



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 10

VERBATIM REPORT

TUESDAY, MARCH 11, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

11
12
13

14
15
16

17
18
19

20
21
22

March 11, 1975.

Tape 321 (Afternoon)

RH - 1

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Fisheries.

HON. J.C. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to inform the House that I have some information here in connection with MacKean Fisheries Outfitting Limited. I cannot hear what the honourable gentleman is mumbling there.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, no. Yes, M-a-c-k-e-a-n. MacKean's Fisheries Outfitting Limited. Mr. Speaker, a firm by that name purchased salmon this Summer, was in the business of purchasing salmon on the Coast of Labrador, purchased salmon there this past Summer. They are in the salmon buying business along the Labrador Coast and they function as an outfitting outlet for the fishermen, sold catches at their buying stations. They had operated successfully for four or five years before 1974 and marketed fresh salmon in the Canadian U.S. market.

However, in 1974, salmon landings were quite high in Labrador and the company got into difficulties in marketing salmon in a fresh form. Apparently the salmon were purchased from the fishermen on the agreement that they would be paid for their catches after the salmon had been sold. When they were unable to sell the salmon fresh, the company decided to freeze salmon and they made arrangements to have salmon shipped to LaScie and frozen there and held there in a frozen state.

In any event, the company was unable to continue to meet its liabilities during the year and during the Fall it went into bankruptcy or made an assignment to a trustee in bankruptcy. The position on the bankruptcy is that total liabilities of possibly \$236,000 are considerably in excess of the company's assets. It is possible that the company will eventually pay forty to fifty cents on the dollar to its creditors. The number of fishermen effected by the bankruptcy was about 159 and the amount of money owed the fishermen involved was \$139,773. The

fishermen, of course, are ordinary creditors of the company, the same as any other creditor except the preferred or secured creditor.

The government, Mr. Speaker, was originally contacted to see what assistance we could give. Of course, there is no assistance we could properly give the company which have got itself into a position where it had made an assignment of bankruptcy, but the salmon that had been purchased frozen at LaScie was in the plant at LaScie originally constructed by government. It has been operated under an arrangement with Newfoundland Quick Freeze Limited, I believe it is. It used to be Job's.

So, the government agreed that if it would benefit the fishermen that the company operating the LaScie plant, whose charges amounted to \$25,000 for the freezing and the care and storage of the salmon, that the government would absorb that loss, that the company did not let the salmon be taken from its possession and sold without collecting what they were owed for the storage cost. Well, as it happened the salmon was sold by the trustee in bankruptcy, but Newfoundland Quick Freeze, I think I have the right company, but anyway the LaScie plant was paid its storage charges.

So, the government then had another look at the situation and negotiated with the trustee in bankruptcy and we informed the trustee that if the rest of the creditors would agree that the \$25,000 would only be distributed among the fishermen creditors, we would authorize, the government would pay \$25,000 to the trustee in bankruptcy representing that amount on condition

that that money only be distributed to the fishermen creditors of MacKean's Fisheries Outfitting Limited. These fishermen creditors are all, I think, in the District of Labrador South or on the Labrador Coast. We are making a payment to the trustee in bankruptcy because the creditors have agreed that the only ones to receive this additional amount would be the fishermen creditors and the fishermen creditors should therefore receive about an additional fifteen or twenty cents more than the other creditors.

I understand from the trustee in bankruptcy that the first interim dividend will be paid next week in an amount of twenty-one cents on the dollar to all creditors, and an extra sixteen cents to the fishermen creditors. That is an interim dividend and they should receive dividends later on. So, it will probably end up that the fishermen creditors will receive from sixty to seventy cents on the dollar on what they are owed by this bankrupt company rather than forty or fifty cents on the dollar.

So, as I say, Mr. Speaker, the government has made this payment of \$25,000 covering these storage charges so that the funds would be available to be paid over to the fishermen creditors.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this situation now apparently has been cleared up, but, Sir, it certainly was a very embarrassing situation and most unfortunate for the fishermen who were affected in the District of Labrador South. I had a number of enquiries from my honourable colleague's district about this matter. Sir, the minister did not make it clear in his statement why it was necessary to pass this \$25,000 fee for storage over to the accountant who is acting for the company. Why was this necessary? Why did not the government pay the money directly to the fishermen rather than through a middle man? There may be some legal reason for it, Sir, but the minister did not make that clear.

I think on this side of the House, sir, we are glad that at least the fishermen are going to recover part of their income through the sale of this salmon. They have been tremendously inconvenienced,

and they have undergone severe hardship down there in the past several months on account of this. It was unfortunate, Sir. This sort of thing seems to happen, or has been happening, along the coast of Labrador for a good many years. It was unfortunate that these people can take advantage of the fishermen down there like this. I hope that the government will take steps to see that it does not happen again. It was unfortunate indeed, Sir, that the gentleman involved happened to be a former Tory candidate in that District of Labrador South.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say at this point that on behalf of those of my constituents who were owed money, lost money through that transaction, that we sincerely appreciate the effort that the government and the honourable the minister put into this.

I might say that right from the very start we did get co-operation from the government. Not the kind of co-operation that we had asked for. Perhaps there were reasons why that salmon could not have been passed over to Labrador Services as we had asked, but nevertheless I think I would be remiss if I did not express my appreciation. The only thing that I would like to say at this point is that this situation is indicative of the kind of thing that has been happening as the honourable the member for Bell Island said, over the past twenty or thirty years along the Labrador Coast. Hopefully the government with their introduction of the Development Corporation will put an end to this kind of thing once and for all providing the Corporation is established along the right kind of structural lines.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, with reference to what the honourable gentleman for Labrador South said, an attempt was made to see if Labrador Services would handle that salmon and smoke it, but it was not possible. Afterwards a good sale was gotten for it. With respect to whether this system can be changed on the Labrador South Coast, I certainly do not recommend to any fishermen that they sell their

March 11, 1975

Tape 322

IB-3

fish on the basis that they are going to be paid if somebody succeeds in getting the sale for it. There are difficult conditions on the Labrador South Coast. Now, there is a meeting being arranged for April 2 in Labrador South to discuss this and other problems to which I will be going and I hope the honourable member for Labrador South and the Canadian Salt Fish Corporation.

This is one of the problems that we are well aware of, the problem of dealing with the salmon fishery in Labrador South. On the

point asked about by the honourable member for Bell Island, of course the only sensible way to distribute this money is to give it to the trustee in bankruptcy, who has the names and addresses and all the particulars of who are owed money by MacKean Fisheries Outfitting Limited and also what accounts those fishermen may owe the company and has all the information, so it is quite obvious that the only way of distributing the money is to give it to him and he is now, or will be mailing out this week interim dividend cheques to the fishermen in question.

As far as whether any unfortunate gentleman who goes bankrupt is Liberal, PC or whatever, there have been all kinds of bankruptcies and your political persuasion does not determine whether you may or may not go bankrupt. You run into unfortunate circumstances, Mr. Speaker.

REPORTS OF STANDING OR SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Social Services.

HON. A. J. MURPHY, MINISTER OF SOCIAL SERVICES: Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in tabling the regulations to "The Child Welfare Amendment Act, 1974." Copies will be distributed.

MR. NEARY: Looks like a heavy document.

MR. MURPHY: Do not judge by that way. It is the brain matter that goes into it.

MR. NEARY: The wrong colours.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Minister of Education.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, I wish to table copies of regulations approved by the Executive Council and these are regulations pursuant to legislation referring to the Department of Education. Actually these are essentially administrative matters pursuant to the execution of legislation passed by the House and they are in the following areas, the regulations referring to the School Board Election Amendment Regulations 1974, the Adult Education Scholarship amendment regulations 1974, the Local School Tax Regulations

1974, the School Board's Allocation of Monies Amendment Regulations
1974, the Schools Act Teachers' Salaries Regulations 1974.

NOTICE OF MOTION:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. H.R.V. EARLE, MINISTER OF FINANCE: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into Committee to consider ways and means of raising the supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

Also I give notice that I will on tomorrow move that the House resolve itself into a Committee to consider supply to be granted to Her Majesty.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

HON. T. DOYLE, MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND RECREATION: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the answer to question number five on the Order Paper of Thursday, March 6, asked by the honourable Member for Bell Island.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the honourable the Premier, Sir, I would like to ask the Premier what his government intends to do about the desperate unemployment situation in this province at the present time, twenty-three-point-four per cent, as of the end of February, 43,000 Newfoundlanders unemployed, a record for this province. What does the government intend to do about this situation?

MR. SPEAKER: The question could be placed on the Order Paper.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, could the honourable Minister of Finance, Sir, care to tell the House because in view of the serious disclosures in the Auditor General's Annual Report concerning Rural Development loans -

MR. CROSBIE: Order, Mr. Speaker, that is an improper question that states an opinion and assumes facts.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The question appears to be that way. I will let the honourable member finish it.

MR. NEARY: Well, Sir, would the Minister of Finance care to inform the House, Sir, if it is his intention to ask the R.C.M.P. fraude squad to investigate loans that have been made improperly under the Rural Development Authority.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! This question is out of order.

MR. NEARY: Batting zero today, Sir. Would the Minister of Tourism, Sir, care to give the House the name of the national advertising company that received advanced payments of over \$20,000 for services that were to be rendered for the months of June, July and August 1974-1975, in the 1974-1975 Estimates, but they were charged against the expenditures for the previous year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, for the second time, and the second answer to the same question - McConnell's Advertising. McConnell's Advertising. There is nothing wrong with the expenditure. There is nothing underhanded, or incorrect, or wrong about it. It is not a precedent. It has been something which has happened repeatedly, repeatedly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, care to comment on a statement that has been made by the head of Shaheen Natural Resources in the last twenty-four hours that his company is ignorant of any agreement to supply jet fuel to Gander?

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

HON. L. BARRY (MINISTER OF MINES AND ENERGY): Mr. Speaker, I think I better have that placed on the Order Paper. I would like to consult the Minister of Industrial Development who is away today on that matter.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the minister aware that his colleague, the Member for Gander has already made a public statement on this matter? Is the minister aware of that?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, how do you answer a question like that? I am aware that my honourable colleague made some statements during his brief career, brief and illustrious career.

MR. NEARY: Were they correct?

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, on this matter, seriously, it was my understanding that the Shaheen group had been involved, and were aware of current developments with respect to ensuring a fuel supply for Gander. This is why I want to consult with the Minister of Industrial Development as he is the person whom I believe was last involved with the discussion.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the simplest say out of it, I think, is for the minister to take the question under advisement, and provide me with the answer tomorrow.

MR. BARRY: Do not tell me what to do Steve.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is time for somebody to tell the minister what to do, Sir.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation care to tell the House if the government have yet taken a decision to build a stadium on the South Shore of Conception Bay?

MR. MOORES: That is notice, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary. Is the minister aware that his colleague already upstaged the Minister of Finance this morning by announcing it, that it is going to be in the budget tomorrow? Is he aware of that?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: No!

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Labrador South.

MR. M. MARTIN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation. Would the minister table before the House the minutes of a meeting convened at the Hoyles Home in December, 1974, which met to decide upon the disbursement of funds which are provided under the federal-provincial agreement concerning native peoples?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

MR. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I do not believe I have the authority to table those minutes. Those are minutes of a joint Federal-Provincial Internal Committee. As I say I do not think - I am pretty sure I do not have the authority to table those minutes.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the Minister of Health, Sir, would inform the House if he has received any requests from the residents of Branch to have a doctor go to Branch one day a week to hold a clinic in that community of Branch?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Health.

DR. A. ROWE (MINISTER OF HEALTH): Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any specific requests from Branch to provide this service. But I can

tell you that we have improved the doctor-patient ratio on that part of the shore considerably from one doctor to four over the last couple of years.

I will look into the question of Branch which - I am not aware of any specific complaint from them or any additional requests. We certainly have increased the number of doctors tremendously down there over the past couple of years.

MR. MURPHY: Four to one in the past two years?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary question to the honourable minister. Would the honourable minister care to inform the House whether or not it is still a part of the agreement with the doctors in cottage hospitals that they have to make home visits?

DR. A. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, this is not a question on which one can give direction. There is nothing which one can do, and no direction one can lay down about doctors doing house calls. It is left to the individual discretion of each doctor as to whether or not he will do the house call. We cannot direct doctors to see patients. There is nothing in the Hippocratic oath which says that they must. A doctor has the right of refusal to see anybody, but in cases where there was only one doctor available, I would think it would be very surprising that that doctor did not meet the commitment. There is no direction anywhere in the world one can give to a doctor to do any specific task of that nature.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Social Services care to give the House a progress report on how the distribution of this free food is going and what happened in St. John's today when the trailer load of food arrived on the parking lot at the Stadium? Would the minister also tell the House, when he is on his feet, if you need a medical certificate to get this food or is it handed out to all people on social assistance?

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Social Services:

HON. A. J. MURPHY (Minister of Social Services): As far as I know the food is being distributed at the stadium parking lot, Mr. Speaker, today. I think there is some form that shows that the people are entitled to this particular food. I think this is the fifth place that it has been done. As far as I know, it is going very well. I do not think there is any consternation or anything else. As I say, members of my department are looking after it. I have not had the time to go down myself and distribute any of it. I have many things to do. Again I have not had any complaints from anybody who received the food, and if there is anybody who has any ideas or knows of people who are entitled to it in some way and would like to go

down and pick up something for them, with the proper recognition, Sir, I would appreciate it if the member would form a committee for people and perhaps we would block the back of his car with these cartons and distribute them. We have had that happen, Sir, in other areas of the province. Volunteers would look after people who perhaps could not attend.

As I say, quite honestly, and we were talking to McCains today in Florenceville, they are quite happy with what we are doing. It has been very orderly. We have received many compliments in the way we have handled the thing, Sir, and I think it is being done better than any other province so far.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker. The minister did not give me a specific answer. Do you have to have a medical certificate to get this food? Can anybody on social assistance go down and get it? Do you need a medical card to get the food?

