

Indexed by S.J. MacK.

Resolution Report of The Comm. on Fishery Industry -  
Amendments to same (P. 7526; 29) (P. 7503-7721)  
ruled out of order carried



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
OF  
NEWFOUNDLAND

---

---

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 56

---

---

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, JUNE 24, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

Indexed 21/11/75 (SJM; R.M.)

The House met at 11:00 A.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is a pleasure for me to welcome to the galleries today a delegation from the town of Clovertown comprised of a councillor, Mr. Samuel Saunders, and the town manager, Mr. Avalon Sparks. On behalf of all honourable members I welcome you here and trust that your visit is most interesting.

PRESENTING PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture,

HON. H. COLLINS (MINISTER OF FORESTRY AND AGRICULTURE): Mr. Speaker,

I beg to present a petition from some 160, 170 - 166 voters to be exact-from Cottrell's Cove and Moore's Cove area in Notre Dame Bay which is the far end of Your Honour's district. We all know of course that Your Honour cannot present the petition in the House but I would like to go on record as announcing your wholehearted support, I am sure, for the prayer of the petition.

That is that the road be paved this Summer from the beginning of Cottrell's Cove around the community to the end of the road in Moore's Cove in Notre Dame Bay. Mr. Speaker, there is a considerable amount of work being done in that particular area. The road, I understand, from Botwood, which is the Northern extremity of my district of Gander, through to Point Leamington is being paved this Summer. I would hope, Sir, that the Minister of Transportation and Communications can see fit to do something for the people of Cottrell's Cove and Moore's Cove. As I said, I am sure you are solidly behind them. It gives me great pleasure in introducing the petition and referring it to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador North.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House support the petition presented by the Minister of Agriculture and Forestry. We too feel, Sir, that it is unfortunate that the minister is not in his seat. But, if you are looking through the papers nowadays

you see a considerable amount of tendering being called for different areas of the Province - very little, I might add, in Labrador - but different areas where there is a considerable amount of road work going on. We feel that the Minister of Transportation and Communications should take this petition seriously and see that something is done for the people in that part of the district.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the president of the Treasury Board is in a position now to tell us what the loss of revenue is to the Province as a result of the liquor store employees' strike?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

HON. W. DOODY (MINISTER OF INDUSTRIAL DEVELOPMENT): I have to congratulate the honourable member on his tenacity, Sir. That is three days in a row. The loss runs I think to about \$500,000 a month. At least, that has been the projection. It is very difficult to say whether it will be that much. It is unlikely because of the beer sales and the catch-up when the strike finishes and the stores reopen. But, judging on last year's revenue, that is the amount that the Corporation figures, \$500,000 a month.

MR. WOODWARD: A month?

MR. DOODY: A month.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question. Sir, would I assume then that the Province in its penny-wise pound-foolish attitude has lost \$1 million revenue so far, over \$1 million?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable member can assume what he wishes. It is his own mathematics. I have given him the answer to the question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Social Services and Rehabilitation. Sir, would the minister inform the House what the government's policy is now on assisting workers who have either been locked out on strike or have refused to cross picket lines as a matter of principle? What is the government's stated policy on this particular matter now?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Social Services.

HON. A. MURPHY (MINISTER OF SOCIAL SERVICES): Mr. Speaker, our policy has not changed. The policy, the law is that anybody who leaves their work voluntarily will not receive assistance. That is our legal stand on it, Sir.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question then, Sir. Can I assume from the minister's answer that families of those on strike or locked out or who refuse to cross picket lines in case of need will be assisted in accordance with the spirit of the Canada Assistance Plan?

HON. J. CROSBIE: (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, that question is out of order. It draws an inference about

what the spirit of the Canada Assistance Plan is.

MR. THOMS: Answer the question.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, would the minister give me a simple 'yes' or 'no' answer? Will the families of these people be assisted?

MR. MURPHY: Yes or no -

MR. NEARY: Yes, a simple 'yes' or 'no' answer.

MR. MURPHY: - depending on the status as covered under the law.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Provincial Affairs. Would the minister care to react to a statement made recently by Councillor Gullage that the minister is passing the buck on a new city dump? What does the minister have to say about that? Has any decision been taken on that matter yet?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Provincial Affairs and The Environment.

HON. W. G. DAWE (MINISTER OF PROVINCIAL AFFAIRS AND THE ENVIRONMENT):

Mr. Speaker, the City Council of St. John's is well aware of our stand on this matter and that we are waiting for those people to either select a consulting firm to investigate an alternate site, which was suggested by the Hon. Minister of Health some time ago, who was then M.H.A. for St. John's South, or either that to approach the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing and sit down with these people to determine what is to happen with regard to the selection of a new sanitary landfill site or decide if they want to carry on with Robin Hood Bay in which event they would have to, of course, upgrade the area and undertake to manage it in a much better manner than they have been up to this point.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Sir, could tell the House whether or not a telegram or a phone call has gone out to the municipality of Wabana informing them that they will be granted an extension to their water and sewer lines this year?

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

HON. A. B. PECKFORD (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Not to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker.

7  
MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. Will there be a telegram or a phone call going out to the Town of Wabana? Will there be an extension of water and sewerage on Bell Island this year?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is a good question.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Could the minister give me a 'yes' or 'no' answer if approval will be granted for an extension to water and sewerage on Bell Island this year?

MR. PECKFORD: No I cannot, Mr. Speaker.

V  
MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Sir. Would the minister tell us when he would be in a position to make a decision and to advise the council whether or not they are going to get financial assistance to extend badly needed and replace badly needed worn-out DOSCO water and sewer lines on Bell Island?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, that is another good question to which I cannot give a definitive answer.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bonavista North.

X  
MR. P. S. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Municipal Affairs. Could the minister inform this honourable House if the list that was publicized lately as to water and sewer projects in the Province, is this the final list for the year or will there be other projects approved as of this date or after this date?

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

MR. PECKFORD: For all intents and purposes, Mr. Speaker, this is the final list for water and sewer projects for the Province this year.

MR. THOMS: Another question for the minister. Could the minister explain to this honourable House why there is a decrease in the building starts across the Province this year? Or housing starts?

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, there is not a decrease in building starts and there is not a decrease in housing starts. As a matter of fact under the Rural Loans Programme administered by Newfoundland and Labrador Housing Corporation there has been an increase in the amount of mortgages taken up to about 225 in the first two months of this year for which funds were available, namely, May and June. With the federal budget which disasterously tries to deal with the housing situation in Canada, the \$200 million that was announced last night will mean another 8,000 housing starts in the whole of Canada for 1975 which is a terrible situation and one which I do not think the country can handle, one which the country cannot put up with, nor can the Province.

MR. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Could the honourable minister tell us if it is true or false that there is a decrease of sixteen per cent as of the end of May this year in housing starts in Newfoundland?

MR. PECKFORD: That is news to me, Mr. Speaker. I understood that we were still above last year's number for this period.

MR. THOMS: The minister should catch up with the facts in this Province. Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Tourism. I wonder could the minister inform this House if he intends to extend the dates on the applications for moose and caribou licenses because many of the outlets for applications have ran out of licenses as of last week?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. T. HICKEY: I have no information on it, Mr. Speaker. It has not been brought to my attention

but I certainly will look into it. I cannot inform the House that we intend to extend it. It has not come to my attention as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Could I get back, Sir, to the potato problem again in the Province and ask the Minister of Agriculture what the position is now on the surplus of potatoes in the warehouses of the Newfoundland farmers? What is happening now concerning the provincial subsidy or federal subsidy or the government buying the potatoes? What is the policy now?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

HON. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, before we get to the policy, maybe we should look at the situation which applies. All of the potatoes in the Central Newfoundland area, Bishops Falls- Wooddale area, have been sold. The greater proportion of them were sold last Fall and early Winter. The great majority of the potatoes which were in storage in Musgravetown- Lethbridge area have been sold with the exception of a number of blue potatoes. All of the whites have been sold, practically. In the area of Pasadena practically all have been sold. There are a great number of blue potatoes still in storage in the Robinson's area on the West Coast. Some of those potatoes are rapidly reaching a stage of deterioration whereby they might not be permitted to be sold. People just will not buy them.

The exact figures, Mr. Speaker, I do not have with me but government is taking a look at the situation now. We do know that the federal people have changed their policy in terms of paying the federal subsidy. It was only paid in the first place to people after they sold the potatoes, after they produced receipts where potatoes were sold. I understand that the federal subsidy is available now on all potatoes which are in storage and that the subsidy will be paid on potatoes which might have to be dumped. It could very well be some blue potatoes have to be dumped. With regard to the possibility of a provincial subsidy, that is under consideration.



MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker: Would the minister tell the House if the government announced policy, announced by the Premier that government institutions would purchase these potatoes that were in the hands of the Newfoundland farmers, if that policy has been put into effect?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Forestry and Agriculture.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding, and probably some of the ministers who have some jurisdiction can confirm this, but

it is my understanding that the institutions across Newfoundland are buying Newfoundland potatoes and have been for some time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question: Is the minister aware that already, I think probably over the weekend, since Friday, that 2,000 sacks of potatoes have been buried in Lethbridge, 2,000 sacks of potatoes and if these farmers will receive the subsidy? Will they be subsidized by the provincial government for their losses or do they just have to write this off as a dead loss?

MR. COLLINS: Well, Mr. Speaker, as I said in my few remarks earlier in answer to the first question, the federal subsidy is available to potatoes in the event they have to be dumped. That is a change of federal policy this past few days. The question of a provincial subsidy being made available is under consideration, and that is all I can say at this time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the minister aware that while these potatoes are being dumped in the Lethbridge area that potatoes are being sold locally in the stores imported from California, and if there is anything the provincial government can do about this?

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, there are no barriers at Port aux Basques or North Sydney on canned milk or potatoes or beef or anything else. It is a free market. Now, if there are vegetables coming in from California or Maine or New York, then of course that falls in the area of jurisdiction of the federal government because we are dealing then with an international border. We are concerned about the potatoe situation. I might say for the information of the House that the prices for potatoes have increased dramatically this past two or three weeks. Prices are back up to \$3.50, \$3.75, I understand. And there is every indication that if the potatoes can be held in storage that the farmers might get the prices which they want and possibly a better price than they did receive last fall.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Labrador North.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask a question of the

Minister of Mines and Energy. In the light of the announcement, recent announcement with the American withdrawal and the reduction in personnel at Goose Bay come June of next year, June of 1976, I would like to ask the minister what is his policy on the development of the Gull Island site? What industry are they looking at? Do they have a plan? How many of the service industries that will be contracting on the site will be contained in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area? I know he was working on this type of programme. And what input will be into the area in terms of the number of jobs into the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

HON. L. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, there has been no change in government's policy nor is there any need for any change in government policy since government policy right from the beginning of the planning of the Gull Island project has been to the effect that the maximum in the way of jobs, the maximum in the way of service industry, the maximum economic benefit for the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area will be supplied, as much as is consistent with good, common sense and sound economics.

The question as to what services will be supplied from Goose Bay-Happy Valley as opposed to what will be supplied directly on site have not yet been finally determined or not yet, at least I have not yet received the information from the Corporation. The planning is actively underway now in this respect, and the policy of the government is that as much as possible as far as this is consistent with sound planning for the project, as much as possible the benefits should go to the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area. That is for the activity connected with the construction of the dam site itself. So, there has been no need for any change in government policy. I expect to be in the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area either late this month or early in July. The time has not yet been set. But we have made a commitment with the town council of Goose Bay-Happy Valley to meet with them to explain and to have people from Newfoundland Hydro there to explain just how they see this

project proceeding. There are problems, there are concerns, I know, on the part of the council, for example, with respect to men employed on site.

There are obviously going to have to be a certain number of men employed directly on the Gull Island site because - what do we have? Sixty miles distance between Goose Bay-Happy Valley and the Gull Island Site? There will have to be some men employed directly at the dam site itself.

Now, one of the concerns of the town is that you will see the families of these men moving up to the Goose Bay-Happy Valley area to be closer to the husbands, say, or the wife, whoever is working in the area, and this will put a heavy burden on the existing infrastructure of the town. Well, this is understandable and we are

sympathetic to the problems that may be caused there and this is one of the areas that we are trying to keep in mind in planning the project.

But again as far as the closing down of the base is concerned, as far as I can see-I will be happy to receive any comment to the contrary from the honourable member-but as far as I can see there is no need for any change in government policy when the initial policy was to maximize the benefits for the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area.

MR. WOODWARD: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. When the minister visits Goose Bay can he tell the House if that plan will be into effect then, will you be able to inform the people of what is going to take place and what sort of an imput the development is going to have on the area? At that time, will you have it as early as the end of this month or early July, so you can put people's minds at ease?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I am not able to say to the honourable member if we will have all the t's crossed and i's dotted at that time. We will have information to supply to the town and we will continue to supply any new information as quickly as we receive it to the town so that the town can be kept fully abreast of developments as they occur or as they are about to occur, and to try and give the town as much forward notice as possible.

You have to keep in mind, Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the honourable member he should keep in mind also that we are proceeding with the utmost of speed in the planning of this project, to get this project underway because it is of such crucial importance to the province and this is putting pressure on the staff of Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro Corporation as far as the limited resources, limited personnel they have and they will do everything possible within their power, I am sure, to keep the community informed. Now the community may complain that they do not have adequate notice. All I can say, Mr. Speaker, is that we will give as much notice as possible, as much notice as humanly possible, but that the town must be aware of the fact that we are proceeding with some

haste, with careful planning but at the same time with the utmost of haste to get this project underway.

MR. WOODWARD: But do not keep it secret.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this administration keeps nothing secret.

MR. WOODWARD: Not likely, Mr. Speaker! I have a question for the Minister of Fisheries and Intergovernmental Affairs. As a result of the announcement and the bungling that went on, the handling of the announcement, the withdrawal of the Americans from the Goose Bay area, which came as no surprise, I might add, to the people of the area. It may have surprised a few provincial ministers or a few federal ministers.

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

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, the question I am asking of the Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs is if he has now opened negotiations with Ottawa with respect to the economy of the Goose Bay area. Are we looking, first are we looking at some step-up or an increase in the Canadian Forces role in Goose Bay to maintain the present status of the airport - we feel we have to have some presence of military if not the airport facilities will revert back to civil aviation which is quite a reduction down from the present status of the airport - and what other negotiations are going on between his government in Ottawa with regards to the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, there certainly will be negotiations with the Canadian Government and the only negotiations there have been so far are those that have been ongoing with the Goose Bay Task Force. But there will be discussions with the Canadian Government now on the role of the Department of Transport who are now preparing to make a statement on what their position is going to be and we will certainly be urging that the Goose Bay base be more heavily utilized by Canadian military forces and that the Department of Transport continue their full role up there so that the base should maintain their present strength of personnel there.

So this will be done but at the moment, apart from what is being done by the Task Force, we have not had a chance yet. But these discussions will be going ahead with the Government of Canada.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Can the honourable Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs tell the House how they are going about planning to negotiate with Ottawa in this respect?

Will we go the route of the project group or will they go another route? Will there be a more definite plan and more definite in the negotiations in the terms of reference?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I believe it is our feeling that something more is needed than just the Coose Bay task force, and that this will be conducted at a ministerial level. What kind of organization will be set up after that then we would have to see how it can be carried on satisfactorily. But certainly more emphasis has to be given to it. And it will be, initially, we will meet with ministers of the Government of Canada who are involved and try to see how much more push and drive can be given to this and then whether there is a new organization required or a beefing of the Goose Bay task force, that will have to be decided. But, first we will try to have a ministerial meeting with Mr. Jamieson, the Minister of Transport, and those affected.

MR. WOODWARD: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker: Can the minister tell the House when, what is the time frame for the negotiations? Will we be doing it within the next week or the next ten days or two weeks or will it go on into months before we reopen new negotiations?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We will be in touch with the responsible ministers of the Government of Canada this week to arrange a meeting as soon as we can.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the Minister of Justice, Sir. I would like to ask the Minister of Justice if he has received directly or indirectly representation from residents of Flowers Hill, Central and Clifford Streets, Sir, regarding increasing acts of vandalism and terrorizing behavior of what the people down there allege to be a gang of punks and they are completely frustrated and may form -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - a vigilante -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!



MR. NEARY: - committee.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable Member for Bell Island is making a speech.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister care to -

MR. HICKMAN: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not received it.

MR. SPEAKER: Orders of the Day.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if we still have -

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: If we still have a moment, Sir. I wonder if the Minister of Justice then could tell the House whether or not he has taken any action on a petition, on the request from the Parents Committee of Conception Bay South to improve the safety precautions in that area because of the number of accidents and the number of children that have been killed in that area?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, we had a very excellent meeting with a group from Conception Bay South, the PTA, representatives of the PTA last week. In attendance were the honourable the Minister of Industrial Development, the honourable Minister of Provincial Affairs, and the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications and myself. During discussions there were many items but all were in the field, I think, within the area of safety insofar as pedestrians on the highway are concerned in that area.

One of the requests they made was that I ask the R.C.M.P. to indicate whether increased patrols are necessary in that area, in that town. I have already made that request. We have undertaken to meet some time in July, all the ministers involved, with that committee and to furnish them a further progress report. In the meantime, there were certain matters raised in their submission which came within the jurisdiction of the school board and they in turn have undertaken to try and see the school board before they again meet with us.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell the House if there was any mention of the Manuel's Bridge because

the people in the area feel that the curve, the bend in the bridge is just as dangerous? There has really been no improvement.

Was there any mention of that? Did they tell you that the engineers who put it in might have had a crooked eye, that the bridge -

MR. BARRY: I drove over it last night and I agree with you.

MR. NEARY: Did the people mention this ninety degree angle on the bridge there in Manuels?

MR. HICKMAN: No. In my recollection, Mr. Speaker, if they did, they did not direct that particular part of the submission to me. I do not recall any mention of it being made. It may be in the brief but I am not certain. I know that they look forward to the building of the Arterial Road from Manuels Bridge out to St. John's Arterial Road. But, I do not specifically recall the Manuels Bridge being mentioned. If any of the other honourable gentlemen who were there at the time can recall it, they can correct me. I do not recall that.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, does the minister know who designed that bridge and why it was designed in that way, that the angle seems to be the same as the old bridge? When will the old bridge be cut off? Will people now have to go right down the center between the two bridges?

MR. DOODY: The old bridge is gone long ago.

MR. BARRY: No, it is still there.

MR. NEARY: No, it is not.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It is.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODWARD: The old bridge is still there.

MR. DOODY: No, there is a new one. The old one has been destroyed.

MR. BARRY: I drove by it last night.

HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what I am really getting at -

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I do not know who designed the bridge and I just, you know, it really does not come under my department, the designing of bridges, and I do not know the answers. The honourable gentlemen, the Minister of Industrial Development and the Minister of Provincial Affairs have assured this House that the old bridge has disappeared, it has been blown up.

HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, seeing the Minister of Industrial Development wants to say a few words I wonder if he could tell us what the possibility is now of settling the liquor store strike so these people can get back to work and we can start collecting some revenue again in the Province, badly needed revenue?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Industrial Development.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, one of the things that the Treasury Board President is not expected to be is a bookie who is able to give odds or averages on the counting of ballots after employees have demonstrated their wishes in the matter. I understand from the union officials that voting will be held tomorrow night at a meeting where the final ballots will be counted, and added to those that already have been counted, at that time I assume we will be in a better position to tell the honourable member when he can get his supply of wine. Until then he will have to be as patient as the rest of us.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary: Is the minister aware or does the minister know who in the government or in the Newfoundland Liquor Commission made the statement on television the other night that immaterial of what the outcome of the vote will be the liquor stores would be open anyway? Does the minister know or is he aware of that statement?

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, I was contacted by the press, by many of the members of the media over the weekend asking me much the same question. They all had about the same amount of information that the honourable member has, that it has been alleged that somebody, unknown, in some capacity or other, also unknown, made a statement, possibly, that the liquor stores might, probably, not open if the strike, possibly, does not get finished when it, probably, should be finished. And I told the press what I will have to tell the honourable House here that in all probability I cannot answer such a question because there was no substance in it.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: I think the Hon. Member for Harbour Grace adjourned the debate on the report last day. (Motion 1).

MR. HICKMAN: He did.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Harbour Grace.

MR. H. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, as a member of that Committee on the Inshore Fishery I would like to support the recommendations contained in this report. I would like to also express or echo the words of the Member from Bonavista South and say that I trust that this report will not end here.

Sir, first I would like to congratulate our chairman of that Committee for the splendid job he did, and also Mr. Dopplinger who is the Director of Planning and Review of the Department of Fisheries and Mrs. Hiscock and the others in fact who travelled around.

Sir, as we travelled around the Province and saw the fishermen appear before this Committee, who were sincere and expressed their concern over the fate and the future of the inshore fishery, and in fact, Sir, the future of Newfoundland without an inshore fishery. Probably, Sir, some of these problems stem back to the terms of our union with - terms of union when we joined Confederation, and it states there very clearly, Sir, that in no way has the Province of Newfoundland got any control over our inshore fisheries.

I would like to say that I read with interest the recent speech to the Trades College given by our Minister of Fisheries and some of

his remarks coincide with the recommendations contained in this report. And I trust, Sir, that he will see that some of them are implemented.

We should remember, Sir, that just about everything is contained in this report. The materials contained in it are - they are the views and concerns of our fishermen.

The major complaints, Sir, as we went around the Province were the lack of fish, the Unemployment Insurance, the high cost of gear, the gill nets, the lack of facilities and the Fisheries Loan Board, and last, by no means least, the cost of fish or the price of fish. Sir, the lack of fish or the supply of fish, and the foreign draggers can only be probably eliminated or remedied if we do get the 200 mile limit.

Our recommendations there, Sir, in this report also suggested there is the possibility that if we cannot get the 200 mile limit, then the 50 mile one.

The high cost of gear, Sir, was of much concern and many of the fishermen termed it as a rip-off by the suppliers of this gear. Especially, Sir, since we have a replacement programme there and I have been told by some of the fishermen, Sir, at that time that the government are being charged \$5.00 a pound for twine.

Today that twine, same twine can be bought for less than three dollars. He also has been informed by the fishermen, Sir, that salmon netting which cost over \$200 to be replaced when the Replacement Programme was in being today is to be bought for \$120 or \$240. These are some of the things, Sir, that probably we should be investigating and see what can be done concerning the high cost of gear and probably some of these rip-offs.

Sir, the matter of gill nets was a touchy subject both by the fishermen and members of the Committee. I must say, Sir, here that much credit should go to the Member for Fogo for his concern and his wisdom and his knowledge of the fisheries brought in at these recommendations concerning the gill nets. Sir, after much discussion our recommendations on the gill nets were unanimously recommended.

Sir, a lack of facilities was another major problem of our fishermen. I feel sure, Sir, that our recommendations there are helpful especially concerning marine complex service centres especially on some parts of the Coast of Labrador. The Loan Board, Sir, came in for a lot of criticism by the fishermen. As stated by the Member for Bonavista South, Sir, our recommendations I am sure with no cost to no one could eliminate some of these problems. I know, Sir, of the fisherman who went to purchase a boat from the Trades College. He tendered on the boat, Sir, and that boat was sold for one dollar more to the instructor at that College. Today, Sir - yesterday I was talking to the same man and as far as the Loan Board is concerned that man actually bought the boat - and in no way, he bought a second hand boat. These boats, Sir, are also sold to merchants who in some cases repair them and sell them for three times more than what they paid for them.

Sir, the price of fish, Sir, must be discussed. Our fishermen, Sir, seem to be still back like they were years ago and are dependent on fish merchants. I think, Sir, something must be done where these fishermen can be independent from the fish merchant and not dependent upon him. There was a case there, Sir, I read in the paper in one

of the editorials there recently where a fisherman spoke out against the fish merchant and he had to apologize openly. He was more or less black-listed by that company and they would not take fish from him. I trust, Sir, that all members of the House of Assembly will support this report and all those recommendations will be implemented and not this report just stowed away something like our family bible to gather dust.

Another thing, Sir, we found was that our quality of fish on the market was not of a standard to compete with the other

fish producing countries. I would like to say, Sir, that I think we should have a much greater budget for our fishermen and I trust that in our next budget that this will be brought about and the fishermen will get more. We will put more into the fishing industry of Newfoundland whereby our fishermen - we must remember, Sir, that the fishery employs, there are about 14,000 to 15,000 people employed more or less directly with the inshore fishery. I am sure, Sir, that something more must be done for them.

Sir, I trust and I strongly recommend that recommendations contained in this report will be discussed fully in this House of Assembly, and that we will reap some benefits and like they used to say, Sir, the fishermen would say, that the fisheries are studied to death, and I hope this report will be implemented and carried out. I thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I followed what the honourable the Member for Harbour Grace had to say in connection with this report very closely, Sir. The member was a member of the Select Committee of the House to study the inshore fishery. Probably, Sir, the most important statement that the member made was that he hoped that this report would not just join all the other reports that had been done in this Province on the inshore fishery and on various other matters and be put on the shelf somewhere in Confederation Building to gather up dust.

I am afraid, Sir, I am afraid myself that that is what is about to happen. Sir, the administration at the moment, the government, told us when the House rose back in May, when the House adjourned in May that the House would open again sometime around the first week in June, I think the date of the 5th of June was mentioned, that the House would open primarily to deal with the report of the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery. Now, we find, Mr. Speaker, after being in the House for almost two weeks that we have dealt with just about every other matter under the sun including setting up a Legal Aid Plan and a Funeral Directors Association. We have



passed laws on just about everything, Sir, except -

MR. ROWE: Amendments to the dog act.

MR. NEARY: Amendments to the dog act, I am reminded by my colleague here. We have discussed just about everything under the sun except the report of the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery. We should hang our heads in shame, Mr. Speaker.

Now, we find that the government House Leader and members of the administration cannot wait to get the House closed down. The fine weather is here and they want to get out again probably to travel to exotic and various parts of the world, but they cannot wait now, Sir, and you can feel it when you walk into the House, that they cannot wait to get the House closed without adequately dealing with the recommendations in this report. They want to get out of here. They are like an honourable crowd, Sir, that are shellshocked. They cannot wait. They say, "Oh, let us close her down today, tomorrow. Let us not have another Private Member's Day."

Mr. Speaker, what have we accomplished as far as this report is concerned? All we have had so far, Sir, all we have been forced to listen to is phony oratory. There is no indication, none whatsoever, that the recommendations of this report are going to be dealt with.

Mr. Speaker, so far, and I regret, Sir, that I was not here for the full debate, I was down on the South Coast for four days last week and I heard the reaction, I heard the reaction of fishermen in the various South Coast communities that I went to on this report and they tell me that they are fed up with being studied and they tell me - I am not an expert on the fisheries, Sir, I can only repeat what I have been told throughout this province right from St. John's to Port aux Basques - they tell me that all the Select Committee did, with due respect, was to summarize what the fishermen and the people of this province already knew about the problems in the inshore fishery. It was a summary of all the problems that we have studied, talked about so much that the fishermen have been pointing out for years and years and years and the committee did a good job of summarizing the problems of the inshore fishery.

But, Mr. Speaker, even though I have no doubt but that the committee might have been sincere and conscientious, that there was no imagination put into that report.

MR. EVANS: It did not say, burn your boats.

MR. NEARY: There was nobody in this province ever said, ever made that statement, Sir. The former Premier of this province may be blamed for it but he never made any such statement and the member for Burgeo would do well to go down and visit his constituents and hear what they have to say about this report and hear their views on the fishery. They have not seen the member since he got elected back in 1972.

MR. EVANS: That is another Liberal lie.

MR. NEARY: That is not a Liberal lie, Sir.

MR. EVANS: Nothing else surer.

MR. NEARY: I attended, Sir, a Lions Club banquet in the fishing community of Burgeo and the clergyman there when he was giving grace asked the gathering to say a prayer for those who have departed this world, and I said a prayer for the member for Burgeo.

MR. EVANS: You got religion all of a sudden.

MR. NEARY: Because they have not seen him since the last election.

MR. EVANS: You were supposed to be in the House last week.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the whole South Coast, the whole Northeast Coast -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - the Great Northern Peninsula, Bonavista Bay, Conception Bay, Trinity Bay, have been watching -

MR. DOODY: Why do you not spend a little time in the House boy.

MR. NEARY: - have been watching -

MR. DOODY: Instead of politicking around the Province.

MR. NEARY: - have been watching, Sir, very, very carefully.

MR. MURPHY: One Opposition member in the House the other night.

MR. EVANS: You were supposed to be in the House last week.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - have been watching very carefully, Sir, the government's attitude, and the House's attitude for that matter, in connection with this report. Because believe me, Mr. Speaker, when I make this statement I am not exaggerating one bit, that the fishermen of this province, the inshore fishermen are fed up with elected representatives spouting off about the problems of the inshore fishery and they are especially peeved and perturbed with the government for not doing something about it over the last three years after leaving the fishermen with the impression in this province that if they were elected that they would do something about it. And after three years the only thing they could up with was the appointment of a Select Committee to study the problems of the inshore fishery, after wearing out three or four or five ministers, four I think it is. Mr. Speaker, all that committee could do was to summarize the problems and not produce one new original idea, not produce one problem that we did not already know about. The 200 mile limit, anything new in that? Is there anything new in that? The administration has not been able to persuade the Government

of Canada, they have failed to persuade Ottawa that the Government of Canada should take unilateral action and enforce the 200 mile limit. Unless, Sir, and until the Province and the Government of Canada get their heads together and take measures, whether they be drastic measures or not, to protect the fish stocks on the Atlantic Coast of Canada, Sir, then I will forecast that ninety per cent of our inshore fishermen will be forced on welfare this time next year.

MR. EVANS: What has the 200 mile limit got to do with the inshore fishery? Nothing!

MR. NEARY: Oh, Mr. Speaker, here is a member who represents a fishing area of this Province who wants to know from me from a mining community what the 200 mile limit got to do with the inshore fishery.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Well, it has all to do with it, Sir. The inshore fishermen will tell you that the fish are being scooped up before they get a chance to go to shore. That is what it has to do with it.

MR. EVANS: It has nothing to do with it!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is a matter of life and death to our inshore fishermen, that, first of all, Sir, the Canadian Government declared a 200 mile limit and then, Mr. Speaker, it will be a hollow victory indeed if we get the 200 mile limit and then the government does not fulfill its promise that it made in two provincial elections in this Province, to build a big trawler fleet. We have not heard anything about that great trawler fleet that was supposed to be built at Marystown. We have not heard anything about that for the last eighteen and a half months to two years. It will be a hollow victory indeed, Sir, and the fishermen will tell you this, unless the administration carries out its pre-election promises to the fishermen of this Province by increasing the number of trawlers so that at least we will be able to catch our quota of fish.

Mr. Speaker, do you realize that today Newfoundland is not

catching its quota despite the fact that we are saying that the foreign draggers and the trawlers and the factory ships are scooping up the fish and depleting our stocks, that Newfoundland fishermen, Newfoundland fish plants, do not have the equipment, the facilities to catch their quota today. What are we going to do if we get the 200 mile limit without putting the gear and the equipment and the facilities in the hands of our fishermen so that at least we could catch our quota.

Mr. Speaker, if we had used our heads and a little common sense and our imagination down through the years, maybe the Russians and the East Germans and the Spanish and the Portuguese and the French might not be out off our coast scooping up our fish. If we had to put the draggers out there and the trawlers, they would not dare come there because we would have cornered the fishery. We let it go by default to the Russians and the Spaniards and the Portuguese. That is why they are out there, Sir, because they know that it is the best source of supply in the world. And we let it go to them by default, piddling around with fish merchants in this Province who spend all their time trying to build up millions of dollars and becoming multimillionaires and going down to Florida and building their estates and building up their fortunes out of the sweat of the fishermen of this Province, and then pawning off their obsolete fish plants to foreign investors and then the government having to buy them back. They take their couple of million dollars or \$3 million or \$4 million, whatever they get for these plants and then they desert the fishermen. How many times have we seen that happen in this Province, Sir?

MR. PECKFORD: How many?

MR. NEARY: Yes, all I have to do is look across the House and I can tell the minister how many times.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: It happened a good many times. Yes, Sir, I could tell you only I do not want to bring personalities,

or get personal. All I have to do is look across the House and I can see with my own eyes members who sit on the government benches who are in that category who built, amassed their fortune from the sweat of the fishermen and then sold out and deserted the fishermen, did not put their money back in.

MR. MORGAN: On the backbench side?

MR. NEARY: On the government benches, Sir, not too far from where the Member for Bonavista South sits, not too far from where the member sits. They built up their fortune, Sir.

MR. MORGAN: What are you talking about?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: They built up their fortune from the toil and the sweat of the fishermen. Then they sold out and deserted the fishermen. Now, all of a sudden they become concerned. They are experts on the fishery of this Province. They had it handed down to them from one generation to the other. That, Sir, is the way the inshore fishermen look at their fishery in Newfoundland. They look at it as just a big racket for a handful of well-heeled fish merchants to take them to the cleaners, go to government when they are in trouble, when they need a handout, when they are in the red, go to government looking for a handout. And when they are in the black take it and put it over in a Swiss bank account somewhere, build an estate in Florida, invest it down in Boston and desert the fishermen, leave the poor old fishermen holding the bag, not when they get into black, they do not pass it on to the fishermen. When they are in the red, go to the taxpayers, go to the government and they will bail you out. When you are in the black, when you are making a bundle, do not pass it back to the government, do not pay your loans back or even the interest on your loan, Do not pass it on to the fishermen, invest it in stocks and bonds and to hell with the fishermen of this Province! That is what has been happening, Sir. That is why the poor, old inshore fisherman is discouraged, disillusioned, disenchanting, downhearted, downcast and browed off with his elected representative, and on both

sides of the House, browned off, Sir! They have had enough. They are fed up.

Do you know what concerns me, Mr. Speaker? They say to their sons - they tell me every place practically that I go in Newfoundland, down in Bonavista, down the South Coast, down the Burin Peninsula, Trinity Bay, they say, "My son will never follow in my footsteps. He will never be a fisherman. He will not have to kowtow to the likes of Spencer Lake. He will never follow in my footsteps. He will not be a fisherman. I will put him in the Vocational School or in the University and I will get a job for him in St. John's or in Grand Falls or in Corner Brook or in Gander or in Labrador City. If I have anything to do with it he will never be a fisherman." That is what they tell you.

Mr. Speaker, we have good reason to be concerned about that because here we are, Sir, advocating a two hundred mile limit, asking Canada, the Government of Canada almost to declare war to get us the two hundred mile limit. And if we do, where are we going to get the young men to man the trawlers and to go out and catch the fish if we are going to educate them for jobs in St. John's and Gander and Grand Falls and Corner Brook?

MR. EVANS: Do you want us to close the schools, or what?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, but we have to take another look at our educational system if that is what we are going to do, because, Mr. Speaker, I contend today that in Newfoundland that if we use our heads and our imagination with one-half of the world starving to death, all we have to do is use our heads, Sir, and we can find the markets can we not. We do not have to wait for the traditional buyers to beat a path to Newfoundland to sell our fish. One-half of the world is starving to death and we got the likes of the fish merchants with the nerve and the cheek to tell us that their warehouses are blocked with fish and they have to get subsidies from the Government of Canada to the tune of fifteen and a half cents

June 24, 1975.

Tape 2596

RM - 3

a pound on fillets. Do you realize, Mr. Speaker, the Government of Canada -

MR. CROSBIE: Nonsense!

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir.

MR. CROSBIE: Two and a half cents.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I will tell the minister what it is. It is two and a half cents to the fishermen. It is two and a half cents to the fish plant operator. But, Sir, that is five cents but you have to multiply it by three



because it takes three fish to make a fillet, a pound of fillet, three to one.

MR. THOMS: Three pound of fish and one pound of fillet.

MR. NEARY: Three pound of fish, one pound of fillet.

MR. THOMS: Right.

MR. NEARY: Three to one. And the total subsidy, Sir, amounts to fifteen cents.

MR. THOMS: Per pound.

MR. NEARY: Per pound. That is right. The minister can screw up his nose all he likes.

MR. EVANS: That is wrong.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Sir.

MR. EVANS: That is wrong.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, but for the subsidy that is being paid to our fishermen and to the fish plant operators at this moment the fishing industry in Newfoundland would collapse right now. They are brazen enough to pounce on the Government of Canada every chance they get.

MR. MOORES: We would not do that.

MR. EVANS: We should eat more fish.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what we need is not phony oratory, sweet-talk, everybody who represents a fishing community up making his little speech, hoping to get a little mileage when he goes back that it will be picked up by the television and the newspapers and the radio and he will get a little mileage, and he will go back and say, I spoke about the fishery problems while I was in the House. Spoke about it once in three years. When we should be here night and day instead of wanting to get out of this House as fast as we can to go off to foreign countries and travel around at public expense and go on vacation, we should stay here until we resolve the problems of the fishery. We do not need part-time politicians, Sir. We do not need lawyers downtown in court when they should be in this House carrying out their obligations

and their responsibilities and their promises to the people of this Province.

MR. EVANS: He was trying to get into the meal plant in Burgeo. They would not take him for meal.

MR. NEARY: They should be here, Sir, this is no time for this Province to have part-time leaders, part-time politicians.

MR. BARRY: Where were you when the House discussed the Javelin Bill?

MR. NEARY: I am prepared to stay here - well I would have liked to be here on that Javelin Bill and the minister would have gotten an earful.

MR. BARRY: So do I. You should know all about it!

MR. NEARY: The minister would have gotten an earful, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, we should be prepared now at this moment because, Sir, by this time next year it may be too late. We have to be prepared to stay here now night and day, forget the vacation, forget the holidays, forget travelling to Japan, France, New York, and San Francisco -

MR. MORGAN: And Ottawa.

MR. NEARY: - and the delights of Paris and the bistros of Spain and Rome, forget it, stay in the House. Stay in this House, Sir, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: - where we should be. If there were ever a group of people in this Province, Sir, that we owe a great responsibility to is the fishermen of this Province. And I would lay down my life in this honourable House, Sir, I would stay here night and day not just to talk about the problems, Mr. Speaker, I would stay here to deal with the recommendations of the Committee. Sir, there is the weakness we have here, we are here glorifying the Committee. You know, in talking about the Committee, Sir, with all due respect, there was not a fisherman on it, not a fisherman - there may be the sons of a few. I do not know if my friend from Port de Grave may have a little experience, but no longer he deserted the fishery long ago, He found greener pastures. He is about the only one.

MR. WILSON: They were not too green when I was there.

MR. NEARY: Well, the member found greener pastures.

MR. WILSON: Why do you not go up and see.

MR. NEARY: Not one, Sir, with all due respect to the

honourable members, not one is a full-time fisherman.

MR. MORGAN: Not now.

MR. NEARY: No, Nor, Mr. Speaker, I would doubt if any of them were ever full-time fishermen apart from the Member for Port de Grave, I might - and he probably, Sir, had less input in this Committee than any other of the members.

Mr. Speaker, here we are now in the middle of June, in the height of the fishing season, in the House praising up the Committee saying, "Oh they did a wonderful job, a magnificent job." And as I say Sir, they may have been sincere and conscientious, but they merely summarized the problems of the fishery in this Province. They showed no imagination, did not say - Mr. Speaker, the Chairman of that Committee is in his seat today. He should stand up man-fashion and say to this House, "Look! If you members, elected representatives of the people had any courage, any guts at all you would stay in this House until that problem is solved, and if necessary, move the whole House of Assembly up to Ottawa."

MR. MORGAN: Now you are talking 'Steve'.

MR. NEARY: Take

the whole works, as the editorial in The Daily News said this morning, suggested.

MR. MORGAN: We will all march on Ottawa!

MR. NEARY: Yes, let us all go up. I am satisfied to go along with that. But, Sir, that is only solving part of the problem. The other seventy per cent of the problem has to be solved in this Province by us if we have the courage and the imagination and the stamina and the will power to do it. If we are not just prepared to come in here with a few platitudes, a little bit of praise for the committee, no action. This is what concerns me, Sir, lack of action on the part of the House to deal with the recommendations of this committee.

Mr. Speaker, I was terribly disappointed that the report did not call for a complete provincial takeover of the fishery in this Province, said -

MR. YOUNG: They did!

MR. NEARY: Oh, they did not, Sir. They certainly did not. The Minister of Fisheries says you had better not interrupt. Well, Sir, the minister will be brought to his feet before I am finished. The minister will get up and say, oh, you are talking about nationalization. That is a dirty word. I am not, Sir. It is not a socialist philosophy that I am expounding here.

MR. CROSBIE: Your prize philosophy!

MR. NEARY: I thought the minister was not going to interrupt me. Mr. Speaker, what I am asking for and what the committee did not deal with was complete provincial takeover by our Crown Corporation. Mr. Speaker, we are pumping the money into the fishery anyway. Ottawa is pumping it in right, left and center. All we are doing, Sir, - do you know, Mr. Speaker, that every year despite what the Minister of Fisheries says, every year Ottawa spends more money on the fishery in this Province than the provincial government does?

MR. BARRY: Have you ever considered offering your services -

MR. THOMS: Five times as much.

MR. NEARY: Five times as much my colleague says. I do not know. but I would say three times or more, three times or more, Sir.

"r. Speaker, we have seen, we have seen the success, Sir, of the Canadian Salfish Corporation, a good Liberal concept, a Liberal philosophy.

MR. CROSBIE: What a laugh.

MR. NEARY: Ah, what a laugh! Sir, right here, here is the laugh! Look! The Fishermen's Annual, 1975 and there he is from Circular Road, the honourable John, "Two men bound together in a common desire, to do something for the fishermen, the Fishermen's Annual, 1975. What does it say inside there and the minister says, what a laugh.

Just listen inside here -

MR. CROSBIE: Romeo and Juliet.

MR. NEARY: Yes. Frankie and Johnny. Salfish Industry on sound footing. The minister endorses that and now he says, "What a laugh!" You know, does the minister know why it is on a sound footing?

MR. BARRY: He did not say that.

MR. NEARY: Yes. It says, Salfish Industry on a sound footing, and the minister has his picture on the front page of this supplement, saying what a glorious thing it is. "Mr. Crosbie's strong hand at the helm, a new direction has come about. He laughs at the - we have a strong hand at the helm all right. Both men have stirred considerable respect in the industry. The minister should travel around this Province.

MR. MORGAN: To a point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MORGAN: To a point of order. We are not debating the Fishermen's Annual Report as published in one of the local daily papers. We are debating the report of the Select Committee of the House of Assembly on the Inshore Fishery, and I ask that the honourable Member for Bell Island be relevant to the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable Member for Bell Island, the Chair feels is perhaps getting carried away in the heat of debate and has strayed somewhat although the Chair has allowed a fair range, it feels, in the debate in this particular motion. But the honourable Member for

Bell Island was straying far afield from the intent of this particular motion.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I will try to be relevant, Sir, to the report of the Committee by getting back to my main point, Sir, the main point that I want - and I hope this will not get lost in the shuffle in all the other things that I am mentioning - that is, Sir, that the fishermen of this Province are going to be awfully disappointed if this House is closed down without one, without one recommendation of that Committee being brought before this House for approval, without one measure being implemented to try and bring about the

survival of that fishery. They brought in their recommendations, the minister says. Yes, Mr. Speaker, we have had all these before. There is nothing new in there and that report will be brought down on the Crosbie Building or the Viking Building over on Crosbie Road and put on the shelf, or wherever the Department of Fisheries may be, I think it is over on Crosbie Road, be put over there on the shelf. She must be lopsided over there. The building must be ready to sink down in the ground with the reports on the fishery, studies on the fishery.

MR. CROSBIE: Ignored up until 1972.

MR. NEARY: Ignored up until 1972! Half the reports that are there came under the former administration!

MR. CROSBIE: They were ignored! They were stillborn!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, one thing we have to say, one thing we have to say is that old Joey built every fish plant we have in Newfoundland today.

MR. CROSBIE: Burn your boats!

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, he did not say burn your boats and the minister knows that is not true.

MR. CROSBIE: Fire your boats.

MR. NEARY: He did not say fire your boats either, Sir. Mr. Speaker, whatever remnants of the fishery we have in Newfoundland today is due to Joey Smallwood and the former Liberal Administration.

MR. CROSBIE: Do not be a joke.

MR. NEARY: That is not a joke. Where are the new fish plants built by our Tory Administration? The one down in Burgeo, an obsolete plant valued at \$500,000, they paid \$2.6 million for it and they have been monkeying around now for three years trying to persuade the Government of Canada and themselves, trying to get their heads together to build a new one. The old one down there cannot last much longer. Then we will have poverty, welfare, unemployment along the South Coast. And the Minister of Industrial Development, every time I ask him about that fish plant in Burgeo, pawns it off on Don Jamieson. I call up Mr. Jamieson's office, he pawns it back to the minister, And the people

are caught in the middle in the squeeze getting the, they are getting the political runaround.

MR. DOODY: Did you get through to Mr. Jamieson?

MR. NEARY: I got through to some of his assistants. And I can tell the honourable minister that the people of Burgeo are getting fed up with getting the runaround. They have not started one fish plant, Sir, not one. As a matter of fact the Minister of Fisheries kowtowing now to his big fish merchant buddies are going to try to eliminate all the small fish plants in Newfoundland, something that they were trying to get us to do for year by tightening up on the licencing.

MR. DOODY: Mr. Jamieson says you are like the bubonic plague.

MR. NEARY: Yes, well Mr. Jamieson can think what he likes about me. But at least I have found a place in the hearts of the ordinary people of this Province and that is more than I can say about the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MURPHY: It must be the seven votes he got at the leadership convention went to his head.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, what we need to do, Sir, is to get rid of the middleman role and set up a Crown Corporation to organize the fishermen at the production level, both offshore and inshore, Mr. Speaker, and as I say right now, Sir, the Liberal Government up there in Ottawa is subsidizing every pound of fillet going out of this province to the tune of fifteen and a half cents.

