



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 24

VERBATIM REPORT

THURSDAY, APRIL 3, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

The House met at 3:00.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would like to welcome to the galleries today twelve trainees from the Adjustment Training Programme in St. John's with teacher Mr. Gerald Bannister, on behalf of all the honourable members I welcome you to the galleries and trust that your visit here is most interesting.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. SIMMONS: I rise on a matter of personal -

MR. EARLE: I rise on a matter of personal privilege.

MR. SPEAKER: I will recognize the honourable Member for Hermitage following - unless the honourable Minister of Finance wishes to yield.

MR. EARLE: On a matter of personal privilege, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. EARLE: I normally ignore anonymous letters but in this case I feel obliged to bring it to the attention of the House because it comes to me on the letterhead of the Leader of the Opposition and I know that the -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. DOODY: We knew that it was a crank letter.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: What do you mean letterhead?

MR. EARLE: It is on the House of Assembly, Leader of the Opposition's letterhead, addressed to the Minister of Finance and I know when he hears the content of the letter that he will not appreciate having some mental deviate or some crackpot using the stationery of the Leader of the Opposition to write such a letter. The letter reads as follows:

"If you do not change your policy toward student-aid, your future may not be too bright. I would even go so far as to say that parts of your anatomy may be permanently damaged. This is no idle threat. Signed - Citizen Kane."

Obviously it is either a joke, Mr. Speaker, or some person who is completely off his rocker. As it is written on the Leader of the Opposition stationary, I would suggest to the House that they support me in having it passed over to the police for investigation.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I wish the honourable gentleman had mentioned it to me outside. I do not need to say, but I will say it for the record, that the letter was not sent by me or by anybody with my consent but if anybody has impounded a piece of my stationary -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order, Sir, the Minister of Provincial Affairs, Mr. Speaker, said it was probably sent by Neary and I demand, Mr. Speaker, that that statement be withdrawn immediately, Sir, immediately.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

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

I would like to inform the honourable Member for Bell Island a point of privilege takes precedence over a point of order. Secondly the Chair did not hear any comments uttered by the honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs and the Environment.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, if I have got to enforce the rules of this honourable House myself I will go over and I will let him have it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Because I do not have to put up with this in this honourable House, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: I am sure the honourable Member for Bell Island can appreciate the Chair is here to enforce rules that are following procedure and the Chair did not hear any comments made whatsoever.

MR. NEARY: I heard him.

MR. SPEAKER: Well, the Chair did not.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the senior member for Harbour Main, his conduct speaks for itself. We do not have to worry about that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: As I was saying if the Minister of Finance wants to send it to the police I would be all for it. I would be as interested as he is to assess this communication. I would also be interested to know how my letterhead came to be involved. I can think of a number of ways, including leaving it on the desk here in the House which I often do, but if he wants to send it to the police, fine. I do think it is a bit of an over-reaction. But I will again say, just for the record, I do not think the minister needs that assurance, but I will give it to him anyway in the House, that it was not sent by me or by anybody, including any of my colleagues or my office or anyone else with my knowledge and consent.

I would be interested to know who did send it.

MR. ROBERTS: And how did it come to the minister? Is it typed or handwritten?

AN HON. MEMBER: Typed. Through the mail.

MR. ROBERTS: Typed. Through the mail.

AN HON. MEMBER: Delivered to my office.

MR. ROBERTS: Delivered. Well then let us by all means if the minister wants, Mr. Speaker, to send it to the police, and let us check the type letters. The typewriter has a signature on it. I would be interested to see just who did send it. Whatever my political views of the minister's or whatever views of the minister's political conduct I do not think we need to do that, this type of thing.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege as well. The matter in which I rise relates to the unprecedented and vicious attack on me by the Member for Bonavista South. I regret he is not in his chair today. I would must prefer to do this in his presence but as I understand the House rules I am to raise this matter at the first possible opportunity. We made an effort to raise it yesterday at 6:00 but the Speaker left the Chair saying it was 6:00 of the clock. And so I now raise it at what I feel is the first opportunity. If the House feels it is more appropriate to raise it in the member's presence I am quite prepared to wait until he comes. But I rise now, Mr. Speaker, because I understand if I do not do so now, I will forfeit my opportunity of doing so.

In that context, conscious of the fact that the member to whom I refer is not present, it is in that context that I nevertheless raise it at this particular time.

I refer, of course, to the completely unparliamentary and very vicious remarks made by the Member for Bonavista South -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: The kind of remarks, Mr. Speaker, that are most unbecoming of this House, most unneeded. He and I, Mr. Speaker, disagree on many matters and will continue to disagree, but I hope that we can at least maintain the decorum of the House when we address each other or refer to each other through the Chair. And the remarks I heard yesterday

in this House, and I did hear them, I have not had an opportunity to get the tapes. I have requested the Editor of Debates to produce a transcript for me. But the remarks I heard yesterday afternoon and have been substantiated by others who heard the remarks, and have been substantiated by the daily press today, are the kind of remarks that we should never hear in this House. There was a personal threat there where the individual, the Member for Bonavista South verbally threatened to cross the House - and I forget the exact terms.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Oh keep quite Pooh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DAWE: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: I gather the senior -

MR. NEARY: Just another remark like that

MR. SIMMONS: I gather the senior member condones this kind of action.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DAWE: I do not condone it at all. I agree with it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Why do you not button your lip!

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable members to my left and to my right seem to persist in interrupting an honourable member when the Chair is trying to hear a point of privilege. And I certainly request honourable members on both my left and right to remain silent.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As I was saying the Member for Bonavista South did threaten to cross the floor and punch me in the mouth. Now on that matter I would be prepared to take him on any time, but that is not the issue.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: The issue, Mr. Speaker, is whether a member of this House is permitted to say that kind of thing and get away with it. That is the issue. He also referred to me as something to the affect the

dirtiest politician that he had ever known. Whether or not he thinks that, Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Well he would know.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Member for Bonavista South happens to think that about me is also beside the point. I submit that he does not have the right under the rules of this House to say that kind of thing. And I am asking the Chair to have the member withdraw these remarks without qualification. I have a motion which I am prepared to put, and can put now if it is the appropriate time? I would like the Speaker's -

MR. SPEAKER: All matters of privilege according to Beauchesne should be accompanied by a motion which the Chair is willing to hear.

MR. SIMMONS: In that event, Mr. Speaker, I would like to -

MR. CROSBIE: If the honourable member would permit me for a moment.

MR. NEARY: The Speaker -

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, I want to address myself to the Speaker's request.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: make the motion and then....

MR. CROSBIE: Well -

AN HON. MEMBER: I will make it but I

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, it does not matter what he wants to say -

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: To that point of privilege. It is up to the Speaker to decide -

MR. SIMMONS: I have -

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The Speaker has decided already.

MR. SIMMONS: As I understand it the Speaker has recognized me?

April 3, 1975

Tape 967 (Afternoon)

PK - 4

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair wishes to say that it feels that it will take the whole matter under advisement. And if the honourable Member for Hermitage - if the Chair decides that the honourable Member for Hermitage has established a prima facie case then, of course, his motion can be debated, He can put the motion but if the Chair decides that there is no prima facie case established then, of course, that is the end of it.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker. Do I have the floor, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on a - I would like to address myself -

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I am now standing on a matter of privilege, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair recognizes the honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to move, seconded by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition that the remarks made by the Member for Bonavista South last evening, the remarks to which I have referred constitute a breach of the privileges of this House and that he be ordered by the Speaker to withdraw these remarks without qualification and that should the member fail to withdraw these remarks without qualification, he be suspended from the House for one day.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will take the whole matter in advisement and rule on it as soon as possible.

The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if I am permitted now to address myself to this question at all, I would like to address myself to the question of this point of privilege. There has been nothing -

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order -

MR. CROSBIE: No, there has been nothing -

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Sir. As I understand the Minister of Fisheries, he proposes now to enter into a discussion on the merits of this question. If that is in order, I would be anxious to do it, but I would ask Your Honour to rule whether or not it is in order because if the Minister of Fisheries is allowed to say a few words on this and, to quote him, to address himself to the point, then in all fairness, and I know Your Honour would do this, gentlemen on this

are this side are allowed to speak to it as well. So I would ask Your Honour - Your Honour has said Your Honour is going to reserve the question and consider it. Now, is it now a matter for debate or for further comment or not, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair would prefer, of course, that no further comments were made re this matter until such time as the Chair rules as to whether or not the honourable member has established a prima facie case. If the Chair decided that there has been a prima facie case established, then all honourable members will have the opportunity to speak to the motion as made by the honourable Member from Hermitage.

REPORTS OF STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. V. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table the regulations under the Retail Sales Act, 1972 as amended.

MR. ROBERTS: Are there many copies of this act?

MR. EARLE: You will get more copies. This is the only one I have at the moment.

MR. ROBERTS: We would like -

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I was asked a question yesterday by the honourable Member for Fogo. He is not in his seat, but I would like to answer the question. I will give him the information privately at a later time. He asked about some watchmen who were given their layoff notices and this is departmental policy. The districts, district one, two and four have already laid off the watchmen. This is the district, district three where that policy is now being proceeded with. The watchmen are now retained only in depots and in sub-depots and sub-depots are defined as depots where substantial extensive repairs are done and two of them only would fall under that definition in district three, which is the one we are referring to now, that would be at Lumsden in Springdale. The rest of the depots are referred to as unit depots.

Now, we had quite a number of people, I have a list of some here but we had another list that during the winter were changed over to other jobs. So they did not lose their jobs and the people here will have termination notices in respect of their present job as watchman up to April 20 and April 30. Every effort will be made, of course, to place these people in -

MR. ROBERTS: How many were laid off?

MR. ROUSSEAU: What do you mean, in - the watchmen? About twenty and they went on the winter machinery work. There are about twenty more involved. They will either probably have involuntary demotion or whatever to a labourers class so that we can keep them on the payroll or every effort will be made to put them on the payroll. They have seniority.

MR. ROBERTS: Are they covered in the union agreement?

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, and we will try and do what we can. Of course, some of them may want to retire because they have a number of years worked and maybe want earlier retirements. So, I can just assure the honourable Member from Fogo that it is a policy that exists in the department with the other three districts. It has now been extended to district three and that efforts will be made to have these people retained in their positions with the department in one way or another, or some other way in which they might wish to have early retirement or anything of that nature.

MR. SPEAKER: I note the honourable Minister of Mines and Energy was rising. Does he have an answer to a question?

MR. BARRY: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I would like to table the answer to a question, question number fourteen by the member from Bell Island.

The answers are no, not applicable and not applicable.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if in view of the number of complaints that we are receiving daily from delegations and individuals who come to Confederation Building to visit the Premier's office and to see the Premier, I wonder if the honourable the Premier could inform the House if he has any special time during the week or during the day when delegations can visit his office or individuals can drop in and see the Premier when they come in, especially from outside of St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

HON. F.D. MOORES (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, it is fair to say that whenever I have the opportunity I meet with delegations. There are also the Member from Trinity North and Mr. George and Mr. Sullivan, who work with my office, who meet delegations as often as possible. Nine chances out of ten, Sir, the delegations are in on departmental business as opposed to any specific business that would deal with my office. Certainly arrangements are made for them to see the ministers in the departments. That basically, hopefully is what they require and what can serve them best.

But certainly I only wish, Sir, that I did have the time to meet all the delegations, but, as the honourable member well knows, there is a great deal of work in that office, and, as I say, if they have seen the department which they are primarily interested in, I think that is the primary concern. When possible I see them myself.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Would the Premier tell the House then if, in view of the bottleneck that apparently is taking place if -

HON. J.C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FINANCE): Order! Order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Order! That is not a question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the honourable the Premier tell us if it is his intention in the foreseeable future to make himself more accessible to delegations and to individuals that come to Confederation Building?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

That question is argumentative.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the answer the Premier gave me to the first question, Sir, I am dissatisfied with and I wish to debate it at the late show at 5:30 this afternoon.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications. I wonder would the minister indicate to the House when he intends to supply the House with the information concerning the list of projects, upgrading and paving projects to be undertaken by his department this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

HON. J.R. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS): I cannot answer that now. We have certain arrangements, of course, to complete with DREE. There will be a joint announcement at that time and consideration will be given. We are developing a policy now, and as soon as we are in a position to we will.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the announcements I am hearing from various government members, I am not particularly satisfied with that answer and I would like to debate it on the Late Show at 5:30.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: This is not question, Mr. Speaker. It is apparently a long preamble and assumptions of fact.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Oh, sit down. Sit down.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: He will suppress it but only for so long.

Mr. Speaker, I am not satisfied with the answer I got from the minister, and I would like to debate it this evening during the Late Show.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. Barbe North,

MR. F. ROWE: A question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMONS: You were not listening for the question, bully boy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: In view of the fact, Sir, that storms this time of the year, snow storms, track up the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Straits of Belle Isle and dump the huge quantities of snow on the Northern Peninsula, and the snow storms cease in the Southern part of the Province around this time of the year, has the minister given any consideration to moving the machinery from the Southern regions of the Province onto the Great Northern Peninsula to cope with the problem?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: This is the honourable Member from Bell Island - yes, I thought this question may be raised today, and I have some information in respect to - I presume the honourable member is talking about the District of St. Barbe North. Yes. Well, right now, just if I may, I have some information on St. Barbe North.

Presently up there we have eighteen snow plows and three sand trucks, two loaders with snow clearing attachments owned by the department and six are hired. We have three dozers, two of which are not operable at the moment, but the other one is operable. We have five graders with snow clearing attachments, two snow blasts and three sand trucks. Now

at this point in time the District Director from Deer Lake advises there is ample equipment in this area at this time. However if we feel there is not enough of equipment certainly we would be prepared to move it up from some area of the Province which is not undergoing the same snowfalls as the Northern Peninsula.

So at this point in time I am advised by officials that there is ample equipment there. But, like I say, should more equipment become necessary we will certainly move it up.

MR. F. ROWE: A supplementary. Is the minister aware of the fact, Sir, that there are certain roads blocked, particularly roads leading into communities, branch roads, and that parts of the Great Northern Peninsula have only one cut, you know, of one-way traffic on it. So it seems incredible that there is adequate machinery under these circumstances.

MR. ROUSSEAU: All I can say is that, you know, the people up there tell me there is ample equipment. You know, I am not up there to see. And I do not doubt -

MR. ROBERTS: man in Deer Lake.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: But the man in Deer Lake is checking with the men up there. But, you know, if they feel there is not enough up there, then good, and we are checking that out. I brought the matter to their attention to make certain, because I know there is a snowfall up there. But we will leave it in their hands. And as soon as we feel that more equipment is needed it will be moved up, I give the member that undertaking, you know.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on this - a point of order. I wish to give Your Honour notice that in connection with the Member for Hermitage and the rules of this House that I want to put it to you under rule Standing Order 31 (g) that there has been no oral question asked by the Member for Hermitage nor has there been any answer that a member could not be satisfied with. And I simply want to point out that I submit to you there is no subject matter of any question to

be raised on the adjournment of the House by the Member for Hermitage. There has been no question asked, and no answer given, so the gentleman can hardly be dissatisfied with the answer.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. My colleague the gentleman for Hermitage asked the Minister of Transportation and Communications a question. If Your Honour wished to consult the tapes, the transcripts would not be prepared yet, but the question is there, the Hon. Member for Labrador West, the Minister for Transportation and Communications answered the question. The Member for Hermitage found the answer unsatisfactory. And subject only to a notice being sent to Your Honour is required under 31 (g), I submit all of the requirements under Standing Order 31 have been met, and the honourable member is entitled to raise the question at 5:30. And the minister may or may not answer as he sees fit. But there was a question asked. I do not remember the exact wording, but the question was something -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: a list of the roads project that the government intend to undertake this year. And the minister said he did not know when he would be able to table it. My colleague found it unsatisfactory. There is no point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: It was the Chair's opinion that the Hon. Member for Hermitage did ask a question. But before the Chair announces what questions, will be debated at 5:30 today, I will read the transcript, and listen to the tape and then establish as to what was said, if it is permitted.

The Hon. Member for Bell Island.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker I have a -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: question for the Hon. the Premier. The Hon. Premier, Sir, is probably -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: While I am waiting for the Hon. the Premier to come - oh he is coming back to his seat now, Sir. Sir, now that the Hon. the Premier is back from Bermuda, could the Hon. the Premier clear

up this matter -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Could the Hon. the Premier clear up this matter of the use of the Churchill Falls jet to carry the Hon. the Premier and his party to Halifax last week enroute to Bermuda on another one of his vacations?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. the Premier.

HON. F. D. MOORES (PREMIER): Mr. Speaker, hardly on another one of my vacations. However, I certainly will clear it up, in that, as the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs and Fisheries mentioned last week, the fact is that the CFLCo aircraft is owned two-thirds by, I guess, the shareholders, by this Province, and one-third by the Province of Quebec. It is available to those people for whatever purposes, but particularly in matters of business.

Regarding my own situation, contrary to what the Member for Bell Island may think, and he is not likely to experience, the Office of Premier of this Province takes a great deal of time, and time is a very important factor. The fact that that day I was going to get away was going to save two days, in fact, of being able to take a long weekend or a six day weekend, a six day week, if you like, off to relax over the Easter weekend after a fairly hectic schedule, the fact that a plane was available, that it was not being

used by anybody else - except actually it did arrive from Churchill Falls with a group of people from Churchill Falls who were employees of the company, which is normal activity - the fact that it was going back at that time, the fact that I went back on it, I make no apologies for, Sir, I hope that explains it to the member's satisfaction

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am dissatisfied with that answer given me by the honourable the Premier and if I get the opportunity, Sir, during the Late Show this afternoon I would like to debate this matter.

Sir, I wonder if the honourable Minister of Social Services can inform the House if the government has taken any decision yet on a request from Teach-A-Tot to keep that day care centre going here in the City of St. John's, could the minister enlighten us on that matter?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, we have taken a decision on it. Perhaps it is not as good a decision as we would like to take, but as far as we are concerned Teach-A-Tot will continue to operate, at what capacity I have no idea at this time. We have met with the groups, I do not know if the member represents the executive or not, but we have met with them, and we have discussed it to the best of our ability and up to the present time we are still negotiating with them, but it will carry on, I say at what capacity it will carry on, whether they will have to reduce or not will depend on the monies available.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary: Has the minister advised the group yet of the government's decision because I do not know if the minister is aware, if he is not aware - perhaps the minister could tell us if he is aware that the centre is scheduled to close at the end of April if the minister does not advise the group of what the financial arrangements are going to be made between them and the Province.

MR. MURPHY: I do not know who contacts the Member for Bell Island but I

hope that my department is being contacted on the same thing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Keep in contact.

MR. MURPHY: Keep in contact, and I am sure that we are very much aware of what is happening and as I said I cannot go into it at the present time but negotiations are carrying on as to how long that group can carry on, how much money we can give Gander, how much money we can give Clarendville, how much money we can give Grand Falls and the other twenty-five places, I think one is contingent on the other.

AN HON. MEMBER: Teach-A-Tot.

MR. MURPHY: Teach-A-Tot, I know all about -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: As soon as we get in touch with them.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, supplementary -

MR. MURPHY: Are you going to debate that too on the late show.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not have time. But could the minister be a little more specific, Will they be contacted, today, next week, the day after tomorrow, next year, Christmas, when will they be notified? They are waiting for an answer. They cannot wait much longer, Sir. They have to make plans to close the place down if they do not get the answer.

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

MR. NEARY: Well, would the minister care to answer the question?

MR. MURPHY: Yes, as soon as we hear officially from these people. We are in touch with them almost daily. I do not know where the honourable Member for Bell Island got to be spokesman for all these groups or not or for anything else -

MR. NEARY: No, the people, I only speak for the people.

MR. MURPHY: But they are quite happy as far as I know with what negotiations are going on with my department.

MR. ROBERTS: I have got a half dozen phone calls myself asking when they are -

MR. MURPHY: Oh well, that is typical.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to ask the honourable Premier whether they are using Celsius or Fahrenheit -

MR. ROBERTS: - retarded children's school and he can come in to.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Perhaps I might ask the Premier later on about Celsius or Fahrenheit in Bermuda but right now I am going to ask the Premier about the oil refinery down at Come By Chance, the expansion. We are told that a minor detail is delaying the agreement. Would the Premier care to elaborate on that matter? What is the minor detail? Will it start this year? The honourable the Premier I am directing my question to.

MR. DOODY: Do you want an answer or not?

MR. NEARY: Okay if the Minister of Industrial -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: It has been explained many times, Your Honour, and I think most of the people in the Province of Newfoundland are aware of the situation. However, for the benefit of the Member for Bell Island, who seems to have more difficulty than most in getting the gist of the message, I will run through it again.

The financing for the oil refinery expansion at Come By Chance has always been in the hands of the ECCD people in London, the Export Credit Guarantee Department of the British Department of Finance. These people have indicated that they are prepared and willing to finance the expansion providing the company can show them long-term contracts will ensure the sale of the product over the period of the financing period.

The company is having difficulty in getting these contracts arranged because under the existing refinery, the one that is now in being, which was financed the same way, they found that the Government of Canada force majeure some of these contracts when there was an oil shortage in Eastern Canada and diverted some of the sales of the product into Canada, which was necessary, undoubtedly, at that time.

However, their long-term customers were reluctant to enter into contracts unless they get guarantees from the Canadian Government that this situation will not happen again. As I understand the

companies representatives are in Ottawa, if not physically at the present time, certainly they have been there recently and will probably be back there again shortly in an attempt to get this situation clarified. As soon as that is straightened out the construction of the refinery will start. Until such time as it is straightened out, the construction of the refinery will not start, and that is the situation as it now stands, Sir.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Rural Development, Sir, could inform the House of any negotiations, any discussions that are going on between the Government of Canada and the minister's department concerning a resettlement scheme that we do not have in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Rural Development.

HON. J. REID: Mr. Speaker, we have been negotiating with the Federal Government this last twelve months to try to have a better resettlement programme and it was only last week we were discussing it with the Federal Government and Mr. Jamieson's department. We are waiting on Mr. Jamieson to see what kind of a settlement we are going to have. We have made several proposals to change the resettlement programme and up until now we have not had any success.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister care to indicate to the House what is involved in these proposals? Could the minister elaborate on his statement and be a little more specific and give the House some more information on these negotiations, some of the finer details of what the minister proposes?

MR. REID: Well, Mr. Speaker, we are trying to help the people to move from various places because of job opportunity. At the present time, we can only send people or move people into various communities that have been selected through the Federal Government in certain places and at the present time we are trying to move people from various places where job opportunities are. We find now with the Resettlement Programme that we can only move into the certain

communities that were selected by the Federal Government.

MR. ROBERTS: Did the Province agree to these communities? Is that a matter of agreement between the Province and Ottawa what communities there are?

MR. REID: This was the old settlement. This is the old agreement. We are trying to change that so as we can now move people from different communities into places where job opportunities are.

At the present time, we can only move into the certain communities and move people which are selected by the Federal Government.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Would the minister care, Sir, to table a list of these communities to which he referred a few moments ago under both the old agreement and the new agreement, the proposed communities that the minister plans on moving these people into, where the job opportunities exist? Would the minister care to table these lists?

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, we can certainly give a list of the old programme and where they were supposed to move, but we feel that we should be able to move people into any community where the job opportunity is. This is what we are trying to do right now, regardless of what part of Newfoundland and Labrador that they want to move. If the job opportunity is there, we would like to move them, but we cannot do it at the present time under this agreement.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary then, Mr. Speaker. Is the minister then holding any discussions with Canada Manpower, who have a similar programme under the Manpower Mobility Regulations for moving people to where there are job opportunities or is this going to be an exclusive provincial scheme?

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I am not that familiar with the Federal Mobile Programme Opportunity, but the point is this is a different system altogether. Normally, when Manpower wants to move these people, they must have the job there and they will move them to any part of, probably Canada. But what we are doing, we are moving people,

homes and everything else into various communities here throughout Newfoundland and they are, as far as I am concerned, we are dissatisfied with that because of the fact that immediately they move and immediately they want them to move, but normally we get together with different groups and that or various people who want to move from one community to the other, We negotiate with them and discuss it with them and then we gradually move them out to the various communities.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Would the minister care to indicate whether these people whose homes will be moved will be moved on barges or tractor trailers? How will they be moved, these houses where people want to move?

MR. REID: Well, Mr. Speaker, we normally use the equipment necessary to move a home. If it has got to go by barge, naturally enough we will do it by barge. If it got to go by float or some other system, or train, or what have you, or boat, we will normally do it. We have barges now working with our department. We have our own barges and normally we move and we have most of our own equipment in rural development to move all the homes and that. We usually go in and set them up and even hook up their homes and that in the various communities.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if the minister, Sir, this is a very important topic, could the minister tell us how many applications are on hand in the minister's department at this very moment from people who want to resettle?

MR. REID: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that at the present moment, but certainly I can get that.

MR. NEARY: I thank the minister for the information.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, could I have a few moments. My question is for the Minister of Transportation and Communications. It is based on representations which I have received from a number of people in St. Mary's District. Could the minister indicate, please, what steps he is going to take to try to improve the road surface conditions on the road which serves the communities of Mount Carmel, North Harbour and Colinet? I understand there is a school bus route in that area and that the road is uncommonly rough. It is not a matter of the spring breakup. Rather it is a matter of the fact there has been no grading services provided that road for the last month or so.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: We have had a number of representations in respect to this road. As I have said a few days back in the House that I have instructed officials to take a look at the actual situation down there and make every attempt to do all they can so that the road will

be put in better condition. I have not checked yet, but I will undertake to find out just what the condition is now and what improvements have been made of recent date and to bring it back tomorrow.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Right.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: Before we proceed with Orders of the Day and this is on condition, of course, that the question raised by the honourable Member for Hermitage is debatable at 5:30 p.m., the order of questions to be debated, the first one will be by the honourable Leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Health. Secondly, the honourable Member for Bell Island and the Premier. Thirdly, the honourable Member for Hermitage and the Minister of Transportation, if it is correct to do that. Fourthly, if indeed the question by the honourable Member for Hermitage is not in order, then we will debate the question by the honourable Member for Bell Island, again with the Premier. But the time limit will permit only three, and possibly the fourth one by the honourable Member for Bell Island may not be permitted.

MR. ROBERTS: It is held over until next week. Is that what will happen?

MR. SPEAKER: I am not sure about that. I have to check that.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, just before Your Honour leaves the Chair, it is not on an important matter. I do not think it requires any formal note, but I think we should note that today is the ninety-sixth birthday of the Yellow Dog of Journalism in Newfoundland, The Evening Telegram.

On motion, the House resolved itself into Committee of Supply.

Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Stagg): Order, please! 1401-01. I believe the Minister of Fisheries was speaking when we adjourned last.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, first of course, I want to add my congratulations to the ninety-sixth anniversary. I had not realized

it was the ninety-sixth anniversary of The Evening Telegram. It is a paper that is always interesting to read and we hope that it will have at least another ninety-six years. That newspaper's interest in the fishery, of course, is an intense one and I hope that this debate will add some further facts and information for them to go on in The Telegram during the present year. Ninety-six years is quite a record for any newspaper and, in fact, I would say it must be one of the longest lived newspapers in North America. It is also a paper that did not have to depend on advertising from any particular source to be a success. I would like to congratulate them on that also.

There is one thing about The Evening Telegram. They have never needed government advertising to survive. They were always able to attract enough advertising on their own.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I just want to refer to

some points that were made by honourable gentlemen opposite on the last time we met, this is Thursday, on Tuesday and the honourable member for - but first I would like to clear up a point that was raised by the honourable Leader of the Opposition, I see he has left his seat but I think he should come back to learn this because it is information that I had not realized and we both made a mistake on Tuesday. I never mind admitting when I make a mistake. That is one of my great characteristics, that if I am wrong I never mind admitting saying so.

MR. NEARY: You do not mind admitting when you get caught.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, naturally if I do not get caught, but on this occasion I am catching myself, Mr. Chairman, because the Leader of the Opposition suggested on Tuesday that the age of our fishing population, of the people who are still listed as fishermen, he said he did not have the figures but he was concerned that the number of fishermen, that they are all older men and that there are not younger men coming into the fishery.

MR NEARY: That is true.

MR. CROSBIE: I had the same impression and I agreed with him but I have found since that this is wrong and that we do have the statistics and I have some copies of this information I will table. But the number of fishermen, Mr. Chairman, and this information comes from Environment Canada, Economics and Intelligence Branch of the Fisheries Marine Service and this is the figures for 1972, which I guess were the latest that they have got. But the number of fishermen in Newfoundland, according to their figures, in 1972, this does not include fish plant workers now or anyone like that, was 14,442 and their average age was thirty-eight. I will just read the figures now. Those who were fourteen to nineteen years of age were 1,690 or 11.7 per cent of the total. Those twenty to twenty-four years of age were 1,912 or 13.2 per cent of the total, and those twenty-five to twenty-nine years of age number 1,569 fishermen or 10.9 per cent of the total. So let us see now that is ten, twenty-three,

twenty-four, thirty-four, just over thirty-five per cent of our fishermen were under twenty-nine years of age, Mr. Chairman. Now that is very interesting because it is quite different from the impression that I had and that the Leader of the Opposition had.

So just to repeat again now, thirty - ten, twenty-three, twenty-four, thirty-four, yes, over thirty-five per cent of our fishermen in 1972 were under the age of twenty-nine years, and thirty to thirty-four years there were 1,285 or 8.9 per cent. Thirty-five to thirty-nine years, there were 1,320 or 9.1 per cent and forty to forty-four years of age there were 1,360 or 9.4 per cent of the total.

So, Mr. Chairman, in 1972 we had listed 14,452 fishermen and 53.8 per cent of those fishermen were under forty-four years of age, while 35 per cent of them were under twenty-nine years of age. So I had not realized this and the officials of my department knew I was wrong when I said this the other night and they never hesitate to draw their minister's attention to the fact that he is wrong. And I am delighted when I find out that I am wrong because it is better to find out you are wrong than to go on being wrong. But these figures are indeed interesting and I have some copies here to table, if anybody - the Leader of the Opposition could have one, and interested members, so that some - and a couple should be sent to the Press Gallery so that they would have the information too.

MR. NEARY: Get good mileage out of it.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, it is not a question of getting mileage out of it, I think it is a very significant fact because the other night we were talking on the basis that we all felt that the age of our fishermen, you know, that there were not young men or younger men going in the industry and now we discover, from information that was readily available, that 25 per cent in 1972 were under twenty-nine years of age, and all of the figures are given in these tables.

So that means then that the fishery is not going to die out if these figures mean anything. At least it is not going to die out from there being a lack of people willing to go into the fishery. Because

twenty-four per cent of the fishermen in 1972 were under twenty-four years of age. So that, I think, is worth noting in correcting the record.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, point-seven per cent were over seventy-five and two-point-one per cent were over seventy. So I think it is interesting to note that and it is important to note it.

Now the honourable gentleman from St. Barbe North mentioned regional offices and complained that there has not much being done in regional offices when he spoke the other night. When we get down into the details of the estimates, I will show that considerable progress is being made in establishing regional offices in the Province and here in the Department of Fisheries. As a matter of fact there are advertisements now in the press. And the Public Service Commission has been asked to find, I believe it is, three more - we are now advertising for three more regional officers to be stationed at various parts of the Province in addition to the, I think it was, six that we already have. When we get down to the estimates where I know where exactly the information is, I will go into that in more detail.