MR. MURPHY: There is some authorization, but I do not know if it is a medical card.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, this is what I asked the minister, and he gets up and tries to be smart.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER : Order please!

MR. NEARY: I asked the minister if you need a medical card to get this food. Yes or not?

MR. MURPHY: I would suggest, Sir, that if the member wants all the information, he can phone Mr. Pope or Mr. Power. They are down there in their offices now, and will tell the story on it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am not getting a minister's salary.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MURPHY: Your not, but nearly.

MR. NEARY: Sir, a supplementary question. Would the minister tell us if there was a big turn out this morning to get this food down on the stadium parking lot? Was there a big turn out?

MR. MURPHY: I really have not the faintest idea, quite frankly.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker - no, never mind, Sir, I will not waste my time.

MR. MURPHY: That is right. Sit down like a good fellow, you are only bothering everybody.

MR. NEARY: I have a question, Sir, for the Minister of Finance. Would the Minister of Finance care to inform the House if he has received a request from the Newfoundland Co-operative movement for a \$10 million revolving loan fund for that organization?

HON. H.R. V. EARLE (Minister of Finance): Mr. Speaker, no, I have not received such a request.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Premier, fresh back from Corner Brook, seems to be anxious to provide the House with some answers. Perhaps the Premier would care to make a statement on this matter. The National Welfare Council of Canada, Sir, says that nearly half of our children in this province are destitute. Would the Hon. Premier care to indicate to the House -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Would the Hon. Premier -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. CROSBIE: Standing Order 31 (c) deals with these kinds of questions, Mr. Speaker. In putting an oral question, no argument or opinion is to be offered nor any facts, stated except so far as may be necessary to explain the same. Oral questions will not be prefaced by the reading of letters, telegrams, newspaper extracts or preambles of any kind. The honourable gentleman's question is out of order on all these grounds.

MR. SPEAKER: The question asked by the Hon. Member for Bell Island did tend to be out of order in that he was sort of prefacing it by a preamble that was a statement of fact rather than a question.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Hon. Premier care to indicate to the House what his government intend to do about statistics that,

March 11, 1975

Tape no. 325

Page 4 - mw

I presume, are facts, Sir, that were released by the National Welfare Council of Canada recently that nearly half of our children in this province are destitute? What does the government intend to do about this situation?

MR. SPEAKER: That is essentially, with the wording changed, somewhat essentially the same question as the honourable member asked.

MR. NEARY: Yes, would the Premier - I am asking the Premier for an answer. -

PREMIER MOORES: Put it on the Order Paper, Mr. Speaker. It is a question that deserves a debate rather than a reply.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, if the Premier is agreeable and the other members of the House, we are prepared to debate the matter.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Sir, care to tell the House what action has been taken on providing a water and sewerage system for the South Shore of Conception Bay?

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

HON. B. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, the action that we are taking on the Conception Bay South water and sewer system, as with all other systems, is that we are analysing each and every one and determining whether we can fit it within our priorities for the capital budget for 1975.

Suffice it to say now, Mr. Speaker, that this whole question of the water supply in that area relates very definitely to the overall regional water supply, some of the money for which is now coming from DREE.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Tourism, no, would it be Provincial Affairs? Who is responsible for snowmobiles?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The Minister of Transportation.

MR. NEARY: Well, would the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir, care to indicate to the House when we can expect regulations governing the operation of snowmobiles in this Province to be made - the Minister of Tourism?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Tourism.

HON. T.P. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, there has been considerable work done on those regulations and work is continuing on them. I cannot give a definite date, but very, very soon, as quick as we can possibly provide them.

March 11, 1975.

Tape 326

RH - 2

They will be provided in the form of a white paper as indicated by the honourable the Premier. Work is continuing on them as we get comments from various people with regards to various sections or various regulations that we had included in the original or the draft ones that we formulated.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, for the, I think it is the seventh day in a row now, would the Minister of Recreation and Rehabilitation care to tell the House what the Province's commitment is to the summer games?

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: We have an agreement this will be Private Members' Day, so we shall discuss motion (2) as it appears on today's Order Paper.

MR. CROSBIE: Motion (1), Mr. Speaker, The Leader of the Opposition has agreed that we might pass motion (1) first, so that the select committee can start functioning. Then we will go on to motion (2).

MR. SPEAKER: Motion number (1), all those in favour of the motion moved by the honourable Minister of Fisheries to set up the select committee with regards to the inshore fishery. Those in favour "aye", those against "nay", motion carried.

Motion number (2) to be moved by the honourable Member for Bonavista South.

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, this motion was on the Order Paper the last session of the House of Assembly and unfortunately, because of the time taken with other private members' resolutions, this resolution did not get debated. The only change now in the resolution is that we are now, the resolution is now asking that this matter be brought forward at the upcoming Law of the Sea Conference whereas last year we were asking it be brought forward at the upcoming ICNAF meeting which was then to take place in June.

Now, this resolution is to me one of the most important resolutions we are going to discuss in this House of Assembly with connection with the fisheries. I have done some considerable research work into the effect fishing on the Hamilton Banks is having on our inshore fishery. It is not the fishing on the Hamilton Banks being carried out by our country, the Canadian fishermen. It is the fishing that is being carried out

by the foreign nations. I think maybe it is by lucky coincidence that we did not get the resolution debated last year, because if we passed the resolution in the House of Assembly and if we had brought the matter forward to the Federal Government asking them to have this matter brought forward at the ICNAF meeting in June,

March 11, 1975

Tape 327

IB-1

I am afraid we would have been very disappointed. Because in reading the minutes of the meeting of the ICNAF meeting, I have no hesitation in saying that I am ashamed of my own country. I am ashamed to be a Canadian because here we are today in Newfoundland seeing the wipe-out of the economy of the Northeast and East Coast of Newfoundland, an area which depends practically solely on the fisheries. There are no industries along that coast. There is no economic base, the only economic base is the fisheries.

I am ashamed to be a Canadian when I saw what our country, my country, did at the ICNAF meeting in June, 1974. Despite the fact that this government under the then Minister of Fisheries, now the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, presented to the federal government a very strong case as to why the Hamilton Banks should be closed during the spawning season, despite that, despite the strong brief, the strong presentation from the provincial government for the closing of the Hamilton Banks during the months of February, March and April which is the spawning season for the codfish, despite that I am now going to relay what happened at that ICNAF meeting in June.

I sincerely hope that the members in this Assembly will also feel the same as I do, ashamed of either the negotiating power of this country or the way they feel about our fisheries in Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, the meeting was convened in June, the ICNAF meeting. We now know that the federal government is going there with the Newfoundland Government demanding, practically, that something be done to protect the inshore fishery on the Northeast and East Coast of this province. That includes the Labrador Coast where the fisheries are so important.

At that meeting and these are the facts - the facts can be borne out by looking at the minutes of the meeting of the ICNAF meeting in June. Canada went in with this position, went in with one position. Canada went in and instead of going in and saying we want the Hamilton Banks closed because it is destroying our inshore fishery along the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador - No, no, they did not do that - they went in, Mr. Speaker, and asked

that the quota be reduced in that area known as sub-area (2) (j) in the ICNAF zones which includes the Hamilton Banks. They went in and they asked for a reduction of the quota. The quota was in 1973, for example, 550,000 metric tons of codfish. That was the quota, the ICNAF quota.

Canada went into that meeting and the first proposal put forward was instead of asking for the closing of the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season, it put forward a proposal asking for a reduction of that quota for 1975, for this year, this fishing year, and the reduction be 470,000 metric tons, a reduction of 80,000 metric tons among all the nations. That was my country's proposal. That was your country's proposal. Is that the kind of concern we have from our federal government for the fisheries of this province? Is that the way the federal government is showing concern for the fisheries?

To me it is an obvious careless attitude. It is an obvious attitude that they are not concerned about the fisheries in this province. Now, that proposal was put forward by the delegates from Canada. After discussion there was one nation strongly opposed to reducing the quota. That nation, Mr. Speaker, was not the Russians. It was not U.S.S.R., a strong nation at these ICNAF meetings, but it was a smaller nation. In fact, Mr. Speaker, a nation which to me surprisingly had more power at the ICNAF meetings than Canada. It was the country of Portugal. The Portuguese delegates objected strongly to the proposal put forward by Canada.

Surprisingly enough they were successful in overruling Canada's proposal. The proposal to reduce the quotas was ruled out completely. Then after the first proposal was ruled out completely, then Canada changed its mind. It said, Okay, if we cannot get the reduction in quota we asked for because of the Country of Portugal being so opposed to it, we will now put forward a second proposal.

Then along came the second proposal. Then they asked for the closing of the Hamilton Banks.

March 11, 1975

Tape No. 328

NM - 1

But that was their second proposal, not the main one, at the ICNAF meeting in June.

But surprisingly enough in this case, when they asked for the closing of the Hamilton Banks, which was Canada's second position at the ICNAF meeting, not its first, not its prime one but the second one, it came second, then along came the powerful Nation of Russia, the USSR came in with their strong delegation and said, no, no way, we are not going to tolerate the closing of the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season. Of course it is obvious the reason is because that is where the Russians continuously fish extensively during the spawning season, on the Hamilton Inlet Bank:

So after again considerable discussion according to the minutes of the meeting of ICNAF, what did the Country of Canada do? Mr. Speaker, here comes the shameful part. The Country of Canada withdrew the proposal to close the Hamilton Banks, it was after losing the first one presented to reduce the quota, it lost that one and the second one, the Canadian delegation withdrew the proposal because Russia very strongly opposed to it.

The main reason why, according to the minutes, why Canada withdrew the proposal completely was that it felt that if the Hamilton Banks were closed, the Russian argument was that if you are going to divert our fishing activity into two other zones along the east coast of Newfoundland that could damage the inshore fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador. So because of that argument put forward by the Russian delegates, Canada withdrew the proposal to have the Hamilton Banks closed.

So actually Canada came away from the ICNAF meetings in June, in my view, in a very shameful manner. They came away not even having their quotas reduced, number one, and not even getting anywhere for closing the Hamilton Banks.

Now these are the facts for each and every member of this

House of Assembly to look at, because the minutes of that meeting are on record and these are the facts as to what happened at the ICNAF meeting. And I would say, Mr. Speaker, with no hesitation, a shameful display, a shameful display on the part of Canada as a negotiating power, or number two, a shameful, obvious conclusion I have come to, is a shameful neglect on the part of the federal government to show concern for the fisheries in Newfoundland and for the Northeast coast of Newfoundland and Labrador.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the reduction of quotas on the Hamilton Banks, you know, many people are going to say, and I know that there are people in our, maybe even in our government, who will say, well, what is the main argument for closing the Hamilton Banks? What effect is it going to have on the inshore fishery? Here are a few facts, Mr. Speaker. In 1972, there were 400 million pounds of fish, codfish, taken off the Labrador and the East coast of Newfoundland, including the sub-area (j), which is the Hamilton Banks area.

Newfoundland, out of that total, only took one per cent. Newfoundland took 4 million pounds only, in 1972, of cod. The rest of the foreign countries, in order as they caught the fish, of course the top one was Russia. The 400 million pounds caught, total in 1972, in the area including the Hamilton Inlet Banks, the Russians took 200 million pounds, half the total catch in 1972 and next came Portugal and Poland and East Germany.

Suprisingly enough to me at that time, the Spaniards were not fishing there, not any extensive fishing in 1972. It was the Russians, the Portuguese, the Polish and the East Germans.

Now the reduction of quotas. The reason why I mentioned it earlier is that there is some argument as to whether we should close the Hamilton Banks or not. Because scientists and biologists, and others who look at the fish stocks along the coast, they are saying, well, look the fish stocks are not being over-fished. And they are right. We cannot put forward a case to Canada, and we cannot put forth a case at the ICNAF meetings, in this case the Law of the Sea, saying, look the fish stocks are being over-fished, and that is the reason why we should close the Hamilton Banks. No, because the fish stocks per se are not being over-fished. The fish stocks are there in February, March, and April on the Hamilton Banks area.

And whether we should close the Hamilton Banks only because of a social reason - that is the main reason put forward now, the social reason. Because every inshore fishermen around the East Coast, and the Northeast Coast, and along Labrador have known it for years that during the months of February, March, and April the Hamilton Banks is where all the mother cod fish go to spawn. They go there in great schools of fish. They go there because during the egg development period they have not got the fish around - they go there in schools. There is just one big body of fish in the Hamilton Banks, on the spawning area. But every Spring in June, and July, or early Summer these fish come up to the surface, and there is a migration movement every year into the shore - the inshore ground.

But now what is happening is because of the heavy fishing by the Russians, and by the other foreign nations, mainly by the Russians, during the months of March, and in particular February, in come these foreign trawlers, and foreign draggers and sweep up these mother fish who are there spawning on the Hamilton Inlet Bank - sweep them up. But now the stocks are there. They do not over-fish what is there. But they over-fish it enough that all of these mother fish do not get into inshore. They are swept up.

For example, here is a diagram, Mr. Speaker, that shows the fishing on the Hamilton Banks, and the amount of production. This is in 1972. During the month of February, for example, this is

strictly on the Hamilton Inlet Bank, not on the sub-area zone, just on the Bank itself - during the month of February we are talking about 90,000 metric tons, during the month of March we are talking about 40,000, during the month of April we are talking about 25,000. But during the months of May, June, and July there is no catch at all on the Hamilton Banks. None. During the months of August, September the maximum for these two months was up around 11,000 metric tons.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what I am getting at is that during the spawning season that is when the big major catch takes places on the Hamilton Banks. That is when the foreign boats come in and sweep them up. This is what is stopping the migratory movement of the cod fish to the inshore grounds along the Labrador Coast, and the Northeast Coast of this province.