MR. BARRY: So they should.

MR. NEARY: Yes, Sir, I am glad the minister is giving them due credit.

MR. BARRY: I have to give them credit.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, take this away and the fishery would collapse in this province. Would Your Honour tell me how much more time I have left, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: About sixteen or seventeen minutes.

MR. NEARY: Thank you, Your Honour.

MR. EVANS: Keep her going.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I remember a former colleague of mine who is late, deceased, made the famous statement, Sir, down in the old



Colonial Building during the National Convention when he referred to the last lonely fisherman on the bill of Cape St. George.

Well, Sir, there will be no last lonely fisherman, there will be no fisherman unless we are prepared to take off our coats and roll up our sleeves and get down to brass tacks and take specific action on some of these recommendations that were summarized in the report of the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery.

Sure, Mr. Speaker, this report has again brought to the fore, brought before the people of Newfoundland the problems of the inshore fishery. But what we need to do now, Sir, is to exert a little common sense and get down to brass tacks and do something about the needs of those thousands and thousands of men and women and children in this province who are

looking to us to try to rescue the fishery in this Province. Mr. Speaker, if we are going to bring the fishery into the twenty-first century we have to act now. We are at the point of no return and it would be cruel, Sir, it would be criminal to close down this House now. I do not care whether it is the middle of June or what month it is. We should be prepared to stay here. It would be an insult, Sir, to our fishermen and our people to rush the business through this House now to get her closed so they can get out in their Bermuda shorts and pranch around in their summer cottages down by the lakes and the rivers. We have had too much of that in the past, Sir. Let us stay in the House.

I am sure the Member for Placentia East who was Chairman of that Committee did not go around this Province just to try to justify an expense account, that he went around sincerely trying to find out solutions to the problems of the inshore fishery, bring his report in, and I am sure the member would be very gratified, would have contentment of mind if some of the recommendations were implemented and not just come in and debate the report. What is the point, Mr. Speaker, of this whole debate? What is the point? I ask honourable members is there any point to it or are we just here trying to get a little mileage for ourselves, trying to leave the appearance with our phony rhetoric and our phony arguments and our phony oratory, trying to leave the impression with the poor, old fishermen who cannot come in and sit in the galleries of this House, that we are concerned about his problem. We are concerned about it all right, More concerned now with getting off to Florida and getting off to Paris and London!

MR. EVANS: You do not even know Summer from Winter. In Winter you have to go to Florida.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the only answer to insuring the continuance, Sir, of the fishery for those hard pressed fishermen upon whom it depends, Sir, is to take it over, for the Province to take it over at the grass root level and provide the fishermen with decent

organization to help them produce the product of the sea that is so badly needed to provide protein in a protein hungry world. We can no longer, Sir, continue this policy of passing the buck to Ottawa. Ottawa has an obligation and a responsibility, no question about that, Mr. Speaker. But, Sir, there is an obligation and a responsibility that falls heavy on the shoulders of the elected representatives of this Province. The only ones who have gotten any protection down through the years, Sir, from any of the assistance and benefits that have gone forward are the fish merchants themselves. They are the only ones who benefited.

MR. EARLE: Half of them went bankrupt.

MR. NEARY: Half of them went bankrupt, my eyeball! Half of them now are off living in foreign countries at the expense of the sweat of the brow of the fishermen of this Province and the minister knows that. Ah! He is not sitting too far away, Sir, from a gentleman who deserted, took his pound of flesh and deserted the fishermen of this Province. No wonder we cannot get any action, Sir! I can look right across the benches on that honourable side of the House, of that rich man's government, and I can tell the fishermen of this Province why they are not going to get any action on this report.

7  
While I am on that matter, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move an amendment. The amendment I would like to move, Sir, is that the resolution be amended by adding the words, "And that an Expediting Committee representing both sides of the House of Assembly be instituted immediately to plot the progressive steps including dates for implementing each of the recommendations presented in the Report of the Select Committee and that this Committee plot a critical path method to cover not only the Committee's recommendations but also to present a proposal whereby both the inshore, mid-water and deep-sea fishermen be fitted out with modern efficient vessels, equipment and methods so that they will be able to take

advantage of any extension of our fishing zone."

MR. CROSBIE: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable gentleman's amendment which is long and torturous indeed is certainly contrary to the original resolution which thanks the Committee for their deligency and perception and directs the government to investigate immediately the feasibility in implementing those recommendations in the report that are within provincial jurisdiction. The burden of this amendment is that an Expediting Committee be appointed to set dates, in other words, to take over the function of the government and to consider what should be done. That is obviously contrary to the resolution that is before the House. The amendment is completely contrary to the principle of the resolution. I submit, Your Honour, that it should be struck out.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I submit to the contrary that the amendment is quite in order. The motion itself, Sir, directs the government to investigate immediately the feasibility of implementing those recommendations of the report. The effect of the motion is to set up a Committee representing all sides of the House - I am sorry, the effect of the amendment is to set up a Committee representing all sides of the House to list or to set forth some certain steps. Obviously the Committee can function only within the powers that are within the power of the government, of the Province as a whole. But, Mr. Speaker, this is merely an alternate method of achieving the end of the resolution. While I do not have it opened in front of me, there are enumerable citations in Beauchesne to the effect that an amendment is in order if it presents an alternate method of achieving the end of the motion.

The main reason why an amendment is struck down, Your Honour - Your Honour has done it on occasion- is that the amendment would negate the motion. This, Sir, will not negate the motion. It is an alternate to the motion. I submit the House should be allowed to consider it. Then if the House accepts it, well and good, and if the House decides

not to accept it well that is the House's decision and sobeit. But I think the amendment, Sir, is in order and I submit it should be accepted and be put to debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is having thoughts on the amendment and would like to take a few minutes to take a look at it before it makes a ruling on it. The Deputy Speaker is not here, so I shall recess the House for five minutes to take a look at it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair has considered the amendment made by the honourable Member from Bell Island and after looking at the content of it very carefully and certain advice from officials at the table I am ruling that the amendment is out of order because if implemented, it would call for an expenditure of public monies which of course only a minister of the Crown can introduce. So, it is out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, here is one, if I was a member of that Committee, who would be prepared to volunteer his time. Sir, that amendment would not cost the taxpayers of this Province one red cent. I am not questioning Your Honour's ruling.

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

MR. HICKMAN: The honourable gentleman -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: The honourable gentleman is questioning the Chair.

MR. NEARY: No, I am not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Well, the Chair is certainly getting the inference now, at least, that the feeling is that the honourable Member from Bell Island is challenging the ruling made by the Chair. Of course, if he wishes to do that, it is his prerogative.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move another amendment, Your Honour. I would like to move, Sir, that the resolution be amended by adding the words, "that an Expediting Committee representing both sides of the House of Assembly be instituted on a voluntary basis at no expense to the taxpayer of this Province, instituted on a voluntary basis and that members be permitted to volunteer their services if required to act on this Expediting Committee to see that the report of the Select Committee is implemented."

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, we have not got the proper wording of this amendment. But adding the word "voluntary" makes no difference whether the committee is voluntary or not, Mr. Speaker, it makes no difference. The Committee is still supposed to do the things

that are outlined in this resolution that would involve spending of public funds and it is completely contrary to the original motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The Chair has to rule that in essence, except for a few minor changes in the wording, the honourable member is introducing an amendment which would result in the expenditures of public funds. Again, the Chair has to rule it out of order.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the honourable members would love to be able to silence me, Sir, because I am taking their buddies and their fish merchant friends and their wealthy, well-to-do friends and cramming them right down their throats, these well-to-do fish merchants who have deserted the fishermen of this Province, taken their couple of million dollars and cleared out and left the poor, old fishermen high and dry.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee's report that we are studying here today did the right thing as far as it goes. But it failed, Sir, as I said a few moments ago, failed utterly in its imagination and in expressing a little common sense thinking to try and bring the fishery of this Province into the twenty-first century. There is no way, Mr. Speaker, that we can allow the fishery to die. If the fishery prospers in Newfoundland, Newfoundland prospers, and we cannot leave it in the hands of the buddies of this honourable crowd who are sitting on the government benches, their well-to-do, well-heeled friends.

We have to, Sir. It is a matter of life and death!

MR. MURPHY: A point of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: I arise to a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: I am sat on this government side and I have not any well-heeled friends or anything else. Let the gentleman, if he wants to, name people. Do not cover us all in that. I have a right to stand up and defend myself.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is just a matter of opinion between two members. That is not a point of order, Your Honour.

MR. MURPHY: I think his time is up anyhow. Get him out of there!

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

The honourable Member for Bell Island, the Chair - honourable members to my left may feel that the honourable member's remarks are certainly uncomplimentary. The Chair in its wisdom has to say that they are not unparliamentary at this point.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, they can be as uncomplimentary and as unpopular with honourable members as they like, Sir, but I am entitled to express my opinion in this honourable House, Sir, and I say that is a rich man's government, and that is my opinion. Kowtowing, Sir, to their rich buddies and we see that now -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - we see that now almost happening in Marystown where we had to buy an obsolete fish plant from a fish merchant for \$2.6 million. He was the only one that benefited by it. Now, he is talking about moving into Marystown and the only claim that he has to fame is that he is anti-union, he fought the union. He still has the people of Ramea under his iron heel, and that will not be for much longer either. There is too much of this going on in Newfoundland.

We would be cowardly, Sir, we would be shirking our responsibility, we would be deserters, we would be weak-kneed, we would be wishy-washy, we would not be worth our salt and we would



have no backbone if we close down this House without taking some action to try to save the fishery of this Province. That is what the fishermen are looking to their political representatives for today. We have frittered away enough time in this honourable House talking about foolishness. We have frittered away enough precious hours, Sir, on ridiculous and unproductive matters and phony oratory instead of getting down to common sense, brass tacks, really aimed, Mr. Speaker, at creating the obvious conditions that have been there before us for years.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Except by leave the honourable member's time has expired.

Does the honourable member have leave?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Sir, could I have a leave to carry on?

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave? No. There is not unanimity. So, the honourable member cannot continue.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Your Honour allowed a member on the government side the other day to finish his remarks, the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: To wind up his sentence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time that has been allocated for the honourable Member for Bell Island has expired.

MR. NEARY: Well, why do we have rules for that side and a different set of rules for this side?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair is not going to sit here and hear comments like that from the honourable Member for Bell Island, and we will ask the honourable member to make an unqualified apology to the Chair or he shall be named.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I offer an unqualified apology to Your Honour, but, Sir, in the heat of the moment I could not help but referring the other day to a minister, Sir, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - who was allowed to finish his sentence.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair asked the honourable Member for Bell Island for an unqualified apology and is not satisfied with the one he just gave.

MR. NEARY: I offer Your Honour an unqualified apology and I hope the fishermen will record it in their district, in Your Honour's district. Close it down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Let us get out of here. Go on your holidays. Go back to Florida.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bay de Verde.

MR. HOWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this report from the Select Committee of the House of Assembly. I happened to be privileged to be a member of this Select Committee. After travelling throughout the different areas of Newfoundland, speaking to quite a few fishermen, I have nothing but sympathy for these people. There is one thing I would like to talk on first, and it is that around Newfoundland we have a lot of small fish plants which are closed during most of the year

because of the lack of supply of fish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. HOWARD: I believe that something should be taken into consideration to try and have these plants supplied with fish in order that they would be operating for nine months out of the year instead of three.

I was very disappointed in learning that Ottawa is not prepared to go along and enforce the 200 mile limit. And, I think, it goes to show that those in authority who should be implementing this do not have very much backbone. But if they come to Newfoundland and see how the fishermen are suffering because of the lack of fish, and travel around as I did with the rest of the members of the Committee, I believe they would have a different outlook on it.

On the gill net situation, I do not think personally, and I know that the district for which I speak would not be in favour of banning gill nets altogether. I believe what should be done is some restrictions brought forward that a fisherman should only be allowed to set the number of nets that he could attend, not for instance set 300 nets and it would take him probably three weeks before he could get to some of them, because this is only ruining the fishery.

We have to look at the fishery very seriously because we have 10,000 or 12,000 jobs involved. And if the fishery is allowed to die in Newfoundland I believe myself that Newfoundland will die with it.

The Unemployment Insurance scheme is not adequate to take care or to look after the fishermen at a time when they are no longer able to fish. There is no incentive in it to have fishermen go fishing because a guy on the land can only work for eight weeks and draw Unemployment Insurance for forty-four, when a fisherman can only draw it for seven or eight weeks. And the Unemployment Insurance, as far as fishermen like around Port aux Basques are concerned, it is of no benefit to them, because they are Winter fishermen and they cannot fish within

the category of the time limit allotted to draw Unemployment Insurance because they are fishing during that period of time.

I listened to the Hon. Member for Bell Island speak here this morning on the fishery. And it amazes me, in fact, to see a man who has been a member of a government for thirteen or fourteen or twelve years, however long he was there, and never had the backbone or the gall to come out and speak up for the fishermen at that time. Over the past ten or fifteen years the fishery in Newfoundland has been allowed to decline to such a state where now it is almost impossible to bring it back. And when the government of that day was busy building white elephants around this Province which closed up shortly after at a cost to the taxpayers, that if they had to pour some of that money into the fisheries at that time I do not think that we would be in such a state as we are now.

And speaking for the district of Bay de Verde myself when I was elected there some three and a half years ago I do not think there was one place in that district that was fit to haul a boat up, there were no slipways there. And a few that were built there by the Government of Ottawa, of Canada, they got in such a state of disrepair that I had to almost get down on my knees and beg Ottawa to come back and repair them, and then they did not get back until the fishing was well underway in the middle of June or the first week in July. But since been elected to office, thanks to this P.C. Government, the Moores Administration, the people in the district of Bay de Verde have adequate landing facilities now for their fish.

Go to Grates Cove! They

have a slipway there that is second to none in Newfoundland where before they had to take their boats to Old Perlican, Bay de Verde, etc., in order to pull them ashore. If a storm came on they had to risk their lives to get out of Grates Cove in order to save them.

That is only one. I could go on for hours on what has been done for the fishermen in the district of Bay de Verde over the past three and a half years.

MR. MOORES: Any federal money in Old Perlican?

MR. HOWARD: The only federal money in Old Perlican when the federal government would not go along with giving that marine complex last year, the provincial government pumped the money in there itself. They did come out this year and put in some money to pave the parking area around the marine complex -

MR. MOORES: What about the breakwater?

MR. HOWARD:- which I think it is about time they did something. The breakwater they spent \$500,000 on, a drop in the bucket, and it took the people in Old Perlican ten years to get them to see that. And I had to wear the phone out and use up half the papers in Confederation Building to get it after.

In travelling with the Select Committee I was fortunate enough to be with the Committee when they visited Forteau on the Labrador Coast. It really would break your heart to see what the fishermen had to do there in order to launch a longliner, much less pull it up. They had to hire two dozers and get a cable on the boats and lower them over a thirty-five to forty foot bank or cliff, whatever you might call it, before they could get it in the water.

I think that in this day and age that is ridiculous and I do not think anybody in this honourable House or outside of it should blame the Provincial P.C. Government for that when it has been there since John Cabot discovered Newfoundland.

Personally I think that if both governments are prepared to carry out the recommendations that are contained in this Select Committee's

Report and to carry them out within the immediate future, I think it will be of great benefit to the fishermen of Newfoundland and I believe at long last they will have some respect for those who are concerned about the fisheries and the committees in the future who will go around the Province of Newfoundland to find out of any minor problems once these major ones are taken care of.

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

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak on this committee. Being a member, I was on that Committee. We have heard in this House already today, being appointed I myself was asked if I would serve on that Committee, representing a district made up of fishermen who put their whole heart and soul into the fishery, and twenty-seven years under the belt, being a fisherman myself, that I thought that at last the time has come when it was a great honour to serve on this Committee and to serve a province and also a district which I represented which was made up of fishermen and I mean to say here now that fishermen, I like a good many more have

sat and listened over the period of years since Confederation about our fishery, and what did we hear? We heard the same thing as we heard here today in this honourable House from the honourable Member from Bell Island. Attacking whom? Attacking whom? The merchants of this Province who helped to carry on the fishery, to build it and stabilize this Province. Where do we go now? I went fishing for twenty-seven years, I mean fishing. I knew something about it, where there were seven or eight men in crew could land twenty-two to twenty-five hundred quintals of fish and make them all and dry them and be home the last of October. Who did we have to go to in the Spring of the year to get on the Labrador to go fishing? You had to go to a merchant with your finger in your mouth, and he supplied you, took chances on supplying you, possibly with enough grub to put yourself and your family over the Summer and enough to put you through the Winter. These are people that we hear attacked on the floors of this honourable House, not only today. All I have to say here now, and I do not have to bring any personalities into it, but it was the former Premier of this Province who has got us in such a state today that you cannot ask a merchant for a lead pencil without it is government backed.

How does this country of ours here in Newfoundland become what it is? Who came and settled here? The life blood of it was the fishery. It has got me and you, Mr. Speaker and many others that are here just through the fishery. They were not looking to government for hand-outs but they were men of ability and it was taught to them that they had to work hard and honest to get it. What did we hear? The reason why our fishery is gone because there was going to be two jobs for every man, and three jobs. It got our younger generation out of the fishing boat. Still, thanks be to God, we still have some of them. We were told here today and told here before there was no one in the fishing boats today only those of

sixty-five and seventy years of age. I tell you if the people who think that had travelled this Island as I did and a good many more on this Select Committee and looked at the younger generation at the meetings, some of them fifteen and eighteen and twenty years of age, they would not say they were sixty-five or seventy who were in the fishing boats.

MR. NEARY: Who said that?

MR. WILSON: It was said here long, long ago.

MR. NEARY: By whom?

MR. WILSON: By whom? By your leader, by your leader, by your leader. That is who said it. Let him go into the place and the communities that we are visiting, the fishing communities and find out and see who we found there, the life blood of this Province. It would make one's heart boil to see that we have a younger generation willing to go and take the perils of the sea to try to make a livelihood, earn a livelihood and earn it honest, not by the sunburn scorching forehead, but the salt water spray, to try to make a livelihood. We still have them. What do we find? What do we find here today? As the honourable Member from Bay de Verde said, we find the Member from Bell Island getting up on the floor, been here for twelve or thirteen years and never made a whisper, never made a whisper



about our fishery. Never made a whisper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to correct the - a point of order, Sir. The statement made by the honourable member, Sir, is untrue. For thirteen years, Sir, each year, I have made an annual speech on the fishery. The member has not been here long enough. When he is here as long as I am then he will realize what he said is untrue.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

Whether the honourable Member for Bell Island made his speech during his career as a member of this House or not is, the Chair feels, a matter of opinion between both honourable members.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, whether it is untrue or whether it is not, his actions here today have shown that he was dead opposed to the fisheries committee being set up under the chairmanship of the able gentleman, the Member for Placentia East.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Your Honour knows that I did not make any such statement or inference or reference. Sir, as a matter of fact I praised the committee. I said they were probably sincere and conscientious, but all they did was summarize what we already knew. Will the honourable member please get his facts straight? Or is he so thick-headed that he does not let it sink in.

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

MR. NEARY: Go back to your lumber business.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Go back to your lumber business.

MR. SPEAKER: Again the Chair's ruling is a difference of opinion between two honourable members.

MR. NEARY: You can see the member's motive, Sir -

MR. MURPHY: They did nothing, you said, they did nothing only rehash what happened several years ago.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, the actions from the Member for Bell Island by trying to offset, to bring in an amendment to this

committee - what he has tried to do here today goes to show that he just does not want this committee to function.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member knows, Sir, that is not true. I was trying to get the recommendations of the committee implemented. That was the purpose of the amendment, Sir. That statement made by the member, Mr. Speaker, is completely false and untrue and I ask Your Honour to either, if the member is going to quote me, to quote me correctly or Your Honour name him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

On several occasions now the honourable Member for Bell Island has risen on a point of order that really was not quite a valid point of order. It is a difference of opinion between two honourable members.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker. It is a matter of a statement that I made.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WILSON: I think I have been granted the privilege of the floor. If the honourable Member for Bell Island would just take it cool. I took it cool when I was listening to him trying to shoot off over there.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WILSON: It goes to show that he was not in favor of the committee or else he would not have brought in anything against it.

But, as I have said before, why did they not when they had a chance do something about it. When the honourable Jack Davis, he was going to clear out the seal fishery they let that go idly by. Now, I adjourn the debate at last.

MR. SPEAKER: I now call it one of the clock and leave the Chair until three o'clock this afternoon.

The House resumed at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! When we adjourned for lunch the honourable Member for Port de Grave was speaking on the Report of the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery and I recognize the honourable Member for Port de Grave.

MR. NEARY: Point of order, Sir. We should have a quorum in the House before we start the proceedings, Sir. I notice there is no quorum.

MR. YOUNG: Sit down! Sit down! Sit down!

MR. EVANS: A retarded party.

MR. SPEAKER: There is a quorum.

MR. NEARY: Does Your Honour not have to wait three minutes before we count the House after the bell rings according to the Standing Rules of the House?

MR. EVANS: You could not count to fourteen in three hours.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Standing Order says that there should be a three minute interval before a quorum is called. I recognize the honourable Member for Port de Grave.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, as I was speaking to this debate before lunch, apparently it seems like some of the honourable members wish to prolong this as far as that is concerned, It seems like they do not want to hear anything about the inshore fishery. They are constantly interjecting into the debate and as far as I am concerned it is high time that we have come to a conclusion to try to do something about the inshore fishery. For many a year, as we all know, since Confederation, it was always passing the buck - gill nets bigger longliners, more trawlers and what not. I think in time past it someone had stood on his own feet in this honourable House that we would not be into the situation that we are into today. Our stocks would not be depleted, and depleted they are, for one reason, because there is no initiative taken by our federal government. That is shown by what is after happening in this ICNAF Conferesnce. We have no one

to take a stand and if Newfoundland is going to be viable as a province to pay our way, our fisheries should be taken care of, first to find out and see if there is something that can be done about it. And I presume if there was a ban put on certain areas of the fishery for five years there might be a chance of seeing where it could be viable again.

But if one would look back and if there is any thought or memory or recollections whatsoever, all of this is placed, as it were, before us in big book to read. If we would only just say stop to what we are now going through! It may be there is nothing that can be done about it but at least we, as a government, as a people, can try and do something about it. And then should all fail you would not be cast aside and it said that you never tried to do your part. And I think this government should be complimented and our Minister of Fisheries

for arriving at this particular point in time when this Committee was set up.

And I am sure we have heard it said the fisheries are being studied to death, and it is true. But studied to death how? Now by going amongst fishermen, getting them into a meeting and finding out their views and their ideas and finding out the situation we are into. It is sad when you come to find out and go to meetings amongst fishermen, one, two, three and four hundred in different communities and to see the despair they are into and do not know where to turn. And I say here and now that is a challenge to the federal government. We are blaming gill nets for the cause of our fish, a lot of it being depleted. And I claim and I stand here now and say now that I do believe it because when all the mother fish are collected while spawning, what you have left is nothing. And that is where we are now.

In my little community yesterday morning there was a longliner went out and hauled their gill nets, I think, they hauled five gill nets, they had twenty-six fish out of five gill nets.

MR. EVANS: In Port de Grave?

MR. WILSON: Right. It is a sad state of affairs. And I say right now that the federal government could do nothing better over a period of time even if they had to pay the people for their gill nets, let them be phased out over a period of years, even if it took say five years for the gill nets to phase out. If we are going to take action and try to do something about it, God knows we cannot wait for any riper time than right now. You can dip water out of a well and receive enough to drink but when you get to the last drop there is none left. And apparently everything has been done with our fishery. It has been pondered over and everything tried every way in the world even to establishing fish meal plants where all the young fish were taken and turned into fish meal. In the days when I went fishing on the Labrador you could land probably 1,000, 1,500, 2,000 quintals of fish, and the so-called rounders or small fish, why, you would be lucky to have five or six or barrels in the Fall of the year, because the

younger fish were turned back into the water to grow. But right now everything is taken, and what is not used say for human consumption it taken to a fish meal plant, everything being depleted. And we have sat idly by - and I do not want to bring politics into this - sat idly by for twenty-three years and under Confederation no one rose to speak about it to try and solve the problems of the fishery. As I said here this morning all you heard was talk of two and three jobs for every man, and our younger generation stepped out of the fishing boat and went to look for a college education. But what did they find? They found nothing! They had education. Some of them never had a fishing boat to get aboard to get out and go fishing, which is a good livelihood. And as far as I am concerned back in the good old days when I was a fisherman for twenty-seven years, and I found the field pretty prosperous when I was at it. Pretty prosperous why? If you were a fisherman you have to put some incentive into it. And I say right here and now, without making any bones about it that one of the problems of our fishery is everybody is looking to the government asking, what is the government going to do?

But the time has come in the fishery for each individual to ask what am I going to do to put something into it? Mr. Speaker, I have found in a few years that I tried to work and strive to build up a business and what not, I found that I had to work hard and honest to put something in, in order for the other fellow to

take something out. But, the day and age has come now when it seems like we are trying to take everything out and put nothing in. Therefore, our younger generation should be put to a place that our federal government along with our provincial government, and the federal has to have the first go on it, to do something to upgrade our fisheries. Supposing, as I said before, there is a ban on certain areas for five years. It is better for there to be a ban for five years than in future to live with nothing. I never saw it in my time, in the town of Clarke's Beach where I live that you could not buy a meal of fresh fish. Now, this is a sad state of affairs, not that we have not got fishermen willing to go fishing but one goes and toils day and night and come back with nothing, only discouraged.

And to sit in this honourable House of Assembly with the Opposition getting up and banging and trying to trigger around this Fisheries Committee, when we should be going hand in hand and trying to do something about it and forget our politics and forget our petty wonders and get down and get to work and try to do something for the Province where we will not be in a welfare state.

MR. NEARY: That is what we are saying.

MR. WILSON: That is what you are saying?

MR. NEARY: That is what I said this morning.

MR. WILSON: Now, I am proud to have worked on this Committee with even a couple of members from the Opposition Party. I make no bones about it. They are men as far as that is concerned who are trying to do their part. I am sorry that the honourable Member for Fogo is not in his seat. I was quite impressed when we had our meeting in Fogo, as I said here this morning about our seal fishery which was just about thrown out. You were not allowed to use a gaff or nothing to save your life, and it came on the floors of this honourable House and no one would battle it. They let it go through until it came to the place that we had about 2,500 fishermen going to the ice every Spring and coming home and deriving a livelihood and they let that all go down the drain.

When I went down in Fogo to the Fisheries Committee meeting to see the men coming in with longliners with 300 and 400 seal pelts probably \$30,000 or \$40,000 in a couple to three weeks or a month brought into a community, this is something to make you proud to be on a Fisheries Committee, to know that you are trying to do something, to figure out something for this Province as far as that is concerned, God knows right here where we are that we have enough people looking for handouts from the government. And who is the government? The government are the taxpayers of this Province. I am one of them and you as well. This is what we have to get down to. We have waited too long. It is too late to put the lock on the door when the horse is gone. It is better to lock the door when he is there.

I say right here and now, Mr. Speaker, that this government as far as that is concerned with its members who have been on the Select Committee and our chairman and those who worked with us, we have fought hard to try to do a good job for the fishermen without any remuneration as far as I am concerned. I was prepared to lose my time and am prepared now and satisfied to say here now, as the Member for Bonavista had said, that this should not stop where we are, this should be an ongoing thing, I am sure, and I speak with confidence with a young, aggressive man as the Ministry of the Fisheries as we have in the honourable member, Mr. Crosbie, I think with young blood, I think that we can build a future, but we have not very much longer to do it. I fear to see that if the generation that is in the fishing boat now slip away and there is nothing done, then there is going to be a sad state in the fisheries as far as that is concerned.

While there is not all emphasis on fisheries, it takes something else besides the fisheries to keep this Province going, there is farming as well of which very little has been spoken about. There are other things in this Province. But, as far as that is concerned it takes the fishery



along with other things as well to make this Province viable. Mr. Speaker, apparently the honourable Member for Labrador North and the honourable Member for Bell Island do not know the language but if they got the education, Mr. Speaker, and they used the dictionary - probably they have swallowed it. I never swallowed mine - so, as far as I am concerned, Mr. Speaker, all we have heard is about the \$40 million for trawlers and this and that. Probably our government is after taking a second look, our Premier and our Minister of Fisheries are after taking a second look on it. Probably it is not the draggers we need. Probably we have got too many now. I say there is a possibility that we have some that we have scrapped and some that are coming over to the other side and a ban put on them, we would have a better fishery.

MR. NEARY: Is that government policy you are stating now?

MR. WILSON: Never mind government policy. It is my idea, not whatever government policy is as far as that is concerned.

MR. EVANS: Would you like to buy the draggers we have now?

MR. WILSON: I hope to conclude, I hope to conclude that my idea may be probably even better one to take hold to than the one the honourable Member for Bell Island has put forth here to try to knock this Fisheries Committee as far as that is concerned.

MR. NEARY: I knocked the Committee?

MR. WILSON: Knock, yes, everything.

MR. EVANS: Knock your wooden head.

MR. DOODY: Knock, knock Neary we will call him.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: How about the lumber industry?

MR. WILSON: The honourable member does not have to worry a great lot about the lumber industry as far as that is concerned. Probably if he had the gumption to start out instead of all talk they might be able to do something for the people on Bell Island as far as the lumber is concerned. I have nothing to claim for lumber,

getting any out of government or anyone else as far as that is concerned.

MR. EVANS: He sold all the lumber in his logger days.

MR. WILSON: Mr. Speaker, as far as that is concerned it has all been talked about the fishery, what has been done for the fishery and what not. We know a lot has been done. But I was very impressed on this Fishery Committee to find out, to be told they wanted bigger boats. They wanted more gear. We went into fishing communities and found out two men in a dory were making more money than men with a longliner that cost \$70,000 or \$80,000 - and two men in a dory are making more money than some guys are making in a longliner. This goes to show me, Mr. Speaker, there is a place for the underdog and there is a place for the big fellow as well. Probably we have paid too much attention on trawlers and longliners. Therefore, by doing that there is only a certain set of people who got it. The smaller fellows, the real fishermen are the fishermen who are after being neglected. It is all right when you are up but I say, Mr. Speaker, the fellow who is down is the fellow you have to get up and lift up and get him up along side the other fellow as well and probably we can do a good job in fishing and a good job in government.

My plea is here now, Sir, is as far as this is concerned, that I hope that the Federal Government will take a second look at it and put a ban on the gill nets and phase them out over a period of five years, supposing you had to subsidize the fishermen and pay them for their nets and supply them with trawls and let them trawl the fish instead of gill nets being lost on the bottom to create a problem, what we call ghost net fishing.

Mr. Speaker, I am very privileged to be able to stand in this House and speak on this Fisheries Committee and the fisheries report, coming from a fishing settlement. I am sure the people of Port de Grave, particularly the fishermen there have tried their best as far that is concerned to make the fishery viable. Some can

and more cannot because the stocks are not there. Until we get some jurisdiction and the Federal Government to go along with the Provincial Government to do something about it, probably the next year or the year after we will be in a worst state because we will have no fishery at all. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bonavista North.

+
MR. P.S.THOMS: Mr. Speaker, as a member of this Committee I thought that like all other members I would try to get my two cents worth in. The Committee, Mr. Speaker, was set up to investigate all aspects of the inshore fishery in Newfoundland and to report back to this honourable House. Mr. Speaker, our hands were almost tied from the word go because a time limit was placed upon the Committee. This, I thought at the time, was very unfair indeed, because to traverse the shores of Newfoundland even in the Summer months is a difficult job in itself. And the Committee had to traverse our shores in the Spring of the year and, of course, in Newfoundland in the Spring of the year we experience some of the worst weather conditions that the North Atlantic can throw at us.

We met, Mr. Speaker, thousands of people during our visits to the various communities. I did not attend all the meetings. I found it impossible. I doubt if any member attended all the meetings. But I attended what meetings I could and I listened very attentively to the problems of the fishermen of our land. And, Mr. Speaker, the problems of our fishermen today are not exactly the same in every community of our province. They vary almost from community to community, from the people in Newtown, who do not have a slipway to haul up their boats, to the people over in St. George's who have to land on the beach to land their catch - they do not even have a stagehead - to all the other problems that we met during our traverse, the problems of both facilities and equipment.

And, Mr. Speaker, I suppose if we went to every community in the Province we would find various problems, different problems and all of these would have to be solved in different ways. There is, however,

MR. PECKFORD: Where is the common denominator?

MR. THOMS: Of course, there is always a common denominator. But, Mr. Speaker, I suppose during this session of the House of Assembly the inshore fishery has been talked about more than ever it has been talked about before in the history of our Province. Now I myself have had very little to do with the inshore fishery. However I have filled up the barrow on many a morning, But both my father's people and my mother's people come from long and outstanding names

in the fishing industry - families in the fishing industry - and have prosecuted the fishery all down through the ages. And I think you will find some of them even today prosecuting the fishery. And so the fishery, especially the inshore fishery, Mr. Speaker, has been in my blood as long as I have been born.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we can stand here in this House of Assembly and we can talk about the problems of the fishery. Any honourable gentleman can get up and talk about certain problems and I can get up and I can thrash over the same old problems and we can accomplish nothing with our long oratory in this House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. THOMS: We have had four hundred years now, and I do not care what political party was in power at the time,

we have had approximately 400 years of neglect of Newfoundland's most important basic industry. Eighty per cent, Mr. Speaker, of our people either directly or indirectly rely upon the fishery for their livelihood in Newfoundland, not only in years gone by but even today. It is with that in mind, Mr. Speaker, that I believe that we in Newfoundland should certainly pay more attention to this basic industry of ours. In Newfoundland the most important industry in our land is the fishing industry.

If you look at the Newfoundland budget, not only this year, last year, but as far back as you would like to go, you will find that our budget has not related at all to the most important basic industry of our land. I examined, for example, the budgets of three other provinces. I particularly examined the three Prairie Provinces. And while their primary basic industry is not fishing but their most important industry is in the agricultural field, and these three provinces have recognized their basic most important industry and have paid specific attention to it.

Alberta, for example, spends two per cent of its total budget on agriculture. Manitoba spends four per cent on agriculture, its most important industry. Saskatchewan spends five-point-eight per cent of its total budget on agriculture. If we compare this to the most important industry in Newfoundland, what do we find? We find that we spend less than one per cent of our total budget on fisheries. This year out of a budget of almost \$1,100,000,000, we are spending \$9.2 million on fisheries. This, Mr. Speaker, does not at all give the fishing industry the recognition that it should have or that it deserves. Our expenditure this year on fisheries should be in the vicinity of \$40 million to \$45 million. I do not blame this on the present administration because the trend has long been set, but I hope and trust that government both now and in the future will pay the proper attention to the fishery of this Province as it deserves.

Mr. Speaker, I could speak I suppose for days on the various aspects of the fishery. I am sure it has all been said before, but

there are a few things which I would like to elaborate on. During our rounds around the Province we did not hear one voice from any of the fishermen, not one voice was raised against the Fresh Fish Marketing Corporation, the Saltfish Corporation. There was one voice raised but that was not from a fisherman. It was from a merchant. I am sure the members of the Committee know who I am talking about.

Mr. Speaker, for the first time in our history the Saltfish Corporation is doing justice to the fishermen who either supply the Saltfish Corporation with fish, either salt or fresh. And, Mr. Speaker, the idea of this corporation was a godsend to thousands and thousands of our fishermen. It would do well of any administration to expand and to encourage this corporation and if necessary to implement a similar corporation to handle the fresh fish

Province. There will be no more restricted licences. What I mean is that a magistrate takes my licence away one month, after five months from that date I can go to the - if he takes it away for twelve months - I can go to the Appeal's Board and apply for my licence and if the Board listens to my appeal, if they rule in favour of my appeal they will then issue my licence back to me, not a restricted licence. They will restore my licence. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is not looking after the fact that we have had so many drunken drivers on the highways and we must cut down on the number of restricted licences. Because in my view, Mr. Speaker, this act or this bill to amend The Highway Traffic Act is going to mean that there will be more licences than ever before issued now after the licence was suspended, because they can take their cases to the Appeal's Board and have their cases appealed by that Board, and decisions made.

And the reason why, if you look at page 4, at the bottom of page 4, the restoration of licence in order of the Board, Section 9 of the main act, that a person whose driver's licence has been suspended or cancelled under Subsection (1) for a violation of this act or the regulations for which he has been convicted or subsection (3) may after the expiration of one half of the period of suspension or cancellation can apply to the Board for an order directing the registrar to restore the driver's licence. That, Mr. Speaker, is quite clear. I can if I wanted to, if I lost my licence, can come in and appeal to the Appeal's Board to have my licence restored. Now what it would mean then, if the Appeal's Board said, "Okay. You are not getting your licence back," we go back to the system we have now, where I could take the decision of the Appeal's Board to the court, to a judge and he would decide whether to uphold the Appeal's Board decision or not.

MR. BARRY: That is your interpretation.

MR. MORGAN: Well according to the act. That is how the act reads now. So the fact is, Mr. Speaker, in my reading of this act, and maybe the minister will clarify the points I am making, but the fact that the Suspension Appeal Board with three or five members can decide on who gets a driver's licence



MR. THOMS: And, Mr. Speaker, the caplin scull is not really struck in yet, and I would suspect that within the next three or four weeks -

MR. NEARY: I was casting for caplin yesterday on Bell Island.

MR. THOMS: - we will numerous examples of where our fishermen will have to dump fish just because the fish plants are glutted at this time of the year. They cannot handle the catches, and we have no other facilities to handle the fish. We do not seem to even have facilities at the present time to salt it. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see the Saltfish Corporation improved, expanded upon so that every fish that is turned down by the fresh fish plants could be salted down and sold for protein food, if not to richer countries then to poorer countries of the world.

Mr. Speaker, I heard a couple of government members mention the gill net fishing, and they spoke against the use of gill nets. And Mr. Speaker believe it or not but this is one of the areas where they and I agree. There is ample evidence as

you crisscross over this Province, that even the fishermen themselves who use these gill nets state that they should never be set in the water. The gill net webbing that is used today, Mr. Speaker, is a webbing that does not rot, only after a long period of time will it break down. Irrespective of what some people may say, that once the nets are planted, they double up, they roll up, this may be so in certain cases but only in certain cases for these gill nets continually fish and there is no evidence brought forth yet, none came to the Committee to prove that they did not fish.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief and the belief of a vast majority of people whom I talked to that these nets continually fish and they destroy fish continuously. Not only do they destroy fish continuously, Mr. Speaker, but the quality of fish that is caught in the gill nets is way below the quality of fish, say, caught in a trap, on the jigger, or by the dragnets or on a trawl or any other method of fishing. The quality of fish is very poor and for this means alone, I believe, that the gill nets should not be phased out over a five year period because, Mr. Speaker, I think if we come to the conclusion that the gill net is bad for the inshore fishery, I think we should chop them off within the twelve month period, compensate the fishermen who have the nets at the present time if necessary, buy the webbing from them, destroy the nets so that this problem will be deleted from our inshore fishery once and for all.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. THOMS: The fish continually rot but the net does not, only after a long period of time.

Mr. Speaker, I was very encouraged by many of the submissions that were brought before the Committee. Many of these submissions had suggested solutions to many of the problems that the fishermen are experiencing today. There is one sure thing about all the suggestions - that government both provincial and federal must take a stronger interest and more realistic interest in the inshore

fishery of Newfoundland, and this interest has to be shown in a very positive way.

When I or members of this honourable Assembly presenting petitions to Government both on the Opposition side and on the government side looking for \$2,000 or \$3,000 to build a small slipway, to improve some of the fishing facilities in a community, and not receiving positive action, then, Mr. Speaker, I wonder do we really thing anything about the fishery at all or really do we consider it an economic venture at all because many of the problems that are found in many of our smaller outports can be solved in a very short period of time with just a \$2,000 or \$3,000 investment.

I believe that the provincial Department of Fisheries must take a close look at the individual problems of the community fishermen,

and only in this way can this government or any other government prove to any of our fishermen in a realistic way that they are interested in the fishery and that they are able and willing to solve the problems that beset them.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in Newfoundland, that is in the inshore fishery, we actually have three inshore fisheries. You have to look at it as three different fisheries - the Northeast Coast is one, the South Coast is another and the West Coast is the third. And all three areas are different, and all three areas should be treated differently. There is no such thing as setting down a policy and applying it to all three areas, it is impossible. And if you set up a policy for the East Coast of Newfoundland it is impossible to apply that policy to the West Coast. Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that the West Coast of Newfoundland should be geared towards the fresh fish market, that is, the bulk of the fish caught on the West Coast should be geared to the supermarkets, to the outlets in Eastern Canada and the Eastern States, so that the fresh fish can be caught in the morning on the West Coast flown to the markets and sold within a twenty-four hour period or so.

There is ample room for this, The facilities to accommodate this idea are already installed on the West Coast. There may have to be some minor organization, some minor installations but basically everything is there for this to happen. The South Coast of Newfoundland is definitely a fresh fish or frozen fresh fish area. The whole South Coast should be turned into an area where Newfoundland produces nothing but fresh cod blocks or fresh haddock blocks through whatever species of fish we have, but fresh fish blocks.

MR. EARLE: Or salt fish.

MR. THOMS: Not necessarily so. But the South Coast is prime for the frozen fish market. And the Northeast Coast, Mr. Speaker, is an area that can be very easily turned into a salt fish area. All of the fish on the Northeast Coast should be bought by a fresh fish corporation which I trust, hope and trust, will be set up, But it

should be set up, and this fish should all be salted and marketed the same way that the Saltfish Corporation is doing now. Thereby you would give the fishermen a basic amount per pound and then at the end of the year if there are any profits you would also pass that along to the fishermen as is happening today, But if there is a loss you do not pass the loss along to the fishermen, This is subsidized by the Corporation itself.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I could take up the time of the Committee and go through each of the recommendations. Most of these recommendations, Mr. Speaker, have been known for some time. It is really motherhood. There was however, Mr. Speaker, a couple of things that the Committee did not investigate,

did not look into and I have to bring them to the attention of the honourable House because I believe it should have been done. I am not sure of the reason why it was not. We have been now for a number of years sending fresh cod blocks to the Eastern Seaboard. There have been rumors upon rumors that many of our cod blocks have been arriving at the Eastern Seaboard in some kind of a condition which would be much less below the standard for human consumption.

MR. DOODY: In the United States?

MR. THOMS: In the Eastern Seaboard which is the United States. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this should have been investigated. What we heard was only rumor. We did not see first-hand. We had no knowledge of it. We had no proof of it. While I realize the time of the Committee was very important, I believe either a Committee or some arm of the government should have investigated these rumors - and they were only rumors - because if our fish was arriving on the Eastern Seaboard in a condition that was not fit for human consumption, then, Mr. Speaker, this would tell us why the Pacific fish took precedence over the Newfoundland fish because we, during this last twelve months, have definitely lost markets on the Eastern Seaboard. I believe it is the responsibility of government, particularly the Department of Fisheries, either provincial or federal to investigate and find out why.

Mr. Speaker, we have off the Coast of Newfoundland, I suppose, hundreds of fishing boats of all types and sizes from approximately fourteen different nations of the world. Mr. Speaker, these fishing boats are very capable and very efficient boats. They can scoop up more fish in a twenty-four hour period than many of us can even imagine. They have been doing so now for some twenty-five or thirty years. Mr. Speaker, as I say, these boats are from various countries, but, Mr. Speaker, someone, someone in Newfoundland is making a tidy mint off of these boats. Someone in Newfoundland is agent for these

boats. Someone is at - while they say that we should not have them out there, some Newfoundlander is acting as the agent for these boats. I believe that the Committee or some arm of government should investigate and find out who these agents are, what are their contracts and what is the value of their contracts because while we are striving to improve the fishery, while we are trying to in some way or other either reduce the catches of these foreign fleets or reduce the foreign fleets altogether, we have some people in our midst who are making a tidy sum and a tidy sum and a tidy sum indeed, Mr. Speaker. This is one question that I would have liked to have seen answered. It was not.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I believe almost every speaker in this debate who arose spoke about the two hundred mile limit. It is a motherhood subject, Mr. Speaker. It becomes a very

very emotional subject with us. Sometimes we get carried away but basically, Mr. Speaker, we can take all the recommendations of this report, both those that are within the federal domain or the provincial domain, and we can take all the recommendations that are not in this report, and not one of them is worth one cent unless something is done about the conservation of fish stocks on the East Coast of Newfoundland.

And while the Member for Burgeo may say that the fish on the Grand Banks is not the fish which his people catch, I would sincerely disagree with him. Because the fish on the Grand Banks, Mr. Speaker, and on the banks along the Northeast Coast migrate from offshore to inshore.

MR. EVANS: Two different subjects.

MR. THOMS: They are not two different subjects, they are one and the same.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee met with scientists from the Federal Department of Fisheries and they indicated to us and told us that if there was a reduction in the catches offshore, that this reduction would be noticeable within months in the inshore fishery.

MR. NEARY: But the Burgeo "Burp" did not say that.

MR. EVANS: Burn your gill nets down in Bonavista Bay and you will see the difference.

MR. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker, this is what we are told by the scientists, and this I believe.

MR. EVANS: They know about as much as you do, which is nothing.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, members of this honourable House all this Winter and all this Spring and now coming into the Summer months have been talking fish. And we have only been talking fish because we have not been doing anything about it. To date, Mr. Speaker, there has not been one positive action emerge from this honourable House -

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. THOMS: - on the inshore fishery of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. THOMS: Let me, Mr. Speaker, throw out a challenge to the



Minister of Fisheries -

MR. MURPHY: Keep the House open!

MR. THOMS: - and I believe it is only the Minister of Fisheries or the Premier who could accept or carry out such a challenge. Let the Minister of Fisheries lead a delegation to Ottawa of forty members of the House of Assembly, and we only have forty here -

MR. EVANS: And you will get quite a reception.