The Department of Fisheries of Newfoundland, Mr. Chairman, has actually doubled in size in the last three years. It was pitifully small in numbers when the P. C. Party took over the administration of the Province. In January, 1972 the Department of Fisheries had forty-six employees, including the Fisheries Loan Board. Last November it had ninety-one employees. The total at the moment would be, I would say, ninety-five. That is double, in any event, including the Fisheries Loan Board and the Fishing Industry Advisory Board. So in November of 1974 there were ninety-one employees and twelve positions authorized but not filled. So that was authority for 103 employees, over double the number of employees in 1972.

AN HON. MEMBER: So what!

MR. CROSBIE: So what, the honourable gentleman says.

On Tuesday honourable gentlemen opposite sneered and said that the emphasis that this government had on the fishery was shown by the fact that the department had not increased in size, and it was doing nothing and so on and so forth, and the same slop and the same lack of concern for the fisheries as they demonstrated was still being demonstrated. So I am simply pointing out to the committee, and I am not saying that this proves very much, but it does show that the Department of Fisheries now has twice as many employees as it had in 1972, and I can say this, Mr. Chairman, it is doing ten times the job that was done in 1972.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: And I am saying that under my predecessor, the member for Gander, who was sneered at and denigrated in this House on Tuesday in a most unbecoming manner, that under that minister the department was re-organized. It was strengthened and that the new structure was created and that there was recruited to the department two very fine assistant deputy ministers, who are still there, young and intelligent Newfoundlanders, and Mr. Dopplinger who was in charge of the planning section and who is now looking after the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery and who is a splendid man, and a whole host of other people. All that work was done while my predecessor from Gander was the minister of that department. We now have, I think, a department that can play a major part in the development of a fishery policy in this Province and a department that is listened to with some respect and some attention by the Department of the Environment at Ottawa. That is not, Mr. Chairman, as it used to be just three years ago. That is why I mentioned that.

Now, involving fishermen and policy. That is not something new, Mr. Chairman. That is being done, and it has only been done, as far as I know, since 1972 that fishermen were ever consulted in what they thought should be done or not done in the field of fisheries. It has been done on an increasing scale by the federal government, and it is being done on an increasing scale by the provincial department. For example, we have a committee - there is a vote for it later on, but I have a note here if I can find it on it - we have a committee now in which fishermen participate. It is further down in the notes here - until I get the exact name of it. But we have a committee that advises the Department of Fisheries, provincial, and that meets at least four times a year, to which fishermen are brought from all around the Province. There is a vote in the estimates for it so that we can get their views on various things that are being done in the Province. We are

co-ordinating more and more. It is just apart from that formal committee, Mr. Chairman, apart from that, yesterday, for example, I went to travel to Forteau, I am sorry to L'Anse-au-Clair, for a meeting in L'Anse-au-Clair with fishermen from Red Bay to L'Anse-au-Clair or to the French border with the Province of Quebec. We met with thirty fishermen there - who the Regional Development Association of Labrador South, the Member for Labrador South was with us - and listened to their views and we received a brief from them. On two or three weeks previously we travelled to Plum Point to meet fishermen from the Northern Peninsula, St. Barbe North in particular, to listen to their problems and we had received a brief from them and to tell them what we were doing this year, and to get their views on it. The present Salf Fish Corporation was with us yesterday, who, I think, are doing a most admirable job. I have a very high opinion of Aiden Maloney. I am sure all members of the House do. He has an excellent rapport with fishermen, and knows their problems, and has a long experience in the fishery.

So we are -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: So we are communicating constantly with fishermen and receiving their views, and if we agree with them and trying what we can to assist them, if we do not agree explaining why, and there is a constant process of communication.

Now, in addition, Mr. Speaker, - Mr. Chairman, I am sorry - during this present year I hope to visit every section of the Province, the fishermen in every part of the Province and listen to their views, and to tell them what we are doing, and to get their suggestions as to what we should do. And apart from that, Mr. Chairman, we have a Select Committee on Fisheries which is not going to work any miracles, as we all know, but which we hope may have some very valuable suggestions, and which is an excellent device for allowing people around the Province at this particular stage to put forward their views as to what may be done. Nine members of this House are now travelling about the Province communicating with fishermen, admittedly on a hurried basis, but giving them a chance to express their views - nine members of the House, which is approximately

one-fifth, just over one-fifth of the membership of this House, all of which I think is to the good.

So when honourable gentlemen suggested that we were not involving fishermen sufficiently in policy, I just cite these facts as an answer to that. He is not correct. And the federal government, I must say, Mr. Chairman, are taking very particular pains to do the same kind of thing. By the way, Mr. Chairman, I will just give you some of the committees on which officials of our department serve or fishermen serve. We have a membership on the Federal-Provincial Atlantic Fisheries Committee, on the F.P.A.F.C. which is that committee's Industrial Development section; on the Atlantic Herring Management Committee; on the Newfoundland Herring Working Group, on ICNAF - ICNAF I understand was discussed here yesterday, Mr. Chairman, and the resolution passed yesterday as to our views on the situation on the Hamilton Banks, and the Canadian position to be put forth at ICNAF will be done in June. And until that position is made public I am not at liberty to say anything about it, but I can say this, that the position the Canadian delegation will put forward this year after consultation with the Provincial Department of Fisheries, as well as other groups in Newfoundland, is going to be an extremely and a worthwhile one. We are represented on the Federal-Provincial Committee on shell fish, the Atlantic Queen Crab Association Committee, the Fisheries Development Liaison Committee, that is a federal committee I believe. Federal?

AN HON. MEMBER: Provincial.

MR. CROSBIE: Provincial. That is the Provincial Committee whose name I was looking for, on which we have representation of the fishermen from about the Island, the Fisheries Development Liaison Committee. The Management Committees for on-going DREE programmes and the Federal-Provincial Resettlement Committee, and I could give a host of other committees that our officials are serving on with great distinction.

MR. NEARY: No wonder you have some new staff. They are all serving on committees.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentlemen cannot have it both ways. They cannot say that the department's staff has not increased in numbers and they are doing nothing, and then when I show that the department's

staff is gone up over one hundred per cent since 1972 say it means nothing. You just cannot have it both ways. I mean you are on sticky wicket. I would suggest the best thing is for you not to go saying any more about that point. It has been demolished. We know it is not of any great significance in any event. Now that was a point that the Member for St. Barbe North had made.

He also - I did not catch all of his remarks but he said that I painted a picture of doom and gloom.

AN RON, MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I do not, you know, I do not paint pictures of doom and gloom or pictures of bright vision and everything is rosy in the garden. All I attempt to do is outline what I consider to be the facts of the situation. Now anyone who examines the facts of the situation with respect to the fishery on the East Coast of Canada has to be painting a picture which is gloomy. I mean, if we do not recognize that, we are living in a fool's paradise. That was not recognized from 1949 to 1972, and I know we are not suppose to go back in the history, and I do not want to be accused of saying anything about the first twenty-three years of Confederation. Well it is a fact that over that twenty-three years nobody said anything about doom and gloom in the fishery because they did not want to discuss the facts. And they ignored the facts on what was happening to the resource and so on and so forth. I am not saying that we would have done or been much different had we been there during that period, but we were not. But if we are not prepared to discuss the facts of the Newfoundland Fishery situation now, sensibly and without honourable members on the opposite side getting up and trying to put the government into a corner or trying to make it appear that the Minister of Fisheries is doom and gloom, and he is old nail-him-and-jail-him, and he is old screw-him, and all this kind of business. If we cannot discuss matters in a rational way here about the problems in the fisheries today, it is a pretty pitiable show.

I have always taken the approach, Mr. Chairman, that what we should do is try to deal with the facts, and the situation that faces

us, and if that is a picture that is not too bright, I would sooner paint it correctly than try to pretend it is all bright, that everything is bright, you know. Now this is not to say although the picture is gloomy we are not attempting to do something about it, we are. That is what the whole thing is about. That is what the federal government are about. There are some bright aspects because it is now proven beyond doubt, and the Government of Canada have got it fixed most firmly in their minds, that they must take major steps if we are to have any East Coast fishery at all. Now that is only lately come to them, I mean to the Government of Canada generally. Only in the last twelve months, and really only in the last eight have they accepted the fact in Ottawa that they are responsible for a major possible disaster that is occurring on the East Coast of Canada in the fishery, that they are responsible constitutionally, and, you know, that they have a responsibility to try and overcome this.

And as I have made clear in my earlier remarks, I am not saying that they should do everything, and that we should not play our part. We are going to play our part. We, this little Province with all its obligations, and all it is attempting to do, you know, we are going to do more. We are going to do whatever is necessary but first we want to see what Ottawa, who has the main responsibility, is going to do and then we will do whatever else is necessary. And I tried to outline some of the things that might be necessary.

So I am not trying to give a picture that should discourage anyone. We are not discouraged. We are not throwing up our hands and saying it is all finished. We do not believe that. If you travel - it is tremendous, Mr. Chairman, to get out of this House and see the real world, see thirty fishermen from Labrador South yesterday, healthy, good looking men, not grey beards, I would say most of them in their early 30's or perhaps in their 40's, fine looking, healthy bunch of men, living a fine healthy life, needing improvements, which we are planning to do this year, you know, now living in the Twentieth Century, who got T.V.

everybody with a ski-doo. You know, the standard of their living and their life has advanced so much in the last ten years that it is miraculous to behold. But these are men, they are not saying that they are not going to fish. They are all still interested in the fishing industry. What they want is a decent support from the government in the way of supporting facilities and they are dying to get back fishing. And some of them are going out in three or four days time, the ice is not as bad this year, to take seals or to get seals if they can get them, and then as soon as the ice is gone they are on the fishery generally. And it does your heart good to see a place like L'Anse-au-Clair, and representatives of the fishermen such as there were there yesterday, and they were in Plum Point three weeks ago. They are not slingers, and they are not wingers, you know, and who are not looking for the impossible. And to see, you know, their position. They are not saying that they are never going to fish again or that all is up. But they have got complaints about the unemployment insurance, which we agree with them on. And there are things and facilities needed there, They need a longliner slipway in that area badly, which we hope to get them this year. They need the community stages upgraded so that they will meet the new regulations, so that they can properly utilize them for the purposes of the herring fishery and in the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation. They need further

work done on the Harbour in L'Anse-a-Loup, the breakwater extended and a better wharf, so they can use their longliners there. These are the kinds of things they are interested in. They are by no means discouraged. They are not in despair. But they do have certain legitimate beefs. Now that brings me to another point, Mr. Chairman, and this was the Member for Bell Island. Now his remarks did not get any attention in the press and I could just forget them, say this was another ploy by the Member for Bell Island, he tried to get some publicity and he did not get it and his latest exposé got nowhere - because it got nowhere, the press was tired of the honourable gentleman crying fire when there is not even a match lit. So they ignored his foolishness on Tuesday about, he got up and made a charge. He thought it was a tremendous charge. It was going to electrify the House. It was going to stun the Province. It was going to put us all completely out of our minds when the House heard, and the public heard, this dastardly fact that he sprang on us last Tuesday. What was the fact?

He said that he understood that the Government of Newfoundland had never communicated in any formal sense with the Government of Canada to urge them to do anything about an Income Support Programme for fishermen. This was a statement. And he said if the Minister of Fisheries got up and said this was not correct he was not going to believe him. He was not going to believe him and the honourable Minister of Fisheries was probably a - and he decried the fact that if I said something people might believe it. He wailed and he knashed his teeth and he tore his hair that if I, the poor old Minister of Fisheries said something that he felt most people would believe it. He said this was unfair. It is terrible for anybody to believe, he is so used to not being believed, he is so used to everybody knowing that he is completely discredited and nobody pays the least bit of attention to his fulminations that he throws up his hands in despair when there might be someone who is believed and I was delighted to hear him say that I was a person of that nature, who when he says something most of the public might believe he was not telling

a lie, Now I am delighted he said that.

AN HON. MEMBER: He might withdraw it.

MR. CROSBIE: No, he will never withdraw. The honourable gentleman will never withdraw. He has not got the grace to withdraw and I would not ask him to withdraw. Because occasionally, of course, he is amusing. We have got to give him credit for that. The gentleman is occasionally quite amusing. He was amusing the other night when he praised the Leader of the Opposition. That was the most amusing moment we have seen in the House lately. Battered and bruised and given the ultimatum, the honourable gentleman from Bell Island had to get up and praise the Leader of the Opposition because he is on his way out of the caucus if he did not do it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Am I irrelevant? Well all right.

Now what about Income Support Programmes? Now is it true that this Province has not made any submissions to the Government of Canada about the need for an improved, either an improved unemployment insurance scheme or what is preferable a new Income Support Programme for fishermen, is that true? Is that charge which should - if that charge was proved correct, surely -

MR. DOODY: It was true when the Liberals were in.

MR. CROSBIE: It was true then, yes. Now the Liberals are in Ottawa and they made certain promises in 1974 in a certain election and we are reminding them of that, and not in a nasty spirit, from day to day.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I find Romeo to be a first class gentleman, and he is working hard in this programme.

MR. NEARY: I do not think it is anything to Mr. Davis. I want Mr. Leblanc and Mr. Andras, these are the two gentlemen that I am talking about.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not deal with Mr. Andras but I do deal with the honourable Romeo Leblanc and the honourable Don Jamieson. Now,

Mr. Chairman, let us just see, has the Province said anything, now I have said at every meeting that I have had with the honourable Romeo Leblanc since October 6, 1974 when I was demoted, when I was crushed, when I was pushed down, when I was put in the ignominy, if that is the word, of the Department of Fisheries, as the Leader of the Opposition said because he insulted every Newfoundland last October, he said Crosbie has had the chop. He was the great Finance Minister, much beloved of by the public when suddenly he was taken and stuffed to this minor department, this wrack and ruin, this tiddly wink department, Fisheries and he said this was a great comedown and a great demotion, That was his view, the honourable Leader of the Opposition's view of the fishery when he should have been saying anyone appointed to the fishery was almost next to the Premier, as the honourable the former Member for Bonavista South used to say, the Premier.

MR. NEARY: What about our government?

MR. CROSBIE: So now what -

MR. DOODY: Years and years and years ago.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable former member for what district, was it, at one time it was Bonavista North and then it was Humber East and then he ran from Humber East to Placentia East and he ran from Placentia East to Clearwater and now he is coming back perhaps to try for another district, he used to kid me about 'our' government. Just because I am a poor illiterate that cannot pronounce my words right, it is supposed to be that I should not be a member of this House.

Now to get back at the point I was going to make, income support, Now we realize, Mr. Chairman, as I have said, and I have talked about this with the honourable Mr. Leblanc everytime I have seen him and he is a man who is generally interested in the fisheries and I think that he, as far as I am concerned, so far he is taking the right approach to the fisheries problems and he is very much interested in them. At every meeting we have had we have brought up the question of income support and as a matter of fact this last week, I think it was, my Acting Deputy Minister, Mr. David Vardy, had a meeting with one of the federal officials who is doing the

work on a proposed Income Support Programme and discussed just where they were with them and the alternatives and so on. And they are having a lot of difficulties with this because it is a very complicated area. But at every meeting we have reminded them that this is badly needed, particularly in Newfoundland.

Now last year, Mr. Chairman, the honourable Jack Davis of that time, had sent out to interested parties suggestions he had made for major changes in the Unemployment Insurance scheme. Among those to whom he sent his suggestions were the Government of Newfoundland. And the Government of Newfoundland, through its Minister of Fisheries, then the Member for Gander and the Resource Policy Committee, I think, of the Executive Council, studied the proposals and on July 26, 1974 Mr. Davis was written outlining our views on what he was suggesting and I have a copy of the letter here but it would not be proper to table it because we have not got consent from the Government of Canada to table the correspondence. But I can mention, any gentleman who wants to see it private can come over and look at it.

It was a long letter. It was a four or five page letter as to what our views were on the modifications they were suggesting. The points that we made in this letter were the points made by the fishermen up in Labrador South yesterday. I will not go into them all. But one of the things that is needed is that the present employment and benefit periods have to be changed, that there should not be an artificial period, which I think is now from December 1 to May 15, and during that period, only during that period can a fisherman get benefits. That period should be extended and should change with the part of the coast and the fishery on that coast that you are dealing with. That is one of the things.

MR. NEARY: That is not an Income Support Programme, That is changing the Unemployment Insurance Programme.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman will have his chance later because I am hoping that these estimates will be debated day after day after day and day after day after day, until we have gone our seventy-five hours. So

the honourable gentleman will have his chance.

MR. NEARY: There will be no formal presentation for an Income Support Programme.

MR. CROSBIE: When I finish the honourable gentleman should slink from the House and go back to Bell Island and lick his wounds.

MR. DOODY: They will not have him on Bell Island.

MR. CROSBIE: No, they will not have him. He is running from Bell Island now. And a large number of other suggestions for major changes in the Unemployment Insurance Plan are contained in that letter.

MR. NEARY: What about the Income Support Programme?

MR. CROSBIE: The rule that limits the maximum weekly insurable earnings of fishermen to \$170 should be eliminated. The wives of fishermen, now here is one that would interest the Member for St. Barbe North, the wives of fishermen who process their husband's catch or aid in procuring the catch, should have earnings attributed to them in proportion to the value their processing adds to the catch or to the extent to which they would aid in procuring the catch and allow them to have equal treatment and be eligible for unemployment insurance proceeds. That is one of the points we made in this letter of last July. We impressed upon them the importance of carrying out these changes before the end of the 1975 - How are you Premier?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Okay.

MR. NEARY: You are spending a fortune boy, go back.

MR. CROSBIE: The end of the 1974 season. Then the Premier met with the Prime Minister and other premiers last summer, I guess that was after the election, at which they discussed the economy generally and at that time the Premier stressed to the Prime Minister the importance of an Income Support Plan for Newfoundland fishermen and the Prime Minister said that he was quite cognizant of this. And I will show you this in a moment now, and on December 13, to follow this up, the Premier wrote the Prime Minister, on December 13, 1974. As I said I cannot table it because it would be discourteous but I will let the Member for Bell Island read it

himself now.

MR. NEARY: The other one too.

MR. CROSBIE: And the other one. December 13, 1974, you may remember this is just the introduction; My Dear Prime Minister, You may remember that some time ago we discussed the Income Support Programme for fishermen which was proposed by the Honourable Jack Davis and we have written on July 26, expressed our support and recommended changes. And it goes on to tell the

Prime Minister how important this is, and we are ready to participate in further discussions at any time. And on February 28 the Prime Minister answered in acknowledging receipt of that letter, on February 28, and I cannot table that because it would be improper, but saying that they are proceeding with studies on this question, and it is their intention to continue to provide unemployment benefits to self-employed fishermen. Well we know they are not going to stop doing that now.

So it is completely untrue to say, Mr. Chairman, you know, that we are not pushing with all the force that we can the development of either a vastly improved unemployment insurance programme for fishermen or a suitable income support programme for fishermen. Now I am not qualified, nor is this the appropriate time, to go into all the problems they are finding with trying to develop an income support programme. They are working on it hard in Ottawa. I understand that they are committed to improving the unemployment insurance programme for fishermen this year if they are unable to bring in a new income support programme. If they cannot do that because of the complexity and the difficulty, that they will introduce changes this year that will better look after the fishermen. And that is important, Mr. Chairman, because it is no good to say that the fishermen might have been - and this was asked yesterday actually, this was interesting at the meeting in Labrador South yesterday when they were making their points about the unemployment insurance programme. One person there said, well, you know, three or four years ago you were not discontented with the unemployment insurance programme for fishermen and why is it such a subject now of extreme distress with inshore fishermen and so on? And the answer was, and I thought it was very interesting, well now, he said, Sir, you know, four or five or six years ago we did not have television, we did not have oil, we did not have to pay our oil bill every couple of weeks or every week or monthly, they

did not have light bills to pay, they did not have the telephone bills to pay for and so on and so forth and now with all these changed conditions the fisherman who lives in Labrador South, the same as the fisherman who lives almost anywhere in the Province of Newfoundland, has to meet his weekly bills and he needs cash for that because conditions have changed. And, therefore, when they are left, say in April, without any unemployment insurance benefits and the fishery may not start until the end of May or June, they really feel the pinch of this because of these changed circumstances. Not only that but they see somebody who works in the fish plant for eight weeks is then eligible to get forty-one weeks, I think it is, or forty-three weeks of unemployment insurance whereas the fisherman who fishes for much longer than that is only eligible for - I forget the exact number - twenty-some-odd weeks of benefits, anyway only between December 1 and May 15. Now are you convinced?

So I only mention these things in passing to lay the honourable member for -

MR. NEARY: Little white lies, little white lies.

MR. CROSBIE: - to lay the mind of the Hon. Member for Bell Island at rest on that point. We are as extremely anxious as any one in Newfoundland would be to see developed a new income support scheme for fishermen or major improvements that will look after the requirements, particularly of inshore fishermen.

Now I do not know if I need - oh, shell shuckers. The honourable gentleman brought up the question of shell shuckers in St. Barbe North and this is a very thorny question. And he has done his best to have it resolved with Ottawa. And the President of the Union, Mr. Cashin and his union have done their best, and they have made representations. And we have done our best and we have made representations. And the whole nub of the problem, it is a matter of technicalities relating to the National Revenue and Taxation Act.

National Revenue says that a normal employer-employee working arrangement does not exist between the independent scallop fisherman and the woman scallop shuckers, their wives. There is no point going into all the details. But the way that this was attempted to be gotten around last year still did not get around these legal technicalities. Their argument is that women were still shucking scallops on their husbands' fishing stages and were not subject to normal company work rules and procedures and, therefore, they would not recognize them as being engaged in an occupation that was insurable.

Well there are ways, as the honourable gentleman doubtless knows, that if they go about it right this year, in a different form of organization and to meet these technicalities, they should be gotten into a position where this year they may be able to scallop shuck but still be eligible for unemployment insurance.

MR. F. ROWE: They were told that last year.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, well they were told that last year, and they attempted a method with Fishery Products that did not go far enough.

MR. F. ROWE: So in other words, the Department of National Revenue agreed with the so-called agreement, and then three months later disagreed with it. That is the tragedy of it.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, exactly. And it is the Department of National Revenue which has been nit-picking about this situation, and we have done our best also to add our voice to that of the Member for St. Barbe North and Mr. Cashin and other people who are concerned to try to get them to change that, but without any success. So if they will not change it, then, you know, we will have to be sure that the parties concerned devised the proper method this year so that their wives will get the unemployment insurance for shucking scallops. I mean obviously it is much better to have the husbands out fishing and catching the fish and the women, under some arrangement doing the work onshore, shucking the scallops, but in a way that will get them covered with the ordinary benefits of unemployment insurance and other such benefits. To do

that, they have to be able to show that they are not just working for their husbands. They have to show that they are working for some third party and it has got to be arranged to meet the technicalities that came up last year.

Now, community stages, I suppose there is no point in speaking at any great length on it except to say that in February 5, 1975 I wrote Mr. Leblanc about the whole question of the ownership and sharing of the cost of major additions and alterations to community stages and holding units constructed under Federal-Provincial Programmes in Newfoundland, which have been in dispute since their construction. There have been several programmes, commencing in 1959 and 1960, where community stages were constructed by both governments with the Province providing the sites and the federal government providing the funds. In the year 1965 to 1967, there was a great deal of discussion and an agreement was almost entered into. The provincial government recognizes its responsibility for the fish holding facilities that were constructed by the Department of Fisheries of Newfoundland without any federal financial assistance and also for the community stages built in 1963-1964 under a Federal-Provincial Programme for which there was a written agreement. We are not trying to shirk our responsibilities. We say we recognize them. We paid one hundred per cent for these stages and we will continue to do so. All we want done is that they transfer to us the administrative responsibility for salt fish community stages and fresh fish holding units so long as they pay seventy-five per cent of the cost of bringing their stages up to proper repair and if there are any major repairs afterwards, they share the cost. But in the meantime, we will carry on with all ordinary expenses ourselves, a hundred per cent, and minor repairs and the like. That was what was agreed in 1969 but never carried out.

Now in the last few years the federal government has spent next to nothing on community stages except through LIP Programmes. Since 1969 the Department of Fisheries of Newfoundland has spent approximately \$5 million on the Community Stage Programme and that is what we have spent in this Province on a programme that was originally almost entirely federal. We have spent over \$5 million. And the federal government since 1969 has spent, I do not believe they have spent anything except through LIP grants on community stages. So anything done in respect to community stages in the last two or three years has been done by this administration and some of that money is being spent on stages originally built by the federal government and some has been spent on stages that started with LIP grants, to retrieve the LIP grants. I mean, that is one of the great pitcies, Mr. Chairman, of the LIP Programme. You know, it is a good programme in many senses.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, no. They were reported. It just shows you, you know, if the money that was being spent on LIP projects and all the LEAP projects and so on could be properly administered, how great the benefits could be to this Province.

Now, in a great many cases when a group gets a LIP grant to start a community stage or improve one, the thing becomes a disaster. They do not get sufficient money in the first place, and they have not got the necessary experience or administrative experience to know how to administer it. They may not have proper plans and so on and we have to come in, and unless it is all going to be completely useless, we have to try to bail them out and give further money, which we have done on some occasions, or if we are just strapped for funds and cannot do it, do not give any.

If the federal government would just, in addition to doing these programmes, would say that in a Province like Newfoundland where the unemployment is so tragically high and the per capita income is the lowest in Canada and all the other facts that we know, that in addition we are going to give promises like that, \$10 million, \$15 million, \$20 million to spend on public improvements - we want the right to agree to what public improvements to use that for, and let us get at it - we would create far more employment with that expenditure of money than would be created with twice that number of dollars in LIP projects and the rest. You know, it would be spent properly and to the best advantage of our whole Province rather than, as now happens, left to the initiative of local areas and local groups and so on, some of which are good and some are bad and so on.

If they want to help us overcome our unemployment problem of the moment, that is the kind of thing to do. Do the LIP grants and so on also, but, you know, give the Province some \$15 million or \$20 million, whatever the figure is, to do necessary works particularly in the fisheries and all about this island. I think that the money will

be far better spent than it is in many cases now in LIP grants.

Well, one of our problems is with stages and facilities started through LIP grants, to see that they are completed, the money is not all lost and so on. But, in any event, since 1969 over \$5 million, the Province has spent on the Community Stage Programme and upgrading and new facilities. Let us see. I forget the number of these facilities - I do not know if I can find it here - in the Province altogether. But, about a third of them, if not more, are federal and provincial and some are in no man's land. We have suggested a solution for it with which we hope that they will agree.

We know that they will agree to turn them all over to us now. But, we do not want them turned over without the federal government having put some of their federal community stages in proper repair before they do, because we are straining ourselves fiscally now to do a lot of the work that we are doing in this Province. It would be unfair for them to turn them over to us unless they were in proper shape for us to administer.

Now, all the information is here. I have a whole list of them here now. The first programme, 1959 to 1960 - they are all listed. There was a second programme, 1963 to 1964. There was a programme of 1965. There was a programme of 1966. There was a programme of 1966 again, and there was our own programme. This all needs to be regularized.

So, if we are doing everything we can, it is the federal government that really - well, they want to bow out of this thing and they want to spend their money on wharves and so on and other improvements. If they are going to bow out of it, let them give us their stages renovated as they should be in accordance with the new regulations and we will operate them from there on along with the other ones that we are operating now.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: But did you not agree to take them over?

MR. CROSBIE: No, they were never agreed to be taken over. They are arguing that there was some agreement, but we can find no agreement that the Province ever agreed to take them over. There was an agreement signed by Mr. Maloney when he was minister and sent to Ottawa

but never signed by Ottawa, never signed by Mr. Robichaud who was the minister in those days. That is the agreement that we are still willing to sign.

The Liberal policy of 1969, this particular one, turns out on examination to be a good policy. That is the one that we want to carry out with Ottawa. We are on four square -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: - with the Liberal policy of 1969 on community stages. So, that is the position on community stages.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, we are prepared to maintain them ourselves as long as they will spend not even 100 per cent. We have said seventy-five per cent of the cost of upgrading them to proper condition. We will pay the other twenty-five.

Now, I think I have touched on just about all the points that were raised by honourable gentlemen. As I say, I have a mass of information here, as we go down through the estimates, on other items, and they will be easier to deal with under individual items as we go down through the estimates. I think that is all I need to say at the moment.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): The honourable the Member for St. Barbe North.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Chairman, I would like to reply to the minister's comments on the debate on, I guess, Tuesday night, it was. Sir, the minister has really not answered one of the questions that was put to him. That was - and presumably he is going to bring up, give the answers to that question when he comes to this particular vote in the estimates, that is the regional offices of the department. He did not mention that. He said he was going to indicate that information on the vote when he gets to it.

One of the things that we mentioned on this side of the House is that the government has failed to encourage participation by fishermen through discussion groups, by providing them with the information developed in the department and through the establishment of regional advisory councils

which will work with the department on the formation of future plans and policies affecting each particular region. Now, the weak and feeble answer that the minister gave to that charge that they have not done this is that the minister and his officials are now gallivanting about the Province meeting with the fishermen personally, year three after this promise was made. Three years later the minister is now taking his officials and going to various parts of the Province to meet with the fishermen personally.

Now, Sir, I see nothing wrong with that except for two or three things. There is nothing wrong with the concept. It is the way it is being done and the timing of it that I disagree with. Number one, I accompanied the minister to Plum Point, and his officials, to meet with the fishermen from St. Paul's Inlet, I was informed, to Cook's Harbour, St. Paul's Inlet to Cook's Harbour, close to 300 miles, 250 miles of coast line, in excess of fifty communities. I turned on the radio one morning, Sir, and I heard the Minister of Fisheries and myself being viciously attacked by a person from one of the communities in my own district because we had flown into the district in the morning, flown out in the night, had a meeting with the fishermen and the people of Green Island Cove and Green Island Brook had not heard a thing about it. That was just one example.

I investigated it, and I found, to my surprise - I sort of suspected this when I was in attendance - that the group of fishermen who attended that meeting of Plum Point were not representative of all of the communities on the North West Coast, but were representative of a minority number of communities. That is one problem.

Now, we can blame that on the Herring Fishermen's Association. By the way, I might point out that this was not the initiative of the provincial government, that meeting. That was the initiative of the Herring Fishermen's Association of St. Barbe, a group of fishermen who got together because they had a problem and got a brief did up a brief with the co-operation of the Extension Department and invited the minister and his officials and invited the member, myself, to that meeting.

Now, that cannot be claimed by the minister as his government encouraging participation by fishermen. This was their own initiative, point number one. Point number two, Sir: I do not know how the minister got to Forteau yesterday, whether it was at his own initiative or whether it was as a result of an invitation from the fishermen on that side of the Straits, similar to the Newfoundland Island side of the Straits a few weeks before. But if this is supposed to represent this government's participation, encouraging the participation of fishermen in the development of policy it is a weak, sick, anemic effort on the part of the Department of Fisheries and, Sir, it comes specifically close to the end of this government's term.

