



PROVINCE OF NEWFOUNDLAND

**THIRTY-SIXTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND**

Volume 4

4th. Session

Number 20

VERBATIM REPORT

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 1975

SPEAKER: THE HONOURABLE M. JAMES RUSSELL

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 Education.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER, MINISTER OF EDUCATION: Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to announce the new scholarship programme that has been made available by McNamara Construction Company. This programme to be known as the McNamara Foundation has been made available by the generosity of the company which to mark the Twenty-fifth Anniversary of Confederation, informed the government that it would make available the amount of \$5,000 to be paid annually over the next ten years in amounts of \$500 each and this for a worthwhile purpose recommended by the government.

The government has decided that this amount will be used for an annual scholarship to the value of \$500 to be made available to a student at the Newfoundland School for the Deaf. This will enable the student to participate in a worthwhile programme during the summer months within or outside the Province.

It could include such activities as specified, summer travel, attendance at selected workshops for hard of hearing persons, leadership conferences, attendance at short courses and in general participation in any worthwhile programme which would be of benefit to the student.

A Board of Selection will be appointed under the Chairmanship of Mr. Clifford Andrews who is Director of Special Services with the Department of Education and will include two members of the teaching staff of the school and two parents of children attending the school. The first of these scholarships will be available during the coming summer.

I am very pleased to be in a position to announce this programme and to express on behalf of the government and on behalf of the students of the school their appreciation to the company for this worthwhile project.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we welcome the announcement by the honourable Minister of Education, Sir, that McNamara's are going to make a scholarship available for one of the students at the School for the Deaf. This is a fine gesture on the part of this Canadian company, Sir, and one no doubt that will be very much appreciated by all and sundry and we do hope, Sir, that other companies will follow suit and that the minister will be able to come into the House in the days and weeks and months ahead and make similar announcements of the calibre of the one that the honourable minister just made, Sir, and we do hope that this will be of some benefit to one of the students down here at the School for the Deaf.

PETITIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Trinity North.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I have two petitions today. I do not know what the format has been, if you want me to present both at the one time or -

MR. SPEAKER: Maybe the honourable member could present one and -

MR. BRETT: One and sit down, thank you, Sir.

The first one is from the Community of Melrose, signed by 194 residents of that community.

AN HON. MEMBER: All Tories.

MR. BRETT: All Tories. It is in the form of a letter rather than a properly worded petition. I will read it. It is addressed to me. It says, "We turn to you as our elected representative in the government in this our hour of great need." I think they should have said in our hour of drought.

"We are petitioning you concerning a serious problem in the Community of Melrose. As you know many of the wells in our community are contaminated and are not fit for human consumption. However, our problem now is lack of water and this has reached an emergency situation. Nearly all the wells in the community are dry and have been for some time. Some families who still have water are sharing with their neighbours, but others are going as far away as Catalina and Port Union for water.

Because of this emergency situation, we the people of Melrose speak with one unanimous voice in petitioning you and your government to provide facilities of water and sewerage for this community."

Last year, Sir, we went into the Community of Melrose and we dug five artesian wells and we ended up with four dry holes and one that was producing approximately two gallons an hour. This was done at considerable cost to the government. It is most unfortunate we did not get a supply of water. Following this the Department of Municipal Affairs and Housing agreed to undertake a study to determine the economic feasibility of extending the water line from the neighbouring Community of Port Union to Melrose.

This was done by the firm of Sheppard and Hedges at Clarendville. The report has been submitted to the honourable Minister of that Department, Mr. Peckford, and I assume that the matter is now under consideration.

I would like to table this, Sir, and ask that it be referred to Mr. Peckford's department.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bonavista North.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my colleagues on this side of the House I would like to rise in support of the petition presented by the member for Trinity North on behalf of 194 residents of Melrose. It is Melrose, although I heard - it is Melrose is it not?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, it is becoming more evident every day that the supply of good water to the people of not only Melrose but to hundreds of communities throughout Newfoundland is becoming of the utmost importance. As a matter of fact, I would almost submit that it is at a crisis point across our Province at the present time.

This problem seems to be building up every day. I know I am experiencing it in my district. I have one -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The honourable member for Bonavista North may speak in support of the petition but I do not think it gives him the liberty to expand on the needs of his own district.

MR. THOMS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was just hoping to elaborate a little, but, Mr. Speaker, this problem with a good supply of water in the Community of Melrose I am sure is of very, very urgent importance to the people there and I sincerely trust that the member from Trinity North can persuade the honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs to look into this matter immediately and come up with a solution to the problem for the people because I do believe that they are entitled to good drinking water especially in this day and age, and especially, Mr. Speaker, when this government so proudly boasts about the \$1 billion budget.

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

HON. B. PECKFORD (MINISTER OF MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING): Mr. Speaker, I heartily endorse the petition presented so ably by my colleague and the member for Trinity North. I would like to inform the honourable member for Bonavista North that the honourable member has pursued this issue with the Department of Municipal Affairs to such

an extent that in the last few months we have gone ahead with a detailed designed work for Melrose to find out what the cost estimates would be to provide them with a decent water system and the thing is well in hand.

As usual this administration will do all it can to see that the smaller communities, rather than move the people out, we will provide them with the basic services necessary so that community will be there for many decades to come.

MR. BRETT: My second petition, Sir.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: They are ganging up on the member for Trinity North.

MR. BRETT: That is all right. I can stand it.

This petition, Sir, is from some 400 - well it is signed by some 400 people in the area from English Harbour to Bonaventure. Actually it is a request for highway equipment. It is a little bit more like a petition. Again I beg your indulgence while I read it.

We the undersigned petitioners do humbly pray that:

WHEREAS a volunteer fire brigade has been formed to serve the area from English Harbour to Bonaventure; and
WHEREAS rubber tired machines are being used by the Department of Transportation and Communications to clear snow in that area; and
WHEREAS these machines are unable to properly clear snow on our byroads, thus preventing our fire truck from reaching a large percentage of our population at certain times during the winter months;
WE THEREFORE REQUEST the Department of Transportation and Communications to provide the following equipment for the area in time for the snow clearing season of 1975-1976.

The honourable minister - they are giving you a year. This is the equipment that they are requesting. Number one, a dozer for the Bonaventure Road. Number two, a front end loader to serve the Trinity, Goose Cove, Dunfield and Bonaventure area. A front end loader for the Trinity East to English Harbour area taking in Port Rexton and the Champney's and a grader for the main highway.

In supporting this petition, Sir, I would like to explain that prior to the election of this government there was absolutely no pavement whatsoever. It was another one of the forgotten areas. There was no pavement at all in that area. Of course the roads were being cleared by bulldozers. Since the pavement, the Department of Transportation and Communications have been forced to use rubber tired machines as is stated here in the petition. These machines are unable to clear the existing byroads that have not been paved. Thus their request for some heavier equipment on the unpaved roads.

I fully support this petition, Sir, realizing that equipment is needed not only in this area but all over the Province. I am sure the government is working on the problem. I ask that the petition be tabled and referred to the proper department.

REPORTS OF STANDING OR SPECIAL COMMITTEES:

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for -

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, my colleague -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS: To a point of order, Sir. My colleague from Labrador North wished to speak on the petition. The only reason he did not rise, and I asked him whether he wanted to, was that the gentleman from Trinity North was awaiting the arrival of the page and my colleague said he felt he should rise. So, I would ask if Your Honour would recognize my colleague to speak to the petition and then the gentleman from Placentia East, of course, if he wishes to present a petition, I presume he would do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair is willing to recognize the Member for Labrador North if he wishes to rise in support of this petition.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. WOODWARD: Are you finished?

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Yes.

MR. WOODWARD: Good.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Chairman, myself and my colleagues on this side of the House would like to support the prayer of the petition that was presented by the Member for Trinity North and signed by some 400 residents covering the areas from English Harbour to Bonaventure. They are looking for equipment, Mr. Speaker, that would possibly keep the roads open during the wintertime when we have heavy snowfall.

Now, I suspect that there are a number of occasions that have been brought to light in this House about the inadequacy and the type of equipment that the Department of Transportation is using on the highroads and some of this equipment is inadequate and cannot do a suitable job, especially when we have snowfalls as heavy as we

have had this year. So, maybe it is an ideal time and an opportune time for the Minister of Transportation and Communications to take a look at the type of equipment that is being used in the Province and no doubt the manufacturers are coming out every day with more sophisticated, upgraded equipment. Maybe it is time that we did take a look at getting away from the old graders and the old dozers that have been used for "X" number of years and getting in some type of equipment that will lend itself to do the job properly, Mr. Speaker.

I suspect that the people from English Harbour to Bonaventure have a legitimate right. No doubt they have brought this to the attention of the Member for Trinity North. I suspect that the Minister of Transportation and Communication in his wisdom should see fit to take a look at maybe not only upgrading and putting additional equipment in for that particular area in the Province, but indeed, looking at the whole aspect of upgrading and renewing equipment all throughout this Province. Going a little bit further than that, Mr. Speaker, maybe he can look at putting some equipment into Labrador. We do not have any.

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: First of all -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Can I speak in support of this one?

MR. WOODWARD: No trouble to see that the House Leader -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: First of all, I would like to assure the honourable Member from Trinity North that the petition will be received by the department and certainly given sympathetic consideration in respect to our positioning of equipment for the next season. Also, on the matter raised by the Member from Labrador North, it is a

point well taken. I think we have had a severely bad winter, especially on the East Coast, the Avalon Peninsula and the Burin Peninsula especially and we found ourselves, and I think everybody is aware of it, that some of our equipment was not heavy enough to move some of the large snow accumulations and we had a terrible time in our attempts to get heavier equipment rented, but I am pleased to say and I think if you have noticed the budget, that this year we have gone from last year's anticipated expenditure of \$2 million to \$3.5 million for new equipment.

I have a complete breakdown, Mr. Speaker, of the equipment which I think will more properly come up when we discuss the estimates, of the age and the positioning of it, but certainly the petition will be given sympathetic consideration and hopefully we will be getting on now in respect to the purchase of new equipment with the budget allocation of \$3.5 million for next year.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Placentia East.

MR. ALYWARD: Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a petition on behalf of the fishermen of Placentia Bay. Now, I admit there are not a large number involved, but to the fishermen who are involved, I respectfully submit, it is a very, very important matter and in fact, it constitutes a disaster for them, Mr. Speaker. The prayer of

the petition is for special assistance to replace the gear lost as a result of ice in Placentia Bay. Anybody familiar with the Placentia Bay area, Mr. Speaker, will realize that that Bay generally is free of ice. And this year is the first time in the history of that Bay to the memory of many, many fishermen, it is the first time that Bay was ever blocked with ice. Some fishermen say that they can recall a similar condition prevailing some fifty-three years ago. These would be older men, as you can appreciate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. AYLWARD: But there are men, Mr. Speaker, who can recall that and they have -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. AYLWARD: They have, they have, some men - an old man in the Placentia area, in fact, a man in St. John's here who comes from Placentia Bay who is very, very close to the fishery says that he himself can recall and they remember the years specifically.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. McCarthy?

MR. AYLWARD: No, Mr. Wareham.

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. McCarthy was a great fellow.

MR. AYLWARD: Yes, Mr. McCarthy, I am sorry, he is generally here.

It is too bad he is not here today.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. AYLWARD: That is quite true.

But, Mr. Speaker, they have had a large number of problems confronting these fishermen in that Bay, this year and over the years. And now to experience what amounts to a disaster is really a very, very serious blow to the men involved. If I may just give you an example, Mr. Speaker. For example, in Little Harbour East a man and his son and another gentleman and his son operated a longliner there and they had in excess of sixty or seventy gill nets in the water, and they represent a cost of approximately \$105 per net and they came in, say on Saturday evening, and the ice came in Sunday. They could not even get out to their nets. Of course, when they did get out everything was

gone. That means that all their gear was lost completely, and they owe a large amount of money for this. And this means, of course, that they cannot now fish, and they have no means of going and getting more gear.

Mr. Speaker, you have really, I suppose, the best type of fishermen in Newfoundland affected by this, because these are men who fish in Winter. For example, there were about four longliners left Placentia in January to fish on the Western Side of Placentia Bay in Mersheen and Isle Valen area. They had all their nets out and they came in on a Friday evening in about mid-January and they have not been able to get their boats out of Placentia since. So all their gear, everything when they get - they are including their moorings - is all gone.

I was also speaking with a pilot, Mr. Speaker, on one of the boats, who pilot those large tankers in and out the Bay, and he was telling me that he - they generally board these tankers, the pilots from Argentina - this year they could not even get their boat out to the tanker from Argentina but instead had to make other arrangements to get there. And they tell me that one tanker was off Argentina from the 17th. of February until around the 19th. of March not being able to get into Placentia Bay. So you can appreciate, Mr. Speaker, that here with most of this ice free Bay what an emergency situation has been created this year. They tell me that tanker was there as I mentioned for this long period. Also the same pilot who was on either the "Frank D. Moores" or the "J.R. Smallwood" one of the smaller tankers that take away the refined product, tell me that they had to reduce the speed of that ship to about four miles an hour because of ice.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, on a point of order, please.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Member for Labrador North.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, I am just going to ask when do we get to the prayer of the petition?

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, if I may speak to that point of order. Surely the House of Assembly, the members of this House will want to

appreciate the tradition and the plight of these fishermen. What I am trying and attempting to do is to document what I have submitted is an emergency situation, and I respectfully submit -

AN HON. MEMBER: Continue on.

AN HON. MEMBER: I am entitled to that.

AN HON. MEMBER: Continue on.

MR. AYLWARD: And I am shocked to hear a person to even object.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! With regards to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

With regards to the presentation of a petition, while the Chair certainly realizes the importance of the prayer of the petition presented by the Hon. Member for Placentia East, I would refer him to our Standing Order 92 which says: In no case shall such a member occupy more than five minutes in so doing, unless by permission of the House upon question put. I submit that the honourable member is drawing near the end of the five minutes.