MR. THOMS: Let the minister or the Premier -

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please! In the past few minutes we have had a number of interjections from honourable members and I intercede at this point so that these interjections do not become the rule rather than the exception.

MR. NEARY: He has not learned to hold his uppers and lowers yet.

MR. BARRY: Order, please!

MR. DOODY: You are definitely lower.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, let me repeat, Let me throw out a challenge -

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. THOMS: - to either the Premier of this Province or the present Minister of Fisheries. Let either of these two gentlemen, Mr. Speaker, lead a delegation of forty M.H.A's to Ottawa.

MR. EVANS: Count me out. Talking about 200 miles for the inshore fishery!

MR. THOMS: And, Mr. Speaker, let us proceed to the House of Commons, either get a meeting with the Federal Minister of Fisheries or the Prime Minister -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: - or the cabinet and while we are up there, Mr. Speaker, let us get all seven M.P's with us -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. THOMS: - and I am sure every one would, to a man, every one

of them, Mr. Marshall, Mr. Rompkey, Mr. Baker, Mr. Rooney, Mr. McGrath,  
Mr. Carter and Mr. Jamieson -

MR. NEARY: An all the other Atlantic Provinces.

MR. THOMS: - and Mr. Jamieson, Mr. Speaker, being Newfoundland's  
Cabinet Minister should lead us. And let us stay in Ottawa until we  
get recognition from the federal authorities -

MR. NEARY: Have a sit-in.

MR. THOMS: - that the federal government will implement a 200  
mile zone.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. THOMS: And if necessary, Mr. Speaker, let us sit in the  
House of Commons day in and day out and if we have to, let us march  
in front of the Parliament Buildings with out placards.

MR. MURPHY: And we will give up eating, too!

MR. THOMS: Let us sit on the steps of the Parliament Building.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. THOMS: We have to, Mr. Speaker, draw attention

to the fishery problems of Newfoundland, to the people of Canada and to the world. We cannot convince the people in Central Canada just by sending a petition to Ottawa, by names signed to it. We have to have action. And, Mr. Speaker, this is the type of action that Ottawa will recognize and the type of action that Ottawa will act upon.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. THOMS: We are not the government. The government of the day -

MR. F. ROWE: Do you understand that or what?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: If the Premier or the Minister of Fisheries would like to lead this delegation, every member of the Opposition will fall in line, every member.

MR. EVANS: Why do you not disown Trudeau!

MR. NEARY: And we would carry the placards.

MR. F. ROWE: That is going to solve the problem is it?

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, there is no need of disowning anyone.

MR. F. ROWE: Do not be so political.

MR. BARRY: Are you supporting the Liberal government in Ottawa?

MR. THOMS: The federal government in Ottawa may need a little push. The members of this House of Assembly have the power to give them that little shove.

MR. BARRY: The Liberal Party in Newfoundland is so interested-

MR. THOMS: Is the government of the day going to rise today?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Glory halleluiah!

MR. THOMS: Are they going to help the fishermen of Newfoundland? Or is the government going to sit by, idly by while the fish are being caught and the jobs in Newfoundland disappear? That is the question today, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Let us go.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Do you want us to take over the Province?

MR. NEARY: Let us go and put up the united front.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: Do you want us to deal with Ottawa?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. NEARY: We will go on our own.

MR. THOMS: Member of this House of Assembly should lay party politics aside for this one issue.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. THOMS: Out of all the other issues, this is the most important issue ever to come before the House of Assembly.

MR. F. ROWE: They cannot resist getting political.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: I know, Mr. Speaker, the schoolboy debater from Placentia West has to be partisan. But, Mr. Speaker, there is no other subject that has come before this honourable House more important than the subject at hand. I say, lay party politics aside. Let us unite for once. Let us go to Ottawa as one. Let us go to Ottawa as true Newfoundlanders. Let us go to Ottawa to get action. And only in this way, Mr. Speaker, will we get action. Any member of government who would not support such action, Mr. Speaker, is not a true-blooded Newfoundlander.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. THOMS: Is the Minister of Energy saying he would -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: - not support such action?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Is he against the betterment -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Honourable members seem to be getting carried away in the heat of debate. The Chair is having a lot of difficulty in following ten conversations all at once. And at the same time I would like to inform the honourable Member for Bonavista North except by leave he has five minutes left to speak.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maybe the honourable members across the way when the time comes, Mr. Speaker, will be generous and give me leave.

MR. DOOBY: No leave!

MR. THOMS: But, Mr. Speaker, like I said - no leave, sure because this is a very important subject.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: This is important to every one of the 20,000 fishermen in Newfoundland.

MR. BARRY: You are playing games.

MR. THOMS: I am not playing games. I am dead serious.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: If you people in the government were serious you would act upon this suggestion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. E ROWE: There is the troublemaker over there.

MR. THOMS: You are taking this report and you are doing nothing with it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Honourable members seem to take as a little bit of a joke the fact that I just reminded them that when a member is speaking he has the right to be heard in silence. If honourable members to my left and to my right persist in yelling out across the floor, then I shall name them forthwith.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, there is no trouble to tell the troublemaker in this House. He is sitting right across from me. But, Mr. Speaker, this to me is the most important topic that has come up in this House of Assembly. We should act upon it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Keep quiet or you will get named.

MR. THOMS: We should act as one because, Mr. Speaker, if we do not put pressure on Ottawa, if we do not get the 200 mile limit

imposed, it is only a matter of time when we can say good-bye to the inshore fishery of Newfoundland. The catches are becoming smaller every year, Mr. Speaker, every year.

MR. NEARY: Gear down those uppers over there.

MR. THOMS: Do not worry, Mr. Speaker, about imposing a fishery zone around Eastern Canada. We have three countries in the world today:

Iceland with fifty miles, Bolivia with two hundred and Chile with two hundred and these three countries are still existing, They are not at war with anyone. They have laid down the law and laid it down firm -

MR. DOODY: Firmly.

MR. THOMS: - and so should we in Canada. And we should urge, Mr. Speaker, the federal government to implement a 200 mile fishery zone as rapidly as we possibly can impose it. Mr. Speaker, any member of this House who would disagree with a 200 mile fishery zone would disagree with the 20,000 fishermen we have in Newfoundland today and would work against their interest.

MR. NEARY: We got the 200 mile limit. All the Tory members refused to vote -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROWE: If we do not implement this 200 mile zone we will lose the fishery and if we lose the fishery we will lose Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NEARY: We will go on a hunger strike.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Finance.

MR. NEARY: The old fish merchant himself.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I thought we would get some wisecracks from the honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. DOODY: Cracks anyway, not very wise.

MR. EARLE: He spent this morning trying to knock the old fish merchants. Well I make no apologies as far as the fish merchants of the past are concerned, I was -

MR. NEARY: You were one.

MR. EARLE: I was one of them for thirty-two years -

MR. NEARY: Still are.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. EARLE: - and basically I think that this country would have been in a very, very poor shape if it had not been men of courage in the past who had enough guts to put some of their money where their mouths were instead of - lots of people around here are all mouth and no money.

MR. DOODY: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. EARLE: The history of the fishery, anybody who bothers to read about it at all or try to sum it up, is that during the past century or so there have been literally hundreds of fish companies gone out of business. There was a time when around the coast of this province there was a merchant in practically every place trying his best to keep the fishery alive. But he found it was an endless, hopeless battle insofar that he either went into a general merchant's store, he got an agency for something or he went into selling motor cars or he went into something else because there was absolutely no livelihood in the fishery for anybody with any common sense at all.

What happened was that the people who tried to do something in this industry over the years were the target of complete political abuse. This has been one of the greatest detriments to the fishing industry in this province, that it was used as a political football right down through the years when the former Premier used it at every possible opportunity to try to knock the people who were trying to do something in the industry and trying to keep the thing together. And unfortunately our friend from Bell Island is still carrying on that same old trend. This is the sort of thing that has been the destruction of the industry in the province. It has led to complete disenchantment and anybody who had a grain of sense at all got out of the industry because all that anybody ever got in it was abuse and criticism and blame for trying to do a job which he was not given the chance to do.

MR. NEARY: Get out of it and go into politics.

MR. EARLE: Actually I know from first hand experience, I hold no brief for it having had thirty years in that business, that the only thing that would keep anybody in the old salt fish business alive at all or in business was if he went into some other field of endeavour because on the fish itself, year after year he lost his shirt. I saw a period from 1929 until 1960 when from records which I could produce the profit made on fish was only anything worth calling a profit in



two years out of that whole long period, Most of the other years were a break even and some of them disaster loss years. So that anyone that stayed at that kind of a game needed to have his head examined. There was no sense or no rationale to it at all. On top of that you were trying to support and look after a group of people who themselves, and rightly so, were completely disheartened because they could see no future in it. They were living in literally poverty-stricken times and of course they had to blame somebody. So it was always used by the politicians as a means to blame the merchant. He was the fellow who got the kicking

around all of the time for this kind of thing.

HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. EARLE: The honourable gentleman from Bell Island talked about going to Florida and setting up places. It was not the fish merchants who went to Florida, it was generally the politicians or somebody who was selling motor cars or toothbrushes or marmalade or something of that sort. It was not the fellow who was trying to keep the fisheries going. He generally ended up pretty darn close to the poor house if he stuck at it. And you only have to look through the long -

MR. NEARY: The Crosbie's and the Monroe's were a good example of it.

MR. EARLE: Yes, but they did not make their money on fish, I might say. These fellows, you take all the names, the Bowrings, the Hickmans, the Ayres and all these people on Water Street, while one day big people in the fish business, they had enough sense to get out of it while the going was good, because if they had not they would have been paupers. All of these fellows saw where the money was to be made and that is what they went into, they did not stay at the fishery because there was no money in it.

MR. NEARY: What about the Moores in Harbour Grace?

MR. EARLE: In any case, this is an endless sort of an argument because the type of person that we are dealing with over there, he is only using it for political ends. He uses it so, so the same old thing that has been going on for twenty-five years continues - knock somebody, beat him down, get something that there is public sympathy for, and in so doing destroy an industry.

I remember well that when the salt fish business was having the hardest time in its history, markets were bad and everything else, this sort of propaganda was coming out about what the merchants were doing, being played up politically, there was an election on at the time, and I was Chairman of NAFEL at that time trying to sell fish in the West Indies. And my cripers! You would go to the West Indies,

you go to Jamaica or Puerto Rico or Trinidad or anywhere else and they would produce the St. John's Evening Telegram to show what a rascal you were and what kind of a crook you were and then they would say, "Now we are going to beat the price of fish down \$5.00 a quintal." We were literally down there trying to sell against our own Newfoundlander who were destroying the industry here at home. And this is the sort of stuff that we had to put up with.

Anyhow this is history, and it is no good. The thing which distresses me is that there is still an attitude in this country and there are still certain individuals who think they can make some sort of headway on that kind of trash. That should be dead and buried and forgotten long ago because this is the -

MR. NEARY: We still got our Spencer Lake, you know.

MR. EARLE: This is the stuff that did the damage. More hats off to Spencer Lake and more like him! By cripers! They risked their money, and what money they made they put into the fishery. There is one company here today that has got a \$9 million a year payroll, they are virtually insolvent, yet they employ 1,500 people. Now these fellows who talk so glibly about the merchant class and this kind of stuff, do they employ 1,500 people? Do they have a payroll of \$9 million? Do they try to keep the thing going? And do they wake up every day and see some blah in the paper by some fool saying what crooks they are? This is the kind of thing that is destroying this country. Anyhow all of that should be forgotten because it is not even worth talking about. That is not the sort of thing that is going to make our industry a success.

There are three basic problems in the fishing industry today. First of all I would like to congratulate this Committee on the work they have done. They had a very, very short time to do it. They got around and they accumulated a vast amount of information at a very difficult time of the year. Unfortunately most of the information they got is already known to everybody, but they could not help that.

It is just the same story being repeated. But they did bring out really what are the basic problems of the fishing industry in Newfoundland. And when you look at them in any sort of rational way and try to sort them out they are enough to frighten the living daylights out of you, because it is a question, it is a very big question indeed whether or not the fishing industry in Newfoundland can survive. First of all you have the main problem of the diminishing catch. The fact is, of course, without the 200 mile limit that our fisheries done off our shore will literally be wiped out. There certainly will be no fish business of any type and no merchants to criticize if there is not any fish to catch. And that is the first basic problem we have to face in this industry.

The second one is, which is almost as serious, is that the cost of operating the fishing business today is astronomical. The sort of equipment that is required, the modern trawler and the modern dragger, or even the longliner and the types of fishing gear that are needed have gone up in cost to such an extent that only a very viable, profitable, economically sound industry could support such an overhead. And the fishery is not a viable, economic, sound industry at the present time, It cannot pay for this kind of equipment. It cannot support it. And how you are going to tie this altogether I do not know, because costs certainly are not going to come down, costs if anything are going to increase. And how are you going to get enough out of the fishery to pay these tremendously expensive costs particularly if

at the same time your production is going down? These are the basic questions which we have to answer. Then there is another and third equally big question which has to be answered in this Province and that is the overall interest of the younger people in the fishery. They have become disheartened. First of all, their fathers and their grandfathers were disheartened because of the sort of propaganda that was put out by politicians in the past about the industry. They were completely disheartened and now the younger people are looking at it -

MR. NEARY: Because they are not going to make any more millionaires.

MR. EARLE: - and the people are looking at it today and going at this and saying, "Look, why the heck should I go into this sort of thing. My father and my grandfather tell me it is a stinking poor industry anyhow. You can never make a decent living at it and you are going to live in poverty all your life and you are never going to make a decent wage. For Pete's sake it would be better for me to go off somewhere and get a job at something else." So here you have this cumulative effect of people saying, "Well, gee whiz, the thing is not worth going into." So you have the three phased programme. You have a diminishing catch. You have an extremely and increasing high cost and you have a rapidly decreasing interest in the industry. Now, how do you solve that?

It seems to me that there is nothing can be done for this industry and I am rapidly becoming a pessimist, unless this is a complete subsidized industry for a long period, a long period of time, a long enough period of time to get the two hundred mile limit, to get inshore control fishing zones and to get the catch up. But this is not going to be done today or tomorrow. It is going to take years to do it. It is going to take many years. While that is going on there has to be a heavy subsidy of the cost of operations because nobody within their right senses, no financier or anybody else - and I have tried this in the past. I have gone to the different finance

people in the different markets and said, "How about coming into Newfoundland and putting some money, some big money, some real money into the fishing industry?" And they said, "Are you crazy? You see, you come to us and talk about putting money into the fishing industry. My heavens above, we can put it in a bank in New York, we can put it in real estate, we can go into anything and we are sure that we will make a decent profit on this. And you talk about going down in that kind of a crazy, risky business to put venture capital into it. You must be nuts. There is no way that we are going to put money into that kind of thing." There are not people in the world who are that foolish that are going to stick out a pile of money to go into an industry when they see that there is no real future and no real profit into it. There is nothing wrong with a profit motive in spite of what our friends say across the way. Unless people are making a profit, unless there is a good profit in an industry, business people are not going into it. They are not going to try to build it up.

This is where the whole thing is falling to pieces, because as soon as anybody makes a dime on this thing he is subject to criticism and abuse and everything else that is known under the sun. This has been the greatest detriment to the industry.

MR. NEARY: The millionaire merchants!

MR. DOODY: Are you going down to Burgeo again?

MR. EARLE: But the industry today is extremely highly capital intensive. In order for this kind of money to go into the industry I do not see any source for it from the normal capital markets of the world. You cannot go out and sell this kind of a job. It has to be very heavily subsidized from a capital standpoint by governments. If the Canadian government, and here I mean the Federal Government, is sincerely interested in retaining a major industry on this Coast, and it is a major industry because it employs some 10,000 or 12,000 people, if they are sincerely interested in keeping this thing alive and keeping

a viable industry it has to be heavily subsidized for a number of years.

Now, if we can control the catching, if that can be brought around that the two hundred mile limit and inshore fishing zones can be created to protect our stocks, if the Federal Government will take a serious interest in the fishery and subsidize it from a capital standpoint, both from the capital expenditure necessary for the equipment and from the capital necessary to carry on the industry for a period of years, and then set about in conjunction with the Province on a long-range educational programme to try to show people that this is an industry which has a future, there may be some chance of rescuing the fishery. Other than that, I think we had better forget it and go off and do anything else. And how can you forget 10,000 or 12,000 men? I sympathize with this Committee going around the country. They go and meet sincere, genuine Newfoundlanders who are puzzled and worried and sick because they cannot see any future in it.

And with all respect to our Committee and everybody else we have not got the answers. Nobody here has come up with the answers. They have looked at all this stuff about such things as gill nets or slipways or little things like this. These are only a very small part of the problem. The basic problem, and I repeat, are to ensure the stocks of fish, to subsidize the cost of catching, and to revive an interest in the fisheries by making it a viable industry where there is a profit to be made and where the fellows who are working in it can get a good wage. Until that can be done there is no future in the fishery.

Now this is not a job that the provincial government alone can tackle. There is no way that this province as such with all its other financial commitments and the demands of our people can take hold the fishing industry and put the kind of money into it that needs to be put into it. The sort of pittance that, and I say 'pittance' with all respects to my honourable friend the Minister of Fisheries, that we have been able to put into fisheries over the years is only scratching the surface. It is not really doing a job. And this province cannot afford to do it alone. It has been recognized by the federal government as an industry that has to be sustained because there is a whole segment of Canada here where it is the only possible way of supporting our people. And until they recognize that and until they are prepared to work with the problems in every possible way, there is no way that this industry can be sustained.

Unfortunately it seems to me that the development of the fisheries in recent years, since the time I was associated, has been more directed towards destruction rather than preservation. The technology which we have developed for catching fish is raping the fisheries. It is ruining the fisheries and it is every man for himself, the devil catch the hinder most. This is what is happening in the fishing industry. Soon there has to be some sense arrived at between the nations of the world and among us as Canadians, that there is only a



certain resource out there which has to be preserved. I am all for this 200 mile limit but even more than that I am all for the inshore fishing zones. Because the area which I represent on the South Coast, it is pitiful when you go down there and see these fellows vying with each other with all kinds of modern equipment and everything to try to make a living out of the stuff and really ruining everybody's chance of doing anything with it because they are cleaning up the grounds. They are cleaning up everything in sight and there is no way that a decent group of men can really make a living at this. The only fellow that can -

MR. MURPHY: ..... a dragger.

MR. EARLE: The only fellow that makes a living at the fisheries today is some fellow who is really an exception. You get a few of them in every outport. You get a man, perhaps with a couple of sons, who is prepared to work all day and all night and go out in all weathers and at all times, and if he works like a slave and sweats like a dog he will make a good living at the fishery. But you are not going to get people to do that today. They would rather go off and look for a job in Toronto or somewhere else and you cannot blame them. I believe honestly, I have been talking to numerous fishermen, I believe seventy-five or eighty per cent of the fishermen in Newfoundland today would rather be doing something else.

I have had applications from men who are prosperous trawler skippers, men who make the top wages that can be obtained in the fishing industry, and they have applied to me to see if I can get them a job on a tug boat or on something else.

MR. NEARY: Do they get an answer?

MR. EARLE: They do not like the fishery and it has to be made a very, very attractive industry if you are going to keep these men at it. You educate men in the Fisheries College. You train them to the best of your ability. Now what do they do? They come out of it and they go and get some other kind of a job somewhere else, a great many of them.

They are really not interested and you cannot blame them. I do not blame these fellows. Unless they can see some future in the thing they are not going to show an interest. So basically, Mr. Speaker, you can mull this thing over all you like, you can look at all the problems about gill nets and slipways and harbours and everything else, but the basic problems of the industry are three-fold. That is, means must be found to preserve the supply of fish. That is the first and basic must, and that is an international question and a question which in co-operation with Canada, and with the backing of Canada which unfortunately we have not got as strong as we should, we have got to get this or there is no future for the fishery. We have got to get the 200 mile limit and we have got to get inshore fishing zones. We have got to persuade Ottawa that to preserve the fishery there must be a very heavy subsidy programme for the next period of five or ten years. And while that is all going on, you have got to recreate a sensible

attractive attitude among the people in the fisheries. Now, forget all this stuff that we have heard the nonsense of the day, about old-time merchants and all this kind of stuff. That has been one of the greatest detriments of the fisheries. Anybody that spills that kind of bull, guff should actually be ashamed to talk about the fishery. Because that is the stuff which the former Premier helped to deteriorate and ruin the fisheries with. There were two or three elections fought on the fisheries. What happened? My cripers, the programmes that came out! Go back and look up 1962 and 1966, the things that were brought out that were going to be done to the fisheries then, and look at what has happened since. There is nothing happened. Literally all this stuff is only designed to fool the people. Our people are not prepared to be fooled any longer and I do not blame them.

Now, it is time for all of us in this government to cut out talking about non-essentials, to talk about honesty in the fishery and to talk to people in a language they understand. Tell them the truth and tell them what we are facing and try by all means, if there is any way at all that we can show that as far as this Province is concerned this industry is essential and if we are part of Canada, we want it preserved.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Twillingate.

MR. GILLETT: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. GILLETT: Unfortunately I was not here on Friday when the motion was moved, I take it, by the Minister of Justice. But, the first part of the motion says that this honourable House thanks the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery for their report and for the diligence and perception which the Committee members brought to their task. At the offset I would like to record my sincere thanks on behalf of my people to that Committee for just doing what the motion intends that we do thank them for.

I know that their task was not an easy one. I know they were subject, perhaps, to, particularly the members of that Committee

on the government side, were subjected perhaps to ridicule. But, I do feel sure, and especially after reading this report, that they did get an intelligent submission by fishermen and by all those in the fishing industry and in the trade. They got this report, Mr. Speaker, from men who know what they are talking about. They got these submissions from men who feel that they know solutions to their problems. They are not ignorant of the fact that the markets are soft. Many of these fishermen, I know, must have lived in the time referred to by the Member for Fortune Bay, the Minister of Finance.

Actually, Mr. Speaker, being a fish merchant or the son of a fish merchant—the son of a fisherman, actually, in the beginning—but, however, having come through the Depression as a fish merchant, having faced the problems, having worked very hard manually in that business, I am very proud of it. I am proud of the part that we played in the small community in which we lived. There was no government then for the people to come to when they were hungry or when they were naked. The government gave them six cents a day and told them what they could have with that six cents. I am not going into it, Mr. Speaker. I could keep this House going not only for today but for the remainder of this year telling stories of poverty and deprivation but of honesty as pure as clear water. I only wish to God that we had that same honesty among our people today. Men who will falsify claims! If their fathers knew it they would turn over in their graves. I only wish we had it.

Now, I had no intention of speaking about this at all,

MR. GILLETT: Mr. Speaker, because it is irrelevant to this motion, but I was urged to say a few words following the Minister of Justice. I agree, looking down over these recommendations, that the 200 mile limit must of necessity be forced upon the foreign fleets. Now whether or not that 200 mile limit is going to increase our inshore catch is more than I, and I believe in more than the scientists can say, I am not too sure. I think if you were to look up the records of the fishing companies and the fish merchants around the coasts of Newfoundland, the Northeast Coast and the Labrador, you will find that before ever there was any fishing on the Hamilton Banks our fishery was in a bad state of affairs - no fish, low prices and no fish.

I have a feeling that the Hamilton Banks were not discovered by the foreign fleets while they were looking for fish. I have a strong feeling that they were examining the seabed around the coast of Labrador and the East Coast of Canada for other purposes. In that examination they discovered fish like John Cabot did.

MR. NEARY: You mean they were spying?

MR. GILLETT: Yes. I think they did not know anything about fishing, they did not know anything about the Hamilton Banks but they did have teeming millions of people who did need protein food and here was a place to get it. At the same time, they could carry out any other activities which they deemed beneficial to them. I might be wrong but I say this because of the fact that the Hamilton Banks were there many years before the foreign fleets fished on them, and during those years we had fish failures, year after year sometimes.

So we have to get jurisdiction, at least, over the 200 mile limit, if possible. Both the endeavours of the Canadian Government in the jurisdiction of the 200 mile limit or the Continental Shelf and also in the quotas have recently failed. Since this report was published even, they have both failed. I am one of these, Mr. Speaker, who believes that there are two ways to get a horse to go. One way is to whip it and the other way is to feed it well. Apparently the feeding has not brought results. The Department of External Affairs,

the Minister of Fisheries and his officials have not been successful in pointing out to the foreign countries who are fishing off our shores the necessity of curtailing their catches, reducing their quotas and making it possible for them as well as us to still continue to fish in the years to come.

I was wondering just a moment ago while the Minister of Finance was speaking, and after listening to my colleague from Bonavista North, we have the Prime Minister coming here on Saturday, you know

MR. BARRY: Should we not hear it from the press?

MR. GILLETT: He is coming here on Saturday and he is the top man -

MR. NEARY: That is all you are entitled to.

MR. GILLETT: - in all of Canada. So I think it would be much cheaper financially for this government to try and arrange a meeting with the Prime Minister while he is here on Saturday, even if he has to sit out one dance, rather than have forty members go all the way to Ottawa and stay there - because hotel bills are very costly now - and stay there until action is taken because we might be there a long time.

MR. NEARY: Well, if there is any liquor being served at the university there will be no trouble in getting the Prime Minister out.

MR. GILLETT: I agree whole-heartedly, Mr. Speaker, that we have to impress upon the Government of Canada, not only Newfoundland, now mind you, but the Atlantic Provinces, impress upon the Government of Canada that they must do something. They must work with the United States, if the United States is contemplating the 200 mile zone, and together they might, not by threatening but

by diplomatic talks and diplomatic relations with these foreign countries to get them to curtail their take off the East Coast of the United States and off the East Coast of Canada. It is going to, perhaps is going to spell the difference between the obliteration of the fishing industry in its entirety. And believe me, in spite of the fact that some of the speakers have said that the young people today do not want to go fishing, I believe they do. I believe they do. I believe they have a different kind of a life altogether from what their forefathers had. No longer are they out in little twenty foot boats.

You know it is amazing, Mr. Speaker - I am just going to get off the motion for a moment too - I looked at a little boat, a little eighteen foot motor boat, it had been in a man's stage for years and somebody bought it just as a little runabout, and I was looking out through my office window one day and I said to my brother-in-law, when you realize that the thousands and thousands of quintals of fish that were exported from Newfoundland down through the ages, down through the years, were brought in in little boats like that, it is almost unbelievable. A trap boat was the largest one we had. I am not talking about the Labrador fishery. I am talking about the inshore fishery because this is what we are dealing with now in particular, the inshore fishery. So, our fishermen today, young and old, have a better way of life. They have a better way of fishing. They have longliners with radars, fish finders. They have all the amenities of that industry. They do like it. They do want to remain at it. Some of them make a darn good living at it, believe me. They drive around in a new car every year. They have coloured televisions. They make a good living at it.

We have other areas where perhaps, and other fishermen in same areas, who do not make that same kind of a living. But there is a fisherman and there is a fisherman. There are two types as there are in every other industry.

However, Mr. Speaker, to go on a little further in section 1 (2) (a), the Unemployment Insurance benefits for fishermen: This is something that I hope and I believe that the federal authorities are trying to correct, because if they do not, they do not correct it then I doubt very much whether the younger fishermen will want to remain fishing because of the discrepancies in the Unemployment Insurance Act. I am not too sure how many of the fishermen around the Island make submissions on the eligibility of their wives to receive Unemployment Insurance if they work in their boats or in the processing of their catches as has been the custom for generations. I think we are sort of stepping on a very slippery piece of ground there. If we have abuses now I think we will have more abuses then, many more.

However, that is something which the government has asked to try and influence the Federal Government of Canada to implement. I am just going to touch on a few of the things, Mr. Speaker. Control of the use of gill nets on a regional basis. Now, this is also taken care of a little later on, I believe, but how do you tell a long-liner owner that he can no longer use a gill net when he has a \$60,000 or \$70,000 boat. That is taken care of, I believe, a little later on when it is recommended by the submission that a subsidy be granted for trawls, ring nets, things and whatnot so that these boats can be used for the purpose for which they were designed. So that is taken care of a little later on in the report.

The Fresh Fish Marketing



Corporation: I think that is a good idea too, Mr. Speaker, might add tremendously to the returns to the fishermen. There is - I am wondering about in Section (c) the actual recommendations affecting either domain. In Section (2) of (c) the government take immediate steps for the wholesale purchase at cost from manufacturers. Now I think this must be, either it is a misprint or it does not convey to me what I believe is meant to convey. I do not think that this means that the government buy from the manufacturers all major pieces of fishing gear at their cost, but buy it at the selling price of the manufacturers - not at their cost, at their selling price - and then distribute it through a -

AN HON. MEMBER: Collective agency and reduce the price.

MR. GILLET: - collective agency. This might, I imagine it will, reduce the cost to the fishermen, if properly handled. It is something for the government to give very thoughtful consideration to. "That consideration be given to the establishment of a viable insurance programme to cover the fishermen's stages and gear losses by storm and environmental conditions." I am not too sure what that "environmental condition" means, Perhaps the Minister of Fisheries, if he speaks, if he has not already spoken, will clarify this for us.

And while we are speaking of gear losses, Mr. Speaker, I am wondering - I am a bit confused, at least I am not satisfied that I understand the policy and the programme of the government in this gear loss and/or replacement. And perhaps if I might, and the minister will make a mental note of it, he can clarify it when he speaks. For instance, let me take an example; if a fisherman lost last year 200 lobster traps, he received \$5.00 for each trap, \$1,000. If for some reason or other he was only able to replace 100 of those lobster pots this Winter, and having replaced that 100 lobster pots had them inspected and certified by a fishery officer, how much money will he receive from the government this Spring?

MR. CROSBIE: He would get none this Spring. He got \$1,000 last Fall. He only got paid for his pots.

MR. GILLETT: Well he is not paid for the loss gear?

MR. CROSBIE: He is paid \$10.00 for every pot that needs replacement.

MR. GILLETT: But is he paid for what he loses?

MR. CROSBIE: The government replaces the pots. We are paying him to replace the pots not to - He is paid if he will replace them.

MR. GILLETT: But if he lost 200 traps last Spring he was given \$1,000.

MR. CROSBIE: He got \$5.00 for each of them.

MR. GILLETT: And if he replaces no traps at all, do you get that money back from him?

MR. CROSBIE: Technically speaking he owes us money because he did not use it for the purpose for which it was planned for.

MR. GILLETT: Well the way I interpret it, this is why I wanted the explanation, the way that I was interpreting this was that if he lost lobster pots he would be paid \$5.00 for the pots that he lost, if he decided, "The heck with it! I made losses Spring after Spring and I am not going at it any more, but I have been paid for the pots that I lost, that I made and then I lost, "He makes no pots -

MR. CROSBIE: He gets nothing.

MR. GILLETT: But he has already got \$500 -

MR. CROSBIE: This is a gear replacement programme, not to pay money to a chap who is not going fishing.

MR. GILLETT: Well then this is going to have to be a new policy that consideration be given to the establishment of a viable insurance programme to cover the fishermen's stages and gear losses by storm. I thought that if he lost gear he was paid for it, If he replaced it he would be paid double in the case of the lobster traps, But if he did not replace them he only got paid for what he lost. Apparently I am wrong.

I imagine a lot of the fishermen around the Island were paid and did not replace them. I have a case in question and that is why I asked that, Mr. Speaker, of the minister.

The licensing of the fishermen: Again, I think this has been discussed before and that is a very touchy subject, particularly as far as it comes to the sale of codfish, lobsters, salmon and the other crustacean fish is a different story. I think that only the bona fide fishermen should be allowed to fish for them. I notice that they have made a submission here for the Province of Newfoundland provided it is beneficial to the seal fishermen concerned, enter into negotiations with the federal authority in order to make earnings from the seal hunt eligible as income under the U.J.C. regulations.

Now, there are some discrepancies, Mr. Speaker, in the Unemployment Insurance Commissions Act regulating the seal hunt. For arguments sake, if a fisherman who is enjoying or is eligible for Unemployment Insurance goes to the seal fishery, he signs on on a ship March 6, he is not allowed to earn money, he is not allowed to go to work until March 15 because of legislation. Nevertheless his earnings are based on from the day he signed on until the day that he signs off. As a consequence of that, one entire week is gone so that it is quite possible that he will have used up four weeks during that seal hunt. His Unemployment Insurance benefits could be developed at that time to a stage where having once been occupied or been employed as they call it, for four weeks he automatically is rendered ineligible for any further benefits. Therefore, has to work for another number of weeks in order to create another claim. This I believe, Mr. Speaker, is something that I would suggest that the Province take up with the federal authorities and see if something could not be done about this as well.

Other than that, Mr. Speaker, I, again I have to say congratulations to the chairman and his Committee. I have to also go on record as supporting this Committee's report, and I hope and pray that this government will carry out the second part of that

motion which reads, directs the government to investigate immediately the feasibility of implementing those recommendations of the report that are within the provincial jurisdiction." We do have some of them, Mr. Speaker, that do lie within the jurisdiction of the government. The fishermen themselves are helpless. To whom can they look if they cannot look to the government to do something to alleviate their sufferings and try and have a positive programme for them.

I can only repeat what I have said in this House before, Mr. Speaker, and that is that without the fishermen themselves, without their full and complete co-operation, this, the federal, any commission, any fishermen's union or Food and Allied Workers Union can do nothing for them or for their livelihood if they do not themselves do everything in their power to make sure that they put the full force of their weight behind their own industry and make it viable for them and for their children who will come behind them. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The honourable the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I am now in my rightful place, I just want to say a few words on the report and on the resolution, Sir. Number one thing that goes through my mind listening to all the honourable members speaking on the fishery and so on is that the thing that disturbs me is something close to what the honourable member for Twillingate was talking about when he started his speech, and that is that in the fishing communities that I have lived in, and there is quite a number of them, it always amazed me and became a pretty fair trend that everyone of those communities when you went in and met the people and got to know the community, as you got to know the names of the various fishermen and so on, it was a pecking order there of ability as a fisherman. Everytime you go in a community the people there would tell you about John Doe, Oh, what does John Doe do? He fishes. Boy, he is some fisherman. And being a welfare worker at that time, a social worker at that time, it always amazed me that there was always a group in each of the fishing communities that never had to rely on welfare or any kind of extra financial assistance to keep them going. They always seemed to be able to get fish, even in the worst year. And it was only this past weekend out in my own district of Green Bay when I was down into a number of fishing communities where I had a meeting, just a meeting on the side of the road with a number of fishermen and other people, just talking about things in general, that the same question came up again, Mr. Speaker. They start naming individuals in Little Bay Islands, in Lushes Bight and Beaumont, in Triton and Jim's Cove and Card's Harbour and the same thread went through it again.

There are fishermen there who have fished the last twenty years, twenty-five years. Everybody thinks that they have a fair amount of money. Everybody says they are excellent fishermen. They never have to rely on government assistance in welfare. They get the normal programmes that are offered and pay back their loans. They are never in arrears on their loans, on their boats or on their motors or on their gear. And

it is one of those things that perhaps, I am inclined to believe that perhaps government programmes that have been introduced over the years, albeit a lot of them are necessary, it is true to say that a lot of them have been taken advantage of as well, the same as the Unemployment Insurance situation scheme, misused and abused and whatever you want to call it. And I think that, as the honourable Member for Twillingate has pointed out, that a lot of our people are not the hard working, diligent - I know of fishing communities where the good fisherman, the guy who has got the reputation, he is up four or three-thirty in the morning, he is out to his trap or his gill nets or out to his fleet of nets, whatever he has got, is back in and has got his day's work done. And the other guy gets up nine or ten o'clock and goes out and tries to see whether he can get out to his nets or not. There might be a bit of a swell on, and well he just cannot get out today, it is not really that good.

So I think that when you get right back to the fishermen themselves, and I think that honestly and bluntly and frankly speaking that a lot of the reasons, I do not know what percentage you could put on it, if you say you have a problem I do not know what percentage of that problem could be traced directly to groups of individuals who call themselves fishermen who are really not fishermen. But I think they have very often helped to produce that stigma that has become attached to the fishing industry over the last ten or fifteen years, that there is a group of individuals who are after whatever government plan or assistance in welfare and everything else that is on the go, who have given the fishing industry of this province a bad name, and I think it is unfortunate that that is so. We all utter the motherhood statements - the fishing industry is the backbone of the Newfoundland economy; without the fishing industry we cannot survive and such like comments. But I know in my travels around the province in the last fifteen years, it never ceases to amaze me that there

were fishermen, no matter how bad it came, who always seemed to be able to keep body and soul together, and to do a lot better than that, and you can pick them out and I am sure the honourable Member for Twillingate can vouch for what I say. And I can list off names of fishermen in a lot of fishing communities around this province and you can go and see them today, and I know fishermen in my own area who, even when the ice was in this last two or three weeks, tied their fleet of nets on to the rocks on the shore and

apparently over the last week or so has caught an awful lot of codfish. This one gentleman in particular in Triton, who is known as a real good fisherman, apparently he has way more fish than anybody else around. Everybody is saying already he is going to make another bumper year out of it. Why I do not know. And when I was talking to fishermen only about four days ago in that area, a lot of them mentioned the abuse that has been taken of this compensation programme, of this gear replacement and so on, the amount of abuse that is in it. I think that if you have - I do not know what percentage of the problem could be attributed to that, but I think we should address ourselves to it. And that is one of the reasons why the kind of comments you hear about the fishing industry, where young people will not get involved in it anymore and where they think it is one of those occupations that has a lower status in the minds of everybody than another occupation, I think it is contributed in large measure to the morale of the fishermen being as low as it is.

I think it is extremely unfortunate and I think that a lot of effort and a lot of things should be said in that regard when talking about the fishing industry. The other thing is, Mr. Speaker, just for me to put on the record as the Member for Green Bay and knowing something about the fishing industry - at one time I even put out salmon nets down in St. Lewis' Bay in Labrador South to supplement my own Summer income. I can vouch therefore that I knew people in that very community that Spring who did not even bother to go out and catch salmon that were pretty plentiful at that time in 1961-1962. I do not know how much money I made but I made a fair amount of money when there was somebody next door who was coming to me looking for an able-bodied relief order. I would tell them I had old torn out nets, tell them, why do they not go and get a few nets or make a few and do the same as I was doing to supplement my income. So, I think there is still a lot of truth in it.

The other point, Mr. Speaker, is that the dilemma that the



fishing industry faces is one that in relation to the 200 mile limit is one that all provinces either on the West Coast or the East Coast of this country face in approaching Ottawa. That is - and I am only stating something that has been stated many times before - is that the federal government is controlled by people from Ontario and Quebec primarily, that it has a centrist philosophy. It is concerned with the golden triangle in Ontario and parts of Quebec, and it is concerned about that area, the industrialized part of Canada, and to try to get the bureaucrats in Ottawa who have too much power and to try to get Mr. Trudeau, Mr. Pelletier, Mr. Marchand and Mr. Lalonde, who are the power in Canada today - These are the four gentlemen who call the shots in Ottawa. Mr. Jamieson does not call the shots. Mr. Lang does not call the shots. Mr. MacEachen does not call the shots. The shots are called by four men, the four musketeers. That is where all the power is.

These people are Quebec orientated politicians, Central Canada orientated politicians. Then in the various departments, the powerful bureaucrats are all belong to the Central region of Canada. That is why we not only have trouble in the fishing industry with getting our point across, or in the housing industry, or in whatever section of the economy. That is the reason we have trouble, because we are up against a stone wall right from the start because they look upon Newfoundland still as just a glorified colony which has not that many rights to finding its own place in the sun. They will more or less set the priorities on how it is to find it, if it ever will. Any association that these bureaucrats have with Newfoundland, they look upon it as their little domain.

I know it is true in certain areas of DREE where certain officials in Ottawa who had some dealings with a number of agreements in this Province look upon it as their own little domain and they will call the shots. That is the major problem we face, and Mr.

Romeo LeBlanc, the minister responsible for fisheries who is from New Brunswick, I think, and some of the other people are very, very minor cabinet ministers in Ottawa and they have not that much power. Then when you couple that with the fact that our population is low and sparse - I think if all the population, the people of Atlantic Canada were in a smaller area where they could all get together a lot easier and lobby in a more effective manner that we would have a lot more in this region of Canada than we now have. But I think we must recognize where the power lies. It lies with people whose sole orientation in politics has been towards the Quebec-Ontario region of Canada, and that all their major decisions are made to affect those two areas. Anything on the periphery that might come in, comes from the West or the East, is a very minor problem. And the only reason why you have any kind of a federal involvement and federal concern for Western Canada today is simply because they have the spondoolics. And when you have the dollars then you are in a position to be an effective lobbyist in Ottawa. But if you do not have those spondoolics, if you do not have those greenbacks, if you have to be continually going trying to persuade, cajole the federal government into bringing in newer programmes to more effectively deal with the economic situation, then you are at a decided disadvantage in that you not only come from a poor area of Canada, you are not only looked down upon as a lesser citizen in the whole country, but you are not supposed to have all that many marbles to be able to put up a good case anyway.

So I think that is we recognize that the power lies with the Quebec orientated politicians, Mr. Trudeau, Mr. Pelletier, Mr. Marchand and Mr. Lalonde, because they are the ones who call the shots, and these are the people whom we have to persuade. It is no good of us killing our case by going to Mr. Jamieson. He knows the Province but his input into federal decision making as it applies as a national policy is not all that great. And it is these people who are running this country, and these people primarily. And their orientation is strictly Ontario and Quebec. That is where

the seats are, that is where the people are.

Western Canada now has a decided advantage over Eastern Canada because it has the money, it has the oil, it has the potash and it has - then you get the large cities who can also lobby strongly. You get Edmonton, Calgary, Winnipeg, Vancouver who can lobby very effectively for housing, for example, and other things. But as it applies to Eastern Canada, we are just a very small part of the total mix of confederation. We are sparsely populated, we are always going. There is just another problem of the many thousands, myriad of problems that we throw to Ottawa each year and therefore we do not get a real good hearing from them.

What does Mr. Lalonde know about the Newfoundland inshore fishery? What does Mr. Pelletier know or Mr. Lalonde or Mr. Trudeau? Absolutely nothing. And if they see a plant, or DREE putting in so much money for a plant or something down here that is a wonderful thing, applaud it. They are not getting at the problem. They are not getting at the problem but they believe in their own heart and soul that they are doing what is necessary. DREE is giving money to assist this entrepreneur to put in a little processing facility here, there or somewhere else. So I think we have to look at the realities of the situation and realize that when we are talking to Ottawa we are talking to four Quebec orientated politicians who in essence runs this country.

So two points, Mr. Speaker: Number one, the fishermen in the last ten years or so have had a stigma attached to them primarily because of his own kind, who are supposedly fishermen but they are not. But they are not, and that has hurt the fishery. Number two, in any appeal to Ottawa we have to recognize just where the power is. In my opinion the power lies with four individuals who have a centrist approach towards Confederation anyway, and it is these people whom we have to try to persuade if we are ever going to effectively deal with the kinds of things that we have to deal with in the fishery.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The honourable the Member for Placentia East.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I listened with interest to the previous speakers in this debate and certainly I found everything very interesting and some very, very good points were made. I would like first of all to thank the various members of the Committee for their diligence, for the effort they put into it, for the great deal of thought and time and effort

to try to come up with some sensible suggestions and proposals for the consideration of the House.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think anyone who knows anything at all about Newfoundland and about the fishery will certainly realize that when this Committee was constituted in March and the terms of reference were outlined which asked the Committee to look into the present condition of the inshore fishery of the Island of Newfoundland and the problems facing the inshore fishermen, fish plant operators and all those involved in the inshore fishery and report back to the House by April 30, realized that this was an impossible task. It was an impossible task but the Committee undertook within the time allotted to do the best they could. It became obvious very, very early in our hearing that further time was required and of course, at the request of the Committee, the honourable House extended the time from April 30 to June 5.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when the Committee was constituted we felt that before we commenced any public hearings we should receive some background information on the state of the fishery in Newfoundland, what was involved, how many fishermen, what was the catch and a great deal of scientific data. So, with that in mind we contacted the local officials of the Provincial and Federal Departments of Fisheries and had a series of private briefings when they provided us with a great deal of background information including the number of inshore fishermen, the different species and where they were caught, the types of boats used and various other problems and one which we all knew from our own experience as members, that a great problem facing the fishermen of Newfoundland was the question of Unemployment Insurance. Of course, at our request the members of the commission met privately with the Committee and gave us some background information on the Unemployment Insurance and its application to the inshore fishermen.

After getting this information we then set about to decide what places in Newfoundland we should visit. This was decided after

consultation with knowledgeable officials in the provincial and federal departments who told us what centres we could expect to meet the largest number of inshore fishermen. With their assistance and co-operation we decided on a series of public meetings and these were held throughout different points in the Province. We met before these meetings with all types of individuals who we felt were specialists. These are mentioned in the report, from the different scientists who were experts on various species of fish, and people from the federal department as well as the provincial department, the secretariat, everybody who we felt could give us some valuable input. Then, as I said, Mr. Speaker, we decided on those public hearings. We set them for St. John's, Carbonear, Placentia, Harbour Breton, Marystown, Port aux Basques, Stephenville, Bonavista, Wesleyville, Fogo, LaScie, Plum Point, Port au Choix, Forteau and St. Anthony. These were points which we felt we could expect to meet the largest number of inshore fishermen.

Mr. Speaker, we realized even before we commenced our hearings that the condition of the inshore fishery was in a deplorable state, that the resource as far as the inshore fishermen were concerned was practically to the point where it was no longer beneficial or viable for them to continue to fish. The meetings, Mr. Speaker, were extremely well attended everywhere except in St. John's. Just one other meeting, that was the meeting in Twillingate, and

I think at that particular time a lot of the men in Twillingate were out to the seal hunt and that explained their absence. But, Mr. Speaker, you would have to be really moved if you attended these public hearings and saw these large number of fishermen come forward and make their views known to the members of the House of Assembly. It was, I think, Mr. Speaker, a depressing task because one could not help but be moved by the plight of such a large number of inshore fishermen who felt so helpless and felt so frustrated, and looked upon us, I suppose, as really another chance that something would be done for them.