Now, the minister says he is going to be travelling around the Province over the next year meeting with the fishermen. Good idea, Sir, but why now? Why three years later after it was promised? Probably the minister should have been in that portfolio three years ago. That may be the answer, but I suspect, Sir, it is more political than anything else, more political. The final months or years or year of this particular term of office for this administration, the Minister of Fisheries goes gallivanting around the Province with his officials and, Sir, what is done at these meetings? There is an exchange. We had three or four gentlemen at one of our meetings had a very great input. We got some tremendous feedback. Unfortunately, three or four people tend to dominate at a meeting such as that, but we did get some feedback, but Sir, what is happening? The minister is going up and he is announcing that there will be a community stage built in a certain harbour that we, we, we, the minister says, and of course, that is taken by the people as we, the government, we will be building a new community stage in, say, Bartlett's Harbour and we will be upgrading the community stage in Anchor Point, in Pond Cove or Blue Cove or Green Island Cove or in Cook's Harbour or Bird Cove or what have you, we will be doing that.

Now, Sir, there are two impressions that are left. One, there is one impression that is left certainly and that is that

this government is going to build or upgrade community stages, but this government is only going to build or upgrade community stages if they get money from Ottawa to do that. Now, Sir, I think this government should level with the people of Newfoundland and say that they have virtually given up on the fisheries because every time they talk about improvements of community stages, for example, or wharves or slipways or haulups or dredging of harbours, it is the Federal Government's money that is going to be used to do it.

There is a marine service station going up in Port Saunders, Sir, for which the honourable Member for St. Barbe South, no doubt, is getting great credit and his administration is getting great credit. Where is the money coming from for that marine service station in Port Saunders? Is it one hundred per cent - ninety.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Fifty. Fifty per cent - are you sure it is fifty? Well, I will accept your word. Fifty per cent of that money is coming from the Federal Government, fifty per cent. I thought it was more. I am going by memory now.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROWE: Well, that is - Okay, of all the, how many new marine service stations are being -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Twelve.

MR. ROWE: Twelve and what is the agreement for all twelve?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Ninety/ten, I believe.

MR. ROWE: Now, well this is what I am saying. Ninety per cent of the money is coming from the Federal Government. Anything that has got to be done with respect to jurisdiction of the fishing stocks is constitutionally the responsibility of the Federal Government and I would say to this government, go in with boots and all on and pound the what have you out of the Federal Government until they act on it and act unilaterally, if necessary to getting jurisdiction over our fishing stocks.

Sir, the point to be made is that the government, this present administration and it is reflected in their estimates, is obviously passing as much of the responsibility for the fisheries in this Province as possible over to the Federal Government, while at the same time trying to take political credit for the establishment or location of new facilities. This is reflected in the budget. The budget for this Fisheries Department is something in the order of \$9 million, if I can find it. The total capital and current provincial budget for this Province is \$9,700,000 and, Sir, the total federal improvement or involvement or contribution to this government in matters pertaining to the fisheries is \$5,025,000 for marine service centres, \$750,000 for fish handling facilities through DREE and \$2,360,000 for fish plants and water systems. In other words, in excess of around, it is about \$8 million, in excess of \$8 million federal money is going into fisheries in this Province.

In other words, Sir, what I am saying here is that everything that this Provincial Government is doing is being matched by the Federal Government. Now, probably there should be more, there should be more Federal Government involvement. If so, let the Provincial Government convince the Federal Government to accept the whole, complete and total responsibility for the fisheries in this Province because when you take the salary vote out of the Department of Fisheries, the salary vote out, the salary vote is \$1.2 million, you are left with less than \$9 million of the provincial funds going into the fisheries.

Sir, the thing that I take exception to is the fact that this government, while trying to get as much money out of Ottawa as possible for fisheries, when such monies become available they very subtly take the credit for the facilities that are being built with Federal Government money. At the same time, they take every opportunity to criticize the Federal Government for not doing enough for the fisheries. That is what we find hard to swallow on this side of the House, Sir.

April 3, 1975.

Tape 980

RH - 4

With respect to the gloom and doom bit, I did not accuse the minister of painting a picture of gloom and doom. I might have used that phrase. Unfortunately, the minister jotted down that one phrase only. I complimented the minister for being John the Honest, as I put it that night, for admitting and confessing that the Provincial Government is incapable and has been incapable over the past three years in coping with the fisheries problems of this Province and they now have to go crawling to Ottawa. It probably should have been done years ago. I do not

know. But, Sir, it was this government that three years ago made wide, sweeping promises about what they were going to do for the fishery, and I will not bore this committee with weeding it all out again. It is one-and-a-half pages of the Throne Speech. As a matter of fact of any single area or department of this government in that Throne Speech, in 1972, March, 1972, there were more words spoken in the Throne Speech and more promises made in the area of the fisheries than in any other single department three years ago.

Ironically, Sir, three years later, there is less done, there has been less done by this government in the area of the fisheries. There have been more promises broken or not honoured in that department than in any other department, I would submit. I complimented the minister on being honest and saying, we cannot cope with it. Well, if that is the situation, I would suggest that the minister get in the plane go to Ottawa and knock it out with Ottawa.

I will be the first one to go up and tackle Basford and Romeo and the boys when it comes to such things as the discrimination, for example, against the female fish processors in this Province who are not employed in a great, huge fish plant with the proper administration and payroll. I will be the first one to get on the air and get on the television with the minister and stick the knife into any government, whether it is Liberal or N.D.P. or Progressive Conservative if that federal government is not going to solve that problem with respect to the Department of National Revenue. It is a stupid little technicality within the Department of National Revenue that is depriving hundreds of women in this Province of making a decent livelihood and gaining from their unemployment insurance benefits.

I have as much criticism for any federal authority as I have for provincial authority in that respect. I have wired Basford, Leblanc, Jack Marshall, the honourable the Minister of Fisheries - I do not know if he was Minister of Fisheries when I sent the wire out, his predecessor or the present Minister of Fisheries, and the President of the Fishermen's Union asking for a meeting to resolve this problem.

I got a reply back from Jack Marshall. That is all I got, that he would do everything possible to see to it that we could get a meeting, but that is as far as we have gotten, Sir. The community stages, Sir, the way the minister describes it, I would suggest that the way negotiations are going on now, I would say, if you can, give it back to Ottawa. I do not know if that is a sane approach or not. It seems that in order for the Province to take over the community stages, that the Province wants the federal government to pay seventy-five per cent of upgrading thru to the required standards.

It seems that the federal government is reluctant to do that. If there is any way, I say, give it back to Ottawa, the whole thing, because they are responsible for wharves on which the community stages are built. They are responsible for dredging around the community stages. They are responsible for slipways and haulups and marine service stations. In the middle of that you have a miserable little community stage which the provincial government wishes to accept the responsibility for.

I do not know. I am not an expert in the fisheries, but I have seen the fishermen and the fisherwomen trying to work under the circumstances in my own district. I tend to think now, throw the whole thing back into Ottawa's face, the

community stage business. It is like, I am trying to think of a good analogy, it is like, I cannot think of a good analogy, but community stages, wharves, slipways and what have you are a unit. Why separate one aspect of that unit out for a different jurisdiction or a different responsibility. Probably the minister can explain why, I do not know where the error was made or whether there was an error made or whether we are on the right or wrong track, but I submit that the difficulty that the Provincial Government is now having to gain jurisdiction and responsibility over community stages, it would be just as well for them to give up and say, go on Ottawa, take over because this is what Ottawa is doing with respect to marine service stations and everything else involving the fisheries.

One is almost led to say, Sir, I am not saying it, that when you look at the constitution and you look at the federal involvement in the fisheries, you sometimes wonder why we have a provincial Department of Fisheries at all. I am not suggesting that we should not, but one wonders why we have one at all when less than \$9 million, about \$9 million, less than \$9 million when you take out the salaries, is being spent in the area of the fisheries by the Provincial Government. \$9 million out of \$1 billion, nine out of \$100,000 million, nine one-hundred-thousands of this budget is being spent in the fisheries which is supposedly one of our greatest resources. Now, the minister has a tremendous problem ahead of him. I do not envy the Minister of Fisheries. He has got a monumental problem ahead of him, but, Sir, his administration, when you look at the total salary vote, the total vote, I mean, for the Department of Fisheries, it is obvious that this administration is not putting the money where the problem is, is not putting enough emphasis on the fisheries. It is reneging. It is trying to slip out from under its responsibilities and pass it over to the Federal Government.

I say it is time, Sir, that this government call a spade a spade and say that they cannot cope with the problem and that they

will do everything possible to get Ottawa to cope with the problem and I just return very briefly again to this whole business, which I find very distasteful, of an administration taking Federal Government money and expending it, administering it in this Province for such things as marine service stations, fish handling facilities, fish plants and water systems totalling \$8 million, take \$8 million of Federal Government money, administering it and subtly taking credit for it, subtly taking credit for it for the establishment of facilities using Federal Government money.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Are you against that?

MR. ROWE: I am against any outfit or any administration or any party who, it is unparliamentary for me to say deceives, attempts to deceive the people.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Deceive the people by what?

MR. ROWE: By giving the impression that it is this administration that is responsible for putting a marine service station in a certain place or a community stage in a certain place when it is the Federal Government's money that is being spent. The honourable the Minister of Fisheries, the honourable Minister of Fisheries arrived on the scene in a certain part of the Province -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Does the budget not set out how much money -

MR. ROWE: Yes, the budget - how many fishermen in Newfoundland get a copy of the budget?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What do you want us to do? Go out and -

MR. ROWE: No, no, Mr. Speaker, I will answer any - The members opposite will have plenty of opportunity to speak or debate or rebut anything that I have said so far, but I will not harassed

stand here and be harassed by three so-called honourable gentlemen on the other side when I am trying to make a point.

Now if the honourable minister would open his ears and close his mouth he might find out what the point is I am trying to make.

AN HON. MEMBER: I doubt it. Keep going.

MR. SIMMONS: I doubt it for another reason.

MR. ROWE: Yes, I doubt it too.

MR. SIMMONS: For another reason.

MR. ROWE: I would probably have to put it in baby talk -

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Or repeat it a dozen times for him to understand, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Make sense.

MR. ROWE: Now, Mr. Chairman, will I be heard in -

AN HON. MEMBER: Big mouth in a small head.

MR. ROWE: Will I be given the courtesy of being heard in silence.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. ROWE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The point that I was making, Mr. Chairman, is that we find it distasteful for any honourable Cabinet Minister, whether it be Fisheries, Municipal Affairs or anything else, to go around the Province saying that we will be building this facility in this community, when in fact there is no commitment, no commitment. They are going to spend Ottawa money. It is contingent upon money coming from Ottawa. There has been no agreement to my knowledge, signed between the provincial government and the federal government, that money will be made available to this provincial government for the purpose of building community stages that have been announced, will be upgraded and built in this province. That is what we take exception to.

Now if the minister has got something I have not heard, or have not seen, I would be only too happy to hear from him. But announcements have been made about where new community stages are going to be built, where community stages are going to be upgraded, but it depends upon money coming from Ottawa and no agreement has been signed. It is as simple as that. The same as reading The Throne Speech or The Budget Speech tonight

or this afternoon, proroguing and calling an election at two o'clock this morning, and by doing that you automatically wipe out the Budget and the Throne Speech. When you are elected or turfed out you have to come up with a new Throne Speech and Budget Speech and this is what is going on here now, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: When the honourable Minister of Fisheries, Sir, commenced his remarks a few moments ago he could not resist the temptation to make some very uncomplimentary remarks about some of the ideas and suggestions and recommendations that I put forward last time I spoke in this debate on the minister's salary. The minister had to poke a little fun in his typical fashion about the lack of coverage that my remarks received. Obviously, Sir, the minister was so wrapped up with his trip to Southern Labrador that he must have missed yesterday morning's Daily News. On page two it says "Neary raps Crosbie on fishery issues."

Then, Sir, in "The people's paper" that is observing its ninety-sixth birthday today, I believe, on page twenty-three, the honourable minister and myself must be slipping, we only got our pictures, the two of us. The minister looking at me, "Neary's speech drives Crosbie to poetry."

MR. CROSBIE: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I have often heard of people driving other people to drink but it is the first time that I have ever heard of a speech driving somebody to poetry. Then right down underneath, Sir, the poem was printed there. Right down underneath. "Crosbie to hold talks with federal minister." You could go all throughout this "people's paper", Sir, that is observing its ninety-sixth birthday today and you will find all kinds of reference to the honourable Minister of Fisheries, who does somehow or other, Sir, manage to get his share of publicity.

I want to assure the honourable minister, Sir, that when I speak in this honourable House on the fisheries, that I speak from the heart and I could not care less if I get one paragraph of publicity. It is too

important a matter. It should be a non-partisan matter and I was the one who suggested, Sir, some time ago that a Select Committee of this House, I was the first and only member to recommend, Sir, that a Select Committee of this House, representing members on both sides of the House, be appointed

to take a look at our inshore fishery, because I had a feeling at the time that the honourable minister and the administration did not have a programme of their own. I did that outside of the House and I did it inside of the House. But, Sir, when it comes to publicity the honourable minister is not exactly behind the door. The honourable minister goes to the john he has got his name in the paper or on television or on the radio. John goes to the john.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The Hon. John goes to the john.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Order, please! The Chair fails to see the relevancy in debate as regards to the subject which we are on. And I could caution the honourable Member for Bell Island that he try to stick to the heading which we are on - Fisheries.

MR. NEARY: I certainly will, Sir, and I hope and trust and pray, Mr. Chairman, that other honourable members of the House will be as relevant as I am, in my remarks about the fisheries. I was merely replying to remarks that had already been made by an honourable member on the government benches, Your Honour. But I am not questioning Your Honour's ruling. I think Your Honour is absolutely right in his remarks about trying to enforce the rule of relevancy which we were told yesterday is very difficult to enforce.

But, Sir, I do not want to dwell on that because that is all childishness on the minister's part. I want to get down to brass tacks, Sir. And I made a statement the other night, and the other afternoon, and the other night about the Income Support Programme. And the minister this afternoon challenged my statements and then invited me to take a look at some privileged correspondence between the Hon. the Premier and the honourable minister's predecessor. And I accepted the minister's invitation, Sir, I went across the House, man fashion, sat down and looked at these documents, looked at these two pieces of correspondences. Now remember, Mr. Chairman, all the bellyaching that we have heard about

this Income Support Programme, You would not know but they were in there boots and all trying to get this Income Support Programme for the fishermen of this Province. And the minister said that I was wrong and he was going to prove it, and he did not want to table the correspondence. Well I can understand that, Sir. This is privileged correspondence between the government and the minister. But the correspondence was addressed in one instance to the Prime Minister of Canada and in the other instance to the Hon. Jack Davis, Sir, and that is precisely what I said the other night - that there has been no approach, and I said the minister would get up and say, oh, in conversation at an odd little cocktail party here and there in Ottawa, might have mentioned it just in passing.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do federal ministers go to a lot of cocktail parties?

MR. NEARY: Sir, there is not one document, not one piece of correspondence in the minister's files or in the government files to the Hon. Mr. Leblanc or to the Hon. Mr. Andras two ministers responsible for the Unemployment Insurance Act and for the Income Support Programme, and Mr. Davis is no longer with us.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do they not talk to the Prime Minister?

MR. NEARY: Oh, of course, they talk to the Prime Minister.

But, Sir, all right I will concede - I will concede that the minister was ten per cent right and I was ninety per cent right because the correspondence, Sir, deals in a large measure about amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Regulations, and the Income Support Programme is mentioned in passing.

I get the impression of reading the correspondence that the government more or less threw up their arms in the hope of getting the Income Support Programme and we are going to opt and we are going to settle for amendments to the Unemployment Insurance Regulations.

But, Sir, that is a matter that needs to be followed up, and the advice that I gave the minister the other night, and I will give it to him again - and I do not know which federal minister, Sir, it will come under, whether or not Mr. Andras, who is responsible for the administration of the Unemployment Insurance Commission, whether he will be the one to implement this Income Support Programme or whether it will

be Mr. Leblanc, the Minister of Fisheries.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Perhaps the Minister of Fisheries can tell us which minister, which department of the Government of Canada will implement this Income Support Programme.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I think that is very important, Sir. Maybe I am being naive. Maybe I should take it for granted that it is going to be the Federal Minister of Fisheries responsibility. Maybe it is, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Maybe it is.

MR. NEARY: I do not know.

But I certainly would like to find out from the minister.

MR. DOODY: We would like to find out too, but Ottawa has been playing games with us.

MR. NEARY: Ottawa has not been playing games, Sir.

MR. DOODY: Oh, come on, admit it now.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the first time an approach was made to Ottawa in writing was back in late 1974 according to one of these pieces of correspondence, the one to the Prime Minister.

MR. DOODY: A Liberal election promise.

MR. NEARY: A Liberal election promise.

MR. DOODY: Jack Davis -

MR. NEARY: But anyway, Sir, be that as it may, the whole matter needs to be followed up. The pressure needs to be put on Ottawa otherwise, Mr. Chairman, the fishermen need not look forward to an Income Support Programme in this Province for a long time to come. Now maybe this particular minister, and I am not laying the blame on his doorstep, he has only been there three months, maybe this particular minister will put the pressure on, will take off his coat and roll up his sleeves and get down to brass tacks and work hard for this Income Support Programme. Maybe you will, Sir. I hope he will. We will just have to wait and see.

Now, Sir, there were two or three other matters that I raised the other night that I think are most important and the minister made no comment on these matters whatsoever when he tried to answer some of the criticism that was levelled at his administration's policy by both the Leader of the Opposition, the Member for St. Barbe North and myself in the last two or three days. I dealt at great length, Sir, with this problem of marketing. And the minister, this afternoon, made no reference at all to that, Sir. If the House will remember, I suggested to the minister and this is a positive, constructive suggestion, constructive criticism that the minister or his predecessors had not yet done their homework concerning setting up a marketing board, either a separate board to market all the other produce of the

sea outside of salt fish, similar to the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, or the terms of reference of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation would have to be revised, expanded. And the minister made no reference to that. What is the minister's intention? Is he going to go and meet with the other Premiers across Canada to try to get an agreement so they can make a united approach to Ottawa? I would submit, Sir, that this is most important because the Government of Canada is not going to take the minister or the Newfoundland Government very serious if they go up and try to go it alone and say, Mr. Prime Minister or Mr. Government of Canada, give us another marketing corporation to look after all the other produce of the sea. And the Prime Minister of Canada and the ministers looking at Newfoundland from the vantage point of Wellington Street up in Ottawa will say, well what about Nova Scotia and New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island and Quebec and British Columbia? What about all these other provinces? Do they want this or are you the only Province that wants it?

And if the minister, or whoever is the spokesman for the Newfoundland Government, cannot say to the Government of Canada, look, seven out of ten, nine out of ten, ten out of ten provinces favour this then, Sir, I submit, that nothing will be done about it. And this matter of marketing, Sir, is more important than anything else that we can do regarding the fishery in Newfoundland at this moment. You can talk about your slipways, your haul-outs and your community stages and your gear and everything else -

MR. CROSBIE: You are getting all excited.

MR. NEARY: I am not getting all excited, Sir. I am merely trying to make a point. I am not worried about whether it is going to be reported or not. I want to make a constructive contribution to this committee on this matter. Whether sticky-wicky likes it or not, it does not make any difference to me. All those old fellows around the gallery here are not going to come down and attack us. They may look at us with askance some times.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sticky-wicky.

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, the minister has to approach or the Premier has to approach his counterparts in the other parts of Canada otherwise, Sir, we will not get this badly needed marketing set up that we need. And we can do everything we like with the fishery. Even Canada can declare unilaterally the 200 mile fishing zone. And, you know, there is another thing. I was really amazed and amused the other night, Sir, to hear the Minister of Fisheries say that we had already passed a unanimous resolution in this honourable House, Sir, and we were debating another one yesterday and every Tory member who spoke, whether it is here or in Ottawa said, get rid of the foreign fishing fleets, get them outside our 200 mile limit, get them off our shores, Every single Tory member that I have heard in the last five years

has advocated banishing the foreign ships off our shores. And the other night, much to my amazement, Sir, you talk about political gymnastics, the Minister of Fisheries says what we should be doing in this Province is processing their catches, here on shore, in our own fish plants.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do you agree with that?

MR. NEARY: Do I agree with it? I do not understand the logic of it. The Hon. the Premier is saying banish the foreign fleets from our shores.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I am not the government. If I were the government I would tell the minister my position.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, the Hon. the Premier -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development - no I have not heard the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development make that kind of a statement. He has not got sense enough to do that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: But I have heard other ministers and other spokesmen for the government say, get rid of the Russians, get rid of the Portuguese, get rid of the Spaniards, banish them from our shores. And the Minister of Fisheries, lo and behold, the other night tells us, and which got frong page headlines on in "The people's paper". Ah, let us keep them here and let us process their catches, I am sure it will create a bit of employment for Newfoundlander's.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Oh, if, if, if, I did not hear any ifs,ands, and buts in some of these statements that I heard made. I heard about gunboat diplomacy. If Canada cannot do it by itself or with the agreement of the other nations, do it alone and bring in the Navy. As a matter of fact somebody mentioned the other night about instead of sending the Navy down to Bermuda where they could lay off in the sun in their Bermuda shorts, bring them to Newfoundland, and let them

chase these factory ships and these big draggers, and trawlers from our shores. I do not know if that was what the Premier was doing down there -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: during the week trying to get the Navy to come up here, to enforce the 200 mile limit. But certainly, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: you know, you talk about a contradiction in a statesman. The Minister of Fisheries says, then let us keep them here and let us take their catch and process it in our fish plants, and even Old Captain Bill, who runs a seafood restaurant, runs two seafood restaurants, I believe, one in Mount Pearl and one in St. John's, picked the minister up on that. And I do not blame him. Can you imagine the frustration and the bewilderment on the part of our people, and on the part of our fishermen, when they picked up "The people's paper" and saw on the front page, Minister of Fisheries says process the catches of the foreign fleets in Newfoundland? And everybody but everybody in this honourable House unanimously said, Yes, let Canada if they cannot get agreement over in Geneva, if we cannot - let us go it alone, they said. Unilaterally let us get the Navy up, the Armed Forces and get the bombers and the fighters in. And let us enforce the 200 mile limit and get rid of the foreign fishing fleet.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is some contradiction! That is typical of the honourable minister. Typical!

When this minister first became Minister of Fisheries, Sir, you talk about a contradiction, and all the newsmen have to do is go and research their files, and see what statement the honourable minister made the first week he was appointed Minister of Fisheries. The honourable minister said Canada cannot unilaterally implement the 200 mile limit. The minister did not know that his buddies, the Tory M.P's up in Ottawa were saying we are talking about gunboat diplomacy and about Canada going it alone, and the Hon. the Premier mentioned it several times. But the minister, when he took over, going to be the statesman, and the great diplomat said, no, Canada cannot do it this. And then within a matter of

forty-eight hours he turned a somersault, he turned cat over skin, turned himself inside out.

AN HON. MEMBER: turkey.

MR. NEARY: He turned turkey. Well I do not know.

But any way, Sir, he did the highland fling, he flicked himself over so much that he almost got giddy in the process, and said oh, yes, Canada should go it alone, when he was reminded by some of his colleagues and probably a little tap on the knuckles by the Hon. the Premier, or maybe a call or two from Ottawa. The minister did say that. The minister - is the minister going to admit that he said that?

MR. CROSBIE: I will deal with it in a minutes.

MR. NEARY: Deal with it in a minutes. Well, all the newsmen will have to do is search their files, go to their morgue and they will find that the minister made that statement. And now -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: And then he turns around and says later, banish them,

get up the navy from Burmuda, get the armed forces down here, start a Third World War out on the Grand Banks, let Canada go it alone. And then the night before last, I thought I heard it all: We will take the catches from the foreign fleets and we will process them here in Newfoundland. Wonderful idea! In other words, we are not going to banish -

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I see. Well, now what is the policy of the government? Is it to banish the foreign fleets or is it to leave them here and take their catches and process it onshore? Will the minister please clarify that for poor, old, stund me? Put it in children's talk so I can understand it, how he can reconcile the two positions? Why, he reminds me, Sir, of a man with his two feet on two pans of ice and the ice is drifting away in opposite directions, and he does not know if he should try to hang on or jump in. But, Sir, Captain Bill, who runs these snackbars, picked the minister up. This is the first opportunity that I have had to take the minister to task about that kind of a statement.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: What we should do - Look, you know, the Minister of Social Services is there lipping off, Sir, - what we should be doing, Mr. Chairman, is this. We should stick by our guns about getting rid of the foreign fleets, and I do not mean through gun boat diplomacy now or anything. What we should do, Sir, we should encourage our own people and our own fish plant operators and our own fish merchants to get there and catch the fish, instead of having to take it from these people and process it on shore. We should be able to prove to the whole world that we can do it ourselves. Never mind the ifs, ands, and buts. Do it ourselves, and this is the kind of talk that I would like to hear from that Minister of Fisheries because, Sir, I think that every man, woman and child in this Province knows that our standard of living in Newfoundland will drop drastically, substantially, without

the fishery. The good things of life that we are enjoying now, Sir, coloured televisions, motor cars, high living, mobile homes, all these other good things of life will not be available in this Province, Sir, if we do not keep up our productivity. The only way that we can improve our productivity in Newfoundland at the present time is through the fishery.

I made a couple of other suggestions to the honourable minister the other night that he choose to ignore today when he spoke, but before I deal with them, Sir, I want to deal with the matter of gear banks. The minister waved a report at us the other night. I do not know if we got a copy of it yet or not. Did we get a copy of it?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is going to table it.

MR. NEARY: The minister said he was going to table it. I have not seen it. Maybe the minister did table it. I do not know.

MR. CROSBIE: There is one copy tabled. - -

MR. NEARY: The minister is going to bring up more tonight and when the minister read out the names of these honourable gentlemen, Sir, who did that report, I was trying to detect the name of the fisherman in the group. I could not find one. They all sounded like foreign names to me. I do not know if there was a Newfoundlander among the group. There could possibly be a Newfoundlander there. I do not know, but I could not detect a Newfoundland name. The minister said all these honourable gentlemen had B.Comm's, and they had B.A.'s and B.Sc's and B.S's and they said that, they advised the government against these gear banks.

Now, Sir, there is a funny thing about this minister. This minister, I suppose,

more than any other minister on the government side of the House has fallen into the trap of surrounding himself by these weird characters that run around with little bits of paper from the University in their pockets. Nine chances out of ten, Mr. Speaker, they had never in their lives had to go out in the workaday world and earn a living.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What have you got against -

MR. NEARY: Nothing. I have nothing against it, Sir. Mr. Speaker, I am putting up an argument here against that report. I have not read it, but the minister gave us a summary of it the other night, gave us a summary. The summary was not very encouraging. The B.Comm's, the weirdoes that the minister got himself surrounded by, recommended by Gar Pynn and Rollie Martin and Olivero, the crowd -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: All good Newfoundlanders.

MR. NEARY: All good Newfoundlanders, Sir, and maybe they are.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Rollie Martin -

MR. NEARY: Ah! A great experience in the fishing boats, great experience of working in the woods, in the mines and of course, they recommend that their buddies, you know, - How much did they pay for that report, by the way? Did they charge for that or did they do it for nothing, free gratis.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, I would like for the minister to check it because this seems to be the kind of a game they are playing, Sir. Get your buddies in, get in on the old moola here. Look, a milch cow we found in this minister, no trouble. All you got to do is do a report.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: All you have to do is be able to convince the minister that you got your B.Comm or your B.S. and away you go. You can go and do a report and charge \$10,000 for it. You do not have to teach over at Memorial. You only got to teach three hours a week. Do a report in your spare time, make it \$2,000 or \$3,000 or \$4,000 or \$5,000.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How about a report on George II?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I am not going to report on George II today.

I could give a report on the Norma and Gladys going off to Japan, the expense of the taxpayers of this Province to promote the fishery. Is that the minister's contribution to marketing or advertising? Who is paying for it? Who is arranging it? Is George McLean doing that? Is it being done with the minister's approval? Is that the government's priorities? But, Sir, getting back to this report -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The Federal Government -

MR. NEARY: The Federal Government is going to - well, over my dead body they will pay for it. I guarantee you this, that if the taxpayers of Canada have to pay to send the Norma and Gladys with the Minister of Tourism on the bridge with his binoculars, his spy glass with a load of flippers on board, bring back a load of rice, I suppose, that the Minister of Social Services will be able to pass around. There is no more chips, no more pies, bring back a load of rice, rice Christians.

Mr. Chairman, I am not satisfied, Sir. I am not satisfied that this government cannot set up a gear bank. The Leader of the Opposition made a firm commitment the other night on behalf of the Liberal Party.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Ah! Sir, it was a firm commitment. I presume it was. I have to look at my colleague, yes a firm commitment. I do not want to misquote the Leader of the Opposition, one of the finest speeches I have heard made in this House in the fisheries. - I beg your pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The honourable Leader of the Opposition said, made a firm commitment, Sir, that the Liberal Party as a part of its policy, one of the platforms in its election campaign in the next election

would be a commitment to establish gear banks in this Province so the poor, old, hard pressed fisherman will not be fleeced by the

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: What does the --- poll say?

MR. ROBERTS: You guys have taken the poll, whether Frank is a playboy.

MR. NEARY: I will come to that at 5:30. I will deal with that at 5:30. But, Mr. Chairman, our inshore fishermen have to be given a break. Sir, the minister has to go a little bit beyond the academics over at Memorial University. Go out in the field. Put some fishermen on a committee to do a report. Get some people who have experience in the field. Get some successful businessmen, not a fellow because he got a little piece of paper from the University that makes him an expert on whether we should have gear banks in this Province. Get down to brass tacks. Get down with the ordinary people and rub shoulders like the minister did down in L'Anse-au-Clair the other day and came back with glowing reports of the fishermen down there, found out, found out that the average age of the fishermen is thirty-eight years of age. All he had to do was go out in front of the Building when the trawlermen were locked out of this Building on that cold, wet, winters day

and just take a look at the faces of the trawlermen and see if they are all a bunch of old men. They were a very young -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. All you had to do was look at these trawlermen.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, I think, Sir, that is probably why this quiet revolution we see taking place in Newfoundland is happening, because the younger generation are getting in there with a little bit of gumption and demanding their rights. Pardon?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Sir, anyway that report, I would submit, Mr. Chairman, is not worth the paper it is written on. I plead with the minister to take another look at the matter of establishing gear banks in this Province.

Now, Sir, there were two or three other things that I brought up the other night. I mentioned canneries and the minister elected to ignore that, which I consider, Sir, to be something that has a great potential as far as our fishery is concerned. What about smokers? What is wrong, Sir, with DREE or the Department of Industrial Development or the Department of Fisheries buying a few smokers and scattering them around this Province so that we can smoke our herring and our mackerel and send it overseas, put it on the list of Canada foreign aid, put it on the food list for foreign aid, send it overseas if we have to.

What about salt fish? We know, Sir, that there is a problem now with fresh frozen fish. I think it was the Leader of the Opposition who dealt with this the other day, probably not at as great a detail and as great a length as maybe the House should deal with it, that is the matter of switching from fresh fish to salt fish. There is a big demand and the minister must have found that out yesterday when he was flying down to Southern Labrador with Mr. Aiden Maloney, Chairman of the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation. The price, Sir, was never as good for salt fish, the demand was never as great. Here we are with our warehouses blocked off with fresh frozen fish, with

cod blocks.