MR. AYLWARD: I am aware of the provisions, Mr. Speaker. This is an emergency situation, and I would hope that if extra time is required to provide the House with the facts, that I would obtain the unanimous consent. If it is not forthcoming, well then, of course, we will accept it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you are familiar with the assistance to fishermen you will have realized that last year both the federal and provincial governments provided special assistance to all the fishermen on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador and replaced all gear lost because of ice. The fishermen of Placentia Bay and St. Mary's Bay could not and did not receive any such assistance. Here, I respectfully submit, is an identical situation where an emergency exists, unforeseen circumstances. There is nothing that these fishermen could have done to avoid the disaster which they have encountered. And I really regret the absence from the House today of the Minister of Fisheries, because I have had correspondence with him about this particular matter, and I know that he has the matter under advisement.

This petition from the fishermen in Little Harbour East itself is only signed by six of them, but what they have lost is their entire means of earning a livelihood. And with the consent of the House, if my time has expired, Mr. Speaker, I would like to read briefly their own submission, which is only very, very short.

"That we, the undersigned, fishermen of Little Harbour East, Placentia Bay have had a great loss of gear this winter due to the unexpected ice blockage in the bay. With no ice reports, we never had a chance to save our nets from ice. Some boats have lost all their nets and will not be able to go back fishing without help from the government. We need assistance to get replacement gear. We need it right away. If no assistance is to be had some boats will have to be tied up with no other choice but welfare. The cost of replacing this gear is too great to get on credit. Since some gear is still owed for. It is very disconcerting on the part of the fisheries and transport that they could not have given an ice report in Placentia Bay where it was so obvious that the boats were fishing."

The fishermen, some of them realize this, but there is a difference of opinion on this, Mr. Speaker, but these particular fishermen feel that the Department of Transport could, or some appropriate office of government, who is aware of this, bring to the attention of the fishermen the fact that ice could be in in a short time. Others, I am told, fear that it was just impossible to avoid it.

"Ice was about the worst in the lifetime of most of these fishermen. Maybe for the first time ever, icebreakers had to be used in Placentia Bay to help shipping. We request help to keep us fishing right away."

And as I said, Mr. Speaker, you are talking here about the best fishermen there are, because they are men who are prepared to go out January, February and March and fish. When they experience a loss of this nature -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Unless the Chair perhaps has set a precedent of allowing members to go over five minutes without getting permission from the Honourable House, I would ask the honourable House if the honourable member has leave to continue with his petition.

Is it agreed?

MR. AYLWARD: There are only a few more moments.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, let it be recorded.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Is it agreed?

MR. AYLWARD: Let it be recorded.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Chair is trying to ascertain whether or not the House grants leave to the honourable member.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has leave on this side.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave to continue?

AN HON. MEMBER: Let him speak in the Throne Speech, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the honourable member have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. SPEAKER: Those in favour -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Okay, the Hon. Member for Placentia East may continue.

MR. AYLWARD: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. AYLWARD: Mr. Speaker, I would have loved to see any of them stand up and object to this. I would have really relished that idea myself.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: But more importantly, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SIMMONS: (Inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. AYLWARD: And I will not be dissuaded by such nonsense.

The plight of these men is very, very important -

MR. SIMMONS: (You were .

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The Hon. Member for Hermitage does not have the right to speak only when he is sitting in his proper place.

AN HON. MEMBER: No boy, not when he has not spoken.

MR. AYLWARD: The point I am making is this, Mr. Speaker, that this is an emergency situation. A precedent has been created, both by the federal and provincial governments when, as I said before, last year on the Northeast Coast and Labrador the fishermen were paid for the gear that they lost because of ice. Now admittedly, it was Arctic ice but what is the difference really if it is only two or three inches thick if it gets caught in the gear, they lose it just as well as they do from icebergs.

MR. AYLWARD: In addition a year or so ago we had the same situation with respect to the fishermen in Fair Haven. They lost every net they had. I submit this petition, Mr. Speaker, to the House, I ask that it be referred to the department to which it relates and I sincerely trust that it will receive immediate assistance so that they can continue to earn a living. Thank you very much.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Fogo.

CAPT. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House certainly support the petition presented by the honourable Member for Placentia East and we certainly appreciate the situation in which the fishermen of Placentia Bay find themselves.

Now the fishermen in Placentia Bay, unlike the fishermen of the Northeast Coast, are very seldom ever used to having to contend with ice conditions at this time of the year. Nevertheless this seems to be the year that they are hit and hit hard as the honourable member said. But, Mr. Speaker, I do not know where the honourable member can get any consolation if we look to the Budget for this year, where we find that for such programmes of replacing gear, the Budget has been cut from \$5.5 million to \$50,000. Surely, Mr. Speaker, this is where the honourable member is going to have to convince the Minister of Finance. Representing a very strong fishing district and having the experience of fishermen losing their gear I have every sympathy for them. But I really hoped that the Minister of Fisheries would be here this afternoon because he is the one. He is the one who is going to have to give those fishermen some explanation. When I looked at the Budget there a few minutes ago on gear replacement and discovered that it was cut from \$5.5 million down to \$50,000, certainly there is no concern there for the fishermen. Loss of gear will prevail. It happens every year.

So we support the petition, Sir, and we trust that the honourable member will have good fortune and good luck in convincing the honourable Minister of Fisheries and his colleague to increase that vote. Because the vote that is there now for gear replacement is

certainly not realistic.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bonavista South.

MR. MORGAN: Just a few brief comments in support of the petition.

The fishermen of Little Harbour apparently are a bit different from most fishermen around the Province because they are longliner fishermen and they are fishing during the winter months. But one point I would like to make and that is that in the future I would like to see the Department of Transport make daily reports through the local media so that the fishermen will know exactly what the ice conditions are because I am sure if the fishermen in Little Harbour and Fair Haven would have known that the ice conditions were as they were on a Friday, they would not have left their gear in the water all weekend. Obviously because of the lack of reporting from the Ministry of Transport, because of that the fishermen were not aware of the ice conditions in Placentia Bay and therefore they have now lost their gear.

So I would hope the Minister of Fisheries will look at the fishermen's request and grant them assistance based on the fact they were not compensated last year for their gear. The gear they have lost is obviously their own gear. It was not gear supplied to them by government. It was their own investment and in order for them to carry on their livelihood in the fishing activity I think it is important that the Minister of Fisheries consider giving them some kind of assistance.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Finance.

HON. H.R.V. EARLE, MINISTER OF FINANCE: Mr. Speaker in speaking to this petition and commenting on remarks made by the honourable Member for Fogo, the relationship of the fishing gear replacement vote in the Department of Fisheries has no -

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, to a point of order!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. THOMS: Is the minister speaking in support of this petition?

MR. EARLE: Yes, I am speaking in support of the petition.

MR. THOMS: Or is he now discussing the estimates?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If an honourable gentleman wishes to make a point of order he gets up and states in affirmative sentences what his point of order is. He does not get up and ask two hypothetical questions, or two questions whether hypothetical or not. A point of order has to be made in sentences ending with a full stop, not ending with a question mark.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! A considerable debate has gone on with regards to this petition. The Chair perhaps gave maybe a little bit too much leeway to all honourable members in speaking to this petition. Other members did refer to it as the budget, and if the Hon. Minister of Finance is rising in support of this petition and clarifying the point then the Chair is willing to hear him, but feels that enough debate has taken place with regards to this petition.

MR. AYLWARD: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down boy!

MR. AYLWARD: To a point of order. With the greatest respect I respectfully submit that any member of the House has the right to support the petition. And this is an important petition, and any member who -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I would remind the honourable Member for Placentia East that being given the latitude to reply in support of a petition is a latitude granted by the Chair, and I assume the Chair has the right to decide when enough persons have spoken to that petition.

AN HON. MEMBER: But any member -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Minister of Finance.

MR. EARLE: Mr. Speaker, I was speaking in support of this petition and just to illustrate this I was saying that the vote in the Department of Fisheries had no relationship to potential fishery gear losses. The fact that there are \$50,000 in there only is just an indication that there is a vote in the department for replacing the fishing gear. There is no way in the world that this government or anyone else can predict what fishing gear losses there may be. It would be similar to say that in the case of forest fires there may be no vote in the Forestry Division to cover forest fires because these are hazards which we cannot predict. And the fact that there are \$50,000 in there has no relationship as to whether or not these fishermen would have their gear replaced because the programme itself might very well end up at \$5 million or \$6 million or \$7 million, it

just depends on what the conditions are this year.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Twillingate.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. H. W. C. GILLETT: Mr. Speaker, I take pleasure in presenting a petition from the people of Cobbs Arm, Pikes Arm and Toogood Arm in the electoral district of Twillingate. They do hereby petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to pave the road, Route No. 346 which connects and passes through the three communities and on to connect with pavement Route No. 340. We do urge you to do this while the paving equipment is still in the district. This road is used daily by three school buses, and also by passengers to and from the Change Islands ferry which docks at Cobbs Arm.

The instigators of this petition, Mr. Speaker, have signed on the original type prayer of the petition, they are; Gordon Jarvis, Lieutenant, I presume, of the Salvation Army, and Boyce Parson, the United Church Minister in the Herring Neck, Cobbs Arm, Pikes Arm and Toogood Arm area.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition I might say that about two and a half years ago, I believe when the Hon. Minister of Finance was then the Minister of Transportation, I -

MR. ROBERTS: The Minister of Finance was never - somebody else was the Minister of Transportation.

MR. GILLETT: He was Acting at that time I believe. He was Acting -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. GILLETT: He still is. When the honourable -

MR. ROBERTS: The Member for Humber East -

MR. GILLETT: The Hon. Member for Humber East was in the hospital, that is correct. And I remember getting in touch with the Acting Minister at that time and that was during the paving of the road down through New World Island, Route No. 340. And I recall quite vividly acquainting the Acting Minister of the excellent condition of the road at least as far as Cobbs Arm, and that, in fact, that road was ready

for paving with the exception of putting on the grade A, I believe, they call it. At that time I recall he told me that he could not get the funds to do it, and that he, in fact, had one mile of road in his district that he tried to get paved and could not get done. However, I accepted it, Mr. Speaker. The equipment was removed from the area and the road to Cobbs Arm was not paved, neither was a small section in front of the homes in Indian Cove where all the traffic to and from Twillingate via the ferry had to pass.

This road, Mr. Speaker, route number 346, is used fairly extensively. It does connect with the Change Islands ferry and all the passengers and a great deal of the cargo, I would say, the freight going to Change Islands goes down over that road. So, therefore, I support this petition, Mr. Speaker, wholeheartedly and I ask it to be tabled and referred to the department to which it relates in the hope that the prayer will be received and favorably, and the job will be carried out while - this is very important, Mr. Speaker - while the paving equipment is in that immediate area.

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

HON. H. COLLINS (MINISTER OF FORESTRY AND AGRICULTURE): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise in support of the petition which has just been presented by the member for Twillingate. It is an area which I am quite familiar with, and I am sure he will agree with me when I say that during the past couple of years it is almost a risk of your life to drive on New World Island, Twillingate Island with all the pavement that has been going down. The main road is completed across the island and the causeway to Hillgrade where the ferry used to land from Twillingate.

Certainly there is a need to connect to good - well nothing is too good for Toogood Arm. There is a need to take into account Cobbs Arm and Pikes Arm as well. I am sure that my colleague, the honourable Minister of Transportation and Communications has plans in mind for a continuation of this programme. At any rate, I would certainly be glad to be able to stand and support this petition which has been presented.

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

HON. J. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS): Mr. Speaker, yes, I would like to accept the petition. Certainly we will give it sympathetic consideration. I have had a number of letters on this especially in respect to the school buses which the honourable member mentioned. We know there are some dangerous curves down there and

we are taking a look at them.

If I am not mistaken, I think I have met with a group of people on this some time ago in which especially the school bus situation was pointed out. I asked people down in the department to take a look at it because certainly we would not want to leave anything that would even resemble accident area when school buses are travelling over it. We know there are some bad turns in the area and so on and so forth, but we have asked people down in the department to take a look at it and make sure that the road is not in such a shape at least that there would be any possibility of an accident in respect of a school bus.

So, we have had a number of letters on that. We accept the petition. We will certainly look at it with the most sympathetic consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

The honourable Minister of Education.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER (MINISTER OF EDUCATION): Mr. Speaker, I wish to present a petition on behalf of the residents of a community in St. Mary's Bay, the community of Gulch and this is signed by approximately forty-five adults. That would be just about the entire adult population of the area. The prayer of the petition is for upgrading of the road from the entrance of the community and a distance of approximately one-and-a-half miles. It is a road going down and through the community.

The residents point out that the road is a gravel one and that there are a number of potholes, that it is especially difficult this time of year. Of course, that is true of practically every gravel road in the area. What they are asking for is upgrading of that approximately one-and-a-half miles of road, a very reasonable request, one which certainly I can personally authenticate. I am very pleased to present the petition on behalf of the residents. As honourable members might know, the main road in that area was paved last year. It is the road from Peter's River up to St. Vincent's and on through St. Mary's. This is a secondary road if one wishes going off the main highway, the St. Mary's Bay highway, down approximately

a mile and a half to the community. The residents ask that it be upgraded and as I said, I am pleased to present the petition in the legislature on their behalf and to request that it be referred to the department to which it relates and indeed to commend its implementation, to request its implementation of the Minister of Transportation.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The Gulch. I do not know the origin of it.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member from Port au Port.

MR. F.R.STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I have a petition from approximately 500 residents of the communities of Port au Port West, Aguathuna, Felix Cove, Campbells Creek and Abrahams Cove in the District of Port au Port, concerning the condition of snow clearing equipment in that community. The situation is not unlike that posed by the Member for Trinity North, that the equipment is old, decrepit and it breaks down at the most inopportune times such as when we have a snow storm - of which we have had many.

There is also an assertion that some new equipment which was on the road was diverted to the Trans Canada Highway at one time during the year, and people would like this corrected and, if at all possible, adequate equipment placed on that road for next year's snow clearing session.

Also, the whole situation might be remedied if snow clearing was put in the hands of private contractors. I know in a number of places within my district the snow clearing is given to private individuals who own their own equipment and they do a very good job. Their equipment is always in good repair because they use it at other work throughout the year.

Mr. Speaker, I support this petition. It is one that is directly associated with the way people live in the rural parts of this district, of this province and it is something very near and dear to them. Of course, the remedy for some of this would be paving the roads because it is extremely difficult to keep the gravel roads open as opposed to paved roads. So I am looking forward to the minister attacking this problem, on having a two-pronged approach to this problem and I trust that there will be something forthcoming in the near future from his department. I would like to table this and have it referred to the department to which it relates.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for Labrador North.