There is nobody in this House of Assembly, or around the Coast of Newfoundland can but look at the fish landings, for example, Mr. Speaker, fish landings whether they be on the Labrador, or in the whole of the province. And fish landings, for example, in 1974, this last year, was a total of 515 million pounds of fish. That was twenty-four per cent down from 1973 when we saw 674 million pounds. In other words a reduction in 1974, twenty-four per cent, the total landings were, below that of the previous year in 1973. For example, for the period up to the end of July 1974, the total catch then, up to that period, and this is by the figures released from the Fishing Service of Canada, that there were 278 million pounds, and up until the end of July 1974 - but for the same period in 1973, it was 424 million pounds. A decrease of 246 million pounds of fish for that period.

Now I am just

March 11, 1975.

Tape 330

RH - 1

using these as examples to show that it is something we already know, that is, fish landings are down. There is no point in going on into statistics and figures and facts that are produced by the Federal Government or the Provincial Government showing that fish landings are down. We all know that.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot help but reminisce on the days when I was growing up on Flat Islands in Bonvista Bay, my father a fisherman, he owned a schooner, my uncle owned a schooner, in fact, I think every man in the Morgan family had a schooner at that time, when I was what they call, I was what they call a bedlamer boy.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Captain Morgan, he is my pirate uncle.

Mr. Speaker, in a serious vein, I cannot help but reminisce on the days when, only in my day, I am only a young man, the days when I would, on Flat Islands, in 1952-53-54, when I was a teenager, and in the fall of the year or September, you go up and look out over the ocean, you see those schooners sailing in, see the sails of those schooners flooping in the wind coming home from the Labrador, the Labrador fishery, a beautiful sight, a sight that only someone like myself maybe can reminisce about with much pleasure on it. Other people who are still out there around Bonavista Bay and around Notre Dame Bay and Green Bay trying to make a living from the ocean, it is not very pleasureable for them to reminisce in these days because now they see themselves in a period of frustration. They feel that there is no more future to the fisheries. They fishery is gone. They got no more bright outlook on life. Everything is dismal for them right now, but these were the days when we talk about schooners, we see schooners coming back from the Labrador, They go down in the early spring and by the latter part of August, first week in September they will be coming back with a full load. Even then, there would be some years when they would go back for the second load to the Labrador.

That has been happening all along the East, Northeast Coast. It was not just in Bonavista Bay. It was all along the East Coast of Newfoundland

when the Labrador fishery was so important to that area of our Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, there is a complete lack of fish. The fishermen who went down there the last two years, three years, five years, I recall the fleet went down there two years ago from Bonavista North. The honourable gentleman from that area can probably talk about the same thing. They went down there and they came back. There was no more fish. They came back with a few hundred pounds and nothing else, nothing. The landsmen went down there on the Ironbounds and these places on the Labrador, nothing. In fact, they talked to one skipper who was down there two years ago and he came back and said he could not even get a meal of fish to eat. There was nothing on the shore.

Now, years ago when the old schooner captains would go there, some years they would find no fish, but it would not happen year after year after year after year, that there was no fish. Some years they would go down and they would come back and they would said, "Look, there is a water haul this year, there is no fish," but they would always find some kind of a reason and the old fellows used to always say if the water was dirty or if the water was cold, exceptionally cold during certain years, there would be no fish, But they would go back the following year and load the schooners. But now what is happening? It is no longer a scientific reason with regards to the temperature of the water or the quality of the water whether it was warm or cold. We all know it is no longer that, Mr. Speaker. We know what it is. We know the resource is gone. The resource is being depleted more and more every year and there is no more inshore fishery along the coast of Labrador and Northeast Coast.

Mr. Speaker, when you look at the point and the fact that sixty per cent of all the fishermen in this Province, all over the Province, that sixty per cent of all fishermen reside in the Northeast Coast of this Province and Labrador, surely we must come to realize how important, how important is this resolution on the fishery and how important the fisheries, the inshore fishery is to our economy, the economy of this Province. Because unless we get the inshore fishery revived, unless we

March 11, 1975.

Tape 330

RH - 3

get the men who can go out on the trap skiff or out on the longliner, the inshore, midshore grounds, we are not going to have an economy along the East Coast anymore. We are going to have a, maybe I should hesitate before I say it, but I would say a disaster area. We

almost saw it last year that there was no fish. I would say two or three years like we had last year and the area will not be able to take it, a complete disaster.

So how can we as politicians in this province, how can we sit here idly as politicians? It really frustrates me to think that we have a government in Ottawa that is not concerned enough to go and demand action. The honourable gentlemen on the other side may also look at us and say, as a government, what are you fellows doing? What are you fellows doing as a government for the fishery? But the main problem today in our fisheries is not whether we got a policy, and we do have a policy in this government on fisheries, it is not that, the main problem is our resource problem and that action can only come from the federal level. It can only come from the nations getting together by some kind of an agreement.

As I spoke in an earlier debate on the Continental Shelf, I do not think we are going to get that agreement but that was maybe being a bit too pessimistic.

Mr. Speaker, my district is a fishing district. My district depends practically entirely on the inshore fishery. I am proud to be the mover of this private member's resolution. I sincerely hope that all members of this Legislature will look at it in a very serious way and speak on it and support it. I hope they will all recognize and realize what it means to districts like Bonavista South and Bonavista North and Fogo and Twillingate, White Bay North and Green Bay and these places, what it means to those areas. What it means to a fisherman right now to realize that, not only realize, but visualize any evening he wanted to by walking to the nearest lookout and looking over the horizon and seeing all those lights like a small city, especially this time of the year, out there fishing, reaping up the fish stocks along our coast. It is the kind of thing that builds up emotion when you come to think of it that it has a right to, because it is affecting so many Newfoundlanders and

the lives of so many Newfoundlanders along our coast.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be too long in this debate, because I am sure other members will want to speak on it, but being a mover of the resolution there is one point I would like to make in connection with the fishery and I listened yesterday very attentively to the honourable gentleman from Burgeo-LaPoile, listened very attentively to what I thought was one of the most sensible, most common sense points made on the fisheries we have heard in the House this year, coming from a backbencher.

I heard him mention that he would like to see the ban, the complete ban, on gill nets. I have talked to him because he is a man who is knowledgeable on the fisheries and I am a man who recognizes that. He earlier said to me there is no point, there is no point in going out and banning fishing during the spawning season on the Hamilton Banks- there is no point in doing it because as long as we got gill nets in Newfoundland along the coast we are not going to have an inshore fishery.

In some respects I am inclined to agree with him. That is the reason why I make this suggestion while speaking in this debate. It is a very sincere, genuine suggestion to the Minister of Fisheries, the honourable Minister of Fisheries to the government; that this year the provincial government, if it has to do it alone without any help from the federal government at all, engage a number of boats, large types, even draggers, engage them, and keep them working all this Summer, or the Spring and Summer, doing nothing else only dragging up the gill nets that have been lost along our coast. East and Northeast coasts, in fact all around our coast of Newfoundland, just dragging up these gill nets. Because what is happening, these gill nets are out there continuously fishing. There is the kind of material in the nets that is not the kind of material that will rot overnight, over a week, over a month, even years. They are continuously fishing. Last year we saw hundreds and hundreds of gill nets lost along

the East Coast and Northeast coast and these gill nets are still out there fishing. They fish, they sink down, the fish rot, the fish nets float up again and they fish and fish continuously.

That is the reason why I think it is a good point that many of the cod stocks are not getting inshore because these gill nets are out there fishing, fishing to no one's benefit. So that suggestion

I sincerely hope it will be taken quite seriously by this government, by the Minister of Fisheries, and hopefully will get some assistance from the federal level of government in doing this, to carry out this programme this summer in having all these gill nets dragged up along the coast, boats going back and forth dragging up these old gill nets, which are not old gill nets but gill nets that have been lost, to prevent any more further fishing to no one's benefit.

Mr. Speaker, in closing the opening part of this debate, the point I would like to make is although our country of Canada did not put forward a very strong case last year, at ICNAF, and although the Law of the Sea Conference is not solely going to be debating the fisheries problem, I sincerely hope that this resolution will be passed unanimously in the House of Assembly, Opposition and Government, and that this resolution be sent to Ottawa prior to the delegation leaving for Geneva, the Law of the Sea Conference, because I am visualizing something which maybe I should not say, but I am visualizing that we are not going to get a 200 mile limit. Again I am being pessimistic, but it has got to be said. I saw what happened at the last Law of the Sea Conference, as outlined in my earlier debate on the Continental Shelf. If we are not going to get a 200 mile limit, at least, we can get a complete ban on fishing on the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season. The Hamilton Banks are included within the 200 mile limit. I think it is approximately 118 miles off the Hamilton Inlet, off Labrador, 115 miles, the Hamilton Banks.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, 110 miles.

MR. MORGAN: Okay, 110 miles. Call me a liar for five miles.

Mr. Speaker, if we cannot get the 200 mile limit, at least, we can make every attempt, and surely if Canada comes back this time from Geneva and says to our little Province of Newfoundland, look boys, I am sorry, we cannot get the 200 mile limit. Look, you fishermen on the Northeast Coast and the East Coast. I am sorry we cannot get the ban for the Hamilton Banks. Here is one politician, and I hope all members of this Legislature, will take the same attitude and say, look, you are sorry for us, well we are sorry for you. We have put up long enough. We want action, and we are

going to get action. No longer are we going to be begging for action. We must get forceful and demand it. We saw what happened in Iceland. I think we will see in a few months what is going to happen in the U.S.A. We are going to demand action, but hopefully with a resolution of this nature, passed by this Legislature and passed unanimously, that the delegates to the upcoming Law of the Sea Conference will put forward a strong case, not based on the scientists data they have gathered or the biologists, because they will say to the delegates, oh no, there is no justifiable reason to close the Hamilton Banks. Oh, no, no, the fish stocks would allow more fishing. You can carry on fishing over and over, more than 500,000 metric tons per year. You can actually increase the quota and, of course, along comes Russia and agrees with that. I am beginning to think that our scientists and our biologists, who are working with the federal government in Ottawa, are Newfoundland's worst enemies, Newfoundland's worst enemies, because they are not looking at the social factors. They are not looking at the social affect on the coast of Newfoundland. They do not take it all into consideration, what it means to a fisherman who could only get a few quintals of fish per year, not enough to keep his family alive on.

They do not take into consideration what it means to all the Northeast Coast where there are no industries, there is no work, there is no employment. That is the main and most important factor that must be taken into consideration. It is the most important factor, the only factor is the social factor. We have to get our inshore fishery back. We have to get it revived. The only way is by demanding action. We have been pleasant with Ottawa long enough, in my view. From here on in, we got to demand action.

Mr. Speaker, I will close the opening part of this debate and will listen to the views of other honourable members in the hope that they will support this motion, and it will be supported unanimously. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I do not see where this motion now is really relevant. Having gone through all of the exercise a few days ago, when we unanimously agreed to that resolution put forward to present to the Law of the Sea Conference, presenting Newfoundland's feeling toward the 200 mile limit and beyond, if we do not get the 200 mile limit, then I doubt very much if we are going to be able to do very much with the Hamilton Banks.

Now we have this resolution so we are going to send two resolutions now. Which one are we putting the emphasis on? Do we want the 200 mile limit or are we going to present this resolution, a motion asking for control over the Hamilton Banks? Now personally, I do not think your motion has gone far enough. What I would like to see on the Hamilton Banks is a closed season, a closed season for an indefinite period.

AN HON. MEMBER: What time of the year?

CAPT. WINSOR: From January to the end of April. That is when we get the concentration of fish on the Hamilton Banks, in January up until the middle of April or the end of April and that, of course, is the spawning period as well. So, we have a great concentration of fish there. We also have a great concentration of draggers and trawlers, draggers especially. Newfoundland, especially, Canada as a whole, we have not been taking our quotas from the Hamilton Banks. Why? Because the Newfoundland trawler owners will not send their vessels up there. The fishing season diminishes after the last of April. Usually the trawlers are forced out by ice, but I would like to - I have asked this question last year on several occasions. I think Fishery Products had an experimental vessel last year on the Hamilton Banks. We never did get very much of a report of how it worked out, whether the vessel was successful during the fishing through the ice?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

CAPT. WINSOR : It did not work? So, you know, what are we going to do? If we are going to take advantage of the Hamilton Banks then surely

we must provide the capability to go up there and fish that bank or otherwise we will always be guilty of not taking our quota. And if we do not take the quota, then how can we argue against the foreigners taking their quota? It is as simple as that.

Mr. Speaker, that is what I would like to see. I speak for this side of the House. I do not know if there are any other members who want to speak, but we certainly have no quarrels with this motion, and we will support it. I would like to see, instead of a spawning period, I would like to see a closed season on that bank, from the middle of January until the end of April for three or four years. This will give the fish time to spawn and grow, because it takes five or six years from the time a fish is spawned until it gets to where it can be of a productive state.

Mr. Speaker, that is the feeling, I believe, of this side of the House. We will certainly support it. Having supported the other resolution how can we do anything less than support this motion? I have had quite a lot of experience, too, along the Labrador Coast, and in the outport of Bonavista North growing up and seeing the activity of the Labrador fisherman. I am sure there is a great number of Newfoundlanders who can recall the glorious days when we had a fleet of Labrador schooners sailing each Spring to Labrador, and returning in the Fall, most times with a very successful voyage. But, Mr. Speaker, it faded out.

It faded out for one thing, because the price of fish went to where it was no longer profitable. It was no longer profitable for a man to outfit in May and go to Labrador and come back with 1,000, 1,200, 1,500 quintals of fish and find that the price per quintal for Labrador fish then was about \$1.80 per quintal. How could they survive? So, it naturally died.