So, it is as plain as the eye in your head, Sir, that we are going to have to change our techniques, change our processing a little bit, get into canneries, get into smokers and get more into salt fish. Does that not make any sense, Mr. Chairman? I am not an economist. I do not have my B.Comm, but does it make sense to the honourable members of the House or am I talking through my hat? It makes a great deal of sense to me, Sir.

The minister made no reference to this. He choose to ignore these positive, constructive suggestions that poured out of the lips of members who spoke on this side of the House the other night. He choose to ignore them. Why, I do not know. All the minister did this afternoon was come in with a bunch of statistics, his B.Comm's and his B.S's were down there providing him with all these statistics so he could come into the House and impress everybody reading out all these statistics. Let us hear something practical for a change, something that makes a little bit of common sense. Let us find out what we are going to do about switching from fresh fish to salt fish and if we are going to put canneries all over this Province and in Labrador, on the island and in Labrador, and if we are going to put any smokers in.

What about dryers, so we can dry the fish? These are the kind of things we want to hear about, Mr. Chairman. We do not want to get bogged down and get the committee bogged down in statistics.

Sir, it is almost five-thirty. Could I move the adjournment of the debate?

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, this gives me a minute or two to address myself to the honourable gentleman.

MR. ROBERTS: A point of order, Sir -

MR. CROSBIE: It is not five-thirty yet.

MR. ROBERTS: A point of order. My colleague made a motion. Whether or not the Committee choose to accept the motion is a matter for the committee to decide, but I would ask for a ruling on the point of order.

My colleague quite distinctly said that he wished to make a motion, and he made the motion.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Yes, but still I did this, bring to the honourable member's attention that we were nearing five-thirty. I did not indicate that he had to cease speaking at that time and of course he did not have to. It is now twenty-nine minutes past five, and I would presume the minister would want to raise the committee at this point.

MR. ROBERTS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I have not yielded the floor, Your Honour.

MR. MURPHY: He adjourned the debate.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He adjourned the debate.

MR. NEARY: I moved the adjournment but the committee has not - well, Mr. Chairman-

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Let us do that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, the minister chooses to ignore these very positive, concrete constructive suggestions that have been made by the -

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: I wish the Minister of Justice would go out and get his licence. He is breaking the law, you know. He does not have his 1975 licence yet.

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Well, he must have gotten it today, He did not have it yesterday.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

I do not know if the honourable member is debating the motion that he made. It is not a debatable motion. It is moved and seconded that this debate adjourn. Those in favour "aye." Those again "nay." In my opinion the "ayes" have it. Carried.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. CHAIRMAN: Does the minister wish to rise the committee?

MR. CROSSIE: I move that the committee rise and report progress.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN: Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having made progress and ask leave to sit again.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chairman of the Committee of Supply reports that they have considered the matters to them referred and report having made progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted.

On motion committee ordered to sit again presently.

MR. SPEAKER: It now being 5:30 P.M., we should commence the debate on the adjournment really and I recognize the Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I gather there are three questions today.

MR. SPEAKER: There are three, yes.

MR. ROBERTS: The gentleman from Hermitage did in fact ask a question - in other words the Late Show. The issue before us now, Sir, is the response or the lack of response made by the Minister of Health to an inquiry which I made yesterday about negotiations which are underway between an association or an organization representing the interns and the residents in the hospitals of this Province on one hand and on the other hand a joint combination of the Newfoundland Hospital Association and the Treasury Board representing the government. The minister has an obvious interest in this because if these negotiations do not work out satisfactorily, according to the newspapers and the press reports, these doctors, and they are all doctors, have said they will go on strike. There are precedents for this. And while this would not close the health services in the Province, it would have an affect upon them. It would mean that some of the senior doctors would have to work a little harder, and it would mean, I suspect, that much of the ordinary routine non-emergency or elective surgery that is done in the teaching hospitals, basically the four in St. John's and the hospital at St. Anthony, and I assume Carbonear - Is Carbonear affected? Are there interns or house officers? Well if so - it is just the four large ones in St. John's, the General, the Grace General, St. Clare's and the Waterford Hospital and the Children's Hospital, the Janeway, five then, and then the hospital at St. Anthony, the Curtis Hospital.

DR. G. ROWE: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, I would be surprised if the Curtis Hospital would be affected, but certainly the ones in St. John's.

My concern though, Mr. Speaker, is not specifically with this group of interns and residents. They have a case and the

matter has been referred to conciliation, and I gather it is a joint referral. My concern is with the whole question of negotiations now underway or about to get underway between, on one hand, the government and the hospitals and the hospitals, Sir, for this sense, are the prisoners of the government. They have no money of their own. They have to do exactly what the government, through the Minister of Health and through other ministers, tell them and on the other hand the representatives of the workers in these hospitals, and I think that probably includes three groups, the nurses' union, I do not know its

official name, not the A.R.N.N., but the union of nurses, or whatever its official name is, the Newfoundland Association of Public Employees and the Canadian Union of Public Employees. And I would think among these three groups they represent every person employed in our hospitals in Newfoundland with the exception of the doctors, including radiologists and pathologists.

Now, Sir, last year we took strikes, we saw strikes in a number of places. I submit that those strikes came about because of the mishandling by this administration of labour negotiations in the hospitals. The question which I put to the minister now is that I want assurance that negotiations will go ahead properly? Whether or not they will result in strikes remains to be seen. If the strikes are lawful then people have a right to strike. And the strike in that sense is a part of the collective bargaining process.

But last year, Mr. Speaker, we saw a body blow struck to the collective bargaining process. The Minister of Health was at best an innocent bystander, a hopeless captive. The then Minister of Finance took a hard line, encouraged the people to go on strike, forced them to go on strike. They went out on strike. We had a six or seven week strike in Corner Brook, and a four or five week strike here at St. Clare's in St. John's, strikes which caused at the very least grave inconvenience. And then the Premier pulled the rug out from under the Minister of Finance, as he then was, the then Minister of Finance, by negotiating over the heads of both the boards and the ministers concerned. The Premier settled the strike. Well, fair marks! More power to him!

But I want an assurance this year, or I would like an explanation, an exposition of what policy the ministry intend to follow this year, whether we are to expect strikes, and whether the course of conduct which is followed by the minister will be that which he followed last year, which, I say again, permitted these strikes, encouraged them, and then when the final resolution came destroyed the collective bargaining process by intervening in the wrong way at the wrong time.

I gather, Your Honour, I have just about finished my five minutes - let me with one more sentence. Would the minister also tell us whether the government intend to accept the principle of compulsory

arbitration? I understand the interins and residents say they are prepared to accept it. I want to know whether the government are prepared to accept it? And that is a way to prevent strikes.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: I have been -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: asked to speak on behalf of the ministry in this matter.

First, Mr. Speaker, to say that the honourable gentleman's question of yesterday and his remarks of today are a perfect example of, you know, of the mischievous intent of the Leader of the Opposition and the Opposition in this whole matter of collective bargaining. The honourable gentlemen opposite cannot wait for the first strike to take place in the hospitals of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: They are waiting for it in anticipation. They are gloating about it. They are licking their lips about it. They cannot wait, they are absolutely impatient for the first strike to occur in a hospital in this Province or in the public service of this Province this year. And that is the purpose of his question yesterday is to try and incite trouble with the interns and residents -

MR. ROBERTS: On a point of order, Your Honour.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: The Hon. the House Leader feels that his colleagues cannot speak and he has a right to speak, but he has no right to question the motives of any honourable member. That is a point of order. And then I would raise a point of privilege as to whether - should I go ahead now or should I wait until Your Honour has ruled on the point of order first of all. But I could get a Beauchesne reference but it is such common wisdom that surely I do not need it. The Hon. the House Leader

can go as low as he wants or even as low as he is used to going,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: but he has no right to question the motives of another honourable gentleman.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, before Your Honour needs to rule on it, I will say that the honourable gentleman may not have been deliberately inciting but what he said certainly had that effect, whether he intended it or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: And, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman well knows -

MR. ROBERTS: Could I have a ruling, Your Honour?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Minister of Fisheries was speaking to the point of order, if he is finished speaking to the point of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The Hon. Leader of the Opposition is correct that in one member should not really question the motives and intentions of another member. And I feel that perhaps the Hon. Minister of Fisheries was doing that, although I think perhaps now he is giving us a satisfactory explanation. Thank you.

MR. ROBERTS: Now to a point of privilege, Your Honour. Now that we have disposed of that. The minister clearly said that I was inciting rebellion - I do not know if he used the word rebellion - I was inciting civil disorder. Again, Sir, Beauchesne is quite specific; it is a breach of the privileges of the House to accuse any honourable member of any act which in any way leads to any improper or unlawful conduct. I would ask that the honourable gentleman be directed either to withdraw - no, to withdraw, and then if he wishes to make some debating points to rephrase them in a parliamentary fashion.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman is not quoting me since I did not use those words and I certainly have no intention of withdrawing what I said, other than what I have already stated in response to that point of order. I mean I am not going to withdraw something I did not say. I certainly stand by what I have said.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Leader of the Opposition rose on a point of order and the Chair subsequently made a ruling and saying in doing that that he felt that the matter had been dealt with by the further words from the Minister of Fisheries and the matter has arisen now and the Chair feels at this point it is perhaps a matter of a difference of opinion between two honourable members.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Speaker, if I might continue. The honourable gentleman says he is concerned with the whole series of negotiations, Yes he is concerned, He is concerned and frightened they might be successful. They are being conducted as they should be conducted, by the Treasury Board of this government and the Hospital Association which cannot be told by the government what position it is to take since many of the items are solely within their own responsibility. Its concern is not that these negotiations be completed successfully at all and there is no point for the honourable Leader of the Opposition to pretend that. There were no strikes last year in the hospital service, Mr. Speaker, in 1974, there was no action taken by the Minister of Finance or anyone else in the government in 1973 to encourage people to go on strike and the only result of the kind of issues that he has raised here today, and that he raised in his question yesterday, the only result of that is to encourage people. Whether the Leader of the Opposition is doing it knowingly or not is to encourage the people concerned to go on strike.

The honourable gentleman is obviously playing a game with matters of the utmost seriousness to the people of this Province as to what happens in their hospitals and what does not happen in their hospitals. We are not going to discuss in this House the progress of negotiations. If breakdowns occur or if strikes occur, then the government's position

will be made clear. We have no evidence or any sign that any such is going to occur. The Treasury Board is doing their usual very capable job of trying to meet the points put forward by the others across the bargaining table.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would like to inform the honourable Minister of Fisheries that the five minutes has expired.

MR. CROSBIE: Well three of it, Mr. Speaker, was occupied by silly points of privilege and points of order that were not -

MR. WOODWARD: Are you challenging the Speaker's ruling now.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: I am not challenging the Speaker's ruling. I am merely pointing out to the honourable the Speaker what occurred.

MR. NEARY: Time is up.

MR. CROSBIE: Do you want me to sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: You are afraid to hear the truth.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! There is no provision in this debate on the adjournment for time taken out for points of order or points of privilege by members on either side of the House. I recognize the honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, during the oral question period this afternoon, I put a question to the honourable the Premier, Sir, about his availability, about his accessibility to the people of this Province and the Premier gave me an answer, Sir, that I thought was most unsatisfactory. The Premier said, Sir, that anybody who came into St. John's did have an opportunity to go to the various departments of government, could consult with any of his flunkies that he has down on the eight -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The Chair certainly takes objection to the word flunkies being used in relationship to persons working for the honourable the Premier's office and would ask the honourable member for Bell Island to withdraw that.

MR. NEARY: I withdraw, Mr. Speaker. But, Sir, when these people come to St. John's they do not come to see hired help, they come to see the head of their government. They come to see the Premier. Now, Sir, one of the great weaknesses in this administration is the closed door policy that has been adopted by the Premier and his ministers, especially by the Premier, Sir, and we have people travelling all the way sometimes from Port-aux-Basques, right across this island, coming in to see the honourable the Premier. Sometimes with an appointment, Mr. Speaker, sometimes they have appointments and when they arrive here they are told that the Premier is not available, he cannot see the people.

I had a delegation come in here from the Southwest Coast last year that sat in this building until a quarter to seven and Sir, the word is gone out, and you know people say that the Premier is a bit of a charmer when they watch him on television, but Sir, somehow or other they are getting the impression -

AN HON. MEMBER: You are worried.

MR. NEARY: And I am not saying this, Sir, but this is the impression that has gone abroad, that the Premier is lazy. Now I do not know whether that is true or not. The Premier can answer that when he stands in his place. But, Sir, what I would hope, Mr. Speaker, is that the honourable the Premier would set aside either an hour in the morning or an hour in the afternoon or a couple of days a week or three or four hours a week, to meet the poor old ordinary people of this Province,

an hour or so a day to meet the people. Yes, just an hour or so that is all they are asking. They do not want to take up all the Premier's time. They know he is busy meeting delegations and meeting millionaires and businessmen from all over the world and meeting the businessmen in St. John's, but the ordinary people do not get a chance to speak to their Premier.

Sir, all you have to do is get aboard the elevator and go up past the eighth floor any day in the week. There is not a soul there because they cannot get in to see the Premier. This is one of the great weaknesses. No wonder, Sir, the Premier complains, as he did in Gander, about the government not being able to get its message across, about being misunderstood, moaning and groaning about the people not understanding the honourable the Premier. The Premier is not giving himself a chance. I think in his own best interest that he should make himself accessible to the ordinary people of this Province by setting aside specific hours or days when the ordinary people can come into this Province and not be pawned off on some of the hired help but be able to talk to the Premier, the head of the government, the elected representative of the people, because in a lot of instances, Mr. Speaker, these people do not want to discuss their business with the hired help.

It is like going to confession. They want to either see a minister or they want to see the Premier. I think, Sir, the Premier would be doing the people of this Province a service and his administration a service if he would just make himself available to the ordinary people of this Province. Maybe the Premier is sick. I do not know. Maybe he needs a holiday once a month. I do not know, Sir. The people are saying this, but I am sure, Sir, that the honourable the Premier would not be complaining about Newfoundland Information Services getting the message out about the great job they are doing.

The Premier should be able to sit down in his office, Sir, when some poor widow or some delegation comes in about -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please;

MR. NEARY: - water and sewerage or roads -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - they should be able to get to see -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - the head of the government, Sir, and not be pawned off -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - on the hired help.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Premier.

MR. MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I want the full five minutes answering such an absolutely asinine subject at this particular point in time. The fact is the Member from Bell Island is being absolutely frivolous in what he says. To defend the position of Premier is not really a very difficult thing to do, but since it came up today, just for the sake of exercise or information, if you like, I did a little research as to how many people I have seen since, the dates taken were from January 7 until the end of February.

MR. NEARY: Ordinary people.

MR. MOORES: During that period of time every person, Sir, is equal. I know the Member from Bell Island discriminates and likes class distinction, but the fact is that most people in this Province, Sir, are treated equally by this government whether they are rich or poor or otherwise. The fact is that all the people in this Province and elsewhere who can help this Province are equal in the eyes of this government.

MR. CROSBIE: Hear! Hear!

MR. MOORES: The fact is, Sir, that from January 7 until the end of that month there were some 781 people in through the doors of the office by my record and 805 during the month of February. Those can be documented as to the number of people I saw. That comes to a total of some 1,586 people.

The Leader of the Opposition says, twenty cabinet ministers at a time. The twenty cabinet ministers, Mr. Speaker, were in Mr. Smallwood's government. There are seventeen in this government.

Also, Sir, it does take time to see the various ministers, as a matter of fact, regarding the policy of their departments and

the major decisions that are being made. It takes time for the staff and the duties of that staff that I have - of course, they have jobs to do. That is why they are there. I hope that will be discussed during the estimates rather than at this time.

Also, as Premier of the Province, you do have to travel a considerable amount to speak to Chamber of Commerces, service clubs, various conventions, various events that are being held in the Province where one meets a great many so called, by the Member from Bell Island, ordinary people. One also has to go to Ottawa to meet counterparts and colleagues in government in that city which we have a great deal of dealings with as well as major conferences in various parts of the country.

As far as the closed door policy is concerned, Mr. Speaker, it is too bad the Member from Labrador North is not here where we had two meetings in one day just last week or the week before where a great deal was accomplished by, once again, as the Member from Bell Island would say, ordinary people. Equally, Sir, this

last six weeks, I have been in Labrador City, Springdale, Corner Brook, Mount Pearl, Harbour Grace and Old Perlican, just to mention a few of the towns where I have gone to meet various groups. For the member's information, Sir, the phone calls that come in are substantial and equally the business of meeting with all these people I talked about and for the member's information, strictly, it is from the weekend before Christmas, well say Christmas, until the Easter weekend which I just had off, I had exactly two Saturdays and Sundays to myself where I was not travelling in this Province.

Now the honourable member would say that there is an obvious reason for that, Mr. Speaker, that there is an election coming and there is work that has to be done. In fact there is always an election coming and there is always work that has to be done, any poll will tell you. But, Sir, regarding my office, the fact is that it is a busy place. The Member for Bell Island well knows that, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Is that allowed to happen? Is that parliamentary, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON. MEMBER: That is the assistant deputy speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair heard the remark made by the Hon. Member for St. George's but did not ascertain as to who they were directed to.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, let -

MR. NEARY: It does not make any difference which member of the House it was directed at.

MR. SIMMONS: Unless, of course, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Unless, of course, he was referring to the Premier, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: The Premier is just -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: He should have the guts to say who he is referring to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Coward.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to come to the matter which I raised during the question period and the question was not a complicated one but it was one that I have asked before, and I have had to ask it again today because I have not got the answer. The question simply is: What is the government's road building, upgrading and paving programme for this year? Now the budget is before us. I would have assumed that the department has made up its mind as to what projects are to be done. I gather from the minister that he cannot answer. I think he chose his words, Mr. Speaker. He said he cannot answer at this particular time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been pursuing this during the past few days, because I submit that the minister can answer but will not. I submit that he knows what projects are being done. Oh, they have a little extra put aside as a slush fund for the projects that have to be looked after in a contingency. They have got a few extra bucks put aside, Mr. Speaker. But by and large the Minister of Transportation and Communications knows now. I submit, Mr. Speaker, what projects are to be done. I say that, Mr. Speaker, because while the minister stands in his place in this House and tells us that he cannot tell us, he cannot make the announcement and thereby, I presume, hopes to leave the impression with us that he is saying that the decision has not been made. I submit that the decision has been made, because I have heard members of this House making announcements of projects in their respective districts. I have heard the Member for Bonavista South, Mr. Speaker, announce what programmes, announce what projects are to be done in terms of transportation in his district this year. I have heard you, Mr. Speaker, in your capacity as the Member for Lewisporte, make a similar announcement.

Now in replying, if the minister intends to, will he indicate whether these two members whom I have identified, plus another half dozen that I could identify, will he indicate whether they are going off half cocked? Are they talking without access to proper information? Or are they indeed speaking as a result of information they received from the minister's department? I submit, the latter. I submit that they know exactly what programmes are to be done. And I submit further, Mr. Speaker that the minister and the government as a whole are playing the worst kind of politics with the money in the budget for road upgrading and paving, the worst, rawest form of politics, Mr. Speaker. They are playing with this one. They are making the old adage about the old saying about, Tory politics in P.E.I. They are recalling that one to mind again where they used to say about one of the Premier's there to the effect that if it moves, pension it, if it does not, pave it. I would expect the Member for St. John's Centre to know that saying, Mr. Speaker, because I would suspect that he is one of the persons who practices it most.

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. SIMMONS: Well the main advocates in the cabinet, Mr. Speaker, for this kind of politics that I am talking about now where the public's money -

MR. MURPHY: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - tens of millions of public dollars are being taken
Mr. Speaker

and used for sheer political purposes.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Oh! Come on, come on, come on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Come on, throw him out.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Minister of Fisheries did rise on a point of order.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, his time has expired.

MR. SIMMONS: No, Mr. Speaker, my time is not expired. Mr. Speaker,

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, Mr. Speaker. I just heard the Member for St. Georges use the word snake -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SIMMONS: And Mr. Speaker, yes, there may be those in the House who think it is very apt, but I submit again, Mr. Speaker, that it is time that people on both sides of this House be asked to adhere to parliamentary expression or to keep silent. I suggest that the Member for St. Georges be asked to withdraw that kind of comment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair is usually trying to listen to what honourable member has the right who is speaking is saying. If there are other members to my left or to my right in numbers of five or six or seven or eight who are talking, I feel that it is mentally and physically impossible for the Chair to hear each and every comment that is made. But I certainly feel too that any member when speaking does have the right to be heard in silence.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I invite the minister now to stand up and tell us exactly, I know he cannot tell us all the projects, but can he tell us that they will be available to us in the next few days. I am saying the projects have been decided. The proof of the pudding is that people on the opposite side of the House have been making announcements to this effect. Now, we -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - who represent other districts would also like to know -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: - what projects are to be done in our districts.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time has expired.

The honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: First of all, Mr. Speaker, to take up a couple of minutes before I try and answer the question -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would ask the honourable Member from Hermitage to withdraw that comment and in fact, pointing at the Chair, inferring that the Chair, a ruling made by the Chair, he only listens to the person that is speaking. So, the Chair is asking the honourable Member from Hermitage to withdraw that comment.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I think I am entitled to explain that that was not the inference I meant at all.

MR. MURPHY: Well, that is what it sounded like.

MR. SIMMONS: Well, I do not care what it sounded like, Mr. Speaker. I tell you that if that inference was gotten by the Chair, certainly I apologize, but that was not the reason at all. I was having an aside to my friend from Harbour Main to the effect that the Speaker obviously did not hear me because he was listening to the member up there. That is fair enough.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Any time an honourable member makes a comment with regards to Chair and points his finger towards the Chair, I think the Chair is entitled to infer and feel that the comment is meant for the Chair.

MR. SIMMONS: I am entitled equally, Mr. Speaker, to say that the comment was not meant for the Chair no matter where I was pointing and if there is any inference, I apologize.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair will certainly accept the comments from the Member for Hermitage.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Three and a half minutes.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Three and a half minutes. First of all, Mr. Speaker,

I would like to say before answering the question, that I resent the implications made by the honourable the Member from Hermitage of calling me a rank, low, dirty or rotten politician and I resent the implications of the honourable Member from Hermitage implying or insinuating that people in the Department of Highways -

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

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, if the minister is going to quote me, he must do so correctly. I said nothing of the kind. I did not say he was dirty or low, any of those words whatsoever. I did not say that. I did not infer it, Mr. Speaker, and I ask that the Speaker invite him to withdraw. If he is going to quote me, he had better do so correctly.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! It is a matter of one member quoting another member that came up a few days ago in this honourable House. I think it was the honourable Minister of Tourism and a member to my right. At that time the Chair had to make three rulings of what was said by one member and alleged by another. It is a difference of opinion between two honourable members.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Let me rephrase it. I resent the implications, suggestions, innuendo or implications suggested by the honourable the Member for Hermitage regarding the playing of politics, and you can use whatever adjective you want to with it, in respect to the paving programme this year. Further, on behalf of the people in the department, I also resent it, to say that we are sitting down there hiding away something -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROUSSEAU: And playing games with the people of this Province.

MR. SIMMONS: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: In the early days I remember it was Rodger Dodger. He has become now Roger the Artful Dodger. Do not try and play

the game the honourable member has put himself into.

Now, I resent the implication and you can use whatever words you want to use to imply what you want to imply.

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SIMMONS: I believe the minister is aware that when he refers to a member of this House, he must do so by the constituency which he represents.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair would -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair is aware that one honourable member referring to another should refer to him by his constituency or his title.

The Chair is also aware that it is six o'clock. The motion to adjourn has been made. Those in favour of adjournment "aye", those against "nay", Motion is defeated. It being six of the clock I leave the Chair until eight o'clock tonight.

The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

On motion that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker left the Chair.

MR. CHAIRMAN: 1401-01

MR. NEARY: Not carried yet, Sir. Mr. Chairman, when the committee rose for supper, Sir, I was dealing with some of the points that had been raised by the Minister of Fisheries in his reply to some of the criticism levelled at the administration, and especially the minister, from this side of the House.

The minister was good enough, Sir, since I made my remarks to send me over a copy of the study of gear prices and the gear bank feasibility study, this blue covered book that the minister tabled in the House a couple of days ago.

Now, Sir, I have just had an opportunity before Your Honour took the Chair to glance over this report and sure enough, Sir, my earlier suspicions are confirmed that this whole approach to the gear bank idea is an academic one done by the minister's buddies, the fellows with the B. Comm.'s and the fellows with the beards, the experts, never in a fishing boat in their life, would not know a sculpin from a jumbo jet and they were the ones, Sir, they commissioned to do this report for the minister.

Just listen, Mr. Chairman, Look, I just had a chance to take a quick look at, listen to this, "The conclusions of this study indicate that the establishment of a gear bank is undesirable at this time. The basis for this conclusion is summarized as follows:" just listen to this, Mr. Chairman, "(1) the supply of gear has not presented a serious problem except in the instances mentioned, that is in isolated areas and for 'hung gear' in season." Hung gear, "The need for a gear bank is not clearly warranted. There is considerable confusion over the concept of a gear bank." No confusion in our mind, Sir. It is part of our policy, the Liberal philosophy. The confusion might be in the minister's mind or in the administration's mind.

Then they go on to talk about the subsidization, The markup on gear is approximately fifteen to twenty per cent. The markup on whose

gear? It is certainly not John Leckie's gear. The markup on John Leckie's gear is more than fifteen or twenty per cent. If that is the hung gear they are talking about. Fifteen or twenty per cent? Go over and get the quotation of prices and compare them to the prices on the Mainland and see if the markup on Mr. Leckie's gear is fifteen or twenty per cent.

By coincidence, these weirdoes say, the current bounty of \$20 approximates this markup. Well what kind of logic is that, Sir. The minister gives out \$20 in one hand, Leckie takes it away on the other, probably triple that much. They say, oh, one balances out the other.

Then no wonder we heard the minister talk about the abuses, or the apparent abuses, in gear replacement. He got it right from this report, Sir. The bearded wonders that are sitting up in the gallery that he takes his orders from and he looks up and they nod and he says, yes that is right. This is where he got this. Look. The abuse apparently occurring under the replacement programme should be thoroughly examined. These are the letters that he is talking about, the unsigned letters and the criticism and the reports that came into his office, came in in this blue covered report from these arm chair experts over here at the university, the minister's buddies, getting himself surrounded by that crowd. He would not put a fisherman on this committee.

"The government should investigate the availability of credit to fishermen for the financing of gear." Hah! "The possibility of establishing a credit programme, similar to the Federal Fisheries Loan Programme but designed for the financing of inshore fishing gear" - that is not the problem, Sir, The problem is they are paying too much for their gear.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh come on.

MR. NEARY: What do you mean come on? That is so. Give the poor old inshore fishermen a break.

MR. MURPHY: Give everybody a break.

MR. NEARY: No, give the inshore fishermen a break. Put the facilities and the gear and the equipment in their hands so they can get out and catch the fish.

MR. MURPHY: Go down and give the longshoremen jeans and overalls and all - give everybody something for nothing.

MR. NEARY: Yes, and give the minister a pair of oilskins if he is -

MR. MURPHY: Give it all away. Who is going to balance the budget?

MR. NEARY: There is the negative attitude. There is the typical Tory attitude, Sir, That is negative. Who is going to balance the budget? Give the inshore fishermen the gear and the facilities and they will drive your Gross Provincial Product up and then there will be plenty for everybody for share.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go away.

AN HON. MEMBER: Like you fellows did.

MR. NEARY: Sure, like we did.

We built every fish plant that we have got in this Province right now. How many fish plants have that honourable crowd built since they took over the government?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: One. One fish plant. Where is that one fish plant the Premier built?

MR. MOORES: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Where?

MR. MOORES: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Oh, the minister's -

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The Hon. the Premier -

AN HON. MEMBER: ... Prince Edward Island.

MR. NEARY: The Hon. the Premier's late dad built two or three plants, I will give him all credit for that. And the Hon. the Premier probably helped to construct them.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know about that. I am not talking about that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, every plant that has been built in Newfoundland since Confederation has been built by a Liberal Government. Some how or other, Sir, the Liberal Government has something going for it, every social reform, every fish plant.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is wrong.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. NEARY: They promised one to the people of Burgeo, and now they are welshing, they are backing down on their promise.

AN HON. MEMBER: Wrong.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir. And they are trying to pawn it off on DREE.

AN HON. MEMBER: Wrong.

MR. NEARY: Trying to say, why do not DREE pay fifty per cent of

the cost. That is not the way DREE is set up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: As far as I am concerned, Sir, they should pay one hundred per cent of the cost.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, say so publicly.

MR. NEARY: I have said so, and the Hon. the Premier knows how I feel about the DREE concept. We see eye to eye on that. But that is not the promise that was made in the beginning. There were no strings attached.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, there was.

MR. NEARY: No, there was not.

AN HON. MEMBER: Always.

MR. NEARY: The people of Burgeo were conned into thinking that this administration were going to go down and build them a fish plant.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: DREE or no DREE. No strings attached.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. DOODY: This government brought the plant down there to keep them alive while your government were putting them out of business.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: Listen to this, Mr. Chairman, just listen to these bearded wonders. "The principle findings of this study can be summarized as follows (1) supply of gear as such is not a problem." Every fisherman in Newfoundland, I suppose, in the last year or couple of years has had a go at this matter of the cost of gear.

AN HON. MEMBER: honourable colleague.

MR. NEARY: And the minister's buddies, Rollie's buddies, Gar's buddies say that gear is not a problem, supply of gear is not a problem. It is incredible, Sir. Absolutely incredible. No wonder we have not got the forward look in our fishery. My advice to the minister is that if he is going to set up any more committees, and I do not know, the minister has not told us yet how much this cost. It will probably cost a few thousand. That crowd over there do not work for nothing. They teach three hours a week and then in their spare time they have found

a milch cow in the minister and the Minister of Finance and his cronies -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is one minister you will be without the next time around, I can tell you that right now.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The kind of dump they are talking about up on the South Shore of Conception Bay. It is not the kind of a dump we have down at Robin Hood Bay.

MR. DOODY: What about the junior minister

MR. NEARY: The junior minister? I do not know. I am working on that.

But, Sir, my advice -

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: the honourable Member for Bell Island will be on the dole.

MR. NEARY: My advice, Sir, to the minister when he is going to do this kind of a study put on some successful fishermen, some successful business people, some people who are actually working at the industry. Let them express an opinion. If you took that out, Sir, and showed it to the inshore fishermen of this Province they are likely to throw up in your face when they read it. And the Hon. the Premier knows what I am saying is true. The Hon. the Premier does not believe a word, I doubt very much if he believes one word of this report. And I just had a chance to glance at it.

MR. MOORES: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The Hon. the Premier has to read it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, I was just glancing at - all you would have to do, Sir, is go over to the back and look at the recommendations, The concluding statement is enough to make you throw up on the floor of the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Read them

MR. NEARY: "The principle findings of this study can be summarized as follows: supply of gear is not a problem, but the availability of gear in an assembled form during the fishing season does

present a problem."