MR. WOODWARD: Mr. Speaker, we on this side of the House support the petition presented by the honourable the Member for Port au Port. I suspect that I will echo the same words that I said in support of the petition that was presented by the Member for Trinity North. Then again, the Member for Port au Port has put a new twist in it by saying that maybe in cases of that nature it should go to private enterprise.

The Minister of Rural Development is not in his seat today, he may welcome something of this nature. But, Mr. Speaker, maybe it would be advisable for the minister to take a look at areas where people have, no doubt this winter, suffered hardship due to the fact that the roads have been, in a number of areas, closed for long periods of time like, I think, down in the St. Mary's area there where I saw snow plows going in digging through snow that was ten feet deep and residents were shut off for a couple of weeks before the plows got in to them.

Maybe in this case we should be looking at the private contractors clearing roads, but then again, we will not get private contractors to clear roads unless the policy is changed in order that the contractors can prepare themselves to get the amount of equipment that is needed in the Fall of the year in order to do that type of job over the winter. You cannot immediately pick up the equipment as the crises arise.

So maybe my friend from Port au Port is making a good suggestion and the minister should pay some attention to it. Again, we should note that there is a great need for the upgrading of the highroads equipment and no doubt the bringing in of new equipment. Mr. Speaker, I suspect that the minister, as I said before, will give this some serious consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable the Member for St. George's.

MR. A.M. DUNPHY: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support this petition so ably and expertly presented by my friend and colleague from Port au Port.

MR. STAGG: Hear! Hear!

MR. DUNPHY:

The particular depot, from which we both draw equipment, at
Stephenville - I have had complaints also in my district along
these lines, about the equipment not being in readiness when
needed. Possibly, if the department would make the necessary
repairs and improvements throughout the slack periods, in
early Fall or late Summer, we

would not be going through these tough periods. The area of his district to which he speaks, Campbells Creek, Felix Cove, all along that area, it is an exposed area to the great bay of Bay St. George and as a result you could some very high winds there and a lot of drifting and it is extremely important that adequate equipment is on hand to take care of these conditions as they arise.

So I support this petition and hope for his sake, for his people's sake, and also my district's sake, that this matter will be taken care of and we will not be running into these problems again.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN, Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, in supporting this petition may I, in reference particularly to the comments from the honourable gentleman from Labrador North, he has raised a very vexacious problem. The problem to which the honourable gentleman from Port au Port in submitting the petition referred, is one that is not that easily solved, as one might think.

We had the same problem. There was experienced in St. Mary's District, on the Loop Road on the Burin Peninsula in the Lamaline Area and there the equipment - we have had more equipment there this year than we have ever had before. But when we ran into the very difficult situation that was caused by an act of God, we then looked to the very gentleman that the honourable Member from Labrador North referred to, the contractors.

We were faced with two problems, Number one, many contractors dismantle their equipment during the winter for the purpose of repairing and getting it ready for the construction season in the summer. Secondly, those who had equipment, some of them, not all but some of them decided to take advantage of an emergency situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: Make some money. I realize that that adds appeal to the business. The honourable gentleman from Labrador North says you cannot blame a man for taking advantage of a situation to make

some money. I say you can. I say that if the going rate for a T.V. tractor is \$30 an hour, that we should not accept the situation where a man who owns that kind of equipment comes along and says, there is an emergency, I want \$50 an hour. That is wrong.

Now, I realize that the honourable gentlemen opposite disagree with that philosophy, but I cannot accept it. This was the very situation that we ran into on the Burin Peninsula. Finally -
SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Oh, the honourable member for Bell Island, he got into the act and he pretended that he knew something about the Burin Peninsula but nobody believed him.

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

MR. HICKMAN: Be that as it may -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It appears to the Chair that the honourable Minister of Justice is now attempting to debate this particular petition.

MR. HICKMAN: I will not debate it. I am in support of this petition, Mr. Speaker. May I say that I have the greatest sympathy with my colleague, the honourable the Minister of Transportation and Communications. He was faced with a problem that only he could handle and he handled it very effectively, very efficiently. He handled it by facing the avaricious demands of the friends of the honourable the member for Labrador North who wanted to make a quick buck, but we did solve the problem. May I say that this government not only supports this petition but we have a great deal of confidence that the Minister of Transportation and Communications will this year come up with a solution that will not permit these merchants of fortune to take advantage of the problems that are caused during the winter months by something over which this government has no control.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I just want to take a moment to support the petition presented by my friend, the member for Port au Port, the Deputy Speaker of the House. In so doing, Sir, I want to take note of the fact that I am glad to see that the Deputy Speaker, the member for Port au Port presented this petition on behalf of his constituents.

If the Speaker had been presented with this petition Your Honour would have given it to one of his colleagues, I am sure, to present but the Member for Port au Port is quite within his right as an honourable member of this House to present such a petition, Sir. And the least that I can do, Mr. Speaker, in the light of recent events, is to support the petition presented by my good friend the Member for Port au Port. And I do hope, Sir, that he will get some new equipment to replace that worn out, obsolete equipment in the district of Port au Port so that his constituents will not have to put up with conditions next winter as they put up with this past winter.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

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

HON. J. G. ROUSSEAU (MINISTER OF TRANSPORTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS): Mr. Speaker, if I told you I had the message that might be the understatement of the year, Of course, all through the snow storm I got a petition from the Province, I suppose, and a phone call, and two petitions today. I think that is a matter I hope we will discuss during the estimates of the department when it comes up. But I certainly support the petition presented by my colleague for Port au Port. I have many happy remembrances of baseball days in that area, and I know many people in the area. And certainly we would not want to see them inconvenienced in any way.

The constructive point brought up by my friend for Labrador North is certainly one that will have to be given consideration. Whether our equipment can handle it, normally it can, but we did not have big enough equipment down in the Branch country and out in Lamaline area. And we had a great amount of trouble in attempting to secure larger equipment. I even personally requested from a number of companies whether they could be hired. Of course, nobody wants to put a machine back in working order for maybe two days or ten days or twelve days. Then again, and I would not want this misconstrued but then again money that is spent on snow is not money that is of

lasting use to you. When the snow goes the money is gone, and there is nothing there to see for it in a year. And to pay a retainer, as we do now to people that we hire from the private field, is money that is well spent. But to get ready for a Winter like we had on the Avalon Peninsula and the Burin Peninsula would be ones that would be a very large cost. As I say, we have more money in this year's budget and we will certainly take a good look at our equipment. We will also take a look at our snow clearing policy. I have indicated to a number of councils that have contacted me that we are prepared to sit down with them in various areas and get a read back on how these people feel it can be improved. We know that the equipment was breaking down. But down in Branch country, for example, we had six pieces of equipment on that - what is it? - twelve miles between Branch and St. Bride's -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Three on each side - it just could not get through the drifts, but it broke down, and there were problems, and we recognize that.

I might mention one problem here now, and I am sorry the honourable Member for Fogo is not in his seat, But each year we have a layoff in the Department of Highways and everybody screams to the high Heavens about the layoff of personnel. We barely get time to take the machinery in from the Summer maintenance programme and to put it in shape for the Winter maintenance programme, and as soon as you do that and there is a layoff in the intervening period Everybody is on your back because they are laid off and how long are they going to be laid off?

MR. NEARY: It is a good thing Spring is here, my son, or you would really be in trouble.

MR. ROUSSEAU: No, but, you know, it is a problem. This equipment has to be taken off the road, but if it is taken off the roads then people are going to be laid off in the department, and there are going to be roads that are not maintained like they should be maintained over

a period of time. That is a difficult thing to do to, lay off people for a longer period, and you think it is a reasonable one. And also to tie up equipment when it should be working on Summer maintenance. But these are the problems that we have learned from experience, and we will certainly try and cope with them, and hopefully provide a better service to the people in the area of my honourable colleague for Port au Port as well as the people in the other areas of the Province that were affected by the very abundant snow fall we had this past Winter.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other petitions?

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Hermitage.

MR. R. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture. It relates to a question I asked him three or four weeks ago on the subject of the small sawmills in the Bay D'Espoir area.

First of all, I wonder if the minister would indicate whether he has had some representations from the independent sawmillers in the Bay D'Espoir area over there - the fears they are having - these are the raw forest product, timber limits and so on.

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

HON. H. COLLINS (MINISTER OF FORESTRY AND AGRICULTURE): Mr. Speaker, not to my knowledge. The last time the honourable member asked that question I suggested to him that I would undertake to find out what might or might not be happening there. I recall after we left the House that I arranged with him for the Assistant Deputy Minister of Forestry, Mr. Brennan, to get in touch with the honourable member. I presume he - you have not been in touch with him?

MR. SIMMONS: Inaudible.

MR. COLLINS: To get in touch with you to see exactly what the honourable member was talking about. I presume - because I have heard nothing since, that there has been some consultation between the member and the official. I will certainly undertake to make sure that that happens, because I have not seen

any correspondence or any complaints, received any complaints myself.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary for the minister: Would the minister be prepared to give the House his assurance that the sawmillers will be able to obtain permits, cutting permits in the Bay d'Espoir area? They are pretty concerned about this matter. Could they have some assurance on the point?

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

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the problem which the honourable member alludes derives from the fact that there is a major sawmill operation been established in the Bay d'Espoir area and for that company to be able to raise the necessary funds from whatever sources, it was required that certain permit arrangements be made available through the Department of Forestry. There might have been some instances where some smaller operators might have been included or excluded from a particular region although we did give the undertaking then that in the event that that did happen, we would be more than anxious really to assist them in terms of forest access roads if that was necessary to make sure that they did have some timber rights to replace those which they might have lost. Certainly, we give the honourable member that undertaking.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Hermitage.

MR. SIMMONS: Mr. Speaker, a question really for the Minister of Mines, but he is not here, so I would like to direct it to the Minister of Industrial Development. Could the minister indicate to the House whether a firm decision has been made insofar as the proposed expansion of the Bay d'Espoir generating station is concerned? Has a firm decision been made by government?

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Industrial Development.

HON. W. DOODY: I think that the answer to that question is yes, Mr. Speaker, having due regard for the influence of an environmental study which has presently been undertaken. The assumption is that that study will turn out well. In the event that it does not, of course, we will have to have another look at the situation and reconsider it. But right now the government is proceeding on the assumption that this study will be favourable and that the recommendations that are made by the people who are doing the study can be followed so that the least possible environmental damage can take place. But the answer for all intents and purposes is yes, the decision has been made.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the honourable House Leader could tell us the whereabouts of the Premier? Is he going to be in the House for the question period this afternoon?

MR. CROSBIE: No, the Premier will not be here this afternoon but we feel that we can try - we can try and do our best to handle any questions the honourable gentleman might have.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we do not want a boy to do a man's job. We want to get it first hand from the honourable the Premier. I have got a whole raft of questions here, Sir. I will have to save them until tomorrow.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: Being Private Members' Day, our motion number (4) moved by the honourable Member for Bonavista South. I think the debate on last Private Members' Day was adjourned by the honourable Minister of Education.

HON. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, it is not my - I was going to start off by saying it was not my intention to be long, but since my few words have been given such warm welcome and perhaps indeed I should go at greater length.

This is a very important resolution and one upon which

quite a number of honourable members have already expressed their views. Points can be made, of course, from the point of view of conservation and maintaining a maximum sustainable yield and conservation of the stock, etc., various biological and partially economic arguments as well for the substantive matter with respect to this resolution.

What I want to suggest is that there are important social reasons as well. Now, honourable members will recall that a couple of weeks ago the Minister of Fisheries tabled a report in the legislature, a report done by Dr. Story and Professor Alexander of Memorial University and it is

called the Report of the Committee on Federal Licencing Policy and its Implications for the Newfoundland Fisheries. Now while essentially that document deals with licencing, if honourable members read through it they will see as well that it is very relevant from the point of view of the social implications of a continuation of the inshore fishery in this Province. As honourable members know the basic historical reason for the colonization of Newfoundland was the fishery, and people came originally here for the fishery and settlement. The reason the Province was settled in the first place was because of its proximity to the fishery and in the centuries which have evolved since there are many hundreds of communities which would never have existed in the first place but for a fishery. And indeed one can ask oneself whether and to what extent they can continue to exist, at least as viable communities in the future without a continuation of the inshore fishery.

Now we hear a great deal, of course, about the growing modernization and technological improvements of the fishery and the increased emphasis on offshore fishery and indeed the absolute necessity for developing a more modern and technologically oriented mid-water fishery. There is no doubt about that. But certainly for the coastal communities, the coastal outports of this Province to continue, then there has to be a resource to fish, either in an inshore or a mid-water fishery. And that I suggest would be one of the reasons for this resolution and for supporting it so that there can be a continuing supply of fish so that the outport coastal communities which must have an inshore or a mid-water fishery in order to continue as viable communities can in fact do so.

I would certainly recommend the reading of that report, which could be called the Storey-Alexander Report, the reading of that report to all honourable members. Indeed, and this is somewhat perhaps peripheral, but indeed when we consider when stated some times

you know, criticism of the univeristy and various activities perhaps in which they are engaged, which some people suggest are not of central importance, not of real importance to this Province, some times we fail to see as well some of the work that is done that is very essential to this Province. And certainly this kind of report done -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: - by two faculty members at Memorial shows to a large extent that in some very important areas work is undertaken of very real significance to this Province. So I would suggest to honourable members that not only in its substance, not only in its references to the importance of an inshore fishery, not only in stressing the social values which are inherent in the continuation of viable outport coastal communities, not only from that point of view, but also as an example of how significant and how relevant and how down to earth and how intrinsically associated with Newfoundland's real needs some of the research and study and work at the university is.

I think for any honourable members who might be overly prejudicial, and I am thinking of during the examination of the estimates of the Department of Education, when we came to the univeristy, and there is no doubt in any budget of thirty-one -

MR. NEARY: To a point of order. I think Your Honour is looking at the honourable minister rather quizzically. Your Honour probably realizes that the minister is completely out of order that his remarks are not relevant to the matter under debate and that is to change one word in the original motion from the Law of the Sea Conference to ICNAP. That is the amendment. We are speaking on the amendment.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: The amendment to the motion.