In every meeting hall that we attended, and as I say here again, Mr. Speaker, every meeting except in St. John's--and that is explainable because there are not that number of, large number of inshore fishermen in this immediate area--were exceedingly well attended, 200, 250, 150. The halls were practically blocked. You would only ask yourself, Mr. Speaker, if only the people in authority who could make the decisions affecting their lives were present and could see these fishermen, It would be worth all this talk, all the debates and all the reports. You would have to really be at any one of these meetings to capture the plight and the concern of these large numbers of men who saw their livelihood practically evaporate.

In Carbonear, Mr. Speaker, we had over 200. In Placentia over 100, Harbour Breton, Marystown, Port aux Basques. The meetings were blocked! People travelled as high as fifty miles by boat to attend these meetings. In Port aux Basques, I remember, Mr. Speaker, that evening in particular, a very, very bad evening and we saw all those men from various parts of the coast come up and pack that little hall. You would be impressed by the number of young men, young men, and when they would tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the catch was so small that they could not get enough really in some cases to buy fuel to continue fishing. We heard young fishermen say, if only they had enough money to travel more miles, to buy gas, to travel a further distance, they would catch more fish, and they

would tell about the great catches that their fathers had and that they had some years ago. And, then of course, Mr. Speaker, they would speak about what everyone of us knew, and that was the pronounced decline in the catch.

Some places had special problems, but I think, Mr. Speaker, we can safely say that one unique problem which we heard at every meeting we attended and that was the problem of the resource, the shortage of fish, the declining catches. And, Mr. Speaker, you would just ask yourself, well, just what, what could this Committee, what could this government, what could anyone do to assist these poor fishermen. This problem did not start, Mr. Speaker, this year or last year or the year before that. This started in the mid-1960's, about ten years. I heard the honourable Member for Fogo and I heard the other honourable member say how we had bad catches. Of course, we did, Mr. Speaker. Of course there are peaks and valleys in the fisheries, but we have never had according to the fishermen of Newfoundland, we have never had such continuous and so many consecutive years of declining catches.

You had one good year, one bad year, or two good years or two bad years. But you never had eight, ten bad years! By bad years I mean, Mr. Speaker, years where they hardly caught enough fish to pay their expenses. Of course, when we were started the present season had not started at all. What has happened this year, Mr. Speaker? I had a call only this morning from



some fishermen in Placentia Bay and they told me that on the eastern and western side of Placentia Bay they are hardly getting enough fish to eat, then I heard the honourable member here for Port de Grave say how the situation was the same in his district.

It is unbelievable, Mr. Speaker. It is unbelievable. You would really have to be present at these meetings and hear these fishermen before you could actually capture their concern and their plight. I know myself, Mr. Speaker, that I had heard on numerous occasions, like any member of this House, like any member of the public of Newfoundland has heard, what a bad state the fishery was in. But you would really have to, as I said before, you would have to travel and you would have to be present at these meetings to see how bad it actually was. And as I said before, Mr. Speaker, it did not start this year or last year or the year before last, it started about ten years ago when you had such a serious assault on the fisheries by the foreign fleets. And, Mr. Speaker, what was done? Governments were warned year in, year out! We all remember SOFA, and I say, Mr. Speaker, myself, in my opinion, that SOFA did more to bring to the attention of the politicians in Ottawa the plight of the inshore fishermen of Newfoundland than did ICNAF, because it served as a rallying point around where anyone who is concerned about the fishery could make their views known and this organization I think, the President of the organization Mr. Etchegary, who met with us in his capacity as a Commissioner to ICNAF told us that even the high school children in some parts of the province were members of SOFA.

Now since Mr. Etchegary has left SOFA and become one of the three Canadian Commissioners to ICNAF, he has undoubtedly made a great contribution, and is a knowledgeable individual in as far as the fisheries of Newfoundland are concerned. But I respectfully state that as far as an impact on Ottawa was concerned, that he did more and the organization which he then led SOFA, than does ICNAF.

MR. NEARY: Than the provincial government!

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, what really can the provincial government do about the resource?

MR. NEARY: What can Mr. Etchegary do?

MR. AYLWARD: What can the provincial government do about the resource? Who has the jurisdiction? The jurisdiction over the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, was given and the report deals with that, not in great detail, but we quote the relevant statutes of the British North America Act and the Terms of Union - where Newfoundland at the time of Union gave complete control of the fisheries to the Government of Canada. What did we see happen, Mr. Speaker? We saw the Government of Canada stand by and see that resource practically wiped out as far as the inshore fishery is concerned.

What, just what can the province do, Mr. Speaker? The question really is one in the political arena. What can they do? If this Committee did nothing else, Mr. Speaker, it did this; it gave the fishermen of the province and the people of the province an opportunity to see first-hand through the coverage by the press of how serious the problem really was. That is what it did, Mr. Speaker.

We met with 1400 fishermen during our meetings, 1400 came forward at these meetings. 143 of these 1400 men got up at the public meetings and they told the members of the Committee what in their opinion was the major problem confronting the industry. We received 31 written submissions. In addition to this we requested any individual or organization throughout Newfoundland to make their views known and in response to that request we received 41 written briefs. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what we did. We gave the fishermen of Newfoundland an opportunity to make their views known to the House of Assembly through us, the elected representatives. And, Mr. Speaker, if anything is to be done about the 200 mile limit that is what we have to do - a job on

selling to Ottawa what it really means, what this really means to Newfoundland. What does it mean? It is easier, as I mentioned in the report at one stage, Mr. Speaker, it is easier to imagine than describe the effect on Newfoundland if we do not receive and receive immediately this control of the 200 mile limit or the Continental Shelf. We cannot, Mr. Speaker, we cannot permit Ottawa to continually, to continue to ignore the plight of the inshore fishery because, Mr. Speaker, the time is not drawing near, the time is now. There is no tomorrow! There is no tomorrow! There is no tomorrow, Mr. Speaker, for the inshore fishery unless the Government of Canada takes this unilateral action. What have they done, Mr. Speaker, since we have given them control? They have sent these representatives to ICNAF. What is ICNAF really, Mr. Speaker? ICNAF consists of the scientists from these nineteen countries that constitute that organization and they have these meetings every year. And Mr. Etchegary, one of three commissioners, one of the three Canadian commissioners himself admitted to us that up until three or four year ago ICNAF had done completely nothing, completely nothing, completely nothing! As the honourable Member for Bonavista South said in his speech, when Mr. Etchegary met with us and made his views known to us, and that was at that particular time what the Canadian delegation was going to ask for at ICNAF, and we felt, we all felt, Mr. Speaker, that this was not going to work, not going to work. But the least we could do, and which is what we did, was really endorse the efforts of the Canadian group to ICNAF.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what the fishermen of Newfoundland have heard for years. They have heard the different Law of the Sea Conferences, one in Geneva, one in Caracas. Then when they saw that Canada could not receive the 200 mile zone by agreement, they had hoped for a reduction of effort by the foreign fishing fleet at ICNAF. That has failed. Well, Mr. Speaker, how much longer can they wait? How much longer can they wait? I do not think they can

wait a day, Mr. Speaker. The fishermen of Newfoundland and Newfoundland itself needs complete control and management of the Continental Shelf because, Mr. Speaker, the scientists have told us that even if the Government of Canada was successful this year at Geneva and obtained management and control of the 200 mile limit it would take at least four or five years before the inshore fishermen would detect any significant increase in their catch. The stocks have been so depleted that it would take at least three to four or maybe five years before the inshore fishermen could see any significant difference in their catch.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the big problem is what are these inshore fishermen in Newfoundland going to do for the next four or five years? Even if we receive or obtain, or Canada obtained the 200 mile control tomorrow morning, if Canada decided tomorrow to declare the 200 mile limit it would take at least three to five years, and what is going to happen in that period of time? What is going to happen, Mr. Speaker? Who is going to support these fishermen and their families and the communities. The whole Southwest Coast, the Northeast Coast and Coastal Labrador are practically completely dependent upon this inshore fishery. The major problem, I say, Mr. Speaker, presented to us was the resource.

Now, what do other organizations and other groups in Canada do, or in a Province do when they have a problem and they cannot get action? What do they do? Would would you do? What can the Newfoundland Government do? We have heard some suggestions here, Mr. Speaker.

I certainly feel that the Prime Minister of Canada, who is to visit here Saturday, he should be met by inshore fishermen in every community he visits. They should come out and make known to the Prime Minister of Canada that their livelihood is at stake, Mr. Speaker, that he, the Prime Minister of Canada, is the only man who can make the decision to unilaterally declare control. Everywhere the Prime Minister of Canada visits in Newfoundland he should be met by the hundreds of fishermen who came out and met us, because what can we do but talk, and talk is cheap, Mr. Speaker, and what can it accomplish?

There is more argument in Canada today about the tough treatment that Morgentaler is receiving, who admits killing thousands of unborn children - that man admits openly that he killed thousands of unborn children, and we have a cry all over Canada, look what is happening to this poor man.

MR. ROBERTS: That is Mr. Diefenbaker leading that parade!

MR. AYLWARD: For what is happening to him. Whoever it is! Whoever it is. The point I am making is this, Mr. Speaker; in the political arena it is the people who make the most noise at the proper place who receive the action. And if the inshore fishermen of Newfoundland were as close to Ottawa and could travel like the people of Ontario and Quebec and they could park on the steps of Parliament Building and be hauled away and dragged away, then I suppose something could be done .

In a speech here before, when I was speaking about the fishery, Mr. Speaker, I suggested that perhaps the best thing the Government of Newfoundland could do was to pay, to charter two or three airplanes and send plane loads of fishermen up to Ottawa and park and pay their way -

MR. THOMS: The House of Commons.

MR. AYLWARD: - on the steps of the House of Commons, -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. AYLWARD: until something was done.

MR. THOMS: I agree.

MR. AYLWARD: Because, Mr. Speaker, that is where the action must come from. That is where the action must come from. And I agree with every proposal made in this debate which will have the affect of making known to the Government of Canada what the plight of the fishermen is. And as I said before, Mr. Speaker, the only man in Canada today who can decide "Look! This action must be taken!" is the Prime Minister of Canada. And the Prime Minister of Canada is visiting this Island this week and we never experienced such a poor fishery as the inshore fishermen are today experiencing. They have not had it as bad in years, and we have had practically ten consecutive years of a poor catch. And we see that not alone the livelihood of the fishermen themselves, their families, the service industries, the community is practically - well, Mr. Speaker, it just cannot continue. Now they should - as I said before, the best service they could do themselves and do the Province and do their families and do their community is meet the Prime Minister and bring it home to him, just like the people who meet the Prime Minister about Morgentaler, just as labour or any other group who have a big problem, that is what must be done.

MR. MORGAN: Like the polar bear in 1970.

MR. AYLWARD: We are not going to get it here in this House, Mr. Speaker, and I agree with every honourable gentleman who have spoken. We can talk from now until Domesday and we can make the great big speeches and call for this and call for that, but we just do not have the legislative authority, we do not have the legislative authority. Legally we gave that authority to the Dominion of Canada when we Confederated. We said, "Here is our fishery, all the power and all of the authority that the Commissioner of Fisheries had in 1949 would be assumed by the Minister of Fisheries in Ottawa."

MR. NEARY: Well what about the problems that come under provincial legislation?

MR. AYLWARD: I will deal with those in a few moments. But all these problems, Mr. Speaker, all these problems sink into the background because unless you can get the fish, Mr. Speaker, you know, there is

nothing that can be done. And I say, Mr. Speaker, to the -

MR. NEARY: You are running out of time.

MR. AYLWARD: Oh, I take it that the honourable gentleman will give me a few more minutes - if I

MR. NEARY: You would have to be kidding!

MR. AYLWARD: I require it.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I listened there this morning with the passionate and the wonderful - no one enjoys the honourable gentleman more than I do. These great, great cries to the people of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, great cries. Well, he remembers I am sure very, very well when the Term 29 Issue was a great big issue in Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: I was at the IWA issue, Sir.

MR. AYLWARD: IWA? Maybe he was, but one of the big problems, Mr. Speaker, was Term 29. And at that time his leader, Mr. Speaker, appealed to the Opposition at that time, "Look, Newfoundland is at stake. Leave your party!"

MR. NEARY: You do not know what you are talking about -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - on the IWA issue.

MR. AYLWARD: And, perhaps, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable Member for Bell Island has the real concern of the Newfoundland people, he could if he is required and we do not get the action on the 200 mile limit, make known to Mr. Trudeau, just like Mr. John O'Dea and the late Gus Duffy and the late Jim Higgins made known to Diefenbaker, that they would not support a party that did not stand behind Newfoundland. That was the great appeal because in our political set-up, Mr. Speaker, perhaps in this particular case the Opposition has more effect and influence upon Ottawa than the government.

MR. NEARY: No, two parties. We have a national party and a provincial party.

MR. AYLWARD: Well, Mr. Speaker, we all remember that great debate when we thought that the big issue was Term 29. But Term 29 is insignificant as far as its importance to Newfoundland compared with the state of the inshore fishery and what will happen if we do not get that type of control.

Mr. Speaker, whatever action the government can take, then I respectfully submit that the leader, that the Premier of this Province should consider as promptly as possible a meeting between himself and the Prime Minister of Canada and this week when Mr. Trudeau visits here to discuss this matter. I would suggest to



him that he meet with his counterparts in the other Atlantic Provinces. And I do not know what the situation is there. With the time allotted to us we did not have time to visit any of the other provinces and we really do not know how significant or what real effect it has on the inshore fishermen of Nova Scotia. But we know that they are very, very concerned about it like they are in the Eastern Seaboard.

But, Mr. Speaker, I suggest that the Premier of the Province mobilize the forces of Atlantic Canada, really, and make an appeal to Ottawa. If the Premier of Nova Scotia and the Premier of New Brunswick have a large number of inshore fishermen, and they must be experiencing the same problem, let them join with the government of Newfoundland in trying to bring some pressure to bear on Ottawa for some action.

MR. NEARY: Sure we are tired of telling them that, to get together. We have been preaching that for the last two or three years over here.

MR. AYLWARD: Preaching what?

MR. NEARY: Get together with the other Premiers of the Atlantic Provinces, put up a united front. Sure I have been saying that for two years here in this House.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, you would really think that the honourable Member for Bell Island has practically answered every problem, you know, that ever comes up in any aspect in Newfoundland life. What suggestion did he make himself in his debate, Mr. Speaker? One of his big criticisms of the Committee was that none of us were fishermen, none of us were fishermen. I suppose no male gynecologist in Canada ever gave birth to a baby, but are we going to say they do not know anything about it because they did not have one themselves? What kind of garbage and nonsense is this, Mr. Speaker? You do not know anything about eggs unless you lay one?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: You are a better judge of omelettes than a chicken.

MR. AYLWARD: Yes. Of course. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is what we heard. And, what was the other great suggestion from the honourable gentleman from Bell Island?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: The other suggestion was he was disappointed in the Committee because we did not recommend a provincial takeover of the fisheries. Now, Mr. Speaker, I think every member of the Committee approached their task with a great degree of diligence, and they listened to the fishermen of Newfoundland, and I think I can truthfully say that hardly any, I do not think any fishermen - I cannot remember one, there may be one or two but I cannot remember one who came forward with such a suggestion.

MR. NEARY: Did they ask you to take over Churchill Falls, the Linerboard Mill?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: What has that got to do with it?

MR. NEARY: To buy Burgeo.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD:

But what kind of nonsense and garbage is this, Mr. Speaker? Is the honourable gentleman seeking to divert my attention? Not one, not one fisherman that I can remember suggested to us that government should take it all over, the government should take it all over. There is a lot of wisdom, Mr. Speaker, in the fishermen of Newfoundland and undoubtedly they look for improved facilities. They wanted some assistance for their gear. They wanted better and more improved terms of borrowing from the Loan Board. There are a number of things. But, Mr. Speaker, they did not want a complete takeover because they realize that governments generally are not the best organizations to conduct industries of that nature.

MR. NEARY: So they can develop hydro power, and run a fish plant down in Burgeo, and run a linerboard mill but they cannot run the fishery?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, as I said, I spent a great deal of time on this because I feel that the basic problem was the lack of the resource. As I said before this is a federal domain. I sincerely trust that sufficient public pressure can be brought upon the Government of Canada that they will see to it that this action is taken and taken forthwith.

Now, another major problem that the fishermen in Newfoundland brought to our attention was the question of Unemployment Insurance and how it affects the fishermen. We dealt with it in some detail in our report, Mr. Speaker, and I think it is obvious to anyone who represents a fishing district, and who has had occasion to discuss this with the fishermen, that it was never designed, never designed to meet the situation that the fishermen of Newfoundland experience. As my honourable friend, the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing said in his debate that a lot of the laws of Canada and the programmes and the plans are made by people who represent industrial Canada, namely Ontario and Quebec. Their thinking, Mr. Speaker, is not towards an economy like ours but towards an industrialized society. The

Unemployment Insurance Programme was designed to look after workers who were at times partially unemployed for periods of time. It was never designed to cover the inshore fishermen but it was tried to be adapted to that, Mr. Speaker. But it has failed and it has failed hopelessly. In fact, I think all the Unemployment Insurance has done was keep the fishermen quiet. The fishermen in a lot of outports in Newfoundland had their gardens. They were independent. They had very little tax, very low taxes in some of these communities and they did not require that much to live, Mr. Speaker. So, what they received in other parts of Canada when that was paid to a fisherman in an outport of Newfoundland, it enabled him to practically support himself and his family by a fairly good standard, but low by comparison with the rest of Canada. Well, all the Unemployment Insurance did was keep the fishermen quiet. It is unfortunate, Mr. Speaker, because I think instead of aiding the fishermen it has lulled him into a false sense of security. Because with the increase in costs they now find, of course, that with the benefits available to them that they cannot, they cannot support themselves and their families.

Unless this is changed and changed immediately you are hardly going to have anyone fishing. The problems are outlined in detail in the report. The least they could have, Mr. Speaker, is parity with the shore workers. It is unbelievable that the differences that exist in the Unemployment Insurance as it relates to fishermen can be allowed to continue. The problems facing the fishermen, Mr. Speaker, are a lack of fish, rising costs and soft markets. These are very, very serious problems, Mr. Speaker, and they cannot be overcome by the fishermen themselves.

There are problems, of course, that concern the fishermen themselves. That is the problem of the quality of their product. This we found, Mr. Speaker, from dealing with the processors and from our talks with the Chairman of the Saltfish Corporation. It is a very, very important matter and one which needs immediate attention because, Mr. Speaker, they are dealing with

with a product that we must sell, and a product that people will eventually eat, so that great care must be taken to maintain a good quality. We found throughout our hearings that in some places in the United States where fish was advertised we were told that the billboards read where the fish was sold, "This is not Newfoundland fish." And that speaks very, very poorly of our quality.

MR. ROBERTS: Where were they?

MR. AYLWARD: In some part of the United States.

MR. MORGAN: If you had had the stocks over there you would know.

MR. ROBERTS: Hearsay or -

MR. AYLWARD: No, no, no -

MR. MORGAN: ..... you know, you know, to listen to him.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman, I just wondered if he stretched the point.

MR. AYLWARD: The point was, Mr. Speaker, that the quality is so important because there is still a big demand in the world today for fish, and even in the United States. But every individual, every housewife who buys fish, like anyone who buys meat or any other product, they want good quality. And if they can get a better quality product that is what they are going to buy. And, Mr. Speaker, there are millions and millions of pounds of fish being sold but it is a better quality. And the quality of our product must be improved, Mr. Speaker, All this effort that we are making to sell our fish, I mean the effort that the province with the federal government and with the other provinces of Canada, I think that what we need is a great sales job done to sell Newfoundland fish because people are eating fish. They are buying the fish but they are not buying our fish. And if our fish were better, even if it cost a bit more, Mr. Speaker, the sophisticated housewives I am sure in the United States would insist upon Newfoundland fish, provided of course that the quality was good. And this is something the fishermen themselves must accept some responsibility for, and I

sincerely trust, Mr. Speaker, that the fishermen will realize how important a quality product means, because the fishermen when they catch the fish they take it to a processor and the processor can only process the type and the quality of the fish that he received from the fishermen, So the fishermen must take care to ensure that while is in their hands it is kept in good condition and good quality.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as far as the 200 mile limit is concerned it is obvious that every individual in this House appears to agree on the necessity. So the job left, Mr. Speaker, is to convince as I said earlier, the Government of Canada to take that action and to take it immediately. And, Mr. Speaker, as has been said so frequently in this debate before, countries smaller than Canada have taken that action and there is no reason, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason or no justifiable reason in the eyes of the inshore fishermen of Newfoundland to delay immediate action on that problem. If we have to, Mr. Speaker, why could the Government of Canada take fifty miles July 1st., another fifty December 31st., and another fifty in July of next year and by December 31st., 1976 right to the 200 mile limit.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable member would permit, I beg to inform him that, of course except by leave, he has five minutes left to speak.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Leave, leave.

MR. NEARY: No leave. Why could not I have leave this morning?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: The big problem, Mr. Speaker, is the income support for the fishermen during the transitional period from when we implement the 200 mile limit until the catch is increased to such a degree that the fishermen themselves can obtain a sufficient return to make a good living from fishing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, since I only have five minutes I would like to deal briefly with what is one of our major recommendations and that is for the Government of Canada to take immediate initiatives to effect further reduction in the foreign fishing efforts beyond any negotiated at ICNAF and to create new outlets for our fishery products through multiple

bilateral agreements which would replace foreign quota fish with fish caught by Canadian fishermen as a portion of an increasingly larger Canadian share of the harvest.

This, Mr. Speaker, is an exceedingly important recommendation because the Committee felt that it is costing the Russians and the West Germans and the Poles a great deal of money - and all the other countries who are signatories to ICNAF - to catch the fish required. And if the Government of Canada would enter a bilateral agreement with these countries whereby they would buy a certain amount of fish which was caught by the Canadian fishermen, then it would accomplish two ends, Mr. Speaker. It would allow the Canadian effort to be increased - that is the catching effort - and in addition, it would provide employment at the processing plants which are now operating, we understand, at about twenty-five per cent capacity.

The Committee felt, Mr. Speaker, that Canadians, we really had in mind Newfoundlanders, of course, could catch and process this fish much cheaper than any of these countries that I have just spoken of, in particular, of course, Russia, West Germany and Poland. We could catch this fish and sell it to them much cheaper than they themselves could catch it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is, I think, a novel concept. We have not heard it suggested it before. It was one that the Committee gave a great deal of thought to and I think this could lead the way to some great agreements which would be beneficial to the inshore fishermen.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the other very, very important recommendation was the one concerning a Fresh Fish Marketing Corporation. It was felt by the Committee, Mr. Speaker, that there are a number of small processors throughout the Island of Newfoundland and these small processors deal, of course, with a great majority of the catch from the inshore fishermen, and these particular processors do not have the marketing capabilities that are necessary to get what we felt was a better price and to do a better job of marketing. And the Committee felt that if an organization similar in form, with similar objects to that of the Saltfish Corporation, which could provide a method of marketing, this could be of a great help to the fishermen of Newfoundland.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is one particular matter that the Government of Newfoundland can and should do something about, and should do something about it immediately, because, Mr. Speaker, it has a profound effect upon the price that is ultimately received by the fishermen for their product.

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

If the honourable member wishes to continue he shall have to have leave. Does the honourable member have leave to continue?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No! No!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair gets the message. The honourable member does not have leave.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame! Shame!

MR. NEARY: What about this morning?

MR. NEARY: We gave two of you leave.

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, if the honourable the Member for Placentia East has finished as I would -

MR. AYLWARD: No, Mr. Speaker, I have not.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman has been extended -

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

The Chair has ruled that the honourable the Member for Placentia East does not have leave to continue.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: In more ways than one.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman from Placentia East, Sir, was extended exactly and precisely the same courtesy which his colleagues extended to my colleague from Bell Island this morning, after we on this side had agreed to at least two honourable gentlemen opposite being given extra time. And if the honourable gentleman from Placentia East is feeling a little nut out at the fact the rules have



not been bent to accommodate him, then my suggestion, Mr. Speaker, is that he should take up the matter with those of his colleagues who saw fit to try to restrain and restrict my honourable friend from Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, this has been a lengthy debate. I had hoped it would be a productive debate and I think there have been some very good suggestions made.

But I think also there has been a great amount of repetition and must heat and a little light shed on the important subject of the fisheries in Newfoundland and particularly the fisheries as we find them today in Newfoundland and as we hope to find them tomorrow and next month and next year.

Now, Sir, I do not propose to in the ninety minutes I have at my disposal - quarter of six, that is about quarter after nine tonight is the limit imposed by the rules of the House assuming we sit at eight tonight. I do not propose to touch upon every aspect of the fisheries, even if I proposed so to do I do not see how it could be done with any justice in this period.

What I would like to do is touch upon a few of the matters raised by the Committee in the report, and then to say a few words about what I consider to be, and I think most members of the House are of the same views as am I, consider to be the important problems effecting our fisheries today.

Now, Sir, let me begin by saying a few words about the report prepared by the Committee of which the honourable gentleman from Placentia East was the Chairman. And I suppose that is in order, because, of course, the motion before the House begins that this House thanks the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery for their report and for the diligence and preception which the Committee members brought to their task. That is the first half of the motion, Sir. And I am quite willing to support that. I am quite willing to thank the Hon. Member from Placentia East and the six other gentlemen who served with him on the Committee. I do not remember who they were exactly, but they should be listed here at the start, the Hon. Member from Bonavista South, the gentleman from Harbour Grace, the gentleman from Trinity North, the gentleman from Port de Grave, the gentleman from Bay de Verde and then we come to the diligence and perceptive part, the gentleman from Fogo and the gentleman from Bonavista North. Actually there are eight members on the Committee, not seven. And

I think they should all be complimented. I think they did the best they could in the time at their disposal to discharge the mandate they were given. I think they faced an impossible task. And indeed, I think the gentleman from Placentia East who chaired the Select Committee would probably be the first to agree with me. The fisheries, Sir, are part of the very warp and woof of Newfoundland life. They have always been part of the very substance of our livelihood and our way of life in this country. Our people came to Newfoundland to fish, our people stayed in Newfoundland to fish, and in large measure the future of Newfoundland will be directly and irretrievably linked to the fishery.

Somebody said to me once, "Without the fishery there would be no Newfoundland." And that might be a little extreme, Mr. Speaker. But I think it is fair to say that Newfoundland can survive only if the fisheries survive and Newfoundland can prosper only if the fisheries prosper.

The Committee were handed really an all-embracing mandate, Sir, to have a look at the fisheries and to recommend what should be done. They were asked in effect to do what successive generations of Fisheries Ministers here and at Ottawa and successive generations of politicians and of all sorts here and at Ottawa, and successive hordes of generations of public servants here and at Ottawa had not succeeded in doing.

I do not think it is unfair or unwarranted to say that the report is very good as far as it goes. There is very little in it that is new, but I think it is a useful compendium of the problems of the fishery, and I think it is a useful compendium of the generally accepted solutions to the problems.

MR. NEARY: A summary only.

MR. ROBERTS: That is a good phrase, Mr. Speaker, that my friend from Bell Island has come up with, it is a summary. A summary in very short, and concise form of the fishery and its current state and its current problems.

The Committee also served a very useful purpose in going about the Province and in soliciting and in hearing the views and the opinions of fishermen. I think that is probably the first Select Committee, Mr. Speaker, certainly the first one to my recollection that has so done. There have been a number of Select Committees that have done good work over the years. We had a Select Committee - I recall just reading the transcripts, I was not in the House nor was I with the government service at the time on the question of the power cycle generation in the Province. Indeed the gentleman from Placentia East was probably at the table of the House when that Committee sat, and it met and considered at some length and recommended that the Province have nothing but sixty cycle power, a very major step forward and one which has been implemented.

There was one I recall on the Shop Act. Dr. Frecker chaired it. The gentleman from Bell Island brought his inimitable spirit and his deep knowledge of the problem to it and that Committee did good work.

But, I think, this is probably the first one -

MR. NEARY: The election was called before we had a chance.

MR. ROBERTS: Was it? Well we won the election anyway, Mr. Speaker, and so the report was implemented afterwards.

But, Mr. Speaker, this Committee, I think, did well. And I compliment the Chairman and I compliment all the honourable gentlemen who served on it. The recommendations are not terribly original and they are not terribly exciting. And I do not say that in any critical sense. I do not think

that the honourable gentleman who served on the committee would take it as such. I do not think there is really very much in this report that could not have been written by any one of a dozen men in this House or anyone of a dozen officials in the Department of Fisheries. Indeed I understand in fact it was largely written by an official in the Department of Fisheries, the gentleman who was secretary of the Committee. It is not unusual. But, there is nothing much in it that could not -

MR. MORGAN: That is not true.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. The gentleman from Bonavista South says it is untrue. Well, I accept his assurance. It is obvious that the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South personally wrote every word of it. Mr. Speaker, I merely passed on my understanding. If it is incorrect, it is incorrect. There is nothing wrong with the gentleman writing the report. It matters not who writes the report. What matters is who signs it and who adopts it and who endorses it and the Committee have made it their report.

If the gentleman from Bonavista South tells me that the information I have been given is wrong, I do not quarrel with him and I do not expect him to quarrel with me. We can find more important issues than that. His quarrel, Sir, is with his own, to use his phrase, his government. As if somehow he were the Queen's, His government, my government. If he has a difference of opinion at this point in the House, Sir, it is with his faithful leader, the Minister of Fisheries who differs with the honourable gentleman in a number of important points including in particular the question of gear banks.

The gentleman from Bonavista South and I happen to agree on the gear bank concept. He is a bit of a late comer to that concept but nonetheless, we welcome his vocal, vociferous and ardent support, Sir. I only wish it would continue but we will see about that.

Now, Sir, the recommendations in themselves are not terribly new. I mean, on page 38, the summary of the recommendations begins. The whole report, Sir, the whole report is only 38 double or triple-spaced pages. That includes about four or five pages of bumph. That

if b-u-m-p-f for the benefit of the girls who have to transcribe us. Bumpf at the start in telling us the resolution and so forth and so on. The recommendations are not terribly new. The ones that effect the Government of Canada, call upon that government to assert proprietary rights in the marine resources over the adjacent Continental Shelf by unilaterally extending Canadian fishery jurisdiction for the full 200 miles and/or the Continental Shelf, whichever is the greater. There is nothing new in that, Mr. Speaker. After all this House of Assembly unanimously adopted a resolution some considerable time ago in this session to much the same effect.

I may add I am surprised that the honourable gentleman's legal eye did not pick that up. The general concept of marginality has to do with property rights to the seabed and the sub-bed and not just to the marine resources. The second recommendation is that we should ensure compliance, that Canada should ensure compliance with restrictions affecting the fishery through increased aerial surveillance and seaborne patrols of such territorial or fishing limits as may have been declared by the Government of Canada. Again, there is nothing new. I mean, that has been said in this House 100 times over the last three or four years. It has been said outside.

To institute in consultation with the Province such restrictions upon the international conduct of the fisheries off our shore as are deemed necessary to protect and preserve our inshore fishery. Again a stunning insight into the obvious. To take immediate initiatives to affect further reductions in foreign fishing efforts beyond any figures negotiated at ICNAF and to create new outlets for our fishery products through multiple, bilateral agreements which would replace foreign quota fish with fish caught by Canadian fisherman as a portion of an increasingly larger Canadian share of the harvest. That is a little newer. But, if the honourable gentleman wants to look back to the few remarks which I addressed to the motion that set up the Committee, you

will find exactly that concept spelled out at some length. And, I did not even pretend it was original there. I thought it was a good idea then. I think it is a good idea now. I am glad the Committee share that view.

Then, we go on to the second chunk of the Ottawa recommendations. We want the U.I.C. Act amended or the U.I.C. regulations recommended insofar as they affect fishermen. Again, nothing new about that. That has been talked about for many years and surely should be done. We want to have an Income Support Programme. I wholeheartedly agree with that. But, I do not think anyone would claim that that is a new idea. To recognize the fact that there are areas in certain fishery where small boats are efficient and economically desirable harvesting tools and they want the subsidies changed so that these owners of such small boats can get help, that is not particularly new. To have a look at the federal fishing vessel insurance plan, to reduce the deductibles. Well, again, that is,

I think, a very straightforward and not a new idea. Finally in that section of the recommendations, to give special consideration to the operational needs of smaller seasonal processors and the initial development of financial assistance schemes for the benefit of the industry.

MR. DOODY: That is not something new.

MR. ROBERTS: No. Well, the honourable gentleman from Placentia East has made my point and I will adopt his words. It is pretty hard to find something new. I am not criticizing the Committee in any way when I say that there is nothing new in it. But he and I are on all fours on the point. I think it is a good summary. I think if one could read, Mr. Speaker, only one document on the fishery as it now exists in Newfoundland and the problems it now faces that this - I wish yellow was not used. It is not a particularly handsome colour, but this yellow coloured document, really, I think is as good a place to start. When next I get a letter from high school students, I suppose every honourable gentleman gets them, Mr. Speaker, saying Dear Sir, Today is Tuesday. I have an essay due in by Thursday. Could you please tell me what the fishery is about or what Newfoundland's future is in not less than fifty nor more than 126 words. I think I would be tempted to say, here is the report and it really is a good starting point. It goes on that the Province of Newfoundland on seeing her fisheries dissipated without having a voice in their management, seek recognition for her legitimate concerns. I would not think that is the sort of thing that people chant from the barricades. Men do not die for the radicalness of that principle but it is an acceptable idea, of course, and demand from Ottawa that we want to be involved in negotiations leading to greater participation in decision making process and so forth, develop regional policies for the use of gill nets, to establish area councils and so forth and then to insure majority representation of fishermen in all bodies established to hear appeals against



licensing decisions affecting our fishermen.

MR. NEARY: A powerful subject!

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, they had a meeting in Northeast Crouse to adopt that and to endorse it. If it were not for the fact that everybody is moving out of Northeast Crouse the case would be established.

Mr. Speaker, the recommendations when we come to the provincial ones are essentially the same of the same type. They are good and I have no hesitation in endorsing and accepting them and then saying that they make a lot of sense.

MR. NEARY: Let us adjourn and go have supper.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, there seems to be a demand, Sir, a wide-spread demand for supper. I know not whether it has anything to do with the fact that the liquor stores are reputedly open. But in any event, if it is in order, Sir, I will move it six o'clock. I understand we are to sit this evening and I will carry on with a few more remarks on that point.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): It now being six o'clock I leave the Chair until eight o'clock this evening.

The House met at 8:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Before we adjourned for our late day repast, whatever form it took, I had said a few words about the Report of this Select Committee, the report referred to in the motion that is now before the House, and I think the point which I had made in a sentence or two is simply that there was nothing in the report that was particularly new, and I think the honourable Member from Placentia East agreed with that, and I am the first to say as well that that is not a condemnation of the report it is more a statement of fact than it is any condemnation or any attempt to condemn.

The point I wish to make though, Sir- I will deal with some of the recommendations in the report. It seems to me that there are probably four that are more important than most, but the U.I.C. recommendation I think is of paramount importance to our people. The Corporation, the Marketing Corporation which the Committee suggested, again that is not a new idea, it is one that has been around for a long time, but I think it is a good idea.

The gear bank recommendation I submit is of great importance to our fishermen and the 200 mile limit matter, of course, is of crucial importance because without the 200 mile limit there just will not be a fishery as we know it in Newfoundland in a very short period of time.

There are other recommendations. I referred I think to almost all of them when I spoke before dinner, and they all have an importance in their way and the mere fact that I have not mentioned any of them does not indicate any lack of concern on my part or any feeling that they are not important.

But the four I have mentioned I think are probably the four most important of the recommendations and I think they are ones which should be looked at with a little more care by the House. As I said the Committee

I think did as good a job as they could given the time limitations in which they had to work. Their report has a sort of plaintive cri de coeur about that. It is to be found on page five where the Committee feels that it was unrealistic to expect any comprehensive study of the inshore fishery as outlined in the resolution within a period of less than one year to eighteen months. However, the Committee did afford the inshore fishermen and other interested individuals an opportunity to make their views known to the House of Assembly.

I think that is probably a good summation of the work of the Committee per se. There was no way they could have carried out the mandate which the government chose to give them. But that in itself should not cause us to condemn them or to cry havoc. They did provide a very valuable opportunity for the fishermen of Newfoundland to participate in the formation of public policy in a way in which they had never participated before. Because for all the meetings there have been and for all the organizations there have been of the fishermen of this province, to my recollection there never before has been a Select Committee, never before a group of members of the House who travelled quite widely in the province and gave fishermen an opportunity to appear before them. That was a good thing and I give my compliments to the Chairman, the gentleman from Placentia East, and to his colleagues on the Committee, the other seven members of the Select Committee. It was their idea and I think it was a good one and I think they have done the fishermen of this province a service.

But, Sir, my concern, and I submit the concern which this House must feel, is not so much with the report and the resolution which is before the Chair, Sir, makes that quite clear. Because the resolution goes on and after making some reference to the Committee in quite complimentary terms it carries on, the final phrase in the resolution is "directs the government to investigate immediately the feasibility in implementing those recommendations of the report that are within provincial jurisdiction."

Now, Sir, to speak for just a second on the wording of that motion, it is wishy-washy, it is weak, it is shilly-shallying, it is altogether what one would expect from a motion that had been moved by the government - not by the Minister of Fisheries, interestingly enough, but by his colleague the Minister of Justice. I would like to have seen far stronger language than that. I would like to have seen this House directing the government to implement immediately those recommendations that are within provincial jurisdiction.

The government's feeling having gotten support is that they now wish to investigate the feasibility of implementing those recommendations. Now, Mr. Speaker, I say and I know that every fisherman who appeared

before the Committee, the deep-sea fishermen or inshore fishermen, young or old, be he short or tall, fat or thin, every fisherman had one common message, one common point to make and that was the need for action. I think the Chairman, the gentleman from Placentia East would confirm that. That there may have been and there was a diversity of opinion on which points were paramount and which points should be pursued, and in some cases completely opposed opinions as on the case of the gill nets, where some fishermen appeared and they said they thought the gill nets were a good thing and many other fishermen said on their appearance that they thought the gill nets were a disaster. And indeed, even here in the House I think we have seen a diversity of opinion on the gill nets.

But every single person, be he a fisherman or be he a merchant or be he a politician or be he any type of Newfoundlander who appeared before that committee, at any point in this Province, Mr. Speaker, stressed the need for action. Action immediately, action effectively and above all, action. Mr. Speaker, that I think is the important point which must be made. We do not need further studies. There may be some aspects that we are not satisfied with. There may be some areas of policy that we do not feel that we have enough information to make the judgements on, but we do not need further studies. In that sense even the Select Committee was not needed. There is nothing in that report which could not have been written before the Committee ever sat.

MR. THOMS: Arthur Wicks could have done it.

MR. ROBERTS: My friend from Bonavista North mentions his constituent Arthur Wicks, a very vocal and very outspoken and, I think, quite knowledgeable gentleman from - Badger's Quay? - from Badger's Quay on the North side of Bonavista Bay.

There is nothing new in the report. We did not need the report to tell us what to do. The value of the report, and I think this is considerable value, is that it gave the fishermen an opportunity to participate and to be involved and to make their views known.

Because of my feelings, Sir, that we need action on this report, not shilly-shallying, not more dallying, not more delaying, not more study or more investigation or more feasibility this or suitability that, I heard the Minister of Fisheries' speech in introducing the motion with a great deal of disappointment, disappointment amounting almost to disgust. I had hoped when he introduced this motion several days after the report had been tabled that the minister would be able to indicate and would indicate to the House the government's commitment to implement at least those matters which are within provincial jurisdiction and to implement insofar as they could those matters of shared jurisdiction which are within their power to implement, and that is almost all of them.

If we look at section (c) of the recommendations, action recommendations affecting either domain, which begins on page 44 and goes through to page 47 - four pages of recommendations there - most of those are matters on which the government of this Province can move. I had hoped and felt that the Minister would come in to the House and would say, "Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, we have the report and here is what we are going to do," and he would go through them and tick them off one at a time. And that in my view is the action which the government should have done. If there are some of those recommendations that they are not prepared to accept then let them state why and let them state the fact they are not accepting them. But, Sir, I venture to suggest that almost of those recommendations are acceptable and should be accepted and must be implemented.

Mr. Speaker, the fishery in Newfoundland has been studied and studied and studied and studied. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think there probably are studies of the commissions that studied the committees that looked into the feasibility of the original reports. We do not need further studies. What we do need is action, and that was the common denominator, the common

theme of every fisherman in Newfoundland who appeared before the Committee. And I can tell the House, and no honourable member can challenge this, this is the common feeling of every fisherman in Newfoundland and Labrador today.

The government, Sir, I think, felt they made a good political move when they brought in this motion. They felt they had brought in something which would capture the imagination and win the hearts of every fisherman in this Province, and that is something which this government desperately needs to do, because they have lost

the affection and lost the support. They have alienated the widespread support which hitherto they enjoyed amongst the fishermen of this Province. When the committee was set up, I knew there was a feeling among many that it was, as my friend from Bell Island has just said, a stalling tactic, that it was one more excuse to involve - I am sorry - to avoid a commitment to action. Then, when the committee met and nothing new came out of it, but I think a good summary was made, many fishermen in the Province said, "That proves it!" Then when the debate comes in the House - and it is a very tardy debate, Mr. Speaker, it is a very tardy debate. This report was delivered in the House on June 5, dated the 5th of June. I believe the honourable gentleman from Placentia East tabled the report when the House met on the 5th of June. Today is the 24th of June, Sir, and I venture to submit that we have done nothing in the interim in this House that is even comparable to the least important part of this debate.

We have had - ah, we have talked about Legal Aid and we have talked about Ombudsmen and we have talked about this and we have talked about that, all of them matters having a certain degree of importance in their own right, but no matter, Mr. Speaker, having the importance for the fishermen of Newfoundland or for this Province of Newfoundland and Labrador as does this debate. And here we are now in what everybody knows is the tail end of the session! The House will probably sit tonight until eleven or twelve or one o'clock in a frantic rush to clean up legislation, a great rush so everybody can get off to wherever we are all going for the Summer, be it holidays or be it moving around the Province one way and another, and almost as an afterthought we are debating this motion. It is not good enough, Sir. The government should have cleared the legislative decks and debated this.

Sir, I say to the minister, whom I understand will speak to close the debate - it is his right. I would hope he would exercise it and I am sure he will - that I expect and the House expects and the people of this Province expect from him an outline of where they



stand on these various points, and what is going to be done to implement them. Words are not enough. Action is what is needed. Where do they stand on each recommendation? Not just attacking Ottawa! I will come to that. It is great fun taking a slice off of Ottawa, and there are some things for which Ottawa should be sliced. But, Sir, the old adage, physician heal thyself is not without application here.

A number of these motions, a number of these recommendations are within the legislative purview of this Province, Mr. Speaker, legislative or administrative purview of this Province. I expect the Minister of Fisheries to indicate just what is going to be done about them, to indicate that when he speaks. Let him take the recommendations and go through them one at a time and indicate what is going to be done and when it is going to be done. That was the point of the motion, the amendment moved by my colleague from Bell Island today, an amendment which was not in order, could not be debated. But, Sir, that was the whole point of it, to try to get from the government a commitment of action because I fear, Mr. Speaker, this report will disappear into Limbo, and there it will join a great number of other reports, some of them having some merit and some not having merit.

But, Sir, it is not enough just for this House to meet, and to heat our gums and to make speeches and to fill more pages of Hansard. That is not enough, Sir. What we need is action, and there are things in this which the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador can do.

Now, Sir, the problem is well known. I mean, one can look at figures. What was it Lord Randolph Churchill said, there are lies, damn lies and then there are statistics. But statistics can be revealing. I think it was Lord Randolph for the benefit of the gentleman from Parbour Main but I am not sure. Well, it may not have been. The honourable gentleman has a deeper knowledge of British history than do I.

Let us just look at the - these are the federal fisheries

June 24, 1975

Tape 2646 (night)

IB-3

figures, Sir, for the month of May, 1975. They were sent out a fortnight ago. They are the most recent available. If one wants just an indication of what is happening in the fishery in this Province allowing for the fact there was a strike of the deep sea trawlers,

in the period between January and May 1975, the first five months of this calendar year, the grand total in production in metric tons in this Province was 8,367.412, call it 8,400 metric tons of fish was produced. The comparable figure for 1974 was 15,366 tons, call it 15,400 tons, almost twice as much. It is true that in the month of May there was some improvement. May 1974 there were 3,720 metric tons, and in this month of May 1975 there were 4,530 metric tons being caught, a little more than the year before.

But, Sir, the fishery is falling off rapidly. And I could take the figures from the last two or three years - they are well known to the House. That is the problem. Let me put it another way, to read another description of the problem, one which I think puts it into perspective. It is probable that most Atlantic ground-fish fisheries are prosecuted at or above the maximum sustainable yield, and, of course, yield of the fish stocks, and are today operating at a loss. The solution to this situation is to very substantially reduce the total fishing effort, by reducing or eliminating the foreign effort on the fish stocks desired by Canada. Within the next few years Canadian fleets will have preference and with sound management we should be able to allow the major stocks to increase so that the Canadian vessels should in time catch substantially more fish per unit of effort, and these fish will be larger in size and generally cheaper to process and produce more valuable products, and the stocks will be larger and the fishery less depend on variable year class survival thereby providing a more stable industry. And that is a good summary of the problem. It has got a lot of bureaucratic jargon in it. But it is a good summary of the problem. And it is a good summary of the solution. But, Sir, that too requires action. It requires action on two fronts, it requires action in Ottawa, and it requires action here.