Well, Sir, I would say that the price of gear, the cost of gear to our inshore fishermen is a problem and it is a big problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: And the only way it can be solved - and I know the honourable minister will get up and he will argue about government should not be into private enterprise, should not be competing with private enterprise. There will be too much abuse. How do you expect civil service to run warehouses and all this sort of thing. But, Sir, if the civil service can run Churchill Falls and run the Linerboard Mill and run the Fish Plant at Burgeo, I imagine they should be qualified enough to run a few old, poor old gear banks scattered around this Province. So what if there is a little bit of theft or a little bit of pilferage. So what!

I heard one of the member's of the House say one time, and he was severely criticized for it, that his constituents were involved in that sort of game, in a certain community of Newfoundland. And

the only retort that I heard from CN, well this goes on all of the time. You know, we admit there is a little bit of stealing going on all of the time. But that is no

excuse on the part of the minister.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Are you saying the civil servants are involved in pilfering?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, that is not what I am saying. The minister will get up and argue - do not be so naive and stupid and foolish - the minister will get up and argue that they cannot, the government cannot run an effective and efficient operation, cannot run efficient gear banks. I say they can. Sir, I hope that the minister will reconsider this and not just take the advice of these so called experts, these fellows with their certificates and B.Comm's and B.Sc's and B.S's and what have you.

Now, Sir, one thing the minister did say this afternoon that rather intrigued me, and I know, Mr. Chairman, we are taking some time on the minister's estimates, but could Your Honour think of a more important subject than the fishery right at a time, Sir, when it would appear to the average Newfoundlander that the fishery is dying? Sticky Wicky may think we are spending too much time on it, but that is what we are here for to debate these issues and we will take all the time we want. We do not have to make any apologies to anybody.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: The heavy handed version of Rex Murphy, trying to imitate Rex but a little more heavy handed. He must be a real thorn in Michael's side trying to keep him under control and trying to keep him half reasonable so the paper will not be hauled up for libel.

We will take all the time we want, Mr. Chairman, because this is a most important - if we, Sir, let Provincial Affairs and Social Services and Tourist Development and - what else have we got over there? Industrial Development is nonexistent anyway. If we wiped all the others out, Sir, and just dealt from now on with fisheries, health and maybe transportation and communications, Sir -

MR. MURPHY: Trying to make up for the twenty-three years we lost.

MR. NEARY: We might be doing something worth-while in this House, Sir. There is no subject, no topic, as timely and as important at this

moment in our history of this Province as the fishery. I make no apologies. I will take all the time I want to make constructive, positive suggestions and make recommendations to the minister. I am not looking for publicity. This is a nonpartisan committee.

But, one thing the minister did say today, Sir, that intrigued me, and I think that I would be inclined to agree with him, That was his remark, although he did not go into any great detail, probably not as much as I would have liked because I think I understood the minister correctly, when he talked about LIP projects whereby -

MR. CROSBIE: You are the biggest lip project.

MR. NEARY: - community groups dream up ideas and schemes and then make an application for a LIP project to build a community stage or to build a haulup or a pull out or to build a wharf or to build something or other.

Then, once the LIP project is ended, the provincial government is saddled with the responsibility of either taking it over and looking after it or completing the job or upgrading it and then the demands start to come in.

Well, now, Sir, recently when Mr. Andras was in Newfoundland. I raised this matter of LIP projects with the federal minister and I told the federal minister that although in the beginning I thought that this was a very worth-while concept and I still do, It was a very good beginning, an excellent concept. Governments have to provide jobs where private enterprises fail. Government has to get into the field of job creation, no question about that, Sir. It is a good concept. The LIP concept is a good, sound Liberal concept. There is no doubt about that in anybody's mind.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: You prove that every day.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Chairman, I pointed out to the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations that I thought that the time had come, Sir, when the matter of developing projects should not be left in the hands of the individuals or in the hands of the community. Even though I am making that kind of a statement, I realize that to a certain

degree the local initiative was being taken away. I think there should be input by the community and by the individuals, but I think, Sir, myself, that a crown corporation should be set up with the community feeding the ideas, their versions of projects, into this crown corporation -

How much more time do I have, Mr. Chairman?

MP. GROSSIE: I would say about another four months.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Ten minutes.

MR. NEARY: Ten minutes. Thank you, Sir.

- feeding the ideas into this crown corporation, but the crown corporation actually undertaking the work and undertaking the work

only after prior consultation with the Province. So that, Mr. Chairman, any future projects that are undertaken will be of lasting value, not only to the community, Sir, but to the Province as a whole.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is sensible.

MR. NEARY: Of course it is sensible. Then, Mr. Chairman, we would get away from this idea of -

MR. DOODY: - lipsticks.

MR. NEARY: No, spending a lot of money on reactivating graveyards or growing pot out in BC.

MR. DOODY: Lipsticks we call it now.

MR. NEARY: That is right. You would get away from this, Sir.

The crown corporation would be able to screen the projects and the crown corporation will take the initiative and they would go in as the employer and run the show. Right now, Sir, I would say the thing is too sloppy, too wide open, too inefficient, too much money wasted, too much local politics. Whereas the concept is an excellent one, Sir, and it has its weaknesses as I am pointing out to the committee, but I think now the Government of Canada and the Province, I am not letting the Province off the hook, this has to be a joint venture, job creation is going to be very important in the future, job creation on the part of government.

So the two governments working together, Sir, should be able to go a long way to solving some of the unemployment we have in this Province by carrying out worthwhile ventures and worthwhile projects, thing that will not only make life a little better in our community but may even place some people in a position where they can earn a living.

Now, Sir, that to me makes a great deal of common sense and if that is what the Minister of Fisheries said today, Sir, when he was criticizing the LIP projects, well, I am inclined to agree with him. That is one time that the minister and I see eye to eye. Now these commitments should not be foisted on the Province by the Government of Canada, They should be done in consultation with the Government of Newfoundland and

they should be carried out by a Crown Corporation and not by these little inexperienced groups that hardly know how to keep a set of records for, what do you call, pay records, not pay records, these payrolls, do not even know how to keep a payroll, in a lot of cases.

MR. DOODY: Some of us do.

MR. NEARY: Some of them do. Some do not.

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, I am not going to get down to specific examples.

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, I mean I could show you a good example over on Bell Island where they know how to do it right, because the member showed them how to do it right.

But, Mr. Chairman, if we are going to get value for our money and we are going to get lasting benefits for Newfoundland, then I would suggest, Sir, that no more monkeying around, fooling around, We have had our pilot project now. We have had our two or three years experience. Now set up a Crown Corporation.

MR. DOODY: Tell that to Andras.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I certainly did and Mr. Andras agreed with me except that he said you would be taking away the local initiative and he said this is the great weakness in the job creation problem they had down in the United States in the dirty thirties.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is right. But anyway, if that is what the minister meant, Sir, I must say that I share his feelings and his thoughts on that.

MR. MURPHY: He will sleep tonight, I will tell you that.

MR. NEARY: Now, Sir, I know the minister cannot wait to get up now on his feet and I do not know whether he will reply to me tonight with a poem or not but over supertime, Sir, I -

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: I must say I am not in a very poetic mood today but I was trying to think of a few words that I might end up this part of my

April 3, 1975

Tape No. 999

NM - 3

speech, Sir, I might end up these preliminary remarks. I was trying to think of a few words as I was sitting down eating my bologna at supertime, and I must say I am not in a very poetic mood today.

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY:

I just could not get on the right frequencies but I managed to put two or three lines together, Sir, that I hope will adequately describe the, adequately describe how the Minister of Fisheries looked today when I stood in my place and tried to give him a few ideas and a few recommendations, offered him some positive and constructive criticism and I am sure the minister appreciates that if he accepts it in the spirit in which it was given. I am sure, Sir, and I hope that I have made some contribution to the future of the fishery of this Province. But, anyway, Sir, I put together two or three lines and I know they are not very impressive. They go something like this, Johnnie left the House today like one that hath been stund/ The little lad from the Iron Isle had made him so forlorn/ A sadder and a wiser man he will return tomorrow morn'.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, it is a hard act to follow. It is a hard act to follow, this detailed scrutiny of the estimates and this boring in on what the government is going to do has been very successful because the honourable gentleman has so bored his colleagues that there are only two of them in the House tonight.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: One.

MR. CROSBIE: Himself and the member, one, yes. Himself and the Member for St. Barbe North and the other members of the Liberal Opposition have fled, have absolutely fled from these precincts because

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Their eardrums are -

MR. CROSBIE: I mean they have not even come in to hear their colleague, the Member for Bell Island speak.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They are on Roaches Line.

MR. CROSBIE: They are on Roaches Line.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: They are worried about the Roaches Line these days. Well, seldom, Mr. Chairman, have I heard such a savage attack on the press as I heard here tonight when the House opened up and one of our most prominent columnists was called Sticky Wicky. I mean I have to get up on his defence and say this is just not so. He is not Sticky Wicky. I mean, to abuse a private citizen and call him Sticky Wicky is just not cricket. It is just not the thing, not on

his ninety-sixth birthday. For ninety-six years, it seems like, we have been hearing from Mr. Wick Collins. To hear him here tonight called Sticky Wicky is something that just terrorizes me. It is an attempt to intimidate the free expression of your views in the press and I want Wick to realize that I am here tonight speaking on his behalf, defending him in the peoples' House.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yellow dog, they called it earlier.

MR. CROSBIE: Yellow dog, was it? Yes, the yellow dog of journalism. So, on behalf of Sticky Wicky, I repudiate it. He is not Sticky. He is just against everything.

Now, the honourable gentleman said that he had bologna for his supper tonight.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: There is no question about that. -

MR. CROSBIE: We have suspected that for years and we have got the proof tonight that he eats bologna. We have certainly got the proof -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: We have the proof of that tonight, Mr. Speaker.

I do not know where to start here. I just do not know where to start, but, okay, I will start with a poem. Now, the honourable gentleman from St. Barbe North, I will deal with his remarks first and then work up gradually to the Member for Bell Island.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Work down.

MR. CROSBIE: And hope to encourage the Member for Bell Island to keep on for another fifty hours. He does not need much encouragement anyway. But the honourable gentleman for St. Barbe North, he was shocked and he was horrified and he was disgruntled and he was disappointed and he felt chagrin and he felt shame and he felt dejection and he felt degeneration and he just felt generally like he had the flu.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Carter's little liver pills.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes. To consider that we were actually going to spend money this year that had been provided to us by Ottawa and my response to that, Mr. Chairman, is: Fe, Fi, Foe, Fum/ Why should I care where the money come from, as long as we have it here in Newfoundland to spend for the good of our fishermen here

in Newfoundland. What difference does it make where it comes from?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: We would not have this money from Ottawa if Ottawa did not have in this Province now a government that they trusted, a government that they thought was doing the right and sensible thing. They had the dropsy in 1971. Until January, what was that -
AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: eighteenth.

MR. CROSBIE: - 18, 1972, they had the creeping meanies up in Ottawa at the horrible thought that that administration might be continuing in office. When they finally knew that the P.C. administration had gotten in there was a sigh of relief and those honourable gentlemen said, Open Sesame, we now have a government that has got some sense of priorities and some sense of rationality that we can deal with. As a result, we have gotten more money from Ottawa in the last three years than honourable gentlemen opposite and the honourable gentleman from Roaches Line got in the last twenty. Why should we care whether the money comes from Ottawa?

When we are out spending our money we do not say to the fishermen, this money was borrowed or this money came from the

sales tax, or this money came from the gasoline tax or this money came from licence fees or where it came from - what difference does it make? The thing is we have gotten the money. and that the Government of Canada at Ottawa today are participating with us and giving us the money because they know it is going to be wisely spent for a good purpose.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Now look, the honourable gentleman for St. Barbe North got up and he tried to make some case that we are only spending \$18 million on the fishery. He moaned and he groaned and he gnashed his teeth, and he wailed and he despaired that we were only spending \$18 million in the fishery this year. Well where was he in 1971-1972, that last glorious year of the regime of a gentleman from Roaches Line? well now it is really recognized as the Roberts-Neary Regime. Where was he in 1971-1972 when that administration spent the grand total on fisheries of \$6,460,000? That is what they spent. That is what they spent. And do you know how much they had from Ottawa that they spent that year? They had \$660,000 that is all they could get from Ottawa. That demonstrates the faith that the Government of Canada and Ottawa had in that administration. Of \$6,460,000 that was their gross expenditure they got \$660,000 from Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Uncle Ottawa.

MR. CROSBIE: Uncle Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: And they were Liberals, and the Government of Canada at Ottawa were Liberals, but that was all that they could get. What are we getting this year? We are spending \$18 million and of that some \$8 million is from Ottawa.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: We are spending this year more than three times what they spent in 1971-1972. Now that is only the start because I already said that we are going to have to ask the House to vote us a half million more in connection with the trawler fishermen's strike and we know that there is going to have to be more spent during the year

when it is finally decided what has to be done to assist the fishery in Newfoundland this year. So how the honourable gentlemen finds it possible in his heart to get and try to criticize this and pretend that somehow there is being less money spent in the fisheries this year than last year when there is more money being spent this year - it baffles me.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes. We do not care, we are delighted to see it from Ottawa. The honourable gentleman is really saying, look, repudiate this money from Ottawa, do not spend that. Tax the Newfoundland people, put your taxes up. Do not spend it from Ottawa. Tell Ottawa to save their money. Up the sales tax and spend that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: What?

MR. F. ROWE: I would submit, Mr. Chairman, that the Minister of Fisheries is grossly misrepresenting what I had to say this afternoon.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, misrepresentation of what another member had to say is a legitimate point of order, and I would submit that the minister is now out of order, Mr. Chairman, and that he would discontinue with these remarks or I in fact ask him to retract them because I did not say any such thing.

MR. THOMS: No, no, that is right.

MR. CROSBIE: I agree.

MR. F. ROWE: He missed the point completely. If he wants to prolong the debate I will get up and rebut what the honourable gentleman is saying -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. F. ROWE: now, when he is finished.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: That is the proper thing to do.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, Mr. Chairman, I quite agree he did not say that. The honourable gentleman positively did not say that. He did not say that. He did not say raise the taxes. He did not. He positively did not say that. What he said was, and bewailed and moaned the fact that we are getting assistance from Ottawa, money from Ottawa to spend in the fisheries.

And I infer from that that he would prefer to see us tax the Newfoundland people and use their money to spend on the fisheries.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Now he did not say it. He did not come out and say it. That is the inference of his remarks. So I agree with him one hundred per cent, he did not say that. He tried to sneak it across. He tried to make a point without explaining what his point involved.

Now if you look at our whole capital and current account expenditures, Mr. Chairman, this year fifty-four per cent of the revenue of the Newfoundland Government this year is from Ottawa. Now if we follow the honourable gentleman's logic we should send it back to Ottawa, and say, no we are not going to spend the fifty-four per cent from Ottawa here in Newfoundland, we only want to spend our own money. We are going to cut out half of the budget. Half the expenditures -

MR. F. RWE: On a point of order, Mr. Chairman, You know, this is getting quite out of hand. The Hon. Minister of Fisheries now is not only misrepresenting what I have to say but he is totally irrelevant to the topic under discussion, and the topic is the estimates of the Department of Fisheries. We are not talking about the total budget of the Province of Newfoundland.

Now to clear up one point, if I may. I did not suggest in any way whatsoever how the money should be gotten. I was simply pointing out the fact that the minister was gallivanting about the Province taking credit for building structures, spending Ottawa's money. And that was the point I was trying to make this afternoon. The more money we can get from Ottawa the better, but the minister is misrepresenting what I had to say this afternoon, and now he is totally irrelevant to the particular vote under discussion.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Chairman, to that point of order, if I may. The suggestion by the Hon. Member for St. Barbe North who is an intellectual man, and an academic man, suggesting that this thing is handed to the government on a platter from the federal government to the provincial government, which he knows is quite different, he is bringing up a rather moot point of order at this point in time. The point

MR. ROUSSEAU: is that the Government of the Province has to fight hard and long and argue and so on with Ottawa to get this money. It is not money handed on a platter. It is money that if we did not get we would have to raise taxes for, and I think the honourable member's point of order is not a point of order at all but a difference of opinion as to the effect of the money that we are spending in the total fishery programme and he is putting more emphasis on the Ottawa portion than he should be putting on it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Well, three honourable gentlemen have spoken on this point of order, all of whom have made a speech and all of whom have made some irrelevant points than the point of order. The only point that is correct is the last point made by the Member for St. Barbe North that the Minister of Fisheries may have been becoming irrelevant when he was speaking of the general revenue of the Province. However, I feel quite sure that had he been allowed to finish his sentence, had he finished his sentence that he would have related this directly to the fishery.

It is indeed difficult for the Chair to anticipate arguments when an honourable gentleman does not in fact finish their complete thought. If the minister had gone on in that vein then it would have been incumbent upon the Chair to interrupt. However, if other honourable gentlemen wish to raise a point of order in anticipation of irrelevance, of course that is their right, However, the point of order should not be abused so that it becomes an avenue for making debate in response to what is basically a difference of opinion between two honourable members.

I am sure that I have sufficiently confused all honourable members. Now, we can proceed.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Chairman, I will certainly try to keep as relevant as I can. If I keep as relevant as the honourable gentlemen opposite, I will have lots of leeway. Now, this silly argument that the Newfoundland Government this year is spending \$18 million on the fisheries, which is more than last

year, but because a greater proportion of that is from the federal government there is not as much being done, just cannot wash. You know it just cannot wash. What matter it where the money come from?

The honourable gentleman from St. Barbe North said that he found it distasteful that the Province would claim any credit for any federal assistance that we might get in the fisheries that we are spending. He found it distasteful that we might take credit for it. Well, I suppose he does find it distasteful for us to take any credit for anything. He finds that extremely distasteful. He does not like to see the government get any credit for anything. I agree with him, From his point of view it is very distasteful.

But I say, Mr. Chairman, that we can take tremendous credit for the fact that we have had increased federal contributions to the fishery under our administration. I think we can take tremendous credit for that, because we put up a sensible, rational programme to Ottawa which they agreed with and therefore entered into an agreement with us to spend some of their Regional Economic Expansion funds on it. Should we hide our virtue under the violet because we did that? Should we hide our virtue behind the screen?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Right. Should we be shrinking flowers about the fact that we have been able to persuade the Government of Canada at Ottawa to spend -

MR. MURPHY: This money from Ottawa that we are talking about now, did they donate that?

MR. CROSBIE: No. The citizens of the whole country have agreed through the Minister of Regional and Economic Development when they paid it in their taxes, or they are borrowing it, we can claim credit for that. I think that, and I did not even do this in my earlier remarks because I did not want to be distasteful, I did not want to compare our performance with the performance of the honourable gentleman's government in 1971-72. I did not want to do that. But when you look and see that they got

\$660,000 from Ottawa in 1971-72, the culminating year of the previous dynasty and that we are getting this year some \$8 million in assistance from Ottawa from marine service centres, from water lines to fish plants and for the other good works that we are doing here, then I think we deserve some credit for that. We are the only Province so far that has been able to enter into an agreement with the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion on fisheries, the only Province, and we have two agreements. Should we not mention that to the public? Should we take no credit? This government is already a government of shrinking violets that does not take the credit for the things that it is doing, but hides its light under a bushel. We are going to change that in the next few months. We are going to make the welkin ring with the virtues of this administration. Why should we not? For three years we have been doing good without exposing it to the public.

MR. DOODY: Let the word go out.

MR. CROSBIE: Let the word go out throughout this land, from one end to the other, of the mighty things that have been rendered by this government.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I say Fee, Pie, Foe, Fum/ What does it matter where the money come from/ As long as we have got it in this Province and we are going to spend it. And that is what we are going to do, we are going to spend it. We are trying to fight unemployment. We are trying to increase our fishery facilities and the rest of it and we are not going to reject money from Ottawa. If they say to us, gentlemen you have got a good idea, we want to support ninety per cent, we are not going to go to them and say, no, we want to lash it into our taxpayers. We want to be independent and not accept your money. We are not going to do that. We are delighted to spend it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Now the honourable gentleman you know he got right morose. He got disconsolate about the fact that we had a meeting up at Plum Point and I told the fishermen what we hoped and planned to do in St. Barbe North

this year. I told him that quite frankly. I was quite frank with him yesterday in Forteau and it ended up with a standing ovation. In fact I am thinking of moving district. I am thinking, Mr. Speaker, of moving it up and asking the people in Labrador South after yesterday's reception.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: The Straits District. When we were in Plum Point we explained to the fishermen of Plum Point what we planned to do this year in the herring fishery, and what we hoped to do with community stages, and about a programme that we were going to put into DREE, which we have now put into DREE, that enables us to have a decent herring fishery up in that area.

We hope to upgrade seven community stage facilities in St. Barbe North and St. Barbe North, a district in the Opposition held by the Opposition, has gotten more money, I daresay, from this government in the last three years than it had from the Liberal Government in the last twenty. That will show how partisan we are. The District of Labrador South, represented by an independent, has gotten more from this government, and will get more this year, is going to have the largest amount spent in it next year of any district in the estimates of the Department of Fishery, Labrador South, that is not in the PC ranks and unlikely to be up to yesterday, but a very great possibility after yesterday.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: \$450,000 we hope to spend on seven community stage facilities in St. Barbe North this year, and a new one at Bartletts Harbour, if we get the assistance we hope for from the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion for this new herring programme, which is sensible and stands on its own feet. And if they participate with us we hope to establish a central chill holding facility at St. Barbe, \$1,400,000. And we are spending on our own account in Labrador South this year to upgrade six community stage facilities, \$450,000 and we are going to put a new community stage at Red Bay for \$200,000. But we hope to also build one at Bartletts Harbour in St. Barbe North, if the federal government will

participate with us in this programme and I explained that to the fishermen of St. Barbe North. Is there anything wrong with that? I did not say you are going to have your seven community stages upgraded this year, full stop. And I did not say you are going to have a new community stage at Bartletts Harbour, full stop. And I did not say you are going to have a central chill holding facility at St. Barbe, I said we are proposing this, this is what we want to do and this is what we hope and expect to do with the participation of the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion and if they participate this is what we are going to do.

I did not try to pull the wool over their eyes. I told them how it was, and if the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion participates in this and the amount of money involved is not great from their point of view, they will know in St. Barbe North that the

Department of Regional and Economic Expansion is participating in it and we will give them full credit and they will get full credit for it. In Labrador South we are going ahead in any event to increase and improve their community stages there. So, there is nothing with this. Is there anything wrong with being honest? Is there something wrong with a politician telling the people how it is? Now, the usual practice would be to go up to St. Barbe North and say you are going to have this, you are going to have seven community stages upgraded and you are going to have a central chill holding facility and you are going to have a community stage at Bartlett's Harbour, full stop. That is not the way, that is not the way it should be. They are going to have all of that if the Canadian Government accepts our proposal for the proper management of the herring resource in St. Barbe and Labrador South. If the Canadian Government does not accept it, then it may take an extra year to get those facilities because we have to try to do it ourselves next year.

This year we are concentrating with our own money on the facilities in Labrador South. If the Canadian Government does not assist us, St. Barbe North will have to wait until the year after the present year. Now, there is nothing wrong with that. If telling the fishermen the thing is what you are planning and how you hope to do it is the right thing to do then that is the right and I think it is the right thing to do. That is what we have done.

Now, we are not trying to take any credit. We will try to take this credit. It is our suggestion. It is our programme. This document here, a special Food Herring Development Programme submitted by the Province of Newfoundland is submitted by the Province of Newfoundland. We thought it up. We originated it. It is our policy. It is not the policy of the Government of Canada and if they accept it and help finance it, then we will give them due credit for doing that and we will take the credit for thinking it up and putting it forward because if we had not done that, it would never have happened.

Now, gentlemen, is there something wrong with that honourable member? Is there anything wrong with that.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I mean, should we take a little, tiny modicum of credit if it goes through and we thought it up and submitted it.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Did the member say he did not want any federal money?

MR. CROSBIE: No, the member has not said he does not want it. I am sure the member agreed, but he felt somehow or other that we are trying to take credit and he said he finds it distasteful. The honourable gentleman found it distasteful that we should try to take credit for doing things and getting money from Ottawa to do them. Well, if that is true, there were twenty-three years of awfully distasteful things went on in the Province of Newfoundland and they are still going on.

Now, the honourable Member for Bell Island, I am not going to elaborate on the Income Support Programme. Wait now! I have not finished with the honourable Member for St. Barbe North yet, I guess. Oh, yes! He said that meeting with groups, he seemed to find something wrong with the fact that this meeting up at Plum Point was called by the organization up at Plum Point, the Herring Fishery Association. The Herring Committee in Plum Point invited the Minister of Fisheries and invited their own member and so on to go to Plum Point for a meeting. That is what we want. We want local organization, development associations. We are funding them. The Department of Rural Development is giving grants to development associations all around the Island. We are trying to encourage local initiative. If they get organized and then they want to meet with the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister of Health or whoever it is, we are pleased and delighted to go. That is the way it should be. We do not want to organize and direct everything from the centre in this government. We had enough of that in the last government. There was only one central point in the last government. In this government, that is not true and we spent a lot of time and

effort in the last two or three years and given a lot of money to encourage the different regions of Newfoundland to form their own associations and given them grants to assist them. So, if the one in St. Barbe North wants to have a meeting on the herring fishery, we are delighted to attend. It is much better than if we organized the meeting and we did not invite who should go. They invited who should go. They invited the fishermen who they thought should attend. It was their show and we went up there to tell them what we planned to do, The same in Labrador South. We did not originate the meeting in Labrador South. The Labrador South Development Association came to the meeting in Plum Point and invited the Minister of Fisheries and gave him a brief and invited the Minister of Fisheries and so on to go there and I agreed to go April 2 and took the member to the district. What could be more fair? What could be more proper?

I cannot remember members of the Opposition in the old days being taken to such meetings by the last administration, not a hope. If they took you, they would shove you out the door half way there, but since they never took anyone, they did not have to shove them out the door. But this is the new practice. We are delighted to do it and perhaps the new Liberal administration in 1995 or thereabouts, they may be humanized by that time and they may do the same thing. I hope they do.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The new, new, new Liberals.

MR. CROSBIE: The new, new, new Liberals. I do not know if it is the Liberal Reform Liberals. Every concept seems to repeat itself. Liberal Reform has a strange familiar ring to me and a welcome one. I welcome any gentleman that can reform the Liberal Party, be he twenty, be he seventy-five. He is welcome to try. I struggled and failed, but perhaps the honourable gentleman who caused my failure this time will succeed himself. We can only wish him the best in his new endeavours.

Now, what else did the Member for St. Barbe North - yes, he suggested - this was the unkindest, cruelest cut of all - and suggested

that this government was near the end of its term and, therefore, there was going to be a frenzy of meetings with the fishermen. We can go two years, gentlemen, honourable members, two years more we can go without an election and if we follow the precedent of the last government, the last government, we will go beyond the five years. We will be here clinging with our fingernails and clinging with our toenails, refusing to go to the people. But we are not like that. It may be that we will go next week. We are ready anytime to put our record before the people of Newfoundland and -

MR. ROBERTS: (First part inaudible) - That was the one that had Brother Moores, the playboy.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not know what Brother Moores is, but he is safe and secure in the affections of the Newfoundland people. The only thing I worry about -

PREMIER MOORES: That is one thing they will never call you, "Ed".

MR. CROSBIE: The only thing I worry about is he going to be here twenty years. I mean, will the man give up after eight or ten. That is my worry.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Still hopeful. You will probably have a gray beard by the time Brother Moores is gone. In the year 2000, I suppose, he will be about ready to totter off.

MR. DOODY: Smallwood -

MR. CROSBIE: And the Liberal Reform group will still be on the go. You can always join them if you are in despair.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He is not being relevant, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, I must get relevant, yes. Now, where was the money coming from for the stage. I think I dealt with that. Part of it is from Ottawa. Now, I think I have covered then what the Member for St. Barbe North said.

The Member for Bell Island got on the Income Support Programme. I do not really need to reply to that. The Income Support Programme for fishermen is a federal promise made by the Federal Government,

the Liberal Party of Canada last year and we have been polite enough and decent enough and diplomatic enough not to be out on the air waves every week saying, when are you coming through with your Income Support Programme that you promised during the Federal Election Campaign in Newfoundland. We have not been rude and we have not been obnoxious because we are not that kind. We do not want to embarrass the Federal Government, but we have written them. The Premier has written them. We have asked them at every meeting how they are coming along and I have explained to the House what their progress is and the tough problems they have in trying to come up with a new Income Support Programme for fishermen.

So, we are not taking a cheap course of attacking the Federal Government every day which we could do about their Income Support Programme for fishermen. We are certainly keeping the pressure on them behind the scenes, but it is their programme and we realize the difficulties and we are pressing them for as much action as we can behind the scenes and our officials have met with them and discussed it with them and I, as the Minister of Fisheries, have met with Mr. LeBlanc and discussed it with him. He is looking after it and in charge of it and there are other departments of government in Ottawa looking after it. Mr. Jamieson is interested in it and his people are and they are all working on it. All I can report is the situation as we know it, that it may be that they will not come up with a new Income Support Programme this year, but if not we are assured they will come up with some very needed amendments to the unemployment insurance scheme insofar as it applies to fishermen.

We are not

trying to harass them or embarrass them. If they would do that, we will say, good, and we will say, yes, we recognize there are great difficulties in coming up with an income support scheme for fishermen, and we will keep pressing them to do that. But, as long as decent progress is being made and as long as at least the unemployment insurance scheme is changed substantially this year in the interim, then we are not going to attempt to embarrass them any further than that. We know they are working on it, and our people have had an input in it. So be it.

Now, if the honourable gentleman from Bell Island wants to try to pretend that this government is in any way slowing down in income support programmes for the Newfoundland fishermen, that is obviously not true. Any slow down in an income support programme for fishermen is caused by the fact that the Government of Canada is having difficulties coming up with it although it was promised last year in the federal election campaign. They will not be allowed to forget that promise, and hopefully they have not forgotten it.

The Premier has discussed it with the Prime Minister, and he has written him and everything possible is being done that can be done to urge them to hurry along with that as fast as they can.

Now, the honourable gentleman for Bell Island tried to obfuscate, tried to confuse the point I made the other night about processing fish from foreign landings. He thought there was some inconsistency. He said, on the one side you are saying banish the foreign fishing fleet and then on the other side you are saying perhaps we can process their catches. There is not an inconsistent bone in my body, particularly in connection with that. I say, banish the foreign fishing fleet and try to process their catches. I will explain why that is not inconsistent.

Now, if Canada is successful at the Law of the Sea Conference, or if unsuccessful takes unilateral action, Canada will control the resource, the fish for 200 miles off our shores if not to the Continental Margin. By the way, we have had an acknowledgement from Mr. MacEachen that he got the resolution of the House of Assembly on the Law of the

Sea. The Speaker has got an acknowledgement, and we have gotten copies. He sent that on to Geneva. All right.

Now, successful or not, either successful at the International Law of the Sea Conference or by taking unilateral action, Canada will control the fishery resource within the 200 miles. Canada will then decide what is the total allowable catch or the maximum sustainable yield or whatever the figure is that can be taken in that resource. Since Canada will not have the facilities, the fleet, the vessels and so on to take that allowable catch, whatever it might be, and it will be considerably decreased from what it is now since Canada cannot take it all, we will have to allow foreign fishing fleets to take the difference between what Canada can take and what Canada is satisfied can be taken properly from the resource.