MR. NEARY: I asked Mr. Speaker, and I was informed by Mr. Speaker that we are debating the amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: Well then, Your Honour -

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, on that point of order, may I -

MR. NEARY: Just a minute, I am not finished my point of order.
Your Honour just stood up.

MR. SPEAKER (Mr. Stagg): I will listen to what the Hon. Minister
of Justice has to say.

MR. HICKMAN: So that the honourable gentleman for Bell Island
does not waste the time of this House, last week in a very
historic moment in the history of the Legislative Assembly of
Newfoundland, the amendment was carried unanimously, with great
enthusiasm and great desk thumping by all honourable gentlemen,
and I know the Hon. Member for Twillingate. I see him nodding
in agreement. I am surprised that

MR. HICKMAN: the honourable Member for Bell Island was out having his coffee at the time but he was not listening.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if I may continue with my point of order, I went to Your Honour and I asked Your Honour if we were debating the amendment or the main motion and Your Honour informed me we were debating the amendment.

Honourable members will remember last week, because of an action taken in the House by the honourable House Leader I was outside of the House at the time. So that is why I went to Your Honour this afternoon. If Your Honour is correct in informing me that we are discussing just the amendment then the Minister of Education is completely out of order, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Well it is not unusual for the honourable member and the Chairman or the Speaker to have a disagreement. However, that particular conversation, the honourable member asked me if we were speaking on the amendment and I said no, we were speaking on the amended motion. So the amended motion is what we are speaking on now.

The Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the amendment was carried last Wednesday and now we are speaking on the amended motion.

MR. HICKMAN: With enthusiasm.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: It was carried, as the Minister of Justice says, with enthusiasm, at least it was carried unanimously and - So the point I was making, Sir, was that this Storey-Alexander Report is a very real example of the kind of activities which the university, Memorial University of Newfoundland has been engaged in and which shows that much of its work is very down to earth and very much related to the economy of this Province and to the social problems here. Obviously not everything is so related and I do not suppose in any Budget of any institution around \$31 million a year everything is going to be totally related to the social and economic conditions of the particular area in which the university is located. But certainly very much of its

work is, and this is certainly an excellent example, this is an excellent example of that kind of activity on the part of the university.

MR. HICKMAN: Inaudible.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Now one brief point I wish to make and that is with reference again to the social reasons for doing everything possible to assure that there is a supply of fish for an inshore or a mid-water fishery.

In Norway, over twenty years ago, around 1951, 1952, the Norwegian Government decided to exclude from its coastal waters up to a distance of fifty miles, and that would be fifty miles from headlands, could well be over a hundred miles from the actual coast in many cases, but the Norwegian Government decided to exclude all non-Norwegian fishing efforts fifty miles beyond certain headlands, which in many cases would be a hundred or more miles from the actual coast and England and Germany and perhaps some other states took exception to this and indeed the matter was decided at International Court.

The reason they gave in favour of Norway's position was based upon what they called the socio-economic dependence of the coastal population. In other words, people who live in coastal communities, in coastal areas, whose very existence is related to and largely dependent upon a fishery that they can prosecute from where they live, that creates a kind of priority of right. Now obviously that can be taken to an extreme which would endanger fulfilling the world's need for protein food, That is a fact as well. But we are not thinking of a quantity which is significant in terms of total world production of fish by any means. But the principle that was established whereby Norway was allowed to exclude everybody but their own nationals up to a distance of fifty miles from headlands and in many cases that would be over one hundred miles from the actual Coast of Norway, was because it was recognized that where a people live in coastal communities, where there are not many alternatives, not any or not many alternatives and

other ways of making a living, where there is this socio-economic dependence of the coastal population on prosecuting the fishery from their areas, then there is a priority of right. That was recognized

for Norway in 1952 and indeed, I think, most nations of the world recognize it for Iceland in the various extentions to their limits which have been made during the past number of years. I would suggest the same arguments and the same priority of right applies to Newfoundland coastal communities as well. One cannot speak of the socio-economic dependence of Canada obviously, on the Newfoundland coastal, on the inshore midwater fishery of Newfoundland, but taking Newfoundland as a society itself, taking the Province as a society itself, then certainly that same, there is that same kind of dependence in hundreds of coastal communities and indeed, if there were no inshore or midwater fishery, then it would appear one of two results would follow. There would be no need for the continuation of those coastal communities. There would certainly be no viable economy there. So they would either cease to exist or would become totally welfare communities. This certainly would not be in the best interests of the people living there or indeed of the Province.

So, I would suggest that the substantive of part of this resolution from the social point of view is very valuable and that everything possible should be done to assure that there is a continuing supply of fish, so that the inshore and mid-water fishery can continue and the essential reasons for that being that only in this way, at least as far as I am aware, can hundreds of communities in Trinity Bay or Bonavista Bay or Notre Dame Bay, some areas on Labrador Coast, some areas, no doubt, of the South Coast, Placentia Bay, St. Mary's Bay, Southern Avalon. Only in this way can some hundreds of communities hope to have a viable economy.

So, Mr. Speaker, I commend the honourable gentleman who originally proposed the resolution and I certainly trust that it will be followed by this House.

MR. SPEAKER (Stagg): The Minister of Rehabilitation and Recreation.

HON. T. DOYLE: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add a few words

to those that have been spoken in this House, in lending support to the amended motion from my friend and colleague, the Member from Bonavista South. I do not imagine that there are many new words left to be said in regards to this motion. However, I do think it important that all members of this House have a few words of support on behalf of it.

I would like to compliment the Member for Bonavista South in the way which he has presented this motion to this House, complete with diagrams and maps. I am sure that when he, in the company of our colleague the honourable the Minister of Fisheries, find themselves among the heather in Edinburgh in June or July of this year that they will be able representatives of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.

I think it is appropriate that I should speak right after the honourable Minister of Education, the Member of the House for St. Mary's District, which district is adjacent to mine, the District of Ferryland at an area, a community known as St. Shott's which for many, many years was and is a typical Newfoundland fishing community. It is very important that communities in Newfoundland such as St. Shott's and all the others on the Southern Shore be not deprived of their right to the socio-economic base which was provided them by their access to the inshore fishery.

In my District of Ferryland there are two fish plants, one at Fermeuse, one at Trepassay. It is hoped in the next few days we will see these back in operation. Parts of the district, Mr. Speaker, are rapidly becoming what might be called dormitory areas for the City of St. John's, and I refer here in particular to a few of the communities in this end of the district, in particular Bay Bulls, Witless Bay and Tors Cove. However,

there are still many fishermen in these places and as we go further up the Southern Shore the lack of the fisheries industry, be it inshore or be it for supplying on a small scale some of the plants, it would mean that that area of Newfoundland would have to be classed as a disaster area. There is no other way it could be described.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Are there small plants in Bay Bulls -

MR. DOYLE: Yes, there are smaller plants in Bay Bulls and Witless Bay, but these are more seasonal as is the one at Fermeuse, although it is larger. The Trepassey one is year 'round and as members will know, the Trepassey area as well as the Burin Peninsula is in pretty bad shape right now. That is why I say I hope with everybody else that these things will be settled the next day or two.

However, Mr. Speaker, I am informed by fishermen in my district that their catches over the last five years or so have declined approximately seventy per cent. Now, this is a tremendous decrease in the possible earnings of the fishermen, as everybody will agree. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the position of this government on the fisheries in general has been made clear many, many times in the last two or three years. At one time in particular, and I would just like to refer to it very briefly, was on the occasion when the former Minister of Fisheries, now the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, communicated to the previous Minister of Fisheries of Canada, Mr. Davis, a year or so ago and in that communique, Mr. Speaker, he said and I quote very briefly, "there is every indication to believe that off-shore 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. Of growing concern to Newfoundland is the extent to which foreign

fishing activity on the Hamilton Inlet Bank is contributing to an alarming reduction in inshore landings by fishermen along the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and the Coast of Labrador. Since the cod fish 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.

That is quoted from a letter which the honourable the Minister of Fisheries, the Member for Gander, wrote the previous Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Davis, now since defeated, about a year and a half ago.

I am just trying to establish the fact that the position of this government is not something new that was thought up on the occasion when the honourable Member for Bonavista South brought this motion before the House a few weeks ago, but it has been on the record books for several years.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. DOYLE: Before SOFA.

Mr. Speaker, it is well known that in the period from February to April that the cod fish spawn on the Hamilton Inlet Bank and then rise and go inshore. It is also well known that foreign trawlers and draggers go in and take the mother fish and the only way we can get around it obviously is to propose a ban, which this motion does.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that this House this year is doing at least one very good thing so far and that is since we have met now, approximately a month, there has been a tremendous amount of debate and discussion on both sides of the House on the fisheries from one aspect or another. I am sure that out of all this discussion nothing but good could come and I refer to the unanimous motion which we passed here a few weeks ago and now to this discussion so rightly brought up by the Member for Bonavista South. So,

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted on behalf of the thousands of fishermen on the Southern Shore to support this motion as amended and compliment the mover.

MR. SPEAKER: (STAGG): The Member for Grand Falls.

MR. A. SENIOR: I have a little bit of difficulty with my eyesight here, and my brains and my eyes do not get connected, I have difficulty communicating and so I would appreciate if I could use this podium.

I too would like to speak briefly on this motion presented by the honourable Member for Bonavista South, Although I represent in this honourable House the great industrial district of Grand Falls, I have an interest, as I am sure most Newfoundlanders do, in the fishing industry of this Province. And I am sure I would be remiss if I did not have some comments to make in support of this motion.

Although I represent a district which is not closely associated with the fishery, I grew up in a very small fishing community. And it might be worthy of note that the honourable Member for Bonavista South was born in Flat Islands, Bonavista Bay, whereas I was born in Flat Islands, Placentia Bay. I am quite familiar with both communities because of the confusion that used to arise from time to time between the two communities.

Sir, my knowledge of the fishery is somewhat limited in detail, but probably wider in scope, in a general sense, it goes back to probably the beginnings of the fishery in Newfoundland, as I have heard stories told by my ancestors over the years of how the small communities in Newfoundland came into being as a result of the fishery industry. Going back more specifically in the great fishing area of the Province, and certainly one of the greatest fishing areas of the Province, the district of Placentia West to the times when the Jersey Rooms were established in the area of Burin, and where immigrants came from England and the Channel Islands and other areas to serve a term of six months on these fishing premises before they were permitted to go out and fish in other areas, and eventually form the new communities. And certainly a lot has happened since that time, a lot of changes have taken place in the fishing industry in Newfoundland.

My own personal experience having grown up in a small fishing community where my father was a fisherman, I have also seen great changes in the fishing industry over the years. I can recall, even at my age, the days of the banking schooners, and my own relatives building schooners and going to some of the major fishing grounds in that area, risking their lives to catch fish.

But I could not help admire the people who went on the high seas to earn a living, and the hope of these people that they would come back with a good voyage. But it seemed that as the years went by there was always need for more hope because there was less and less fish. And, I think, that relates directly to the issue before us today, the declining of the fish stocks of one of the major fishing grounds of the world on the East Coast of Newfoundland.

And I would like to commend the Member for Bonavista South for presenting his motion before the House so that it could be debated and if we could show as members of the government, in fact, all of the members of the honourable House that we are indeed concerned about the future of the fishing industry in Newfoundland.

You know a lot has been said, and maybe I could repeat that word "said" and emphasize it, about the fishery in Newfoundland by various governments over the years. It seems to me that in doing a little bit of research in this area that the Newfoundland fishermen have indeed been studied to death, and one could not blame them if at this particular time they started to complain because there was not more action by government on their behalf.

During the last twenty years we have had nine major studies commissioned by various governments to assess the state of the fishing industry in this Province. And there have been countless other reports written by government officials and researchers. Out of these studies, out of these reports, out of these research documents have come some good proposals. But if one follows through, one will find out that very little action has been taken to correct the problems of the fishery and, in fact,

if any action has been taken at all, much of it has been to the detriment of the fishing industry. Occasions in the past when crises have developed in the fishing industry, they have been merely given the band-aid treatment to appease the fishermen by great statements, by great promises of things to come.

I feel, Mr. Speaker, in listening to this debate and the good arguments that have been put forward and in studying some of the documents that have been prepared previously, that we have defined the problem. I believe, Sir, that the time has come for action if we are to build a strong fishing industry for Newfoundland, for Eastern Canada or in fact for all of Canada. If we look at Newfoundland specifically, we go back to the days of John Cabot when fish were so plentiful in this Province, when, as it has been reported, you could merely put a basket into the sea and draw it up full of fish. That is almost 400 years ago.

You know, almost since those days up until at least the late nineteenth century the fishing industry has been almost the entire basis of the economy in Newfoundland. It was only when we were able to develop industrial projects such as paper mills and mines and so on that the economy became more diversified. Over the years, Sir, as our Province has developed, we find that other countries have placed a great deal of emphasis on the fishing industry. So much so that as we mentioned before in this debate, that I am sure they have spent hundreds of millions of dollars to provide equipment and facilities to come and catch and process fish off our shores when it appears to me, Sir, that the fish would be eating the kelp off the rocks and we would hardly bother to go and catch them.

In the last twenty years, and I would like to quote some statistics to justify some of the arguments which I propose to make in the next few minutes as to what has happened in the last twenty years - I do not refer to this figure twenty years with any political connotation, but merely as a period of time - in the last twenty years the offshore fishery in Newfoundland has only increased by one per cent. To justify that, Sir, let me quote some statistics.

In 1953 we had approximately 16,000 fishermen in Newfoundland, 16,000 in 1953. That was quoted from an APEC document. I am assuming that is correct. The figure given was that five per cent of these people were involved in the offshore fishery and ninety-five per cent were involved in the inshore fishery. In early 1970 it was estimated between 16,000 and 18,000 people were involved in the fishery. Six per cent were involved in the offshore fishery and ninety-four per cent were involved in the inshore fishery.

Now, Sir, that shows an increase in the offshore fishery of one per cent in that period of time of almost twenty years.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SENIOR: No, Sir. I may further on have some figures in that regard, but I am sure I would need two or three hours to go into an in-depth debate on this particular subject and to give all the relevant facts. I have merely - maybe these particular facts have been presented previously in the debate, but what I am trying to do here in preparing what I wanted to say today, was merely give a cursory glance to some documents that were available to me rather than to go

into a detailed research, and merely to bring out some statistics to justify some points which I wanted to make.

