

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, MAY 25, 1977

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

If the hon. gentleman will permit me, I would like to welcome to the gallery two people this afternoon, first Dr. Elizabeth Goudie of Happy Valley, Labrador, the author of the book Women of Labrador. As hon. members will recall, Mrs. Goudie was made an honorary doctor of Memorial University of Newfoundland, and she is visiting St. John's for vacation and also to attend the Conference of the United Church of Canada in a couple of weeks time. I know hon. members join me in welcoming Dr. Goudie to the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. SPEAKER: As hon. members are probably aware this is Big Brothers Week in Newfoundland and I am also happy to welcome on behalf of hon. members Mr. Vincent Quigley, who is himself a Big Brother, accompanied by his little brother, Derrick Tizzard.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I would like to draw to the attention of hon. members of the House, Sir, a very historic first for the iron ore industry in Labrador West, in Wabush, where the workers of the Wabush Mining Company chalked up a million hours work without a lost time accident. This is a first for Newfoundland, Sir, for the mining industry. I believe it is a first in North America in the mining industry. 827 employees are credited with this outstanding achievement. The company, Sir, can only arrange the safety programme but it is up to the workers to see that it is carried out and in this case 827 employees can be credited with this outstanding accomplishment. I am told now, Sir, that the workers have their sights on the two million mark.

Mr. Speaker, I can only remember one occasion before this, Sir, in the mining industry again, when ever one million hours were

MR. NEARY: recorded without a lost time accident and that was in the electrical department of DOSCO, Dominion Wabana Ore on Bell Island back in the 1950's when they recorded well over one million hours worked without a lost time accident but at that time the number of employees was not quite as great as in Wabush.

So I do hope, Sir, that this House will see fit in this day and age when we are talking so much about productivity, about work stoppages and safety and lost time and so on, that this House will see fit to send a message of congratulations to the management, but especially to the workers who are responsible for this magnificent achievement in the City of Wabush in Labrador. It is not too often, Sir, we get a chance in this hon. House to pay tribute to the workers and the citizens of Labrador and I hope that the House will embrace this opportunity to send out a message of congratulations to the workers of the Wabush Mining Company for recording over one million hours work without a lost time accident.

000

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: I would like to make a motion, Mr. Speaker, that this House go on record and extend congratulations to two very outstanding medical men in the names of Dr. Thomas and Dr. Paddon, who has been awarded and become the recipients of the Royal Canada Bank award. It is the first time it has come to Newfoundland and I think I should go on record, Sir, and extend our congratulations to those two great men of medicine who have made great contributions in the medical field in this Province.

Now, Sir, I had the privilege of knowing both hon. gentlemen for many years but more so Dr. Tony Paddon of Northwest River than Dr. Thomas. I first met Dr. Paddon in Labrador in 1939 when he was then a student with his father practicing along the Labrador Coast. They operated that in the

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Margo, the mission boat Margo, latterly the Strathcona; that was before the air ambulance came in and took over from the ships.

Sir, I am sure and I am delighted that Dr. Goudie, whom I am very pleased to see sitting in the gallery, if Mrs. Goudie could stand in this House this afternoon and speak and pay a compliment to Dr. Paddon, both the late Dr. Paddon and Dr. Paddon, Jr., I am sure, Sir, she could tell us of some of the great services rendered by those two great men of medicine. And, Sir, it was a great privilege for me to have known Dr. Paddon all down through the years. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, it was a tradition with Dr. Paddon, I think Dr. Paddon's father came to Labrador and practiced at Northwest River and his mother came to Labrador as a nurse and they were married and following in his father's footsteps

Capt. Winsor:

Dr. Tony Paddon came back to Labrador after the war and he too like his father married a nurse who had come over from England. So I think, Sir, this House should go on record as extending congratulations to those great men who have made a great contributions in the field of medicine and I can think of no men more deserving with a dedication and devotion to the needs of humanity than both Dr. Gordon Thomas and Dr. Tony Paddon.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. J. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I think we have a problem because I would like to, if I have the courtesy of the House and the leave of the House, to reply to the wonderful courtesy extended to me by—and my constituents—the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), Unfortunately the hon. member for Fogo (Capt. Winsor) started before me, and I did not want to interrupt him. I could reply to that now and I would like to, or as a ministerial statement -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! All of the procedures or what is said now in a sense is all by leave. There is no motion before the Chair, and every hon. gentleman speaks by leave, I am sure the hon. gentleman would have the same leave as the hon. member for LaPoile and the hon. member for Fogo had when in fact they spoke.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, for continuity maybe the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) first, and I can do it after.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Naskaupi.

MR. GOUDIE: Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to second the motion put by the hon. member for Fogo in relation to the award of recognition to Doctors Thomas and Paddon. Dr. Paddon, of course, is still practicing medicine in my district in the community of North West River, providing an invaluable service as he has over the years to not only the people in the West end of Lake Melville, that area, but also to the residents from all over, the coastal section and perhaps at some point in time even the Western sections of Labrador. As I

MR. GOUDIE:

mentioned the contribution to medicine, to the health of the people the Labrador section of the Province is vitally important and has been vitally important all through the years. And I would like to personally second that motion and to offer my commendation for what it is worth to both these hon. gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, I would like to second the motion the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) or make the motion, and maybe the hon. member might like to second it out of courtesy. I assume, and I am assuming in the very broadest sense of the word since I just arrived in the House after 'admit strangers' and I am certain that the hon. member for LaPoile was ardously searching me out to make the motion which he would have seconded, and I am very pleased to do that, I am very pleased as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, that only two weeks ago today that we had a meeting with some executives from Wabush Mines - Pickands Mather, the managing agent there - and some of the shareholders, the Canadian shareholders, and at that time my colleague, the hon. Minister of Consumer Affairs and the Environment in his role as minister responsible for the environment presented a plaque to Wabush Mines - or Pickands Mather as the managing agents - in respect to their environmental excellence in the mining industry. They were selected to portray that excellence and a suitable plaque was presented to them. I might say that I have already discussed the question of the million work hours of the people in Wabush with my colleague, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, and my colleagues in Cabinet, and it is government's intention as well as the House of Assembly's intention in this motion to suitably recognize this achievement, It is a second million hour without accident milestone in this Province within the past few months - not in the mining industry, the first one in the mining industry. And with the situation that exists today, I am sure that many hon. members would like to be involved in this - the hon. Minister of Health, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, the

Mr. Rousseau:

hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay and the hon. member for Grand Bank who are involved in the question of occupational health and safety, and indeed safety in general in the mining institute, this million hours is much appreciated - and the hon. member for Windsor-Buchans. It is something that we would like, I am sure, all members in their areas would like to see the mines that operate in their areas accomplish. A million man hours without loss due to accident is something that as Minister of Manpower, the minister responsible for the Workmen's Compensation Board, is ministerially a very good thing and of course

Mr. Rousseau.

as a member of the House of Assembly for Menihek and as a boy from Wabush, not from Gambo but from Wabush, I am very pleased that this milestone was accomplished and I certainly concur with, I am sure, hon. members of the House in providing suitable recognition from the House, and, as I say, in discussions with my colleague, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy, and the remainder of my colleagues, a suitable recognition from government as well on this great milestone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Before calling Statements by Ministers

I wish to inform hon. members that I have received today a copy of the second annual report of the Parliamentary Commissioner, the Ombudsman, for the calendar year, 1976, and this is in compliance with Section 29 of the Parliamentary Commissioner Act, and it will be distributed presently.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS:

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

MR. NEARY: We heard it all before. We heard it on CBC.

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker -

MR. NEARY: Lay it on the table. Do not waste the time of the House.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, point of order. May I be heard in silence?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman wishes to speak without interruption.

MR. NEARY: We heard it all on CBC.

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, this is, in my opinion, an historic day for the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, primarily because it will mark the concrete evidence of this Province's position as it relates to offshore development, particularly as it relates, at least, in the first instance, to oil and gas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to place before the House a white paper and draft regulations relating to the development of this Province's offshore oil and gas resources. This document

Mr. Peckford.

sets forth this administration's policies on a number of key issues relating to these resources and provides a blueprint for ensuring that these resources are development first and foremost for the benefit of their lawful owners, the people of the Province. Before setting out some of these policies, I would like to stress that a number of crucial offshore oil and gas matters are not covered by this document. I refer in particular to the broad area of environmental protection. A separate, comprehensive and strict set of regulations will have to be developed for that area. The preservation of our fisheries and our marine environment generally must be first and foremost in our minds. Neither does this document deal with the nature of the joint federal-Newfoundland administrative and management structures required to make a political settlement acceptable to this government. The importance of such management structures and the defects in that proposed by the marine Provinces political settlement with its overriding federal veto and its once and for all delegation of provincial regulatory powers to Ottawa will be discussed in full in a future paper which hopefully will be laid before this House this session.

Mr. Speaker, these draft regulations should be put into law for a number of reasons. One, they are the expression of the offshore oil and gas objectives of this Province, and we should begin now to work towards those objectives. Two, they are needed so that potential investors can obtain the security of provincial production rights to at least part of the offshore lands they now hold under federal permits. I stress, Mr. Speaker, part of the lands they presently hold under federal permit because we must always remember that this Province, trying to establish a rational management regime in the context of a federal system which has not had the best interests of this Province in mind. On page four of the white paper, you will find an all too ample listing of the kinds of things that are not the concern of the federal government's regulations. Just a reference to figure six, Mr. Speaker, which contrasts Ottawa's give-away policies

Mr. Peckford.

with the more logical step by step policies of West European countries will demonstrate that.

What then are the major objectives of these regulations? They are, one, ensuring that offshore exploration and production rights are granted in an appropriate manner and that there is a proper backup administrative structure. Two, ensuring that a moderate level of offshore development takes place at the earliest possible environmentally safe date. Three, maximizing

Mr. Peckford.

the revenues which will flow to the Province while on the other hand allowing the oil companies to make an attractive rate of return on their investment. Four, ensuring that local labour, goods and services are used wherever possible. Five, ensuring that industries and users in this Province have first crack at all oil and gas found offshore. Six, protecting the Province against an inflationary and socially disruptive rate of development. And seven, providing for a public input into the environmental, social and economic review of the development of all offshore oil and gas developments. Two of these objectives are discussed in detail because of their complexity. Part four of the white paper deals with the public revenue aspects of the regulations. Under these regulations the proposed Newfoundland-Ottawa split of the total government take would be seventy-five/twenty-five in our favour instead of just the opposite under a Maritime Provinces type agreement, just as important.