I will come back to the 200 mile question, because I think that is crucial and central to the whole piece and there is nothing in

which we in Newfoundland can do by means of executive action to implement a 200 mile limit. We have no jurisdiction in international affairs.

MR. CROSBIE: It must hurt to admit that.

MR. ROBERTS: I do not find that at all hard to admit. What little constitutional law I know I learned from an extremely good teacher, a man who has now gone on to become Chief Justice of Canada where presumably he will make constitutional law instead of just teaching.

MR. CROSBIE: He will discover the law.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry. The honourable gentleman thinks that Mr. Chief Justice Bora Laskin will discover the law. I would suggest, Sir, that -

MR. DOODY: You discover him.

MR. ROBERTS: I will suggest that the Chief Justice of Canada has probably forgotten more constitutional law than the Minister of Fisheries would ever know, he probably is not in quite the same league, Sir, as is the gentleman from Harbour Main who is recognized throughout the breadth of this land as being an expert on constitutional law, -

MR. DOODY: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: - particularly the pith and substance doctrine which is right up his alley.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, -

MR. DOODY: I am more of a substance than a pith.

MR. ROBERTS: Well if the honourable gentleman opposite chooses to lisp that is his problem.

Now, Sir, there are some things which we can do provincially, and the report mentions them. The report goes into them in some detail. First of all, and not necessarily first in order of importance, but I think it most intriguing that this recommendation should be made, most salutary that should be made in a report produced by a Committee six of whom are Tory Members of the House, but I think it is a sound recommendation. It is on page 44, that the Minister of Fisheries hold the portfolio of Fisheries only -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: - that he not be expected to carry a dual portfolio.

MR. MOORES: He does not have a dual portfolio.

MR. ROBERTS: That would apply - I will deal with the Premier, and the Premier apparently does not even know what his own cabinet is up to these days.

MR. DOODY: He is the minister responsible, but he is not administering two portfolios.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the Premier may or may not be responsible, in fact, he is in theory. The point I am making, and this applies equally to Ottawa or to here, it is raised in the dual section of it, -

MR. NEARY: Ottawa would not have -

MR. ROBERTS: - is that the Minister of Fisheries should hold only one portfolio.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: The present Minister of Fisheries holds two.

MR. MOORES: He does not administer two.

MR. ROBERTS: There are two. Well then he is masquerading, because there are two separate departments created by Statute of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, one called the Intergovernmental Affairs Department. We put an act through this session -

MR. MOORES: He is responsible for it.

MR. ROBERTS: It may be - the honourable gentleman holds the title. I do not know if he has ever been sworn in, he has been sworn at often enough, I do not know if he has been sworn in as Minister of Intergovernmental Affairs or not.

But the fact remains, and I do not care about the semantics, the fact remains the Minister of Fisheries, a man of very great ability, of very great ability, Sir, is not able to devote his full time in the ministerial sense to fisheries.

MR. NEARY: Ottawa will not talk to him either.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the honourable the Minister of Fisheries holds the position of House Leader, a demanding position and one which I know takes a lot of his time, even with the assistance of the honourable the Minister of Justice, understudying him and helping him and aiding him in every way, pouring over the statutes and the rules night after night. He also, Mr. Speaker, holds responsibility, and I believe there is a portfolio although I have not got the statutes in front of me, of Intergovernmental Affairs.

MR. NEARY: Minister of Fear.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: The minister's recommendation is that the minister hold only one portfolio and I think that is a very good one and I would say to the Premier - well I know he is rather short of Cabinet talent, Not of Cabinet aspirants but of Cabinet talent - he might do very well to relieve the Minister of Fisheries of everything except the Fisheries portfolio. I think it is worthy of it and I think it is important enough to justify it. The Minister of Justice would make an admirable House Leader. He is over there lusting for the position, Sir, and just waiting to get a crack at it and his record, Sir, as House Leader speaks for itself in this House. There has never been a House Leader quite like the Minister of Justice.

I think as well, Sir, the government should implement the gear bank concept. We have had a lot of chitter-chatter about the very bad report produced by three young gentlemen who are I believe on the faculty of the university. I believe the Minister of Fisheries intends to go to the wall to defend it. He and his friend and colleague, the gentleman from Bonavista South, had a difference of opinion, I understand, on the matter here in the House and they may have had the difference outside. Mr. Speaker, I have seen nothing to convince me that for once the gentleman from

Bonavista South is not correct. Certainly the fishermen of this province believe that they are being ripped off with respect to fishing gear and even in my own appearance before the Committee at St. Anthony I think I was able to give an example. I do not know if the Committee were able to track it down, a quite dramatic example of how the cost of gear was it \$2,000 or \$3,000 in the difference between the same engine bought in Nova Scotia and bought here in Newfoundland?

Mr. Speaker, there are many other examples and whatever report three academics may have turned out on a very quick look, a very cursory look at the whole fisheries question, whatever report they may have given, surely the opinions of 5,000, 10,000 or 15,000 fishermen count for something, and the Committee have made a recommendation which I believe should be accepted and implemented immediately, page forty-four, "the government take immediate steps for the wholesale purchase at cost from manufacturers of all major pieces of fishing gear," and it goes on, "provided the retail distribution of such gear could be accomplished through collective agencies of the fishermen themselves. I think the unions might be able to help there, possibly some of the co-ops we have. We may need some other mechanisms. Mr. Speaker, I think that recommendation is a sound one and I would like nothing better than to hear the Minister of Fisheries stand up and say that it will be accepted, that it will be acted upon. We have been hearing this matter debated in the House now for two or three years, The minister when last he spoke defended the report of the Committee. I have nothing against the gentlemen who wrote the report, I am sure they did their best, but I do not think their best measured up -

MR. AYLWARD: Point of order, I mean I think the Leader of the Opposition disparages us. I mean we are responsible. We wrote this report.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I do not know what the honourable gentleman is raising a point of order about.

MR. AYLWARD: Well I mean you are suggesting that someone other than the Committee wrote the report.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, Mr. Speaker, I earlier in the afternoon said - I do not know what this got to do with this right now, I am talking about a

recommendation on page forty-four.

MR. AYLWARD: The honourable member has us confused.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, I know he is confused! But I mean, must he show us?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: But I did say earlier, Mr. Speaker, that I understood the report had been written by - it does not matter who writes it.

I am sure the Premier in the course of a day signs many letters he does not write. That does not make them any the less his letters.

MR. NEARY: He is so concerned about Thursday he cannot think of anything else.

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the honourable gentleman from Placentia East has - I mean does he want to persue a point of order or had I said something that -

MR. AYLWARD: That boat at Twillingate is coming up before Court on Thursday.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, there is a great story behind the, what is the name of her -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: - the Rose Marie, a great story behind that, Sir. But in any event I am talking about the -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. DOODY: Mr. Speaker, this is important.

MR. ROBERTS: Well it may not be important, unless the gentleman from Harbour Main holds a third or fourth mortgage on the boat which seems to be -

MR. NEARY: I tried to raise the issue three or four times but the Speaker shot me down!



MR. ROBERTS: The shot that was heard around the world, eh? as opposed to the herd that was shot around the world, which is the normal government process.

Mr. Speaker, the second recommendation of gear banks is one which I would like to see implemented. The Minister of Fisheries has never made any convincing argument against it. The only argument he has made in the House or outside that I ever heard is to table and produce a very weak and insubstantial and I think quite bad report from three gentlemen over at the University. I have had a look at the report. We debated it at some length in an earlier debate. I think there were enough holes poked in that report to show that the concept which was turned down by the report, the concept of a gear bank, is still a viable one. I find it most significant that the Committee, independent minded men, determined to try to do their best for the country have recommended that we carry on with a gear bank concept. I think it is important. The cost of gear is a very important and very significant part of the cost of any fisherman in operating.

MR. CROSBIE: The report recommended -

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry?

MR. CROSBIE: They reported that a lot of fishermen did not think it necessary.

MR. ROBERTS: I know what they said but I know what they recommended too. A lot of fishermen say a lot of things, but I am talking about what the Committee have recommended, what the Committee in their considered judgment have recommended after they had heard those who wish to appear before them. After they had considered such evidence as they wished to seek, the Committee disregarded the views and adopted another view. That surely is their right. I suppose now they are to be condemned by the Minister of Fisheries for daring, Mr. Speaker, to differ from a view which he espoused. Well, I say to the minister that he is wrong. He would be a bigger man if he admitted he was wrong.

MR. CROSBIE: I am wrong.

MR. ROBERTS: Hurrah! Now, Mr. Speaker, let that be engrossed upon parchment and entered in the roles of this House. The Minister of Fisheries admitted he was wrong. Let all here who are witness - this, Sir, is an historic event. The Minister of Fisheries admitted he was wrong. Well, let him admit when he comes to speak that he is going to implement his admission and that he is going to go ahead with a gear bank and go ahead now.

The purchasing corporation, Sir, the Fresh Fish Marketing Corporation which the commission recommended, it is on page forty-two,

MR. CROSBIE: Page twenty-one.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman's report has - page twenty-one - so does mine, Mr. Speaker. And the honourable gentleman when he speaks may quote page twenty or twenty-one or page twenty-two or even page 121, which is not even in the report, if he wishes. He may quote whatever he wishes as long as it is in order. I am referring for the benefit of the honourable gentleman to the recommendation on page forty-four, the recommendation, not the Committee's report but the recommendations which concluded their report and which after study and deliberation - the honourable gentleman to make any other tack he has got to contend that the Committee did not do their work at all well. Well, I say they did on this point.

Now, let me come on to page forty-two, Sir. "Major policy recommendations affecting the provincial domain." These are ones, Sir, where the buck squarely stops in Confederation Building or in the Viking Building. The prelude, the preface is "that the Government of Newfoundland demonstrate its determination to maintain and to re-vitalize the inshore sector of the fishing industry by taking prompt steps: (a) to establish a Fresh Fish Marketing Corporation which will promote and actively engage in the sale of the fresh and frozen output of Newfoundland's small and medium sized processing firms who obtain the major portion of their supply from inshore fishermen

in order to increase the market share of Newfoundland products." My only complaint is that does not go far enough. I think we need in our fishery in Newfoundland - the term one-desk marketing has been used often, I am not so sure that we should just have one selling agency but certainly we should have only two or three at most. I think the Committee's suggestion that we should have a Crown Corporation that works with the product of the small and medium sized plants is a very good one because we all know of cases where the Boston market, the only real point of sale of most of our fish in Newfoundland, has been knocked down a couple of pounds because some smaller owner is being pressed by the bank or is anxious to move his product, he agrees to sell it off centre to off market price and that knocks it down. It takes weeks for the market to come back.

Of course, the honourable gentleman from Placentia East also spoke of quality, and quality is all important. Newfoundland fish no longer has the reputation it should have. A way to insure that the quality comes up, I suggest, is to have a Fresh Fish Marketing Corporation.

The Saltfish Corporation has been the salvation of the Saltfish Industry. The honourable gentleman from Fortune Bay spoke today in defence of the merchants. I do not want to engage in the age old game of attacking the merchants. They have got to live with their own consciences. But, Sir, the salt fish merchants nearly destroyed the salt fishery in Newfoundland from the period in the mid 1960's on when NAFEL was - I am sorry, not the mid 1960's, before that - NAFEL was ended by order of Mr. Diefenbaker and the Tory Government in Ottawa. They ended NAFEL's monopoly, the legal monopoly which NAFEL enjoyed up until that time. The result, Sir, was chaos in the salt fish industry. It just about saw the death of the industry.

MR. NEARY: Then they fought against the Canadian Saltfish Corporation.

MR. ROBERTS: They certainly did fight against the Canadian Saltfish Corporation in every way they could. They gouged and they scratched and they bit and they spat, and then the Saltfish Corporation came in, and while it may not be perfect it has saved the salt fish industry in this Province. Today it is the most prosperous sector we have. There are problems in it, of course. Mr. Speaker, the salt fish industry is in better shape than any other part of the fish industry in this Province today. The problems in it are far more capable of solutions than are the problems in the fresh fish industry.

The Fresh Fish Marketing Corporation would be a great step forward. It is something which the Government of this Province can do. It may need the authority of this House, but I believe, Sir, if the government brought it before the House they would receive a welcome and a ready support from all sides. Let me talk about marketing. Let me just read a note which I have on market outlook.

As a consequence - the summary in conclusion - as a consequence of the economic boom and the high meat and poultry prices, 1973 was an extraordinarily good year for groundfish sales in the U.S. market. That is almost all of our fish. What? Ninety-five per cent of our fish goes into the American market? Ninety-

eight per cent? Does anybody - does the honourable gentleman from Placentia East care to hazard a guess? Is it ninety-five per cent?

MR. AYLWARD: Ninety.

MR. ROBERTS: Ninety. But, you know, it is almost all of it. The American market is where our product is sold. What is sold elsewhere is relatively insignificant in the total. As against about 706 million pounds in 1972 the 1973 U.S. groundfish consumption amounted to 740 million pounds, an increase of seven per cent.

Now, that is not our share of the market. That is the total groundfish consumption in the United States. In contrast the general business slow down, the oil crisis and declining meat and poultry prices since the end of 1973 brought about a substantial drop of groundfish sales and prices in 1974. During 1974 the total U.S. groundfish consumption amounted to 603 million pounds as against 740 million pounds in 1973, a drop of nineteen per cent. If one wants to look for the trouble in our industry today, Sir, there is a great deal of it contained in that one sentence. During 1974 the total U.S. groundfish consumption amounted to 603 million pounds as against 740 million pounds in 1973, a drop of nineteen per cent, call it twenty per cent in round numbers.

Not only are we not catching the fish, we cannot even sell that which we catch. Of course, the price has dropped as well. In the wake of depressed sales, groundfish processors, wholesalers and retailers slowed down their purchases. This problem was further aggravated by the tight money situation and the high cost of money. As a result, in 1974 Canada exported only 34 million pounds of groundfish blocks to the U.S.A. as against 65 million pounds in the previous year. Simultaneously, Canadian groundfish fillet exports to the U.S. dropped from 160 million pounds in 1973 to 120 million pounds in 1974. The decreased quantities were exported at substantially decreased prices.

Between February, 1974 and 1975 the price of cod blocks dropped from eighty to fifty-eight cents. That would be a pound. The price of the one pound cod fillets from eight-fifty to seventy-

five cents and the price of the one pound ocean perch fillers from sixty-one to fifty-two cents. The retail trade was the most depressed segment of the U.S. groundfish market in 1974 since retail prices did not follow the downward drift of wholesale price. The institutional end of the market did not suffer so much. It goes on, Sir.

Since the U.S. economic situation is not expected to improve this year - and this is a current report, it is only a month or so old, so we are talking of 1975 - since the U.S. economic situation is not expected to improve

this year and U.S. beef prices are expected to remain on a depressed level, no major improvement to the American groundfish market can be foreseen in 1975. Total U.S. groundfish consumption is likely to remain on a 1972 level. Price improvements are likely to be sporadic and modest in the rest of this year." And that is the outlook which our fish companies now face, Mr. Speaker. The fish that they catch they are going to have trouble selling and they are going to have trouble selling it at anything like a realistic price.

MR. NEARY: It is a good thing Ottawa is subsidizing it or she would go belly up.

MR. ROBERTS: Right! "Market developing and promotion of fishery products would appear to be critical factors in the revival of the market." Sir, if there is one sentence or phrase that should be engraved in letters of burnished bronze with respect to the whole marketing end of this business - it is not enough just to talk about catching the fish, Sir, We cannot sell it till we catch it, but it is no good once we catch it unless we can sell it - if there is one sentence that should be recalled and remembered it is that one.

"Market developing and promotion of fishery products would appear to be critical factors in the revival of the market."

I think the Fresh Fish Marketing Corporation will go a long way towards meeting that concept.

MR. CROSBIE: Is that APEC's report?

MR. ROBERTS: No, I cannot tell my friend where it comes from but it is from a highly placed authoritative source, and I do not call APEC either highly placed or authoritative in this sense.

MR. DOODY: But it used to be authoritative.

MR. ROBERTS: No, It is an always reliable source. But, Sir, the facts are there, the facts speak for themselves, and the facts are that all the talk of the 200 mile limit, while it is important and relevant, is only half the story. We have got to bring our marketing into line, we have to bring our whole approach to the American market on an up-to-date basis, we have to do it quickly.

MR. NEARY: We have to get new markets. That is the theme.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, we have to get new markets and we have to continue to develop the older markets. We lost a large share of the market in the last couple of years to the Alaskan Pollock, so-called, and to the products from Japan, and the other products from Japan and from Korea. They took all the minced fish market, all the minced fish fingers market - a very large market in the States - that was won over on a price basis by this Alaskan Pollock. I do not know the official or the Latin name of it. It is not called that, it is not its genus, but that is the market name of it, just as Greenland halibut, our turbot, was for many years marketed in the States under the name Greenland Halibut. It is now, I believe, called Greenland turbot.

Now, Sir, I could go on but I do not want to repeat unduly. I think the point is there and I think the point is a good one, and I think the Minister of Fisheries should accept that recommendation and should announce this night the government are going to move to implement it. There is no need for further study. How much more do they need? A Committee comprised of their own backbenchers, led by one of the leading lights on the other side, the gentleman from Placentia East, has brought in a recommendation that we should have this corporation. There can be no possible reason for delay, no possible excuse. If the government are the least bit concerned with this situation they will act and they will act now.

MR. NEARY: Can we bring in a Private Member's bill?

MR. ROBERTS: We cannot bring in a Private Member's bill, Mr. Speaker, for the expenditure of money. Only a minister of the Crown under the B.N.A. Act has that right.

MR. DOODY: For the last couple of years.

MR. NEARY: Wait until the government changes!

MR. ROBERTS: The other Provincial matters are straightforward and again I would hope the minister of Fisheries when he speaks will announce that these things are being done, or in the case of amending the regulations, they have been done. It only takes an Order-in-Council



to amend them. I do not know what the cost would be but I do not think the cost would be very much in dollars. The Committee do not give any figures. I have no way to compute the figures but, Sir, the cost would be insignificant compared to the gain. And if this government care in the least for the fishery of this Province they will act. We have had enough grandstand plays. Let us now have some action.

Mr. Speaker, the U.I.C. matter does not require a great deal of comment. I think we all agree it must be changed. We are seeing now on the Northeast Coast of the Province -

MR. CROSBIE: Why do you not get your friends to change it?

MR. ROBERTS: We are seeing now on the Northeast Coast of the Province -

MR. F.B. ROWE: You are right in there with Ottawa, why do you not get them to change it?

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman, I will deal with him in a minute. We are seeing along the Northeast Coast of the Province now, Sir, an utter disaster situation. The matter was raised in this House on numerous occasions by gentlemen on this side. The Minister of Fisheries took no heed of it. His only appearance came last Thursday or Friday when he tried a grandstand play sending a telegram off to, I think, Mr. LeBlanc, the Fisheries Minister at Ottawa, and simultaneously releasing copies to the House and to the press. All well and good, but that is the first thing he did apparently and the situation has been there for over a month.

MR. NEARY: We have been hounding him now for a couple of weeks.

MR. ROBERTS:

The gentleman from Bell Island, the gentleman from Fogo, the gentleman from Bonavista North, myself, others of us on this side, have been pointing out this problem and saying that no fisherman along the Northeast Coast was able to fish. The gentleman from Fogo sent a telegram to the gentleman from St. John's West, the Minister of Fisheries on the 17th of May. He sent one off at the same time to Mr. LeBlanc. Mr. LeBlanc replied and took the position that under the policies and programmes, action must be initiated by the government of the Province. The government of the Province, Mr. Speaker, took no action until the 18th or 19th of June. I have the precise date here somewhere in this file of pages, anyway last Thursday or Friday, whatever day it was, the 18th or 19th of June.

The Minister of Fisheries, Sir, will have to answer for that. There is no fisherman along the Northeast Coast, Mr. Speaker, who has had any fishery this year. Whether it starts at Sandy Cove or the Straits of Belle Isle or whether it starts at Cape Norman and comes right down to about Cape Freels -

MR. ROWE: The ice is still in.

MR. ROBERTS: - the ice is still in. I flew down more than a week ago and every harbour between Musgrave Harbour and St. Anthony or Quirpon was choaked with ice, right tight against the shore, not pack ice, Sir, just loose slob ice floating about, just enough of it so that no boat could be launched and no net could be set. I do not suppose there is a fisherman on that coast who has caught a fish this year. There may have been a few lobsters taken.

But, normally, Sir, by the end of June the fishery is well underway even in the most Northerly parts of the Island. The Unemployment Insurance scheme - we all know its defects. It is not very good. It is a devil of a lot better than anything the provincial government have proposed. It is a lot better than anything they have done. But, it is not good enough and it must be changed. The Government at Ottawa have said they will change it. I would like to see some action to go along with their words.

But, again, Sir, even words are more than the government of this Province has done for the fishermen.

MR. CROSBIE: Speak too at the Liberal Ball.

MR. ROBERTS: I will certainly speak at the Liberal Ball and so will the 1,500 people who are beating down the doors to get tickets.

MR. MOORES: Including Mr. Smallwood.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Smallwood has bought his ticket, Sir, and will be there and I am sure the Premier will be delighted to hear it.

MR. MOORES: He has bought his ticket.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, he bought his ticket. He paid his \$5.00 - he always did, Sir. Yes, he is one of the speakers, Sir, and I have no doubt everybody there will listen and be very pleased by what Mr. Smallwood has to say. He will make more sense than the gentleman from Bonavista South normally does. Now, Mr. Speaker, the honourable Minister of Fisheries should be concerned about Unemployment Insurance, Mr. Speaker. He may need it when the time comes.

Now, Sir, Ottawa will have to answer for what they do or do not do with respect to Unemployment Insurance. But, Sir, at least they are concerned about the problem, which is more than I can say about the government of this Province. They have not even shown any concern. This report came in on June 5 and three weeks later the Minister of Fisheries and his colleagues deigned to bring it up, almost three weeks to the day. The Premier has been so busy at important meetings today.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries, his colleagues took office as a new broom, and all we - we have had four Ministers of Fisheries in less than four years, one man giving up in complete despair, and we have had the Premier on and off and then we had the gentleman from Gander, who distinguished himself in a number of ways, none of them to the benefit of the fishermen, and then finally we got one of the ablest men in the cabinet, the present Minister of Fisheries, the gentleman from St. John's West -

MR. NEARY: How about Walter Carter? Walter Carter -

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Mr. Walter Carter will shortly be resigning his seat to come back here to seek election to the House of Assembly thereby opening up another seat in St. John's West which Mr. Trudeau and the Liberal Party will elect a candidate in. Is Walter going to be the Minister of Fisheries?

MR. NEARY: He or John Lundrigan.

MR. ROBERTS: He or Mr. John Lundrigan. Well, either Sir, would be welcome. It will be a short term appointment only.

Now, Mr. Speaker, honourable gentlemen opposite seem eager to wish to participate in the debate. I hope they will. I am very glad the Minister of Fisheries will deign to say a few words, Sir. Who knows, we may even be lucky enough to drag a few out of the Premier before this day is over.

MR. NEARY: Why would Walter Carter come back?

MR. ROBERTS: Why would Mr. Carter come back here? I cannot answer that. But, of course, he has got no future politically in Ottawa. So, he hopes, I suppose, to come back here.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the U.I.C. must be changed. I do not think changing the U.I.C. is the answer. I think what we need is an income support programme, and I see no reason why one should not be put into effect. I expect one will be put into effect. I would like to see the government of the Province make some suggestions as to what could be done instead of just being negative and nay-sayers and trying to make a few political points. I would like to see the Minister of Fisheries or the Premier or any spokesman for the ministry, even the gentleman from Bonavista South, stand and make a suggestion as to what form an income support programme should take.

I think, Sir, it is

probably the greatest single need which the fishermen have, leaving aside the question of the 200 mile limit. I think it is something which must be done and must be done quickly or else we are not going to have men going to the fishery for a career. The fishery now, Sir, is an employer of last resort. In case after case men go fishing, Sir, only because they cannot find anything else to do. That is no way to build the industry that should be an important part of the economic backbone of this Province.

In district after district in this Province, Sir, the number of men who will be fishing this Summer depends on whether there is any work in the roads or in construction projects or in the woods or anywhere other than the fishery. That is not the way it should be, Sir. We used to hear a great deal from this government when they were seeking election, before they had to try to live with their words. We used to hear a great deal about making the - what is it? - "We shall do best that which we do best," or some such terrific slogan. We used to hear about trawlers and not one of them, Sir, has had a keel touch the water. The Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, who was then the Minister of Fisheries, at one stage had the gall to stand in this House and I asked if the contracts were being let for the trawlers, And what happened, shortly after, Sir? It was he who was let, let out and moved into the Forestry and Agriculture Department. I do not know what anybody has against our Forestry and Agriculture resources as to wish the honourable gentleman upon them.

Sir, nothing has been done by this government. This report points the way for some steps which should be taken. I am quite willing to castigate Ottawa where they should be castigated and this is one of the areas where they should be. But it is not enough just to stand and to attack. The people of this Province expect better from their government than that.

Sir, let me say a few words about the 200 mile limit. I thought the honourable Member for Placentia East was - I noted down his words. I thought they were very good - he was going to have us, and I think I quoted him accurately, mobilize the forces of Atlantic Canada, that the Premier should meet with all of his colleagues, Mr. Regan in Nova Scotia, Mr. Alec Campbell in P.E.I. and Mr. Hatfield, the Premier of New Brunswick. They should together as a unified body and make an appeal to Ottawa. Well, I would be all for that. It is a little late. The Premier has been in office for three and a half years. We have had a resolution of the House of Assembly unanimously passed by every member here, many of whom spoke to it, a resolution saying that the policy of Canada insofar as this Province was concerned, the policy of Canada necessary for the survival of this Province should be the implementation of a 200 mile limit, unilaterally if necessary. It is a little late for the Premier to come galloping to the rescue.

MR. AYLWARD: What about the suggestion that he should intercept Trudeau?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. Well, I would like nothing better than if the Premier would somehow make some representations. Our position is quite clear. I sent the Prime Minister a telegram the day after the report came down, June 6. "You are aware, I am sure, that the stand taken by our House of Assembly with respect to Canada's fishery jurisdiction, this resolution which I proposed received the unanimous support of our House. The resolution reaffirms the absolutely vital importance of the fishery to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador. It calls upon the Government of Canada to gain for every Canadian, particularly for our people, an extending fishing limit. We believe that this is absolutely essential to the survival of our fisheries and thus of our Province. The resolution further states that if the Geneva Law of the Sea Conference did not establish the extended fishing limit, then Canada should act unilaterally. The failure at Geneva is now

history. Your colleague, the honourable Romeo LeBlanc is about to leave Canada to go to Scotland to attend the ICNAF meetings." (That was not correct. Mr. LeBlanc, as far as I know, did not attend the ICNAF meetings. Dr. Needler did, did he? Dr. Needler headed the delegation. Our own Minister of Fisheries dropped in for a bit.) "I earnestly urge and implore your administration to take the firm and resolute position that Canada is going to have an extended fishing limit and that we are going to take control of our fishery resources.

"A quarter of a century of experience with ICNAF leaves little room for confidence that our needs will be met by action through that body." This was, Mr. Speaker, while our Minister of Fisheries was saying that ICNAF was the answer. ICNAF is not the answer, never has been and never will be.

It goes on, The principle of unilateral action is neither new nor offensive to Canadian public policy. I would refer you merely to the action which you and your colleagues took in unilaterally extending Canada's territorial jurisdiction in Arctic waters in 1970. I cannot stress too greatly the absolute necessity of extending our fishing limits nor the overwhelming importance which our people attach to it. Newfoundland can survive only if her fisheries survive. Newfoundland can prosper only if her fisheries prosper. To survive and to prosper, our fisheries must have the benefit of extended fishing limits, a limit 200 miles from our coast in any case, and at the edge of the Continental Shelf where that extends beyond the 200 mile limit. It is the right position to take in the interest of the fisheries and in the interest of Newfoundland and Labrador, and in the interest of Canada.<sup>11</sup> This was a telegram which I sent to the Prime Minister on June 6. I have the reply here and I will read it in a second.

MR. CROSBIE: You got the reply on the weekend, did you?

MR. ROBERTS: I have the reply. It came a day or so ago.

Mr. Speaker, that is our position as a party and as a group. It is not a new position. It is the same one which we put in the House and which the House supported when the resolution which I moved early in this session was debated and adopted without a dissenting vote. But while our government was fooling around with ICNAF and fooling around in Edinburgh and Glasgow and Greenock and Aberdeen and in the Highlands and wherever else they may have been on their Edinburgh jaunt, Sir, that is the position which they should have taken.

The Prime Minister sent me back a reply. It was nice of him. I will read it. It is not marked private or confidential. It is dated June 16, and I got it on June 20.

MR. NEARY: The day before my birthday.

MR. ROBERTS: It is the day before my honourable friend's birthday.

MR. DOODY: Happy Birthday 'Steve'.



MR. ROBERTS: I hope he will get a better birthday present than this one from time to time, because I do not consider the Prime Minister's reply to be what I wanted to hear. I cannot make the man do anything, Sir. I cannot make the Government of Canada do anything, but I am going to try.

MR. DOODY: The people of Canada are aware of the problem.

MR. ROBERTS: Anyway the honourable - yes, the people of Canada ruled last July, did they not? And Mr. Stanfield - and by the way, Mr. Speaker, I have not all of the research which I would liked to have done but exactly what has Mr. Stanfield said on the 200 mile limit?

MR. THOMS: Not anything.

MR. ROBERTS: Not anything says my colleague from Bonavista North. His record on most things -

HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. ROBERTS: He spoke over - ah the one where Mr. Lougheed whom we are supporting for the Leadership - Mr. Lougheed.

MR. DOODY: Right! Full speed ahead.

MR. ROBERTS: No, Sir, I am not sure what Mr. Stanfield says, but certainly if he said anything it has not made much of an impact on the public prints.

MR. DOODY: He is very low keyed.

MR. ROBERTS: When he was going around talking about wage and price controls last year he did not talk about the 200 mile limit. He was at a meeting in Harbour Grace, Did he say anything there?

MR. MOORES: I have no idea, Mr. Speaker.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, the Premier has no idea. Obviously the Premier was at the meeting and heard Mr. Stanfield's speech.

MR. MOORES: He did not say -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. MOORES: - the Leader of the Opposition -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, -

HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, -

HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, honourable gentlemen opposite can have great mirth but I would point out that just a few months ago all of them were busily announcing that Mr. Stanfield was going to be the next Prime Minister of Canada. And how they have changed it. Now we are hearing it for Peter Lougheed. A fine gentleman, a great Premier of Alberta and our Premier has sold out our interests and our birthright right down the line in his effort to make Peter Lougheed Prime Minister of Canada.

MR. MOORES: Sold out which way?

MR. ROBERTS: Which way? The Premier would do it either way, I am quite sure, Sir. Either way or anyway. What is the old saying, three ways and six diseases. That might be applicable.

MR. MOORES: Did you say you have learned that already?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Sir. I have been taught by the Premier and I am an avid learner, Sir, and I believe in going right to the fountain head,

MR. DOODY: This is right.

MR. ROBERTS: - as opposed to the other end which is why I do not listen to the gentleman for Harbour Main.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, Hear!

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Sir, the Prime Minister's letter begins, sensibly enough, "This is in reply to your telex regarding the extension of Canada's fishing limits."

MR. DOODY: Is that a telex or a letter?

MR. ROBERTS: This is a letter, on his lovely gold-crested letterhead.

MR. DOODY: Quite a bit of waste there.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, he probably felt he could not send it collect, things are pretty rough in Ottawa, you know. "As you know Canada has been among the most active countries in the world in pressing for international agreement on a 200 mile limit for the Fisheries jurisdiction of the coastal state, on its special interest in the coastal fish stocks

of the Continental Margins beyond 200 miles, and on the primary rights of the state of origin in respect of salmon spawned in its rivers. Although the Law of the Sea Conference unfortunately has not yet concluded a final convention on these and other matters, the emerging consensus within the conference indicates that Canada's major fisheries interests should be well predicted in the eventual agreement. Meanwhile

MR. ROBERTS: I am aware of the difficulties facing Canada's Atlantic fisheries. I fully appreciate the concerns of Canadian fishermen in coastal communities affected by declining stocks and declining catches. The government is exploring all possible measures to bring an early solution to these problems. For your information I attach copies of recent statements by the honourable Allan J. MacEachen, and the honourable Romeo LeBlanc who have a direct bearing on the matters you have raised.

MR. DOODY: They must have made them since last Thursday.

MR. ROBERTS: Well they are all here. If the honourable gentleman wish I would be happy to read them. But I am sure they have already read them.

"I am sure you will understand that a unilateral extension of jurisdiction is one possible course of action that has not been rejected." A negative way to phrase it, but there it is. "The government has taken such action before, both in respect of fisheries and in the protection of the marine environment. However, it is because of this background of practical experience that we wish to maintain the maximum flexibility in regard both to the kinds of measures that might be taken and to their timing. I am glad that you have brought my attention once more to your concerns and those of your province and its fisheries, I can assure you that the federal government shares these concerns and is determined to deal with them."

Well that is all fine, Sir, very nice, very polite -

MR. CROSBIE: Thanks a lot, PET. There is action for you!

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Fisheries has just said what I am going to say, because I would say, and I have said to Ottawa exactly what I have said to the government of the province and that is we must act now. That is more than the government of the province have said. The Minister of Fisheries, Sir, has fallen all over himself in anxiety to accommodate the Ottawa position. He has gone to Geneva. He has gone to Edinburgh. He has gone everywhere but to the root of the matter. The fact remains, Sir, that there can be only one position for this province to take and that one position is that we must have unilateral action and we must have

it now. That, Sir, is the position we must take. If, as has been suggested by my colleague from Bonavista North, and I think one or two honourable gentlemen on the other side picked up the refrain and carried it on, if we should all go to Ottawa and camp on the steps of the Peace Tower then we should do it. Maybe the Minister of Tourism could organize that. It would be a devil of a lot better than anything he has organized yet.

MR. NEARY: Here is another idea, Let us have an emergency session of the Legislature on Saturday and get Trudeau in here on the floor of this House.

MR. DOODY: Trudeau?

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, whatever steps we should take as a province, whatever steps, Sir, whatever steps we should take as a province, if honourable gentlemen to my right and across from me would permit, whatever steps we should take, Mr. Speaker, let us take them. The government of the province have been strong in word and weak in action. They have not taken the stand they should have taken.

MR. DOODY: \$64 million.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, \$64 million, I do not know what the figure means. I do not know where the honourable gentleman gets it.

MR. DOODY: I got it from the -

MR. ROBERTS: But, Mr. Speaker, I will say that whatever has been done for the fisheries in Newfoundland this year has been done by Ottawa and they have put millions of dollars into it and I hope they put many millions more. Whatever significant amount of money has been put into it has been done by the Ottawa Government. What is our contribution? \$500,000 was it into the settlement of the trawler strike? \$500,000? \$600,000? it is in the estimates of the Fisheries Department. That is their contribution. It is interesting to see the report of the Committee on our expenditures, for all the noise and braying of the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries, they have not increased significantly in any worthwhile sense over the years. I can read the recommendation and the comments of the Committee. The Committee was quite scathing in its remarks that for a province that

regards the fisheries as primeval and primary, there is nothing in there in the estimates, not enough, most of the money that is in the estimates now for the fisheries this year is coming from Ottawa, much maligned. Let them speak for themselves.

On the 200 mile limit, Sir, we should take whatever steps we can properly take. The Premier and his ministers, his colleagues, can do a great deal more than they have done and they should do a great deal more than they have done and if any member of the House can think of more to do then let us do it. I cannot think, Mr. Speaker, of anything that is more important to this House now and that is why on opening today I give notice of a motion with respect to a 200 mile limit. The government have let all these years come and go.

MR. MORGAN: ..... your colleagues in Ottawa.

MR. ROBERTS: Ah the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South says - Mr. Speaker, I do not pretend to speak for my political friends in Ottawa, I campaigned for them last year and I infinitely prefer them to the Tories because, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Trudeau and Mr. Jamieson and the men who now form the Government of Canada are infinitely better for the people of Newfoundland and Labrador than are their Tory counterparts. The last time we had a Tory Government in this country, Mr. Speaker, was the infamous administration of Mr. Diefenbaker, a man whom the gentleman from Placentia East today ridiculed and called down, and what John Diefenbaker and his administration did for Newfoundland can be summed up in words that are not parliamentary so I will not use them.

But I have no hesitation for saying that I campaigned last year and before that for Pierre Trudeau and the Liberal Party and I would do it again. Oh, sure! We could have had wage and price freezes in this country. Sure, that is a great policy. That would have helped the fishermen in Newfoundland.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable the Leader of the Opposition I feel is straying somewhat from the rule of relevancy of this particular motion, even though there is a fair degree of latitude given.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, I thank Your Honour and I was talking about the effect of wage and price controls on the fishermen of Newfoundland. Surely, Sir, that is relevant to the motion. I may have strayed but I thought I had found my way back, Sir, back to the straight and narrow path. If the Tories had formed the Government of Canada we would have presumably had wage and price controls for the fishermen of Newfoundland now.

MR. CROSBIE: You are going to have anyway.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, we are going to have anyway, says the Minister of Fisheries. If he knows more than I do let him tell the House. Let him enlighten us. Are we going to have them? Sure, if the government of this Province try to bring them in. The Government at Ottawa have given their answer, be it unsatisfactory or not.

MR. MORGAN: It is quite unsatisfactory.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the honourable gentlemen opposite wish to debate what the Tories have done for Newfoundland fisheries and what the Liberals have done for Newfoundland fisheries I am game to do it, but they would come out a long way behind on that debate.

MR. CROSBIE: You did not want much debate in 1972.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker, Mr. Speaker -

MR. CROSBIE: All you did was cry and bawl then.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable the Minister of Fisheries is obviously building up for one of his great pejorative, and I am going to nip out for a cup of tea when I finish. I shall listen, no, I will not even need the P.A. systems on because he is obviously booming up now. He is going to be as self-righteous, Mr. Speaker, as a man can be and that is

saying a great deal. I have no doubt, Sir, that we will see a vintage performance. I welcome that, Sir. I am very glad we are going to see a vintage performance.

MR. CROSBIE: Measured and statesmanlike.

MR. ROBERTS: The honourable gentleman says he will be measured and statesmanlike. Well, Sir, that may be true. But if so it will be a case rare in history of the leopard changing his spots. What I want to see - I do not care if he has vintage performance or not. Let him drip vitriol on the floor of the House if he wants to, Sir. Let him spit vitriol if he wants to. But let him say what is going to be done for the fishermen of Newfoundland and let him say what is going to be done by he and his colleagues now, not any more studies or reports. Let him talk about the past if he wishes. He was part of the past. I could go on for some length, Sir, about the honourable gentleman's connection with the fisheries in the past. His father, Sir, was a great entrepreneur. His brother is a great entrepreneur. If the honourable gentleman, Sir -

MR. NEARY: Over to see Joey last week, I hear.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes. The honourable gentleman, Sir, the honourable gentleman has never done anything for the fisheries of Newfoundland that I know of. No, it is not parliamentary to say what I was going to say, so I will not.

Mr. Speaker, let him talk about, let him talk about what he did when he was in the Liberal Administration, how much he did for the fisheries. Sir, I was not in the Cabinet. I never had the dubious pleasure of serving in a Cabinet with the honourable the Minister of Fisheries. But there was a time when he was going around semi-publicly, semi-publicly at least, saying that we should, back in 1968 when every fish plant in Newfoundland was on the verge of closing down and the Birdseye people did close in Harbour Grace and the Ross Steers people closed across the Harbour. The Minister of Fisheries was saying, let them close, they are all losing money. That Cabinet was lashing out loans and guarantees. The honourable the Minister of Fisheries, let him tell us what he did then.



Mr. Speaker, it ill behooves the honourable gentleman to talk about the past. If he wants to let him. But let him talk about the future. Let him talk about what is going to be done and what he and his colleagues intend to do now. We are going to have an election this Fall, I devoutly hope. Maybe we will have it next week and that would be even better. If the honourable gentlemen are going to seek some support from the country let them read the lesson, read the lesson of Hermitage.

MR. CROSBIE: "Rog' cannot stay there.

MR. ROBERTS: And of 1972 and 1974 and their own polls and our polls, everybody else's polls. And, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker, let them heed it and let them, Mr. Speaker, let them do something for the fishermen.

MR. CROSBIE: His band is going to Carnegie Hall.

MR. ROBERTS: I think that requires another drop of water, Sir. Do we have a page, Mr. Speaker, or has he gone off somewhere?

MR. YOUNG: All the pages are written out.

MR. ROBERTS: All the pages are written out, are they, says the honourable gentleman from Harbour Grace.

MR. MURPHY: Carry on anyway.

MR. MORGAN: You only have ten minutes left anyhow.

MR. ROBERTS: I know. But, Mr. Speaker, I know the government are hard up and they are being parsimonious but I would think they would give Your Honour at least two pages so if one page were depaged, the other page could page. Mr. Speaker, we should perhaps turn the page, you might say.

Mr. Speaker, I have said really what I wanted to say on this motion. We could have a uproaring political debate and I am glad it has not deteriorated into that. I hope the honourable gentleman from St. John's West does not lower the debate into a partisan one with one of his circus speeches. If he wants to have a little fun

Let him. You know, he and his colleagues are fine at that, and I would merely say to them that those whom the Gods would destroy, they first make mad. You can add to that arrogant. The honourable gentlemen opposite show that. Mr. Speaker, let him also deal with this report. We have not had any single statement from the ministry as to what they feel about this report. I do not think a minister has spoken of any substance. I know the Minister of Justice made a speech but he said remarkably little and took a long time to say it as is his wont.

The Minister of Finance enlightened us at some length. But, we are still trying to figure out what he said. Did any other minister speak?

MR. MOORES: It is over your head.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, Sir. It may well be over my head. Much of what the honourable gentleman does is over my head. I would rather have him over my head than behind my back, Sir, now with his record.

Mr. Speaker, we have not had a definite statement from the ministry on what they intend to do with this report, and let them give us that statement. Let them give the fishermen that statement. Let them give the people of Newfoundland some indication. Let them say what they intend to do on the 200 mile limit. What are they going to do? Are we going to have a march on Ottawa?

MR. MOORES: I have a resolution to bring to the Prime Minister and his people.

MR. NEARY: Well, I will support it.

MR. ROBERTS: Well, that is fine. That is fine. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that we should also have Mr. Stanfield and Mr. Lougheed and Mr. James McGrath and all the others come along.

MR. MORGAN: There is only one Prime Minister.

MR. ROBERTS: That is right. There is only one Prime Minister, Sir, and he is there for at least another three years. I would think, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier would do very well to communicate with the Prime Minister and say something to him besides increase the oil costs, which was the Premier's most recent message to the Prime Minister of Canada in public was let us increase the oil costs. Now, Mr. Speaker,

MR. MOORES: Yes, five cents a gallon. The rest was his own idea.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier would permit and if the honourable gentlemen opposite would permit. I am grateful to the junior Member for Harbour Main who I hope has settled the liquor strike which will be a bigger service, Sir, than he has performed yet for the people of Newfoundland. There is only one service yet left for him to perform after that. That, Sir, is to resign.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the 200 mile limit is something we must have. We can go on debating it at any length we want but I think every man who has spoken has taken that position. I think we all feel that we must act unilaterally. Canada has acted unilaterally. Canada should act unilaterally again. I have no hesitation in saying it here or outside. As I have said to the Prime Minister in a telegram and as I intend to say to him when we meet on the weekend. He at this point as his letter makes clear does not accept that and he and his colleagues do not feel we should proceed that way. Well, I think they are wrong, Sir. I am concerned about Newfoundland's interest. They are presumably concerned about Ottawa or Canada's interests.

But, I think, Sir, for Newfoundland's sake we must have this 200 mile limit and that can be the only position that Newfoundland takes. The government, Sir, have not given us the lead they should in this matter. They have not given us the lead they should have in marketing. They have not given us the lead they should have in any one of the thirty or forty things and matters discussed in this report. They should tell us. The Minister of Fisheries should have taken the report when he spoke to introduce the resolution and he should have said, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the recommendations here is our feeling, here is our policy with respect to each one. Instead, Sir, he spoke at some length and said a lot of things but said nothing of any importance or nothing of any real value.

Let the minister in closing, or the Premier if we can entice

him into it, speak and tell us what the government are going to do. Some of the recommendations we agree are not their's to implement. The ones on pages 38 to 41 are federal and the most that we can do is say we think they should be done, perhaps lobby a little and try to bring pressure to bear by all the legitimate means of doing that.

But, Mr. Speaker, there are some things which are ours to do. The establishment of the Fresh Fish Marketing Corporation can be done this week by this House. The amendment of the applicable bounty acts can be done this week by this House. The amendment of regulations can be done this night by the cabinet. The amendment of the Fisheries Loan Board Act can be done this week by this House. The amendment of the repayment provisions of the Fisheries Loan Board Act can be done

this week by this House. The amendment to the regulations can be done this evening by the cabinet. The amendment of existing regulations to ensure that fishermen are given priority in the sale by tender of all boats can be done this night by the cabinet. The requirement that any vessel constructed in provincial institutions be designed for effective use in the fishery and be sold to fishermen on a priority basis can be done this night by an order from the Minister of Education to the appropriate institutions.

Then the recommendations that are joint, that affect either domain. That the recommendation that the Minister of Fisheries hold only the Portfolio of Fisheries can be done by the Premier this night. The government take immediate steps for the wholesale purchase of cost to manufacturers of all pieces of fishing gear, that can be done by this government this day. The ensurement that in any future gear replacement programme, that fishermen be required to pay a percentage of the cost of the gear replaced and that gear replacement be restricted to bona fide fishermen, can be adopted by the government as their policy this night.