Now, Sir, foreign fleets in 1970 were taking eighty-six per cent of the total catch in the Northwest Atlantic of cod, which would indicate to me, Sir, that compared to what is happening in Newfoundland that most of their fishing is concentrated on offshore fishery. In 1949 Newfoundland was catching twenty per cent of the total catch in the Northwest Atlantic. That had declined to fourteen per cent in 1970, and we can compare that to what is happening with the foreign fleets, with the great expansion programmes that they have had on.

Now, Sir, this was during the period, of course, of the former administration, from 1949 up to 1970. And we can see what happened to the offshore fishery in Newfoundland during this period, when we see great advances by the foreign fleets coming into our waters, spending hundreds of millions of dollars, and travelling thousands of miles to catch our fish and yet here at home we see stagnation and decline in one of our great industries and one of our great renewable resources.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. SENIOR: Now, Sir, I mentioned at the beginning of my few remarks that there have been extensive studies done over the years. It would take me some time to comment on all of them, and I do not think it would be necessary because they all deal with practically the same problem in essence. So I will just comment briefly on some of these studies and what happened as a result of them.

I noticed back in 1951 to 1953 the Newfoundland Fisheries Development Committee did a study of the fishery of Newfoundland. They came up with certain recommendations. One was to modernize the operation, the same old phrase is repeated, if you will, utilizing resources to the best advantage, meeting marketing requirements, and this is a unique recommendation, Sir, or a unique comment, an amazing comment to me, to provide a standard of

living in the industry with the national level. I am sure most people in this Province would never dream that the standard of living of the fishermen of Newfoundland would reach the national level. But we do not have to go too far, Sir, to see that this may be possible because if we take such countries as Iceland, which I do not know a great deal about, but I have heard some remarks made from time to time and I have done some reading on this particular country where they are totally dependent on the fishery, and I understand that they have a very high standard of living, that they have full employment because of the policies which their government have brought in concerning the fishery in that country for conservation and marketing and processing and what have you, and I am sure that the same thing could be possible here if the correct measures were taken.

Okay, this study was completed, the recommendations were made - this is back in 1951 and 1953 - both the federal and the provincial government at that time failed to act on the recommendations. Or the reaction of the federal government was, let things go the way they are going and, of course, we all know what the reaction of the provincial government was at that time, burn your boats, because there are going to be three or four jobs for every man and certainly that speaks for itself as they had no indication of placing any emphasis on the fishery in Newfoundland. So the reaction in this particular instance of the federal government towards the fishery in the province, I think, is indicative of the action of the federal government towards, maybe not only the Province of Newfoundland, but other provinces as well. It is becoming increasingly clear to me that many of the policies formulated by the federal government are formulated based on federal thinking, on Central Canada thinking, on Central Canada priorities, policies and legislation which was brought in in the national interest without taking into consideration the regional differences that exist within Canada.

Sir, the growing of wheat is very important to the Prairie Provinces and from time to time, I am sure, the federal government have taken note of that and they have certainly been very sympathetic

to listening to these provinces in the production of their products. It seems to me that we cannot seem to get the same attention from the federal government for the fishery in Newfoundland. Maybe one of the reasons for that is, as has already been mentioned in this debate, that as the Gross National Product of Canada, the amount of fish produced, I think, represents something like 1.5 per cent of the Gross National Product of Canada. And when you consider that to protect the fishing grounds in Newfoundland, to have jurisdiction over the fishing grounds, we have to negotiate with countries from many parts of the world, and it would appear, Sir, that the federal government are not going to rock the international boat for something that represents about 1.5 per cent of the Gross National Product of Canada.

Now this is unfortunate because it points out a statement that I made earlier that the federal government is insensitive to the differences that exist in various parts of Canada when they are formulating their national policies. Sir, we may be at the end of Canada, geographically as far as the federal government is concerned, but I would remind the federal government, Sir, that we are at the beginning of the best fishing grounds in the world.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SENIOR: Let us go on to other studies. You know, when you talk about the fishery, and I got into a speech here last year on rural development and at that time, you know, it was difficult to isolate one particular thing, to take it out of context without considering other matters that relate to the federal government, and I think the same thing can apply to the fishery, because if you go back and just give some of the studies, a cursory glance, some of these recommendations of studies that have been made over the years, you will find out that they are related to other things as well. For example, and the Hon. Minister of Justice may be more familiar with this than I am, but back in 1957 there was a study commissioned of the fishery on the South Coast.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right, the Walsh Commission.

MR. SENIOR: The Walsh Commission, that is true.

And out of that commission came two main recommendations. There were that development of the fishery in this area depended on two alternatives: One was to reduce the number of fishermen, and it went on to qualify that by saying that one way to reduce the number of fishermen would be to implement a Resettlement Programme. That was back in 1957. Number two would be to increase the size and number of the export markets. Now, Sir, that is very relevant. That is very important. That is very significant. Because that will relate to the point I am going to make a little later on which is particularly the first recommendation that they would resettle the fishermen and solve the problem in that way. These are documented facts. These are not political statements. These are not statements made to point a finger at somebody or someone like that. These are documented facts which can be substantiated.

Now, Sir, what happened? Obviously the government of the day opted for recommendation number one, that the fishermen in the area would be resettled. And the rationale or the methodology or the criteria or whatever you want to call it was that they would install a large fish processing plant in various centres to employ the people who were resettled, and they would expand the offshore fishery to supply these plants.

I am going to go back to this in just a moment, but I just want to relate a few facts here. to sort of lay a background for what I am going to say. ICNAF came on the scene in 1950. Because of the increase in the foreign fishing fleets in waters close to our land, they came on to protect and conserve and maintain the fisheries in the North Atlantic to make possible the maintenance of a maximum sustainable catch. But in spite of their efforts, Sir, the foreign fleets continue to expand, they continue to build bigger trawlers, and they continue to take larger catches. And I can substantiate that by quoting statistics from a four year period from 1956 to 1960.

In that four year period the Russian catch in the ICNAF territory or the waters that would be under their jurisdiction, the Russian catch increased from seventeen (17) to 250,000 metric tons of fish. From 1950 to 1960 in the area under the jurisdiction of ICNAF, or the area that would be under their perusal, whatever word you want to use, jurisdiction, the Russian catch increased from seventeen (17) to 250,000 metric tons of fish.

Now this was happening at a time when ICNAF was set up to protect and conserve and maintain the North Atlantic Fishery, to make possible the maintenance of maximum sustainable yield in the area.

West Germany increased from thirty-seven to 217,000 metric tons of fish. Significant increases were also recorded by Spain, France, Denmark, and the United Kingdom. What happened to Canada during this period?

Canada's increase in this same ICNAF area, during the same four years, increased 1.3 per cent, from 714,000 to 723,000 metric tons of fish. I understand now that at the present date there is something like 300,000 and 400,000 metric tons per year in that particular area.

AN HON. MEMBER: I audible.

MR. SENIOR: 714,000 to 723,000 in that four year period. So when you consider the increase by the foreign countries as compared to the increase by Canada, I think it speaks for itself the attitude that Canada has towards the fishery.

So, Sir, when all this was going on over a period of, well up to 1960 and certainly the provincial government of that time was aware of what was happening and the tremendous increase in fishing on the various banks, the Hamilton Banks, the Grand Banks and so on and the St. George's Bank and the St. Pierre Bank and Banquereau, one I am not that familiar with, but off Labrador

which is the Hamilton Bank, the government was aware of what was happening, Sir. It was impressed upon them by the various studies that were made by the reports that came in. It was impressed upon them in great detail. What was happening, recommendations were made to them to take some action to approach the federal government, This was even done ten years before 1960. Way back there when the Walsh - back in 1950.

So anyway between 1960 and 1963 the Province prepared two reports. This was the report on recommendation of the Newfoundland Fisheries Commission to the Government of Newfoundland. At that time they urged the provincial government to petition the federal government, which is basically what we are doing now, to take action for the protection of the fishery adjacent to Canada shores. Now that was ten years after the Fisheries Development Committee submitted its report to the provincial government that they decided that they would at least go to the federal government and ask them to take some action.

Now, Sir, what happened? Again it is very interesting to note what happened. The federal government's position was, we are not willing to take any action but maintain the status quo. Actually a lot of more funds to the resettlement programme to resettle the fishermen in the Province. The provincial government of that day instead of fighting the reaction of the federal government they accepted and implemented the proposal of resettlement as the solution to the fishery problem in Newfoundland.

As far as I am concerned, Sir, except being a member of ICNAF, Canada has done little else to promote offshore jurisdiction. I quote again from documents that I have read that in the 1958 Geneva Law of the Sea Conference, after all the negotiations and discussions that went on, Canada accepted the three mile territorial limit at that time and it is said that no one was more astonished at the stand taken by Canada at that time than were the members at that particular conference.

So on and on it goes, Sir, studies, reports, recommendations,

no action, or any action that was taken was certainly to the detriment of the fishery in this Province.

You know it is a subject that literally has been beaten to death over the last seven or eight years or so, and that is the resettlement programme. Well, Sir, when one does just a little research into the federal government's attitude towards rural Newfoundland and towards the fishery in this Province, some things become very, very clear, that the Federal Government of Canada have very little interest in developing rural Newfoundland and that carries over on the fishery of Newfoundland.

I am wonder, Sir, unless their attitude is going to change drastically, what stand they are going to take at the Law of the Sea Conference in Geneva that will take place shortly.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is on now.

MR. SENIOR: Oh it is on now, I am sorry. Because, Sir, any long term plans for the fishery in Newfoundland is certainly contingent on the success or the failure of Canada on the stand that they take at the ICNAF Conference.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SENIOR: I beg your pardon.

MR. SIMMONS: I was just commenting, the member represents a great fisheries district, I was telling my colleague here.

MR. SENIOR: The member represents a great industrial district.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SENIOR: But the member grew up in one of the greatest fishing areas of the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Flat Island.

AN HON. MEMBER: He knows a lot more -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SENIOR: And it is an issue when I sometimes hear some of the remarks,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SENIOR: And if anything I need to make a good speech without any notes it is a good heckler. The honourable Minister of Fisheries has been with me on a few occasions when I have made some speeches and when I have had a good heckler it turns me on. Nothing turns me on more than to be considering one of the major resources in this Province, that is the fishery, where people get up and gab and gab and gab for hour after hour after hour and say nothing that means anything to the fishermen of this Province, to get on the air waves, they try to brain-wash the fishermen of this Province into what they are going to do if they get re-elected in this Province and I have just outlined in the last fifteen or twenty minutes what the previous administration did for the fishermen of this Province.

What did they do? On the recommendations that came in from all nine studies and reports that were done in this Province they did absolutely nothing only sit on their fannies and go along with what the federal government recommended to do. They did not have the guts to stand up to the federal government and say look, we are not going to resettle the people from rural Newfoundland because if we destroy rural Newfoundland, we destroy the fishery in Newfoundland, we will destroy Newfoundland and we are not going to accept that position and there is no way that we are not going to accept it. There is no use in you presenting it to us.

But instead of that they did not have the guts to stand up to them. If they had done that ten years ago, the fishery in Newfoundland would be in better condition than it is today.

I will tell you something else, and I am sure I speak for the Progressive Conservation Government of this Province, when this resolution is passed in this honourable House and it goes to the federal government for consideration and they come back to us and say we recommend that you continue to resettle the fishermen from the rural areas of the Province to some urban areas where they become a liability on that community, I got a feeling that this government is not going to accept it.

It is about time that a few people in this Province and maybe a few people in this House, including myself, had as much gumption and guts as some of the fishermen around this Province. If we had as much common sense, which appears to be so uncommon in the House at times, we would tackle problems more realistically and we would take things a little bit more seriously and there would be a little bit more action and less talk and less repetition and less waste of time. We have been studied to death in the fishery in Newfoundland. I know, I know how hard the fishermen work. I know what it is to stand at a splitting table all night myself and pull the guts of the fish and put the liver in the liver barrel. I have done it. So, do not tell me anything about the fishery, although I represent a district which I am very proud of, the District of Grand Falls, but I grew up around the fishery and my father pulled salt water out of his eyes for seventeen years to put me to school because he -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: - misunderstood me completely.

MR. SENIOR: No, I did not misunderstand you.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SENIOR: But if there had been a few more people, if there had been a few more ordinary people elected to this honourable House who maybe had been born on the islands in Placentia Bay or the islands in Bonavista Bay or Notre Dame Bay who had grown up around the fishery, they would have a more common-sense approach to the fishery problems in this Province.

Peter Simple said to me one time - I do not know his real name, but he was known as Peter Simple.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Rupert Jackson, the late Rupert Jackson.

MR. SENIOR: Rupert Jackson, the late Rupert Jackson, said to me, one time, he said, do you want to know what is going on around this Province, do you want to find out, do you want to find out from the people who really know. He said go up and talk to Granny upon the hill in a rocking chair, she will tell you. If you want to know what is wrong with the fishery in Newfoundland today, go out around this Province and talk to the fishermen.

They will tell you and they will come up with more common-sense answers and solutions than half the brains in this building because they have learned it from experience.

The Honourable Minister of Justice was asking me a question a few moments ago, Sir, about the fish yield. Now, I have not compiled a great deal of statistics in this area, but I think it is evident to anybody who has even taken a cursory glance at statistics that have been made available that fish stocks have declined considerably over the last few years and particularly in the last year from 1973 to 1974. It is worthy of note, Mr. Speaker, there was only one exception to the decline in fish stocks and that was that the catch of caplin had increased last year by 107 per cent. The increase in the take of caplin last year, catch of caplin, increased by 107 per cent from 14 million to 29 million pounds.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: That is offshore.

MR. SENIOR: Offshore, right. Now, Sir, let me go back to Placentia Bay again.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SENIOR: Just let me go back to Placentia Bay again where we learned a little bit about the fishery up there, you know, because we used to fish. The same thing applies to the fishery, as far as I am concerned, in all areas of the Province. I am relating this to a specific point, in saying that the catch of caplin last year increased by 107 per cent and any fisherman up there in the day when I grew up knew that there was no use of him putting out his cod trap until the caplin came to shore. If there were no caplin, there were no fish. It was as simple as that. "No caplin, no fish", that was the way it was put. They got up in the morning before daylight to find out if the caplin came in. Communications were not that good in that area but I will tell you, Sir, when those caplin hit the shore, you had no trouble to hear about it. There were lots of motor boats going. There were lots of gear being put in the boats because

the fishermen were smart enough to know that when those caplin came to shore the fish came looking for them. Sir, I am convinced that if we are going to rape the resource of caplin the way it is being done now, that the inshore fishery will continue to decline and, in fact, will die.