It shows that the internal rates of return accruing to the oil companies are attractive and should lead to a healthy level of exploration. Based on a set of light hypothetical fields, total net revenues from these fields of \$64 billion would be split \$35 billion for the Province, \$11 billion for Ottawa and \$18 billion for the oil companies. It should be stressed, Mr. Speaker, that these are hypothetical numbers and will remain so until commercial oil and gas deposits are proven up. That is \$35 billion out of \$64 billion - there would be \$35 billion for the Province, \$11 billion for Ottawa and \$18 billion for the oil companies - hypothetical. It gives you some idea of the breakdown.

Mr. Speaker, it is proposed that the Province collect its share of the total government take by means of a basic royalty, additional sliding scale royalty, provincial corporate income tax, and a full forty per cent interest in each lease. I will return to the forty per cent interest in each lease later in the statement.

Another major concern of the regulations controlling the rate of the development is dealt with in part five of the white paper.

Mr. Peckford.

Clearly, Mr. Speaker, this government would if it had been presented with a clean sheet have opted for the prudent step by step approach to offshore leasing characteristic of such countries as Denmark, off Greenland, Norway and the United States. Limiting the amount of acreage under exploration at any one time is, Mr. Speaker, the first and most important line of defense against too fast a rate of development. The more prospective acreage that is out, the more likely a larger number of fields will be made. Instead, however, we must face the fact that rightly or wrongly the oil companies have for the most part and up until now assumed that Ottawa's lax regulations would govern their operations. Large amounts of money have already been spent. And while this creates no legal rights, we have to recognize the fact of those expenditures. Thus the amount of acreage we propose to issue in the first round will be less than that presently under federal permit, but still more than that which we would have issued if no expenditures had been made offshore. This gives rise to the possibility of an excessive rate of development. Consequently, we have introduced a system of annual aggregate production levels above which fields would have to go through a waiting period before being developed. This waiting period mechanism is a critical one, and I look forward to the debate on the proper production levels, levels which must reflect not only our concern over the proper rate of development but also the petroleum needs of Eastern Canada and Eastern Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, the production level and waiting period mechanism will not by itself protect this Province from the negative impacts of offshore developments. The development

MR. PECKFORD: of each field will in itself be a gigantic multi-billion dollar venture and planning for them will pose a major challenge. A key to answering that challenge will be the Development Plan Review which will be the subject of full public hearings.

Mr. Speaker, this government proposes the formation under special acts of the Legislature of a Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Board. The NLPB for short would hold the Crown's 40 per cent interest in each lease and would sit on the operating committees of all leases. Mr. Speaker, given our free enterprise system, the formation of a major new Crown corporation in the form of the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Board which may come to play a key role in the life of the Province obviously should not - has not been proposed without a great deal of thought. NLPB would not be another Petro-Canada operating in competition with private industry, but would have a far more restricted role. It would not engage in exploration on its own, nor would it engage in refining or distribution activities. It would only operate in partnership with private industry through the 40 per cent carried interest mechanism, in the safe post discovery, post payout stage. Mr. Speaker, the carried interest mechanism and NLPB represents a major change in our traditional relationship with those multi-national natural resource companies whose capital and expertise we will need to develop our resources. NLPB participation would represent a genuine partnership between the Province as owner of the resource, and private industry. It is very important, Mr. Speaker, to note that the Province will not have to pay out a cent for its 40 per cent share. However, the Province would not start to receive its 40 per cent share of the value of net production until after its private partner has recovered his investment two and one-half times. The question then can be asked, Mr. Speaker, why NLPB? And four reasons stand out: One - it would represent a new and healthy partnership between the Province and private industry in the off-shore petroleum field; Two - 40 per cent participation provides a flexible revenue collection mechanism which adjusts to the profitability of each field. Its income

MR. PECKFORD: would be protected from federal corporate income tax, thus allowing this Province to achieve a share of the total government take vis-a-vis Ottawa similar to that enjoyed by Alberta and Saskatchewan, and NLPB's representatives on each operating committee would ensure that the local labour, goods and services are given a fair shake. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, the whole area of ensuring that local employment and business opportunities are maximized is another key area dealt with in these regulations. Of particular importance will be the training and research and development expenditures which the companies will be required to make in the Province. These measures will ensure that we are in the forefront of this existing new technological frontier. Mr. Speaker, I should stress that these are draft regulations. We welcome comment from all sectors of our society and from the oil companies themselves to ensure that this great undertaking goes forward to our mutual benefit. This document may appear to some to be a dry and technical piece of business. No one should mistake our businesslike approach to this crucial matter as disinterest. We on this side of the House feel extremely strong on this issue and we would go so far as to say that our position only mirrors the feelings of most of the people of this Province. The outcome of the debate over these regulations will truly be crucial to the future of this Province. Mr. Speaker, off-shore oil and gas could transform this Province. Will we be able to determine the rate and direction of that transformation? This administration says we must if we are to remain masters of our own destiny. The challenge of a lifetime is before us, Mr. Speaker. Let us make sure that we are equal to the task.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, I am well aware of the ruling that one cannot enter into the realm of debate in response to a ministerial statement,

Mr. Strachan:

but there are a number of aspects of the regulations, the proposed draft regulations which the minister has outlined, that one would like to get into. First of all may I say that most of us on this side, and we have been asking for a number of weeks, and almost two months, have been asking for these regulations which have been shown already to the corporations. The corporations have had time to study them and to give some opinions, obviously, on these regulations, and yet we still feel that the people of this Province have never seen these regulations up until this time. We also feel that many other areas, the press for instance, the Board of Trade this morning, and others have seen these regulations and only now were we given the opportunity to see these regulations, and as far as we are concerned these regulations should have been given to this House at the same time as they had been given to oil corporations and to the press and to other interested business organizations. However -

MR. MORGAN: They are only draft regulations.

MR. STRACHAN: I mentioned draft regulations, Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Transportation would just shut up and allow me to continue, I will continue without getting furious about it. The man should study it if he wants to understand it.

The regulations are very important, I agree with the minister, and here I will get into some of the fields he mentions here. These regulations are fundamentally important to this Province if oil and gas does go ahead - and I said 'if' oil and gas does go ahead in this Province - the effects in this Province will be tremendous, horrendous in fact and we have to guard against, totally and absolutely guard against any exploitation of these resources, and the total wipe out, with only half a million people, and we can be totally wiped out at this type of development if it occurs here at the pace it occurred in other countries, including Britain.

However, I am concerned in the regulations in as much as that I feel that - and I understand the minister's feelings on this -

Mr. Stwachan:

that these regulations should be of a non-partisan type. I feel that, as he stated, that it is this administration's policy, and we understand the administration is in power, and it is their power therefore which gives them the right to state these policies, but I feel some how or other that this Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Board which is set up, and whatever occurs in the future should be laid down in a far more non-partisan fashion than in previous dealings with our natural resources, non-renewable or renewable resources in the past. And this is fundamentally important, as the minister has outlined, because if we are going to deal with these companies and encourage these companies and at the same time get a fair rate of return to us, we must set an atmosphere now which can continue on for the next ten, fifteen or twenty years. There is nothing worst to these corporations to have gone down the road, half-way down the road and after seven or eight or nine years find that the regulations change or the economic revenues change or various other aspects of the regulations change, and that they are brought up to a halt and then have to renew again. And I think it is very important that if we are going to plan a blueprint for this Province for the next twenty years or twenty-five years in oil and gas that it should be done with the aim being the total benefit to the people of this Province and not done in any partisan fashion, and to this I think we would commit our side in that view.

We feel very strongly on some of the aspects of it. I have only heard the regulations for the first time as outlined, and I am more interested in the economic sharing as laid out by the minister, and this is the first time I have heard it, so it is obvious that I can get into many of the aspects of it in detail. It is a difference from the old idea of concessions in this Province, which has always been the way, not only in this Province but in many other countries, the idea of conceding to corporations or companies the rights to do things, then hear this here we are talking about a healthy partnership, as the minister states it. He talks about the

Mr. Strachan:

40 per cent participation which will be revenue going back into into the NLPB so that they will be able to operate in this field.

However I have concerns about this in that other countries which are involved in exploration and development of oil and gas, and these include the Middle East countries, Saudi Arabia and so on, because I think we must forget that although we think these countries are exotic and far away, we are now if we are going to enter into the oil and gas field, we are now becoming equally an exotic country as they are, and we therefore must study the examples which have occurred there, the examples in history, the examples of how they have handled these corporations, and we must understand how they have gone from concessions and economic exploitation by the oil corporations to try to form their own petroleum corporations, and I think that the minister here used Petrocan, I think, in a bad fashion,

Mr. Strachan.

I did not like the idea of this Petrocan here. I think that a far better organization to study, for instance, would be Petro-men in Saudi Arabia, which owns the resource, and the companies are virtual contractors. They are contractual employees of the country. And I think that something along these lines could be examined. I understand totally the minister's concern with the rate of development, and I think this is fundamentally important, and I think it is time that a step backwards is being taken, as he said, to decreasing the amount of acreages which are given out in leases and this I welcome tremendously. The only way to control that development is to control the amount of acreages coming into production. And I think in that area and aspect there - I have not seen the regulations in detail - I think that what has been stated here is excellent and it is at least a start on a way to try to control a development which would blanket out large parts of this Province.

I am concerned a little bit about the split between the oil companies, Ottawa and Newfoundland and the hypothetical example given by the minister will have to be studied in detail, and I think looked at carefully. But I understand that they have been working at this in his department and many of the members in his department have worked over the years, and I commend them for their work and their interest in trying to prepare some of these regulations, but I still think we should start possibly looking maybe at a little even more radical approach than the one outlined by the minister here. And I think that we should do it again, as I say, using the best brains in the Province regardless of where they are, the university and various other people, and try to get together some kind of board - not in a political sense, but a board which is a non-partisan board, which can operate within the field of oil and gas. And that is my main concern about the Newfoundland and Labrador Petroleum Board, NLPB. My main concern there is exactly how much leeway they have to involve themselves. The minister has stated that they have a restricted role, only operating at a restricted level and using their forty per cent, which will come afterwards. And I am concerned there about how that operation

Mr. Strachan.

will work and whether that is really as modern as we could be or as advanced.