The establishment of viable insurance programmes can be done by this government, Sir. It can also be done by Ottawa or it can be done jointly, but it should be done. That the livelihood of fishermen be protected by instituting restricted licensing for the sale of fish and/or crustaceans; that, Sir, can be done by this government under the powers the Minister of Fisheries has already exercised with limited effect.

The revitalization of the crab fishery: A great deal to be done there by this government. And on and on, Sir. The seal fishery: There are some steps that can be taken there.

Recommendations 7, 8, 9: The development of educational programmes can be done this night. Mr. Speaker, much can be done by this government. The question is, will they? Not can they, but will they? Do they have the will to help our fishermen? Do they care? So far, Sir, they have given us a lot of words and remarkably little

action. The test is now here, Sir. "The time has come," to quote a phrase. The time has come for this government to show whether they care for the fisheries of this Province or not. I hope they will, Sir. I hope they will. They will be measured with care. Their own Committee, Sir, has recommended action. Let them now live up to that recommendation and let them live up to it now in this House this night. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Premier.

MR. MOORES: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Fisheries will be closing off, I understand, this discussion on this report. In the meantime there are a few words I would like to say, because it is not often that, I suppose, such a subject as the fishery, which has been given attention by this Committee and which has been used by politicians for hundreds of years, when at such time one has to come to grips with the reality of where it is at.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the Leader of the Opposition tonight and what he had to say. I find it almost inconceivable that a Leader of the Opposition could be, when he is - I know he enjoys speaking and he speaks long and, I suppose, grammatically fairly well. But the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that glib phrases and reading correspondence from the Prime Minister and so on is not really where it is at as far as the subject of the fishery in Newfoundland is concerned. There was one good comment and suggestion that came from the other side which I will deal with in a moment.

The Leader of the Opposition between talking about salmon spawning and six diseases and three ways and the other things that he talked about, made one wonder if he was talking about the fishery on occasion. But there was one good suggestion from the other side, Mr. Speaker, and I would hope that that member, the honourable the Member from Bell Island would have the leave, the unanimous leave of this House to bring in the resolution, the suggestion he made. Because certainly the idea of getting the Prime Minister of Canada, requesting him to appear before the bar of this House, to be in this House to speak to us on Saturday on the 200 mile limit, on the income support

that the federal government promised last year, and on the fisheries subject in detail and in depth, is something that

we on this side would only too gladly appear for. I would think, Sir, that that would be much more meaningful than the Liberal Ball as far as the future of this province is concerned. I think the Member for Bell Island if he moved this motion to that effect would certainly receive a lot of support. I think it would be even more appropriate, Mr. Speaker, as last year the Prime Minister could not see fit to come down for Newfoundland's twenty-fifth anniversary, that in fact he does show up at least when it comes to the fishery and to stroke the Liberal Ball, one being much more important than the other.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I would like to thank the Committee for a great deal of work they did in bringing in this report. A lot of people will say that it has all been said before and I think that is probably, in one form or another true. However, there is a difference. There is a difference, Mr. Speaker, in that this Committee was commissioned and went to rural Newfoundland for the first time and met the fishermen with their problems in the areas where they earn their livelihood. Fishermen participated in the making up of this report as did many other concerned Newfoundlanders because, Mr. Speaker, there are a great many Newfoundlanders who are concerned about this particular subject.

After all, Mr. Speaker, a lot of us forget it on occasion, I suppose all of us do on some occasions, that our job as politicians is to represent people. We are elected to represent people and their feelings and their emotions and all the things that matter to them and their way of life. I do not suppose anyone exemplifies this better than the fishermen who have been used in many ways by politicians in this province for many, many generations. I think probably from the members of the Commission I have talked to the thing that surprised them most was the calibre of the men they met. I think they found that there are a great many people fishing in Newfoundland who are not, as a lot of people think, lazy, not as some people would say, uninformed, but they met a lot of concerned Newfoundlanders. I think the thing



that surprised me most about the report and I am sure surprised the Committee was the age of the fishermen in this province. I think for a lot of years a lot of people thought the inshore fisherman of Newfoundland was a middle aged or even elderly gentleman of a fast declining breed. I think the average age is somewhere in the thirties, the early thirties if I remember correctly -

MR. AYLWARD: Thirty-eight years old.

MR. MOORES: Thirty-eight years old and that is an average age of any form of employment I would say, Mr. Speaker, is tending toward the young side, and I would say from my own experience in Port aux Choix two weeks ago to see these young men for all intents and purposes, dedicated to what they want to do with the independent spirit that has made the fishermen what they are in this province. They thrived under austerity better than the province has as a whole over 400 years and still they do survive and they will survive, Mr. Speaker, and up until now, through no fault of government, any government at any time, and that is a large statement, most people do not realize that there are people who go to sea, there are people who want that way of life and will do well at it.

When you look at our history in the fishery, Mr. Speaker, we are looking at a province, a part of the world really, because we were a colony or a country, whatever you want to call us, where there were vast resources of fishery stocks on the Grand Banks and on the Continental Shelf, right from Hamilton Bank where I suppose now is the most popular codfishing area in the North Atlantic, right around to George's Bank right off Gloucester, Massachusetts, right through Bankquereau, the Grand Banks, Eastern Edge, the whole area, all these vast resources were being exploited by a very few countries and in fact very few fishermen.

At that time as there was no sophisticated marketing, there was no sophisticated catching methods, nor was it necessary because the fish in those days, Mr. Speaker, used to come to the people living on this Island, used to come to us as opposed to us going looking for them.

The situation has evolved where today we are looking at exploitation by many countries of the world. I suppose you could take the colonial system that this province was under for many, many decades and say that that same colonial system without the rules is now being applied to the fishery of our province. It is being applied by tens of nations who are fishing in an area which was once just fished by very few.

Mr. Speaker, families replaced the old system of colonialism, if you like, in the fishery and I for one standing, I suppose, in the unique position do not believe that hereditary businesses can work. I think they work for a while, I do not think they work when you are competing in an international market, where a father may have initiative and be an entrepreneur and a son may carry on and his son may carry on, but there comes a time, Mr. Speaker, when there is a son who really does not care or if he cares does not know how to do it.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, in fact is that in a professional world where we are talking about people who excel in expertise, we are talking about taking the best brains available in a market as opposed to necessarily just blood lines. As convenient as that is, international competition, Mr. Speaker, will not allow it in the future. And we are, when we talk about the fish, talking about international competition and an international commodity.

As I said before

fish no longer come to us. The day of sticking a cod trap out and making a living wage in five weeks for twelve months, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, by itself is no longer valid or feasible. It is fairly obvious, Sir, from this report and from knowledge previously ascertained that different gear is required and particularly in certain centers of the Province which I will talk about in a moment.

The deep-sea fishery of the South Coast, the attitude of the fishermen of the South Coast is one that has grown over the years. They have a pride and tradition in the deep-sea fishery and they do it well. They have probably the single, healthiest form of fishery of anyone in this Province because, as I say, they are particularly good at the deep-sea fishery. You can go to Port au Choix and see seventy-eight large longliners being very successful. But, Mr. Speaker, a lot of people do not realize why they are successful. I think the reason is because they fish when the market is there and when the resource is there for scallops. When need be they have changed to shrimp. When need be they have changed to catching cod, flounder.

But, really what we are talking about, is a diversification not just of the boat and the gear but of the attitude and the mentality and the acceptance of the proposition by the man. Now, this has happened in one area of our country. I am not saying, Mr. Speaker, that the rest, all the rest of the Northeast Coast, as an example, is ready for that sort of diversification even if the opportunity was available. That I would also like to talk about in just a moment.

Mr. Speaker, in my opinion it is a huge job to get the fishery in this Province in the position I think that all members of the House and all the people of this Province would like to see it in. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I think any programme that is undertaken will take from now until 1980 before the first returns are really seen. That is at least five years in order to put a realistic overall programme together that is going to in fact start to cover the multitudinous problems that exist in this particular sphere of our society.

In the meantime, the fishery has to be kept afloat. The processing plants, the fishermen, all those associated with it, the plant workers, all have to be kept going so that when this resource, this protein food becomes available into the viable industry that it can be so that at that time people are still in position and have not gone off getting a two or three month construction job, unemployment insurance, and a way of life, Mr. Speaker, which is not natural to them in what they are prepared to do now. But, they must be given an opportunity to stay at what they are doing.

Now, there are ways that that can be done. It will take heavy subsidization by both governments, unfortunate but it will have to be done. Secondly, we are talking about new types of fishing. We are talking about more emphasis on pelagic fishing for instance. Herring in Newfoundland was used for bait fish for years. The market for herring today is the reverse of cod, for instance, and that is pretty well unlimited at this point in time. Caplin for reduction, whatever it happens to be. All these things can be used to salvage and keep the industry going until the real action starts. But, the real action will only start, Mr. Speaker, if certain things are done.

MR. NEARY: What about fish farming in shallow waters?

MR. MOORES: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: Fish farming in shallow waters.

MR. MOORES: I think it is a possibility. Mr. Speaker, I would like for a minute to talk about the fishery because it is in fact a whole way of life in our Province. It is something that we are very glib about, we talk about but very few people realize exactly how much of a way of life the fishery is. The committee on fisheries went up the Northeast Coast and went to Labrador. They went into communities, Mr. Speaker, where that was the only way of life, not one of several choices but the only way of life.

Now, the alternative for these people in rural Newfoundland and these small communities is if they want anything else,

basically resettlement to the community where they want the different way of life, or to commute and leave their families at home. Mr. Speaker, neither of those are tolerable to these people.

I was very upset tonight, Sir, to hear the Leader of the Opposition on his political kudo kick, because for once I would like to hear the fisheries discussed as a meaningful and hopefully soluble problem and way of life in our Province. The Leader of the Opposition complained about the lack of action. Never any suggestions from himself! Never any suggestions of any great magnitude from the other side! Expect, you know, tonight I think the Leader of the Opposition showed he was uninformed on the subject but he had to speak on it, naturally, it is political. And he agrees with the report, but he says nothing about the methodology of putting it into effect. He just says, it is a good report. We all knew it before. But any word on how it should be done, when and by whom - not at all! No, no. That is just in debate so we just broad brush it. How convenient it is! Act now! No one disagrees with that, Sir. We will plan here to do that. My only wish is that the Leader of the Opposition or ourselves could speak for Ottawa at the same time.

The Leader of the Opposition says from the 5th. of June until the 24th. of June no action has been taken. Mr. Speaker, it has been 400 years in this Province since any worthwhile action has been taken. The fact is that we have been 400 years getting to what is in fact a fairly archaic level that we are today, But we are progressing, and we are willing to progress much faster than ever before, but the Leader of the Opposition says from the 5th. of June to the 24th. of June, in nineteen days, we should have cured the fisheries problems in Newfoundland. Incredible, Mr. Speaker, even he in all of his wisdom could not achieve that even with God's help or Mr. Trudeau's.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee report speaks of what are the provincial responsibilities and I will deal with some of the major ones. First of all, the setting up of a Fresh Fish Marketing Corporation which will promote and actively engage in the sales of fresh and frozen output of Newfoundland's small and medium-sized processing firms. This basically, I suppose, is an idea but it will take a lot of thought, Sir, because here you are dealing with an area where I do

not think governments, nor do I think hereditary businesses are really very good at it either. I think they are talking about professionals, professional expertise that in fact form part of the overall marketing process.

The other thing is the total dependency on the U.S. market. When we talk about the total dependency on the U.S. market we are, I think, being traditionalist to a degree that is hurting. Because in the U.S., Mr. Speaker, for many years fish there was sold because it was cheap food or because it was Friday, but Americans, not Canadians for that matter, really take much great enjoyment out of eating fish. Whereas in Europe, I think you will find a very different situation. The Leader of the Opposition says the major problem is not the 200 mile limit, it may be one of them, but it is marketing. Mr. Speaker, if we do not get the 200 mile limit we will not have any problem marketing because there will be nothing to market. Mr. Speaker, we do need new markets and regarding the 200 mile limit that I will speak about just a little later.

The second proposal that the provincial government can do is to amend the applicable Bounty Acts and regulations to compensate builders or purchasers of small inshore fishing vessels for any discrimination towards small craft. I think this has possibilities, but I think it should be looked at. And I think it makes a lot of sense in some areas, Mr. Speaker, because small boats as opposed to in many cases the longliner is a much more viable proposition and as I say I will be mentioning that in just a second. To amend the Fisheries Loan Board Act so that funds can be made readily available to fishermen for the purpose of modifying their boats for diversification to fish various other species: I think, Mr. Speaker, it is probably the most, if not, certainly the most, one of the most important things that the provincial government can do -

MR. CROSSIE: And we if not we are doomed.

MR. MOORES: The diversification programme which has been started, which is underway

can be and I think will be expanded whereby all our people have an opportunity if they are that way inclined, and not all people are, Mr. Speaker, to make sure that this is done. Actually, Mr. Speaker, looking at this, the provincial responsibilities are very few. To give fishermen priority for repossessed boats at the Loan Board and for boats built in any government institutions. This should be done. This has not been done before. But this is a very minor thing when you look at the overall, Mr. Speaker. When we look at the major recommendations for either domain, as it says in the report, or for the federal and provincial governments, that the Minister of Fisheries hold the portfolio of fisheries only and that he not be expected to carry out a dual portfolio. Well contrary to what the Leader of the Opposition has said, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries is responsible for intergovernmental affairs, it has always been that way. Mr. Speaker, what better portfolio where Ottawa has most of the responsibility for fisheries, what better responsibility than to be responsible for intergovernmental affairs, to aid and abet the fisheries portfolio than for the same man to give the emphasis to both jobs.

I agree basically that it should be a separate portfolio. But in this situation where Ottawa has such a tremendous influence on the fishery, and what happens? To me, Sir, it is obvious that the Minister of Fisheries and the Minister responsible for Intergovernmental Affairs is a totally natural one, an adjunct to the other

It also says that the government insure in any future Gear Replacement Programme that the fishermen be required to pay a percentage of the cost of the gear replaced. That makes sense Mr. Speaker, that they put some reality into programmes which have developed into giveaway programmes, provincially and federally shared, abused by many fishermen, supplemented by governments but basically very little control over that programme. I think that percentage of the cost of the gear being replaced is certainly a worthwhile one

and certainly bona fide fishermen will support it. Consideration be given to the establishment of a viable insurance programme to cover the fishermen's stages and gear losses: Mr. Speaker, that is easier said than done. I think Ottawa and ourselves to a lesser degree have looked at this but it is not an easy programme to put into effect, as badly needed as it is.

Mr. Speaker, that the livelihood of fishermen be protected by instituting restricted licensing for the sale of fish: I think it should go a little further than it just says here. The licensing of fishermen, commercial fishermen, I think, is an absolute necessity in time. I think they should be the only ones who are eligible for insurance programmes or any government programmes that go with the fishery. However, whilst they are the fishery as we know it, I do not think any Newfoundlander, no matter where he is from or who he is, should be restricted from fishing in the old inimitable way that our people have had for many generations whereby if a man wants to go out and jig a few codfish or get a couple of lobsters, I think that is something that Newfoundlanders basically as a people would never ever forfeit. But they should not be eligible for government programmes. They should not be eligible for subsidies. That is a hobby and a way of life that is part of our whole heritage.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: They should not be able to sell the fish.

MR. MOORES: And they should not be in competition, of course, with the licensed fishermen. Mr. Speaker, there are a great many items to discuss in this report and I do not want to be too long because the Minister of Fisheries is going to clue up. But it says that the Province of Newfoundland provided it is beneficial to the seal fishermen concerned entered into negotiations with the federal authorities. Mr. Speaker, we tried these things. We have already told the Federal Government that in fact we would like to see the seal hunt put back. We would like to see these people made eligible for Unemployment Insurance benefits. But the



Federal Government does not put the same credence into the seal hunt as we do. It says that the Province undertake the development of an educational programme for elementary and high school students and a planned public relations programme and educational effort to show the true picture and importance of the fishing industry. I agree with that, Mr. Speaker. But as education progresses to do this, the fact is that we must come to grips with the immediate problem first.

There are, Mr. Speaker, - number fourteen - it says that provincial and federal government subsidies on gillnet fishing gear be phased out over a reasonable period of time. Mr. Speaker, I would

go further and say I think that there are areas of this Province where probably with proper advice the gillnet fishery should not be allowed now. I think over a period of years with proper gear and equipment and with the replacement of income, if you like, that the gillnet fishery over a period of many year, I suppose, will be replaced entirely. I do not think there is any question about the fact that gill nets do destroy a tremendous number of fish. There are varying theories on it as to how much and where. But certainly something geared towards more information, something geared towards more conservation, something geared towards more productivity does make sense.

Subsidies on trawls, ring nets and seines be established: That also, Mr. Speaker, is something of great importance and then we talked of the diversification of the fishery itself.

Information being made available to fishermen is something which is important. Mr. Speaker, for a moment I would like to talk about the federal responsibility as well as really where we are at here. All these recommendations, Mr. Speaker, make sense. The recommendation that the Province have greater participation in the decision making process; the income support scheme which was promised last year; to immediately amend the Unemployment Insurance regulations; small boats which are in fact, in many ways efficient and can make a viable income themselves, all these things can be done, Mr. Speaker. But first of all - last of all, I should say, I want to talk about something that, with all these recommendations, Mr. Speaker, with all these things that had to be done, none of them will amount to a row of peas if we do not establish the 200 mile limit and bring in the conservation that is so critical for our fishery to survive.

Now all these regulations are good, all these suggestions are bona fide, all of them can help. And, Mr. Speaker, none of them can help, not one, if conservation measures are not put in where the fish themselves show up. A fishery with everything perfect will not work without fish. Mr. Speaker, the 200 mile limit has been something that we have talked about and other people have talked about for many,

many years. We saw about a year ago, I suppose, the first realization by Ottawa that it was a serious proposition and that Newfoundland and Canada should do something about it. We saw the Canadian Delegation go off to the Law of the Sea Conference with all flags waving, saying that Canada will have the 200 mile limit. "We will do everything we can to bring it to a vote. We will make sure that this goes through." And they went there and they found, of course, that a lot of other people had different ideas.

And the Law of the Sea Conference now has been postponed again but I am sure after they meet again they will decide that this should be discussed when they meet again. In the meantime, we went to ICNAF with Dr. Needler to Edinburgh. I am sure Edinburgh was nice at this time of the year and I am sure that the bagpipes met all people concerned, But, Sir, the fact is that Canada is asking for forty per cent reduction of the fishery in the North Atlantic, we did not even get forty per cent acceptance, did not get any acceptance. I mean, we are just being played with, Mr. Speaker. Unless Canada and unless the U.S., which is a possibility, declares a 200 mile limit it would seem that Canada is not going to take unilateral action, certainly not with the present attitude. They seem to be backing off again, And I hope I am wrong, but, Mr. Speaker, I do not know about Mr. McEachern, I do not know the man that well, but certainly when Mr. Sharp was in that position ÷ I do not think there is any more appropriate pose for Canada's External Affairs than for Mr. Sharp

to have a blue hat on of the United Nations peace keeping force wringing his hands as he did in the House of Commons, not knowing what to say.

The fact is that Canada has not ever done anything but the popular diplomatic thing, the thing that is so popular with everybody of not offending anybody, and the fact is, Sir, that we are not yet really facing up to the fact that we are dealing with a way of life in this province. And when I say dealing with a way of life, Mr. Speaker, we are talking about the Continental Shelf and what a lot of people do not realize, and I do not know what the ratio is now but I would not think it was much better, but in 1969 every one ton of shipping that sailed out of Eastern Canada - out of the Gaspé, the Quebec North Shore, Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Newfoundland - for every one ton that sailed out of our ports there were eighty-three tons of foreign ships out there. For every one ton boat that went out there was an eighty-three toner from some nation of the world shooting around doing their thing. That theoretically is on our Continental Shelf.

MR. NEARY: That is our fault.

MR. MOORES: Oh sure it is our fault. I am saying it is our fault as people. The fact is that Canada has never realized what the fish that is presently being caught and that has been caught for the last decade or more on the Continental Shelf, if that had been processed in Canada, caught by Canadians, what that would do to our Gross National Product.

Mr. Speaker, I forget the exact figures but I know it is almost double what agriculture is contributing to our economy today, and look at the play that gets in Ottawa. As far as the fishery is concerned, Mr. Speaker, the fisheries policy for years I think has been based on the yield of the Upper Ottawa River, for it is certainly not based on the North Atlantic.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we have Ottawa face reality. We need an overall programme to get what is a huge job done. But there has

to be changes and the funny thing is, as I said, the deep water fleet, those that go and hunt the fish, are I suppose as modern, fishing from a plant-which is what Newfoundland is, in the middle of the supply area-as anywhere. The small boat operator, the man who goes and gets lobster and salmon and cod, and the one man and two man operation also in certain parts of Newfoundland have a very convenient and a very happy and a very successful way of life. But the massive number of our fishermen, Mr. Speaker, are inshore fishermen. Their problems in many ways are sociological as well as economic. As I said, we have to face reality.

In my opinion the present Minister of Fisheries is doing a better job, with all due respect to our other colleagues and other ministers in the past administration, he is doing a better job in effort and in ability and in making progress than any Minister of Fisheries this province has had before.

The government is dedicated to back up the Minister of Fisheries in this respect. The government is dedicated to back up the Committee for what they have done. Mr. Speaker, we will do our part. The resource that we have is in fact probably the only resource anywhere in the world which is such an intricate part of our way of life. Mr. Speaker, we have a big job to do and we will, politics to the contrary, do our utmost to do it. We realize the problems. We realize the provincial limitation but within our limitations we will do, as I said, what has to be done. Mr. Speaker, once again I would like to congratulate the Committee. I would like to thank all those Newfoundlanders, fishermen and others who helped participate in making the report such a good document that it is.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for St. John's North.

MR. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, before the minister rises to close the debate there are a couple of points I would like to add to what has already been said. I would like to begin by saying that I think that Mr. Lysenko was wrong. He was a famous geneticist who claimed the people could inherit acquired characteristics. Now as far as I know I am the first member of my family in two hundred years who has not made his living by fisheries and I do not suppose there is a person

June 24, 1975

Tape No. 2664

NM - 3

alive who knows less about the fishery. To me it is one of these mysteries that I accept, rather like the Trinity. But I think the research of the Fisheries Committee has concluded that the experts do not know it all and that even the least of us may occasionally make a contribution.

Now I have heard some authorities suggest that one of the problems with the fishermen who moor gear out in the

main traffic lanes on the high seas is that the gear can be torn up and there is no redress and there is no possibility of any redress because there are no witnesses, there are no courts that have jurisdiction, no real jurisdiction. But, I have heard it suggested that the fishing gear could well have booby traps attached to it, and I would suggest that fishermen consider when they put out expensive nets and trawls that they attach something fairly substantial and sharp so that -

MR. EARLE: A land mine.

MR. CARTER: Well, the Minister of Finance has suggested a land mine but I think that is a bit extreme. However, if I owned a \$2,500 cod trap, I certainly would not leave it with just a couple of floats attached to it. There would be more attached to it than that, I can assure you.

I have heard that the, some of the states along the shallow part of the North American Continent where the sea bottom is shallow for quite a distance and is sandy have moored car tires and metal scraps as a refuge for small crustacea and this is considered to be ecologically sound because crustacea have very little defense. Their only defense is to flee and to find crevices and crannies to hide in. Certainly I am thinking of Narragansett Bay and the Chesapeake Bay where the water is warm and the production of fish there must be probably twenty times that of the production of fish of the colder waters of Newfoundland.

To what extent can we assume a 200 mile limit since we cannot claim it? I understand that there is a part of the Grand Banks where the bottom can be seen. It is about twenty fathoms, twenty, twenty-five fathoms deep. Is there any possibility of mooring a ship or a platform rather like an oil drilling rig and allowing that to be a permanent stake-out of Newfoundland so that we may perhaps have a, it would sort of be, not a commercial venture but just a flag waving venture as opposed to - to what extent is this practical? To what extent is it possible to permit foreign fish landings? This is certainly a very tricky point. I am sure it has

been debated and will continue to be debated and is fraught with danger.

However, we did hear earlier in this debate the suggestion that some billions of pounds of fish have been caught and processed or have been caught in the waters around Newfoundland, and if that quantity of fish had been processed, we can well imagine what this would have brought into our economy. When you consider the money that sports fishing brings in, I would think a great many fishermen, sports fishermen consider that the fish they catch costs them probably over \$100 a pound when they consider how much they have spent on their trip and how few pounds of fish they have caught. I am sure that a salmon fisherman from the United States is very lucky, considers himself very lucky if his salmon costs him less than fifty dollars a pound.

But, of course, the main reason for discovering and settling in Newfoundland was because of king cod. When people speak of king cod, they are speaking of salt cod and salt cod was one way of preserving protein 100 years ago. And 100 years ago, I understand Newfoundland relatively speaking was as well off as any other part of North America. But of course since then improvements in freezing and canning has made other forms of food and protein available and perhaps they are more palatable



than fish and salt fish. Perhaps what we need to do is import a French chef - who knows?

But these are a few of the questions I would like to leave with the Committee. I suppose it is too late to debate them fully but I do think they are questions that could be raised. And I would like the minister when he stands to close the debate to discuss as fully as he feels is advisable the difficulties of allowing foreign fish landings here in Newfoundland, and the implications, the economical implications of processing foreign fish. I realize that it is a subject that has been debated for years and it is not an easy question to answer. But I would like to hear a few comments by him on that. And that ends up the few points that I have to say and I do not think there is much - I have elucidated much of the mystery of the fishery and I do not think that we will ever master it all. The sea is a deep place and I think it will retain many of its mysteries for many years to come.

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

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, before speaking on the debate I would like to move that the House not rise at eleven of the clock this evening.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The motion is that the House not rise at eleven.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why?

MR. CROSBIE: So we can go on for a bit longer.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour "Aye", those against "Nay". Carried.

MR. CROSBIE: To do some second reading.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in the debate. I am somewhat subdued, I had gotten myself aroused to a fine point of indignation when the Leader of the Opposition finished, but -

MR. WINSOR: Do not lose your pants now.

MR. CROSBIE: - the last - I do not want to lose my pants. The honourable gentleman, the last speaker who raised these questions of crustaceans and foreign landings and my response to the honourable gentleman from St. John's North as far as foreign landings of fish are concerned is that if they do that and sell any of it here

they will have to use savoury dressing. We will pass the law that you can only have baked fish with savoury dressing.

MR. CARTER: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: And that may -

MR. MURPHY: Mount Scio savoury.

MR. CROSBIE: Mount Scio savoury dressing. I think the record should show, Mr. Speaker, that at 9:25 this evening there was no one in the House from the Opposition. They were demonstrating their great interest in this subject by all having left, gone I know not where but I think the record should show that.

MR. WINSOR: An emergency caucus.

MR. CROSBIE: An emergency caucus.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is the closing of the debate on the report of the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery. And with a few exceptions I think the debate have been well conducted. I am surprised to notice that the Leader of the Opposition was somewhat partisan in his comments, and not surprised, of course, at all to discover that the Hon. Member for Bell Island was completely partisan in his comments because anyone who has been in this House since 1972 knows that is his nature, and we can hardly expect a serious contribution to a debate on the future of Newfoundland without partisanship from the Hon. gentleman from Bell Island.

Now just let us get this in perspective. As I said, Mr. Speaker, when I spoke for the first time in this House as Minister of Fisheries, we have to face the facts which the Select Committee faced not as any excuse, not that we need excuses, but the facts are as this Select Committee points out that the constitutional jurisdiction over the fishery is in the hands of the Government of Canada, That is the indisputable fact of the B.N.A. Act. And therefore the Province's role can only be additional to or supplementary to the federal role in fisheries because we cannot control anything that happens once you get into the water and once you are dealing with the fish in the water, We can do nothing. Our hands are tied. And therefore it is the

federal government that we have to look to for many of the changes that must be made. And they cannot deny that and they do not deny that. And the fishermen themselves realize it, and the report shows it.

Now on page 7 of the report, Mr. Speaker, the Committee points out that from the hundreds of fishermen who spoke to them and whom they have met with, and the frequency of mention of various issues are given on page 7 as to what the fishermen said the problems were with the fisheries. And on page 7 of the report the number one reason given by the fishermen themselves, the ordinary fishermen of Newfoundland who appeared before this Committee, was declining catches, mentioned 114 times as the reason for the present perilous state of the fishery. Now this is what the Committee found from the fishermen - 114, that was the top, declining catches. Who can do anything about declining catches only the Government of Canada who

are the only body in this country that can control whether we have a twelve mile limit or a three mile limit or a 200 mile economic zone or what happens at ICNAF or what we put forward to ICNAF or whether we close our ports to foreign fishing vessels and the like. This is their responsibility, clearly their responsibility and they recognize it and acknowledge it because they are responsible for the declining catches because they have not exercised control in the past. They recognize that by the subsidy programme they have in effect this year and without that subsidy programme we have no East Coast fishery. So they have acknowledged their responsibility. They are responsible for the declining catches, totally and irrevocably and wholly and solely responsible. So, the fishermen themselves said 114 times - declining catches, who is responsible? The Government of Canada!

Then they give various causes for declining catches. Forty-three of them said trawler operations. That is federal jurisdiction. The control of trawlers, can they come within twelve miles or 200 miles or three miles? That is federal. (b), they said, absence of the 200 mile limit, twenty-one times, federal. Twenty times, they said gillnet use was causing declining catches. The use of gill nets is wholly and solely with the jurisdiction and power of the Government of Canada. Only the Government of Canada can say what kind of nets or gear you can use, not the Government of Newfoundland. Let us get that very clear. I can announce here today the policy of the Government of Newfoundland is you cannot use gill nets and the answer will be, so what. It is the Government of Canada that decides can you use gill nets or not use gill nets.

Then they said offshore caplin catches was given eighteen times by the fishermen as the reason. Who can control that? The Government of Canada and only the Government of Canada. And we know that the Russians are catching twice as much caplin as they are reporting. The Government of Canada knows it. Who can do anything about it? The Government of Canada, unless they are afraid of Russia, unless they are afraid Russia is going to drop the bomb on us because

we protest against their taking twice as much caplin as the quotas allow them to take.

The final reason for declining catches, insufficient patrol and enforcement of existing limits, twelve times mentioned by fishermen. Canada solely and wholly, Canada, the jurisdiction of Canada and Canada has not spent nearly enough money on it. There is insufficient patrol and enforcement. We all know that. I gave the figures when I opened the debate about the number of inspections. In 1972, thirty or forty inspections I think it was - sorry, 1973 there were only thirty or forty inspections. In 1974 there were 200 and some odd and this year I said they hoped to do 300 and some odd. I gave the exact figures in the last debate. That is all federal.

So, 114 fishermen said declining catches was the reason and every reason for declining catches is a reason that is within the jurisdiction of Prime Minister Trudeau who comes to visit our Province this week. I will come to that later. Then they said- they are talking about their problems, what are their main problems - seventy-seven times they mentioned unemployment insurance, income stabilization or guaranteed annual wages, seventy-seven times. Who is responsible? The Government of Canada. Who promised to change it? The Government of Canada. When? In the last Federal election a year ago, definite and specific promise given that the unemployment insurance would be changed with an income stabilization formula or some kind of guaranteed income for fishermen. That promise is not yet carried out. I hope the fishermen of Newfoundland are going to remind Prime Minister Trudeau when he comes this week on his visit that this is a promise not yet carried out. Unemployment insurance, income stabilization or guaranteed annual wage - Federal Government! Government of Canada!

Then the fishermen said sixty-two times when they were giving their main problems, rising operating costs, gear prices, compensation for lost gear, cost of vessel acquisition and vessel insurance. That is partly federal and partly provincial. Partly provincial because

the Provincial Government has inserted itself into gear programmes and gear prices and vessel acquisition and vessel insurance. We should not have to. The fisheries is not ours. It is not our responsible. It belongs to the Government of Canada. The Province should not have had to get into gear prices and compensation for lost gear and vessel acquisition and vessel insurance. But it did to supplement an inadequate federal programme for the fisheries. What has the fisheries ever gotten in the budget of the Government of Canada? Next to nothing. So the Province had to insert itself. We do not have jurisdiction but we can help our fishermen and we can help them get gear and we can help them to get vessels. They cannot stop us from doing that because that is all done on land. But we can not help them to get gear the Federal Government does not approve of or vessels they do not approve of because they control the kind of vessel, the kind of gear and the like.

Then, fifty-five times the fishermen said prices on the marketing of fish. The

marketing of fish is federal. We cannot control the marketing of fish except if it is marketed inside Newfoundland. We can control the marketing of fish within Newfoundland. And how much fish is sold within Newfoundland? Next to nothing! But the federal government has the control over it inter-provincially and they have the control of it internationally and we cannot interfere and they will not let us interfere. It is their constitutional jurisdiction. If we had the power we would have one marketing organization here in Newfoundland for all Newfoundland fish. We would do it tomorrow, but we cannot do it. We do not have the legal authority to do it. The Government of Canada has it.

And then forty times the fishermen said "unsatisfactory or inadequate shore facilities." Now that is federal and provincial. Why provincial? Because the Province had to step in, finding the federal effort to be inadequate and insufficient, and supplement it. Why should the Province have to be involved in Marine Service Centers and slipways and stages and the like, all to do with the fishing industry that is the constitutional jurisdiction of the Government of Canada? Because the efforts the Government of Canada make are inadequate and have been inadequate and shall continue to be inadequate because you cannot shake money out of them for these purposes except small amounts to try to keep people quiet, because they have no serious interest in it, because they think that the inshore fishing industry in Newfoundland is as dead as the dodo. They do not think it is going to last. They cannot see it surviving. They do not want to spend their money on it.

MR. NEARY: Do not be passing the buck, boy!

MR. CROSBIE: Passing the buck! They pass me the bucks and I will see they do the job. That is the trouble, Mr. Speaker. Give me the bucks and I will have the fishing industry on its feet in this Province within twelve months.

MR. DOODY: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: And we would not be wasting it.

Now, what else did they say? Thirty-five times they mentioned licensing and registration schemes. Federal! Now I not just saying

this, these are the facts. These are facts that nobody can deny. Which no one can deny. So of all the reasons the fishermen gave for the decline in the fishing industry, and for the suffering they are undergoing, and for the decline in their income, and so on and so forth as reported by this Committee on page 7, practically every reason they gave - every reason they gave actually - is a reason for which the Government of Canada is responsible. And where we are doing anything, we are inserting ourselves although we have no jurisdiction in the matter at all.

Now these are the facts and the Leader of the Opposition gets up and tries to pass gently by the federal government. The Prime Minister of Canada is coming down to Newfoundland this week. For what purpose? Is it at the invitation of the Government of Newfoundland? No. The Government of Newfoundland invited the Prime Minister down here last year for our twenty-fifth Silver Anniversary of Confederation, but he chose not to come. What is he coming for this year? Is it at the invitation of the Government of Canada? No. Then whose invitation is it? Apparently the invitation of the Liberal Party of Newfoundland to attend their twenty-sixth annual Liberal Ball. He could not come to our Silver Anniversary Confederation Dinner, but the Prime Minister can come to the Liberal Ball.

All right! We cannot deal with the Prime Minister here government to government, then we have to ask the Leader of the Opposition to deal with him at the Liberal Ball or somewhere on their visits around the Province. I hope that our fishermen, as the Member for Placentia East mentioned here tonight or this afternoon, will make themselves known and what they need done when the Prime Minister visits Marystown, and when the Prime Minister visits the Port au Port Peninsula, and when the Prime Minister visits White Bay North, L'Anse au Meadows and Labrador South, and they let him know there what needs to be done and remind him about what his ministers promised when they were on the campaign trail down here twelve months ago. But the Leader of the Opposition wants to slide gently by, attack this Government attack the government, pretend the government has the responsibility.



the Province has it, that the federal government has just a little old responsibility, a 200 mile limit, they are nothing, it is all the fault of the Province. It is all the fault of this wealthy Province that has billions and billions that we refuse to spend on the fishery, instead of the fault of the Government of Canada. Whose budget are they going to cut now they got their billion dollar cut up in Ottawa? I can tell you one of the departments they are going to try to cut is the Department of Fisheries of Canada. They have already told us that we can only have half of the shared-cost programme money we had last year.

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. CROSBIE: Three hundred thousand dollars instead of six.

AN HON. MEMBER: What is that?

MR. CROSBIE: The shared - cost programmes are to experiment on this, and look for that, and do mussel farming and scallop this and whatnot and so forth around the shores. All they are telling us now is that we can have three hundred thousand although we had six hundred thousand from them last year which we matched. But now we are cut to three hundred and they are going to confirm it or whatnot after the budget brought down yesterday. We already know that the Federal Department of Fisheries is being told they have to watch it, their budget has to be cut. Why pick on the little puny department of Fisheries of Canada whose budget I do not think approaches one or two per cent of the total? Well that is who they are going to cut. Who else are they going to cut? Will they cut the Department of Regional Economic Expansion? There are some signs in the wind that they are going to cut

it too. The Department of Regional and Economic Expansion was supposed to help the areas that are underdeveloped and that have the great unemployment. Is it to be cut?

MR. NEARY: They should cut it out altogether for what good it is.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, we would sooner have some federal money through DREE than to have no federal money whatsoever. So it has got some good purposes.

Now, action now - the Leader of the Opposition, "We want action, action now." But, his call for action now to Prime Minister Trudeau is very muted. I wonder will he go up to him next Friday and say, "Action now Prime Minister, action now." "Action now on what, "Ed"?" "Oh, on the dance floor, Prime Minister!"

MR. NEARY: Joey is likely to give us a little action.

MR. CROSBIE: Action now. Yes, I hope the ex-Premier Smallwood will give them a little fly in the air.

MR. MORGAN: Well, do not worry he will. He is the star of the show.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, here is what we want action on. About two months ago we put a little programme up to the Government of Canada at Ottawa on the development of the herring fishery in St. Barbe North and Labrador South. The expenditure is a huge sum of \$2,200,000 to put the herring fishery on its feet in St. Barbe North and Labrador South. It involves building a warehouse, a cooling facility at St. Barbe and improving certain community stages in St. Barbe North and Labrador South. It is not even P.C. territory because that is not the way we think. We do not care if St. Barbe North has got a Liberal member or P.C. member or whether it has got a member at all, or Labrador South. This is a little programme we put up because their herring has spoiled up there for the last two or three years, and they lose all their herring, and the fishermen up there can catch at least 20,000 or 25,000 barrels of herring if it is processed properly and sell it and make a good thing from it, if they have got the proper facilities. We asked the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation to go up this year and to operate there and have guaranteed them against losses for the next three years. That is action.

It was not done in 1972 or 1971 or in the ages before the P.C Government began to give this Province some progress and the fishery some attention.

Now, that is a little DPEE programme we put up to DRFE to solve this whole herring situation up in St. Barbe North and Labrador South. What do we find out about it? You would think it would whistle through in four weeks. Now it is two or three months and we still cannot get an answer. We heard little murmurs that we had to wait for the budget yesterday, wait for the budget on a little \$2.2 million programme that will save the fishermen up in Labrador South and St. Barbe North and give them facilities and allow the Salt Fish Corporation to have proper premises to take the herring and process it properly so it does not all spoil and they all lose their money at the end of the season.

Mr. Rompkey - I am still waiting for Mr. Rompkey, the federal member, the federal Member for Grand Falls-White Bay-Labrador, whatever the district is, to push that little programme through rather than get on the air with all his mischievous half-truths that he gets on with. Let us have Mr. Rompkey get us some federal action on this little herring development programme that we have put up, -  
MR. NEARY: He is in his district.

MR. CROSBIE: - this little drop in the bucket.

MR. DOODY: He is at the caucus meeting.

MR. CROSBIE: \$2.2 million.

MR. DOODY: He is in at the caucus meeting.

MR. CROSBIE: I hope Mr. Rompkey is in there listening because this is a message for Mr. Rompkey, "Get up out of the caucus, get on the phone and get on to Uncle Don and get him to approve this \$2.2 million programme." That will give you action.

Now, what else do we want action on?

MR. NEARY: The Burgeo Fish Plant.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, we had action. The Burgeo fish plant - we took that over when the Liberals left office. It was moribund. It was spellbound. It was strike-bound. It was lock-bound. It was not

operating and had not operated for months. We took that over. Yes, the honourable gentleman's friend, Mr. Lake was in control and they would not touch Mr. Lake. They were not going to put their foot in that puddle or their big toe in that Lake but we have solved that. But that is going back into ancient history, and we are not allowed to mention anything that has happened beyond last, you know, last week in this House.

But, action, now let us see what is some other action that we have taken. We took action on the trawler fishermen's strike and helped get that settled. We have taken action now on the queen crab situation, the queen crab. We have been waiting now two or three months for the federal government to act on the queen crab. The queen crab is not in our jurisdiction. It is in the federal jurisdiction. The crab goes along the bottom of the water. It is that kind of crab, and not what the honourable gentleman is used to. It goes along the sea bottom. It crabs along and you catch it and it gets processed. Now that is federal jurisdiction. Mr. Speaker. Federal, absolutely federal.

Now, the federal government for perhaps reasons that are good and sufficient, I do not know, have not taken any steps to help the crab processors of New Brunswick and Newfoundland and wherever else they are and the crab fishermen

for the last two or three months. They helped them get rid of their inventories and they are doing audits and studies. Some crab plants opened in New Brunswick but no crab plants opened in Newfoundland. Ordinarily they open the beginning of May and most of them, I think some of them just opened the last few days, most of them have not opened here because the crab processors were only prepared to pay the crab fishermen eight cents a pound or at the most ten cents for their crab. Last year they paid sixteen cents going down to twelve cents for their crab as the season went on. This year they say the markets are bad, they are losing money, they can only pay eight or ten cents and the crab fishermen would not fish. The Federal Government will not act for what may be good and sufficient reasons for them, I do not know.

I am just saying when the honourable Leader of the Opposition talks about action now, I am telling him where the action is coming from. All right, the Federal Government will not take any action but we have a thousand people, we have about 150 crab fishermen not fishing and 1,000 people working in crab plants not processing, who will not even be able to get their unemployment insurance this year if they do not go to work. So obviously we cannot wait any longer and we have not waited, Mr. Speaker. We have taken action. I never heard of this from 1949 to 1972 when the last honourable crowd were in disgracing themselves in the seats of government. I never heard once of any programme they introduced to help the crab fishermen, never once. So we have told them, Mr. Speaker, we, we, this government - the Leader of the Opposition says action now. We acted now long ago before he even thought of it. He would have been out bellowing on the air waves if he thought of this. He would have been cackling on the air waves, help the queen crab fishermen. But he was not. He was not! Never said a word! This is going to be a surprise to him now.

So, we have told the fishermen, we told the crab processors and we have told the crab fishermen that we will pay four cents a pound to the plants to pay the fishermen if the crab processors will pay them ten cents a pound at the plant for a month until we see what the Federal Government -

MR. NEARY: For how long?

MR. CROSBIE: Listen to it over there. Just listen to it. How quiet it was in government, Mr. Speaker. We never used to hear of him in government. He was so busy liping Mr. Smallwood that he never got a chance to say a word when he was in government. But now he is in the Opposition by himself lung after lung. Now you just be quiet. The honourable gentleman was slaving around the seats of power in those days and he still is on the other side of the House.

So we have said, Mr. Speaker, to the crab fishermen and the crab processors that we are willing for one month until we see what the Federal Government does, to supplement the ten cents a pound for crab with another four cents a pound once the two parties have agreed. Now we have not heard that they are agreed on all points yet, that is the crab processors and the Fishermen's Union who represents most of the crab fishermen. Well, I dare say they will shortly agree and we will then supplement what the fisherman is going to get by four cents a pound. That is action. That is the kind of action that the honourable gentlemen opposite never took when they were in power and never would think of taking.

MR. NEARY: There were no crabs around when we were in power.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, that is another piece of action. What other action have we taken? What other action have we taken? Community stages; I described to the House how confused the situation was about community stages, some of them federal and some of them provincial and some federal-provincial and so on and so on and so on, all this left over from the last administration, years and years of

utter confusion on community stages. Now the Federal Government has agreed because we have pushed them, I have pushed them. the Federal Government have agreed and they have agreed that we are doing a joint survey and they are going to agree to pay seventy-five per cent of the cost of upgrading the community stages that are now in an inferior condition to bring them up to standard and that they will pass all community stages over to the Province once that is done. We will operate them and maintain them from then on. That is action. That is something that was ten or fifteen years in neglect under the last administration.

I did not get up tonight to speak on all that we have done because we like to hide our lights under a bushel. That is the type we are, modest, quiet, retiring, destined for political suicide like a bunch of dumb lemmings, rushing for the cliff edge, afraid to be thought of as immodest. Therefore, we do not tell the world about the little things we are doing. But now goaded by the honourable Leader of the Opposition, I have had to confess that we have been doing things. Action now - my heavens what a joke, Mr. Speaker! It would make his head spin with the action that I can tell him about. "Marketing," he says, "marketing is one of the big things. It is no good having the fish if you cannot sell the fish." One thinks to oneself, this is indeed

indeed - I knew I had missed something, I knew that I had missed something - it is no good catching the fish if you cannot sell it. So I thought, what action have we taken on that? Well, we have joined in with the rest of the countries that sell fish in North America, in the great North Atlantic seafood advertising campaign to increase the consumption of seafood on the North Atlantic and in the United States of America.

MR. DOODY: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: There is hardly an aspect you can mention that we have not taken action on. What I want to see now is some action at the old Liberal Ball. And get Prime Minister Trudeau to come out of that Liberal Ball. If he comes out of that Liberal Ball with a 200 mile limit I will buy an advertisement in it, "Compliments of a former friend."