Why did this happen? For one reason, the Russians exceeded their quota considerably. The Canadians did not meet their quota at all, which shows, and I think this is the point of the whole situation here, a lack of control, a lack of jurisdiction, a lack of concern, a lack of any regard by the Federal Government for the fishing industry in general. That is the purpose, Sir, of this whole resolution, to bring to the attention of the Federal Government that, you know, something has got to be done and it is only the Federal Government that can do it. All the Province can do is catch fish if it is there to catch. It is up to the Federal Government to bring in measures to conserve the resource, to conserve the species. Even if they bring in laws and extend the territorial limits to 200 miles or the Continental Shelf, we still have a problem in enforcing these laws.

So, it is not an easy problem to solve, but, Sir, even if they made an attempt, even if they recognize it as a real problem, you know, in the real sense, in a sincere sense, then, at least, we would be on the road to going somewhere. But, you know, even if Canada is successful at the ICNAF Conference or the Law of the Sea Conference, whichever it is called right now, I understand, Sir, that it will take ten to fifteen years to replenish the fish stocks on the fishing grounds in Newfoundland, Hamilton Banks included.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: How long?

MR. SENIOR: Ten to fifteen years to replenish the fish stocks to a point where the fishing industry in this Province will be a

viable industry, to the point where a fisherman can make a living on a standard with other citizens.

So, that calls for immediate action, but it goes back again and all these recommendations were made years ago, ten, fifteen years ago to the previous administration and they were urged to go to the Federal Government, urging the Federal Government to take measures to protect the fish stocks, to increase the territorial limits and so on and what did we get? Forget about the fishery. We are not going to take any action. We are going to give you a few more million dollars to move the fishermen out of the fishing areas and move them into the urban areas and that will solve the problem. If we have not got any fishermen, we have not got any problem because they are not going to go out and fish. That was the Federal Government's attitude. I do not believe in that, never did, never will because I think the Federal Government have got a responsibility to this Province to recognize that the fishery is still the basis of the economy for this Province. It is not the basis of the economy for Canada. It represents a small, small, small portion of the Gross National Product of Canada.

The lesson that the Federal Government has got to learn is this, that when they are formulating policies, when they are bringing in legislation, they have got to consider the differences that exist within Canada. They have got to consider the priorities that exist within the different Provinces of Canada and only then can they come to grips with the problem and it only then can they even make an attempt to deal with it. That is where I have not seen too much evidence of that, not only in the fishery but in other areas as well in my brief time as minister in dealing with the Federal Government. That is one of the biggest problems that we had to cope with, was having the Federal Government realize that we are different down here. Our priorities are different. Our

March 26, 1975.

Tape 802

RH - 5

needs are different. What is important to us is not important to Ontario or Quebec or British Columbia and they got to recognize that. How can you stress that too much? I can stand here for an hour and repeat the same thing over and over and over, but of course, I would be ruled out of order. But I repeat it for the purpose of making an impression, not on the Member for Hermitage because obviously he is not well versed in the area of fisheries because he is on the different side of the coin whereas I know a little bit about the fishery. I do not represent a fishing district. He represents a fishing district and does not know anything about the fishery.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SENIOR: I did not start it, boy. I like a little provocation when I am speaking because I am usually a very mild, placid person. I just like to get up before the honourable House and make a few points, but when I get a good heckler on the other side it sort of stimulates me a little bit and the old wheels start turning and I start thinking a little better. I feel more relaxed on my feet and I feel I can talk much more freely.

So, you know -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SENIOR: Oh, well I had better go back, Mr. Speaker, and just make a few more points in that regard because I feel, Sir, that the points that I have made are very relevant to the subject. Now, it may have appeared to some members of the honourable House that I have strayed from the subject somewhat when I have mentioned subjects like resettlement, about moving the people from the rural areas to the urban areas of the Province. This was the great master plan of the federal government, to solve the fisheries problem in Newfoundland.

If we have not got any fishermen, then we do not have any problem. They are not going to complain. If the fishermen are moved out there and we put them on welfare or whatever and they become a liability in that community, they are not going to be going out fishing so they are not going to be complaining about the fishery. The Province is not going to be coming bugging us, taking action with other countries of the world to extend their territorial limits and so on and so forth. So, if we can solve the problem like that, if we can get all the fishermen out of those small communities, our problem is solved. That was their attitude. That was the way they were going to deal with the fisheries situation in Newfoundland, a documented fact.

The amazing thing about it is - it is bad enough that this was the policy of the federal government - but the amazing thing about it was that the government of the Province at that time which was close to the situation, which was right on top of the situation, which had been informed time and time again of the problem that was on our

doorstep, that was coming our way by the tremendous increase in foreign fishing fleets off on the Grand Banks and the Hamilton Banks and what have you, they were aware of it. Even if the federal government was not aware of it, they were aware of it. In my opinion, it was their responsibility if they were acting in the best interests of the people, as they would appear to tell us now they would be if they were re-elected, if they were the government of this province - but then that day, Sir, and it is not that long ago, it is only three or four years ago, this was their attitude, that they were not prepared to take a strong stand for the Province of Newfoundland in the area of the fishery and go back to the federal government and say, we are not prepared to accept that position.

I mean, do we have to accept everything that the federal government tells us to do? I do not know much about the terms of Confederation, Mr. Speaker, but I have gone through them on occasion. I do not see any reference there, Sir, where it says that it is mandatory that we must do everything that the federal government tells us to do. Surely as a Province it is our responsibility to decide what the priorities of the Province are. It is the responsibility of the Provincial Government to present to the federal government the cause of the fishermen of Newfoundland. This is what has been neglected over the years in Newfoundland right from day one, right from the day they said, pull up your boats and burn them. They have done absolutely nothing to make a case to the federal government, a strong case for the federal government to take action on our behalf and to indicate to them that if this Province is going to survive we have to have the fishery.

If Saskatchewan is going to survive, they have to grow wheat. If Ontario is going to survive, they have to have the big industrial parks and so on.

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

MR. NEARY: A point of order. Your Honour, we have sat here now for the last twenty minutes or so very patiently listening to the honourable member. The honourable member, Sir, has been completely irrelevant, out

of order for about twenty minutes, but we have let the member ramble on, Sir, because it is not very often he makes a speech in this honourable House, But I would submit to Your Honour that the resolution that we are debating is whether or not the ICNAF, or we should send the resolution to ICNAF asking to have the fishing on the Hamilton Banks curtailed during the spawning season.

I would submit that the member is not relevant and that Your Honour ask the member if he would get back to the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The pains being experienced by the honourable member for Bell Island will soon be relieved because I was about to remind the honourable member for Grand Falls that he has two minutes left in which to speak.

MR. SENIOR: If I only have, Mr. Speaker, two minutes left to speak, that might be time enough for me to just get back to the relevant points.

MR. SIMMONS: Inaudible.

MR. SENIOR: I beg your pardon?

MR. SIMMONS: Inaudible.

MR. SENIOR: It seems like I have only been talking for five minutes. It seemed long before I got provoked, Mr. Speaker, but once I got provoked the time went very quickly. It seems that time just flies when you are stimulated when you are speaking.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Carry on by leave.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Want to carry on by leave?

SOME HONOURABLE MEMBERS: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The two minutes are fast becoming consumed.

MR. SENIOR: Mr. Speaker, I support this resolution. One more point I would like to make, Sir, is this, I was merely drawing an analogy, a comparison between the attitude of the previous government and this government. It is that we support this resolution. We are going to send

it to Ottawa and we are going to demand that some action be taken.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable member for Port au Port.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, the member for Grand Falls is going to be a hard act to follow. However, I will do my best. I would like to make some points which I think have been made originally by the member for Bonavista South. I would like some more emphasis to them. I hope I am not irrelevant, but I am sure that honourable members will be vigilant in that regard.

Mr. Speaker, I wonder why this whole thing is necessary. Why is this motion necessary? We have been part of Canada for twenty-six years. It will be twenty-six years within a few days. Why is it necessary after twenty-six years as part of Canada for Newfoundland to be going up to Ottawa and telling Ottawa to do something they should have always done, assume a responsibility that came with Confederation, the responsibility to preserve, conserve, exploit reasonably our fish resources off the Coast of Newfoundland.

Now, it is obvious that foreigners, foreign jurisdictions, are far more vigilant, crafty and willing to participate in the Newfoundland fishery than are the Canadians. Now, the Canadian Government has made it relatively unnecessary. They have never made it easy for Newfoundlanders to participate in the fishery. Mr. Speaker, I wonder now after twenty-six years as part of Confederation, I am wondering whether this motion, this superfluous motion that we have before us here, something that should never have to come before this House, yet has consumed approximately three weeks of debate in this House, why is it necessary?

I think it questions the very fabric of Confederation. It does question it. The Westerners, British Columbia, Alberta, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, they question Confederation at a moment's notice. The people from Quebec, major concessions have been given to people of Quebec over the years just to cajole them into staying into Confederation, and coincidentally to elect a government that reflected that idea.

What has Newfoundland done? Newfoundland, to coin a phrase, has been more Catholic than the Pope so far as Confederation is concerned.

It has been apostasy, heresy to question Confederation in Newfoundland. If you ever questioned Confederation in Newfoundland over the past twenty-five years you were practically run out of town. It was something that was just not done.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I question it. I question it with regard to the federal government's attitude towards the Newfoundland fishery. I am wondering whether Newfoundland needed Confederation at all. I am wondering whether the government had raised the minimum wage laws on the American Airforce Bases in Newfoundland back in the late 40's and early 50's, that we could not have injected triple, quadruple the amount of money into this province.

MR. NEARY: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I would like to draw to Your Honour's attention the BE IT RESOLVED part of this resolution, that the legislature urge the federal government to make a strong case at the upcoming ICNAP meeting that a ban be placed on fishing on the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season.

Now, Your Honour, for the last

five minutes I would like to know what relationship the remarks made by the Member for Port au Port, the Deputy Speaker of the House, Sir, has to that resolution to that "be resolved." I will submit to Your Honour that the member is not relevant and that Your Honour ask the member to observe the rules of this honourable House.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, if I might address myself to -

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: As I understand what the honourable gentleman is saying, the honourable gentleman for Port au Port, the relevance of it is that he is pointing out that this resolution should not have to be passed because the Government of Canada should not have to be urged to make a strong case at ICNAF for prohibiting fishing on the Hamilton Banks during the spawning season. And he is pointing out that this is inadequacy in Confederation, and it is part of the total failure by Canada to meet our needs adequately, or this is how he is developing his argument. And that is the relevance of it to this situation.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. CROSBIE: So he is pointing out that we would not need to pass this resolution were Canada really interested in what happens in the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. NEARY: The minister and the House Leader on the government side, Sir, had a very desperate struggle that time to make a case to support the honourable member's remarks. It was a very weak case, I submit to Your Honour. And I am glad to see that the minister is finally awakened this afternoon. But, Sir, no matter what the minister said, the Member for Port au Port is still out of order, Sir. And I would ask Your Honour to ask the member if he would be relevant to this resolution that is under debate at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Chair would certainly remind the honourable Member for Port au Port about the rule of relevancy.

MR. GILLETT: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak to that point of order, and if this is in order, and if the honourable Member for Port au Port is permitted to continue in the vein in which he has started perhaps he might tell us why the states of the United States, the fishing states of Maine are petitioning the federal government of

the United States for the same reason, and they have been confederated much longer than we have, much, much longer.

AN HON. MEMBER: The whole thing is completely out of order.

MR. GILLETT: Sure it is.

MR. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Port au Port.

MR. STAGG: Well, I will attempt to observe the rule of relevancy, although I do believe I am making a point that is completely relevant, and I have to back up my point with argument.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear! Hear!

MR. STAGG: And the argument that I am using is the complete and abject failure of Ottawa to assert its jurisdiction in this very important and vital field so far as the economy of Newfoundland is concerned.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right!

MR. STAGG: And there is nothing more relevant.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right! Right!

MR. STAGG: And there is nothing more relevant that can ever be brought before this House. And if in doing so I have to question the fabric of Confederation, well so be it. And I wonder, I wonder aloud whether or not Newfoundland was better off in our out of Confederation?

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do I understand from the member's last remarks that he is questioning Your Honour's ruling? My understanding was that Your Honour asked the member to be relevant to this resolution, and the last remarks made by the honourable member, Sir, would indicate to me and the House, I am sure, that the member is questioning Your Honour's ruling. Now the Deputy Speaker of the House should know that there is a procedure in the Standing Rules of this House to question

Your Honour's ruling if a member wishes to do so.

AN HON. MEMBER: To that point of order,

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, unfortunately the honourable Member for Port au Port is not speaking in baby talk, and the honourable Member for Bell Island apparently cannot follow the setting up of the rationale to make his point. And I am here listening with much interest to the rationale being set up and I am sure that the point he will make as a result of that rationale will be very pertinent to the resolution under consideration.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Chair did not get the impression that the honourable Member for Port au Port was questioning your ruling, indeed the Chair reminded the honourable Member for Port au Port about the rule of relevancy. And the remark with regards to proper procedure of questioning the ruling of the Chair perhaps would apply to many honourable members of this House.

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will jump two pages in my speech to avoid the caterwauling from across the floor.

AN HON. MEMBER: You will have to come back to that later.

MR. STAGG: And the third page says how does all of this relate to the Hamilton Banks? Now the press and the House are going to have to do without these very cogent and some times provocative, I would say, remarks that I have here. But in order to preserve peace and quiet I will have to explain how all of this relates to the Hamilton Banks.
Well -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. STAGG: I might.

I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that all is not lost. I will give Ottawa one more chance. This is the season for one last chance. Ottawa has a chance to vindicate itself over the next five years. I am not completely without hope that they will do something, I am sure that the pressure from this House of Assembly and from other jurisdictions

in Canada, British Columbia and the other coastal provinces of Canada and the fact that the Department of Fisheries had been reinstated in Ottawa is going to mean that Ottawa is finally going to spend or is going to give a great deal of attention to that which they should have paid attention to a number of years ago.