Finally, my last point about it is that I am concerned that the regulations that are set forth here, which can be passed into law without coming before the House, as I understand. These regulations must be, and I hope open-ended enough and flexible enough so that as changing conditions in the world markets occur, as changes in the corporation structures occur, and as changes in our financial standings occur, we can move with the times so we are not locked into a type of regulation or a type of concession that we have noticed in the past in the mining industry, for instance, where we cannot change it, where we cannot move with the times, and where we have made mistakes - and there will be mistakes among this as well as many other good points - but where we have made mistakes that we have an open-ended clause which can keep us moving with them so as to keep us moving down the line and never find ourselves caught in a situation in which - although we now believe that we are getting the good end of the deal - we may find out some time in 1985 or 1987 or 1990 that there are some clauses which can hold us back or which tighten us down. And I think that it should be more open-ended and more flexible, and to this end I think that this should be done.

I welcome the regulations that the minister has presented. As I said our main criticism, and always will be, is the fact that the oil corporations saw them before we did, before the people of the Province had seen them, and many other organizations had some input into them before we had any input into them, and that the press and various others and the Board of Trade and so on have had them, and we feel that these regulations should be made public to the people of the Province and to the House and to all of us in a non-partisan way long before it was ever given to any of the oil corporations or businesses.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

NOTICE OF MOTION:

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

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The City of Corner Brook Act."

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

MR. PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Labrador Lands Reservation Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Tourist Establishments Act."

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill, "An Act To Amend The Solemnization Of Marriage Act, 1974."

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to answer a question asked by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) yesterday with regards to incidents over the weekend in Provincial Parks.

I would like to inform the House, Mr. Speaker, that over the weekend there were seven people arrested in Butterpot Provincial Park and these arrests were drug related and made during a normal RCMP patrol. There were five arrests made at Gushue's Pond Provincial Park. The RCMP were called to the scene by park attendants because of a disturbance related to drinking. I might point out, Mr. Speaker, that this is the only incident where action was taken by my staff or there was a need for action to be taken by my staff and that the RCMP were in fact called.

The arrests were made after the RCMP were treated with abuse and obstruction of their duties. Also at Gushue's Pond Provincial Park three groups of people had their permit cancelled and were removed from the park by park attendants as a result of rowdiness. There were no arrests made in this incident. At Bellevue Beach during a normal RCMP patrol two arrests were made in connection with minors consuming alcoholic beverages.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out that incidents such as these usually occur during a major holiday weekend and are by no means normal situations in the park on any given day. They are exceptional situations and are handled effectively by both park staff and the RCMP. During 1974 there were 2.2 million visitors to the parks, in 1975 there were 2.7 million, in 1976, 2.9 million.

Mr. Speaker, the statement made yesterday is quite accurate when we say that this is not a serious situation in relation to the number of people visiting our parks; the number of incidents of rowdiness or vandalism is relatively small. I do

MR. HICKEY: not mean in saying this to leave the impression that we are not concerned about it, indeed we are, and we have taken every action that is possible. No chances are taken and certainly my park attendants people take immediate action if they deem it necessary and call the RCMP and in this connection the RCMP never hesitate to come and there is no great lapse of time from the time they are called and the time they get to the scene. Usually they are patrolling the areas anyway.

MR. NEARY: No, they are not. They are on an accident somewhere or fighting a fire or something.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, you know, the member for LaPoile is an expert on a number of things but I can assure him he is not an expert on what the RCMP are doing and what they are not doing.

MR. NEARY: I happened to be talking to one the other night and he got three calls.

MR. HICKEY: I am not worried, Mr. Speaker, whether the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) believes what I am saying or not. I am interested in passing this information on through this hon. House to the people of the Province to remove once and for all the suggestion as made yesterday by the member that our Provincial Parks are taken over by a bunch of rowdies.

MR. NEARY: Certain parks.

MR. HICKEY: Now, Mr. Speaker, no park -

MR. NEARY: There were just two incidents last year. We have had two already this year.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, may I continue in silence?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! There should be no debate during this period and the hon. member was recognized specifically to answer a question.

MR. HICKEY: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I want to convey, Mr. Speaker, the message to our people that contrary to the belief of some people, including the hon. member for LaPoile, our parks, none of them, are taken over in any way, shape or form by rowdies, nor is there any great increase or cause for concern because of any increase in vandalism, rowdyism or anything else. It is on the 24th. of May weekend, the Labour Day weekend one can look for incidents of this type. They are not increasing to any great degree. There is no cause for concern and, as I said, while we are concerned about it I am assured by my staff that my staff in the parks are able to cope with the situation and that the RCMP have never failed to co-operate, nor have they been negligent in coming when they are called upon to do so.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. the Premier. Is the Premier in a position to inform the House as to when the by-elections in St. John's West provincially and Ferryland may be called?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, this seems to be a daily habit of this question coming up now, and with the weather outside today one would not expect an answer in the affirmative, but we have looked at the two Opposition parties' conventions - candidate conventions - they have always complained that they never had enough time. I think probably they have had a time for preparation now. We are trying to give them every break possible so that we can have a more competitive situation. I think that both districts need representation and voting day has been called for June 16th.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would like to put a question to the hon. the Minister of Transportation, Sir, and to ask the minister if the Atlantic Pilotage Association's increase in fees is going to affect business in the harbour of St. John's as has been forecast by the Atlantic Transportation Commission?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am not too familiar with what the hon. gentleman is referring to, but I know that the last attempt, the last unfortunately successful attempt by the Atlantic Pilotage Authority to increase their fees was opposed by this administration by means of hiring a legal adviser to put forward our case. What effect it will have with a further increase, I think it is obvious that the first increase had an effect, a serious effect. The unfortunate thing is that as a government in the Province, we have no one to make our representations to, because the Atlantic Region Pilotage Authority is responsible to no minister in the federal Cabinet. The federal minister responsible for Transportation is not responsible for the Pilotage Authority. They are

MR. MORGAN: a body that can operate on their own, an autonomous body with powers to regulate and set fees, and this is a great concern to not only this Province, but in fact, all the Atlantic region, and we have made representations jointly from the region to the federal minister, and in fact, to the Prime Minister, pointing out that we feel it is necessary to change the federal government's legislation giving this federal body such powers as it now has and to put the Authority under the responsibility of at least one minister in the federal Cabinet.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. Does the hon. gentleman have a supplementary?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

We have been waiting now, Mr. Speaker, for several weeks and months to find out whether or not there was going to be any agreement from Ottawa with respect to the Trans-Canada Highway, and I wonder if the minister is in a position to let us know anything at the moment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, yes, we are and we are not, based on the fact that this morning the federal minister responsible that the provinces have been negotiating with for the last eleven months now - serious discussions and negotiations, numerous meetings and submissions on the matter of the Trans-Canada Highway primarily, but connecting with and concerned with all methods of transportation in the region - today the federal minister is announcing the decision of the federal Cabinet and because I understand to date he has not called his press conference in Ottawa, I cannot comment on the details or outlines to the House of Assembly although we do have the information prior to

MR. MORGAN: the federal minister announcing the decision to the federal Cabinet.

MR. F. WHITE: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, can the minister tell us whether or not he is optimistic about the agreement that is coming or is it going to be a 50/50 kind of thing as we have heard? Is there anything he can tell us before Mr. Lang holds his news conference?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I have always said that the necessity of upgrading our Trans-Canada Highway - I think it is obvious to all concerned and to the federal officials and the federal authorities, to them as well - and I have always been hopeful that the decision would be to our favour; however, I cannot indicate to the House of Assembly right now what the decision is going to be announced this afternoon. I would prefer to wait for the federal minister to make his announcement and then I will be commenting if you want me to in my estimates before the House tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in connection with the Baie Verte Road, the controversial road that we have heard so much about in the last week or so, in connection with asbestos

Mr. Neary.

dust on the road: Would the minister tell the House if the government or if the minister has approached the mining company to see if there is any legal responsibility on the part of the mining company to pave these roads and eliminate the health hazard that they have created in that area mining asbestos there in Baie Verte?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, that question is really a very complicated matter to deal with at one Question Period. With regards to the overall situation in Baie Verte, the most serious concern to me as the minister responsible for roads in that area is that to date we have still not received any official report from the man who was doing the survey work and the study work in that area, Dr. Selikoff from Mount Sinai institute in New York. However, the question is put forward as to whether or not we will attempt to have the company concerned who was carrying out the operations in the Baie Verte area to have them pay for some of the costs if we pave the roads to overcome a problem. That matter will be given consideration. In the meantime I will again reiterate that we have not as a government received any official confirmation or report from Dr. Selikoff regarding the possible hazard of asbestosis being in the road dust on the Baie Verte Peninsula.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary?

MR. NEARY: No, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman from Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Justice. In view of the drownings that occurred in Bay Bulls Pond over the holiday weekend, would the minister tell the House if he intends making life jackets obligatory for anyone going on salt or fresh water in small boats?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: I will have to take that as notice, Mr. Speaker, because it does not come within the jurisdiction of my department, most assuredly on salt water, but I will check, because I am under the impression that there are some existing regulations right now administered

Mr. Hickman.

by the ministry of Transport in Ottawa, and I believe that the federal law prescribes that they shall be worn. But, you know, I will find out anyway for the hon. gentleman and most assuredly will advise the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. member for Lewisporte .

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the Minister of Mines and Energy, Sir, tell the House if the Alcan agreement that was signed with Teheran recently, an agreement with the Aluminum Company of Canada, signed during a visit by Jean Chretien, the Canadian Minister of Industry, Trade and Commerce - and I presume there is involvement, financial involvement input by the Government of Canada - would the minister tell the House if this agreement is going to have any affect on the future of mining operations in St. Lawrence?

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

MR. PECKFORD: We are not altogether sure. We are attempting to ask Alcan the same question to see whether the whole market situation would thereby improve to provide the kind of increase in pre-unit costs at St. Lawrence which would allow the thing to continue. But within the next couple of days I will have a more definitive position as to how it affects the St. Lawrence operation or otherwise.