But there is another contributing factor, Mr. Speaker, which must be borne in mind, and that is the temperature of the water. The member mentioned it in moving the motion. The temperature of the water does have a bad effect on the fish coming to land. In 1971 while I was filling the post as Minister of Fisheries for a short period, we undertook to have an experiment carried out along the Labrador Coast. We found that the boat making the survey went up the Labrador Coast and in areas around Cape Aillik and Cape Harrison they found the temperature of the water very cold, actually below freezing.

They pursued on north outside of the Queens Lakes just outside of Nain. There the water was still very cold, the temperature very low, and there were no fish. However, they came back in September and surprisingly enough in September that temperature had risen and fish began to strike the coast. At that time there were very few fishermen fishing. Very few of our Newfoundlanders ever stay along the Labrador Coast later than the last of September -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: August.

CAPT. WINSOR: It is before August too.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: July.

CAPT WINSOR: In July, that is right. Environment plays a very peculiar part with the codfish, Our seals, of interest, Mr. Speaker, the other day, two days ago, I was talking to a federal inspector who had flown out over the area around the Gannets spotting seals. He said - it was yesterday if I remember correctly - You know the seals this year, today, are only pupping. I said, You do not mean that? He said, The seals are only pupping today. This is why the killing date has been extended to March 15 because the seals are too small to take. Last year they were still very small and this

is what led to the further delay this year in taking the seals.

So, something is happening, and I do not know what. The member the other day criticized the federal government for carrying out and spending another great sum of money in exploratory work, scientific work. This is one fault we have in Canada. We do not have enough scientific knowledge of the fishing industry. We have very little compared to what the Russians have. The Russians are top-notch in their scientific field. They know more about the fishery along the North Atlantic than Canadians do, Newfoundlanders more especially. So, I cannot see the justification to criticize the government to carry out more scientific experiment.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

CAPT WINSOR: Well, it may take that long with the equipment that they have. However, Mr. Speaker, I think the motion is - the member is sincere in presenting the motion, and he, like all of us, has a great interest in the inshore fishery, like all of us. We represent inshore districts, inshore fishery districts.

Another phenomenon last year, Mr. Speaker, and the year before, there were very little fish along the Northeast Coast except in one or two areas. The area of Musgrave Harbour had a very successful inshore fishery last year and the year before, although a few miles to the south, a few miles to the north, it was almost a complete failure. How would this happen? What is the reason? So, there are a lot of questions which have got to be answered scientifically. What is the best way to go about controlling the Hamilton Banks? If the Law of the Sea Conference will pass our request and grant the 200 mile along the Continental Margin, I do not think we will have any problem with solving the problems of the Hamilton Banks.

So, I do not see where this motion really is all that important at this particular time, having done what we did last week.

HON. J.C. CROSBIE (MINISTER OF FISHERIES): Mr. Speaker, first I would like to congratulate the honourable gentleman on his motion. It shows, of course, the great interest that the honourable member for Bonavista South has in the fishery and the time and effort he spends

in trying to protect the interests of his constituents, very many of whom are inshore fishermen in the historic District of Bonavista South which I am sure, Mr. Speaker, he will be representing for many, many years to come in this honourable House of Assembly. There is no protection against the vicissitudes of election campaigns. Despite that I think that the honourable gentleman will be back in this House for many years to come.

Now, I do not agree with the honourable gentleman opposite, that this motion is not necessary because last week the House passed a motion putting our position before the Government of Canada urging them to continue to argue at the Law of the Sea Conference that the Law of the Sea Conference should agree on a boundary that goes out to the end of the Continental Margin rather than just the 200 mile zone and so on. As the members know, it was passed last week. These resolutions deal with two different things.

The question of whether fishing vessels are extensively fishing on the grounds known as the Hamilton Banks and whether or not they should be stopped from fishing there during the spawning season is quite irrelevant to the work of the Law of the Sea Conference. They will not be taking any cognizance of this question. It is not their duty to consider such questions as this. They are not being asked to deal with the question of quotas. That is all in the hands of ICNAF, and ICNAF is the International Commission for the Northwest Atlantic Fishery. It is in the hands of ICNAF to decide whether or not this request should be met.

Now, the resolution itself, I think, would need an amendment to be critically correct, that the legislature urge not the federal government to make a strong case, but at the upcoming ICNAF meeting of June, 1975 that a ban be placed. In other words, the words "Law of the Sea Conference" should be deleted and I think the words, "Upcoming June, 1975 meeting of ICNAF" should be substituted because it is ICNAF that will be dealing with this question and not the Law of the Sea Conference. They would not know what you are talking about

in the Law of the Sea Conference if you mentioned spawning. They are not going to deal with the question. It is not on their agenda at all.

Now, the Law of the Sea Conference would only affect it, if Canada did receive the 200 mile limit or jurisdiction out to the Continental Margin and that area would take in the Hamilton Banks. Then Canada itself could decide, presumably, whether or not you will be allowed to fish there during the spawning season. I would not allow the honourable gentleman from Bell Island near it during the spawning season or otherwise because of the great danger there would be of pollution, but that is another question, Mr. Speaker.

Now, what is the position of the Government of Newfoundland on the resolution? I must say there are a lot of fishing resolutions on the Order Paper this year, Mr. Speaker. There is an amazing interest in this honourable House this year on the fishery which, I suppose, one should not be amazed at, but certainly far more than there has ever been in previous years. Of course, we all know the reasons why, because we are now going through a crisis.

Well, what position has the Government of Newfoundland taken on the question that the honourable member for Bonavista South brings forward? Well, as is reported in the report of the Department of Fisheries and as was reported at the time, last year the honourable then Minister of Fisheries, the honourable Harold Collins, our member for Gander, did write the Minister of Fisheries of Canada, who was then the honourable Jack Davis, who is no longer the Minister of Fisheries, but who was a very capable Minister of Fisheries of Canada. He wrote him about

closure of the Hamilton Inlet Bank. I do not know if the letter was ever tabled in the House. But that letter summarizes what the position of the Government of Newfoundland is on this question, and the reasons for it. The letter is dated February 13, 1974. This letter asked the Canadian Government to see that at the ICNAF Conference in June of 1974, to see whether they could get closure of the Hamilton Inlet Bank during the cod spawning period. And they were not successful last year.

The Hon. Minister of Fisheries of Newfoundland's letter says, "as you are well aware the Government of Newfoundland are very concerned about intensive foreign fishing fleet activity in the Northwest Atlantic waters. Sharp declines in catches from this area, and the current, un-healthy economic state of the province's inshore fishery." Now this was a year ago, Mr. Speaker. Our concern about the inshore fishery is not a concern that just developed yesterday, or Monday when we brought in the Resolution on the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery. Our concern did not arise last week. Our concern did not just arise last month, or five months ago, or six months ago. But our concern has been evident since 1972. In this particular instance this was evident in February of 1973 when Mr. Davis was written.

"There is every indication to believe that offshore fishing effort has been a significant factor affecting availability of a cod resource, in particular, in inshore waters. And performance of this sector continues to reflect problems related to resource availability, and resource accessibility."

I have here a study which has not been made public yet, but I guess the figures have been made public. Inshore catches of cod in Labrador, in Division 3 (k), which is on the Northeast Coast and Labrador, and Division 3 (l) East Coast declined by sixty to seventy per cent between 1969 and 1974. So that the inshore catches of cod in Labrador, and along the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland have declined sixty to seventy per cent in the last five years. The catches along the South Coast fluctuated during that period but were low in 1974 - for several reasons. Catches on the West Coast declined by

fifty-four per cent between 1969 and 1974, although they were lowest in 1972. So there is not any question, Mr. Speaker, about the inshore catches of cod having declined tremendously in this province, and the figures I just gave you illustrate that.

Total ground fish catches declined from 169,000 tons in 1959 to 77,000 tons in 1974. But most of the decline occurred in Labrador Divisions 3 (k), and 3(1). That again is Labrador and the Northeast Coast.

Some of the decline of 1973 and 1974, in total ground fish as well as the individual species can be attributed to the very severe ice conditions in these years preventing inshore fishermen along the East Coast from commencing fishing as early as before. Some of the problem last year was due to ice. But that is not the reason for the problem.

Now there is one other - in addition to the decline in the catch, Mr. Speaker, well then you have to ask, what is causing the decline in the catch despite the vastly increased fishing effort? What is causing it? Well we all know in Newfoundland what is causing it. And the studies, of course, support the fact. This study that I am looking at now but cannot name because as yet it has not been made public says this, "Practically all the inshore stocks that supply these plants" they are talking about inshore plants "are subject to offshore fishing pressures by Canadian and foreign vessels. Over a time this has tended to reduce the seasonal migrations of these fish into inshore waters, and has resulted in a more severe decline in raw material supplies than has been experienced by offshore plants. This contributes to all the other weaknesses in connection with the inshore plants."

So, Mr. Speaker, the whole and the major cause of the present problems in the Newfoundland fishing industry are first due to the decline in the resource, and in the catch. That is true of the offshore fishing industry as well as the inshore. But in connection with the inshore fishing industry it is equally clear that the inshore fishery itself, the inshore fishing effort has not caused a decline

in the resource. It is the offshore effort that has caused that decline. It is equally sure that the difficulties in the inshore fishery are because of offshore fishing pressures by Canadian and foreign vessels. This has reduced the seasonal migration of these fish into inshore waters.

So all of these points are crystal-clear, and agreed by the authorities, or anyone who knows anything about the situation.

Now to go on with the letter that the Member for Gander wrote a year ago last month. "Of growing concern to my government is the extent to which foreign fishing activity on the Hamilton Inlet Bank is contributing to an alarming reductions in inshore landings by fishermen along the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland, and the Coast of Labrador. Since the codfishery constitutes the economic backbone of these areas it is proposed that strong steps be taken to reduce foreign fishing pressure which is directed toward the Hamilton Inlet Bank cod stock.

"The indigenous cod stock of ICNAF Divisions 2(j) , 3(k), and 3(l) is referred to as the Labrador East Newfoundland stock. And scientific evidence indicates that large numbers of cod concentrate on the Hamilton Inlet Bank, the major spawning ground of this stock during the February to April spawning period. It is during this period that the resource is exposed to very intense foreign fishing effort. It is the foreign fishing effort - Canada has taken practically nothing there - With greater than eighty per cent of the total annual catch of approximately 300,000 to 600,000 metric tons being taken during this period of heavy resources concentration."

So the figures show, Mr. Speaker, that eighty per cent of all the fish taken on the Hamilton Inlet Bank is taken between February and March when the fish have congregated for purposes of spawning. That is when they get this fish, eighty per cent of what they catch. And the catch is not being taken by Canadian vessels. (Talking about fish, could I have a glass of water please. Thank you.)

The letter went on to say, "The major characteristic of this stock, and of direct significance to the Newfoundland inshore fishery is the shoreward feeding migration in the early Summer, and an offshore movement in late Summer, and Fall."

"Tagging has shown - that is the Templeman Study - that the Hamilton Inlet Bank cod stock after spending the winter in deep water offshore rise near the surface and move shoreward in late June, and early July, and form the basis for the highly seasonal fishery of Coastal Labrador, and Northeastern Newfoundland." Now this is where the Newfoundland and Labrador Fishery originates from, from this stock. They get fed up staying offshore, and they rise to the surface and come in feeding.

"Foreign fleet activity therefore affects the inshore fisheries by reducing both quantities and sizes of cod available." It is not just the great quantity they are taking, Mr. Speaker, but it is the fact that the larger cod is getting scarcer and scarcer. I believe the honourable gentleman for Burgeo-LaPoile, who is not here this afternoon and who spoke most eloquently yesterday, referred to the size of the fish they used to get. How many fish can make up, I think it was a quintal, in the days when he was pursuing the fishing industry? "It reduces both the quantities and the size of the cod available."

I believe the closure of the Hamilton Inlet Bank to all fishing operations during the identified spawning period will help reverse downward trends of inshore cod landings. That is the position the honourable gentleman for Bonavista South puts forward, and which we agree with. That if -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No, not that I know of.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: No reply.

But if we are going to reverse the downward trend in inshore cod landings along the Coast of Labrador, and Northeast Newfoundland then you have to stop fishing during the spawning season on the Hamilton Inlet Bank. And if we are going to have an inshore fishery, and as far

March 11, 1975

Tape 334 (Afternoon)

PK - 5

as the government are concerned we see no alternative of the fact that we must have an inshore fishery, particularly along the Northeast Coast, and Coastal Labrador, this will need to be done.

The letter goes on to say "Although the stock has been exposed to fishing operations for many years the Hamilton Inlet Bank Fishery has intensified since 1959 when European trawlers commenced a Winter-Spring offshore fishery in the area." Now the the foreign trawlers, Mr. Speaker, were not fishing the Hamilton Inlet Bank until 1959. That is when it started.

Now what action the Government of Newfoundland took in 1959 to 1972 I am unaware of. As far as I knew they took no action.

MR. NEARY: You were in one of these governments.

MR. CROSBIE: It was another example, Mr. Speaker, of that legendary regime's lack of concern for the fishery. Now I know we are not supposed to discuss the virtues or the vices of the Smallwood Administration or what I now prefer to call the Neary-Roberts Administration. We are not supposed to discuss their virtues or their failings. Well I do not see how I can debate the fishery and not point out to the House, Mr. Speaker, that from 1959 to 1972 these things occurred. The Newfoundland and Labrador catch went down tremendously. The foreign trawlers and draggers went onto the Hamilton Inlet Bank and they grabbed the fish when they were spawning and they grabbed them when they were not spawning. They fished during the spawning season. They took hundreds of thousands of tons of fish without, as far as I know, a squeak or a peep or a mutter or a murmur or a sound from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, not a word, not a sound. Because that government was not interested, Mr. Speaker, in the fishery as is evident by their whole twenty-three year regime.