So, it will not mean that only Canada -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No. The poor gentleman, the poor, poor, poor gentleman cannot understand anything that is more difficult than two and two makes four. Right! We get control of the whole resource. Canada does not have the vessels and the facilities and the men and so on and so forth to catch what it is proper to allow to be caught in that area. Therefore we are going to have to, Canada will have to agree that other nations will continue to be allowed to fish and take the difference between what Canada decides is the proper sustainable yield from those waters and what Canada herself can take, and there is going to be a considerable difference. They will still be allowed to fish for that.

Now, one of the conditions that Canada could make would be that so much of that, of the catch we allow you to take, whatever the country is, will have to be processed on our shores or the foreign fleet may want to land some of that. It may be more economic for them to have it landed and processed on our shores. I say, that being the case, that we should encourage it as long as our own fishermen and our own facilities can catch all that they can catch with the effort that we can put in it. We cannot say to the rest of the world that the rest of it cannot be caught, that the rest of the sustainable yield cannot be taken. Canada is not going to be able to do that.

So, fine, if there is a difference and there will be, then there is no reason that I can see why we should not have some of that processed here in Newfoundland under proper arrangements because one of our main problems here in Newfoundland in the fishing industry is the low put-through of our plants of production. They are not utilizing now forty per cent of their capacity to produce fish.

MR. NEARY: That is our fault.

MR. CROSBIE: It is our fault. It is the Government of Canada's fault. It is the fault of the fact that we cannot catch the fish. It is a whole lot of faults. The fact remains that sixty per cent of our capacity is not being utilized. If we are going to utilize it all we are going to have to use the catches of other countries in addition to our own until such time as we have the vessels and the fishermen and the facilities to catch it all ourselves. That is not going to be in the next couple of years.

MR. NEARY: Either you are going to drive them outside the 200 mile limit or you are not going to drive them outside. Now, you have to make up your mind.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman, you know, I wish he would go to the university. Canada gets control of the resource. Then presumably Canada decides what is the total allowable catch you can have from the area. Canada will not have the ships, the men, the facilities to catch all of that fish. So, other nations will have to be allowed to take that difference. Canada will have control of the management. It will not be able to take all of the fish.

MR. NEARY: Is this an Einstein theory now or a Crosbie theory?

MR. CROSBIE: This is the theory that they are talking about at Geneva. This is the theory that everyone who knows anything about the fishery is discussing and no one else. Do you think that Canada is going to be able to say, here is 200 miles that we control, and if we do not catch a fish, no one else can catch a fish. No nation in the world is going to agree to that kind of tommyrot.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Ask Jack Davis, he has talked about it for years.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Canada is trying to get control of it to decide what can properly be caught and what the effort should be. That does not mean to say if Canada cannot catch what the proper effort is, that no one else can. That is not being suggested at Geneva. That is not being suggested anywhere. The other nations of the world are not going to agree to tommyrot like that. We should not expect them to. What we cannot take ourselves, we have to allow others to take. That is only just common sense.

MR. NEARY: The Crosbie formula.

MR. CROSBIE: No. It is MacEachen formula. It is the Jack Davis formula. It is the Romeo Leblanc formula. It is the formula of anyone has any sense who knows anything about fisheries, in the world. That is what they are discussing over at Geneva. So, here we are with plants under-utilized that we cannot fill with fish ourselves with our own efforts. Then it only makes good sense if we can make sensible arrangements to do it, to allow foreigners to land their catches to be processed here and exported back to their own countries.

Now, when the day comes that we can catch enough fish here in Canada and have enough put-through to keep our own plants occupied 100 per cent of the time, fine, you do not need them any longer, and you say, good bye, lads -

MR. NEARY: And drive them outside the 200 mile limit.

MR. CROSBIE: No, you do not drive them out. They have entered into an arrangement and they go. That is what I am suggesting that we have got to seriously look at.

Now, the honourable Member for Bell Island admitted tonight, not tonight, this afternoon, that he took his advice in fisheries from Captain Bill. Captain Bill has two fish take-out stores.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Maybe he got it from Captain Morgan.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes. He might have got it from Captain Morgan before he got it from Captain Bill, but he has taken his advice - Captain Bill was on today. I heard him on today saying this was a shocking concept that I have advanced the House of Assembly. I wish Captain Bill well.

I hope that he does well in his fish take-out stores because I see no reason why Captain Bill should not grow as big as Colonel Saunders.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Who has the nicest legs in town?

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I was just coming to that. Now, if the honourable gentleman was getting his fisheries advice from Captain Bill surely the honourable Gentleman from Bonavista North is probably getting his agricultural advice from Colonel Saunders. I mean, now we know who the honourable gentleman's experts are. He accuses us of having the bearded gentleman and the academics and so on. Well, hardly Captain Bill and Colonel Saunders are the resource experts for the honourable Gentleman from Bell Island. Well, so be it. We hope that his resource experts do well. We hope that Captain Bill does as well Colonel Saunders.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He might be a colonel himself some day.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, it might be Colonel Steve and he will be putting out flounders because he has been floundering here now in this debate for the last couple of days, the flounder expert. So, I hope that I have explained that to the honourable gentleman.

Now, the gear bank, there is no -

MR. ROBERTS: Did you table a copy of the report yet?

MR. CROSBIE: Well, the honourable

Leader of the Opposition was late coming in but the Hon. Member for Bell Island has had it there, you know.

MR. DOODY: He went through it in thirty seconds.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes. There is a report which will stand on its own feet, and I will table some more copies in addition to the ones already tabled that have looked into the whole business, and it is reported that in Newfoundland the prices of gear are lower than they are in Nova Scotia and that there is no great problems with the supply of gear, so on and so forth. These are people responsible who were asked to come in and do a job and to investigate this whole situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: B. Comm.'s.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, with B. Comm.'s and Ph.D.'s and so on. And why not? These are the kinds of people you want to look at dollars and cents and to look at books and to look at the prices and figures and compare them. And they have done a report and they have given us the report. Now if the honourable gentleman does not like it, fine. He does not like it. But let him first read it. Without having read it this afternoon, he criticized it, and he criticized the authors. And tonight having looked at nothing but the last page, he criticized it again and criticized the authors. There is something wrong to the honourable gentleman from Bell Island if a man has a beard. Now I do not know if either one of those three authors has a beard. I suspect they do not. But I do not care if they got beards, if they got hair from head to toe, if they are the hairiest animals in the universe, I could not care less. If they are qualified to do their job I am not going to discriminate against a man because he got hair. And I am not going to discriminate against him if he has not got any hair. So what has hair got to do with it? And what has it got to do with it if he is an academic, if he went to Memorial or he learned something and he got some specialty? Why should we look down on any one who has got a B. Comm. or a Masters Degree or an Engineers - must we look down on people with degrees? Are they something less than the ordinary man? Are they something

less than the fishermen or less than any of us? I cannot see how they are. What have we got our university for if any one who goes through it and gets a degree is going to be sneered at and laughed at and joked at and abused in this House of Assembly? Is this not a queer kind of attitude to have? That because we have a report on gear prices and gear supply and so on from three gentlemen from the Faculty of Commerce at Memorial that they must be jeered at and insulted publicly.

Now we are politicians, we are used to it, eh?

We can take it. I do not care what it says in the paper about me tomorrow. Well, I might care. Some times I get aggravated. But anyway we are in that game so that is a voluntary assumption of risk that we take. But must three gentlemen who are asked to do a study, you know, to be abused and scoffed at and laughed at?

AN HON. MEMBER: Did they get paid?

MR. CROSBIE: Sure, they were paid. Why should they not be paid? Naturally they were paid. Should they be abused and scoffed and laughed at in this House as three useless academics and bearded creatures and hairy monsters and all the rest of it? I do not think so, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN (Mr. Dunphy): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: If they did take money from the public treasury, they are a fair game.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, that is it, is it? Well, the honourable gentleman took a lot of money from the public treasury and spent it on Bell Island. He did not think he was fair game. He protested that greatly.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: So do not give us that malarkey. Now here is a new theory, Mr. Chairman, this is a new one. If the public treasury pays anybody anything they are fair game to be slandered, maligned and abused in this House of Assembly. Well the public treasury was paying The Daily News for advertisements, but we were not allowed

to malign or attack or slander them or even withdraw the advertisements. What a twisted concept of thinking!

MR. NEARY: Point of order, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, point of order.

MR. DOODY: Here it comes.

MR. NEARY: The minister, Mr. Chairman, is getting a bit carried away and accusing me of having slandered and maligned and libelled these gentlemen, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: You did.

MR. CROSBIE: Right.

MR. NEARY: I did?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes.

MR. DOODY: You did. You laughed at them, sneered at them.

MR. NEARY: Laughed at them?

Mr. Chairman, I would submit, Sir, that the minister is incorrect in his statement, Sir, and I ask Your Honour to ask the minister to either rephrase his statement, to lay a charge or to withdraw his statement, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not want to put you in a tough spot. I will rephrase my statement. I will rephrase them. The honourable gentleman scoffed at this, these academics.

MR. NEARY: So what? Right.

MR. CROSBIE: He laughed at these three academics. He held them up to contempt. He held them up to ridicule. He pooh-poohed them. He sneered at them.

MR. NEARY: There is pooh-pooh over there, look.

MR. CROSBIE: That is what the honourable gentleman did with the three men who wrote that report from the Commerce Faculty of Memorial University, and there is no point in his trying to deny it now. And he is saying that any one who dares do anything for this government,

to do a study, to be paid a cent by this government, is fair game to be abused and ridiculed and attacked in this House and that is what he has just said with his interjections. Because if you are ever paid a cent from the public treasury, you are fair game. Well that is a vulture philosophy that I do not agree with, and it is not true, and it is not sensible and it is not right and it is not decent. And I hope the honourable gentleman has reconsidered now, and we will hear no more of these sneers about the three gentlemen who did that gear bank study and did their honest report.

MR. NEARY: I want to see a fisherman on this committee that is all.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I do not know. I cannot see what expertise a fisherman would have, the ability - these gentlemen went around, Mr. Chairman, and they interviewed the fishermen, and they interviewed the people who sell gear.

MR. NEARY: They interviewed nobody. They made up their own report.

MR. CROSBIE: And they looked at the books of the people that sell gear. And they went to Nova Scotia, and they did the same in Nova Scotia, and they had full access to all the information.

MR. NEARY: Did they have public hearings?

MR. CROSBIE: No, they did not have public hearings.

MR. NEARY: How did they interview the fishermen?

MR. CROSBIE: Why should they? We never asked for a Royal Commission on gear prices. Do not be so foolish. And when the honourable gentleman talks about gear prices, you know, when he has the gall to get up in this House and complain about gear prices, when this Government's Gear Subsidy Programme is far more generous than that that was in effect before it was brought in last year, and for him to talk about gear prices, where was this friend of the fishermen, this hero of the fishermen, this hero of the toiling masses before 1972? He has lately come to it. Why did he not have the gear

programme of the last government? Why did he not lash out the free gear when he was with the last government? Now he gets up in the House and says that the Liberal Party, if it gets into office, it is going to have a gear bank. It is going to have this and it is going to have that. It is going to have nothing, nothing, promises, promises. This government has improved the Gear Subsidy Programme and precious little thanks is got from the gentleman for Bell Island for that. None. We have got a better and a higher subsidy programme now than was in effect ever in this Province. But we will not hear that from the honourable gentleman for Bell Island. He is going to complain anyway. He suggested today that all gear should be paid for and given away free. Well, that just happened to a certain section of the coast.

MR. NEARY: It was given away?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Every one who lost gear just had it replaced on the Northeast Coast for zero, for nothing. They never had to pay a cent for it. If they put in a claim saying it was lost due to the ice or it was lost -

MR. NEARY: Did I say that?

MR. CROSBIE: - due to the ice, from St. Shott's right up to Labrador and down, I think, around Port au Choix -

MR. NEARY: You must be dreaming my son.

MR. CROSBIE: - they had it replaced for nothing.

MR. NEARY: I never said any such thing.

MR. DOODY: You did not. No, you did not.

MR. NEARY: You are talking through your hat, boy.

MR. DOODY: You did not.

MR. NEARY: Pardon?

MR. DOODY: You did not say that.

MR. NEARY: He said I did.

MR. DOODY: No, no, nothing like that has ever come from you.

MR. NEARY: No, he is daydreaming.

MR. DOODY: No one has ever accused you of saying anything constructive.

MR. NEARY: What did the Premier bring back from Bermuda for the private dining room?

MR. CROSBIE: The bearded wonders. One of his favourite adjectives this afternoon, Mr. Chairman, was the bearded wonders. They were a bunch of bearded - Rollie Martin and his bearded wonders.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Rollie does not have a beard. The poor fellow is beardless. I mean I do not care if the wonder -

MR. NEARY: Is he old enough to shave yet?

MR. CROSBIE: I do not care what the wonder is, whether it is bearded it or unbearded. If that wonder can perform his wonders to perform, I am delighted to have him. I do not care what he looks like, if he looks like the man in the moon.

MR. DOODY: He cannot be much more abusive than the Member for Bell Island

MR. CROSBIE: Now the honourable gentleman -

MR. NEARY: They turned down \$30,000 a year, that crowd. They are like that.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman went on to talk about canneries. Well, more canning of fish in this Province, I think, would probably be desirable. But his solution, you know, the other day to can the whole thing and send can openers over to Bangladesh and so on, I mean who can take that seriously. He chastised me for not responding to his suggestion about having more canneries and, you know, the problem was that they did not have can openers in the countries that could use the canned fish, and we would have to supply can openers too. Well, I mean if I am supposed to reply to that, as the Minister of Fisheries, and deal with that, well I am dealing with it now because the honourable gentleman brought

it up again. Yes, I think it will be a good thing to have more canning of fish on the island. But if the fish is going to be canned just to be sold to the Canadian International Development Agency it will not be able to survive.

MR. NEARY: Not necessarily.

MR. CROSBIE: Because they do not pay the prime price for canned fish. They do not want to be a dumping ground for fish that just gets canned because there is too much in the market here -

MR. NEARY: It is the federal government who will buy it.

MR. CROSBIE: - and the fish could be canned and then sent off to South East Asia.

MR. NEARY: It is the federal government -

MR. CROSBIE: They are willing to do that from time to time, and they have taken canned fish, perch, I think, is the fish that they have been buying up in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick to help out. But the price that they have been paying for it is not a price that gives any return. It is a price that gives the producer of it a loss. Now producers of canned fish cannot operate year after year at losses. But from time to time when they have very heavy inventories it may help them to get rid of some of that inventory by having it bought by the Canadian International Development Agency and sent to countries that can use it. Well, more canning

of fish - yes, if we could get a canning operation in Newfoundland I think that would be to our advantage, It would give us another alternative in addition to the frozen alternative to get rid of our fish. And putting more fish in salt while the sale fish market is a good market is another thing that we have to try and aim at and encourage the processors here in Newfoundland to do -

MR. NEARY: Good stuff, boy!

MR. CROSBIE: -particularly at this time.

MR. NEARY: Good ideas, good suggestion.

MR. CROSBIE: Smoking fish? Yes, the more we could get smoked, the more we can encourage that the better. Where that can be encouraged and that can be done it should be done.

The Burgeo Fish Plant: Well, I am not going to say much about the Burgeo Fish Plant except this; the Province has made its position known and it will do its part. It is going to be a huge expenditure of money to put a new fish plant in Burgeo. Applications have been made to DREE and we are waiting to hear from the Department of Regional Economic Expansion. Is it going to participate? If it is not that will probably kibosh the new fish plant in Burgeo. If they participate we have made it plain time and time again that we are prepared to do our part.

At the present time, I believe that it is the position of the Government that they are waiting to see what they have to do for the whole East Coast Canadian Fishery this year, and until that has been decided and until they know what the whole future of the fishery is likely to be on the East Coast of Canada, they do not want to make a commitment on our spending ten-odd million dollars down in Burgeo to build a new fish plant there. That is their position and I can understand that. It is not unreasonable. It is not unreasonable but our point of view is that if Burgeo does not have its fish plant and our reasoning is shown by our action in 1972 when to overcome the strike that could not have been overcome otherwise, the government agreed to buy the plant from Spencer Lake

to ensure that the community carried on. Our position is still the same. We are following up our 1972 action which we had to take by saying that if the present plant is inadequate, and it is, that we are prepared to go on and spend a great deal of money, provincial money, on a new plant. Because without that Burgeo has nothing. And since there is a lot of public money in Burgeo, and since a lot of public money has been spent on the road from Burgeo up - that has now been under way for the last two or three years under this present administration helped by the Government of Canada - for all of those reasons we want to see Burgeo continue as a viable community.

You can say, looking at the project by itself, that this is crazy, this is not something that should be done, that we need another new fish plant like a hole in the head. You might say that. Yes, and if you said that it might be true but not when you related to the social and economic circumstances of Burgeo. When you relate it to Burgeo, a community of two thousand-odd people, maybe 2,500 -

MR. DOODY: 4,000

MR. CROSBIE: 4,000? Oh! The honourable the Minister of Industrial Development says 4,000. All right, if you relate that to a community of 4,000 people that will die without it if the present plant is inadequate and not replaced by a new one, then you can understand why the decision of the Newfoundland Government is that we should go ahead and put considerable public money into a new fish plant at Burgeo. And when we hear from DREE as to whether they are going to participate then we will be able to proceed or not proceed depending on their decision, It is as simple as that. So any criticism of the Burgeo situation is a criticism by the honourable gentleman opposite of his own cohorts, his own party at Ottawa and of the Minister of Regional Economic Expansion at Ottawa.

All I can say is that we realize why they are studying it so carefully -

MR. NEARY: Remember, Fee, Fie, Fiddly, Fo, Fum/ We will spend the money/

We don't care where it comes from!

MR. CROSBIE: Right. I am just saying we understand why we are not getting a quick decision from them because of the state of the Eastern Canadian Fishing Industry. But we have been ready for the last year to proceed at Burgeo and waiting for the last year to hear from the government and the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, and when we hear we will know exactly what the position is. So there is no -

MR. NEARY: They are waiting to hear from you.

CROSBIE: They are not waiting to hear from us. They have heard time and time again -

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: They sent the Mayor.

MR. CROSBIE: They are not hearing.

MR. NEARY: They sent the Mayor of Burgeo.

MR. DOODY: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: I saw the telegram, they sent the Mayor of Burgeo.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not care what the honourable gentleman saw, This government has been ready for the last year -

MR. NEARY: The telegrams are identical.

MR. CROSBIE: The honourable gentleman has made a savage attack, a vitriolic and an unjustified and unwarranted attack on his Liberal colleague at Ottawa, the honourable Don Jamieson.

MR. NEARY: Listen, are you sure that is not spiked, what you have in that glass?

MR. CROSBIE: That is only water, Mr. Chairman.

MR. DOODY: Eat your heart out.

MR. CROSBIE: Look, I resent somebody saying that I have had a drink. I have not had a drink since January 1, I have lost twenty-two pounds, my pants are just about dropping off me -

MR. NEARY: No wonder you are so incoherent, you are half starved to death.

MR. CROSBIE: Now I am speaking in this House and to have this kind of public, savage allegation made against me, I tell you, Mr. Chairman,

it is more than a human being can bear. It is a wonder that I can carry on under these conditions.

MR. NEARY: You are in a coma, boy, You are half starved.

MR. CROSBIE: Now I think that I have exhausted all the arguments the honourable gentleman from Bell Island put forward.

MR. NEARY: No, not all.

MR. CROSBIE: Did I miss anything?

MR. NEARY: You missed the marketing one again, the most important one.

MR. CROSBIE: Which marketing one?

MR. NEARY: About going and meeting with the other Premiers and the other provinces to go approach Ottawa.

MR. CROSBIE: Was that on marketing?

MR. NEARY: Yes.

MR. CROSBIE: No. Well, I do not think that is necessary, Mr.Chairman.

MR. NEARY: I would like to know what your intentions are.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, look, I have said that we are flexible on this, that the marketing of our salt fish, of course, is done under the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation. We are willing to consider the same kind of arrangement for the fresh and frozen fish industry or an arrangement which may be more sensible, where they are going to have several selling desks for fresh and frozen fish products. We are willing to consider all of these and doubtless there are going to be major changes in marketing.

MR. NEARY: But you are going to have to take the initiative if you are going to -

MR. CROSBIE: We do not have to take the initiative, Mr.Chairman. We will take the initiative with the Government of Canada hopefully, jointly, together agreeing on what needs to be done. That is the only way you can proceed in this matter. The Province is not going to take the initiative but if we conclude with the Government of Canada that this is the desirable step, one of the desirable steps in the fishing industry today, then we will co-operate with them.

We will not have to go to the other nine provinces. If we agree with the Government of Canada that there should be a new marketing setup for Newfoundland, frozen and fresh fish, the

two of us together can do the job the same as it was done with the Canadian Saltfish Corporation.

MR. NEARY: There had to be an agreement with the other provinces to set up the Canadian Saltfish Corporation. The minister knows that.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not think so. Not at all.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. CROSBIE: Quebec has agreed to be represented by them but Nova Scotia has not, New Brunswick has not.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

MR. NEARY: Sure.

MR. CROSBIE: Is that right? Well, in that case we would have to go to one of the other Maritime Province but we do not have to go across Canada to see will Alberta agree to our marketing board.

MR. ROBERTS: - with respect to the Salt Fish Corporation they can disband these corporations without further notice.

MR. CROSBIE: Right! That is right. The only thing that makes one wonder is why they are not also given the jurisdiction in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, but that is a decision for them to make.

MR. ROBERTS: - Nova Scotia and New Brunswick sat in opposition.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, they objected to it at that time, but why they have not done it since.

So we are quite open and flexible on marketing and hopefully we will be able to agree with the Government of Canada on what the changes should be. We will agree to put legislation to our House to complement legislation that they would have to put forward at their House and we proceed on that basis. So I think then, Mr. Chairman, that I have covered all the points I noted, anyway, that the two honourable gentlemen made.

MR. NEARY: No poem?

MR. CROSBIE: No, I had my poem - Fee, Fie, Fo, Fum/ we don't care where the money come from, as long as we can spend it on the fisheries. \$18 million is more than \$16.5 million. And \$18 million

plus \$500,000 which we are going to ask the House to increase it to will be \$2.5 million more than last year. What we are going to have to spend later on in the year, we are going to ask the House for Supplementary Supply for, we do not know yet, but we have no doubt that it is going to be considerable. In addition to what the House is asked to vote here, who knows what we might have to guarantee in the year ahead? So for anyone to pretend that this is all the Newfoundland Government is going to spend on the fisheries is just so much nonsense.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I notice we have in the gallery a former member of the House, cabinet minister and Chairman of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, Mr. Aiden Maloney.

Welcome Aiden and if we can elevate our debate so that we keep him interested it would be, I think, a single achievement.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, let me for those of us on this side say how pleased we are to see Aiden Maloney here tonight. He is no stranger to the House and served here a number of years, the Member for Ferryland District, and resigned from the House, retired from the Cabinet to become Chairman of the Salt Fish Corporation. Before he did he sponsored in this House the Newfoundland Legislation which together with the complementary federal legislation has given the Saltfish Corporation its charter and has given the salt fish industry a new lease on life. I sometimes think we should ask Aiden Maloney if he would want to take over now the entire fresh fish as well as the salt fish industry. Conditions may not be the same but if the same job could be done by him and his associates there as they have done in the salt fish, we would be a lot better off.

Now, Sir, let me deal with two or three minor, or less major points that have not been touched upon in what I think has been quite a good debate. We have seen one of the minister's vintage performances. Whether or not it is vintaged or bottled in bond I do not know, but a vintage performance that only the minister can give us. When I conclude in a few minutes what I wish to say now, I will make some remarks which I think the minister's performance and I can call it only a performance, Mr. Chairman, the minister's performance both in the committee today and in the committee on Tuesday when we discussed this item of fisheries estimates and earlier the minister's performance, I think, shows a great deal of what is wrong with the whole approach of this administration, this government to the fisheries questions.

When I spoke on Tuesday, I guess it was, I dealt at some length with a number of questions in the fisheries and I do not intend to repeat what I said there. I will note that most of them the minister has not dealt with, and those he has dealt with he has not dealt with satisfactorily or on their merits or substantively. All we have seen is a typical performance. The minister would make a good first act,

an opening act in a vaudeville show. He has the ability to entertain, a histrionic ability, an ability at verbal character, not character assassination, he has that, but the ability to verbalize vituperation and abuse in a degree that is rare even in this House. He uses all these tactics as a substitute for bringing his undoubted mental ability and his learning and his knowledge and his skills to bear on the problems.

I think it is more revealing to the minister, this feeling towards the fisheries and the people of Newfoundland, than it is of anything else. We began this debate and carried it on in a very, I do not know if the word is high, on a high plane. We debated the issue seriously and the minister today just cannot resist the temptation to engage in his little games. Well, I think the issue is infinitely more important than that and I regret that he has adopted this attitude. But I think it reflects his entire performance, incredibly negative, incredibly destructive, incredibly aimed at putting down and trying to attack and to explain away but no thought given to building up or to constructing, no thought given to viewing the fishery as it can be in Newfoundland and as I believe it should be. Instead all we get is a performance of scorn and vituperation and abuse and histrionics and hysterics.

I am disappointed in the minister. I had expected better of him. I had hoped for better of him and all I can say really, in a parliamentary sense, Mr. Chairman, is I am disappointed. Before I go on though with some of that let me just mention one or two things which I think are pretty revealing of this administration's feeling for the fisheries. The other day the minister tabled in the House an Order in Council which was enacted by the Cabinet for, just over the signature here of the Deputy Clerk of the Council, Mr. Jenkins, on December 10. This order, which was gazetted about the time it was made, of course, says that the Governor in Council, the Cabinet by another name, using certain powers conferred upon him by the Fish Inspection Act, which is an act that has been on

the books, I do not know, fifteen years, twenty years, that the Governor in Council has chosen to make certain regulations and these are called the Fish Inspection Amendment Regulations, 1974, and when you go through the legal jargon which tends to crop up in these Orders in Council which goes on avoidably so, it boils down to the fact that this is an Order which prohibits the semi-processing of crab landed in this Province and there is quite

a long definition of semi processing. It includes cleaning, shucking, filleting, smoking, icing, chilling, freezing, packing, cooking, pickling, drying or preparing in any other manner, for marketing to persons or corporate bodies who make it a business to carry out further processing or to reapportion into consumer packs or to market for such purposes. It is fairly clear cut, obviously eminently desirable. And on December 10 the cabinet with a mighty effort moved, they moved this into law. As an example of the sense of urgency which the Minister of Fisheries and his colleagues have brought to this question, and I think urgency is of some import, because December 10 was the end of the season, indeed a season which was disastrous for our crab processing plants, and that is not the fault of the government or the minister, but last year was a disastrous year. Indeed I understand that there is presently in storage either in the frozen or in the timed form, the two forms in which we prepare crab in Newfoundland, the queen crab, there is in storage approximately last year's total production. In other words they have not been able to sell any fish out of last year's production, or if they sold some of last year's production to various processors, it has only been enough to make up for what was left from the year before.

So obviously the industry needed attention last year. And equally obviously the value added concept is one which we should adopt. We used to hear a great deal about this from the Premier. He used to go off to Toronto and some of his best speeches have been made in The Globe and Mail. He made one once in Toronto to The Globe and Mail and maybe to anybody who was listening to the effect that we were going to have further processing of fish in Newfoundland. Well that was the last we had heard of it because, of course, there has not been one fin processed any further because of any action by this government since they came into office, not a fin or a cod's head, nor a tongue, nor a sound, nor a scale. No action taken by this government has resulted in any further processing. It resulted in no added value to the product.

Then in any event on December 10, Sir, with a mighty sense of urgency the cabinet in solemn deliberation moved to enacted this order. Was this some sudden crisis, Your Honour? To show just how important this

issue is, to show how much concern there is for the fishery, a small matter but very revealing, the Minister of Fisheries who was then Member for Gander, the all-time disaster in the portfolio and he has been that in several portfolios issued a release, it came out from our infamous Information Service, and it said the Fisheries Minister, the Hon. Harold Collins said today he is concerned over reports that several companies involved in crab processing in Newfoundland are shipping semi-processed products out of the Province for further processing. Mr. Collins said he will not condone this practice as it is the department's policy to encourage and to promote fish processing to the greatest degree possible in the Province. In addition to the loss of jobs to Newfoundlanders we are not maximizing the potential economic benefits to Newfoundland. Now that is not in quotation marks. It should be, But the Information Service is illiterate, and their illiteracy shows up from time to time in things like that.

Then it goes on (in quotation marks) "This is particularly true he said for new and developing fisheries such as crab where there are established markets for fully processed products and the technology is available to the fishing industry to do this. The minister went on to remind those involved in or contemplating getting in the crab production that Section (6) of the Provincial Fishing Inspection Act gives the minister the right to refuse fish processing licence, if, in his opinion, the operation is not in the best interest of the Province. Mr. Collins said that he is serving notice to fish processors, particularly those in the crab business, that he will take appropriate action under the Fish Inspection Act to curb such practices if he deems it necessary." And that is the total release. And that release which resulted in the amendment.

Your Honour, my point is quite simply that this incredibly long amendment - it has got fifteen whole lines in it - that it took the government how long to do it? Maybe ten days? That would be a line and a half a day. Maybe two weeks? Let us give them a line a day of this very complicated drafting. I mean, after all two lines of these regulations may be cited as the Fish Inspection Amendment Regulation 1974. That would take at least .

a day to draft. The draftsman would have to put that down. He would have to think about it and weigh his words and he would then have to consult. He might need an interdepartmental committee and then we would go on and possibly we would have to go back to the minister for instructions or maybe the cabinet to get the principle cleared.

So, obviously with fifteen lines it would take some time to draft. Mr. Chairman, the minister's press release was issued on May 31. So, it took all of June and all of July and all of September and October and November and half of December for the government to act. If I had to pick any one single incident, Sir, that reveals this government's attitude to our fisheries, I think the saga of the crab processing, semi-processed regulations would be better than any I have heard of. It took nearly six months to put through a very simple amendment to regulations. It did not even require approval by the House, an amendment which implements the principle which we would all accept as being valid, vital and valuable.

Now, this is but one of a piece. It is the same government that in three years and in four sessions has not yet seen fit to amend the Collective Bargaining Act. Typical! Now, I did not expect any better. I had hoped for better, but I did not expect any better from the minister's predecessors. The Premier held the portfolio on two occasions which were distinguished by a lack of knowledge, a tension, concern, and everything else that one could bring to bear in the Premier's usual fashion.

The minister who preceeded the present minister, the Gentleman from Gander, is a fine enough fellow, and I have no objection to him on fellowship grounds, but as a Minister of Fisheries, he was, you know, a dope. He just did not understand the problems, had no idea of how to go about them, would not or could not recruit people to help him to understand them, and had no intention of doing anything to try to solve them.