MR. SPEAKER: I had indicated that I would recognize the hon. gentleman for Lewisporte next, followed by the hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing. We have been waiting now for several weeks to determine when decisions would be taken with respect to the water and sewer projects that will be going ahead this year. Mr. Speaker, it is almost June, and a lot of councils have been contacting me wondering if I knew anything about it or if I would ask the minister about it, and I would like for him to tell the House exactly what the delay is in making decisions with respect to water and sewer projects?

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

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, there have been a lot of requests, as the hon. members knows, for water and sewer systems this year. Some of them are without feasibility studies, some of them are without final quotes from consultants as to how much the cost of these systems will be. We are waiting for those. It should take another couple of days, then I will bring the recommendations to government and have them approved. It should take no more than a week, or two at the most.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South, followed by the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Tourism on two points, if I may, it is really the one question. One is relation to the long promised park for Topsail Beach. I am wondering where that situation stands at the moment. And secondly, I know them - I do not have to tell the minister the problems we have had with law and order and disturbance there over the years, and I must say, I think, he has made a real effort to try and do something about it. God knows they cut down his posts the last time he put up a couple. But I am wondering what measures he might have in store for this year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I happen to concur with my hon. friend that that is probably one of the worst areas when it comes to vandalism in the Province when one takes into account repeated acts of vandalism, and it seems very difficult to try to control it.

On the matter of park development, we have run into some problems. As my hon. friend is aware I am sure, for quite a number of years we have been attempting to acquire suitable land and an amount of land which would permit the proper development of that site. We have reached the stage now where we have sort of put a handle on the land in terms of ownership and now we are faced with a very serious and a very difficult situation in terms of acquisition of that land with regards to price.

I am sorry that I am not able to give definitive plans for this year because caught up in this whole land problem is a dollar value and what we are able to do during the existing year. I am in the process and my staff are in the process of putting together the whole situation which I will take to my colleagues so that we can determine just exactly what we are going to do, how much land we can acquire based on either the money that is available this year and next year if possible.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

CAPTAIN WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, a question for the hon. Minister of Fisheries. Has the minister received any representation from the fishermen around the Long Harbour area requesting his intervention if need be to get that area reopened which was closed because of contamination some time ago?

MR. W. CARTER: Long Harbour?

CAPTAIN WINSOR: That is right, up around that area.

MR. W. CARTER: No, I have not, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question to the Minister of Tourism. In view of the fact that the date deadline for applications being received for big game licences was Friday past, almost a week, would the minister indicate to the House how the number of applicants compares this year with last year, last year I think it was 41,000, how the number of applicants compares?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I am unable to give the hon. gentleman an answer to that question. I have asked for that figure because I too am rather interested to see if there is a decline in the number and we certainly hope there is.

MR. FLIGHT: There will be. Do not worry.

MR. HICKEY: However, Mr. Speaker, because the system this year in applications being received all over the Province, final returns are not tabulated as yet but I should have them in a day or so, hopefully tomorrow and I will be glad to pass them on.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. FLIGHT: Is the minister in a position to indicate to the House at what point the monies to the unsuccessful applicants will be refunded since this year they are paying with the application? A ball park date as to when the monies will be returned to the unsuccessful applicants.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, as my hon. friend is aware, that cannot be done until the licences are drawn. However one of the problems we have encountered in the past and certainly one which has been both difficult for us to handle and has proven to be very difficult for the potential hunter is in the hunter knowing early enough so as to plan his or her vacation or his or her hunting trip. Because sometimes people will forego a vacation during the Summer if they

MR. HICKEY: know they have a big game licence.

So we are attempting to get the licences drawn as early as possible. I cannot suggest a date but I would hope that it will be early July or before and as soon as that is done then certainly we will return the monies with the greatest of speed to those unsuccessful applicants.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not his department has experienced any difficulty in collecting applications from those people who live in rural, isolated areas. I am thinking of communities like Harbour Deep, communities on the South Coast and the Northern Peninsula and whether the minister has any indication of whether or not all those people in those areas who wanted to apply for a big game licence have had the opportunity to do so.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, I have received no complaints from anyone

Mr. Hickey:

in any part of the Province, I can only conclude from that that everyone who is interested has had that opportunity. In the more isolated areas that my friend refers to we have sent people there and I have no indication that there is any problem, however, if there is and if there is a bona fide case put forward then certainly I will be quite prepared to take a look at it and see what can be done.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte followed by the hon. gentlemen for LaPoile and for Conception Bay South.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Public Works and Services. Mr. Speaker about two months ago the Minister of Tourism held a news conference to outline that three new regional chalets, tourist chalets, will be built in the Province, one in Port aux Basques, one at Notre Dame Junction near Lewisporte, and one at the Argentia Access. I am wondering if the Minister of Public Works can tell us what the delay is in calling tenders for the two regional ones at Notre Dame Junction and at the Argentia Access, since the plans were announced two months ago, and the models were even shown on television by the Minister of Tourism. So what is the delay?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, the only one that we have moved on so far from a point of calling tenders has been the Port aux Basques one I am travelling! - and we have tenders received on it, the Port aux Basques Interpretative Centre. The Department of Public Works, of course, as soon as the Department of Tourism is ready to move, we call the tenders. To my knowledge I do not think that the Department of Public Works has yet received the go ahead for tenders on the other one - is that correct, my colleague? - but we are working on land acquisition. So as soon as we are in a position I think it took, what? four or five weeks for the Port aux Basques one so it should not be a long period of time once we have the go ahead

Mr. Rousseau:

to call the tender for them.

MR. WHITE: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is to the Minister of Tourism, and I wonder if the minister will tell us what the delay has been since he did have the plans and the specs for the these chalets, you know, months ago, what the delay has been in getting them to Public Works so tenders could be called?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister for Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, the specifications and that are at Public Works or were sent to Public Works quite a while ago, but there were some changes - not to the Interpretative Centre - that is finished and done with in terms of specifications and drawings - but on the information centres or the chalets, the regional chalets. The design as put forward by the architects was changed again, for the better, I am told, because it was rather irritating to me the thing had been dragging out so long. But I was told it was for the betterment of the building, it would cut cost somewhat, and for the amount of time that was involved that it was wise to allow them to make the necessary changes. Now that is done; I know for a fact it is done because I was supposed to see them myself last week but I could not take the opportunity, but my staff have seen it, and to the best of my knowledge the request to Public Works and Services is gone out now showing the change and requesting whatever change in drawings and specifications. As soon as that is done we should be ready to go to tender and to request my colleague to take whatever action is necessary on the site.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. gentleman for Conception Bay South.

MR. NEARY: A question to the Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir. In view of the fact there is a story on the front page of The Evening Telegram today insinuating that the reason the golf course is going to be built in Terra Nova Park is because Mr. Pickersgill, the former Minister of Transport, James Morgan, Provincial Liberal Leader Ed Roberts all have Summer homes near the

MR. NEARY:

edge of the park. Now I am not concerned about the golf course, what I want to ask - and Mr. Tom Doyle, a Newfoundland businessman also has a Summer cottage near the park. Would the minister confirm whether this is true or not, and if so would the minister also tell the House if it is correct that the Government of Canada is going to provide an access road that will serve these Summer home owners?

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I think this question should be really answered by the minister responsible, in this case my colleague the Minister of Tourism, but to answer the question in connection with me personally I am only too pleased to tell the House of Assembly that the charges made by Mr. Rodriguez, a member of Parliament, with regards to properties made by myself in the Eastport-Sandringham area there is absolutely no truth whatsoever. I have no property anywhere near the golf course. I do own property in the community of Salvage which is about ten or eleven miles away from Sandringham, and I own no Summer home, and I have no property anywhere near the golf course location, the proposed location.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. J. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Transport. The minister knows that

MR. NOLAN: within his department there is surveying going on probably all the time, either in his department or by another department for his department.

I have become aware in the last few months of surveying that has been done in Conception Bay South. In one instance a man, well over eighty years old, found his fence cut down, and people, allegedly civil servants, in on his property. I mean, I would like to know the policy of the department in this regard. I do not think the minister is aware of it frankly and I have not had an opportunity to discuss it with him personally. But if this is happening in my area I suggest it is probably happening in other areas as well and here we have people who do not know what their rights are and you have bureaucrats moving in and I would like to hear a statement from the minister answering now as to what the position of his department is on this matter and what steps he is prepared to take to cure this matter, assuming that it is going on - and it is no assumption. I know it has happened in my own district.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am glad the hon. gentleman has brought this to my attention because I am basically the same opinion as my hon. friend that this should not be occurring and it is not a policy of the department. It may be by coincidence that in some cases an engineer working in the field may walk over property assuming that the person who owns the property, like the hon. gentleman just mentioned, that he has been contacted by head office and innocently the engineer may walk over his property with an instrument surveying the land or right of way for some road. So I will give the hon. gentleman my assurance that this matter will be brought to the attention of the head of the engineering division to assure, just as a matter of courtesy, that when walking over or trespassing on someone else's property

MR. MORGAN: in carrying out survey work that at least on courtesy alone that the engineer or the man working in the field, to contact the property owner to advise what he is doing there and why he is there.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile, followed by the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health, Sir. I am sure that the whole Province was shocked this morning at the headlines in The Daily News that ten year olds were getting abortions in this Province, especially the pro life groups. Would the minister tell the House whether it is correct or not that children age ten to fourteen years are getting abortions done in this Province and if so can they get it done on their own request or does it have to be confirmed by their parents?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated to the House in the past and in response I think to the hon. member, a recent amendment to the criminal code of Canada, I think it was in 1967, made it possible for abortions to be done in Canada provided a certain criteria were met, namely an accredited hospital, a board, an abortion committee to be established and the abortion committee to hear the request dealing with an application for an abortion. Specialists are involved in determining whether the abortion should take place or not. That is all in accordance with the Criminal Code requirements, Mr. Speaker, and there is not much I can add to it.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister admit that we have reached the stage in Newfoundland now where we now have abortion on demand? Is that a fair assumption? Would the minister care to comment on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: No, Mr. Speaker. I am not going to get involved in being bated by the hon. member here. I just outlined the procedure for abortions, not only in Newfoundland but all across Canada in accordance with an amendment to the Criminal Code of Canada, the recognized elected Government of Canada and to my knowledge, Mr. Speaker, the procedures followed in Newfoundland are in accordance with the requirements of that amendment to the Criminal Code.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, MR. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate to the House when the House can expect to get the information that has been asked of the minister now for about a week or so in connection with the age groups, if there was any research done to see the damage that was done to the women, the females that had abortions done, how far advanced their pregnancies were and then the technique that is used in this Province? When are we going to get this information? And has the minister replied to Mr. Breen's letter yet? The minister had an opportunity over night to check on that I suppose.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that I replied to

Mr. Collins.