MR. NEARY: Where were you -

MR. CROSBIE: And the hundreds of millions they poured into oil refineries and glove factories and chocky factories and boot and shoe factories.

MR. NEARY: Where were you at?

MR. CROSBIE: I, Sir, I was here in Newfoundland part of the time and out of Newfoundland part of the time.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

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

MR. CROSBIE: But the honourable gentleman for Bell Island who now is

March 11, 1975

Tape No. 335

NM - 2

so concerned about the fishery, and we see his mournful face expounding on the fishery day after day, was in that government from 1969 to 1972 and did not care a hoot about the fishery nor does he now care a hoot about the fishery.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. MORGAN: Come on boy, keep quiet.

MR. CROSBIE: Now, stop interrupting my learned discourse.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, you know when they are speaking, when honourable gentlemen opposite are speaking and they are interrupted, they have a pitious little plea, they say to you, "Mr. Speaker, we are entitled to be heard in silence." I make my pitious little plea, Mr. Speaker, I am entitled to speak in silence.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. CROSBIE: Now where was I? Oh yes, I was pointing out that from 1959 to 1972 not a word, not a word was said by the Government of Newfoundland to the Government of Ottawa about this situation. Well, I do not want the press to note that. I do not want to be quoted saying - that is bad form these days, it is bad technique, it is bad morally, it is bad politically, it is jejune, it is intollerable, it is absolutely nauseating to have anybody in Newfoundland say a bad word against that old administration of 1972. But, however, I am going against the trend, I am swimming against the tide. I did not like it in 1972. I do not like it now. And I still think it had a lot of faults and this was one of them.

Now to go on then, Mr. Speaker, Canadian effort, largely Newfoundland, which has always been concentrated over inshore Labrador grounds, declined over the 1938-58 period, mainly because of depressed market conditions for salt cod and has remained relatively stable since then. However boyant market conditions, salt cod price increases and technological developments within the catching sector are contributing to increased Newfoundland inerests in the Labrador inshore

fishery in particular."

So from 1938 to 1958 the inshore catch in Newfoundland was declining, partly because of the market for salt fish and the price of salt fish and so on. But then it started to come back again.

"Indicative of the Hamilton Inlet Bank contribution to overall ICNAF landings is the fact that intense foreign fishing activity has resulted in cod landings from Labrador waters, and that is the ICNAF zone now, increasing from four per cent of total ICNAF landings over the 1955-1958 period, to fifteen per cent in 1959-1961 and eighteen per cent over 1961-1964."

In other words, if you take all of the ICNAF areas in 1955-1958, four per cent of the total ICNAF landings came from the Labrador, northeast coast section, 3 (j) and 3 (k).

But then by 1959-1961 it is up to fifteen per cent of all the fish taken in the ICNAF area and from 1961-1964 it is up to eighteen per cent. In contrast, Newfoundland inshore landings in the same area declined from one hundred per cent of the total catch in 1950, we used to take one hundred per cent, because it was only an inshore fishery. It was one hundred per cent in 1950, thirty-two per cent of the catch 1958-1958, and only nine per cent of the catch in 1961-1964.

The letter goes on, Mr. Speaker, "largely because of high fishing costs related to such factors as adverse weather and ice conditions," some honourable gentlemen opposite mentioned that there are not any Canadian trawlers fishing there, that is true. Why not? Because it is very, very expensive, Mr. Speaker. It is a high cost area for us to fish in. "Largely because of high fishing costs related to such factors as adverse weather and ice conditions, Canadian offshore fishing effort in northern waters will not increase by any significant degree in the near future."

Consequently Canada's share of a lot of quotas will continue to be taken by the inshore and middle distance catching sectors which are

dependent on the shoreward movement of the Hamilton Inlet Bank cod stock.

Now there is not a Newfoundland trawler that fishes on the Hamilton Banks during this period. I believe that National Sea today have, I am not sure whether it is one or two trawlers which are currently fishing there, especially built for that purpose and which have just come back I think with pretty good catches - but there is not a Newfoundland trawler - and they would be the first Canadian trawlers.

One reason, Mr. Speaker, is the distance away, the longer time you would be away from port. The danger of ice, you have to have ice strengthened vessels and other higher costs that make the area unattractive to Canadian trawler and fish companies.

The cost do not bother the foreign fishing fleets because they are fishing not to re-export to some other country but mostly for their own consumption and because no matter what the higher costs are, they are cheaper than the cost of meat or other competing protein in those countries.

Well, my predecessor's letter went on, "Total reduction of offshore fishing effort during the spawning period would result in larger numbers of cod moving shoreward during the summer months. At other times of the year the stock is widely dispersed and is not as susceptible to concentrated fishing activity. As a result of closure for example, the inshore fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador would not be characterized by fluctuations and landings to the same degree as is now the case."

The Province of Newfoundland's position advocating closure of the Hamilton Inlet Bank during the cod spawning season is based on, now I would like to make this point, is based on social rather than biological factors. The minister said, "I realize that biologically there is no sound justification for closure of the bay since the overall stock per se may not have been exposed to over

fishing."

In other words, Mr. Speaker, the biologists say that this stock of fish is not being over fished. The scientists and the biologists are not worried. They are setting higher total sustainable yield or allowable catches from this area than are now being caught.

They say that the present fishing effort is not endangering this species of fish. So that there is no biological reason, no biological reason. The Member for Bonavista North I see is looking with great interest and I know he has a keen interest in biology. There is no biological reason for this closure. So we say it is based on social rather than biological factors.

The minister said, "I realize that biologically there is no sound justification for closure of the Bank since the overall stock per se may not have been exposed to over fishing. Social factors, however, give rise to a strong case for the position set forth. The socio-economic fabric of coastal Labrador and Northeastern Newfoundland is dependent on the shoreward movement of cod and the current unhealthy economic picture of the inshore fishery can be largely attributed to the effects of foreign fishing on cod migration patterns."

So we say that there are social reasons why the fishery should be closed in the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season, those reasons being that we have an inshore population from coastal Newfoundland and Labrador which for 400 years fished these stocks of fish and which as a result of this effort of the last fourteen or fifteen years, are now getting smaller and smaller and smaller size fish as a result, and that ICNAF should therefore see that those inshore fishermen are protected and their social requirements met.

In other words, if we cannot have any kind of an inshore fishery on the Northeast Coast or coastal Labrador, there will be no economic basis to sustain a society there at all,

and anyone who wants to live there will have to live there on relief or go away to work and come back and receive unemployment insurance during the winter. There is only one real alternative, only one real economic effort, that they can participate in while they live in the very attractive environment in which they now reside, in their own homes for the most part, and the rest of it.

Now, I am not saying that Labrador South has got tremendous highways or roads or water and sewer systems and all these modern amenities, but it has a lot of other factors which offset that as does the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and these things will eventually be overcome. But, in any event, most people who live there can own their own home and they live in a healthy environment and they do get basic services of one kind or another and the alternatives to their present occupation, there are no alternatives to their present occupation for most of them. So, for social reasons, if not biological, fishing on the Hamilton Inlet Banks should be closed during the spawning season.

Then the letter went on to say, "The latest statistics show that approximately sixty per cent of all inshore Newfoundland fishermen reside along the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador." So sixty per cent of all our inshore fishermen are on that Coast. "In view of the fact the fishermen tend to be the least mobile and furthermore, because of extremely limited economic opportunities within the region, we urge that your government carefully examine all aspects of the Hamilton Inlet Bank Fishery. It is our contention that Ottawa should have a strong position placed on the agenda of the upcoming June, 1974, ICNAF meeting advocating closure of the Hamilton Inlet Banks during the identified cod spawning period on these grounds as a necessary first step to insure protection of an important sector of the Newfoundland fishing industry."

Well, that was last year. We had to repeat the same request this year. If this honourable House passes the honourable gentleman's resolution, and the honourable the Speaker or the Clerk of the House cannot

prepare it in proper form, we can send it to Mr. MacEachen or we can send it to Mr. LeBlanc, we can send it to the delegation that goes to ICNAF and whatever weight that will have, and I hope it would have some weight, to help strengthen the position they took last year which was not accepted then.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: It would be, sixty per cent would be \$10,000 to \$12,000, I guess. I mean a lot of those now are part time.

Well, the letter went on Mr. Speaker, to say, "The logical second step for both governments would be to place a very high priority on the redevelopment of the overall capabilities of the inshore, near offshore sector to such a degree as to insure that not only the cod but also other resources are harvested, and the fish, in an economic manner. Surely, there must be wealth of technical expertise available either in Canada or elsewhere to insure that this objective can be achieved in a relatively short period of time. We look forward to any further discussion which might take place in this matter."

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that there was any reply to that nor do I think there was any discussion. But that is the position that the Province has taken which certainly corresponds with the position that the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South is putting forward. Now, there was an ICNAF meeting in June, 1974 and as the honourable gentleman for Bonavista South has mentioned, the Canadian delegation did put forward, did put forward- first they put forward a position that the total allowable catch should be reduced, the TAC as they call it, from 550,000 metric tons to 470,000, below the maximum sustainable yield, and an argument developed on that. They did refer to the difficult situation of our inshore fishermen and as the honourable gentleman from Bonavista South said, the Portuguese delegate argued against it and a Spanish delegate and they said that a lot of the problems of our inshore fishermen is due to inefficient fishing which could be best improved by changing the technology of fishing. Other delegates were sympathetic with our arguments and so the discussion proceeded. Then the Canadian delegate did suggest that the spawning grounds

March 11, 1975.

Tape 336

RH - 3

be closed during the months of February, March and April as his second choice, but after a discussion, and when the experts gave their advice, they concluded that closing the Hamilton Inlet Bank during the spawning season would probably result in diversion of fishing effort to divisions 3K and 3L, whatever this means. Since this could have an adverse effect, I think what they meant was that they would just move down and fish more in two other areas that would also effect the inshore fishery of Newfoundland so that there would not be any net gain, and eventually a total allowable catch of 550,000 metric tons was established for that area.

So, the position was put forward last year, but must be put forward again this year. Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not claim to be any expert on this area -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Hear! Hear! Those are the truest words you have said -

MR. CROSBIE: Yes, right, but luckily, of course, in our system of government, a Cabinet minister does not have to be an expert. If a Cabinet minister had to be an expert, you would have to have a highways engineer for a Minister of Highways, you would have to have -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: That is what I say. Ministers are not supposed to be experts. We have our experts to advise us. I am not an expert in the fishery although in my younger days I did participate in the fishery, the herring fishery, the whaling fishery.

MR. NEARY: You know all about it.

MR. CROSBIE: I fished in Williams Port and I fished in the Bay of Islands, Bay St. Paul, -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Keep quiet over there, boy, be serious.

MR. CROSBIE: So, I have some experience, I have -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: That is right. I have some experience in the fishery years ago, but I do not claim to be any expert. We have our experts to advise us.

Now, we know that in this situation the scientific experts are not,

you know, are going to advise against the position we are suggesting and we do not suggest that we are putting our position on biological grounds. We suggest that we are putting it on social grounds and we can all see what the results of being at the fishing activity for the last fifteen years. I mean, if we are going to make a conscience decision that there has to be an inshore fishery preserved in this Province, if the Government of Canada agrees with that position, - and sometimes you have doubts whether they do or they do not, I do not mean officially but there are experts and officials - some parts of our inshore fishery can stand on their own feet economically and some parts cannot. In the new things that are going to happen in the fishery in the next few months, there will have to be a conscience decision made as to what we do with the parts of our inshore fishery that can no longer survive on an economic basis alone. If we decide, as I would think in most cases we will, that certain plants and certain fisheries have to be continued even though they can never break even and even though there will always have to be a public input or subsidy to keep them operating, that they have to operate for social reasons to provide employment in those locations to give people a chance to make the kind of living that can be made there and not just to give no alternative but social assistance, if that is going to be the case, then Canada should support our view that to help protect the inshore fishery in these areas the Hamilton Banks should be closed.

Now, if Canada gets control, is successful at the Law of the Sea Conference or the Conference that follows that - and I was reading, Mr. Speaker, just lunch time, the speech made by Mr. MacEachern, the Minister of External Affairs, about three weeks ago, about the Law of the Sea Conference, and nothing I have seen so far indicates to me that we can expect that the Conference to be held from March 17 to May 10 is going to conclude this matter. Mr. MacEachern's speech indicated that he did not think that this is all going to be settled at Geneva by May 10 but that will probably have to be a conference to follow that if there is agreement.

March 11, 1975.

Tape 336

RH - 5

However, if there is agreement and Canada gets the limit to the Continental Margin or two hundred miles, or if Canada declares it unilaterally as Canada must do, as Canada will have to do if we are not successful in having international agreement at the Law of the Sea Conference, then Canada itself can decide whether the Hamilton Inlet Bank should be closed to draggers and trawlers during February, March and April of the year.

Now, as I mentioned, I am not an expert myself, but I am sure most honourable gentlemen of this House know Captain Max Burry, Glovertown, a distinguished

citizen of that area and a man who has fished on the Labrador for many, many years. He used to be a good Liberal, but now he is a good Tory, I would say. He is a good Tory like most Liberals are now.

MR. NEARY: Do not fool yourself.