The immediate predecessor or the first minister full-time was the then Gentleman from Hermitage, Mr. Roy Cheeseman, who gave up

in despair after a year and issued a statement explaining his resignation, issued a statement which can only be called a statement of complete and utter frustration, frustration partly with the Government at Ottawa, I would assume, although he did not make that clear but certainly frustration with the administration of which he was a part.

Now, we have the present Minister of Fisheries. We used to hear a great deal from the government about new ideas in fisheries. We used to hear about further processing. Well, I have done some checking and I do not claim to be all knowledgeable nor do I claim to have exhaustively looked at every piece of information. But, as far as I can determine, there has not been one single action unless one wants to count a six month delay in getting out a fifteen line piece of regulation, one single action by this government that encourages further processing or discourages processing outside the Province. All the great grandeur's plans we heard are so many airy, fairy castles. Not a thing, nothing. The hundreds and thousands of Newfoundlanders who believed the Premier when he went around the Province saying that when we are in office, we shall make sure that our fish is processed to the ultimate possible stage in Newfoundland before it leaves.

Those people have been disillusioned, deceived, shocked, and altogether let down. Sir, there was a great fish auction system. We used to hear about the Dutch auction system. Mind you, anybody who knows very much about the industry would agree that the system is at best impractical in Newfoundland. Most people I have talked with feel it is unworkable. But that did not stop our Premier. If Your Honour were to go back and have a look at some of the Hansards two or three years ago, Your Honour would find that in speech after speech the Premier used to talk of the fish auction system, another false start, another deception.

In the first Throne Speech, the election manifesto speech, we had the promise of a gear insurance plan. Nothing has been done on that. The minister has not dealt with any of these items that I have heard. I have not heard every word he has said, but I would like him to deal with them. I would like him, if they are ideas that have

April 3, 1975

Tape 1009 (night)

IB-3

been scraped, then let him say so. There is nothing wrong with throwing out an idea. As a matter of fact, there is everything to be said for throwing out most of the ideas the Premier has advanced on the fisheries. The minister did not come to grips with the trawler situation, with the great fleet of trawlers which we were assured in the Tory Times, the glad tidings of its era, the one that came out before the Hermitage by-election which now has a value exceeded only by the rarest of rare books, the Tory Times which told us that there were going to be seven trawlers built and seven more after that and seven more after that. Not one

keel has touched the water yet. Is the plan now ended? Because, this is the same minister who stands up and tries to worm his way out of one of the more foolish statements I have ever heard made by him or anybody else in this House, which he bumbled into the other evening - He is not big enough to admit that he made a mistake. We all make mistakes. Some of us make more than others - Where he said, well, let us have the foreign processing of fish. What we should be doing, and if we have any concern for Newfoundland what we will be doing is making sure that we have in this Province the equipment - we have the men, Mr. Chairman. We have hundreds and thousands of men who are willing to go fishing, who are anxious to go fishing given the equipment and given a decent income. No thanks to this government they may get the income. As a matter of fact that victory was achieved over the dead bodies, metaphorically speaking, of spokesmen for the administration opposite.

What we should be doing is making sure we have that capability. Instead we have a minister who feels that we should, once we get control, we should encourage and not discourage foreign trawlers. Make it easy for them. Let them land their fish ashore. That is what he said. He can twist and he can squirm and he can do what he wants, but that is what he said in this House.

Now, I say that what we should be doing is directly to the contrary. There is no point in our having control of the Shelf, Sir, if all it means is that you have got to come by Ottawa or come by St. John's to get a license to fish, and we will say, well, boy, we cannot take the fish, you go ahead and take it. Oh true we then at least control the catch whereas now the ICNAF regime has not worked. It has not succeeded in holding the catch within the biologically viable limits, let alone within the economically viable limits. We might gain that advantage.

But, what we should be doing is launching on a great programme in Eastern Canada. This should be a federal-provincial programme. I am not going to suggest that the government of the Province should launch on this alone although if we can find \$1.5 billion for power, and that is good stuff, I am all for that, we can find \$100 million or so for the

fisheries. Let us build twenty or thirty or forty or fifty or sixty trawlers, build them in our own plant at Marystown and build another plant if we need it and let us build those trawlers so that we can catch that fish. Since our fish plants are now operating at less than capacity, and the minister has not really dealt with how he is going to increase the put-through or the through-put at Englee or LaScie or Twillingate, plants that are ice bound for three and four months of the year. He may be able to truck a few hundred tons of fish into Twillingate and possibly even into LaScie when the Government at Ottawa paves that road. But, what are we going to do for Englee and St. Anthony and Port au Choix. That is a problem he has not dealt with.

You know, we are talking about seasonal plants. Maybe the most that any of them can operate is fifty or sixty per cent. The plants that are year round operational now, what is there percentage of utilization? It is not forty. I do not know what it is. It may be eighty. It may be ninety. Their trawler fleets are more or less geared to - I am sorry?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The plants at Fortune and the plants at Marystown and the plants at Grand Bank and at Trepassy and at St. John's, if they are not up to capacity - I am not saying they are but obviously it is more than forty, much more than that. Forty, Mr. Chairman, that forty per cent is an average, possibly a medium for the entire Province and it includes the plant at St. Anthony which is capable of putting through 12 million or 15 million pounds of fish throughout a year or three

times that in round ground fish which is now producing a million or two a year. And it includes the plant at LaScie, and the plant at Englee, the plant at Twillingate, the plant at Bonavista, all of which are operating at possibly a third of capacity or a quarter of capacity, and I do not know what capacity means either, It could mean twenty-four hours a day, seven days a week. You know, the minister was most free with his forty per cent figure and less free with the data that supported it. But there is obviously unused capacity even at Fortune and Marystown and Grand Bank and Trepassey and here in the National Sea plant here in St. John's. There is certainly unused capacity in the government run plant at Burgeo. They are operating about two days a week, I understand. But what we should do is build our own trawlers, Sir, or for that matter go to the Russians and the Poles and the East Germans, if we are going to take control of the Shelf let us take it for our interest. Let us buy their ships. Pay them off in fish. Why not? Their concern is surely with getting the fish, the food, protein food we hear so much about. As opposed to fishing, why make it easy for them to come across the Atlantic? Why help them? Why encourage them? Surely our policy should be to discourage them, to make it harder for them, to make it more difficult for them. Let them have the fish, if they want it, Sir. Let them buy it in five pound blocks or fifty pound blocks or one pound I.Q.F. fillets. Sure! Or let them buy it as breaded portions or in consumer packs, whatever, whatever the market and economics dictate. I am for that. But, no, let us not encourage them.

It might have made sense a few years ago when we could not get control of the Shelf or we were not going to get control of the Shelf to say, all right boys. If you cannot use it, or if we cannot use our capacity you come in and use it any way. We will be good fellows. We will rent you our space. And we will rent you our labour. And there is an argument for that. There are five jobs assured, I am told, for every one at sea. But why should we not get all six jobs, and not just the shore jobs.

The minister's policy, Sir, is a counsel of despair. What he should be doing, if he were at all forward or progressive or concerned with the future, if he were anything more than a big bunch of negativism,

a nabob of negativism would be to espouse and to work for a policy, a policy that would realistically enable us to take the fish that is on our Grand Banks and on the Continental Shelf, all of it, all that can be taken within the biologically and the economically sound limits, and those may not be the same, Sir. The biologically sound catch in any given year, I am told, may be infinitely more than the desirable catch. We cannot fight economics, nor can we fight biology.

But if the minister's policy has its way, if the Tory policy prevails we will only get a quarter or a half of the value we should be getting from this great policy to take over the Continental Shelf. And Mr. MacEachen, not 'MacEachern', the minister's knowledge of Ottawa is sufficiently weak that he does not even know the name of the Hon. Allen MacEachen.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not being, Sir, - the minister gets up and he talks about 'MacEachern'. Mr. MacEachen, and whoever the Canadian people are in Geneva, the Canadian Delegation, Mr. Beasley. The case they are trying to make -

MR. BARRY: It should be televised.

MR. ROBERTS: The case they are trying to make -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Chairman, it should be televised. I would - I would - the Liberal Party has very few dollars, but any time the Minister of Energy would like to go on the television and espouse the policy his colleague espoused or either that his colleague would like to go on the television the Liberal Party will finance that gratefully, Sir, to let the people of Newfoundland know exactly what the Tory thinking is. Just as any time the minister would like to go down to Marystown and try to explain away why - and I mean the Minister of Energy in this case - why he took the side of the companies in the strike I will gladly do that too, Sir.

MR. BARRY: You are a liar.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, I ask the honourable gentleman to withdraw that remark, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: It is withdrawn, Mr. Chairman, even though in all my heart I know that it is true, but it is withdrawn. And the honourable member opposite knows it is true. He is a stubborn leader and that is obvious.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! Order, please, I am sure we do not want this matter to

become something that could be very serious. And we cannot have an indirect withdrawal. It must be a withdrawal with no tail on it.

MR. BARRY: A withdrawal, Mr. Chairman, for the purposes of complying with parliamentary procedure in this withdrawal

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

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

MR. ROBERTS: I think Your Honour is satisfied with that. I mean I pay no heed to the honourable gentleman's opinions because I know what they are worth. Now, Sir, they know how easily they are obtained.

Your Honour, as I was saying, I -

MR. BARRY: Televised it in your own -

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, as I was saying -

MR. BARRY: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, the honourable gentleman has not yet spoken in the debate, whether it is because he is not allowed to or whether because his camp following abilities will not carry him in the debate. If he does not wish to speak, Sir, let him observe the rules of the committee and allow me to make what remarks I wish to make, as poor and as humble and as ill-informed as they may be in his august eyes, allow me to make them, Sir, without his inane harassments.

Now, Sir, the great flaw of the Tory policy, which the minister espoused, is that we should be increasing our own catch, not talking about how we are going to take care of the catch from the overseas, the foreign fleets. We should be increasing our catch, the Canadian catch, the Newfoundland catch. And the Government of Newfoundland should be taking the steps to do that. And if people opposite wish to debate this issue in the country I, for one, would be happy to do it any time they wish and on any forum they wish. The same thing applies with gear

prices, Sir. I listened with great care, both here and outside in our common rooms on the marvellous loud speakers systems we have to the minister's impassioned denunciation of my colleague, the gentleman from Bell Island. One thing is obvious from the minister's remarks. I have not read the report. The minister has not done us the courtesy to give us a chance to. It is typical. Whatever information he has got, he hoards, as if somehow it gives him a little advantage, a little debating advantage. He tabled it this afternoon, I gather, only after we made repeated requests.

MR. CROSBIE: I tabled it Tuesday.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir. He may have given it to the table of the House on Tuesday, but he did not follow the normal courtesy of providing extra copies for members of the House.

But one thing is obvious, Sir, and all his history on it and his denunciation and his great bravura performance, the government intend to do nothing at all about gear prices. That is what is obvious. That is the Tory policy. That is the minister's view. He can justify it in his own eyes. That is fine. But it is obvious that the government do not intend to do a farthing, a thinker's d- - n about the fishing gear prices in Newfoundland. They can justify or they can say what they want. They can persuade themselves of anything, but they do not intend to do anything about it. That is the nub, that is the up-shot of exactly what the minister had been saying at some considerable length. They have set up a committee. Three gentlemen, who submitted a proposal, and presumably on the strength of that were hired and went and did some work and produced a report, and I have not had an opportunity to read the report so I certainly cannot comment on it. I would not attempt to. The recommendations so-called appear to say that the gear banks will not work. That is fine. There were reports that said that the Saltfish Corporation would not work too, and yet it has worked. Common sense tells us. And I have not read this

report, I cannot debate the report. If the minister had any concern, he would have made it public some weeks ago. I noticed it was marked restricted until somebody took a little bit of whitewash and the whitewash left over from the report and used it to mark out what I assume is restricted. I do not know what it said there. It may have been private or it may have been anything. I cannot tell. Certainly it has never been made public. Indeed its existence was not even admitted until I raised the whole matter and embarrassed the administration somewhat by pointing out the fact that the Premier had made a commitment in June, in the middle of an election, and it was only at the end of July, the 30th day of July, that the administration took any action. But

it is not enough. It is not enough, Sir, just to be negative and to say that we can do nothing. That is a counsel of despair. There are all sorts of - one thing just leaped at me out of this report and I looked at the last, or the last but one page. The government's pricing policy, the government's subsidy policy was such that it increased the costs to the fishermen. Yes, yes, it increased the total cost and therefore increased the costs to the fishermen because the government pay, not a percentage, the government pay a fixed dollar amount. It was pointed out here and I can find the page, Sir. I wish I had the time to read it with care, but I think I was accurately quoting the section. It dealt with the effect of the present subsidy. The minister may know the page. Oh, yes! Yes, page fifteen, "However, experience with the 1974 Replacement Programme, suggested that the government, by its actions, may have been establishing prices. The Department of Fisheries apparently established certain maximum prices it would may under the 1974 Replacement Programme. Thus, the \$117 maximum price - we are now on page sixteen, Sir, - thus, the \$117 maximum price for hung cod gill nets and the \$105 maximum for the kit were established as the prices the supplier could charge and became in effect, a minimum price. The result was that suppliers who may have been pricing these items below the maximum prices soon increased prices to the government "established" prices."

"It could be argued that the government programme prompted higher prices if this were the case." Go back to page fifty-six, Sir. One sentence out of a statement that, depending upon the extent of government subsidization, the prices charged for gear from a gear bank would most likely not be substantially lower than those under private enterprise. They are operating at no profit. The profit element, that has not affected prices, if one is to believe that statement which is obviously nonsensical. It says, the markup on gear is approximately fifteen to twenty per cent. By coincidence, the current bounty of \$20.00 approximates

this markup. Now, the authors of the report made that statement in support of their conclusion that there should be no gear bank. If anything, Sir, it proves the contrary. I wish I could debate the report. If I had had the opportunity to read it, perhaps I would be in a better position to debate it, but all I can say is that this report may or may not be a valid document. I have no way to tell. The minister obviously is not very proud of it. It had to be dragged out of him. It has not been made public. It has not been circulated to the fishing bodies. We heard a great deal from the minister about how he was willing at the drop of a hat to go anywhere in the Province, to meet with a fishing group or a development association and well and good. I am all for that, but this has not been made available in any form to anybody that I know of.

For all I know maybe every fisherman in Newfoundland has it. Maybe I am the only person in the whole Province who has not heard of it. Perhaps that could be, but it is highly unlikely. The government, Sir, intend to do nothing about gear prices. The minister talks about the Subsidy Programme. The government now are not paying as high a percentage of gear as they were a few years ago. The government subsidy increase has not kept up with the rise in prices. The government may not be responsible for the rise in prices, but they are responsible, they are responsible for the subsidy.

Our fishermen, Sir, our fishermen - two, four, six, - Mr. Chairman, I think we should have a quorum call, Sir. If the fisheries are of this little interest -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - - agreement -

MR. ROBERTS: What agreement? I am not aware, and I mean that, I am not aware of any agreement on anything on this. What is that?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: No, is there an agreement on what? I mean, there are a number of government members who are so unimpressed and

uninterested in the fishery. I do not mind them being unimpressed by what I say.

MR. MURPHY: Of course, that is the trouble -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, look, if I impress the Minister of Social Services I would be worried. I would be seeing a psychiatrist then. If I -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Did we agree to that?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Sure -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, then I -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - one select committee is out of town -

MR. ROBERTS: Well, have we?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Half hearted. -

MR. ROBERTS: Half hearted. Well, then I half heartedly withdraw the quorum call in that case, Your Honour. I do not mind honourable gentlemen slipping out for a cigarette. I do not do that, but I slip out for a cup of tea. I just wanted the Minister of Industrial Development back because he has been so vocal in this debate with his interjections, so unvocal with his comments.

MR. DOODY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, now, Mr.

Mr. Chairman, the gear thing -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, if there was an agreement, I was not aware of it and I am not aware that agreements are being made.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Chairman, the little green giant is at it again.

The little green giant instead of the great green giant, the little green giant, the honourable, the man who is in the - oh, I cannot say that. That is not parliamentary.

Now, Your Honour, the gear price thing obviously should be debated at length, and if it could be arranged that after we had a chance to look at the report and talk to some people, I would be very anxious to debate it. But I think all I can say now and what I know now and what the minister has said, is it is obvious we are not going to have any action from this government to do anything at all with regard to gear prices. They can keep going up and up and up and up. The government may or may not at any given year be shamed into increasing the subsidy. They are not going to do anything to ensure that the prices are held to a minimum possible limit. They are not going to do anything to take out any undue profiteering. All we have got now is a report.

It does not say in there, from what I can see on a quick glance through, exactly whom these people talked to. They did their work obviously quietly. They may have talked to every fisherman in Newfoundland. I do not know, but they have done their work quietly. The minister has kept the report quiet, kept it hidden, kept it close and then gets up and attempts to say, this is the justification for doing nothing. Well, Sir, that too is a counsel of despair.

Mr. Chairman, my finding fault with the minister is more than anything based on his attitude and the words 'counsel of despair' I think are the best and the most accurate description I can find of the minister's approach to the fisheries. He has obviously made up his mind, obviously, judging on what he said these two or three days, that the fisheries have a dim future, a grim future, a slim future. He is not prepared to do

anything more than adopt a businesslike attitude of ice water in his veins, that if they are not economic, well then we will write them off. We will close her down, boys. A balance sheet mentality which may, if one was in a school of commerce at the university or if one was running a five and ten store down town or running a business, be a very valuable attitude to take. But it is not the attitude which the Minister of Fisheries or any government should take in this Province.

When the minister finished his tirade a few minutes ago, and he will begin another tirade shortly, when the minister finished his tirade a few minutes ago, he said - I do not think I am quoting him out of context - he was referring specifically to a marketing problem or a marketing initiative, but he said that we are not going to take any initiative. We are going to look to Ottawa. Now, if there was any fairer indication of why the government of this Province have no fisheries policy other than one of negativism and of what is wrong and what cannot be done and we cannot do this and we wring our hands here and we cannot do that, it is that attitude to Ottawa. This is maybe the whole problem. To Ottawa the Newfoundland fisheries are not a terribly significant economic factor. Newfoundland is only two and a half per cent of the population of Canada. We are not the most affluent in dollar terms. We are far off. We have peculiar and particular and very real problems. It is a costly Province to govern. It is a costly Province to provide services in.

Because of our history and because of the fact that we did not Confederated until 1949, we had 100 years of social development to cram into twenty-five. The result was time and time again we were in Ottawa asking for this and asking for that and demanding this and demanding that. But, Ottawa does not look upon our fisheries in the way they should, nor does the minister. The minister thinks it is some sort of a little business, a subdivision, a division of a company or an operating division.

the whole problem is the government will not take any initiatives. What they should be doing is working out a comprehensive plan, not - that is not parliamentary either - not what they have been doing the last two or three years, five men holding the portfolios, some of them tenuously, some of them tentatively. Five men in three years stand up like nine pins and get knocked down like nine pins. And now an able man is there, able I agree, Sir, an able ambitious man, I cannot say "Yon Cassius hath a mean and hungry look," as Shakespeare did. He does not have a lean look, Sir, but he certainly has the hungry look.

AN HON. MEMBER: He is on a diet.

MR. ROBERTS: He may or may not be on a diet. I do not know about the minister's eating habits or his consumption habits, but Your Honour we have a minister now who apparently feels his role is to say no, is to look at all the grim side and to trot up the balance sheet and then if there is a loss we will lop off this division and we will close her down. He came close the other night to saying we are going to have to close down the Northeast Coast. Write it off boys. That is it. Tough. They are there, they have been there for a couple of hundred years but it is only people, write them off. Forget it. It is not economic. That is it. It is hard stuff, boy. Tough. You know I could use a few more phrases that our people would but I suspect Your Honour would object to them. Because they are not the sort of phrases people normally use in this House, nor should they use.

There is no sense of direction, no sense of commitment. The Premier has treated the fisheries, he used to pretend he was a great expert and pretend he cared and was concerned but the whole thrust of this government in the three years he has been in office has been to do anything except the fisheries. They are off now on the great kick again of industrialization and that has a valid place in the strategy for Newfoundland's development. Of course it does.

If the honourable gentlemen opposite want they can talk and we can have great sport about what may have gone on in Mr. Smallwood's Premiership. I am not sure that Mr. Smallwood always placed the right

emphasis on things. That is fine looking back. I heard no honourable gentlemen opposite raise their voices at the time. They can be as wise in hindsight, as wise in hindsight as they wish. People in Newfoundland are wise in hindsight too. That is one thing the polls do show quite clearly, that if they had had their time back things would have been very different. But coming events will cast their shadows and we will face that glee and pleasure when it comes.

But we have a minister now who reflects the administration's policy. It was a deliberate move by the Premier. The Premier is no fool. He is nobody's fool. He is a very shrewd individual, Sir. Moving the Minister of Finance as he then was into Fisheries.-

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not know who said I had better believe it but I do believe it. Sure I have no hesitation about believing it. I would not have said it if I did not believe it. The Minister of Finance in, the administration's hatchet man, the administration's accountant, the administration's toughie, moved into Fisheries to do the job and we have seen the last three days now in this committee, Sir, how he is doing the job.

Where oh where is the vision? Where oh where is the plan for the future of Newfoundland for the fisheries? If this man and that government had their way, Mr. Chairman, the fisheries of Newfoundland would not be in any form they now are or they can be. We will have Russian ships lining up to get in here and German ship and Polish ships and American and French and Swiss, for all I know, or Burmudian, coming in the Narrows, queuing up to get in there at the - you would have to book six months ahead to get at the plant. What a policy from a man who has powers of intellect! He has everything, Sir, except imagination. He has courage. He has ability. He has powers of intellect. He has powers of analysis but he has no faith in this Province and no imagination, no vision of what this Province can be and should be. That is what is wrong. And that is what he has revealed these last three days in this

committee, time and time again. Negative, terribly negative, destructive forces proving what is wrong and how we cannot do this and we cannot do that. We give her up, boys. Well, Mr. Chairman, there would have been no Newfoundland if that attitude had prevailed fifty years ago or one hundred years ago.

It is not new in Newfoundland. You can go back through our history, Mr. Chairman, you can find time and time again those councils. We heard them before Confederation, the same thing, if we go into Confederation the country is gone. You can find it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Economic union.

MR. ROBERTS: Economic union, you can find it in the, read the debates of the National Assembly, Your Honour. I do not doubt the honourable gentleman genuinely holds the views he has espoused

and I am not saying he had espoused those views in 1949. He was only ten or twelve or fifteen years old then. I do not know how old he was. He was not very old. But it is the same thing. It is a recurring theme in Newfoundland history. It is the wrong theme. I am not saying that we should throw prudence to the winds, of course not, although the gentlemen opposite now will get into this debate and say that and be reckless. That is what they will accuse me of and all that sort of thing. Well that is fine. Let them say what they want. My words will stand and fall on what I say. I will stand by what I say.

The trouble with this administration, Sir, the fatal flaw, is that they have wasted three years. They have done nothing. Ah, they talk about 112 acts. They have done nothing in the fishery, and in field after field of government activity they have done nothing. And the Minister of Fisheries, for all his ability, and by Heavens, Sir, I grant him his ability, I am not paying him compliments. I would not want to get him in trouble with his colleagues, because I am paying him compliments. I recognize his ability. I think Mr. Smallwood summed him up very well a number of years ago when he said that he would make a first-class deputy minister. He really would, Sir. He ought to be able to turn that brain power on to a problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: How about Secretary of the Treasury Board?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, he may even be Secretary of the Treasury Board.

But, Your Honour, it is not the leadership the people of Newfoundland expect. It is not the leadership the people of Newfoundland deserve. The government of this Province, Sir, must accept the fact that the fisheries are Newfoundland. They are not all of Newfoundland. They may become a smaller part of Newfoundland. But without the fisheries, Newfoundland, as we know it, will not exist. And they should be setting forth in this committee

and in this House and in this Province a policy, a programme, some plans, instead all we get is, oh, well, Ottawa. If you look through these estimates, Your Honour, the only significant development programmes are Ottawa money, eighty per cent, ninety per cent. The minister had great sport with his fling to Forteau, his trip to Forteau, in talking about how much he is going to do there and in Labrador South and on the St. Barbe Coast and St. Barbe North. But he had to point out that the money is Ottawa's. and if Ottawa does not provide the money there will be very few programmes. They will not all be gone, no. The money is not all Ottawa's. But in place after place, over half the money of this department, Sir, -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition has five minutes left of his forty-five minutes.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour I have ninety minutes according to the rules of this House, Sir.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the Deputy Speaker. I have ninety minutes and then I have ninety minutes again, you know, when some honourable gentleman speaks.

MR. CHAIRMAN: That is correct.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROBERTS: It was Witch Hunt's rule not mine. You know, blame Witch Hunt. The poor fellow is not around now. He is down between Al Evans and Haig Young, of all the ignominious fates to befall a man.

Your Honour, as I was saying, what development money there is in these estimates is, in the main, Ottawa money. Most of the Province's part goes into the salaries, travelling expenses, office expenses. Valuable enough and necessary but, Your Honour, in place after place the money that will benefit the

fishermen and the fisheries is coming from Ottawa, almost in every subhead, and that is just typical. I believe that we should put the Government of Canada to the test. I think the Newfoundland Government should go to them with a great programme, not little natterings the honourable gentleman has had and why we cannot do this and we cannot do that and ha, ha, ha, is it not hard, is it not tough, with a programme for the fisheries. If the minister were to work that out, I would be the very first to applaud him. Then he could become a great Minister of Fisheries. As he is now going, he is heading to be a great disaster. All the sadder because he has the ability. The gentleman from Gander, Sir, nobody expected very much of him. It is not his fault. The Minister of Fisheries, Sir, has the ability, and he has the knowledge. If only he had the concern and if only he had the care and if only he had the imagination and the feeling and the belief, but he has none of those, Sir, in his speeches here - and we will get another one. The Premier has revved him up. He has become the Premier's little puppy dog. The Premier has revved him

up now. That is parliamentary by the way, Sir. I have a precedent if Your Honour cares to raise the issue. Yes, he is the - and it is a case of a tail wagging the dog either. We will probably get another of his tirades now. I will be listening to it. I will be -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well a puppy dog, Sir, leaves its mark behind him, and so does the honourable gentleman, you know.

Now, Mr. Chairman, let the honourable gentleman now come up and let him have his sport. I will enjoy it. I will be listening, but it is time to adjourn for a brief cup of tea, and there is a gentleman waiting to see me.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Let him dance his only jig, his every jig, and we will come back - I assume we are back at 11:00 o'clock tomorrow morning. I would hope we can go back because I think this has been one of the more valuable debates we have had.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier says it was until I got into it. Well the Premier, fresh back from his Bermuda holiday having travelled partially there at the expense of the people of Newfoundland, you know, is well advised - let him speak in the debate.

MR. MOORES: Where are you staying this holiday?

MR. ROBERTS: Let the Premier - let the Premier. Where am I staying this holiday? At Hogan's Pond or Happy Adventure.

MR. MOORES: last year.

MR. ROBERTS: No, no, no, no, I was not anywhere last year.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: The Premier is very full of these things. I would quite gladly compare holiday sojourns with him, Sir, in any way he wishes publicly, privately, before a royal commission, before the House, anywhere he wishes, anywhere, anytime.

Now, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, the Premier used to express a concern for the fisheries. There were those who believed he knew something about the fisheries. They have shown to be wrong. There were those who believed he cared. And they are beginning to believe he is wrong. I hope the minister now will get up and outline as I asked him two days ago a plan for the fisheries, a statement of faith in this Province. Because all we have seen so far is the destructive powers, an awesome destructive power. I am the first to marvel at it. If only that energy, Mr. Chairman could be put to some useful purpose. It is like the great geyser in Yellowstone Park in the United States, its terrible, awesome energy shooting off. If only that could be channeled, Sir, if only it could be used we might not have an energy crisis. If only the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, would try to help instead of to hurt, to try to build instead of to tear down, then, Sir, he might claim a place, a place of honour instead of the place he is going to have.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Now let him come. Let him come! And with every word he utters he will prove there is truth in what I am saying. He

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: is more interested, Mr. Chairman, in debate than development.

MR. CROSBIE: That is right.

MR. ROBERTS: He is playing games. And he will play them again now. And that is fine. But if Nero fiddled while Rome burned, John jiggled while our fishermen - no that is not parliamentary, the word that - even with seven letters is not parliamentary -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, while John fiddled. That is getting parliamentary. I am not a poet. I do not have the honourable gentleman's pretensions to poetry.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: But, Sir, - no and I am not a supporter of the honourable gentleman, the junior Member for Harbour Main. And that is one of the most things I am not, I am happy to say.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Your Honour, let the Minister of Fisheries now, Sir, let him show us what he can do. Let him prove me wrong. And I hope I am. I have waited carefully and patiently for a couple of days to hear what he had to say. He could not resist the temptation to fall into his old ways. He still thinks he is in Opposition. Well if he keeps it up, Sir, he will be again.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Destroying, dragging down, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: attacking,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: Let him, let him, let him do it. Let, let him do it. But then let him get out of Fisheries and let somebody go in there who will do something for the fishermen of Newfoundland. They deserve better than that, Sir, and I hope they will get it. Now your buffet, Sir. I am going for a coffee.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, over the weekend I had the opportunity to read a little book. It is called Cycle Chemistry.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: And it talks, Mr. Chairman about -

AN HON. MEMBER: the Chemistry.

MR. BARRY: the relationship between the workings of the mind and what we take into our systems, either by the way of food or liquid -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Ingest.

MR. BARRY: Or fully ingest, yes, either purposely or accidentally. While the honourable Leader of the Opposition was going on there I was wondering if I had struck upon it, Mr. Chairman. I started to think, now, something is wrong with the honourable Leader of the Opposition -

MR. MURPHY: Everything, not something.

MR. BARRY: We have looked at various things that could be bothering him, external things. I wondered could it be something that he had ingested. Now, Mr. Chairman, it finally came upon me, the honourable Leader of the Opposition is allergic to fingernails. Yes, Mr. Chairman, he has got his fingernails right down to the quick.

MR. MURPHY: Bitten to the elbow.

MR. BARRY: Over the last few weeks since we have seen certain activity initially in Clearwater -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - and later in St. John's -

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: Am I relevant? I am sorry, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I was waiting patiently for the honourable minister to make his point relevant. It appears as if he may be wandering further afield, he is heading further out to sea than he was at the beginning. So, I suggest that the minister will have to make his remarks relevant.

MR. MURPHY: He was just getting interesting, too. Why spoil the fun?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, I thought that it was a very relevant point because we had the Leader of the Opposition stand up there for forty-five, fifty minutes and he spoke before in this debate at length, and I have yet to hear him make a constructive suggestion.

MR. MURPHY: Not a word. Not a word. Only his hatred of humanity.

MR. BARRY: We have seen, Mr. Chairman, his criticism of the Minister of Fisheries after we have had more information supplied to this honourable House and to this Committee by the Minister of Fisheries over

the last few days concerning the fishery than, I suppose, has ever been supplied to this House or any other House in history, Mr. Chairman.

There was so much information supplied, I believe it took up, what, three, four pages of the Evening Telegram after the first day, and there have been a constant stream of articles ever since, front page articles, Mr. Chairman, second page, third page, choice copy. Every time the honourable minister gets up he is choice copy. The points that he was making, Mr. Chairman, are matters that go right to the fundamentals of the fishing industry.