Before coming to the recommendations of the Committee, Placentia Bay is mentioned in the Committee's report. What did honourable gentlemen opposite do about the fishermen of Placentia Bay? They laughed all the way to the refinery. They did nothing for the fishermen of Placentia Bay. They told them. "Psst! shhh! shhh! psst! Do not scare away the refinery. Shh! You might scare Mr. Shaheen! Shh! Do not say anything about the fishermen. Do not make a fuss, fishermen. For God's sake do not stop us from putting this magnificent refinery in the Bay." And they kept the fishermen of Placentia Bay mute. Now they got a bit obstreperous when ERCO, you know, caused a little upset down the Bay there. Well, that was only - ERCO is only going to cost the people of this Province 200 million bucks over the next twenty years subsidizing their electric power. I do not want to rub salt in any old wounds tonight so I will not mention it. But ERCO, you remember, polluted the Bay.

MR. THOMS: It was okay with you. You wrote the agreement.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, sure! I wrote every word of it. Yes, I was writing all those deals in those days.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen from Placentia Bay protested



on that occasion but they did not say much about the refinery. And the refinery went there without one word in the agreement for the protection of fishermen, or what was to happen to the fishermen if the tankers coming up the Bay disrupted their fishing, or the anchorages at Come By Chance were disturbed by the tankers, or oil spills or anything. Not a word! There is not one syllable in the agreement that protects the fishermen, the poor forgotten fishermen of Placentia Bay.

"Action now!" the Leader of the Opposition said. I say, what about the action then? But I will not rub that in. We know he was not responsible. He was not responsible for anything according to him, anything that went on in 1972.

MR. NEARY: You were in the cabinet.

MR. THOMS: And your colleagues.

MR. CROSBIE: Listen to this now. Look, the honourable gentleman's brother was at a P.C. meeting in Labrador West - no, the Member for Bonavista North - showing commendable sense last Friday night.

MR. THOMS: When was that?

MR. CROSBIE: And I said that I would smile at his brother in the House of Assembly just on his behalf. Now we are even.

Now, Mr. Speaker, what have we done? Now hear this! Now hear this! Action line! This is the action line! That is where I am going by the way, I am not running in the next election. I may as well announce that now, Mr. Speaker. I am going to be an open line moderator and I am going to pillory anyone who gets elected.

MR. PECKFORD: Action line!

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, it is going to be called reaction line. It is going to be called - well I am not going to give away the name. Now what have we done? What have we done about it? We have told the fishermen -

MR. NEARY: We would not let you in to the Liberal Ball.

MR. CROSBIE: I hope you are as lungy on Friday night with the

Prime Minister. When you curtsy to him whisper to him, "Income support for fishermen."

Now what are we doing for the fishermen of Placentia Bay? Mr. Speaker, the fishermen who have complaints about loss of fish due to the anchorages in Placentia Bay and the tankers coming up and down the Bay and so on, what have we done? We have agreed to bear seventy-five per cent of the cost of legal services for any lawyer they select to deal with their claim. We have had provincial officials headed by Mr. Laws and federal officials go down and do a thorough survey with them and give them all forms - everyone who alleged he has had any loss - give them all forms to complete and make out. We are now assembling that information so they can make up a claim if they have a claim. We have agreed to see that in connection with the second refinery there will be inserted a clause that will provide compensation to any fisherman who is dislodged or prejudiced as a result of any marine traffic operating on behalf of the refinery in Placentia Bay. We have told them we will protect them. There will be a clause in the agreement to see that they are compensated if they are disturbed by marine traffic as a result of that second oil refinery, if the second oil refinery goes ahead, or an extension of an oil refinery. And we have told them that if they can show they are entitled to compensation and for some reason there is no legal claim against the oil refinery,

that we will see it is made good to them. Now, can we do more than that? That is about one thousand per cent more than the last honourable crowd did. What else have we done? Well, we know, Mr. Speaker, that there is a number of fishermen operating in Placentia Bay with older longliners who do not have radar and do not have radiotelephone or they do not have the latest navigational gear and such like. We know that there is a federal programme to help put in this kind of gear in newer vessels. So, on December 23, 1974 I wrote the honourable Romeo LeBlanc re assistance to fishermen for procuring electronic, navigational, communications equipment in Placentia Bay, and explained the situation there and explained that one of the findings of the Placentia Bay Tanker Route Committee was that many of the longliners operating on the East Coast of Placentia Bay are not equipped with the necessary electronic equipment such as radar and radiotelephone which they should have for navigating and communicating under the new conditions with tanker traffic in Placentia Bay.

Going on in more detail with it, I pointed out that when new vessels are built they get a federal subsidy under an agreement between federal and provincial governments amounting to thirty-five or fifty per cent for this kind of gear according to the size of the vessel. Included is all the electronic, navigational, communications equipment. I suggested to him that we do the same thing with these other older vessels in Placentia Bay that need radar. Twenty-five of them need radar; sixteen, radiotelephone fifty-one v.h.f. and ten need a depth recorder or an echo sounder. The cost of the whole thing would be, if they paid fifty per cent and if we paid fifty per cent would be \$96,400 and the vessel operators would pay the rest if we give them a fifty per cent subsidy.

Do you think I can get an answer to that? I have written four times since and I do not know how many telephone calls. It would be \$96,000. This is the government that I have written who is responsible for the fishery and for the fishermen - December 23, 1974.

\$96,000, \$96,400 would be the cost to the government. Well, if the Government of Canada will not come across then we will do it ourselves. But we wanted to get the Canadian government in on it. Every dollar to us counts. Every dollar is important. But if the Government of Canada— and I still cannot get any response, I was hoping to get it for this debate— will not do it, then we will. Us poor little fellows down here will do it.

MR. NEARY: We will say, Romeo, wherefore art thou?

MR. CROSBIE: Exactly. So, we will do that. Action now! We are worn out taking action. If we had the spondoolics to take the action that really should be taken, honourable gentlemen would not get re-elected for the next 1,000 years. Now, that is just some side-line. I have not got to my main speech yet, Mr. Speaker, because I got off the track somehow about action.

MR. THOMS: You only have just minutes left.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not care. You can call time on me. I will take my story to the public. I do not care about this crowd in here unless the press is getting it all down. If the press are getting it down, then I think it is time well spent. It is no good trying to educate members of the Opposition. Their minds are closed.

MR. NEARY: Take it to the press gallery.

MR. CROSBIE: Exactly.

Now, let us get on with the report, first class report. Oh! You do not want to hear about the action. Well, I have got more notes here, if that is the way you are going to get on about action. I have skipped -

MR. NEARY: You have been irrelevant for the last half hour.

MR. CROSBIE: I have been right on the fishery. Oh, yes! Gear bank; I had to laugh at the Leader of the Opposition talking about the gear bank. Gear bank, ha, ha, ha, ha! \$7.2 million we spent on gear last year for the fishermen. It did not cost the fishermen a plugged nickel. It was between the Federal Government and ourselves. If you look in this report here, you will see that the total value of gear in Newfoundland is given here in

one of these tables. In 1973 was, I believe, \$14 million, \$14 million.

MR. NEARY: Was that for the gear used by the hon. Member for Harbour Grace?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, gear. Wait now. I am coming to it very rapidly.

Then it breaks it down into the gear and - yes, the total value of gear from table seven, page sixty-one, in Newfoundland in 1973 was \$14,577,000. That is just gear now, traps and nets, trawl lines, so on and so forth. The programme for the Northeast Coast last year, from half way down the West Coast and up around and down the Northeast Coast and down to St. Shotts was \$7.2 million it has cost to date to replace the gear lost allegedly due to ice. The total amount of gear owned in Newfoundland by fishermen in 1973, and we have to allow for price increases, was \$14.5 million. And the honourable gentleman says we should have a gear bank on top of that, A gear bank for what?

Perhaps we should have a gear bank and that is something we will study. But it should not be forgotten that out of a gear bank the gear you sell has got to be paid for. That was \$7.2 million that nobody had to pay a cent for. There was no one paid a cent for who got it back.

MR. NEARY: Uncle Ottawa.

MR. CROSBIE: Uncle Ottawa paid for some of it and we paid for some of it. None of it would have been done if we had not done it. Which reminds me, Mr. Speaker, the honourable the Leader of the Opposition, I better not miss this point, talked about my telegram to Mr. LeBlanc Friday. I told the House there was no need to send Mr. LeBlanc a telegram. If we want to share, if we want to suggest a programme to replace fishing gear with Mr. LeBlanc then, yes, we have to take the initiative although there is no reason why they could not, but that is the practice. They want us to take the initiative. But to ask the Federal Government to extend the Unemployment Insurance claim period or to initiate an income supplement programme for the time the ice has been in that delayed the start of the fishing season, we do not have to ask the Federal Government to do that. They are responsible for the fishery and they are responsible for Unemployment Insurance. For them to use the weak-kneed excuse that they had to wait for the Province to wire them is just too laughable for words. They did not need to wait despite the fact that some of their federal members said, like Mr. Baker was on mouthing off, oh, they were awaiting for a wire from us. We tried to play the game without politics, Mr. Speaker. That is a fatal mistake I make. I played the game with Mr. LeBlanc without any political, keep politics out of it. So I never wired Mr. LeBlanc a couple of weeks ago saying do something about the gear or do something about the income and so on because I did not want to embarrass the man unnecessarily and so on knowing he did not have to hear from me to take action.

Then his own members in the House of Commons from Newfoundland get on yacking that he can do nothing unless he gets the request from me. Well, if that is the way they want to play the game, they will

get requests. I will send them 1,000 requests. I will put them on the spot every day of the week if that is the political game they want to play in Ottawa. But I have not been playing that. I made a mistake, not being political enough. But if that is the way they want to play it, they will get lots of requests from this Province. We will not act the statesman again.

Now, to come to the report, as much of it as I can cover.

MR. NEARY: You are out of time.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, if I am out of time, I am out of time. I will tell the members. I will have a meeting with the members and tell them. I do not care. The Committee knows we are going to do all we can. The 200 mile limit; I am not going to go into. It has been well covered. We all know who has got to take action on that. We are all hoping for great things from the Liberal ball Friday night, an announcement of the 200 mile limit.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Saturday night.

MR. CROSBIE: Saturday night, is it? Right. The monofilament gill net - now, that is the subject that the Committee hedges on. I do not blame them. It is a subject of great controversy and divergent opinions among fishermen. Now the only thing we can do in the gill net, if we are really convinced that the monofilament gill net should not be used, is cut out our subsidy. We can do that. We have not the authority, Mr. Speaker, to stop our fishermen using the monofilament gill net. The only thing we could do would be to cut out the subsidy. Now, our subsidy now is only, I believe, twenty-five dollars on a gill net. The gill net, I believe, costs something like \$125. Would that be right?

MR. MORGAN: About that.

MR. CROSBIE: The Member for Bonavista South says gill nets are about \$125. Our subsidy is twenty-five dollars.

MR. NEARY: From John Leckie?

MR. CROSBIE: Or whoever it is from. Perhaps the honourable gentleman

will become a salesman of gill nets. Our subsidy is only twenty-five dollars. Now, if we decided that this was right, that no part of this Island should be allowed to use the gill net we could eliminate our subsidy. But we could not stop fishermen from using the gill net. That is completely federal. The control is in federal hands. The gill net would not be that bad, Mr. Speaker, if it was properly regulated and a man was not allowed to have too many gill nets, if he is allowed to have just a certain number that he could set and go out every day with he and his crew and take them out of the water and remove the fish and do that every twenty-four hours there will be nothing wrong with the gill net. That is what they do in Japan and they do in other countries. They do not have too many. But some of our fishermen have 300 or 400 and they put them all out and it would take them two or three or four days to haul them. So, no wonder the fish rots and no wonder the fish gets bad and no wonder



the nets sometimes drift away because the gill net is abused by a lot of people, not because there is something against the gill net.

MR. NEARY: What about rough weather when you cannot get at them?

MR. CROSBIE: Right. There is always some of that but that is not the main cause. So the gill net is not barred anywhere else in the world, should it be barred in Newfoundland? Well the federal government will have to make a decision on that. But the real fault is that we have not proper regulations and enforcement, so many to each vessel and they have to be hauled each day and the rest of it. In any event the federal government will have to make the final decision.

I agree with what the Committee says here. Perhaps we should check bay to bay on a regional basis, or the federal government should. We can encourage them to do that to see whether they be allowed or not. I dealt with the Placentia Bay fishermen there on page 13. Page 14, the Committee at Port au Choix - the shrimp fishermen were concerned about the lack of adequate research to establish the extent of the sustainable shrimp yield. I agree that that should be changed and it is federal responsibility. I have a letter here somewhere that says the Fishery Research Board plans to do some research at Port au Choix this summer. They plan to take samples to estimate the age of the fish stocks and try to ascertain the size of the stock.

The Research Board vessel A.T.Cameron is going to do some analysis in the stocks at Port au Choix this year. So there is going to be some action from the federal government on that this year.

I will skip the Unemployment Insurance and income support. We all agree with the things that are wrong with the Unemployment Insurance scheme. This government wrote the federal government a year ago outlining all of those points that the Select Committee has here, and suggesting that the Unemployment Insurance regulations be amended this year, to change each one of those points made by the Select Committee. And they have not changed that yet, and they have

not introduced any income support scheme. And honourable gentlemen opposite will take that up with the Prime Minister when he is here on Saturday, I trust.

Loan repayment terms: On page 20 it is suggested that loan repayment terms of the Fisheries Loan Board might be based on the gross stock of fishing vessels or on through-put of plants. I am sorry to say that I have to disagree with that. We do not see how it could ever be administered. It would be wide open for abuse. You know, if you get a mortgage on those kinds of terms you would never collect your mortgage. It would be extremely difficult to administer. It is done voluntarily now occasionally when you have - it can be done voluntarily but to institute that as the only system of repayment on mortgages would not be practical. We will have another look at it but I do not hold out any big hopes that we can institute that system.

Now gentlemen, do you know, Mr. Speaker, that the only province that gives bounties on gear is the Province of Newfoundland? The only province that gives a bounty on the fishermen's gear is the Province of Newfoundland. We note the Committee's suggestion about the wholesale purchase of gear and we will have another look at it, and see whether we can implement something like that.

The Committee points out on page 22 about the interest rate of three and a half per cent, and our collection policies are the most advantageous and lenient to be found in Canada. That is the Fisheries Loan Board.

MR. NEARY: Only five minutes more.

MR. CROSBIE: I do not care. Do not worry! Do not get me all upset. Repossession and resale of boats: The position now is that if the fisherman has had a boat up to five years and it is repossessed it can only be sold to fishermen. The difficulty with what the Committee is suggesting here is that the fisherman who has a boat repossessed from him - the Member for Bonavista South would be interested in this - the fisherman who has a boat repossessed from him and the boat goes up for sale at public auction, now that fisherman can be sued for the deficiency

that is left over after that boat is sold after having been repossessed. He is responsible still for the balance. Suppose the fisherman owed \$10,000 on the boat. It goes up to public auction, they get \$5,000 for it, he is still responsible for the remaining \$5,000.

MR. NEARY: That is not legal.

MR. CROSBIE: Do not be so foolish! So, Mr. Speaker, you have to get the highest price you can for that fisherman. Now if there are two bidders and one bids \$5,000 and he is a fisherman, but another man bids \$6,000 and he is not a fisherman, it is in the interest of the fisherman from whom the boat was originally repossessed to have the highest bid taken because it reduces the amount he is still responsible for. Now that is one of the problems.

MR. NEARY: That is not fair.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, we prefer for the first five years that it can only be sold to another fisherman. But the practice has been after the boat is five years, or the loan is five years old then it can go to the highest bidder. That can be changed. The only thing I point out is that there is some danger for the person who had the boat repossessed from him. Now in actual fact we know that if a fisherman had a boat repossessed from him he is never going to pay the balance anyway because he does not have the assets and so on to pay it. So maybe when it is checked out it is an academic point.

MR. NEARY: Is it within your rights to sell it?

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, of course it is within our rights to sell it.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is a new law according to my information.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, I could be wrong but anyway that is what I am told. So, these points that the Committee makes right here -

MR. NEARY: That is not a decent low.

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

MR. CROSBIE: Now, the point about a special agency to sell the products of small and seasonal processors - we have got to work in conjunction with the Government of Canada on the marketing. We have told them we are prepared to have one marketing agency for fresh and frozen fish if that is what the study turns out to recommend, or we are prepared to consider two or three marketing agencies. This is something they are suggesting. The Federal Government can control it because they can institute a licensing system and you would only be allowed to export if you have a license from them. They are going to reduce the number - we are no longer going to have thirty or forty little firms or big firms selling fish outside Canada. They are going to be reduced, Mr. Speaker, in any event to perhaps two or three selling groups. If that does not work, then it may be changed to one or two selling agencies for the various Provinces.

We are in favour of that. We want the marketing situation changed. But only the Federal Government has the legal power to do it. So we are right in there with them on their study and co-operating with them and we are all gung ho for a new approach to marketing. But we cannot start our own agency as the Committee suggests because we have not got the legal and constitutional powers to do it. But honourable gentlemen do not need to worry about that because there is either going to be one marketing agency, government controlled, or there will be two or three selling groups. The small and seasonal processors will be associated or put into one of those two or three selling groups and all their selling will be done by one of these selling groups. So it is going to go that way.

MR. NEARY: A crown corporation?

MR. MORGAN: One agent for all the small plants.

MR. CROSBIE: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Take over the fishery, boy! Put it under crown corporations!

MR. CROSBIE: Ah, my! At twenty-six, the Committee supports our action with the Salt Fish Corporation. Well, that is good.

I will not go into all that now. I dealt with the tanker.

Licensing and registration: the Committee's position is exactly the same as the government's and the Premier reaffirmed it tonight.

Now you come to page thirty-four and the Committee says,

"The present expenditure submitted by the government of the estimates fall short of any real change in attitude or substantial attack on the problem, I do not agree, Mr. Speaker. I do not agree that that is so. But I do agree that more money should be spent on the fishery.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The table advises me that the forty-five minutes allocated for the honourable minister has expired.

MR. CROSBIE: Well, with unanimous consent, and I am sure the House will give it, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. THOMS: There will be no leave, Mr. Speaker, by no means.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh! You do not want to know what the government's position is on the report. The honourable Leader of the Opposition asked for it. He begged for it. He wanted to hear from the Minister of Fisheries. What is our position -

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

MR. THOMS: No leave, no leave!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Obviously there is not unanimity so the honourable Minister of Fisheries cannot continue.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh! I thought there was unanimity. Well, in that case, Mr. Speaker, I very proudly move second reading.

MR. NEARY: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Your Honour has pointed out to the Minister his time has expired. He has to take his seat.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! The Chair is well aware that the time allocated for the honourable minister has expired. Those in favour -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order, please! Order, please! Honourable members to my left do not have the right to speak, let alone not being in their own place. Those in favour of the motion "aye", those against "nay". The motion is carried, carried unanimously.

On motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Highway Traffic Act." (Bill No. 84)

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

HON. T.A. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, there are two bills on the Order Paper, bill number (84) being the bill that is now presently under discussion, namely, "An Act Further To Amend The Highway Traffic Act." Immediately following that is bill number (85) "An Act Further To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act." Most of what I say

In connection with the bill that is now under debate will apply equally to the other bill, the one to amend the Automobile Insurance Act.

There are several features about this bill, Mr. Speaker, that I would hope will commend themselves to the honourable members. Firstly, before I deal with the compulsory automobile insurance feature of the Act, may I draw to the attention of honourable members the fact that under this legislation that is now proposed, and in particular clause 3 thereof, it repeals the restricted drivers' licences, the jurisdiction that was conferred on the courts of this Province by this Legislature, I think it was three years ago. In saying that may I draw to the attention of the House that the Criminal Code of Canada does provide for restricted drivers' licences, does give the courts the right, Canadian courts the right to grant a restricted drivers' licence following a conviction of a motorist of impaired driving.

The law is quite clear and has been recently adjudicated on in the Supreme Court of Ontario, that despite this provision of the Parliament of Canada it does fall within the jurisdiction of a Provincial Legislature to impose upon the Registrar of Motor Vehicles that following a conviction of impaired driving, or the offence of impaired driving, that the Registrar shall suspend a driver's licence.

The provision in this Act is that whenever - and what the law will be if this Act is passed by this honourable House - whenever a motorist in Newfoundland is convicted of the offence of impaired driving that the Registrar of Motor Vehicles shall suspend the driver's licence for a period of six months. This bill also - and that section is section, and whilst this is not spelled out in clause 3 of the bill before the House, I draw to the attention of honourable members that the section, clause 3 of this bill which repeals the section 4 of section 2 of the Revised Statutes, Act No. 45, that by repealing that it brings into play again section 66(3) of the Highway Traffic Act, as found in the Revised Statutes which makes it mandatory for the Registrar to suspend for a period of six months.

What I am saying, Mr. Speaker, is that you will not find in this bill a clause which says the Registrar shall upon being notified of a conviction by the courts suspend a driver's licence for a period of six months. That provision is contained in section 66(3) of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland in the Highway Traffic Act. The section that was brought in in 1972, I think it was, gave the discretion to the courts. That discretion has been taken away so that the Registrar now has it all by his little self.

MR. ROBERTS: Indeed, if the Registrar does not have discretion it is mandatory now.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right. It is now mandatory upon the Registrar. It is also provided in this bill, Mr. Speaker, for the setting up of a review board, and under the provisions of the Board the Driver's Licence Suspension Appeal Board, if a motorist feels that he or she has been unduly penalized, then an application can be made to the Board and if the Board is satisfied that it is in the public interest, then the Board may, if it deems it appropriate, recommend to the Registrar the issuance of a restricted driver's licence.

It is the opinion of this administration that this amendment is necessary, necessary because in our opinion too many restricted driver's licences have been granted in this Province over the past couple of years, far more than it was ever the intention of the Legislature or the intention of the legislation.



to see granted. Obviously if we are going to treat drunken driving on the highway as the serious offense that it is then some very restrictive and some very firm decisions have to be taken by this Legislature in the enforcement of the law as it provides to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the other main point in this bill is the bringing in for the first time in this Province of a compulsory motor vehicle liability insurance. This, Mr. Speaker, we believe is necessary. We have had some research done by the Motor Registration Division and it was found in 1973, and that is their last figures to date that comes from a book that is fondly known, referred to by motor vehicle registrars and others as The Green Book, that 22.5 per cent of all private passenger motor vehicles operating in Newfoundland in 1973 were not covered by automobile insurance.

MR. ROBERTS: You mean neither of the parties was covered?

MR. HICKMAN: No, no 22.5 per cent of the private passenger vehicles, people who own motor cars.

MR. ROBERTS: What percentage of the accidents?

MR. HICKMAN: That I do not have that figure, Mr. Speaker. Insofar as commercial vehicles are concerned the percentage was probably even higher, but there it is rather difficult to put an exact figure on because it is quite often the practice of those who operate commercial vehicles only to insure their vehicles for part of a policy year and consequently it is somewhat difficult to come up with a figure.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there may be people who will argue that this is an invasion of the liberty of the subject. Of course I have had heard arguments before with enforcement of the Motor Vehicle Act from organizations along these lines that this is an invasion of the liberty of the subject. We believe and I am sure that the House believes that the overriding purpose and principle of this bill, namely that to provide that all drivers must be fully insured up to the minimum limits, and our minimum limits now is \$75,000, I think, are still the highest in Canada. I know when they were implemented two years ago or last year they were the highest in Canada, and I have

not heard of any indication that any of the other provinces have yet reached that same plateau that we did last year.

And it is our submission, Mr. Speaker, that we should and must impose this obligation upon the motoring public for the protection of the public at large.

There will be, Mr. Speaker, an necessity for Judgment Recovery Limited to continue in operation, because whilst you can make laws and you try to enforce them as best you can, and as efficiently and as effectively as you can there is always the possibility that someone may slip through the net and still be uninsured at the time he or she is involved in a serious accident.

Government has looked at a number of schemes and the insurance scheme, the compulsory insurance scheme that, I think, is the latest and newest and certainly one that seems to be operating very effectively is the one in Alberta which is quite similar to the one that is proposed in this legislation.

The Province of Nova Scotia has a form of compulsory automobile insurance but that is in name only, because in the Province of Nova Scotia the onus is on the legal owner to carry the insurance and no proof of insurance is required at the time of the registration renewal or the registration of the motor vehicle. And the only possibility of a person getting caught is if the police should happen to stop a motorist and ask that he produce a proof of adequate automobile insurance.

This bill provides that regulations can be made and regulations will be made to provide that when a motorist applies for a renewal of a driver's licence that there will be filled out a form, an application signed by the motorist indicating that

and some furnishing of proof, giving the name of the insurance company the kind of policy and the coverage provided in the policy that is issued to the motorist and this will be a condition precedent of any motorist in the Province obtaining a driver's license.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is going to involve a fair amount of change in work and change in forms on the part of the Department of Transportation and Communications and particularly the motor vehicle division of that department, and the officials in that department propose to avail very heavily of, and expand on the computer programme for motor vehicle registration as presently in force.

What we are aiming for - the date that government is aiming for for the implementation of this programme is January 2, 1976, this coming January, 1976. I read somewhere in the press that someone has suggested it was going to be 1977. I have no idea where that date came from. It most assuredly did not come from government. We feel that between now and January of 1976 it will be incumbent upon the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and his officials to make certain that the motoring public are aware of this change in policy, this change in law and that they fully understand that when they make application for a renewal of their driver's license or a new driver's license next year, then they will be obligated to present proof of adequate insurance.

MR. NEARY: What happens to a person who does not have a car?

MR. HICKMAN: Well, the person, Mr. Speaker, would still have to show proof that that vehicle -

MR. NEARY: But he does not have a car. He just goes in and wants a license.

MR. HICKMAN: No, the honourable gentleman - that I cannot answer, Mr. Speaker, but I am trying to visualize the situation where that could occur.

MR. NEARY: There are thousands, literally thousands of them around.

MR. HICKMAN: Maybe it could. But, the license - no, Mr. Speaker - the license, it is the motor vehicle license, the motor vehicle.

I am sorry, the honourable gentleman threw me there. There has to be proof that the license of the motor vehicle sought to be licensed, or the application rather, that the owner has adequate insurance and that covers anyone who drives the automobile with the consent of the insured. But, Mr. -

MR. NEARY: Does it?

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, sure. But, Mr. Speaker, the provisions also in the act are for the - there has to be a very close liaison between the insurance division of the Department of Provincial Affairs, the insurance industry and the Registrar of Motor Vehicles. This bill, this act makes it incumbent upon the insurer in the event of the cancellation or suspension of a policy of automobile insurance to notify the Registrar of Motor Vehicles and when he receives such notification he will then ask the registered owner of the vehicle to return the plates to the Registrar until adequate proof is furnished that a policy has once again been issued.

The Driver's License Suspension Appeal Board, Mr. Speaker, also will have jurisdiction to hear applications from any motorist, say, whose policy of automobile insurance has been suspended, and if that person feels that the policy was improperly suspended, that he has been denied the right to get insurance, that he is ready and willing and able to pay for his insurance policy, then again, Mr. Speaker, the board will have the right to direct the insurance company in question to issue the policy of automobile insurance to the extent of the minimum limits. These are the basis principles, Mr. Speaker, I think contained in this bill.

I cannot think of any others. The penalties have been somewhat increased as honourable gentlemen will note by looking at the second last clause of the act. The act also provides that any one or more of the sections can come into force at a time to be proclaimed by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. That may be very necessary, Mr. Speaker, because it probably will be necessary to have the board in place before the mandatory sections of the act become law early next year which, as I say, is the time that we are aiming

for because it has to be at the first of the year. This is when people are generally applying for renewal of their licences.

The other provision is that there is the right of appeal from a decision of the Review Board to a District Court. And there is a new section in the Act, that is somewhat new, at least, in appeal procedures, and that is that where the Board deems that an applicant might suffer undue hardship or expense in appearing personally before it, that he or she can make their submission on appeal by mail if they so desire.

MR. ROBERTS: Not appeal to the Court, appeal to the Board.

MR. HICKMAN: Appeal to the Board, that is right, Mr. Speaker.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that this is a good piece of legislation. It is one that should hopefully commend itself to the honourable members. It should be read in conjunction with the bill to amend the Automobile Insurance Act which comes thereafter, but maybe I had better - I might as well reserve my comments on the Automobile Insurance Act which sets up the board with respect to the controlling of rates to be charged by the automobile insurance industry which is very necessary when you have compulsory insurance, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker. If you are going to compel all motorists in Newfoundland to carry automobile insurance, then obviously they become almost a captive clientele and there has to be some regulatory control over the rates to be charged. And that is what is envisaged and will be done in the Automobile Insurance Act, the amendment that is order 16 on the Paper. I move second reading.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is about eleven o'clock. Have we moved a motion to - okay, so we are going to sit a little later. Mr. Speaker, the House crowded as it is listened enthralled to the lucid, literate and quite complete explanation of the Minister of Justice on this bill, and I think his eloquence has won widespread support. By my count there are four of us on this side and two, four, six on the other side. There is no quorum so I think we should begin with a quorum call. If we are going to sit late, the least we can do,

Sir, if have fourteen men in the House. There are only two, four, six, eight, ten in the House at present, Sir. There are only ten, eleven counting Mr. Speaker. We need a few more.

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members. Would the Clerk count the House please. There is a quorum.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, that is comforting.

Now, Sir, the minister in introducing the bill I think outlined what I conceive to be the bill's major provisions and I would like to direct a few remarks to the provisions as he outlined them. He made the point, and I think it was a very good one, that this bill really must be read in conjunction with the bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act," because they really are two halves of the same whole. I understand we will be debating bill 85 when this bill has been dealt with by the House and so I will save part of what I want to say until then because I want to make some remarks about no-fault insurance, and

I think they are probably a little more applicable under the Automobile Insurance Act Amendment than they are under this amendment here.

Now, Sir, as the minister explained the bill and as I read it, and for once they are roughly the same, this bill if we enact it will do two things essentially; it will take away from the magistrate courts and the other courts of criminal jurisdiction in this Province a jurisdiction which they now have with respect of drivers licences and the suspension of those drivers licences under the terms of the Highway Traffic Act, and it was also make some provisions for compulsory insurance.

Let me deal first with the first item, the taking away of discretion from the magistrates. I think that is a wise thing to do. There has been a great deal of public concern for the last little while about restricted drivers' licences, the case where a person is convicted under the Criminal Code of an offense that requires his licence to be removed and subsequently it is given back by the magistrate using his jurisdiction. It is a shared jurisdiction. The Criminal Code has some provisions that affect the right to drive and the Highway Traffic Act has some provisions. But suffice it to say that I think it is a step forward to limit the cases and the causes in respect of which a so-called restricted driver's licence can be issued. And this bill as I understand it will achieve that end and I very much welcome it.

The case of the drunken driver is a very sad one and I think it requires quite a strong approach by society as a whole. Whether or not a man should drink is essentially a private matter, but whether or not that man should drive while under the influence of alcohol or any other substance, a drug or some other substance, is not a private matter but a matter striking right at the root of our social framework. There is no doubt that in a very large percentage of motor vehicle accidents alcohol is to blame. We do not need to go into that, we do need to establish it, but the fact remains that in many automobile accidents, I suppose, almost all automobile accidents in some way or

another liquor figures and liquor helps to cause accidents and liquor makes accidents far worse than they would otherwise be. In every way liquor and automobiles are a very bad combination. So when a man is convicted of driving while intoxicated or driving while drunk under the provisions of the Criminal Code and then is able to get his licence back within the law, I think that is not a very severe penalty. In effect all that happens in most cases then, Mr. Speaker, is the man is no able longer to use his driver's licence while he is driving sociably.

MR. NEARY: Then he pays a higher insurance.

MR. ROBERTS: Well my colleague from Bell Island tells me that he pays higher insurance, but he is still able to drive. And I feel it may be a heavy penalty to say to a man, in effect, you are going to lose your livelihood but that may be the deterrent that is necessary. A man, Sir, who drinks and then drives knows what he is doing. It is not an accident. It is an act of will to drink and then to get behind the wheel of a car or a truck and make that car or truck go on the highway. The only way to stop that, Sir, or to cut it down is for that man in his own mind to come to the resolution not to do it. And if he realizes that not only is he risking a criminal conviction and all that follows from that, but he is not going to get his licence back and that may mean that he loses his job, it may very well mean that, then, Sir, it is in his control not to put himself in the position where he does drive while under the influence of liquor. And many people have come to me - I suppose every member of the House gets constituents and others throughout the Province coming and saying, Sir, can you help me get back my licence? And I must say that I have less sympathy for that than I do for almost any other appeal that is made to me. Because a man - you know, it is no accident - a man who drinks and then drives knows what he is doing, Nobody makes him take that drink, He takes the drink on his own and it is an act of his will to get behind the wheel of that car and make it go. And I have very little sympathy for that, Sir, very little sympathy at all. And if we



June 24, 1975

Tape 2680 (Night)

PK - 3

do nothing else this night except let the word go forth that people  
who drink and drive in Newfoundland will no longer find it quite  
so easy to get back their licence,

7732

will not put it upon the magistrate to say to a man, in effect, as has been happening in the past, you must lose your job. I think that is something that we the legislature will take upon ourselves. The magistrate is often put on the spot by the man applying to have his license back, the magistrate using his discretion under the Highway Traffic Act, and the man says in effect, if you do not let me have my restricted license, Sir, I will lose my job. Well, that is not the way the value should be measured in my eyes, Sir. That man is not being fair when he says that to the magistrate because that man is in that position because of his own act, and I have no sympathy for it at all, Sir. I think the way to solve that problem is not to give the magistrate the power but the way to solve it is for the man not to take that drink or if he takes that drink not to drive. I think that part of the bill is a very good move indeed. I do not think our magistrates in Newfoundland will for one moment regret losing this element of discretion within their power.

Now, when the man appears before them, if on the facts he is convicted of impaired driving or drunk driving within the meanings of those terms as defined in the appropriate legislation, then the magistrate has no jurisdiction or discretion on the question of whether or not he loses his license. We, the legislature, have laid it down that that man will lose his license. It is quite definite. The registrar has no discretion. The magistrate has no discretion. The license is lifted. It is suspended or cancelled for a period of not less than the period for which the court has so prohibited him from driving. Of course The criminal Code has some mandatory sections in respect of which licenses must be cancelled and suspended. I do not know the precise moments, but I do know that in the sections - 221, is it, the drunken driving? The gentleman from Port au Port practices at the bar. Is it 221, the drunken driving sections now?

MR. STAGG: 236.

MR. ROBERTS: 236. I thank him. It used to be 221 under one of the pre-consolidations. But the court has no discretion on it. In certain cases it must suspend the license. Mr. Speaker, I am

very much in favor of that, and I am very much in favor of that section of the bill.

Equally, Sir, I am very much in favor of the compulsory insurance aspect. It has taken the government a long time to move to this point and I think that the public outcry that has come from a number of sources has probably moved them to it. They have moved with almost indecent haste for a government that claims to have studied the matter for a number of months or even years and we have heard talk of committees of officials and studies and one thing and another. I understand that they have not even sought the advice of the insurance industry. I am not suggesting -

MR. HICKMAN: Advice on what?

MR. ROBERTS: On the legislation. The legislation has not been sent around for comment. I think that is a practice we might do more of in this Province. I am not suggesting that any industry or any group of people should have the right to veto legislation, but I think it very much in the public interest that legislation that affects any group or any organization, that those people should have the right to comment on the legislation and to make their views known.

This bill, Sir, was distributed to the House, I guess, it was today, this morning. It was placed upon the desks of members of the House and by, I guess, by the time we have risen tonight the bill have received second reading and be well on its way towards entering the statute books. I do not pretend to know, and I do not think anybody in this House pretends to know, whether all of the provisions of this bill are good or bad or whether or not they can be made better.

Mr. Speaker, I think that is a defect in the legislative process. Where we must move speedily, we should. But this is a case where surely this legislation could have been introduced and given first reading two or three months ago and then anybody who was interested could have had a look at it and made any comments he wished publicly, privately to one of the minister or to one of the members of the House. Sir, that is not to be done. I can only

conceive that it is not being done because this bill has been drafted quickly and drafted within the past ten days or so and I think it has been done in almost indecent haste. But, that, Sir, should not take away from the fact, whatever the government's reasons for acting, I think that they have finally done something that is right. Compulsory insurance is something that should just be. There can be no argument against it that I can see.

I think it should be a condition of driving on the roads of this Province, and that is what this bill does, but before a motor vehicle can be taken on the roads of this Province, it must be insured so that if there is an accident or if that motor vehicle does cause some damages, using that term in the legal sense, then there will be available resources to pay that award, the award of damages. That is essentially what compulsory insurance is.

The minister says that twenty-two per cent of the vehicles in Newfoundland were not insured, and that is quite a high percentage. But, an even more revealing fact if we could get it would be what percentage of the vehicles

in accidents are not insured. And I suspect it might be far higher. And I suspect that in many accidents, you know, neither of the parties, or only one of the parties - assuming there are only two - are insured. And, Sir, that can cause great hardship and great tragedy and great inconvenience, to put a very mild term on it, so obviously it should be part of public policy, a part of the right to drive in this Province. Nobody has a right to drive as such, Mr. Speaker. That is a right conferred by this Legislature or under authority of this Legislature. Nobody has a God-given right. There is no natural law, to use that philosophical term, that says that a person has the right to go on the highway and drive. That is a right, Sir, which society confers. Society sets the rules. We say that a person must be seventeen to get a permit to drive, that a person must pass a test before he can drive. And now we are putting an additional right upon it, and so we should, that a car must be insured.

I would like to see us go further. I would like to see us make insurance a condition of getting a driver's licence. Many provinces do that now, and I think we could require that before a driver's licence is issued, before the permit to operate a vehicle is issued, the person operating, the person getting that permit shall have an insurance policy, that it shall be for certain minimum amounts. In other words, we know that before a person gets behind the wheel of a car or a truck in Newfoundland, he has a certain amount of wherewithal in the event he should be involved in an accident and damages should lie against him.

MR. NEARY: Well will vehicle coverage also cover the driver?

MR. ROBERTS: My colleague asks whether coverage of the vehicle will also cover the driver. I think it does, but I want to know why we are going at it this way and not the other way around, of requiring the driver to carry it. Because, Mr. Speaker, we all know that some drivers are less safe than others. I do not understand how it is done, but, you know, there is quite a complex procedure. And you see, if we require the driver to be insured and not the car, then we can move into

a system which I believe we should have in this Province, the point system.

The point system does not relate to cars. The point system, Sir, relates to the driver.

MR. MORGAN: It protects the public.

MR. ROBERTS: I thank the gentleman from Bonavista South, you know, as sometimes he is on the point. And I am told there is authorizing legislation but I have not gone into it in detail, I have not been briefed in the legal sense, but we should have a point system in Newfoundland. If the legislation is not adequate to enable it to be introduced, then let us amend the legislation. People say to me from time to time, "But the Act says so and so," to which my answer is that the House of Assembly makes 100 Acts a year. And if something needs to be changed, then an act is not the laws of the Medes and Persians, it is not one of the Ten Commandments written on tablets of stone and bronze, it is only a piece of paper that has gone through a certain form in the House. Without taking away from the dignity of the House in any way, we all know that many acts go through here that are not fully understood by all the members of the House. Some of them go through, I suspect, not fully understood by any of the members of the House, including the minister who introduces them.

So if the statute law is not adequate, if it does not express what the House of Assembly feels should be the social policy of this Province, then let us change the Act and that can be done very quickly. And I want a system, Sir, whereby we have a point system. Because the point system is the best way that has been devised of measuring a driver's failings. And if he does have a sufficient number of failings then he should not be allowed to drive. It is that simple. We all know how the point system works. I have here some details of the point system that is in effect in the Province of British Columbia, and what it says is a long line of offences, driving offences. An individual starts off with a credit of, I believe it is twelve points, maybe ten, and the individual has that point system

or point credit. Then he can loose points if he is convicted of an offence. There is quite a long list. I do not propose to read it all, but for a fairly minor offence results in the loss of two points. Parking, Your Honour will be glad to hear, does not lead to a points loss. Those of us who sometimes end up paying a dollar

or is it two dollars to park instead of putting a dime in the meter are not affected by the point system. For example, disobeying a traffic sign or a signal; well upon conviction of that and a long range of similar offenses, a person loses two points. An act that is more serious, for example, passing on the solid double line or passing without a clear view of safe distance or failing to stop properly at a stop sign, the individual loses three points.

Then there is another category for which he loses six points, driving without due care and attention. Upon conviction of that under the Motor Vehicle Act in British Columbia a person is assessed at six points. Then the most serious category, dangerous driving, criminal negligence, driving while impaired, that sort of thing, the individual loses ten points. Sir, when the points reach the magic level, the license is removed.

It is by far and away the best way. Downstairs now in our computers or wherever - I suppose though they are over in the basement of Elizabeth Towers - but every drivers license now is computerized. They are all issued by computers. Sometimes, they are misissued by computers.

MR. NEARY: Over in the Viking Building.

MR. ROBERTS: It is in the Viking Building. I do not know where. It used to be in Elizabeth Towers. I think I was one of the incorporating shareholders or whatever they call it, Crown - I forget even the name of the company. But, anyway there is a crown corporation that does all the computer work.

MR. BARRY: The great Liberal bungler over there in Elizabeth Towers.

MR. ROBERTS: Elizabeth Towers. Well, the crown corporation in this sense was not, Sir. We will talk about Elizabeth Towers later.

Mr. Speaker, it is not impossible. It is quite possible in fact to introduce the point system, and then all that is required is whenever a conviction is registered to send that information in to the motor vehicle's registrar or some appropriate official and then it is debited against the individual's license, and if one runs



a given number of points, he will get a warning. If his number is six, he will get a warning and at ten or twelve, wherever it is, the axe falls. Of course, one starts clean with ten or twelve points and then you lose them, and then if you are a good boy for a certain period of time, you come back up to twelve points. You do not have to - I suspect all of us over the course of our lifetime even at two points for the most minor traffic offense would run up twelve points. But, it is a period of time. It can be a year or two years or three years. It does not matter. That is a matter for judgement.

Mr. Speaker, here is the way it works in British Columbia. If three points or less are present on an individual's driving record, these are deleted at the end of one year. So, if you can get through a year with only three points at the end of the year you start again with a full complement. Point values for motor vehicle act and criminal code offenses are removed after three years. But criminal code offenses remain on the record for at least five years and longer if a bad record persists.

When you lose a given number of points, or when you accumulate a given number of points, it matters not whether one starts at zero and goes to ten or one starts at ten and goes down to zero, the license is taken away. That is a very effective system. I do not know how many provinces of Canada now have it but I suspect almost all of them do. It is marvellously effective. It is the way to get at the people who are persistent offenders, who persistently break the law, who persistently disregard the provisions of the Highway Traffic Act and the Criminal Code and often they get away with it. They may be caught. They may get a conviction.

MR. NEARY: The Member for St. John's East Extern would have the -

MR. ROBERTS: Is the Member for St. John's East Extern an offender?

MR. NEARY: Well, he said that the R.C.M.P were harassing him there a year ago.

MR. ROBERTS: But they may get a conviction. But, the problem is that often the license is not taken away, and often the offense in itself is not serious enough to take away the license. But the

beauty of the point system is that it clearly and quickly identifies an individual driver who is persistently careless or criminally delinquent to put a fairly mild word on it. I think we should have it in Newfoundland. I see no reason we should not have it immediately.

I am told that it is probably the biggest single improvement we can make towards lowering the accident rate in this Province. By lowering the accident rate we can lower the insurance rates. I am remorseful that the Minister of Justice has not seen fit to move to implement the point system. As I said, I am told the legislation is adequate. But if it is not, then there should be an amendment brought in now as part of this bill. Of course if we require the driver - this is the importance of having the insurance conditioned upon the driver's license and not the vehicle license. In that way if a person is sort of a regularly bad driver, we can assess him a higher insurance rate and so we should because it is quite statistically well established that people who are careless drivers or bad drivers have a far higher accident rate, incredibly higher,

than do people who are careful drivers. The problem without a point system is that there is no way really to identify - oh, sure, Mr. Speaker, we can identify the people who have spectacular crack-ups, or the people who get nailed for drunk driving - and that is a lot - but it is a very small percentage, I would suggest. to the people who drive carelessly, Indeed there are probably very few men in this House, Mr. Speaker, who at some point or another have not driven carelessly and but for the absence of the R.C.M. Police or the Constabulary here in St. John's would have had a ticket and should have had a ticket, they should have, you know, been convicted. I do not think there is any man in the House bold enough to say that he has always driven within the provisions of the Highway Traffic Act, Most members of the House, most members of the public are not aware of all of the provisions of the Highway Traffic Act, you know, the detailed provisions as to what can and cannot be done.

But I want to see a point system, Sir. I think we should have one in Newfoundland, and I think we should have it quickly. I think that is one way that we can improve the situation on our roads and help to reduce or to even eliminate the absolute carnage. Our accident rates in Newfoundland are frightfully high and liquor is involved in too many of them and careless driving is involved in more. And if we change this Act so that we do not licence, in the insurance sense, the car, but the driver, then we could say to a man who is a consistent offender and has the points to prove it then he will pay a higher rate, We will make them smarten up through their pocketbook if they will smarten up no other way.

Again, Sir, careless driving is like drunk driving. It is not an accident. It is a matter than is in an individual's control. It is an act of will or volition on the part of an individual to make a car go eighty, ninety or a hundred miles an hour. The car does not do it on its own, for it requires the pressure of the foot to the accelerator and the way to stop it, Sir, is to make the individual not put his foot on the accelerator with quite that same weight. So I think the

point system is something that should be looked at and which should be adopted. It has been studied long enough.