Mr. Breen , because while my name was not mentioned in The Daily News this morning, I think hon. members who have read The Daily News will recognize that the information which he provided was in response to a letter which I received. Yesterday I indicated that I was pretty sure that I answered the letter, but I did not want to mislead the House. I wanted to go back and check and make sure. I received the letter from Mr. Breen -

MR. NEARY: Would the minister table it?

MR. COLLINS: - on the 6th. May, and I responded to the letter on the 13th.

MR. NEARY: Table it.

MR. COLLINS: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not intend to table letters, all the letters which are received from various people.

MR. NEARY: No, but table the answer. Will the minister table the answer?

MR. COLLINS: There is no reason why I should. The letter was written to me, I presume on a confidential basis, and my response to that gentleman, and I still regard it as being on a confidential basis.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, then I recognize the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a lot of the information in that letter, Sir, has been placed on the Order Paper. has been asked by myself during the Oral Question Period and would not the minister consider tabling the letter or give the House the information that the House has requested?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member in his response for information, similar to that which I provided to Mr. Breen, asked a lot of other questions which I undertook to find the answers to, and as soon as I get them all put together, then I will provide the hon. member with the information.

MR. NEARY: Well, how soon will that be?

MR. NEARY: The year after next, or what?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Justice.

Again I refer to the Scanlon report done by a professor from Ottawa following the Chafe fire in the Goulds on the communications within the fire department, police and various other public agencies. I now ask the minister again when he is going to table a copy of that report since there are a number floating around?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, that report was prepared by a gentleman named Scanlon who I understand is under a form of retainer with some federal agency. I have a copy he sent to me. He did not authorize me to make it public, but I have every intention of asking him whether he and/or his minister, who is the minister responsible for emergency planning in Ottawa - I cannot recall which minister that is - would be prepared for me to make it public. Obviously, I am aware that at least the fire chief for the Goulds has a copy, because I read in this morning's paper where he said that Mr. Scanlon was very complimentary toward the emergency procedures that were brought to play on that very tragic night.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: Is the minister then prepared to inform the House as to whether Mr. Scanlon made any reports on any deficiencies that there might exist within the system since we are talking about instantaneous action that is needed to protect lives in emergencies, whether they be fire or otherwise? What recommendations did Mr. Scanlon make? And what steps has the minister taken to implement any recommendations made?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, my understanding of Mr. Scanlon's terms of reference indicates that it was not the kind of report from which recommendations would flow. He, I believe, is under - and this is subject to correction, because, you know, I am not aware of his arrangement with the minister responsible for emergency planning in Canada - but

Mr. Hickman.

he is under some sort of an arrangement with that department that whenever there is an emergency in Canada, he may at his discretion go and take a look at the manner in which the response to that emergency took place. In this particular case, my recollection is that his main concern was to see the response that was effected as a result of reliance on the emergency telephone number, 911, and I think he was very impressed with that. I am not sure that all jurisdictions yet have adopted that kind of an emergency telephone service. I do not think that he was to make any recommendations, and I am not sure that he did. Certainly, if he made them, he would make them to the Government of Canada.

He is a professor at Carlton University, as I recall it, but he has this retainer to go around to various parts of Canada whenever an emergency takes place, if he sees fit so to do, and to see whether or not in his opinion the response to that emergency was adequate. But I do not think he has under his terms of reference nor indeed the power to make recommendations, because he is a federal retainer, and obviously he is dealing with matters that fall within the jurisdiction of the Provinces. But

MR. HICKMAN: anything that is capable of implementation will be studied very closely by the Fire Commissioner, who I am pretty sure has received a copy of the report, and Fire Chief Sooley when he receives his report, if he has not received one already. And we do know that the Fire Chief of the Goulds has received his, and I am sure that whatever is in there that may be relevant or helpful in the future will be accepted by them. I suspect, but I do not know this, and I guess I may be straying beyond my powers, but I would not be surprised if that report formed part of the evidence that will be submitted to the Commission of Inquiry. But that is a matter for the Commissioner and for the Counsel for the Commission. If there is anything further I can do to help the hon. gentleman from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) -

MR. NOLAN: Yes, you could resign.

MR. HICKMAN: - with this answer I will certainly do my best, Mr. Speaker.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Members' Day, the adjourned debate on Motion 8, the hon. member for LaPoile adjourned the debate.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, last week on Private Members' Day the hon. the Premier spoke on behalf of the administration, on behalf of his government and outlined the government's policy for the future of the fishery in this Province; And I was in the process, Sir, of winding down my part of the debate, because as hon. members know, I close the debate. Being the member who moved the resolution it falls on my shoulders to close the debate. And I believe I have about fifteen or twenty minutes left. I do not know if I will take all that time, Sir, but the House at this particular moment finds itself in a bit of a dilemma.

MR. NEARY: The Premier during the course of his debate told the House that he was prepared as leader of the other side to appoint a special committee of the House to look into this whole matter of joint ventures. Now what the resolution is asking for, Mr. Speaker, is a select committee of the House. So we find ourselves in a bit of a dilemma because we are not opposed to a special committee, but we are going to have to vote in favour of the resolution which calls for a select committee, at least I am. I find myself in the position where I would be quite happy to get any kind of a committee at this particular time to look into both short term and long term plans for the development of the fishery. Mr. Speaker, it is a good move to appoint a committee, whether it is a select committee or a special committee. It is a good move. Because we need, Sir, to firm up now wisely devised plans for the future. Because as the hon. the Premier confirmed in his remarks last Wednesday, Sir, the fishing industry, the fishing processing capacity in this Province is being under utilized at the moment. Recent figures, Mr. Speaker, show that our present fish processing capacity is 1.2 billion pounds, which is now being utilized at less than 35 per cent of that amount or just over 400 million pounds. That is only one shift. Mr. Speaker, again, Sir, I have to draw to Your Honour's attention that I am getting the rumble from outside. I can hardly hear myself speak, Sir. And, Mr. Speaker, that is about twenty times this session we have had to try to restore order in this House. Either close up the doors, Sir, put the padlocks on the doors the same as we have done with the industries that were started up around this Province, or let the members go in their common room if they want to have an Upper Island Cove meeting.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Would the Sergeant-at-Arms please take appropriate action to diminish interference of the proceedings of the House from outside.

MR. NEARY: Everybody talking and nobody listening.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member.

MR. NEARY:

The hon. the Premier wanted to know what an Island Cove meeting was, Sir. Well, it is everybody talking and nobody listening.

So, Mr. Speaker, we have the capacity of one shift to process 1.2 billion pounds of fish, but at the present time we are only processing 400 million pounds. So to overcome that problem, Sir, we must improve and increase our own catching effort. We must, as I said last week, Mr. Speaker, provide ships that are bigger,

Mr. Neary:

more sophisticated and capable of fishing in ice-ridden waters that surround our Island and border around the Coast of Labrador. Further, Mr. Speaker, and this is most urgent and very important, Sir, we must start training Newfoundlanders to man the new types of ships and take advantage of the new technology that is now needed in the fishing industry.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Would the hon. gentleman allow a question?

MR. NEARY: Go ahead, Sir.

MR. SMALLWOOD: In his sincere opinion, and I take it his sincere and considered, carefully thought out opinion, does he believe that no matter how comfortable and attractive, in a certain sense of the word, attractive, the draggers are made, the deep-sea draggers, how comfortable the accommodation, how good the food, and how relatively speaking attractive the work, does the hon. gentleman believe in his heart that ten, fifteen years from now if everything continues as it is with regard to life, social conditions in the Province, that ten years from now or fifteen we will still be able to get Newfoundlanders, native born Newfoundlanders reared in this Province to man a substantial fleet of deep-sea draggers operating out of this Province?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, to sincerely and honestly answer the hon. gentleman's question, Sir, I would have to admit that this is a problem of major proportion, It is something, Sir, that we are going to have to work at very hard, and if we cannot encourage our young people to pursue fishing for a livelihood, then I am afraid, Sir, we are doomed, that the fishing industry will fail.

MR. SMALLWOOD: No, it does not follow.

MR. NEARY: Well it does follow, Mr. Speaker - that is as far as Newfoundland is concerned.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Well.

MR. NEARY: Unless we allow the foreigners, unless we allow the foreigners - and my hon. friend rightly so points out to me - unless we allow the foreigners to come in and catch the fish and all we do is process it on shore. And God only knows that nobody wants that

Mr. Neary:

to happen. We must show our young people, Mr. Speaker, that the fishery can offer them excellent careers, fine working conditions and incomes that are comparable with any others in the Province. And if we can do that, Sir, I am sure that our young people will rise to the occasion. We must constantly work to develop real team spirit between our fishermen, our plant workers, and our plant owners. Only through such team spirit, Mr. Speaker, may the fishery become successful, reach its potential, and play the prominent role that it should be playing as the most important basic industry in this Province that can still employ large numbers of people in Newfoundland and Labrador.

Truly, Sir, the fishery is one of the few labour intensive industries left in the world. And we here in Newfoundland must be prepared to regard it as such, and to plan to make it such. There is no room in the fishery, Mr. Speaker, for fast buck artists, for con artists, and Come-From-Aways who will only just take over a plant for the sake of the government grants that they can squeeze out of Ottawa or out of the Provincial Government, and then as soon as they have exploited these grants to walk off, walk away leaving the fishermen and the plant workers high and dry just the same as we have seen happen in my own district of LaPoile in the community of Isle aux Morts, where first we had Nelpack Fisheries, which was British Columbia Packers, and then the marriage of convenience between Nelpack or B. C. Packers and Connors Brothers, which is the same company. We cannot afford, Sir, to have these kind of weak sisters in our fishing industry in the future; neither, Sir, can management be inefficient. They must learn to be truly efficient and to learn the ins and outs of marketing their products on the Mainland and throughout the world. No longer, Mr. Speaker, must our fishermen be expected to subsidize management inefficiencies in their industry or unfavourable market conditions by accepting less for their catches. If management cannot afford to pay decent wages, if management

Mr. Neary.

cannot afford to pay a decent price for the fish. if management cannot afford to pay decent wages in their plants, then management must learn the skills of management and marketing just as our fishermen have to learn their skills, and the plant workers have to learn their particular skills of cutting and so forth and whatever else they do in the plants.