But I would like to bring up one other point. I am not sure of my facts here, I am not sure of the exact amount of money, but I heard much to my chagrin about a month ago that the Department of the Environment is going to spend approximately \$8 million on buildings in the St. John's area to house their federal fisheries workers - \$8 million. Now there are many members in this House who have been after the federal government for year, and years, and years - I have been elected now for three and a half years, and there are other members here who have been elected for the same length of time, and many members for longer, and I am sure all of us have been after the federal government for quite some time to do something constructive for the fishery. Now as far as I am concerned doing something constructive for the fisheries is not making posh air-conditioned offices for their staff, and that way -

AN HON. MEMBER: On a point of order. Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: that way they will never get out to the Hamilton Banks, Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: They will never get out to the Hamilton Banks, if -

AN HON. MEMBER: On a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. STAGG: they are restricted to their plush air-conditioned offices. However,

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, does the honourable Deputy Speaker know the rules of the House? Your Honour, I would submit, Sir, once again that the member is irrelevant, I hate to be interrupting the member because I know he is trying to do the best he can. But, Sir, this resolution

deals with the matter of urging the federal government at the up-coming ICNAF meeting to place a ban on fishing on the Hamilton Banks. Now, Sir, what does a federal government fishery office downtown have to do with that, Your Honour? I would submit that the member is completely irrelevant and ignoring Your Honour's ruling.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order. I am talking about the federal government's priorities. I have heard nothing from the federal government with regard to their priorities so far as the Hamilton Banks is concerned. Apparently it is a priority with the federal government that they spend these excessive amounts of money on buildings. Now they have got plenty of buildings down there at Pepperrell. They have not had any problem that I am aware of, having an office. And I do not like the idea of having -

AN HON. MEMBER: Thirty million.

MR. STAGG: Thirty million - well I said \$8 million I was conservative.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker,

MR. STAGG: Thirty million dollars.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, -

MR. STAGG: And not one -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Can I have a ruling on my point of order, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The honourable Member for Bell Island rose on a point of order, and the honourable Member for Port au Port said that he would like a few words to that point of order. He has -

MR. NEARY: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: If the honourable Member for Bell Island wishes the Chair to continue I would suggest that perhaps he would give the Chair the opportunity to do so.

The honourable Member for Port au Port was taking considerable time in getting his reply to that point of order, and again I would remind him of the rule of relevancy, although it is most difficult for the Chair to rule on that particular ruling.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Member for Port au Port, however, may continue.

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, the harassment from the honourable member will continue no doubt.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of personal privilege, Your Honour. Mr. Speaker, I would ask Your Honour to ask the Member for Port au Port to withdraw that remark, Sir? In this honourable House it is our duty and obligation and responsibility to see that the rules of order, the Standing Rules of the House are carried out, Sir. And that is all I was doing, I was doing my duty as an elected representative, as a member of this House, Sir, and I resent the Member for Port au Port accusing me of harassing him because that is not what I am doing, Sir, I am merely trying to show the member how to follow the rules of this House and how to debate in this honourable House. And that is my duty, Sir, and responsibility.

MR. SPEAKER: The Member for Burgeo.

MR. A. EVANS: To that point of order, Sir, I suggest we send the Member for Bell Island out to the Hamilton Banks.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CROSBIE: Mr. Speaker, there is no Standing Order of this House which says that honourable gentlemen have to be relevant.

MR. NEARY: There is.

MR. CROSBIE: If there was most gentlemen who speak in this House would be ruled out of order about ninety percent of the time, and a great deal of leeway has to be given. Now this is just harassment of the speaker. The Member for Port au Port is relating his remarks to the Hamilton Banks - what are the priorities of the federal government. It is quite illogical, and a debating technique that is used constantly.

I submit to Your Honour that this harassment by the acting -
I do not know what he is, Acting House Leader or as the Acting Leader,
He is acting like a leader -

AN HON. MEMBER: How?

MR. CROSBIE: - he is acting like a House Leader, He is the
one man band on the Opposition side - should be directed to stop
this interruption of the honourable gentleman's speech.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

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

The Hon. Member for Bell Island rose on a point
of personal privilege and was not accompanied by a motion of any
kind. If he interprets remarks made by the Hon. Member for Port au Port
as not being correct, I submit that it is a difference of opinion
between the two honourable members.

MR. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I take it back that I am not being
harassed by the Hon. Member for Bell Island. He is just rising
on numerous procedural points which have the same effect as
harassments. So a rose by any other name is still a rose.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have pretty well come to the
end of my remarks. They only had a few remarks.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. STAGG: Well, Mr. Speaker, I do have a couple of concluding
remarks that the Hamilton Banks, as far as I can ascertain given the
information of the learned member for Bonavista South, they are
where the fish spawn and these fish come inshore. Now down the
West Coast of Newfoundland through the Straits of Belle Isle come
these tremendous fish from the Hamilton Banks. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker,
they have not been coming in such profusion in the last few years
as they had previously.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Well, why is that?

MR. STAGG: Why is that, the Minister of Education says?

Well if the fish were there once, and the Hamilton Banks are being ravaged, and they have been ravaged over a number of years and the fish are not there now, I maintain, Your Honour, that conservation of the fish stocks on the Hamilton Banks have a direct relation to the fishermen of St. George's Bay, the Bay of Islands and all up and down the West Coast of Newfoundland. We do have a lot of fishermen on the West Coast. It is unfortunate that the Select Committee on the Inshore Fishery does not have a member from the West Coast, Unfortunately, the reason being that the Hon. Member for St. George's and myself have other duties in the House, but I certainly would have liked to have been on that committee. But we have extreme difficulty over on the West Coast now looking towards the future so far as a fishery at all is concerned, because our fish do come, in the main, from the North. They are good, large fish but the quantities have been falling in latter years.

AN HON. MEMBER: And size.

MR. STAGG: And they are not as big as they were, right.

Mr. Speaker, the federal government spends all its money on buildings and yet they will not put any money into harbours. And maybe the reason that they are not putting any money in harbours is that they know the Hamilton Banks are going to be ravaged -

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

MR. STAGG: The Hamilton Banks are going to be ravaged -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would I be considered -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: If I raised a point of order, Sir, would that be considered as harassment by Your Honour because the member is completely ignoring the ruling of Your Honour. Time and time again, Sir, I have had to stand in my place to remind the honourable House that the member is completely out of order and not relevant to the debate under discussion, the resolution, and I would ask Your Honour that if the member does not follow Your Honour's instructions that

Your Honour ask the member to take his seat in this honourable House and he not be allowed to speak any further, Sir, in this debate.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Point of order, please.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Education.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: As I see it, Mr. Speaker, the honourable gentleman from Port au Port is using a time honoured method of debate and that is relating cause to effect. He was stating the reluctance of the federal government to build harbours as the effect, and he was suggesting as the cause the fact that there may not be fish on the Hamilton Banks. So he is directly relating the Hamilton Banks to various matters.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, to that point of order, if I may too?

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

MR. ROUSSEAU: I think the Hon. Member for Port au Port is bringing up a number of pertinent points which are of interest to the people of this Province. And merely because the Hon. Member for Bell Island appears to be against the fishery in the Province they are not concerned with the problems that the fishery is encountering. Then, you know, I see that as no reason why he should not allow the Hon. Member for Port au Port, who is from a fishing district, and wants to echo some of the problems experienced by fishermen by letting him bring out these points.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

Perhaps it is that the Chair has been harassed by continuous points of order being raised. However the Chair feels that it is capable of ruling on points of relevancy whether or not they are right or not. The Hon. Member for Port au Port may continue.

MR. STAGG: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Member for Bell Island appears to be obsessed with the idea of relevancy as it pertains to this particular speaker,

and Mr. Speaker, he will not let me finish the sentence. I will repeat what I was saying before. The federal government, maybe they know something we do not know. Maybe they know that they have no plans for the Hamilton Banks, that the foreigners can come in and ravage the Hamilton Banks, and there will be nothing left, so why build any harbours on the West Coast of Newfoundland? Why spend these millions of dollars on the West Coast of Newfoundland? But maybe it is better to build fancy buildings in St. John's so

that the civil servants can sit there and ponder the lost fishery. Maybe that is their rationale. I do not know.

Mr. Speaker, the whole thing relates right back to the fabric of Confederation. This problem should never have arisen and it makes me wonder who is paramount in Canada? Is it the power brokers of Ontario and Quebec? Or is it the elected members throughout the country. I maintain that Ontario and Quebec have for many years held far too much power. They have had no empathy for the fishery in the coastal provinces and it is something that they do not want to dirty their hands with. We are just a bunch of lousy fishermen down here. They think of Newfoundland as a bunch of fishermen, a bunch of people who are probably a little less than they are.

Well, I do not believe that Your Honour. I believe that the people of this area who were once an independent country, we were an independent country at one time, up until 1949 when we could have resumed our independence we chose to become part of the Dominion of Canada and now we find ourselves twenty-six years later asking Canada to give us something, give us back something we already had. If we had remained independent we could have been like Ireland. We could have sent out a couple of gunboats, shot down a couple of their trawlers. We would have had people coming here to finance a very viable fishing industry. Instead we find ourselves in this ludicrous position, twenty-six years later, twenty-six years of lost time, asking the Government of Canada to give back to Newfoundland something that they threw away, and I am not satisfied, Mr. Speaker. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The honourable Minister of Justice.

HON. T. A. HICKMAN, Minister of Justice: Mr. Speaker, this has been a very, very excellent debate this afternoon and I would like to congratulate the speakers who have gone before me. They have had the opportunity to hear the honourable the Member for Port au Port indicate to this House some of the concern that I believe is shared by many Newfoundlanders with respect to the voice that this Province has in the affairs

of our nation.

We have been very fortunate indeed to hear from the honourable the Member for Grand Falls, who had the very good luck of growing up on the South Coast of our Province, who is a native of Port Elizabeth, one of the great inshore fishing communities of this Province whose family, the Senior family, played a very meaningful role in the development of Placentia Bay. I suggest that the honourable Member for Grand Falls, probably more than anyone here, is in a position to elucidate upon the decline and fall of the inshore fishery of our Province and his remarks were very, very relevant, Mr. Speaker, to the resolution that is presently before this House. Because what we are saying and what this resolution says, that because of the rape of the Hamilton Banks by the foreign fishing fleets, that the inshore fishery of the Northeast Coast, maybe the inshore fishery of the entire province and certainly the inshore fishery of the Labrador section of the Province of Newfoundland

has diminished, declined, in some instances almost disappeared and we as a Province have to stand by helplessly and watch this tragic situation occur. The honourable the Minister of Education who, as honourable gentlemen may be aware, is considered in legal circles as an authority on international law as it relates to the Law of the Sea and who, to my knowledge, is one of the few Canadian lawyers whose thesis on international law as it relates to the Law of the Sea has been published in Chitty's Law Journal, is it?

MR. OTTENHEIMER: A portion of the Canadian Journal -

MR. HICKMAN: Canadian Law Journal. He, I think, put his finger on one of the factors which was also referred to by the honourable the Member for Port au Port, namely, that the Law of the Sea in international law very clearly indicates that the rights of coastal states in the socio-economic dependence of coastal communities on the fishery is a very influencing factor insofar as international law is concerned. Unfortunately, was the socio-economic dependence of coastal communities in Newfoundland is such as to make a very, very strong case. We, as a Province, under the British North America Act have absolutely no jurisdiction and absolutely no right to be heard, as we are reminded from time to time by external affairs, in negotiations and discussions as they relate to the fisheries off our shores.

The result is that in these ICNAF discussions, in the Law of the Sea Conference, Canada cannot make a strong, or is unwilling to make a strong a case as we in this Province feel she should make because she is not in a position or is not willing to stress the socio-economic dependence of the coastal communities of this Province on our fisheries.

I think it is significant too, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the statistics that have been furnished in this House by the honourable Member for Grand Falls, that when we look at this motion we have to

decide or try to make up our minds as to what impact a unanimous resolution from this House will have upon the government of Canada and maybe the Parliament of Canada. In that context, we cannot overlook the fact that the fisheries constitute something less than, I think it is, three per cent of the Gross National Product of Canada. That, obviously, is one of the reasons why we have seen less enthusiasm in Ottawa for resolutions and representations coming from Eastern Canada and indeed, from the Pacific as it relates to the fisheries.

The success of this kind of resolution, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, will depend upon the attitude, not simply of this House, but the attitude of Eastern Canadians. I think we have got to be realistic. We have in the Parliament of Canada a total of thirty-one seats out of something in excess of 200. Except in a close election, the vote of Atlantic Canada is going to decide on the fate of any government or any particular party. But this simple statistic, in my opinion, should not dismay us because the Prairie Provinces, they have but thirty or thirty-odd seats. But there is very little doubt that Western Canada has far, far greater influence in the corridors of power of Ottawa than does Eastern Canada

and there is a very simple reason for it. In the Prairie Provinces we have two Socialist Governments and one Tory Government which will be returning tonight with the biggest majority of any political party in Canadian history. I suspect that their philosophies may be somewhat apart. I suspect that the philosophy of Premier Blakney, who was sort of a right wing Socialist, is somewhat different from that of the Progressive Conservative Premier of Alberta, Premier Lougheed. But the significance is that when there is discussion as to the resources of the Prairie Provinces, when there is representation to be made as to freight rates and the cost of getting the product of the Prairies to the coast and shipped to foreign markets, Premier Lougheed, Premier Blakney and Premier Schreyer speak as one voice.

We have not been getting, Mr. Speaker, that kind of unanimity in the Atlantic Provinces. We have not been getting, with respect to the fisheries, the kind of support that this Province has been seeking and soliciting for the Maritime Provinces. It was this Province, it was the Premier of this Province, the government of this Province, that brought the resolution before the first ministers that there be consultation with respect to the Law of the Sea Conference. It was this Province that asked that the Government of Canada abandon its good citizenship of the international community and become a little more courageous and try and protect the Hamilton Banks and our offshore resources.