I think at the same time, Sir, the way we can improve things very much in this Province is if we instituted a much, much stricter driver licencing procedures and examination procedures. I think it is a fact that in this Province once a person passes a test and gets his licence, and I think that is a little harder to do than it was hitherto but it is still not very difficult, that a person can then go the rest of his life and as long as he is not caught drunk driving or some other serious offense will never again be tested, Sir, And that person can lose his eyesight and still each year send in his application into the computer, The computer does not know the fellow is losing his eyesight, whether he has got some degenerative disease or anything. All the computer knows is that the man sends in his form and he sends in his money and bang! By return mail out comes the licence. Our licences now are for three years our individual drivers permits. There is no reason that I can think of why we cannot be examined every six years, maybe every three years is too often, There is no reason why every person of the age of sixty or sixty-five should not automatically have to have an examination each year. It may not have to be the full examination that a seventeen year old would take getting his first licence. And so we might have to hire a few inspectors. It might be one way to solve part of the unemployment problem. It would also be a way to prevent the carnage on our highways because, you know, our accident rates in Newfoundland are high and they are high because we drink too much and because we drive badly. And one of the ways to solve that is to make sure that the people who drive know what they are doing. In any event, I do not pretend to be one of the world's great drivers, Indeed my wife if she were giving testimony, and fortunately under the Canada Evidence Act she cannot be compelled so to do, my wife would -

MR. P. S. THOMS: I would like to verify that.

MR. ROBERTS: My colleague from Bonavista North have at times accused me in trying to create two by-elections at once when we are driving somewhere, although that is is not admissible in court, 'Paul'.

Mr. Speaker, you know, many Newfoundlanders, Sir, are bad drivers. We need stricter driver licencing. We also need driver educational programmes. Much of what is taught in our schools is a remarkedly little practical importance. It is useful to have it and it is good to train one's mind and all those things, Sir, but much of what is taught in our schools have little practical importance, while a driver education course would be a very great practical importance. Surely there is no reason the Education Department cannot amend the curriculum to ensure that every young person coming out of school has a proper driver education course. I do not think that is unreasonable at all, and I think it is reasonable to expect that almost every young person has a drivers licence. I know some people in Newfoundland who have never had a driver's licence. The Late Mr. Justice Higgins to be knowledge never in his life had a driver's permit, He never had one. I am not sure whether Mrs. Higgins did or did not, that I do not know, but Jim Higgins never did, Sir. And there are a few people around who do not drive, a few who do not have permits.

MR. NEARY: My late father drove a tractor but he never drove a car.

MR. ROBERTS: Well then the honourable gentleman's father probably did not need a licence and probably did not have one.

MR. NEARY: He had to have a licence to drive a tractor.

MR. ROBERTS: Did he? But he

never in his life drove a car. But, Mr. Speaker, there are very few Newfoundlanders today of the age of seventeen and older who do not have a driver's permit. I do not know what the figures are, I do not have them here, but there are very, very few, and I think in the conceivable future there will be even fewer, so it is something that should be important.

I think there is another step we can take. I think the government could require seat belts to be made mandatory and make it an offence not to wear them. There has been a lot of noise about it in other provinces. In Nova Scotia Mr. Pace, who was, I believe, the Attorney General at the time said he was going to bring it in and there was some sort of great uproar and then they did not go ahead with it. I think it is on the books but it has not been proclaimed or not being enforced. But I think it is something we should look at, Sir. Again, the evidence, as far as I know, is quite conclusive. The evidence is that wearing seat belts decreases the likelihood of being seriously hurt if there should be an accident.

MR. WINSOR: What about if you have a fire and you cannot get out?

MR. ROBERTS: Well, my colleague says if you have a fire you cannot get out. That is true, but statistics show that, I suppose, ninety-nine percent of the injuries sustained in automobile accidents comes not when car one hits car two, but rather when the person behind the wheel of car one goes through the windshield of car one after car one has hit car two. It is the so-called second collision that kills or hurts. All one has to do is to look at any car that has been in an accident and see the dents on the dashboard or on the windscreen where the person's head has gone through to see exactly what happens. Or go and talk to the orthopedists, or to my honourable friend's wife who works, I believe, in the Emergency Department at the General, and the number of people who are dragged in there on the weekends with crushed chests where they have been thrown up against the steering wheel and their ribs broken and their chest cage crushed in. Seat belts could lower that dramatically.

My brother did not believe in seat belts. He never would wear them. He wears them now. He was in an accident the other month over in Nova Scotia. He was driving down a ramp one night, a ramp off a superhighway and a gentleman coming the other way sort of occupied both halves of the road and my brother was forced off the road. As luck would have it he was wearing his seat belt. If he had not been his wife would have been a widow by now, so he now wears them quite faithfully. I think that is something we could look at if we are concerned about automobile safety in Newfoundland and the Highway Traffic Act. And also, Sir, that will reduce our insurance rates because our insurance rates are a reflection of the costs of doing the insurance business in Newfoundland.

I think that enforcement of improved standards of road and highway construction and the maintenance and elimination of roadside hazards would help. The Minister of Highways, who is notable by his absence, has been toying around again with the never ending question, and I suppose there is no right to it and there is no wrong to it, of these foolish "Keep right to pass lanes" or "Slower traffic keep right". Every time I am on one of them I am taking my life in my hands, I feel, and so is anybody who is within a car's length of me, because some Newfoundlanders seem to feel that we should keep right except to pass and others say we should keep in the centre lane except - well the slow lane or the inside lanes are for slow traffic and the right lanes are for slow traffic - nobody seems to know what is happening. Then of course there is the hauncho, the cowboy, who feels that the rules do not apply to him anyway and if he wants to get by you and you are in one lane he will go in the other whether he is fast, slow or in between. Those passing lanes built, allegedly, as an improvement but I am not so sure that they have not been a great death trap.

And there are other bad places in the roads. There are still bad hills that have not been cut down. A matter that bothers me, bright lights shining on the road. There must be some

control over people with spotlights on their houses.

MR. NEARY: What about the service station lights from here to Holyrood?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the service station lights that effectively blind you. Now surely we must have some control over that. The people own the roads, we built them, we borrowed the money to pay for them, so surely some officials somewhere in the government, in the Transportation and Communications Department, has the right to go to these people and say, "You shall not shine your spotlights." There is one of the Logy Bay Road. If you are driving in the Logy Bay Road coming in from Logy Bay towards town, just about at the Sugar Loaf turnoff -

MR. MORGAN: They are bad in Holyrood there -

MR. ROBERTS: The Holyrood - those orange lights that Golden Eagle have are very bright, they shine for miles at night. And this Logy Bay one coming in to town along the Logy Bay Road, just about coming up to the Sugar Loaf turnoff, Sir, coming in from, you know, out of town, there is



a house or a service station there that has a light so situated that one is convinced it is an oncoming car, it just blinds you. When you get close to it you realize it is not an oncoming car. It is a person with a spotlight under his eave. I do not begrudge the man the spotlight under his eave, but I do, Sir, feel that we should make sure that lights are placed so that they do not blind a driver. The Holyrood problem that the gentleman from Bonavista South and my friend from Bell Island speak of is another one. There are many throughout the Province.

Another thing that would be a very great advantage along those lines is having overhead signs, you know, overhead signs on the roads to say which lane to take. We seem to use markings on the highway. But in this Province snow covers the ground, if we are lucky, six or seven months a year, sometimes longer. The lines get worn off. And so I think, Mr. Speaker, these are all things which the government could do. If they are at all serious about the highway traffic thing, if they are doing a little more than just window dressing, they should go ahead and implement some of these moves.

None of them would cost a great deal of money. All of them would have immediate and dramatic benefits and none of them should cause any perturbations in public policy. One of them is a particularly radical idea. I think all of them would help very much to lower the horrendous and horrible accident rates we live with in this Province, or die with, I should say in this Province.

Now, Sir, one or two words about the other provisions of the bill. I note again that the government are falling into the old trap of letting people hold office during pleasure, section 78 (a) of the act as it will be amended has that. I would ask the minister to amend that in committee. This government used to talk - I agreed with them - that we should not have people holding office during pleasure but again in this bill and in the Automobile Insurance Act it creeps in again, members are appointed to boards and they shall hold office during pleasure. Well, that is fine. I mean that is a legitimate way to do things, if the House so wishes.

But of course it takes away from the independence of those people. In theory, at least, they can be turfed out at any time. Maybe they would and maybe they would not be. The minister used to speak eloquently when he was in Opposition against that provision and now we find him sponsoring the same offensive legislation.

I will not accuse him of having instructed the draftsmen so to put it. I think the draftsman just puts it in in abeyance, in the abeyance of any firm instructions on the point.

MR. NEARY: He should draw his pencil through it every time.

MR. ROBERTS: Of course he should draw his pencil through it every time. It is the same as, you know, the Wildlife Act. I am sure that the Minister of Tourism had no idea what was in the act but he was too stubborn to admit it once it was pointed out to him and so we are cursed with that and we will be cursed with it until the next government removes it from the statute books. But, anyway, that provision is in there. I would ask the minister to take it out.

Another point - I do not know if it should be spelled out or not - is that the terms under which policies are issued are not governed by this. The board have the authority to say to an insurance company, issue a policy. Now I realize that this must be read in conjunction with the other act which specifies that rates and so forth are set by an independent board. But I want to know if there is any danger that under this - and there are some people that nobody is going to want to insure, you know, and yet they must have insurance before they can drive or the car must have insurance before they can drive. That in itself is a weakness because the fellow may get - let us just take the case of a man and his wife and the man has a horrible driving record and the wife has a perfectly mediocre one in that she has not done much driving. The man has had seventeen accidents. The wife has had none. So, she puts the car in her name and she goes up to the insurance company and the insurance company agrees to insure it, and it is insured and the rate is whatever rate is paid by thirty-three year old women who have, you know, good driving records. And then her husband, the bucko, gets behind the wheel and takes off some night and he has his

eighteenth accident. Well, of course, the insurance company is bound to pay according to the terms of their contract but it is hardly fair to the insurance company because they thought they were insuring a thirty-three year old woman who drove moderately and instead it is her thirty-eight year old husband who is a hellion on wheels.

But, you know, I think that is, if anything, a further argument that we should require the driver to be insured and not the car. The minister has not told us why he has chosen this route of insuring the car instead of the driver.

MR. NEARY: Is we had a point system -

MR. ROBERTS: The point system, the husband would get caught under that. But, in any event, I want to know - I think I know the answer - but I would like to hear the minister -

MR. HICKMAN: They have the assigned risk plan.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, the minister tells me the insurance companies have an assigned risk plan but that has never been terribly successful and I want to know how it is going to work. And can the board in some way, either the board in this act or the board in the other one, Mr. Speaker, specify the terms and conditions because the insurance company could say, we will insure you and that rate will be 100 per cent. If your insurance cover is \$100,000, your premium is \$100,000 to take an absurd example. But it is something that, you know, I want to be sure. People should pay what they must for insurance but they should pay no more.

I, for one, do not see why I should pay for people who are worse risks than I am. Nor in turn should people who are better risks than am I, pay for my delinquencies on the road. I think we have to be very careful on that.

And finally, Sir, I have a question with reference to the proposed 79A (9) that a single member of the Board has the right to hear, or the power to hear an application and that he can then go to the full Board. I think that should be deleted, Sir. I think that is a very strange power. We are setting up a board with not less than three and not more than five members and then we are saying that any one member can hear it and then he can report to the Board, and the Board may view the applications, appeal, complaint or other matters as if the hearing had been held before the full Board. Well why bother having a Board, Sir, if any one can hear it? We do not say to our Court of Appeal that three judges will sit on a Court of Appeal and any one may hear it and he can then go to the other two and they can have a cup of tea and they can deal with it as if the three men had sat on the bench and heard it. Is there a reason for this?

MR. HICKMAN: (Inaudible) I am pretty sure we say it is the same as the Utilities Board.

MR. ROBERTS: I must confess I do not know what we say to the Utilities Board, but we are not talking of the Utilities Board here we are talking of a Board with quasi judicial powers.

MR. HICKMAN: Public Utilities were -

MR. ROBERTS: Maybe we should change the Utility Board Act too. But under this, Sir, any one member really acts as the Board and he has the power to - the Board will largely rubber stamp it. They only know what he tells them. I do not see why it is necessary. I do not think the workload is going to be that heavy. If it is, then we will appoint a bigger Board and let them sit in panels. But, Sir, I know of no - other than the Public Utilities Board, and I have not checked the point, I do not know that - but the normal administrative law practice, either you are going to have a single man subject to an appeal to a court or you are going to have a Board. Why here have this curious hybrid of one man hearing it and then he reports to the Board and the Board deals with it? It is foolish! Either let one man do it or let the Board do it. But I do not know why this power is put in.

I cannot conceive of it. I cannot conceive of them going on circuit, it is not that case. There are not going to be that many applications under it, maybe a couple of hundred a year to start with. I think they will clearly fall into case law very quickly. You know, it is an unusual power and I do not see any reason to put it in unless there is some reason which the minister as yet has not advanced.

Mr. Speaker, those are a few general comments on the Highway Traffic Act and the subject matter of this bill. I think we can do better than this. This is only a timid and a pallid first step. It has been brought in with some indecent haste, I would assume for political reasons, so the administration can say well, we are doing something about the highway traffic problems. But I think we can do better, Sir. I think the measures which I have suggested, none of which would cost a great deal of money, but any one of which would immeasurably contribute towards reducing the accident rate and increasing the safety rates on our highways. Taken altogether I believe they could go a long way towards eliminating the carnage on our highways.

If the minister is really serious about this problem, if he is doing a little more, if he wants to do a little more than just a little window dressing to say, well, we have done something, we have brought in compulsory insurance, then let him look at these other measures. Compulsory insurance is good, but insurance, Mr. Speaker, insurance is curing the hurt. Insurance only becomes operative after the house is burned down, or after the accident has caused the damages. My concern is that we should put more thought on the preventative end of it and lower the number of accidents, reduce the number of accidents and reduce their severity. I think that would make it a far better bill and would make this a far better Province in which to drive.

We all drive all the time, Sir. Life cannot function without it. It is an important subject and one which really deserves more attention than this administration has given it. We will vote

for the bill, Sir, because there is, other than these one or two questions I have raised, you know, I do not object to it, and I think these are more - other than with pleasure, sort of a pleasure business - most of it is unobjectionable. But it does not go far enough, Sir. It is too little and it is too late. It is a pallid palliative. What I wanted to see, Sir, and what I still hope we will see is a firm and resolute attack upon this problem. We can do better, we should do better and I believe we must do better. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, on the act to Amend The Highway Traffic Act I have a few maybe reservations or questions asking for clarification. The Driver's Licence Suspension Appeal Board which is going to have quite strong powers will, I assumed when I read the bill first, only have the authority to appeal cases when if I went down as a new applicant for a driver's licence and I applied and because I did not have insurance then my licence would be denied me. I could then go to the Appeal's Board and ask them to take my case. And the reason for not having insurance could be because I am not insurable for third party liability, number one. Number two, I could find the fact that I am, because of the number of accidents in the past, finding the insurance too costly, I cannot afford to buy the insurance at a certain time, a number of factors could be combined together to deny me the right to get a licence because I cannot afford it or some other reason to get the insurance. Now that is a good thing to have, an Appeal's Board to take my case to when I am denied applying for a licence for the first time.

But this Appeal's Board has a power which I do not like, and that is the power - if I go out tomorrow and am convicted of impaired driving and lose my driver's licence then I can, if I want to, make an appeal to this Driver's Licence Suspension Appeal Board after, according to the act there, after half the period that the court has taken my licence away for, say for example my licence is taken away for twelve months, then after six months I can come into this Appeal's Board appointed by the government of the day, a five member Appeal's Board, or indeed maybe even a three member Appeal's Board, and they can sit down and decide whether I should get back my licence or not. Mr. Speaker, I do not like that at all because if one member of that Board, as the present act states can be carried out, if one member can sit down and listen to my appeal, and if that certain member does like me for any reason at all, or if he likes me, and if I happen to be a friend of his, he will say, okay, Morgan here is your licence back. This to me is going to mean the complete elimination of any further restricted licences in this

Province. There will be no more restricted licences. What I mean is that a magistrate takes my licence away one month, after five months from that date I can go to the - if he takes it away for twelve months - I can go to the Appeal's Board and apply for my licence and if the Board listens to my appeal, if they rule in favour of my appeal they will then issue my licence back to me, not a restricted licence. They will restore my licence. Now that, Mr. Speaker, is not looking after the fact that we have had so many drunken drivers on the highways and we must cut down on the number of restricted licences. Because in my view, Mr. Speaker, this act or this bill to amend The Highway Traffic Act is going to mean that there will be more licences than ever before issued now after the licence was suspended, because they can take their cases to the Appeal's Board and have their cases appealed by that Board, and decisions made.

And the reason why, if you look at page 4, at the bottom of page 4, the restoration of licence in order of the Board, Section 9 of the main act, that a person whose driver's licence has been suspended or cancelled under Subsection (1) for a violation of this act or the regulations for which he has been convicted or subsection (3) may after the expiration of one half of the period of suspension or cancellation can apply to the Board for an order directing the registrar to restore the driver's licence. That, Mr. Speaker, is quite clear. I can if I wanted to, if I lost my licence, can come in and appeal to the Appeal's Board to have my licence restored. Now what it would mean then, if the Appeal's Board said, "Okay. You are not getting your licence back," we go back to the system we have now, where I could take the decision of the Appeal's Board to the court, to a judge and he would decide whether to uphold the Appeal's Board decision or not.

MR. BARRY: That is your interpretation.

MR. MORGAN: Well according to the act. That is how the act reads now. So the fact is, Mr. Speaker, in my reading of this act, and maybe the minister will clarify the points I am making, but the fact that the Suspension Appeal Board with three or five members can decide on who gets a driver's licence



and who does not get a driver's license and the fact that one member of that board can go out and hold a hearing and he can make recommendations to the board so the board can decide, I think is giving that board too much power. I am not in favor at all. I said so before on other debates and other pieces of legislation in this Assembly, that giving individual boards appointed at pleasure by this government or any government, appointment of boards at pleasure, giving them this kind of power, is wrong. I said so before and I am going to say it again here tonight in regards to this legislation here. A board of this nature should not have the authority to decide. It should be the courts only and not a board, a board set up by any government, to decide on who should receive a driver's license and who should be suspended from getting a driver's license and who should be restored his driver's license at any time in the future.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, may I first deal with the points raised by the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South. There is a very marked difference in the law as contained in this act and what presently exists. The law as it presently exists is that if a motorist is convicted of impaired driving, he may then and there - and this has been the practice - apply to a court to have a restricted driver's license issued to that motorist there, and if that court makes this decision as they have made them on literally hundreds of occasions, the registrar has no discretion then, no right, he has to allow this motorist to operate with a restricted driver's license.

The new act - now let me repeat so there can be no mistake - says that when once a person is convicted of the offense of impaired driving, the registrar shall suspend his driver's license for a period of six months. Now then there is a provision in one of the powers given to this **Review Board** is that after the period prescribed in the act, if a person wants to make an application to that board and if it is in the public interest and the onus is on the convicted

person to show this, then a three man board can make a decision to grant a restricted driver's license or a driver's license if they so desire. But this law now is far more rigid, imposes a far greater penalty than we have had in the law heretofore, and you must give the - if you are going to take away rights, you should and must in my opinion, give a person some forum to which he should appeal. Now, you say it is the courts.

Our experience has been on application to the courts for a restricted driver's license where a magistrate, convicting magistrate has refused to grant a restricted driver's license, there is a procedure where an application can be made to the district court. This has imposed upon the people in this Province undue hardship. Let us take the case, for instance, of a man, say, living in St. Anthony. He is convicted of impaired driving. The presiding magistrate has refused under the existing law to grant him a restricted driver's license. If he wants to make the application he has got to go down to Corner Brook and make that application before the district court judge in Corner Brook and this is far too expensive. Our hope is that with the board - this is why in that act there is this provision - that one member of the board may go and hear on behalf of the board the case and present the evidence to it.

But if you have a person again, say, in St. Anthony, who wants to make an application to this appeal board, it certainly would I think be expecting too much of the state to send all the retinue of that board down for one case. But one member of the board can do that. I certainly have no strong views on the provision that is put in there with respect to holding office during pleasure, and between now and tomorrow afternoon when the matter goes to the committee I will certainly take it up with my colleagues. As I say, I have no hesitation at all in seeing fixed dates. Maybe something like we did for the, like the provisions in the Medicare Commission Act where they are appointed, one man for two years and somebody else for three years and somebody else for four years,

stagger their term of office so that there will be some continuity there. But that is certainly not a principle that I am hung up on.

The other matters raised by the honourable the Leader of the Opposition - may I say that, you know, being against rigid enforcement of the Highway Traffic Act would be like being against motherhood. Of course we must continue to enforce more rigidly the laws applying to the operation of motor vehicles on the highway. This bill has not been drafted in haste, Mr. Speaker. The reverse is the situation. Government has been considering for a long time the alternatives of no-fault insurance

or simply compulsory insurance. We together with the other seven non-NDP provinces have been trying to come up with and get from the industry - and there has been great consultation with the insurance industry on this - a no-fault plan that is satisfactory and acceptable and within the reach and beneficial to Newfoundlanders and would be interchangeable within the other provinces and if possible uniform legislation. But we have not reached that yet, and the opinion of government was and is that we cannot wait until we get the sort of perfect no-fault plan and there has been no such a plan yet evolved in North America that falls into that category, that we must first and should go ahead with the compulsory insurance.

I was pleased to read in the press that the insurance industry in this Province through their spokesman, Mr. Harry Megann, have indicated their approval of this legislation and this principle. I move second reading.

On motion a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Highway Traffic Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House, tomorrow.

Motion second reading of a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, a lot of what has been said and is relevant to this act has already been said in the debate that transpired during the second reading debate of the "Act To Amend The Highway Traffic Act." Under the act that has just passed second reading there is a provision for compulsory insurance, and the main thrust of the bill that we are now debating, the "Act Further To Amend the Automobile Insurance Act" is to provide for the establishment of a Newfoundland Automobile Insurance Board and to confer upon that board the power to approve rates and investigate any matters relating to the automobile insurance.

It will be obligatory upon companies when this becomes law to apply to the board for approval or to file with the board for their approval and they must have approval before they implement any new rates. It is the opinion of government that this board is necessary, that this protection for the public is required.

There is a provision in section 54 (1) (d) for the establishment of the board, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to make regulations for the establishing of a plan for the equitable assignment of risks and empowering the board to direct an insurer to accept assignment coverage.

I realize, I suspect in any event that within the act that there is that same provision of - there is an appeal provision to the Supreme Court in this one, that the members of the board shall hold office during pleasure. May I say as I said earlier, I certainly have absolutely no hang up on that at all. I personally like the idea of staggering the term of office of members of the boards so that there can be a continuity of experience at least. These are the provisions I think that are in the Medicare Act with respect to the appointment of the Medicare Commission, that some members are for two years, other for three and other for four. But, that -

MR. ROBERTS: Do you think the amendment could be drafted overnight?

MR. HICKMAN: I already asked them this morning to try and work something out for me on that, Mr. Speaker, but I will have to consult with my colleagues, but certainly I am not up tight about it. I move second reading.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, the minister has been - he might want to have a look at the latest issue of Canadian Dimension which has an article, quote, "Divorce Newfoundland Style" that may or may not be in contempt of court.

MR. HICKMAN: What?

MR. ROBERTS: A publication called the Canadian Dimension which is considerably to the left of most publications of Canada, a very interesting document indeed but it has an article in there called "Divorce Newfoundland Style", which may or may not be in contempt of court. I suggest the honourable minister may want to have a look at it. However, that is a little way away, Your Honour, I suspect

MR. ROBERTS: from an 'Act Further To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act.' Mr. Speaker, the minister has in his usual way said everything that needs to be said on this, but I would like to say a word or two to expand upon what the minister hinted at, or outlined, or to use a marvellous word, limned - l-i-m-n-e-d, for the benefit of the young lady who has to transcribe it.

Sir, the bill implements a principle which we on this side have been advocating for some time. Essentially that is to bring under the regulatory authority of the state the insurance industry insofar, at least, as it affects automobile insurance. At this time there is no thought of involving life insurance, my friend and colleague from St. Barbe North will be glad to hear, or home insurance, fire insurance, accident insurance, all that kind of insurance. Anything except automobile insurance. And that is well and good because this is probably the most important field of insurance in Newfoundland and certainly the one that most directly affects most people.

The Act, although it is fairly complicated, at the same time is fairly straightforward. The only comment I would make, really I think the only comment I need make at this time is again this offensive section appears, the one to which the minister referred, the holding office at pleasure section. The act will require quite a deal of implementation and it will make quite a complicated piece of legislation to administer, but I would hope that the appointees to the Board would be men and women of a calibre to administer it adequately. This administration's record on appointments, Sir, has been lukewarm in some cases. I would hope this will be a case where the members of the Board will be officials. I do not think there is much need -

MR. HICKMAN: They should be public servants?

MR. ROBERTS: Public servants, yes. I think there is probably enough need here to make it full-time. What the minister might do as a suggestion is take the members of the Public Utilities Board, maybe expanding that board by one or two and make them the regulatory Board.

Then there is no reason a member of the Public Utilities Board cannot hold office on this Board as well. There is nothing in the legislation of which I am aware. And I think that it is important that we begin to develop in Newfoundland an administrative law cadre, a group of men and women who are skilled in administrative law, who have mastered the field and who are able to, you know, adjudicate matters effectively and efficiently according to the principles of administrative law.

This is quite an important board. You know, it is all very well, it is twelve o'clock at night and we are down to a corporal's guard in the House, and everybody is tired, and since there is some degree of unanimity on the principle of the bill it will go through very quickly. But nonetheless it is an important Board we are setting up. This Board will have the power to say to an insurance company at what rate it may offer a policy to - an automobile insurance company, I am sorry - at what rate it may offer a policy in Newfoundland. And that power, if used wisely, can be to the benefit of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, but if used unwisely it can be very much to our detriment. It can also be very much to the detriment of the insurance company, but that is their concern and not mine. So I think it is important that the members of this Board should be men and women who are able to devote their full time to it. It is not a large Board, not more than five nor less than three members. And surely the right way to do it is to take one or two or three public servants or to appoint people to the public service to become skilled and expert in these things. I do not know if the provision is in here but surely the board is self-financing. If it does not have the power - I am not sure it does - to levy upon the industry it is regulating, it should have that power.

The Public Utilities Board in that sense is self-financing, the Workmens' Compensation Board, which in a sense is a regulatory Board, has that power, and in that sense, again, it is self-financing. There is no reason here that the insurance companies should not pay the cost. They will pass it on to the people they serve. It will be a

legitimate part of their operating costs. But, Mr. Speaker, that is the way it should be. Why should we the people of Newfoundland have to pay it? Let the people who are going to avail of the protection and the services offered by this Board, let them pay the cost.

Basically that is what I want to say. The merit of the Act will be shown in its application, because the real question is, can insurance rates be lowered in Newfoundland? Are our insurance rates too high now? Are we being ripped off?



These are questions which nobody can answer. The insurance companies say that we are not. Indeed they maintain that they are losing money, they are operating. As far as I can gather according to them, out of some sense of charity. Well I do not wish to be unkind but my colleague from St. Barbe North who has recently become a lobbyist for the insurance industry, life division, says that they too are operating at a charity. Well that may be because of the policies which my colleague is selling.

Mr. Speaker, you know, the insurance industries say they do not make very much money on automobile insurance. Well so be it. Now we shall have a way to settle that argument.

MR. NEARY: Give his company a plug.

MR. ROBERTS: I am not allowed to mention Sun Life, is that the company you work for "Fred"? Mr. Speaker, there is no conflict of interest. I have no insurances with Sun Life nor am I likely to have any, but if anybody wishes an insurance -

HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: My colleague is quite willing to sell life insurance to anybody, but political insurance, Sir, is a lot more difficult to come by and we are not offering any of that this year.

MR. NEARY: We should all insure our lives before the next election.

MR. ROBERTS: Let us all insure our lives before the next election.

Mr. Speaker, I guess this line of thought has gone far enough and there are other assets which the honourable gentleman may wish to insure as well.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me conclude what I am saying by making the point which I have been trying to make despite the help from my colleagues on this side, that this Board hopefully will settle at long last the age old question we have in Newfoundland, are the insurance companies ripping us off or not? I am going to be very interested to see. Some of my best friends are insurance agents, and they maintain that they are not make undue profits. Well we will soon know for sure and certain. I do not know whether rates will go down or not. It will be very interesting to see whether rates do go down. It will be very

interesting to see whether the rates set in and rates as approved after the Board has investigated whether those rates differ substantially from the rates which we now are charged and which we now must pay.

I tend to think that whether or not rates will be lowered because of this, rates can be lowered by implementing this sort of measure which I referred to when I spoke in the second reading of the Highway Traffic Act Amendment Bill. I think that would lower the accident rate and that in turn would reduce the rates.

The rates are set presumably on some sort of insurance principle. They bear relationship to the costs of the insurance, at least that is what the insurance companies tell us, and the rates go up they tell us because the cost of parts have gone up and the cost of labour has gone up and the amount of the average claim has gone up. Well we will soon know all of those things. The Board will presumably be appointed fairly soon. It will start to work, it will require all of the insurance companies to submit their rates and then we will have a form of hearings and we will go on from there. I shall await the event. I think the Board will provide a partial answer, but not the complete answer to the age old question of whether or not we should have state run insurance. I must say and I am not sure that all of my colleagues would agree with me, but I must say that I have seen no evidence to indicate that the state run insurance plans in Western Canada are significantly cheaper in the cost to the consumer. Indeed the insurance industry maintains to the contrary, and I have seen people who are not - or I have talked to people who are not in the insurance industry who say that while on the surface they may appear to be cheaper they are heavily subsidized out of public revenues and therefore in effect they are not cheaper. It matters not from where the dollar comes, Mr. Speaker, if we must pay it, if it comes from our pockets then, you know, it is a cost to us.

But in any event this Board hopefully will help to settle that issue and we will see then whether we could have insurance run more cheaply by the state because we will know whether or not the insurance rates being charged by the private industry are the proper rates and that they are making a fair rate of return and not an unfair rate of return. So

in that sense the Board could be a step forward. It remains to be seen just what it will do. I hope it will achieve the purposes that we have in mind. If it does well and good and if not I suspect you will see an amending act one of these days again before the House.

But in closing, Mr. Speaker, let me say that I for one would welcome an assurance from the minister that the members of this Board will be members of a calibre of the Public Utilities Commission. Maybe the members of that Commission are over worked now. I know that the Chairman, Mr. Powell, most certainly is. Maybe we should try and find two or three more Clarence Powells. There are men and women of that standard in the Province and they should be appointed to the public service and they should, you know, make a study of administrative

law and of regulatory bodies and they should then be in a position to serve for a number of years in this very important function. I hope these members will be full-time and not just faithful friends of the administration of the day, whether it be the current crowd of gentlemen or whether it be their successors. You know, that is well enough and if we want to have patronage, then we can have patronage. But, I do not think this is the sort of board which should admit of that principle. I think this board should be made up of public servants, man and women who are trained and skilled in this particular branch of administration. It is a difficult field. It is a growing field. In many ways it is a new field. It is one of which we are going to hear a great deal in the years to come.

Having said that, Sir, you know, for my part we will have to await the conduct of this board to see exactly what it does achieve. I expect great things of it and I will be disappointed if it does not come. Hopefully now we will know whether or not we are being ripped off and more importantly, from now on we will know that the insurance rates we pay in this Province are reasonable rates and are no greater than must be charged if we are to get the insurance that we need and must have.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not going to delay the proceedings of the House, Sir, very long. You may detect in the few remarks that I am going to make that there is dissension in the ranks, Sir, that I do not entirely agree with the statement made by my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition, that public insurance is the best route to take because I am convinced, Sir, I am convinced in my research that it is, as is stated in the Toronto Star on May 17, 1975 that it is better, let me see, if you are going to crumple a fender, it will pay to crumple it in British Columbia, Saskatchewan or Manitoba where they have public insurance.

Mr. Speaker, the introduction of this bill into the House is most timely because it is being introduced, Sir, at a time when the insurance companies have announced their intention to raise

rates of insurance in this Province across the board by eleven per cent. And as the members of the House know, the Leader of the Opposition and myself and various other elected members in this House have been asking for an investigation at once by the Consumer Affairs branch of the Department of Provincial Affairs into this matter of the increase before the insurance companies are allowed to implement the increase. The public, Sir, in my opinion, are entitled to know whether this raise in insurance rates, this eleven per cent increase, is merely designed, Sir, to increase the profits of the insurance companies or is to take care of the results of, as my colleague, the Leader of the Opposition pointed out earlier, to take care of the poor driving habits of the drivers in this Province.

Now, Sir, maybe the board will decide once and for all the matter of private insurance versus public insurance. The Toronto Star, Sir, back on Saturday, May 17, carried an article which is most interesting, and shows the situation right across the whole of Canada as far as this matter of private insurance versus public insurance. The article, Sir, starts off with big, bold headlines, "Car Insurance".

In Toronto it costs \$227 to insure this Volkswagon. There is a Volkswagon on the front page. And, in Vancouver, just listen to this - the minister interrupted me there, Sir, but I will repeat the figures again. In Toronto it costs \$227 to insure this Volkswagon. In Vancouver under government insurance it costs only \$145.

MP. CROSBIE: How much does it cost the taxpayers to subsidize that?

MP. NEARY: Well, now, Sir -

MR. CROSBIE: Another \$100.

MR. NEARY: I will come to that if the minister will just hold his water for a minute. You are getting a little bit ahead. Sir, even -

MP. CROSBIE: Answer the question!

MP. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, even if you did -

MP. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - even if you did have to dip into the public treasury, even if you did, and they do out West, you are merely taking a part of the sales tax on gasoline and passing it back to its rightful owners, the car owners. What do the private companies do? The private companies require, demand a profit and they take their money and they invest it in foreign real estate.

What public insurance does is pass the benefits back to the premium holders. That is not what the private companies do. They take their money and invest it in foreign countries in a lot of cases. They want to balance their books. Mr. Speaker, why should not the government, the Minister of Finance, take a few dollars that he collects on the gasoline tax and pass it on to the poor, old consumer so he can get low cost insurance? What is wrong with that?

MR. CROSBIE: Nothing, except he is using it to build roads.

MR. NEARY: Using it to build roads! Huh! I wish I had been in, Sir. I was sorry I was out. I wanted to get in on that other debate on that other bill there because one of the things that we badly need in this Province is a divided highway all the way from St. John's to Port aux Basques.

Mr. Speaker, just listen to this. Here are some examples, Sir, here are some examples of private insurance premiums versus public insurance premiums right across Canada. In the first instance, Sir, we are talking here about a 1974 Ford Galaxie 500: Quebec City, premium, \$380; St. John's, \$369; Moncton, \$304; Charlottetown, \$282; Hamilton, \$271; Toronto, \$263; Halifax, \$252; Edmonton, \$243; Winnipeg, \$198; Vancouver, \$196; and Regina, \$175. Newfoundland is the second highest in the whole of Canada, the highest rate, the second highest rate, in the whole of Canada. What about the 1973 Chevelle? Let us take a look at that one: Quebec City, \$348; St. John's, \$334; Moncton, \$310, and I can go right down to Regina -

MR. DOODY: Do they have anything on a 1927 Bentley?

MR. NEARY: Very, very funny, Mr. Speaker. It ranges from \$348 in Quebec City, \$334 for Newfoundland down to Regina, \$155; Winnipeg, \$185; Vancouver, \$159. Again, Newfoundland the second highest premium, the second highest rate in the whole of Canada. Then, we have the 1974 Volkswagen Beetle: Quebec City, \$321, St. John's, \$302. Again, Sir, again we are number two on the totem pole.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that obviously must speak for itself. There is no question about it, Sir, that the obvious direction to move is towards public insurance operated by the Province. It is as plain as the nose on your face, Sir. Ontario is now thinking about it, Sir, the Tory Government out in - yes, the minister shakes his head. I have got it right here in the insight section of the Toronto Star, the Tory paper. The Premier of Ontario, Premier Davis, Sir, is now seriously thinking about moving in the direction of public insurance. Mr. Speaker, the article points out that the claims are handled faster by public insurance. They are not interested in balancing their books. The rates are much lower. In the case of private insurers, they charge pretty stiff premiums.

Mr. Speaker, this administration is committed, Sir, is committed to taking a good, hard look at public insurance. You know, Mr. Speaker, we are setting up this board and we just passed this other bill here to make insurance compulsory. Well, Sir, all that creates is a bonanza for the insurance company. That is all it does. It is like everything else, Sir, we have been talking about in this honourable House, Sir, for the last few years. We have to get rid of the profiteering middleman. The sooner the administration lives up to its obligation and its promise made to the people of this Province in two provincial general elections that they were going to take a good hard look at public insurance, I would say



the better. The other provinces are moving in that direction and we should be doing the same thing, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, as I say, I do not want to delay the House, the hour is getting late, Sir, and I must say, I am really not up to it tonight. I am more demoralized now since the President of Treasury Board told me the liquor strike is not over yet. I thought I might get a bottle of wine tomorrow, Sir, to boost my morale a little bit.

MR. THOMS: It is not over? You cannot even get a -

MR. NEARY: Not over.

MR. DOODY: You people who are dedicated to that sort of thing, I suggest you try to hold out for another while.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DOODY: You should have stronger moral fibre.

MR. ROBERTS: Or more supplies.

MR. NEARY: Whether or not, Mr. Speaker, for the time being automobile insurance is left to private enterprise or operated by the government, it is high time, in my opinion, to analyze the causes of vehicle accidents in this province.

MR. MOORES: It is beer here all the time.

MR. NEARY: I was going to give the honourable Premier an answer, but was it not Paul Fardy, who opened the vats of the local -

MR. DOODY: \$3,000 wasted.

MR. ROWE: Let us in on the story boys.

MR. NEARY: Charlie Devine.

MR. ROBERTS: I wish they would let us all in on their joke or whatever it is.

MR. NEARY: I hope, Mr. Speaker, that this Board will spell out in black and white, Sir, how many accidents in this Province result from poor mechanical conditions of the vehicle and how many from poor driving habits, such as the failure to signal on proper turns and failure to obey existing laws and regulations.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know if it is too late, but under

section 5 of this Act, we have that standard provision that this Act or any provision thereof shall come into force on a day to be proclaimed by the Lieutenant Governor-in-Council. I want the minister to tell us if it would be too late for this Board to investigate this eleven per cent increase that we now have facing us. Will it be possible for this board to investigate whether or not this increase is justified before the companies are permitted to increase their rates? If not, Sir, perhaps the Minister of Provincial Affairs, himself, or his Consumer Affairs Branch can get a real breakdown on this whole matter of what is causing Newfoundland, Sir, to have this second highest premium in the whole of Canada. If the Board cannot be set up on time let the minister and his Consumer Affairs Branch find out if it is caused by our poor driving habits, the poor record of Newfoundland drivers. If it is, Sir, then let the penalty, let the punishment be imposed on these reckless drivers, and these drivers who have a poor record rather than against the total population of drivers in this Province, especially those, Mr. Speaker, who have good records. This, Sir, would be a grave injustice if this were allowed to happen. I hope that the minister will assure this House now, when he is closing the debate, that this will not happen. That either the Board will be instructed to roll back any increases or the Minister of Provincial Affairs, through the Consumer Affairs Branch of his department, will see to it that justice is done in this case and that if there is an increase, if the increase has to go ahead, that it will only be applied against reckless drivers, drivers with poor driving habits in this Province, and not against the general driving population as a whole who have good records.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable minister speaks now he closes the debate.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, most of this debate seems to have centered around, although it was relevant to the bill, centered around the merits or demerits of private insurance versus public insurance. Three of the western provinces, the N.D.P.

Provinces have over the years implemented this programme, the last being the Province of British Columbia.

According to a report in The Globe and Mail by a Ms. Linda Hughes, the British Columbia government's automobile insurance programme had a loss of \$34.2 million during the first full year of operation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not feel that there is any way that one can justify calling upon the taxpayers of British Columbia, if I was living in British Columbia, to make up that deficit because, Mr. Speaker, the automobile insurance, well I suppose I mean the broader sense of the word of the automobile insurance is there to protect not only the motorists, the motoring public but to protect all. But I see that it would be a long, long time in my opinion before this province would find itself in a position where we could afford that kind of money.

The honourable the Leader of the Opposition in approving of this bill and indicating his support for it expressed the hope that the members of the board would be ladies and gentlemen of high calibre. This certainly will be attempted. I am not satisfied that it would be necessary to have members of this board on a full-time basis. I am absolutely certain that the present members of the Board of Commissioners of Public Utilities who also have responsibility for enforcing and administering the Motor Carrier Act, which in some provinces I understand is done by a separate board, just do not have the time to take on this task.

I would imagine and I can foresee some difficulty in getting the right type of people on that Board. Obviously there should be some member on that Board with a great deal of experience in the insurance field. It would not be proper to have someone on the board, if it is a part-time basis, who is still active in the insurance business. But to find someone who has had some experience in that - the honourable gentleman from St. Barbe North is out but he will be borne in mind after he gets some experience - with experience in the insurance industry may be somewhat difficult indeed.

The other point raised by the honourable the Member for Bell Island; this Act will not do anything with respect to the recent increases which were

announced by the insurance industry. There is a provision in this bill before the House that on or before August 1st., 1975 every insurer has to file the proposed rates or the rates that they are charging and propose to charge with the Board. I move second reading.

On motion a bill, "An Act Further To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act," read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the remaining Orders of the Day do stand deferred and that this House on its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three of the clock and that this House do now adjourn. And before the motion is put may I, for the edification of honourable members, indicate that there is but one piece of legislation, one bill to come before this House to be debated tomorrow, namely the bill relating to The Fisheries Advisory Board and that honourable gentlemen opposite have agreed that tomorrow will be a day to deal with government business and hopefully with a bit of luck we should conclude the business by tomorrow at six.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that this House do now adjourn until tomorrow Wednesday at three of the clock. Those in favour, "Aye," those against, "Nay," carried.

CONTENTS

June 24, 1975	Page
<b>Presenting Petitions</b>	
By Mr. Collins on behalf of residents of Cottrell's Cove and Moore's Cove requesting that the road linking the communities be paved. Supported by Mr. Woodward.	7485
<b>Oral Questions</b>	
The strike of liquor store employees. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	7486
Policy on assisting workers on strike, locked out or refusing to cross picket lines. Mr. Neary, Mr. Murphy.	7486
Query as to whether such employees will be assisted in case of need. Mr. Neary, Mr. Murphy.	7487
St. John's City dump. Mr. Neary, Mr. Dawe.	7488
Extension of water and sewer lines at Wabana. Mr. Neary, Mr. Peckford.	7488
Financial assistance for Wabana. Mr. Neary, Mr. Peckford.	7489
Query as to whether the published list of water and sewer projects is final for the year. Mr. Thoms, Mr. Peckford.	7489
Decrease in housing starts. Mr. Thoms, Mr. Peckford.	7490
Housing starts down by 16 per cent. Mr. Thoms, Mr. Peckford.	7490
Extension of dates for the submission of applications for moose and caribou licences. Mr. Thoms, Mr. Hickey.	7490
Surplus potatoes. Mr. Neary, Mr. Collins.	7491
Government policy for government institutions to purchase local potatoes. Mr. Neary, Mr. Collins.	7492
Dumping of potatoes at Lethbridge. Mr. Neary, Mr. Collins.	7493
Importation of potatoes. Mr. Neary, Mr. Collins.	7493
Policy on the development of the Gull Island site. Mr. Woodward, Mr. Barry.	7494
Informing residents of the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area about government policy on the development. Mr. Woodward, Mr. Barry.	7496
Negotiations with Ottawa concerning the economy of the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area. Mr. Woodward, Mr. Crosbie.	7497
The start of such negotiations. Mr. Woodward, Mr. Crosbie.	7498
Vandalism and terrorizing behaviour attributed to young people in a section of St. John's. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickman.	7499
Highway safety precautions in Conception Bay South. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickman.	7500
Manuels Bridge. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickman.	7501
Design of Manuels Bridge. Mr. Neary, Mr. Hickman.	7501
Settlement of the strike of liquor store employees. Mr. Neary, Mr. Doody.	7502

CONTENTS - 2

Orders of the Day	Page
Report of the Committee on the Inshore Fishery Resolution (continued).	7503
Mr. Young	7503
Mr. Neary	7507
Amendment moved	7526
Ruled out of order	7529
Mr. Neary (continued)	7529
Amendment moved	7529
Ruled out of order	7530
Mr. Neary (continued)	7530
Mr. Howard	7533
Mr. Wilson	7537
Adjourned the debate	7541
The House rose at 1:00 p.m.	7541
The House resumed at 3:00 p.m.	7542
Report of the Committee on the Inshore Fishery Resolution (continued).	7542
Mr. Wilson (continued)	7542
Mr. Thoms	7551
Mr. Earle	7570
Mr. Gillett	7582
Mr. Peckford	7592
Mr. Aylward	7599
Mr. Roberts	7619
Adjourned the debate	7628
The House rose at 6:00 p.m.	7628
The House resumed at 8:00 p.m.	7629
Report of the Committee on the Inshore Fishery Resolution (continued).	7629
Mr. Roberts (continued)	7629
Premier Moores	7673
Mr. Carter	7688
Mr. Crosbie	7692
The motion was put and carried unanimously	7721
On motion second reading of Bill No. 84, "An Act Further To Amend The Highway Traffic Act."	7721
Mr. Hickman	7721
Mr. Roberts	7728
Mr. Morgan	7754
Mr. Hickman	7756
On motion Bill No. 84 read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.	7759
On motion second reading of Bill No. 85, "An Act Further To Amend The Automobile Insurance Act."	7759
Mr. Hickman	7759
Mr. Roberts	7760
Mr. Neary	7767
Mr. Hickman	7773
On motion Bill No. 85 read a second time, ordered referred to a Committee of the Whole House on tomorrow.	7776
Adjournment	7776