So, Mr. Speaker, to wind up my few remarks I would again like to impress upon the House, and the government and especially the Minister of Fisheries the role that the government can play in establishing a properly balanced teamwork between the plant workers, the fishermen and the plant owners, and the trainees, the people that my hon. friend just spoke about, the newcomers who will be entering the fishing industry, we hope, in the years to come. There must be planning to train the fishermen, and to provide him with the vessels and equipment that will enable him to harvest the sea. There must be training and retraining for plant workers so that his product may appear on the markets of the world as a Grade A product that will make the name of Newfoundland synonymous with that of top quality, and there must be seminars and conferences and training programmes for management so that they will not only be able to operate their plants at peak efficiency but also able to market their products in a protien hungry world at prices that will maintain a proper level of productivity and a proper standard of living for all employed in the fishery team. This should be the goal of the government, Mr. Speaker. This is the ultimate objective towards which we here in the House of Assembly should all now be aiming our efforts. And this is the target, Sir, to which we should be steering our course, and directing our efforts not only throughout the remainder of this session, but during the sessions of the House of Assembly ahead.

Mr. Neary.

And so, Mr. Speaker, I am all for the special committee. I have no choice but to vote in favour of the resolution that was placed on the Order Paper back when the House opened in February of this year. If hon. members will check the Order Paper, they will see that: BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House urge the Minister of Fisheries to undertake - no, that is not the one. I am sorry. Just a second now. I am reading my hon. friend's petition from Placentia East. BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in view of the great urgency of this question, the Committee be directed to submit an initial report, that the Committee have power to sit; and BE IT RESOLVED that in order to give effect that the purpose of a Select Committee be appointed.

Well, Sir, I am all for the special committee. I am going to vote in favour of the resolution. I have no doubt that my hon. friends on the government side will vote against the resolution in favour of a special committee. If that happens, Sir, and the government uses their majority to defeat the resolution, and support a special committee of the House, then I hope that the hon. Premier will see to it that this Committee will be able to meet when the House is closed, that if necessary the Committee will travel to Ottawa, that the Committee will be able to - and I am not talking about joy riding around at public expense, Sir. It seems to me -

MR. COLLINS: You did your share.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir, I certainly did not do any of it. When I was in the administration when I made a trip it was an essential trip. It was not joy riding at public expense.

MR. COLLINS: You did not see the world when you were working on Bell Island.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. And what I did, I saw more of the world when I was working on Bell Island than I have since I got in politics. I did a fair amount of travelling when I was working with the mining company. I have done much less since I became a member of the House of Assembly and when I was a member of government, and I have done less again since I became an Opposition member. I do not believe I had a holiday, Sir, in five

Mr. Neary.

years. I am like the hon. the Premier. I am just bubbling over with energy. I do not need a vacation. It is a vacation for me to come in to this hon. House and make a speech. It is a holiday for me to be working for my constituents. It is pleasure to be working for the ordinary people of this Province, and I do not need to joy ride around the world at public expense. But if this special committee does have to travel to look at new technology, to look at fish plant operations, to look at boats, well then, Sir, I certainly would not object to it. If there are things they cannot do by telephone or by writing a letter and using a twelve cent stamp, well then so be it. It has to be done. And so I hope that the committee will be able to start meeting immediately and get down to brass-tacks and start to look at this problem of joint ventures, and that they will be able to meet throughout the Summer and keep meeting right up until the time this House meets again.

So, Sir, having made these few remarks I now conclude my speech, Sir, And I do hope that, just in case hon. gentleman

Mr. Neary:

because there are some hon. gentlemen who are so stunned and who spent so little time in the House, and the member for St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) is no exception, today it must be raining, he got out of his savoury patch today to come down to spend five or ten minutes in the House. No doubt before the day is over -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: No. I do not know if the hon. gentleman will have a chance. But we have gotten wise to the game that the hon. members for Kilbride (Mr. Wells), St. John's North (Mr. J. Carter) and St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) are playing, they came into the House once in a while, drop in to try and justify their existence, say something foolish that will get the headlines and then they disappear again for another three or four or five weeks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: And that is why I suggested the other day, Sir, that there should be an attendance record kept in this House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: That the Clerk should -

MR. J. CARTER: Put in a punch clock.

MR. NEARY: - not put in a punch clock, I do not mean that, But the Clerk should keep an attendance record and put it out through Newfoundland Information Services once a month so that the hon. gentlemen's constituents can take a good hard look at the hon. members the next time a provincial election rolls around.

MR. SMALLWOOD: What is the business?

MR. NEARY: The business before the House at the moment is a resolution that was moved by myself in co-operation with the Leader of the Opposition on joint ventures. "Whereas joint ventures with foreign nations could become a way of economic life to the point of forcing Newfoundland fishermen off the very high seas to which the 200 mile management zone finally gives Canada title; And Whereas the reason advanced for allocating part of our quota to foreign fleets is that the ships and equipment of foreign nations

Mr. Neary:

are much better than ours; And Whereas there has been considerable discussion of the desirability and the feasibility of Joint Ventures being arrangements entered into by fishery enterprises based in this Province on the one hand and foreign fishing interests on the other; And Whereas there is a considerable measure of disagreement about the desirability and the feasibility of joint ventures; And Whereas it is essential that the final facts about joint ventures to be made public, and that the implications thereof be fully examined; Now Be It Therefore Resolved that in order to give effect to these purposes a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the proposals with respect to joint ventures, to examine their implications and effects with respect to the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador and to report thereon;

And Be It Further Resolved that the Committee have power to sit in and out of Session, - this is very important, I just referred to it a few moments ago - to send for papers - well a Special Committee may not be able to do that, they may be able to send for them, but they will not be able to subpoena the papers under the Enquiries Act - and other documents and generally to exercise the powers which may be conferred upon Commissioners under the Public Enquiries Act. Well that goes down the drain if this resolution is defeated in favour of the Premier's suggestion; And Be It Further Resolved that the Committee have power to sit in and out of Session - no I am sorry - be authorized to sit from place to place throughout Newfoundland and Labrador; And That It Be Further Resolved that in view of the great urgency of this question the Committee be directed to submit an initial report within thirty days of its appointment, and a further and final report within ninety days of its appointment." So I can see now that it will be a continuing committee, this Special Committee. I would still like to see a report say within three months, within ninety days of the Committee being established, but seeing that it is going to be a continuing Committee then we would not expect to get a final report, but we would

Mr. Neary:

expect reports from time to time by the Committee.

It is a very important step, Sir, for this House to take.

And I am all for it, and I will vote for the resolution. If the resolution is defeated then I have no choice but to go along with the Premier's suggestion of a Special Committee.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The hon. member for Twillingate.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker,

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! Is the House ready for the question?

MR. SMALLWOOD: Do I have the right to speak on it, Your Honour?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I have to inform the hon. member that when the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) spoke he closed the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Is the House ready for the question?

AN HON. MEMBER: What is the question?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): The question before the House is as set out in motion (8) in today's Order Paper. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion? Those in favour, please say "Aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Those against, please say "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Nay".

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): In my opinion the "Nayes" have it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): This being Private -

MR. NEARY: Can we have a standing vote, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): This being Private Members' Day -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh! oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): - motion (9) -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: strange things.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: Calling (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I did wait sufficiently to allow three members to rise if that was their desire to create the division, Not having seen three members rise I had no choice but to go on to the next motion. The question -

MR. NEARY: That has to be a record -

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): - before the Chair is as set out -

MR. NEARY: - the fastest time in history.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): - in Motion (9), The hon. member for Placentia East (Mr. Patterson) moves the motion. The hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: I would like to speak on the motion, the restrictions on the redfish catches on the Southeast Coast of Newfoundland.

"Whereas it has been demonstrated in 1977 Federal Fisheries Management Plan of the Government of Canada has had a very severe impact on those Newfoundland fish plants which depend on landings of groundfish by side trawlers;

And Whereas side trawlers in the Newfoundland fleet have traditionally fished the redfish stocks of the Gulf of St. Lawrence;

And Whereas restrictions have been placed on the operation of Newfoundland-based side trawlers within the Gulf of St. Lawrence;

Now Be It Therefore Resolved that this hon. House urge the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment of Canada to undertake a review of the Fisheries Management Plan of the Federal Government to give greater flexibility and provide opportunities for side trawlers fishing options and to reconsider a request by the Newfoundland fishing industry that special assistance be given to side trawler operators."

Fish plants on the South Coast which depend on side trawlers for their raw material supplies have experienced considerable downtime and low productivity during the latter part of 1976. This was caused by the fact that the Canadian redfish quota for 1976 was exhausted by September that year, and the old-fashioned side trawlers used extensively in the redfish industry were not suitable for fishing for other types of fish.

The Federal Department of Fisheries in 1976 warned the industry that the redfish stocks in the Gulf could be depleted to the point where trawlers would not be able to secure sufficient redfish per trip to make it viable, and subsequently they would be all caught and destroyed, and destroyed forever the redfish stocks in that area. Federal authorities at that point should have set up a quota system sufficiently severe to protect the stocks from being raided, which they were by large midwater trawlers which had the endurance and the capacity to fish farther afield. These trawlers

Mr. Patterson:

should not have been permitted to fish such a restricted area with a very limited catch resource.

This has therefore imposed a severe burden and penalty on the plants which used side trawlers exclusively for a number of years long before the advent of the midwater trawlers.

MR. PATTERSON:

They are now faced with the loss of their traditional main fish stocks and are forced to travel on new grounds which are also suffering for the same overfishing to the point of their being nearly depleted.

Some attempts were made to send the side trawlers after other species other than redfish. However, the side trawlers began returning to port with catches of between 25,000 to 50,000 pounds of mixed fish compared with previous redfish catches of between 150,000 to 200,000 pounds.

Ottawa did agree to subsidize a trip by Nova Scotian and Newfoundland trawlers to the Hamilton Banks to try experimental fishing; however, this was separate from the assistance requested by local plants that are affected by the reduction in the redfish quota.