MR. CROSBIE: I any event -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: I do not care whether he is or not.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: I could not care less whether Captain Burry was a Tory, a Liberal, N.D.P., New Labrador, I do not care. He is just a delightful gentleman who has made a success of his life here in Newfoundland, who has gone and fished on the Labrador many, many years. He plays a great part in community life here in Newfoundland, and is a man who knows a lot about the fishery. He is one of those who say that unless the Hamilton Inlet Bank is closed to foreign trawlers and our own trawlers during the spawning season, there will never be again a successful Labrador fishery. So I mean the views of men like that, who have had a lot of practical experience, cannot and should not be ignored. It is the least of my concern, Mr. Speaker, you know, this foolishness about somebody is a Liberal or he is a Tory. Honourable gentlemen opposite, when they get on the radio, I hear them on the radio and on the television, and the Hon. Leader of the Opposition is like he is holding his nose and he says, the Tory Government did this or the Tory Government did not do that, thinking that this has got some affect on the electorate, that the electorate care if your are a Tory or whether they call you P.C. or what. We call this crowd Liberals. We do not care whether the public likes the word Liberal. We do not go around trying to make some word, Lories or Dories or dumb-dos or any number of names we could call them. But, the Tories do this, and the Tories government did that, and everybody watching the set is supposed to shiver and shake and think to themselves, Tory times are hard times. This is supposed to be the theory. What childishness.

We do not care on this side of the House whether somebody is a Liberal or he is a Tory or he is N.D.P. or what else. He is a good Newfoundlander and he makes his contribution, and what difference what he is. But the honourable gentleman's childish and pernicious thinking is illustrated by his interjecting on what politics Captain Max Burry has. Now how did I get off on that?

Stock characteristics, I guess it was the characteristics of the stock opposite that just got to me. Now, Mr. Speaker, what else can we say on this subject? Yield curves indicate that the maximum sustainable yield of the Labrador-East Newfoundland stock is estimated to approximate 600,000 metric tons. So, that is what you could take a year out there according to the scientists.

It is anticipated that the U.S.S.R. and Eastern European nations are going to intensify their fishing effort, Mr. Speaker, on the Hamilton Inlet Bank cod stock, which is another reason why action should be taken now to prevent that possibility. They are planning to devote more and more effort to fishing that stock.

In recent years, particularly 1973 and 1974 because of ice, the catch in that whole ICNAF zone has not exceeded the estimated maximum sustainable yield. The catch of all nations in 1972 - it sounds like a lot of fish to me, Mr. Speaker - the catch in that area, the Hamilton Banks was 420,000 tons. Right? Does that agree with your figures?

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: 420,000 tons in 1972 or 200,000 tons less than they would have been permitted to take by ICNAF. Landings were approximately the same in 1973. They were expected to rise in 1974, but I think the ice pressure prevented that.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, this is a chart which shows you the monthly catch in the particular area that includes the Hamilton Inlet Bank. In January the catch just goes - this is the catch for 1970, but it illustrates what happens every year. The catch in January is fairly reasonable. The catch in February is gigantic. The spawning season starts and they concentrate. The catch in March is quite considerable. In April it is quite considerable and the rest of the year there is very little catch.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How much time does the minister have left?

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, I have unlimited time.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: No, Mr. Speaker, he does not have unlimited time.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the honourable minister has forty-five minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair is well aware of the length of time which the honourable minister has to speak, and I inform him that he has five minutes left.

MR. CROSBIE: Is the honourable gentleman not interested in listening.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Unanimous consent. You can continue.

MR. CROSBIE: Oh, unanimous consent, and I can continue. Well, I only have five minutes left.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is a whole lot more can be said on this issue, but we have a plethora, a veritable platoon of speakers on this side who want to address themselves to this resolution and to support it and to give it their support. Every member of this House should support it for he that doth not support it must be taken as being against it. I am sure the honourable gentleman from Twillingate and the honourable gentleman for Bonavista North and the honourable gentleman for Labrador South certainly want to be on the record as supporting this move, which is a move to help protect the concerns of the inshore fishermen. So, I am sure that all will put themselves on the record in connection with this subject.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Question.

MR. CROSBIE: Never mind the question. There are other resolutions on the Order Paper but we have got all winter to debate them. We have got - what is this? March? - we have got April, May, June, July. We are willing to go all year. When the House of Assembly is closed, Mr. Speaker, by the way, you hear honourable gentlemen opposite on the radio and they are screeching and howling, the House should be open.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

The minister must address himself to the resolution.

MR. CROSBIE: We have a very strict Speaker. All right, Mr. Speaker. I will forget the honourable gentlemen opposite and some of the queer little things they do and come back then to the inshore fishery.

I think it is another - whether the scientists are right or not and whether there can be more fish taken in this area offshore, one fact remains, this; that the Canadian Fishing Industry is not anxious to spend tens of millions of dollars in developing trawlers that will fish out on the Hamilton Banks during those months of the year. It is very expensive. If Canada ever comes to control the area as it must, then obviously the Canadian vessels should fish in the areas that are most economic for Canada and let the foreigners fish in the uneconomic areas. Why should we go out in the ice laden areas and fish there if we control it? We can say to the Russians and the rest that they fish there while we fish in the areas where you can get greater catches at less cost. I mean, if Canada controls the resource surely that is the kind of thing you would do, or that we should do.

Now, we must remember this, Mr. Speaker, that if Canada does not by the end of 1975 have full control over what happens in the 200 mile area limit or out to the Continental Margin, we are demanding that Canada take unilateral action. So, by the end of 1975 there will not be any excuse that ICNAF did not agree to closing the Hamilton Banks during the spawning period. Canada itself must be responsible by the end of 1975 for this whole situation. The Government of Canada,

which has a constitutional authority will itself have to say whether or not it will close the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season. I intend myself, Mr. Speaker, to go to the ICNAF meeting which I think is going to be held in Edinburgh this year in June. The Newfoundland Government should be represented there. I do think we have been represented by the minister in recent years. One of our officials usually goes, the Assistant Deputy Minister, but this year I certainly intend to go myself to see what it is all about and to lend my voice, if I can, to try to see that our position -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Edinburgh. I would sooner that it was somewhere more exotic. Newfoundland must be represented. It may be that the author of the resolution here today, perhaps we can arrange for him to attend that meeting too. I will certainly ask the people who organize it. There is no reason why one of our members should not come. The member who is interested enough to introduce this resolution, to my mind should obviously be the man who can come and have a look at how ICNAF perform.

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: Not a one way ticket. So, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The minister has thirty seconds left.

MR. CROSBIE: In ending these few words then, Mr. Speaker, I certainly support the resolution. My predecessor, the Minister of Fisheries, certainly believes in it. This government has taken action. I think it will help us if the House of Assembly unanimously approves the resolution with the slight amendment that I have suggested. That being the case, then if the member for Bonavista South and I do go to Edinburgh, we can see that our resolution, this House, inspires the proper measure of awe, respect and fear among the fishing countries of the world that it should because if they do not give it proper respect, at least we can strongly express our views to them in the moments that they are not in official session.

March 11, 1975

Tape 339

IB-1

MR. EVANS: Mr. Speaker, it is not usual for me to get up to speak in this House two days in a row, but I feel that with my experience of what has happened in the past to our fishery through lack of conservation, I should add a few words in support of my colleague from Bonavista South who has introduced this resolution presently before the House.

Now, I can go back to what I learned from my Granddaddy who was one of the great fishermen of Fortune Bay before I was born. Fortune Bay was full of herring. You could almost walk across the bay on them. The American residents used to come down from Gloucester at that time every winter by the hundreds. They used to freeze herring. You know what winters are like in Newfoundland, Probably you had almost a full load of herring frozen. The next thing you get two or three mild days. They were all dumped overboard. Every vessel that came down out of 300 or 400 vessels probably caught two or three loads before they finally secured one that was fit to take back to the United States.

It happened. People never dreamt it. It was going on year after year, that same operation. Finally, all of the sudden, the herring were gone. There was not one left in the bay. They came back in the course of time. The next vanishment, we will say, of the herring took place in my day, back in the 1930's. The minister's ancestors, I suppose, the Crosbie Company, built a reduction plant in Bay of Islands. Now, up to that time the only way that bar seines were used was to catch herring to bait the banking vessels of Fortune Bay and also from Nova Scotia. I spent two springs myself seining herring and they were so thick at that time we had a one hundred and fifty fathom seine on the round, twenty fathom deep and we could tie on to the same pegs, go out in our seine skiff and we had our seine full of herring. The same spot every year. But within a year or so after the advent of the reduction plant in Bay of Islands the seines were kept out later in the spring. After about two years, we went for about twenty in Fortune Bay -

you could not get a herring to eat. There was not a meal in the Bay.

Now, probably - I am not suggesting that they were gone everywhere. They could not have been. There must have been stocks somewhere in our waters. At that time there were no purse seiners down here. They either came in to the land or else you did not get them. Purse seiners as they came into our province from British Columbia back in the mid sixties - the first reduction plant that I know of being herring was in Harbour Breton by B.C. Packers - Now, these purse seiners were considered to be something new down here. They were not. My uncles kept some seiners back in Gloucester back around the 1920's, probably a bit earlier than that. They were not new up there.

Now, I am dwelling on one type of fish here in particular because everyone, as I point out, can see the results of overfishing in this direction, herring. When the boats came in from British Columbia, they were putting up herring for reduction only for years. They got them for nothing, too. They paid our fishermen nothing compared to what they were paid back in British Columbia. As far as I can gather, they were paying fishermen back in British Columbia upwards of \$100 per ton and they came down here and got them for \$17.

If they only wanted probably fifteen or twenty tons to complete a load, they hauled the seine full. They dumped them. They polluted the water and destroyed the herring at the same time. This is one incident

March 11, 1975.

Tape 340

RH - 1

where nature took care of its own. Our herring stocks would have been completely annihilated if we had not had four hard winters in a row. The herring went up under the ice in the bays where they were seining them previous to that every other winter when it was mild and the stocks have been preserved. Today, I would say that our herring stocks are pretty near on a par with what they were fifty or twenty years ago.

Now, I can go back a long way myself in the fishery. I fished on St. Pierre Bank in the dory schooners and if anybody thinks that was an enviable trade, they will never get the chance to try it anymore because nobody would ever foolish enough to do it, of course, anymore. It was something that you would rather not talk about. But, at that time on St. Pierre Bank, especially in the Fall, we got what we called the jumbo haddock, the big ones. There were thousands of them there. The next thing, the draggers started and within a matter of two or three years there were no more jumbo haddock. Then they started to get into small ones, ping pong they called them. I know one skipper, one of our great skippers from Burgeo, Captain Jim Greene - he got a son today who is a credit to us, a skipper of the R.C.M.P. patrol boat there in the area and he fished draggers, skippered them himself, as well, before he went into the R.C.M.P.- but his father was one of the most conscientious men I ever met and for years they would not take these ping pong haddock in the plants and they were just taking the big ones, you haul up a net full and you picked out what was big enough. You dumped the rest overboard. They were dead, of course, pressed to death in the net and it drove that skipper, Jim Greene mental. The man went off his head as a result of it to see what he was doing. He knew what it was going to do to future generations of Newfoundlanders.

Today about every brand of fish in Newfoundland waters has been exploited to the same extent. The redfish -we would not have had any problems with redfish only they got too greedy. Redfish through another form of protection by nature at certain times are on the bottom and then at other times they rise from the bottom under the conventional type of

dragging nets, the otter trawl we call it. When they are off bottom they could not be caught in a dragger net. I know years ago when our Burin draggers were landing at our plant in Isle aux Morts they would go in the Gulf, usually in three or four days they would come out with a load. They were not big draggers. They carried about 150,000, 160,000 pounds but there was the odd ship that would come in probably after a week's fishing, 60,000 or 70,000. What happened boys, bad weather this time, I suppose. No. Weather was good but the fish were afloat.

Now then, somebody came up with the bright or satanic idea, whichever you wish to call it, and invented the mid-water trawl which has its own depth sounder on the trawl and is gauged for whatever depth of water the fish is in. That sounder picks up the fish, the same as on a fish finder that you have in a pilot house on the conventional dragger, and whatever depth the fish were swimming they could catch them day or night. It played havoc with our redfish, not only in depleting the stock but filling the cold storages both here and on the mainland with products that were too great for the demand.

That has happened, as I say, to - I could go into detail as far as flounder and other types are concerned. Halibut are not affected so much by the ordinary types of fishing. They are not affected at all by the mid-water trawl because a halibut is a bottom fish, a ground fish. But, the cod, the life line of our Province, is the one that I am most concerned with and the one that we are most concerned with when we are making any talk at all concerning the Hamilton Banks.

Now yesterday I dwelt mainly on the fishery, and my experience in it, past and present, and I stated there and then that the gill net is the enemy of all of our fishermen. Of course, as I pointed out yesterday, it cannot be eliminated overnight. I tried hard for a good many years to drive that point home, both to federal and provincial fisheries, and I have had some success, marked success, I would say, within the last year or two. We still have to go farther by other methods as I indicated yesterday.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. EVANS: They are still being used, but they are being used in a way that most people do not realize. Gill nets made of nylon, except for one type of nylon, a Japanese variety, which does not last in the water because the crabs eat it, but that is only one type -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. EVANS: They will not eat ordinary nylon, but there is one type of nylon that they will eat. Most of the nylon, they claim that it will fish for the next forty years, and they claim that it fills with fish, sinks on the bottom, carries the floats down, down around the head of the net, and it rises four times a year to its original depth, the leads keep the foot rope on the bottom, of course. If you take four times a year for forty years, and in the case of mono film, probably double that length of time, there is an awful lot of fish destroyed that we do not know anything about.

Now I had an argument with - well I will not mention his name - but a very prominent member of the Department of Fisheries last year, concerning these same gill nets, and I said, they have to go. Well, he says, we cannot definitely, definitely we cannot cut out gill nets completely. He said, we have to have them under control as they do in Iceland. I said, you are talking about a different quintal of fish when you compare most of our fishermen, not that they are not good fishermen, but with the training that they have, navigational aids and so on up to now, a good many of them - you got a different quintal of fish altogether.

In Iceland every skipper is there, and I would say, without fear of contradiction, that probably ninety per cent of his crew has enough knowledge of long-range navigation that if he went 500 miles offshore and set nets today, he would go straight for that buoy and find it tomorrow. That has not been the case with a lot of our fishermen in longliners who have been using gill nets in the last few years. They have put hundreds, thousands of nets overboard and never found them again. It is a menace to our people in the fishery for years and years to come.

