the rents charged with the owners, obviously the Newfoundland Liquor Commission must know who the owners are. If the Newfoundland Liquor Commission knows who the owners are, let us have their names. If the Premier knows who the owners are, let us have their names. There are twenty year leases entered into in those transactions and the people who own those leases do not have to have them renegotiated at all, they have got legally binding contracts, signed by the Newfoundland Liquor Commission. We have to presume it is approved by the Premier of the Province or initiated or directed by him that the leases be entered into. So what is this nonsense that Mr. White, Chairman of the Newfoundland Liquor Commission, is now going to negotiate with these owners!

There is a situation where you badly need a public enquiry. Not a Commissioner appointed, one Commissioner, who can decide whether or not he is going to have a public enquiry or a private enquiry. He should have no choice in those circumstances. It should have to be a public enquiry.



MR. CROSBIE: So unless the hon. Minister opposite has some amendment that he wishes to suggest to the Bill, laying down in what particular circumstances an enquiry can be held privately or part of the enquiry can be held privately, it should be held in public.

The rule should be the same rule that applies to the courts. Public enquiry - all the evidence given in public, unless in certain particular circumstances, the Commissioner in the interest of the public morals or whatever the House decides holds that it is not in the public interest to have some particular part of the enquiry in public.

So this legislation badly needs consideration. If the Government wants private enquiries, let them have their private enquiry. I do not doubt that there are many private enquiries carried out by the Government, certainly by the hon. the Premier, many, many private enquiries. But if it is to be a public enquiry, if it is in the public interest, if it is to look into matters in which the public are affected, if it is to look into misuse of public funds, such as these Liquor Commission rents, if it is to look into dereliction of duty like that, if it is to look into a raid on the Treasury, as those liquor leases are, if it is to look into somebody dipping into public funds to enrich themselves at the expense of the taxpayer, then the enquiry should be public and nothing else is satisfactory, nothing else is good enough, and only passing the amendment of the hon. Member for St John's East will make that possible.

MR. NOEL: Mr. Speaker, I can hardly believe my ears here this afternoon to hear the hon. member for St. John's East and the hon. member for St. John's West demanding that this Bill be passed and that in every case that these enquiries be public.

I have always interpreted the heading of The Public Enquiries Act to mean - an enquiry into a matter of public importance or matters affecting the public. I never did interpret that to mean that the enquiry itself was to be public.

MR. NOEL: I only had one experience really with Royal Commissions and that was the Royal Commission on Price, Food and Drugs. Now in that case the enquiry was held partly public and partly private.

What we did there was that we issued subpoenas to about ninety-eight people dealing in groceries and things of that nature and we gave them a warning of the questions that were to be asked, and these questions went into every aspect of their business. In addition to that we subpoenaed company records, under individual records, including their income tax returns for a period of three years. Well when these subpoenas went out, attached to these subpoenas was this list of questions and the demand that they would have to produce their income tax returns for three years, we got back the most ferocious

MR. NOEL: objections to this, because they felt that their whole business was now going to be laid open to their competitors. They did not really care whether the public knew, but they did not want their creditors, not their creditors, well some of them did not want their creditors to know either. After all if a man is operating his business at a loss, he does not want his creditors to know that. But it was their competitors that they were mostly concerned about and some where concerned about their creditors knowing.

Well I was solicitor to the Royal Commission and naturally they contacted me. Now when I informed those people that their answers to these questions and that their income tax returns would not be revealed to the public, but would be for the private use of the Commission, when I informed them that we had retained not a local firm of auditors, but a firm of auditors from outside the Province, we did not then have one objection. Every single person that was subpoena said, "good, great" - we received the upmost co-operation. But I did notice though that when the hearing started there were some persons who turned up, there amongst the public who were in businesses very closely akin to the businesses that were before the Commission on that day. I know myself they turned up simply to find out about the other persons business. This is what they were there for. So I do not think it is only a question of, as the hon. the member for St. John's West said, of matters of morals or anything like that, I can think of hundreds of cases in which an enquiry may be ordered by, we say, the Government into something which is a public concern. In other words, they want to get an answer or something. But I can see all the intricacies of that and the people who are going to be involved, a lot of these people are innocent people, a lot of interests are going to be effected, and I do not see why the Government should have the power to order this in every case. It is something the same as putting a person on trial who has not been charged.

Now perhaps we should have two Acts. Perhaps we should have an Act which requires public enquires and perhaps we should have an Act which covers the

MR. KOEL: other case. I am not saying that perhaps we should have both. But the Bill that has been introduced by my friend from St. John's East requires that all enquires be public. I do not think that he really means that. I do not think that he would really support that. I think that if the hon. the member for St. John's East really means that, every enquiry shall be completely public, I have misjudged him, I really do not think that he really means that. I am sure the hon. the member for St. John's West does not mean that.

Now the principle of this Bill is that, all enquires be public and, to my mind, it just does not make sense.

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the questions?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, there are a few brief points that I would like to make. First of all, touching upon the remarks of the hon. the member for St. John's North, The fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the holding of a public -

MR. SMALLWOOD: If the hon. gentleman speaks now, he closes the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: I am closing the debate, yes. I have the right, do I not, to speak to close the debate?

MR. SPEAKER: It is obvious, if some other hon. member wishes to speak, he cannot close the debate. The hon. member cannot take it upon himself to close the debate, but should adjourn the debate to the next day.

On motion debate adjourned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Thursday, at 3:00 P.M.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 20, 1971, at 3:00 P.M.