The side trawlers of Burgeo, Ramea, Gaultois, Harbour Breton, and to a somewhat lesser degree, Fortune, are now fishing under severe restrictions since the allowable quotas and the long steaming distance to obtain other species have made it impossible for them to secure reasonable voyages, putting the trawler operations on a continuous loss position.

The redfish quotas for 1977 were revealed by Mr. K. C. Lucas at an offshore groundfish advisory committee meeting in Halifax during December of 1976. The plan called for a total allowable catch, including by-catch, of 18,150 tons to be allocated as follows - 6,000 tons to Gulf based vessels less than 100 feet; 3,000 to Gulf based vessels greater than 100 feet; 4,000 tons to shrimp and miscellaneous by-catchers; 3,000 tons to large vessels now Gulf based; 2,150 tons for French by-catch, including 300 ton French allocation. Under this proposal there will be no directed fishery for redfish for the large vessels based outside the Gulf. Once the permitted redfish by-catch for both Canadian and French fleet is taken, the Gulf codfishery will end. In the plan, an attempt was also made to provide special consideration for the side trawlers inasmuch as that they would

MR. PATTERSON: be permitted to make one redfish trip per month in areas outside the Gulf of St. Lawrence while all other vessels would be prohibited from fishing redfish until June 1st. The Province outlined its position on the redfish management scheme in a proposal to Ottawa on February 10, 1977. Among other things the Province pointed out that in order to provide some degree of flexibility in the deploying of side trawlers and to allow them to operate more efficiently under winter weather conditions, side trawlers be permitted to catch a maximum of 250,000 pounds of redfish per vessel per month from areas 3P and 4V during the period of January 1st to May 31st, 1977. This proposal was considered in an offshore groundfish advisory committee meeting in Montreal on February 7th; however, no final decision has been made yet. The federal government is morally obliged to assist these producing companies in their attempts to keep their trawlers at sea, thereby making it possible for approximately 350 to 400 trawler fishermen to continue the occupation of their choice which is of so much importance to our economy.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Burin - Placentia West.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I have already read this resolution, and the simple answer to this problem is this, or the situation is this; that the Gulf, like all other fishing grounds, has been fished out - not only side trawlers, but

Mr. Canning:

stern trawlers with deep water and ground trawls have depleted the stocks in that particular area, and now according to research they are at a dangerous low. So the obvious thing now of course, the obvious thing that the Federal Government did, federal department did was to curtail fishing. They had no other alternative; the fish just is not there, and it is only history repeating itself. The Americans and the Mainland of Canada and Newfoundlanders have fished in that area for years. The Americans came down, the American trawlers came down after they had their own fishing grounds fished out, they had to come farther afield. About thirty years or thirty-five years ago a trawler in Boston or Gloucester or in Maine when when she was forty miles from home she was on a long trip, she was far off. As time went on and they fished their grounds, they went afield until eventually, in the 1940s and the 1950s they had to come on to the Grand Banks some 1,200 or 1,400 miles from home. So it is just a repeat on our grounds. We have fished them out. I said in this House some years ago, I remember saying one time, I was encouraging our Department of Fisheries to encourage better draggers, to seek better markets and so on, things were very poor with the fishermen who were fishing and making very little wages, that we had two things that we could do, the way the fish was being destroyed by the foreign draggers coming in on our grounds at that time, was that we had to make our mind up, were we going to get out, get better facilities, get better boats, try to get better prices for our fishermen, get out and take our share of what is being destroyed. I forecasted at that time, that the time was not far off when there would be no fish to catch, and of course time has borne that statement to be correct. However the Federal Department of Fisheries who made this regulation, who made this quota, had no alternative; it was either one thing or the other, it was either give them larger quotas to fish away and destroy the fish, and as I said earlier when I spoke was that according to the research, the survey had been made, the search had been made, that redfish in the Gulf is definitely down to a serious point where I

Mr. Canning.

do not know if the scientists are certain even if stocks are sufficient even to restore that species within the next ten, fifteen or perhaps twenty years. It may take ten years or longer before they will get back anywhere to their original stocks.

Now it was of great concern of course when this was realized. It was late - I will certainly blame the federal government for its sin of omission there, where they let the conditions arrive at this situation, but as it is there is no other alternative. And what aid they can give them. I believe the resolution recommends help but the only help that I can see is help that they are already getting. But if those draggers are held up they cannot fish and those fishermen are not in a position to earn, they must be subsidized until such time as the stocks are built up.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I will say this about side draggers. One hon. member asked another hon. member a few minutes ago if it would be expected within ten years from now Newfoundlanders would be - young Newfoundlanders would come up to fish, carry on the fishery. My answer to that would be they will provided that the conditions that the draggers that they fish in, working conditions, and prices are sufficient to give them a decent living, then I think they will. I think the fishery will go on for a long, long time, perhaps forever, if the proper preservation of the stocks are carried out and particularly when they are restored to where the industry including to the fishermen is

Mr. Canning.

more profitable. But, Mr. Speaker, I will say now that I have watched this happen, that the side draggers will go out as such. At the moment anybody who can get a berth on a stern dragger would not be caught on board a side dragger. It is the conditions. They are fishing in the open; they are smaller, there is a rougher time on them and, of course, in most cases they make lower wages. Whereas the stern draggers, even today, a few days ago, last week, there was a record wage made for one week in one particular dragger fishing out of Burin. The deck hands for, I think it was seven or eight days - I am not sure - somewhere between seven and eight or the ninth day or from the day that they left home until they came back, a deck hand's share was \$ 1,486. So the money there, I do not think they would complain about it. I think it is a record wage that was ever made in Newfoundland's fishery with our draggers anyway. One thousand our hundred and eighty-six dollars for eight days. Of course, they worked long and hard. Our draggers today have to cover - I do not know - five times as much ground, I suppose, than they did, say, even five, six, seven years ago. They are continuously dragging from the time they go out until they get back to get a decent load and a profitable voyage, a profitable trip.

I support the resolution as far as aid being given to those fishermen or even to the companies. Ottawa has not been too slow to give it. We are being subsidized so much per pound for fish. And both the firms, I think - I am sure if the member for the Southwest Coast area speaks afterwards, he is most familiar with it. I think in one instance a couple of years ago quite a subsidy was given to both the companies and the men, of course, shared as a result of this. But what I would suggest or what I would think the government will consider is while present conditions exist, it is not the fault of those fishermen that the grounds are wiped out. It is not their fault that the foreign draggers were in for years and years, particularly in recent years, in great numbers, the

Mr. Canning.

larger ships , more technology and what not. It is the sin of omission of the federal and American governments who so sadly neglected the great industry of the sea which replaces itself. We have not protected it. We have not brought in reasonable regulations, have not noticed what is going to happen. Everybody talked about it, and no action was taken until recently now the 200 mile limit has been established. So, Mr. Speaker, I would support the resolution in as far that those companies, those people who have produced the dollars , those Southwest Coast companies who today are employing many thousands of people on shore and afloat should be helped along until such a time that they can stand on their own feet. We cannot let the industry die, we should not let the plants go out or close. I think it is the responsibility of both governments to the people that help in some way will be forthcoming until we find out what the results of the 200 mile limit will be , how successful we are going to be in realizing the restoration of our stocks. I think most people are hopeful. Fish breed very fast. And it may be less time perhaps than even the scientists guess at the moment that we will see our stocks built up again.

So in the meantime I think that the federal government, and our own government as far as we possibly can from a financial viewpoint , should help in any way possible to keep this industry going. Our farmers, as we know, in the West get grants. They have even been paid for not growing produce. So I think that it is the duty of the government to come to the aid of those people who got those smaller draggers, those side draggers, in some form even to enable them to have access to the larger draggers so that they will be able to go farther afield.

MR. CANNING: But in the meantime this situation of the small draggers still in our midst - they are going out fast both on the mainland and here the last ten years. I think the government I was with, the Liberal government, was instrumental in first introducing the stern dragger to our waters when Atlantic Fish came into my district - the first draggers - the first comfortable ships the fishermen ever fished in. The working conditions on shore and afloat were upgraded immensely and, of course, then sort of a revolution effort really on our part that the other plants followed suit and other companies got the stern dragger and improved their conditions. And since then the fishery has not been going on too badly. Our returns have been fair. And as I stated there a few moments ago, when the fishermen have reached a point where they can make \$1,486 a week it would bring him up - I think if he made forty trips he would probably come up around \$50,000 or \$60,000 a year. Well, we hope we will see the day when our stocks are restored that the fishermen will be making wages like that. They deserve it; they are our producers. It is our main industry. Newfoundland depends on it, and I hope that everything possible will be done. And in that light, Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: It is fairly obvious from the large attendance here that there is deep interest in fisheries, or no interest whatever in this motion.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: You have a real crowd over there.

MR. J. WINSOR: I did not lay any blame on either side of the House. Those over on the other side were having general conversations the same as the hon. Dr. Smallwood and the hon. member from LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. NEARY: I was listening to the hon. gentleman.

MR. J. WINSOR: You could not hear him. You said yesterday you could not talk and listen at the same time.

MR. NEARY: I was not talking - I was listening.

MR. J. WINSOR: You were listening to the hon. J. R. Smallwood.

MR. NEARY: One thing I can do - I can listen to two conversations, but I cannot talk and listen at the same time.

MR. J. WINSOR: I see.

MR. SMALLWOOD: I can read and listen.