This person I referred to a few minutes ago in the Department of Fisheries, he said, that does not affect you upon your coast. I said, man you must be crazy. Why, he said, your fish does not come that way. I say, no? I said, let me tell you something. You may be a big wheel in the Department of Fisheries but you have a lot to learn. Our winter fish comes out of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, through the Straits, down from the Labrador. When the ice comes in the Gulf in early winter, that fish comes on down on the south coast. It is a smaller run of fish, too.

Now back in the days when we really had a fishery, one that you could depend on every year, in the month of March, some time in March, you probably went out one day and you had a skiff load of fish. You probably went out the next day, and you get two dory loads a trawl, and you came back, you never saw the head of a fish. They went clean, when they went. About the first, or sometimes it would be up to the second week in April, you got what we call the spring fish. That fish came up the coast. That was driven off the east coast and the northeast coast by the ice that came up around the latter part of March or the first part of April. It was a bigger run of fish, a different breed of fish altogether.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. EVANS: They came up from the east coast, came up the south coast. Of late years since the gill nets have been used extensively, we do not see any spring fish. It has gone, completely.

That is a direct result of the over-fishing, and the catching of the breeding stocks by the gill nets. There is no way that anybody can say otherwise because that is a fact.

Now as I said earlier, this is the third time I think I have referred to this point, nature looks after its own. Our fish upon the South Coast, now a few years back the foreign trawlers came in to the rocks at night, and to tell you how fish are affected by dragging over the banks, especially on spawning grounds, as in the case of the Hamilton Banks, it is even worse. But in our experience on the South Coast a turbot is a deep water fish. You will never catch a turbot only in one hundred or probably up to two hundred fathoms of water, red fish the same thing. A few years back when these draggers were in abundance, Sir, we got turbot and red fish in abundance up in thirty fathoms of water. They were driven up there by the draggers. That was the only way they could survive.

I met with an old friend of mine last night -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EVANS: It was not a her, Sir, and if you could ever be as much of a man as his little finger you would be a way better than you will ever be. That guy has been skippering a dragger for years. I knew him when he was a mate. He was only a boy. And the skipper of the boat that he was on then was only a boy in years. I do not mind telling the name of the guy that he started fishing with, Captain Kurt Mitchell from Burin, I and Byron Adams, the guy who was in my room last night, an old friend of mine, is a guy who I respect more than most people I know because he is the salt of this earth. And if you want to get opinions on the fishery, not haphazard opinions but opinions that are based on fact, knowledge, learned the hard way, these are the guys you want to talk to.

He said, sure we will talk 200 mile limits. We will talk to the Continental Shelf. But he said, it is only an exercise in futility. It is too late now. That should have been done years ago. The area you have to concentrate on today is the area fifty miles offshore,

What fish are left is gone into this area because they are driven off the Grand Banks and others places, the same as the turbot and the red fish were driven up in shoal water by the foreign draggers. And instead of being so keenly - of no doubt, I agree with still protecting the Grand Banks - but that fifty mile zone around our coast should be barred to every other boat, from every other country except Canadian, then you may save the stocks that are here at present.

Now as far as I am concerned -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. EVANS: Yes, if we think it is in our interest, and I am inclined to think so, I would say that the Hamilton Banks should be given the same consideration.

I pointed out here yesterday that our fish do not breed on the Grand Banks, not the fish that are coming into the Newfoundland waters, they breed right in our own bays -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. EVANS: and on the Hamilton Bank as well. And if as this Resolution says, there should be some control, I would say let us go the whole hog and keep all foreign boats out because it comes under the scope that I have already suggested and emphasized as being one that should be guarded by us at every opportunity, and to the utmost. I am not forgetting the fact that the Leader of the Opposition said last Fall, oh there is plenty of fish. I will never forget the comments of the Mayor of Port-Aux-Basques who was also a big fish operator, T.J. Hardy. He was asked to comment on the statements that were made by the Member for White Bay North. I heard the tape on radio. And it was the first time I ever heard a guy express himself as forcibly as he did. He said, Christ do I have to swear, to make me swear he said. He said, where are they? we have the less boats -

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Hardy.

MR. EVANS: Mr. Hardy - and the best fishermen in the world, and we have, I will take, no contradiction from anybody on that.

March 11, 1975

Tape 342 (Afternoon)

PK - 3

MR. MURPHY: The Leader of the Opposition was not available to go up and

MR. EVANS: He said, I wish you were here. But I heard afterwards that the Leader of the Opposition apologized. He was watching "Hear and Now" on a fisheries show, and he saw what he thought was fish on the beach and it turned out afterwards that they were sheep. But

that is not going to help our fishery a bit. But, I have gone into this to the extent that I think that everyone should realize what has been done, and what is going to be needed, if we want to keep a fishery in existence.

And while I am on the subject, I think the minister raised a point just now that I would like to discuss. It is not exactly, I suppose in the strict sense of the word, relevant to this bill, but in my mind it is closely correlated with it. And that is, what is going to become of our fishermen, the inshore fishermen? There is a programme being drawn up. Last year in the federal election Trudeau came up with the promise, if you wish to call it, of a guaranteed income for the fishermen. That, in my mind, and in the mind of every real fisherman, would be the end of our fishery.

Let me put it to you now so that everybody can understand it. It could only work one year unless the strictest of controls were exercised, and they would have to be on a regional basis, not one policy for the whole of this island and the Labrador.

If you were fishing today, considering that policy, you would have to look at both sides of the coin, depending on whether you were the owner and operator of a boat or whether you were sailing in a boat operated by that owner.

If you had a guaranteed income it would only last one year, as I said, because who could maintain a longliner to operate two or three months a year, because the rest of the time he would be by himself. Most of the guys, as soon as they would qualify they would be ashore, burn your boat or sink her after that.

As far as my area is concerned, you have a different problem from the rest of Newfoundland and some of my fishermen up there have said to me, we have got to have something. Yes, in the form of a subsidy we can agree on, whether it is going to be another cent or two or whatever it may be on a pound of fish, it is going to give us more mileage, that we can operate without going into the red. But it is different from the rest of the island.

The Northeast Coast, the East Coast, the Northwest Coast people could not go fishing in the wintertime if they wanted to. At the present time they are eligible for unemployment insurance, which as it is administered today is not adequate for fishermen. The policy itself, by which it is governed, only allows a fisherman about six or eight week unemployment insurance in spite of the fact that he might have had paid in more to the Commission than a lot of people who were eligible to work eight weeks and then draw forty-four weeks a year unemployment.

MR. MURPHY: Inaudible.

MR. EVANS: Right. As far as I am concerned, that policy of unemployment insurance benefits for fishermen should be changed in the case of the Northeast Coast to give them a guaranteed supplement for the months when they cannot fish. But that would not apply on the South or the Southwest Coast. You could not stay ashore wintertime and draw a guaranteed income and piddle around two or three months in the summer when there is no fish to come. It would have to be mandatory that the people on that coast would have to fish in the wintertime when there is fish to be caught, otherwise they are only just a, well another form of welfare and our people do not want that. You have to use different approaches when you are dealing with different parts of this province, when you talk of any kind of support, and I am sure and certain that if this programme is brought in to administer to the needs of fishermen in each section of our province in accordance to their limitations and the times when they can make a go of it -

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! The honourable member's points are quite interesting. They are tending toward the irrelevant at this point. If he is going to make a point then direct it at the motion -

MR. EVANS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): I suggest he do so.

MR. EVANS: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am not disputing your ruling but in my humble opinion

I was leading up to a point, that we can have all the support we like, whether it is regional or on a haphazard basis as so many of our policies have been from the federal government who was in the main responsible for any type of action that is going to be taken in this direction, in a monetary sense at least. Regardless of whatever programme is implemented, we must have controls brought in to protect our stocks, especially in the areas where fish breed, and cut down on the gill nets, as I stated earlier. And there must be a programme brought in that we are going to have to scour the bottom. There are about 60,000 or 70,000 gill nets on bottom according to the information that I have received from the Department of Fisheries. You can ban them and do what you like, unless we succeed in bringing the greater part of these nets to the surface and restoring them, all of our efforts will have been in vain. We had better discover oil or something fast. If not, we are going to be left with a sadly depleted resource here in this province.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): I recognize the member for Port de Grave.

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I submit that I was on my feet first.

Your Honour had his eyes glued to that side of the House.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

Maybe the member for Port de Grave would yield to the member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. The honourable member has been recognized by the Chair. He can have the floor, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): The member for Port de Grave.

MR. WILSON: I have no intention of yielding the floor to the honourable member for Bell Island. I have sat in this honourable House and taken enough from the member from Bell Island so I would not yield the floor to him.

MR. NEARY: What about Jack Dawson and Jim Roberts over there. They have taken enough off the honourable member too.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please!

MR. WILSON: Action and category is a different thing altogether.

It is not pertaining to the fisheries whatsoever.

MR. NEARY: No, it is pertaining to the member's district and the fisheries is big over there.

MR. WILSON: That is appealing to political views, and as far as I am concerned, my political views are well known.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to stand and speak to this resolution so ably put forward by the member for Bonavista South for these reasons. I think the time has come, Mr. Speaker, when something should be taken and looked into by the Department of Fisheries. For too long that we have sat idly by and seen the main resource of our province go down the drain. While I say this, Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of things entangled with the fishery that one could come up with, all kinds of excuses and what not.

I think what has been brought forth through this resolution mainly is to look for something that is duly belonging to the Province of Newfoundland. By trying to protect it we will be here standing in our position to try to protect the resource of our province. Why would one not be proud to stand in this honourable House and speak in support of this resolution?

My district happens to be a district with quite a number of fishermen in it. I, for one, have been one myself. In 1929 the torches rocked and rolled when they had the earth tremble. A lot of our fisheries' resources, that we do not have today, pertain, in fact, to that very particular time of change in the Gulf Stream. These days on the Labrador Coast we have to go about fifteen miles or twenty miles inland into the head of the bays just to get caplin for bait. Apparently on the Labrador you scarcely see a caplin and you will see less elsewhere.

The real depletion of our fishery has now been

on the way and well fortified and that is what harvesting caplin stocks in the fishing season will do. This is the bait of the codfish and the codfish follow it to land. If the caplin fish are harvested before they reach inshore, I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, we will have no inshore fishery if this is allowed to carry on. Because caplin have to come to land to even spawn so as to have caplin to harvest the next season. When they come to land the fish come with them. This is a thing that is naturally known to every Newfoundlander, especially those who went through the years from 1929 onward, I may say this here in this honourable House and lots of the younger generation may pay little heed to it, but it has happened.

Another thing, we need not expect any great harvest from the inshore fishery, When I went fishing on the Labrador, in one harbour on the Labrador there would be more traps out of that harbour itself for fishing than is all over the Labrador Coast at this particular time. If any man can show me on the Labrador Coast or any other coast, 200 or 300 men who are going to catch as much fish inland as what used to be caught years ago, I do not see it.

We were fishing at that time inshore for a purpose, because there was nothing else to do. You had to go fishing or get nothing. Today if you go out in your boat and there is no fish, you come back and you go look for a job somewhere else.

My good friend, the member in the person of Mr. Herb Gillett, might know well what I am speaking of and went through these days on the Labrador Coast. But this does not say, Mr. Speaker, that we should not try to maintain and hold onto the resources that we already have.

It might not be in order, Mr. Speaker, but I had to come up with the point in order to make the one that I am speaking. and if we got anything to show us of that here this last few days that we put in this House on the debate on the Churchill Falls,

March 11, 1975

Tape No. 345

NM - 2

we can sure see that we have an industry in the fishery that we have, we should stand to maintain it, we try to find the trouble that we have to get something through this House to get new industry. That leads me to believe, Mr. Speaker, that our fishery should be protected, both inshore and offshore. And if we do not protect offshore, we cannot have any inshore. There will be no inshore if offshore is not protected.

Our younger generation probably, if we get it protected and get it back, may be interested, probably, in going in the fishing boat, probably not the one, Mr. Speaker, that I or the other man went into, probably something better, and I claim probably deserves better.

But how can they get better if I and the honourable members in this House of Assembly who form the government do not take a stand to try to do something about it. We can all get out on a street corner, probably some prefer to go to a beer tavern or elsewhere, or probably

in the church porch, to do our chores instead of backbiting about Mr. So and So and about the merchants about what not, about when they weighed the fish with rocks and did all the rest of it.

Mr. Speaker, to me, as far as I am concerned in my day, that is what preserved the inshore fishery, these very self same people who have been cut from ear to ear because they are millionaires, they claim. I have no worry, Mr. Speaker, about what millionaires could be made out of the fishery if we could get our fishery back on its feet. I would be well prepared to put up with it because we would have an industry back on its feet and stabilized.

Right here in my district alone, two fish plants at Port de Grave, one in Barened, one in Brigus, one in Cupids, five fish plants in my district. Why would I not be interested in the inshore fishery? They have no trawlers operating from them, Mr. Speaker. They are all beholden to the inshore fishery and what they can get elsewhere.