We have a number of problems in the fishing industry, Mr. Chairman, and it is almost, when you look at it, only it is so far fetched, it is almost as if there were a conspiracy against the fishing industry because I do not suppose in any other industry at any other time in our history we have seen so many adverse factors come to a boil at the same time, come to the crunch at the same time. We have deteriorating markets in the United States, Mr. Chairman, our prime market. At the same time as we see a tremendous decrease in fish stocks, At the same time as we see a tremendous increase in the cost to the fishermen of getting his gear, getting the fuel that he needs and so on.

We see all these things coming to a head at the same time, Mr. Chairman. No wonder the fishing industry has come upon hard times. Now, what needs to be done? Well, these adverse factors are not unrelated.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Chairman, a point of order. I just noticed something, Mr. Chairman, that I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention. It has always been the tradition and the custom in this honourable House, Sir, that members when they took their seats in this honourable House will be dressed properly, that they wear a shirt and tie. It did not make any difference what kind of a jacket you wore, Mr. Chairman. I would submit, Your Honour, that the honourable minister is not properly dressed to take his seat in this honourable House tonight and that he be asked to go out and put a necktie on.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: That is true. Now, Mr. Chairman, that has happened in other Houses recently, Mr. Chairman.

MR. NEARY: That has happened in other Houses too, Mr. Chairman.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Well I too observed the honourable minister as he came into the House this afternoon because it was my impression that this was the case so I did check the rules and I find that they are silent on the matter and I would presume that it is left to each honourable member's choice of good tastes as to what is appropriate to what he wears. I see nothing offensive about the honourable member's clothing.

MR. NEARY: He will soon be coming in with oilskins on.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, there are better men than the honourable member opposite who are not ashamed to wear oilskins.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! If the member wishes to dispute the Chair's ruling he may do so. I have explained that this did come to my attention and I do observe things as they go on and I observe members as they come and go and I noticed the wearing apparel of the honourable minister and I have checked and I find that there is nothing to prohibit it. I am pleased that I did not find it.

MR. NEARY: Prime Minister Trudeau got kicked out of the House of Commons -

MR. BARRY: But look where Mr. Trudeau got to, Mr. Chairman, look where Mr. Trudeau got to. Mr. Chairman, it is clean. It is clean, Mr. Chairman. It is washed, recently washed. I do not think it is going to affect, Mr. Chairman, the substance of what I have to say. If that is the only criticism the honourable member has let him leave, you know, if his eye is offended, or pluck it out.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Chairman, we have, as I say, these adverse factors which are not unrelated because the cost to the fishermen and the cost per pound of fish is directly related to the decreased stocks off our shores. There has to be more time, more gear, more fuel, more money spent on catching smaller colonies of fish. So if we can improve the situation with respect to fish stocks, we can improve the cost, the unit cost of the product that leaves our Province for export to the markets of the

world. There is not much we can do overnight to cure the marketing problem but if we can keep our costs reasonable and if we can diversify our markets, then this problem can be solved over the long term.

Mr. Chairman, I do not think the Newfoundland public would take very kindly to this government getting up and saying that in a month's time or in two months time the present problems of the fishery are going to be solved, because they are not. Every man in every fishing boat in this Province knows that it is going to take time to solve the problems that are presently affecting our fishery. But with the present Minister of Fisheries, with the policies that we see him developing, with the action that he has taken, already taken, in consulting with the fishermen to find out what it is that the fishermen believe should be done, because Mr. Chairman, if anybody can make constructive suggestions surely it is the people who are right on the scene, who know the problems they are experiencing.

Since, Mr. Chairman, this government has come into office I submit that we have had dialogue with fishermen. We have had consultation with the fishermen of our Province. I am happy to say for example, Mr. Chairman, that in my own district we had some very serious problems. We still do, with respect to the industrial projects that are new to Placentia Bay, that were

brought in, encouraged to come in by the previous administration with, I was going to say very little regard, I would say with absolutely no regard for the effect on the fishermen in Placentia Bay and it is ironic, Mr. Chairman, it is ironic to see the number of jobs that are adversely affected, that are endangered by the ERCO Plant and by the Come Bay Chance Refinery. We have already seen a very serious case of pollution from the ERCO Plant, a plant that is very heavily subsidized by this government. We now see the problems that the fishermen of Placentia Bay are experiencing because of the tanker traffic and the activity around the Come Bay Chance Refinery.

Mr. Chairman, this government has not stood idly by. The previous Minister of Fisheries set up a task force to investigate the problems caused to the Placentia Bay fishermen by the operation of tankers in Placentia Bay, by the refinery activity, and the present Minister of Fisheries has followed up on that report, has been out, has met with fishermen of my district, has gotten their views at first hand as to the problems that they have been experiencing and, Mr. Chairman, has brought in recommendations made by the fishermen to government, and has implemented some of them. Others are still in the process of being implemented, but government is committed to the implementation of them. For example, Mr. Chairman, anybody who has fished or been in Placentia Bay knows that for many months of the year it is called the home of the fog. The bay is enshrouded in fog and it is very hazardous to the small craft moving across the lines of traffic of the tankers when you have these severe fog conditions.

This government has made a commitment, Mr. Chairman, to the fishermen to see that the necessary equipment is provided to them to insure that they can carry on the fishing activities safely in Placentia Bay. The fishermen have also pointed out that some of the prime areas for fishing in Placentia Bay in the area of Come Bay Chance are now taken up as anchoring grounds for the tankers.

This government, Mr. Chairman, has made it clear to the fishermen that we will support them in researching and in presenting any legal case that they have against the refinery or against anyone else that has caused them the loss of fishing capability because of the activity of the refinery. It was indicated to us at our meeting that you could see a severe decline in fish catches, Mr. Chairman, a decline that is not just the normal fluctuation that you have your good years and your bad years, but it is related to specific areas of the Bay, to areas where we now have the tanker traffic and the activity from the refinery. Other areas of the Bay, last year, the year before, there were fairly good catches. In the area of the refinery, in the area where these tankers were moving and anchoring the fishermen reported a serious decline in catches.

Now, if their ability to earn a living is being interfered with they are entitled to compensation, and the way that we see, the best way of going about this is for them to retain a lawyer to have this claim researched and government is committed to, if it is necessary, to assist them in meeting the expenses of such a legal case. It may not be necessary because it may be that they can make adequate arrangements with a lawyer, that is, we have to find out from the committee of fishermen themselves. But, Mr. Chairman, that is an example of positive action on the part of this government to try and rectify some of the problems that have been created by the negligence, by the lack of attention of the people who initially made the decision to bring in this industry and locate it where it was located, in an area where

there traditionally has been good fishing, but people are still able to make a good living if they are permitted to carry on their activity unhindered by foreign activity.

I was very interested in the remarks of the Minister of Fisheries today where he pointed out that the Leader of the Opposition had gotten him off on the wrong tack when they referred to the increasing average age of our fishermen because from my experience around my district I have seen a lot of young people remain with the fishery, in some cases even return to the fishery. I have one community, South East Eight. The first time I went there I was amazed at the number of young men who were making a good living at the inshore fishery, because I had the same impression at one stage. I thought that there were very few new people moving into the fishing industry. Well, that is not the case and I am glad to see the statistics confirm the impression that I had from the experience in my own district.

I am glad to see, I think it is a good sign, that we still have young people interested in fishing. Why should they not be? They know, anybody who is familiar with the life of the fishermen knows that it is an independent life. You do not have to answer to the beck and call of an employer. You do not have to keep a nine to five or an eight to five or an eight to four routine. You name your own hours. It is not an easy life, but it is an outdoor life, healthy, independent, and, Mr. Chairman, there is a good dollar to be made in it, still to be made in it provided we ensure that the fish are there to be caught.

I was happy to see Mr. Maloney in the galleries tonight because I think that there is a great role for the Saltfish Corporation to play in the fishing industry. I think that people generally recognize that salt fish today is no longer a staple, it is a luxury food. It is very difficult to obtain even in our Province. I had the opportunity to speak to the Spanish ambassador when he was visiting the Province

a couple of months ago, and he said it is the same way in his country in Spain where traditionally salt fish has been a staple diet. It has now reached the price where it has become a luxury item, almost a gourmet dish. So, if we can encourage the development of the salt fish industry, if we can see more of our catch put into this form or product, there will at least be no problem as far as markets are concerned.

There are social factors that weigh against any great increase, I think, in the number of people who are prepared to catch and salt their fish, particularly in areas where they cannot just have it delivered to the Salfish Corporation because anybody who has ever gone out on a flake and made fish, knows that it is a pretty well full-time occupation. You put your fish out. If you do not have a dryer - I suspect, Mr. Chairman, that you are aware of the fact that the artificially dried fish does not have the same flavor or the same fantastic taste of our fish cured outside on the flakes. But, anybody who has made fish knows that it is a full-time occupation. You put it out. Half an hour or an hour later, with our weather, there is a rain storm. You have to rush out. You have to bundle it up, cover it up. Half an hour later the rain is gone and you have to put it out on the flakes again.

Traditionally this was a family activity. The whole family pitched in,

wives, children and maybe today this is no longer possible. I do not know. But it is not just a matter of saying well, if we cannot sell our fish fresh, then we can expect fishermen to salt it. Because really, we have a new way of life in the Province today, we have more demands on, I think, our fishermen's time. We do not have a system where they can, after getting away from it, just move back to salting their fish in great quantities. It will mean again to have to change their life style, and it will not be that easy. But that is one bright spot on the fisheries horizon, I think, the continuing and increasing demand for salt fish, the apparent success of the Saltfish Corporation. I am particularly interested in the smaller plants that they indicate they are prepared to get involved in. There has been a proposal prepared by the Placentia Bay - Fortune Bay Development Association that I am happy to support, a proposal to have a salt fish plant put in the Baine Harbour - Rushoon area in my district. It is something that would be put to good use in this area, Mr. Chairman. We have a large number of fishermen and some of the best fishermen in the Province. Mr. Chairman, I submit we have some of the most successful fishermen in the Province operating from that area. Indeed I believe it is from that area that we had the gentleman who received the highest return from the Saltfish Corporation in 1973. And that was considerably in excess of \$20,000, Mr. Chairman. So this is an industry where there is still good money to be made for people who are prepared to work at it provided, as I said, that we continue to see the fish available for catching. And there are some minor areas where, not minor, but minor in terms of that there is very little needs to be done in order to rectify them where we can get some good conservation measures.

The question of ghost nets, Mr. Chairman, is being brought up, and is being brought up, I notice in the papers, before our Select Committee. I was interested to see one gentleman, at least, indicate that these may not be the conservation hazard that I thought

they were. - I still suspect they are - where you have these nets made of synthetic fibres that will not rot for, I suppose, twenty, thirty or forty years - I do not know how long - but for a very long time and that can float and continue to catch fish. They fill up, the fish decay and the nets are still floating after breaking loose from their moorings, made of nylon or other synthetic material and just continuing to fish forever. I noticed, as I said, one gentleman before this Select Committee indicate that he thought that the crabs feeding on sort of the first catch of these ghost nets, in his experience, made such a mess of the nets, and they got them so tangled up and so on that they were no longer a hazard as far as fish were concerned. And that after the first catch, the fish tended to avoid them. But, Mr. Chairman, I would like to see some study go into this particular area before we can safely assume that this is not something that we should rectify. If we find that these nets are a hazard, then I submit, Mr. Chairman, that it may be time that we looked at some regulations with respect to the type of material that can be used for fishing nets. Because one thing we can be sure of, there will continue to be nets that will break loose from their moorings and will drift off and if we cannot expect them to decay within a reasonable period of time then these are going to be a hazard, and they are going to be a wasteful, destructive factor in our conservation efforts.

Mr. Chairman, perhaps the most important area where action is being taken, where very strong representations have been made by this

honourable House, by the Hon. Minister of Fisheries, by our government is with respect to the Law of the Sea Conference and the steps that must be taken to protect our offshore fishing areas. And it was at the Premiers Conference, Mr. Chairman, back in 1973 - I believe it was 1973 - in Prince Edward Island that our Premier got this initiative started when he received the unanimous support of all the Premiers present, Premiers from each Province of Canada for our representation to go to Ottawa requesting that unilateral action be taken in the event that it cannot be achieved by a negotiation with the foreign countries fishing off our shores.

We now have the Canadian Delegation actively engaged in working on doing exactly what this government have indicated that they should be doing. Let us hope that they take the hard nosed approach in the negotiations in Geneva that they should take, if they ever hope to get any success. If we can ever expect, Mr. Chairman, to get control, not just out to the 200 miles, but out to the Margin, the edge of the Continental Margin we have to see the Federal Delegation at the Law of the Sea Conference take a tougher stand than they have been taking at other International Conferences. And the Member for Bonavista South has already pointed out the inadequacy of the representation made at the ICNAF Conference. I just do not understand, Mr. Chairman, how we can say that ICNAF is doing a good job when the quotas they set in almost every area are in excess of the catch for the last two, three, four years. I cannot understand how they can say that you can set a certain figure for the sustainable yield, a figure which is more than has been caught in any year, when we see a continued decline in catch. That is whistling in the dark, Mr. Chairman. It would be better if there were no ICNAF than if we had our public, the people in Newfoundland, in our Province and other provinces assuming that because we have this organization that therefore it is looking out for our interests. Because I do not think that the efforts of ICNAF, in the past, have been adequate to conserve the fish stocks.

Mr. Chairman, I do not want to take any more time of this Committee.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: But there are -

MR. MURPHY: It is interesting. Everybody is interested in what you are saying.

MR. BARRY: But there are another fifteen or twenty items that I would like to refer to.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: we can go on until 3:00 o'clock in the morning.

MR. BARRY: We have -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: We have three communities out in Placentia Bay, Mr. Chairman, that are presently isolated, where the main, and indeed the only occupation is one of fishing, total dependence on the inshore fishery. And there are many areas, Mr. Chairman, around our Province, the Northeast Coast particularly, where our people are dependent upon a continuing inshore fishery. I for the life of me cannot understand how anybody can be stupid enough to say that we should forget about the inshore fishery, we should continue to develop our offshore fishery but forget about the inshore fishery. When you have a possibility of continuing to see the fish rolling ashore, rolling ashore after the caplin as they have for the last 400 years of this Province's history, coming in to the fishermen instead of it being necessary for the fishermen to go out to them, eating the rocks. But they will not come ashore, Mr. Chairman, if they have nothing to follow. They will not come ashore if we permit the caplin to be fished and over fished and destroyed.

I was speaking one time to an engineering professor at the University and he had this great scheme for fishing where he saw

that if we put a cable out to Flemish Cap and you sort of have a continuing, revolving line with hooks on it and you just keep that running between the Flemish Cap and here, a long trawl and you just keep that operating and you keep pulling the fish ashore.

Well, you have almost the same mechanism in the natural cycle that mother nature has provided in her wisdom. You have the cod chasing the caplin and the caplin for their own reasons, their own esoteric reasons deciding that they need to roll up on the beaches. So, you have the cod following the caplin into shore. You have the caplin doing part of the fishermen's work for them. Now, we see man in his wisdom deciding, ah, ha, we do not need that mechanism. Let us get out there and let us start cleaning out the caplin. What is going to happen? We have seen statistics, Mr. Chairman, where the decline in the catch of the inshore fishery is directly related in particular areas to the amount of offshore fishing.

We have seen, for example, off Labrador, in years when there have been bad ice conditions and the trawlers have not been able to do their usual scraping of the banks off Labrador, when they have not been able to have the same concentrated effort on the offshore stocks of fish, we have seen a good inshore fishery in Labrador the following year. This has happened enough to see that in all probability there is a direct correlation and why should there not be. If you catch more fish offshore, then there is less fish to come inshore. So, we should take a hard look, Mr. Chairman, at what is necessary. Once we get control out to the edge of the Continental Margin or the 200 miles, if that is all the Canadian delegation is going to be able to come home with, and the indications that we are getting from Geneva are that there appears to be consensus developing on up to 200 miles, outside of that, not so clear.

Let us assume that we get control, Canada gets control out to 200 miles. Mr. Chairman, we should not be complacent enough to assume that therefore the problems of the inshore fishermen are going to be solved because they have as many problems with our Canadian

trawlers coming inshore, tearing up their gear, ignoring in some cases, I would suspect, quotas that are set in particular areas. So, we are going to have a responsibility once we get control out to 200 miles, we are going to have a responsibility to develop proper conservation methods. I think one of the first serious indepth studies that should be done is the one with respect to the caplin and with respect to the vulnerability of this particular fish stock to overfishing.

Now, this is an area, as I have mentioned before, where I do not think enough money has been spent, enough work has been done, the area of research into our various fish species either for conservation purposes or, Mr. Chairman, to permit better catches because the more information we get about a species, the more we learn about their life cycles, the better we are able to plan, the better we are able to know what to do in order to catch them. We have seen developments over the last several years by other countries in most cases. We have seen the Spanish pair trawling. We have seen other countries bringing in new technology. We have seen the Russian mother ships, the factory ships. But, all the new ideas, all the research seems to be done in other countries. There is very little done in Canada. This is where we are going to have to see a great increase in federal funds. We are going to have to see a much greater effort put into this area of research ~~once we gain control~~

once we gain control, because just getting control is not going to be enough. We are going to have to give direction to our own fishermen. And here is where the federal responsibility is that has not been lived up to in the past.

Another area, Mr. Chairman, very briefly, where I think some research and some new policies are needed is with respect to the providing of bait for our fishermen. I imagine if you go around this Province, every community, every fishermen in every community would be able to tell you how frustrated he is to see the schools of herring and mackerel in the bays in the Summer months which he knows that are going to be used, they are going to be useful to him for bait come Fall, but he has got nowhere to put them. And he knows that come September, October he is going to be buying herring, mackerel shipped in from Nova Scotia, shipped in from outside of the Province. Under the Terms of Union there is a clear federal responsibility for providing a bait service. It is unfortunate, Mr. Chairman, that this Province has had to, not wanted to, not wanted to get into an area of federal jurisdiction, but has had to get into this area - has had to, for example, in my district get involved in putting in a cold storage room where fishermen could put just not bait, Mr. Chairman, but baited trawls, when a fishermen gets his gear baited up the evening before, and wakes up the next morning and finds there is a gale on, finds that it is too stormy to go out that day. What does he do with his gear and his baited gear? If he has got a cold room, if he has got a freezer, okay he is all right. If he does not, what does he do?

Mr. Chairman, there are other areas with respect to the provision of bait for our inshore fishermen where we can have new and improved policies. It is an area where, as I say, there is a clear responsibility under the Terms of Union for federal involvement. They have not lived up to their responsibilities here. It does not appear that they are going to. So it appears that we are just going to have to do it ourselves. And I am sure that the Minister of Fisheries is aware of these problems, and he is already working on them in many areas.

AN HON. MEMBER: Night and day.

MR. BARRY: Night and day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. MURPHY: You are the one.

MR. ROBERTS: It will soon be 11:00 o'clock.

MR. MURPHY: Call it 11:00 "Leo".

MR. BARRY: Oh, yes my fisheries access road.

Mr. Chairman, I have another little community out in Placentia Bay, Petit Forte. It was brought up with respect to the poor coastal service it is getting. It is onshore. It is not an island. But it is not connected by road to our highway, our provincial highway system.

MR. MURPHY: Why did you not let us know, we would have ...

MR. BARRY: It is about twelve or thirteen miles, Mr. Chairman.

But it is going to be an expensive road to build. There are a fair number of rivers between it and the Burin Peninsula Highway, some indraughts that you have to go around, and it is going to cost a few dollars, Mr. Chairman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Another hundred miles.

MR. BARRY: No, it is not another hundred miles, but it is about twelve miles as the crow flies, but unfortunately -

MR. MURPHY: How far if she walks?

MR. BARRY: Unfortunately, yes, there are very few cars fly or swim, so we will have to detour around a few indraughts, and across a few rivers.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: But, Mr. Chairman, I made a proposition to the -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Yes, I made a proposition to the Hon. Mr. Jamieson, our minister responsible for DREE and I passed that along to the Minister of Fisheries as well -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: and I know he is making representation, that why do we not consider a fisheries access road? You have a large number of fishermen going back to Placentia Bay in the Summertime, Mr. Chairman,

going back I might say to live under very primitive conditions because of a resettlement programme which, I cannot say it was all bad, but I could say --

AN HON. MEMBER: ... Red Island.

MR. BARRY: I could say it was over-done.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: I could say, Mr. Chairman, that it would probably been better if we had kept a centre in Placentia Bay where fishermen could receive services from, where they could move out from, and go to their fishing banks --

MR. MURPHY: The Merasheen Banks.

MR. BARRY: The Merasheen Banks, the O'derin Bank, to the Brule Bank to the other fishing grounds where they are now going back to, Mr. Chairman, where they are still -- they are going back in the Summer and making a good living. But they live under the most primitive conditions. We have seen one unfortunate accident, Mr. Chairman, with some loss of life, of people moving back and forth between one of the islands in the Bay, and Placentia in this case.

But, Mr. Chairman, I submit that we should consider a fisheries access road out to Petit Forte to open up Placentia Bay, Mr. Chairman, to permit our fishermen to carry on the fishery in Placentia Bay the way they are accustomed to, and the way they should be permitted to continue.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. BARRY: Now, Mr. Chairman, these are a very few --

MR. MURPHY: I will do that the first thing in the morning.

MR. BARRY: a few constructive suggestions, Mr. Chairman, to make to the Minister of Fisheries, to make in consideration to this House. I submit, that the Leader of the Opposition could make a few constructive suggestions as well.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. ROBERTS: It is 11:00 o'clock.

HON. MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: We have got to go until 2:00 or something is it not?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: I move that the Committee rise and report minimal progress and ask leave to sit again.

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

MR. CHAIRMAN (DUNPHY): Mr. Speaker, the Committee of Supply have considered the matters to them referred and have directed me to report having made some progress and ask leave to sit again.

On motion report received and adopted, Committee ordered to sit again on tomorrow.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand suspended or deferred, and that this House at its rising do adjourn until 11:00 o'clock in the forenoon tomorrow, Friday, April 4.

On motion the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Friday, April 4, at 11:00 A.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

APRIL 2, 1975 and APRIL 3, 1975

April 2/75

Answer to Question 17, March 11, 1975, asked by Stephen A. Neary (Bell Island):
To ask the Minister of Public Works and Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

QUESTION: (1) What is the nature of the arrangements which have been made by Government for the telecommunication of press releases, statements and bulletins both in written form and in verbal form by manner of voice tapes by the Newfoundland Information Service to radio stations, television stations and newspapers in the Province?

ANSWER: On application by media with daily service, TWX teleprinters with two-way universal and selective transmission capability, have been installed for print delivery.

QUESTION: (2) On what date did this telecommunication service commence?

ANSWER: September 1, 1972.

QUESTION: (3) For each radio station, television station and newspaper office which has a telecommunication linkage with the Newfoundland Information Service of Government (a) what is the name of this station or office (b) what is the name of the town or city in which it is located (c) what is the quantity, type, make and model of the telecommunication equipment that has been provided it for this purpose (d) what is the monthly cost to that station or newspaper or to the company or corporation which owns or operates it for the operation of this telecommunication equipment and for the information service which is provided it by means of this equipment?

ANSWER:

- (a) CJON Radio and Television
- (b) St. John's
- (c) TWX 33 P. S. R., Single -Station Dialer, I. B. L. s.
- (d) NIL

- (a) VOXM Radio
- (b) St. John's
- (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.s.
- (d) NIL

- (a) CBC Radio and Television
- (b) St. John's
- (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.s.
- (d) NIL

- (a) The Daily News
 - (b) St. John's
 - (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.S.
 - (d) NIL
-
- (a) The Canadian Press
 - (b) St. John's
 - (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.S.
 - (d) NIL
-
- (a) CFCB Radio
 - (b) Corner Brook
 - (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.S.
 - (d) NIL
-
- (a) The Western Star
 - (b) Corner Brook
 - (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.S.
 - (d) NIL
-
- (a) CHCM Radio
 - (b) Marystown
 - (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.S.
 - (d) NIL
-
- (a) CJOX Radio
 - (b) Grand Bank
 - (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.S.
 - (d) NIL
-
- (a) CJCR Radio
 - (b) Gander
 - (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.S.
 - (d) NIL
-
- (a) CBG
 - (b) Gander
 - (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.S.
 - (d) NIL
-
- (a) CBT
 - (b) Grand Falls
 - (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.S.
 - (d) NIL
-
- (a) CJCN
 - (b) Grand Falls
 - (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.S.
 - (d) NIL

- (a) CKCM
- (b) Grand Falls
- (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.s.
- (d) NIL

- (a) CBYT Television
- (b) Corner Brook
- (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.s.
- (d) NIL

- (a) CJWN Radio and Television
- (b) Corner Brook
- (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.s.
- (d) NIL

- (a) CFSX Radio
- (b) Stephenville
- (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.s.
- (d) NIL

- (a) CFGN Radio
- (b) Port aux Basques
- (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.s.
- (d) NIL

- (a) CFLW Radio
- (b) Wabush
- (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.s.
- (d) NIL

- (a) CBC Radio
 - (b) Goose Bay
 - (c) TWX 33 P.S.R., Single-Station Dialer, I.B.L.s.
 - (d) NIL
-

.....4

QUESTION:

- (4) What is (a) the monthly cost to Government and (b) the total cost to Government since the date of installation and as of a current date for (1) the installation and (2) the operation and maintenance of telecommunications equipment provided for the communication of press releases, statements, et cetera by the Newfoundland Information Service including such telecommunications equipment located at radio stations, television stations and newspaper offices in the Province and at the offices of the Newfoundland Information Service at Confederation Building, St. John's and at Government Buildings at any other location in the Province?

ANSWER:

- (a) \$696.65 per month for seven original units at the commencement of service in September 1, 1972.
- \$1,595 per month for 13 additional units provided as per agreement with Newfoundland Telephone Company, effective April 1, 1974.
- (b) (1) \$275 for original units
\$580 for additional units
- (2) \$40,736.15 subject to an adjustment of approximately \$4,000 to compensate for operating problems experienced for the first few weeks following installation.

APR 3 1975

The following information is supplied by the Honourable
Minister of Mines and Energy, in reply to the Question No. 14
(Mr. Neary, Bell Island) Order Paper dated 10th March, 1975.

QUESTION 1 (1) Were any payments made by the Department of Mines
and Energy during the fiscal year ending March 31,
1974 to Nacon Limited, McLean Public Relations,
International Events or to any other company with
which Mr. George McLean is, or was associated
for the production of slide presentations, films,
booklets or brochures?

ANSWER 1 (1) No.

QUESTION (2) If the answer to (1) above is affirmative, for
what purposes were these slides, films, booklets,
or brochures used?

ANSWER (2) Not applicable.

QUESTION (3) If the answer to (1) above is affirmative, what
was the total amount paid to said company for this
work?

ANSWER (3) Not applicable.

QUESTION (4) Were public tenders called for this work and,
if so, on what basis were contracts awarded for
this work?

ANSWER (4) Not applicable.

CONTENTS

April 3, 1975	Page
Personal Privilege	
Mr. Earle rose to report receiving an anonymous threatening letter on the letterhead of the Opposition. He suggested the matter be referred to the police.	2897
Mr. Roberts disclaimed knowledge of the letter and supported Mr. Earle's suggestion.	2898
Mr. Simmons rose to protest an alleged threat of physical violence purportedly made against him the previous day in the Legislature by Mr. Morgan. Supported by Mr. Roberts, Mr. Simmons moved that barring an unqualified withdrawal Mr. Morgan be suspended for one day.	2900
Mr. Speaker took the matter under advisement.	2903
Reports of Standing and Select Committees	
Mr. Earle tabled the regulations under the Retail Sales Act, 1972 as amended.	2905
Answers to Questions for which Notice has been Given	
Mr. Rousseau gave his department's policy on layoff notices issued to a number of watchmen in response to a question asked the previous day by Capt. Winsor.	2905
Mr. Barry tabled negative answers to Question No.14 placed by Mr. Neary.	2907
Oral Questions	
The availability of the Premier to visiting delegations and individuals. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	2907
Mr. Neary gave notice to raise the issue on the debate on adjournment.	2907
Request for listings of road upgrading and paving projects. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Rousseau.	2908
Mr. Simmons gave notice that he wished to raise the issue during the debate on adjournment.	2908
Consideration to moving snow clearing equipment from the Southern sections of the Province to the Great Northern Peninsula to deal with late Spring storms. Mr. F. Rowe, Mr. Rousseau.	2909
On a Point of Order Mr. Crosbie argued that Mr. Simmons had not asked a proper question of Mr. Rousseau, that no answer had been given, and that the matter could not therefore be raised on the adjournment of the House.	2910
Mr. Roberts.	2911
Mr. Speaker, reserved his ruling to hear the tapes and read the transcript of the exchange.	2911
Use of the CFLCo jet to transport the Premier and his party to Halifax enroute to Bermuda on vacation. Mr. Neary, Premier Moores.	2912
Mr. Neary gave notice he wished to debate the issue on the adjournment of the House.	2913
Whether a decision had been given by Government on a request for financial assistance from Teach-A-Tot day care centre. Mr. Neary, Mr. Murphy.	2913

CONTENTS - 2

Oral Questions (Continued)	Page
Day care centre officials apprized of government's decision. Mr. Neary, Mr. Murphy.	2913
Need for day care centre officials to be apprized of Government's decision. Mr. Neary, Mr. Murphy.	2914
Expansion of the oil refinery at Come-By-Chance. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	2915
Discussions on a resettlement scheme between the Governments of Newfoundland and Canada. Mr. Neary, Mr. Reid.	2917
Elaboration sought. Mr. Neary, Mr. Reid.	2917
Agreement between the Governments on communities to which people may move with financial assistance. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Reid.	2918
Table list of communities involved. Mr. Neary, Mr. Reid.	2918
Discussions with Canada Manpower on a similar programme. Mr. Neary, Mr. Reid.	2918
Methods of moving residences. Mr. Neary, Mr. Reid.	2919
Number of requests from people wanting to resettle. Mr. Neary, Mr. Reid.	2920
Steps to be taken to improve conditions on the road which serves the communities of Mount Carmel, North Harbour and Colinet. Mr. Roberts, Mr. Rousseau.	2920
 Orders of the Day	
<u>Observation of the ninety-sixth anniversary of The Evening Telegram.</u> Mr. Roberts, Mr. Crosbie.	2921
Committee of Supply (Fisheries Estimates, 1401-01)	2921
Mr. Crosbie	2922
Mr. F.B. Rowe	2946
Mr. Neary	2957
 Debate on Adjournment	
Contract negotiations with those employed in the health sector, e.g., interns, residents etc.	
Mr. Roberts	2977
Mr. Crosbie	2980
Availability of Premier to visiting delegations and individuals.	
Mr. Neary	2983
Premier Moores	2986
Government's road building, ungrading and paving programme.	
Mr. Simmons	2989
Mr. Rousseau	2992
The House adjourned at 6:00 p.m.	2994

CONTENTS - 3

The House resumed	2995
Committee of the Whole (Fisheries Estimates, 1401-01)	2995
Mr. Neary	2995
Mr. Crosbie	3008
Mr. Roberts	3042
Mr. Barry	3071
Adjournment	3090