But, we did not get much support from Nova Scotia. We did not get so much support from New Brunswick. We did not get any support from Prince Edward Island, but Nova Scotia's fisheries are about equivalent to Newfoundland's, the total landings per year. The result was that the task of this government was made all that more difficult to convince -

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: I do not know why. I cannot tell you. Maybe it was political partisanship. Maybe it was the fact that the other Maritime Provinces were not particularly enamoured with the fact that the

Government of Newfoundland was taking the lead in this. But we did take the lead. We did succeed. We did before the External Affairs Committee at least convince the Government of Canada that they should change their position to the economic zone theory and at least demand control over conservation - they did not go as far as we wanted - of the Continental Shelf. We did succeed in that.

I think it is significant and proof positive as to what you can do if you make a bit of noise. The Government of Newfoundland was the only government of the four Atlantic Provinces invited to make a formal submission to the appropriate committee of the House of Commons, and the Government of British Columbia that made similar noises on the West Coast. What do you think would have happened, Mr. Speaker, if all four Atlantic Provinces had decided that they were going to take a similar position?

Nova Scotia lands, I think, as much fish or close to it as are landed in the Province of Newfoundland, but it does not play the same significant role in the economy of that Province as the fishery does in Newfoundland. Whatever the reason was the same interest was not shown. The Province of New Brunswick is not that heavily involved in the offshore fishery, but they do have a very viable fishery around the North Shore of New Brunswick used primarily in inshore fishery and salmon fishery. Then in Black Harbour there is a sardine industry.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we are burying our heads in the sand if we believe that unless we continue to pass resolutions similar to the one that is before this House and pass it with enthusiasm, pass it unanimously, not let it die after this is passed, if we think that the Government of Canada is going to pay very much heed to the problems that are presently facing the fishery and the economy of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the ICNAP conference will open in June in Edinburgh, Scotland. In the past we have had representatives from the trade at ICNAP

MR. HICKMAN: conferences. We have had, I think, some representation from the Fishermen's Union at these conferences. We have occasionally had a competent official from the Provincial Department of Fisheries. But to my knowledge we have never had -

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. SPEAKER (STAGG): Order, please! The honourable gentleman is being interrupted by an irrelevant conversation which the Chair has detected.

MR. HICKMAN: I appreciate Mr. Speaker coming to my rescue. I really am not certain that I agree with Your Honour's ruling that the conversation between the honourable Member for Bell Island and the honourable the junior Member for Bell Island was irrelevant to the future of this country. I think it is -

MR. NEARY: No, we were wondering if -

MR. HICKMAN: Very, very relevant and I look forward to the fact when the honourable gentleman from Bell Island joins his former colleague and goes out and campaigns against the rest of his colleagues on the other side of the House. That is relevant. That is relevant to the future of this country because obviously it is going to be an exercise in futility for both the Liberal Reform Party and the Liberal Party of this Province. But I do thank Your Honour for rescuing me from it.

May I say, Mr. Speaker, that to my knowledge this province has never been represented in an ICNAF meeting on the official level by any Minister of the Crown or by any honourable member of this House of Assembly. I would hope that the Government of the Province will see fit when the Edinburgh Conference of ICNAF opens in June, to see to it that not only is there a Minister of the Crown with official status present at this meeting with full authority of this House to present the resolution as it relates to the Hamilton Banks and as indeed it relates to the Continental Shelf off Newfoundland. But he would be accompanied by at least one backbencher in this House.

The fishermen have been represented at previous conferences by their union, and in an observer's capacity I think.

AN HON. MEMBER: Inaudible.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not you.

MR. SIMMONS: The member for Grand Falls.

MR. HICKMAN: Far be it for me to indicate who the backbencher should be. The honourable Member for Hermitage is excluded because he knows nothing about the fishery.

AN HON. MEMBER: He knows nothing, period.

MR. HICKMAN: The honourable the Member for Grand Falls obviously could make a strong bid for it because of his strong fishing background. The honourable the Member for Bonavista South, who again was a victim of resettlement, he too, who grew up the son of an inshore fisherman, could make a very meaningful contribution to the Edinburgh Conference. But whoever it is, Mr. Speaker, I do hope that the government and this House will see fit to insist that there be strong representation at that ICNAF Conference.

The honourable the Member for Grand Falls catalogued today to this House statistics which prove beyond all reasonable doubt the total lack of interest that successive governments in Canada have had insofar as the fishery resource off our shores is concerned.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, together with the resolution that was passed a few weeks ago and at least was transmitted to Ottawa, I am looking forward to seeing some proof positive that it was carried with pride across the Atlantic by the Minister of External Affairs, that these resolutions must of necessity be of some benefit to the people of this Province. True, it is a belated attempt, a belated effort, but it is an effort to indicate to the only government in Canada that has jurisdiction over the fisheries, the only government in Canada that has jurisdiction, indeed exclusive jurisdiction in foreign affairs, that we in Newfoundland are not prepared to sit idly by and to allow a resource that means so much to us be depleted because of lack of courage,

March 26, 1975

Tape No. 809

NM - 3

lack of ability to enforce even ICNAF regulations and ICNAF agreements
on the part of the Government of Canada.

The honourable the Member for Grand Falls, in some of the statistics that he furnished this House, referred to the inshore fishery of this Province and the percentage of people engaged in the offshore fishery of Newfoundland. I do not question the percentages, but I am disappointed that he did not have with him the figures that indicate the contribution in terms of landings of the offshore fishery of Newfoundland because if we looked at the landings, Mr. Speaker, then we would get a full appreciation of the contribution of the offshore fishery to the economy of our Province, the Hamilton Banks, the Grand Banks, Banquereau, Mizzen, St. Pierre, Green Bank. The fish that is landed in this Province as a result of the exploitation of that resource by our offshore fishermen would, in my opinion, be - would account for a very high percentage of the total fish landings in Newfoundland, so that when we are speaking of conservation on the Hamilton Banks, we would be very unwise indeed if we did not couple with that. The obligation on the part of the Government of Canada and the concern on the part of this House to see to it that the other offshore fishing areas receive equal protection and equal concern and equal conservation procedures by the government of this nation and we have not seen it.

We have not seen the willingness to listen to the fishermen of this Province. We have seen the total disregard on the part of a succession of ministers of the environment and in days when the Government of Canada thought fisheries was important, when they used to have a Minister of Fisheries. We have seen their total disregard for the pleas of our local fishermen with respect to haddock, the pleas of our local fishermen with respect to the Labrador fishery, the total reliance on the marine biologists that we had not gone below the sustainable yield on the Hamilton Banks, the sustainable yield of haddock on George's Bank and Brown's Banks and the other banks off our shores was still there

and then all of a sudden they realized that these fishermen of Newfoundland knew what they were talking about, but it was too late. It is almost too late on the Hamilton Banks, not quite, almost, and if we do not get decisive action this year, if the Government of Canada fails in convincing the members of ICNAF to impose the ban that we now seek on the Hamilton Banks, then, in my opinion, the Fed's have no alternative but to unilaterally enforce these conservation methods and restrictions. If they do not do it, then, Mr. Speaker, a debate on this issue next year will be extra size -

MR. NEARY: Can the minister tell us how he would propose to go about doing that?

MR. HICKMAN: Very simple, Mr. Speaker. The honourable gentleman from Bell Island says how does the Government of Canada, how do his his friends in Ottawa go about,

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Liberal friends.

MR. HICKMAN: How do his Liberal friends in Ottawa go about taking unilateral action.

MR. NEARY: No, enforcing it.

MR. HICKMAN: And having taken unilateral action, how do they go about enforcing it? I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if we could be optimistic enough to suspect that somewhere within the confines of the pentagon of Ottawa that there is somebody with half the courage of the man who commands the Icelandic navy of two ships.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

MR. HICKMAN: We have two more ships.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: The minister could use the navy.

MR. HICKMAN: We have two more ships, Mr. Speaker. We have at least more ships than the great historic navy of Iceland.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Battle ships or destroyers?

MR. HICKMAN: Not destroyers. Iceland did not have destroyers.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HICKMAN: Iceland had a couple of gun boats. They went out. They waved them around. They fired a couple of blanks into the water. The great fleet from West Germany disappeared. Ruler Britannia disappeared. The English boats went home. They all disappeared. Nobody declared war on Iceland.

AN HONOURABLE MEMBER: Inaudible.

All we have to do, Mr. Speaker, is suggest to the Canadian Navy that they make the supreme sacrifice that they give up their Bermuda maneuvers, that they get off their summer shorts and put on their oil skins, go out on the Grand Banks, go out on the Hamilton Banks, They will not have to fire a shot. All they would have to do is steam by and say, this land is our land and off you get. This water is our water, and they will go. Make no mistake about that, Mr. Speaker, but it takes a little bit of courage. The Minister of External Affairs will have to stop drinking cocktails with the Foreign Secretary of the Soviet Socialist Republic for a week. He will have to do it. You do not have to put the battleships, but you do have to do something more than take, Mr. Speaker, these few little, what do they call them, putt-putts that go out from the South Coast, in particular, at eight o'clock in the morning and must come back at five o'clock in the evening, and they cannot go out on Saturday and Sundays. They cannot go out on Brunette Banks when it is being ravaged by the foreign trawlers because they are not allowed to go out after five o'clock.

MR. NEARY: What would happen if the Russians said, no, we are not going?

MR. HICKMAN: The Russians will not say no, Mr. Speaker. And if they say no, then we will have to do what the Hon. Minister of Fisheries suggested a few years ago - we will send out Captain Piercey and one of his water bombers, and we will drop a load of water right down their smoke stack.

AN HON. MEMBER: Great thinking.

MR. HICKMAN: Gone, lost with all hands, Mr. Speaker.

AN HON. MEMBER: As gutless in Opposition as you were -

MR. HICKMAN: That is what we will do. That is what the Government of Canada will do. That is what is being advocated, Mr. Speaker, in the Parliament of Canada.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: That is right. That is it. Now we have it, Mr. Speaker. Now we have it. That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are quick to catch on.

MR. HICKMAN: That is right. That is right.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: You asked me the difference between the Tory Party and the Liberal Party of Canada, There is very little, but there is one difference, one fundamental difference. The Federal Liberal Party of Canada does not believe in gunboat diplomacy.

MR. CROSBIE: They do not believe in anything.

MR. HICKMAN: Well, they do not believe in gunboat diplomacy. That is one thing, Mr. Speaker, that we are sure of. They are not prepared, Mr. Speaker, they are not prepared to go out and show just a little bit of muscle. Remember, Mr. Speaker, that the European Nations, these nations who fish in the North Atlantic, they need protein, and they are going to need more and more of it. Do you think, Mr. Speaker, that they are going to be prepared to risk an open confrontation with the North Atlantic Nations that are sitting on the greatest source of supply insofar as protein is concerned? Of course, they are not. You do not have to fire shots. You do not have to declare war. You do not have to call out the Canadian Navy and ask them to take -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: You do not have to get "The Bonaventure" out of mothballs. She can stay there, if she is still afloat. But what you do have to do, Mr. Speaker, what you do have to -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HICKMAN: Well, wherever she is, she was a very expensive little hobby on the part of someone. You do not have to take any of these steps at all, Mr. Speaker. What you do have to suggest to the international community is that the government of this nation in the interest of Eastern Canadians is prepared to flex her muscles

so about the same extent as that great powerful nation of Iceland,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister permit a simple question before
he -

MR. HICKMAN: I am instructed by my boss, Mr. Speaker, that I
have to move the adjournment of the debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: But would the minister permit a question before he
adjourns.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: I was wondering if the Premier had gone down
to Bermuda to recruit the navy, because I understand he flew
down there today. Is that what he is doing down there?

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Speaker -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

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

MR. CROSBIE: I believe, Mr. Speaker, we would have no trouble
in jawboning the Russians to death. That is our biggest threat.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: (Inaudible).

MR. CROSBIE: Well with that bray, we know where you are.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the remaining Orders
of the Day do stand deferred and that this House do now adjourn
until tomorrow, March 27, 1975 at 10:00 A.M.

MR. SPEAKER: It is moved and seconded that the House do now
adjourn until tomorrow Thursday at 10:00 A.M. Those in favour "aye."
Those against "nay." Carried.

I do now leave the Chair until 10:00 A.M.

Thursday, March 27, 1975.

CONTENTS

March 26, 1975	Page
Statements by Ministers	
Mr. Ottenheimer announced that McNamara Construction Company to mark the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of Newfoundland's entry into Confederation had made the sum of \$500 annually available for the next ten years for a worthwhile purpose recommended by Government. The amount will be used as a scholarship available to a student at the Newfoundland School for the Deaf.	2335
Presenting Petitions	
By Mr. Brett from residents of Melrose requesting installation of water and sewer systems. Supported by Mr. Thoms and Mr. Peckford.	2336
By Mr. Brett from residents of the area from English Harbour to Bonaventure requesting snow clearing equipment for the 1975-1976 season. Supported by Mr. Woodward, Mr. Rousseau.	2339
By Mr. Aylward from a number of fishermen of Placentia Bay asking for special assistance to replace gear lost because of ice conditions this year. Supported by Capt. Winsor, Mr. Morgan, Mr. Earle.	2343
By Mr. Gillett from residents of Cobbs Arm, Pikes Arm and Toogood Arm requesting the paving of Route 346. Supported by Mr. Collins, Mr. Rousseau.	2355
By Mr. Ottenheimer from residents of Gulch requesting upgrading of the gravel road leading from their community.	2358
By Mr. Stagg from residents of Port au Port West, Aguathuna, Felix Cove, Campbell's Creek and Abrahams Cove concerning the condition of snow clearing equipment in the community. Supported by Mr. Woodward, Mr. Dunphy, Mr. Hickman, Mr. Neary, Mr. Rousseau.	2360
Oral questions	
Representations from independent sawmillers in the Bay D'Espoir area about timber limits. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Collins.	2367
Ministerial assurance that sawmillers in the Bay D'Espoir area will be able to obtain cutting permits. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Collins.	2368
Firm decision on the proposed expansion of the Bay D'Espoir generating station. Mr. Simmons, Mr. Doody.	2368
Request to know if the Premier would be available for the question Period. Mr. Neary, Mr. Crosbie.	2369
Orders of the Day	
Private Members' Day. Debate continued on a motion by the hon. the Member for Bonavista South, "Be it therefore resolved: that this Legislature urge etc."	2369
Mr. Ottenheimer	2369
Mr. Doyle	2377
Mr. Senior	2381
Mr. Stagg	2401
Mr. Hickman	2413
Adjournment.	2427