If someone had told me, and some of the honourable members in this House were told twenty years ago or twenty-five years ago that you would have a job to buy a quintal of fish, the salt fish in Conception Bay, well you would say, Well, go get your head examined. Mr. Speaker, that has really happened, not only in Conception Bay but in every other bay, and all emphasis has been placed on fresh fish, fish plants. Now we have a hungry market for salt cod and none supplied. The markets for the fresh fish plants are blocked to overflowing.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think as far as this resolution is concerned that we will have any different climate because I believe every honourable member in this House is well aware of what is needed. What is needed is to protect what we have got and what we do not have, look forward to the future and try to fight to get it. I have much pleasure in taking this opportunity to support the resolution so ably put forward and congratulate our Minister of Fisheries on the fine job that he is trying to do for the Province

of Newfoundland. I thank you.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this motion until I listened to the remarks of the honourable Minister of Fisheries, the member from Circular Road. The minister, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The minister, Sir, this afternoon treated the House to forty-five minutes of tedious repetition. At least, Mr. Speaker, what the member for Burgeo had to say made some sense. The member for Burgeo seemed to know what he was talking about when he spoke about the fishery, but the member for Circular Road, Sir, the last time I suppose -

MR. CROSBIE: To a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The honourable gentleman is not permitted to address any other member in the chamber except by the title of the district he represents, the honourable member for St. John's West or the honourable member for Bonavista North or whatever. I live on Circular Road and I have no objection to the world knowing it. There are a nest of Liberals living down there also, but I do not object to that, Mr. Speaker. The honourable member should address me when he refers to me as the honourable member for St. John's West.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order if I may. The Hansard is being taken of this House. In forty years time someone is reading the Hansard and discover there is a member for Circular Road and they go look for the election results on Circular Road and there is no record of it anywhere.

MR. NEARY: They burned the ballots.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair on several occasions in the past few days has had to remind honourable members about the very same thing as raised by the honourable Minister of Fisheries. I think it is only fair that when a member is addressing another member, he address him by his ministerial position or by the district which he represents in this honourable House.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Fisheries, Sir, the Member for St. John's West who resides on Circular Road, when he spoke in this debate this afternoon, Sir, read from a letter that was written by his predecessor to the Hon. Jack Davis when he was Minister of Fisheries in the Government of Canada.

Well, Sir, if my memory serves me correctly, this letter was written, this government took a stand, took a position, when they were prodded, cajoled, pushed, driven, forced into it by an organization in this province known as SOFA, S-O-F-A - Save Our Fisheries.

AN HON. MEMBER: It had nothing to do with it.

MR. NEARY: It had all to do with it, Sir. It had all to do with it, Mr. Speaker. They never heard of the Hamilton Banks.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: They never heard - No, they never mentioned it. Mr. Gus Etchegary, Sir, was one of the gentlemen, one of the leading lights, one of the gentlemen who played a leading role in the last ICNAF Conference.

AN HON. MEMBER: He was opposed to closing the Hamilton Banks.

MR. NEARY: And, Sir, it was SOFA that brought this matter to the attention of the people of this province. The Hon. Minister of Fisheries, the minister's predecessor, did not even know, I suppose, the Hamilton Banks existed until he heard SOFA out carrying on this great crusade, this great campaign to try to save the fisheries in this province.

Mr. Speaker, the minister says he is going off to the ICNAF Conference in Edinburgh, and he is going to take the Member for Bonavista South with him. He would be far better off, Sir, if he took a few fishermen from this province with him.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Never mind a half a townie. Take some fishermen to the ICNAF Conference if you want to make your point, if you want to prove something.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Member for Burgeo.

MR. NEARY: Take the Member for Burgeo with you to the

ICNAF Conference. The last time the Member for Burgeo saw something like the Minister of Fisheries it had a hook in the side of his gob. Going to take the Member for Bonavista South to the ICNAF Conference at the taxpayers expense I suppose!

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No, at his own expense - at the minister's expense.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well if the member is going to pay his own way I say the more power to him. Let him go. But, Sir, I am all for people from this province going to the ICNAF Conference, and going to the Law of the Sea Conference but I would like to see fishermen go. If the minister is going to take anybody in tow to that conference -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: No. Mr. Speaker, the minister could not resist the temptation to make this debate a little bit partisan this afternoon by referring to the previous administration. The Neary-Roberts Administration, he says, they did nothing about the fishery of this province. We were too busy, Sir, keeping our eye on Newfoundland Dehydration, Eastern Provincial Airways, Newfoundland Leaseback, Arts and Culture Centres, hospitals, and public buildings. We were too busy watching these contracts, Sir, to concentrate any of our energy on the fishery. But we had a fair amount to say about the fishery after they bailed out, leaped overboard, took off, chickened out. We had a lot to say about the fishery. It was during the days that my honourable friend, the present Minister of Fisheries, and his colleague the Minister of Justice, and the Minister of Finance were in the cabinet that nothing happened regarding the fisheries of this province. They were too busy, Sir, with other matters to worry too much about the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, I have not run out of steam yet, I have a few more choice words for the honourable minister.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: If he had a hook

in his gob, Sir, he would look like a codfish.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when the minister was quoting from that letter over there, it was written by his predecessor, he said that the big argument that they used with Mr. Davis and Mr. Davis was expected to go off to ICNAF and sell all the countries of the world that are fishing off our shores, to sell them on the idea of getting off the Hamilton Banks - the selling point, Sir, would you believe it? I could not believe it when I heard the minister quote it from that letter. The minister, if I am quoting the letter incorrectly he can get up and deny it or table the letter in the House, but, Sir, I wrote it down, wrote it down. The reason they wanted the Russians and the Spanish and the Portuguese and the French and all the other, the Americans and everybody else to get off the Hamilton Banks was for social reasons, the minister told us, social reasons. And in the very same letter, Sir, what a contradiction, just listen to this, in the very same letter the Minister of Fisheries at the time goes on and says that the fish on the Hamilton Banks, he says, may not have been exposed to over-fishing, to quote from the letter, "The Hamilton Banks may not have been exposed to over-fishing," may not have been exposed to over-fishing, still not being over-fished.

Well, Sir, the big argument that I have listened to this afternoon very carefully is this, that there has been over-fishing, that the fish are not coming in to our shores because of the over-fishing.

MR. MORGAN: You cannot understand -

MR. NEARY: Ah! Mr. Speaker, I can understand.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I can understand, Sir. I can understand the contradictions in that letter. Mr. Speaker, that is half the trouble. We have put a weak case forward to the other countries of the world. We have to do a selling job, Sir, and when the present Minister of Fisheries was appointed to his portfolio, Mr. Speaker, one of the first boo-boos

that he made, Sir, publicly on radio and television - Your Honour can go back and research it and find out that what I am saying is correct - the minister said that any extension of the offshore fishing limits would have to be negotiated. The minister said they would give no strings attached. The minister said publicly that he did not believe in the Government of Canada making a unilateral decision.

Now, the minister did not say "if, if, if". He said, if nothing . The minister did not say -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Do not twist the facts.

MR. NEARY: Ah! I am not twisting the facts, Sir. Every news reporter in this Province and every fisherman in this Province knows what the minister said because I picked him up on it the next day. I said he is contradicting his buddies up in Ottawa, his counterparts in Ottawa who were saying that the Government of Canada should unilaterally declare a two hundred mile limit and drive the fishermen, drive the trawlers and draggers off the Hamilton Banks.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Mr. Speaker, can we call it six o'clock?

MR. NEARY: No, we are not going to call it six o'clock yet. I got a few more choice words for the minister. Now they are squirming over there, squirming. Mr. Speaker, what a weak argument. What a weak case, Sir, what a weak case to go to this great meeting of all the fishing countries of the world, ICNAF and say, Look, Mr. Russia, Mr. Spain and Mr. Portugal, for social reasons, because we do not want our people on welfare down on the Northeast Coast of this Province, will you please stay off the Hamilton Banks from January until the end of April when the fish are spawning. What a weak case, Sir, and that is what the minister -

MR. MORGAN: There is no other case.

MR. NEARY: There is another case.

MR. MORGAN: Scientists say no.

MR. NEARY: Oh! The scientists, my eyeball. Sir, what you have to

do, what you have to do, Sir, is sell the Russians and the Spanish and the Portuguese and the French and the Americans, you have to sell them on the idea, Sir, that if they do not stay off the Hamilton Banks when the fish are spawning, there will be no fish for anybody.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, it is original. It certainly was not included in that letter I just heard read. That is why you need fishermen, that is why you need fishermen to go along to these conferences and not the townies and half townies

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Sir, we have to convince -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Sir, I spent as much time on a boat, I think, as the Hon. Member for Bonavista South.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: But, Sir, what the member for Burgeo said made some sense. All the Minister of Fisheries was doing, Sir, was punching in time this afternoon. I could detect the insincerity in his remarks because he did not want to get the other resolution on the Order Paper, put on by my colleague, the Member for Hermitage. That is why the minister got up and wasted forty-five minutes in this honourable House. My colleague already told the House, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution is like the one put forward the other day by the Leader of the Opposition, supported unanimously by all the members on either side of the House, that this is a motherhood resolution, Sir. If I have any complaints with it, it is that the wording of it is not strong enough, Mr. Speaker.

Just listen. In case members have forgotten, this afternoon with all irrelevancies that have been put forward and all the punching in -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is all right, Sir.

Mr. Speaker, one of the traditions of this honourable House, Sir, is that in debate you have one member on the government side, one member on the opposition side, one member on the government side, one member on the opposition side - that is a general accepted principle in this honourable House, Sir. We have had four now on that side of the House, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: So, I think I am entitled - we have only had one on our side and I think I am entitled to my say. I will take my time, Sir, and I will

put my points across in my own style and my own way.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is too bad. If you do not like it, go home.

Mr. Speaker, in case members have forgotten what the resolution is all about, because I do not think that any of the speakers so far this afternoon, Sir, have zeroed in on the resolution, it says:

WHEREAS Foreign fishing vessels are extensively fishing on the fishing grounds known as Hamilton Banks; and

WHEREAS The Hamilton Banks are the spawning grounds for species of fish commercially fished by Newfoundland and Labrador fishermen; and

WHEREAS it appears that stocks along Newfoundland and Labrador and Eastern Coasts are being severely reduced because of the fishing on the Hamilton Banks - (But the minister tells us in his letter it is for social reasons we should have the draggers and trawlers taken off the Hamilton Banks). It goes on to say:

BE IT RESOLVED: That this Legislature (Listen to this, Mr. Speaker, how weak this wording is) urge the Federal Government (not demand, not say, "Mr. Federal Government, you do this or else. Just listen, Mr. Speaker. Give him a little slap on the wrist, something like the honourable member for St. John's South would word or say) that this legislature urge -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: A little diplomacy, boy.

MR. NEARY: Oh, diplomacy. I thought the member did not believe in that. He believed in gun boat diplomacy.

That this legislature give the Government of Canada a little slap on the wrist and urge that the Federal Government make a strong case in the up coming Law of the Sea Conference that a ban be placed on fishing on the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you were a member of ICNAF, and if you saw the Government of Canada throw its Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Romeo LeBlanc or Mr. MacEachern - I imagine Mr. LeBlanc will play

a major role in that ICNAF Conference. What role incidentally will our provincial Minister of Fisheries have at that conference? Will he be on the agenda? Will he be allowed to speak?

MR. MORGAN: We certainly hope so.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: He will be down South then.

MR. NEARY: Yes, there is no doubt about that. They say at last they brought us over a souvenir from Newfoundland, a sculpin from the Northeast Coast.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: I thought it would be a model of you.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. The only thing he has not got is a hook in his gob.

That is what they say. But, Sir, will the Minister of Fisheries be allowed to participate in these discussions, and to what extent, or are we just going to send this very weak worded resolution off to Mr. LeBlanc and to Mr. MacEachern and urge them to put up a strong case? Is the Minister of Fisheries going to meet with Mr. MacEachern before he goes to this conference, or whoever the spokesman is for the Government of Canada? Will there be any prior discussions or is this it? Is that letter written in 1974 it? Have there been any discussions in the last few months? The minister did not tell us this afternoon. The minister, Sir, and his colleagues, I am afraid, are trying to get a little mileage out of this unfortunate situation, a little political mileage, winding up, warming up for an election. Now is the time to get a little mileage.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: It was on the Order Paper last year, all year.

MR. NEARY: Trying to get a little mileage, Sir. I can detect the insincerity in it. But for Mr. Gus Etchegary apparently, who has given up SOFA, has faded into the background in the last few months. Maybe they are too busy with other matters, Sir. But for Mr. Etchegary and the members of SOFA the matter would not have been raised at all. The government had to be forced into it. Now, they are up pounding their breasts, the heroes. We are no further ahead today, Sir, than we were when that letter was written. If we do not beef up this resolution, and make it a little stronger and hold some discussions with the Minister of Fisheries or the Government of Canada and show a little muscle, we will be no further ahead this time next year.

The member for Bonavista South says, Well, we had a resolution last year. Well, we will have another one next year. What we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is not go off moaning and groaning and saying, Look, the people along the Northeast Coast, our inshore fishermen are going to all be on the dole if you do not get off the Hamilton Banks. That is no way to sell them on the idea of getting off the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season, Sir. You have to be a little stronger than that. You have to point out to the members

of ICNAF, Sir, that it is for their own benefit to reduce their quotas, to get off the Hamilton Banks -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. NEARY: Oh, it is, Sir. Mr. Speaker, it was pointed out also this afternoon, and rightly so in a point that I made the other day in another debate, that we have not even taken our quota off the Hamilton Banks.

The minister's buddies, millionaire buddies, the fish merchants, have not seen fit to get equipment and boats to go out on the Hamilton Banks to take our quota.

Sir, it being six o'clock, I would like to move the adjournment of the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island has adjourned the debate.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, it is a good time to adjourn.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at three o'clock in the afternoon. Since we are adjourning for the Budget Speech, that the normal Orders of the Day be superseded tomorrow for the usual procedure on Budget Day.

On motion that the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 12, at three of the clock.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

MARCH 11, 1975

MAR 11 1975

MARCH 11, 1975

ANSWER TO QUESTION #5 ON THE ORDER PAPER OF THURSDAY MARCH 6TH. 1975
ASKED OF THE HONOURABLE THE MINISTER OF REHABILITATION AND RECREATION
BY S. NEARY, M.H.A., BELL ISLAND

- (1) No
- (2) N.A.
- (3) N.A.
- (4) N.A.