MR. J. WINSOR: That being as it may, apparently there is not a great deal of interest in the hon. member from Placentia's motion. It had merit when the motion was first put on the order paper I am sure, which I believe was some months ago when it was a hot issue what was happening to the side trawler plants and the redfish, the management of the stocks and about which a lot of people quote some strange numbers, total allowable catches and areas or different regions, different areas of the total 200 mile limit area - 3P, 3V and 3VS, 3K, 2P and all that. I doubt if three people who were discussing it know what these areas are and what real affect they are having on our total fisheries. Our fisheries are so important to Newfoundland, to Canada, that there should be a deeper interest in the House of Assembly right now and always on it, because it is the only really renewable resource that we have that is directly renewable. All right, you can grow a tree in thirty to fifty years but the fish fortunately replenish a little faster than that. But to talk to the motion, it has been demonstrated that the federal Fisheries Management Plan of Canada has had a severe impact on Newfoundland fish plants which depend on landings of groundfish by side trawlers. This is certainly true. It had to happen. It has had impact not only on the side trawlers that fish for redfish, it has had an impact on all trawlers that fish all species. It has had impact internationally on Russians, Spaniards, French, East Germans - you name them, so that the federal Fisheries Plan has had

Mr. J. Winsor.

more of an impact on the side trawlers. And there is no way they can give out larger quotas. The Gulf is now closed to the side trawlers. There are no more redfish to be had up there. It was said that you could steam through them for so many hours, but when the boats went there to do some test fishing there were no fish available. So they just are not there. We were told in 1972 down at Fort Pepperrell by knowledgeable scientists from the Federal Department of Fisheries that in four years there would be no fish, no sustainable stocks worth talking about left in the Gulf. And most of the industry, and I think most of the Department of Fisheries, both provincial and federal, said, Nonsense, they will always be there! Well, they are not there. I know that the boats that fish out of my home town, they go out, and they have had severe quotas on red fish put on them. Fortunately, they saved up their quotas, because they were not out fishing early in the year, and they could pick them up later on in April and a few in May. And they have had reasonably good success. Not good, because there is no way they are coming in with big trips like they could do at one time, 275,000 pounds, 300,000 pounds which was a full load. If they got 140,000 now it is considered a good trip, which is only half. It has certainly had a severe impact on these boats. But they are getting along. Where they are really going to feel the pinch is within the next six months or longer. Now the Gulf is closed, and other areas are closed to different species, like plaice. Plaice is flounder - American plaice it is called in the industry. It is flounder. I have a list of the Canadian groundfish quota here, and the amounts that are left to be caught are really not all that much. So it is going to be a bad time. But if we can slug through the next six months -

AN HON. MEMBER: They will hang on.

MR. J. WINSOR: They will get enough, hopefully. There are going to be hard times and I would not be surprised to see some plants closed down again in the Fall, or even earlier than that. But we are going to have to go through it. There is no point in squaking about it. If the fish are not there you cannot catch them. We will just have to wait

MR. J. WINSOR.

until those stocks bounce back to where they are really worth fishing.

Now unfortunately redfish is a very slow growing fish as the Minister of Fisheries pointed out here some time ago, and it is going to be three to five to seven years before the current stocks of fish, which are swimming around, are going to be fit to take out of the water. And there is not much point in talking to them. If you do, you will have nothing left, there will be no renewables.

So to speak to the motion again, and to come back on track, the federal government is doing something about it. They are still paying subsidies on fish, on cod fish. For the inshore fishermen everything over sixteen inches, head on and gutted, cod that is, he gets two cents a pound for it; one and a half cents for ground fish if it is over sixteen inches. They are trying to eliminate the under sixteen inch fish for obvious reasons, quality control. I think the minister touched on this very fully earlier on. There is no point in catching it although he did mention that they were trying to devise machinery to fillet under sixteen inch fish. I do not know. The minister is very knowledgeable, I am sure, about fisheries, But I doubt if he has seen as much slush go through a plant as I have under sixteen inches from the Sydney Bite, and there is no machine in the world as gentle as a fish-cutter's hands. And boy! when it came away from the knife, it was not good. It should have been left in the water to grow up. And I do not think there is much point. This is why the federal government is not paying a subsidy on under sixteen inch fish. There is no point in having it. If you put it in a package, and sell it to somebody, they will not have much to eat. I do not think anybody in Newfoundland would eat it. They might eat it the first time, because they are stuck with it.

MR. W. CARTER: Would the hon. member allow a question?

MR. J. WINSOR: Certainly.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: With respect to the filleting, of small fish, and I am sincere in this - I know the hon. member has a lot of experience in the fisheries - but is it possible, for example, to salvage small fish that is caught in the trap? If a fisherman goes out on

MR. W. CARTER: the storm-tossed Atlantic in a small boat, tries to haul a trap and to dip the fish out of that trap, does it make sense or is it possible for him to measure that fish, to take his rule and measure it - '16 inches, we will keep that one - 15.9, we will throw that one away.' You know, I have said, Mr. Speaker, said when I made the announcement about the machine, that it is a crime to catch the fish, yes. But it is a bigger crime to dump it once you catch it.

MR. J. WINSOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker. In the first place he would not be hauling a trap on a storm-tossed sea unless he was mad; and to answer your question directly, if they would put four or four and one-half inch mesh in the back of the cod trap instead of the three or three and one-half they are currently using there would not be that many small fish caught. And I am sure there are people in this House who know that right now.

MR. W. CARTER: I am told it will not work.

MR. J. WINSOR: Well, the fishermen suggest -

MR. W. CARTER: When the strain comes on the mesh goes together.

MR. J. WINSOR: Well, yes. That is for sure. And the wings of the big stern trawlers, they are, some of them, as much as twenty-four to thirty-six inch. They go together, but they do not go together as much as a ten inch or an eight inch or six inch, and there is more slack in it. And this was suggested to me by a fisherman that this is the way to eliminate the small groundfish. Now I have not seen a cod trap hauled since I was seven years of age and when it was dried out I was chucked into it. That was your baptism of fire in Notre Dame Bay, but the fishermen tell me that if you increase the size of the mesh at the back of the trap you will get less small fish. And I am sure, like you say, that if there is small fish caught, well, you just do not throw it away - you try to do the best you can with it, and unfortunately, an awful lot of it goes into -

MR. W. CARTER: For a fish that size you cannot do it overnight, can you? It has to take time.

MR. J. WINSOR: Oh, all these problems take time to be corrected. Unfortunately, it has taken us nearly five hundred years, which is a mighty long time, to correct the problems in fisheries. We do not learn easily or we just do not change our ways easily, one or the other. I am fully aware of that. And this is talking to a motion. I am afraid I am digressing a little bit. But I think it was said; 'Where are we going to get the men to go in the trawlers?' I know that the men are going back to the trawlers, because there is good money in it and I do not know of any company that has any trouble getting men to go to sea and fish. Because they are getting a decent living wage - even better than that, and they have more wall-to-wall carpeting in their homes than a lot of people in St. John's who are not fishing - maybe working with the government, I do not know.

MR. SMALLWOOD: How long has this been going on?

MR. J. WINSOR: Well, it has been going on, Sir, for about - the change goes back over, I would say, six to eight years. I remember one time when we used to have to pretty well almost bludgeon fellows to get them to go aboard the trawlers -

AN HON. MEMBER: Kidnap them.

MR. J. WINSOR: - in the winter. There are plenty of fair weather sailors, but in the winter it is a different ball game altogether, and it takes a real man to go out there and fish during the winter. But the platforms they have today are very excellent trawlers. even the side trawlers, they are beautiful ships and they have every comfort imaginable on them. And the boys - young men - are going back to the fisheries. Only I am afraid there is not enough training. They are going back without the essential training. And the skipper will take a fellow and put him on the deck - as long as he knows he came out of a dory or a jolly boat or a punt or whatever you call it - a rodney. If he knows he could

MR. J. WINSOR: row that one right around right end first he will take him and put him on deck. And some of the product of the College of Fisheries early on was not to the standard that they required for the simple reason the boys went to the Fisheries College without any initial training in boats like most boys that grew up in the outports did have. They were in the boats when they were six and seven years old and they can row an awful lot better than most people in this House of Assembly today at that age.

MR. NEARY: They had no intention of going fishing until -

MR. J. WINSOR: They had no intention of going fishing at that time, because fish then was - you know - two to two-and-one-half cents a pound. That is a far cry from seventeen.

Anyway, the federal government will do this for the side trawler plants, and this applies to April and May, they are doing it on a two month period. I do not know if this is general knowledge or not,

Mr. J. Winsor.

but I am sure that the minister is aware of it. After the two month period if the plant can show a short fall, show where they are in a loss position by the 10th. July, for instance, as for April and May, then the federal government will look at their position. And it has not been established yet as far as I know whether they will give them a grant-in-aid or they will pay a subsidy on the amount of fish that was caught. That has not been nailed down as far as I know. This I would say in a way sort of makes the motion redundant. But I would have to vote for the motion, that the management plan be looked at. I am sure that there are still possibly some areas where this plan could be adjusted, the same as they did last year. I think the minister spoke on it. They took a piece of V N and put it into V S. And I am sure that the minister knows where that is, because he has looked at it often enough to know, and certainly had to work with it, and that gave an extra boost to the Lunenburg boys who were kicking up their heels about, you know, being robbed of their traditional rights and their traditional grounds on the Mizzen Bank, Banquereau, and the little holes around there. There may be still adjustments that the federal authorities can make. So I would have to vote for the motion, this particular motion. I see nothing with taking a second look at what you have already done. And there may be holes that they can open up for the smaller boats, because these side trawlers go from the Newfoundland ports up to the Nova Scotia coast - Banquereau, they call it. Our fishermen call it Quereau, because it is easier to say. And there may be a few areas where they can loosen up the regulations. That would be for flounder, sole, some cod, plaice instead of flounder. There are no redfish. There is no way they are going to get any more redfish quotas, because they are just not there.

And I think with these few remarks I would have to say that I would vote for the motion and ask the federal government to take another look at it. But I doubt that you are going to come up with any major improvement in the total allowable catch. I do not see it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to have a few words to say on the motion. I do not intend to be very long. And when it comes to talking about fishing, I think, Mr. Speaker, of another kind of fishing which I will not go into in the House now. But we are naturally talking about fishing for species of fish which are found in the sea. And before I get to the motion, I would like to say that it is difficult to speak about any phase of the fisheries without saying a few words about the minister who is constantly, day in and day out, who is really trying to do all he can in the interest of the Newfoundland fisheries. Of course, the Premier himself has had great experience in this line having run his own plant in Carbonear, and I feel that these are men who know what they are talking about when it comes to fisheries.

I also want to congratulate the mover of the motion, the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), a man also who has experience, I am sure, in the fisheries as he has experience in many walks of life. But I feel that

MR. WOODROW:

I should really mention the member for Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor); in fact, he has been dealing with fisheries for about twenty-five years I suppose, twenty-five years, and I do feel he knows what he is talking about. I wonder sometimes if we are not over fished. And moving out to the district of LaPoile, there are plants like the Hardy plant in Port aux Basques, a plant in Margaree, Burnt Island, Isle aux Morts, Rose Blanche; then there were plants in Ramea, Burgeo, Gaultois, and Harbour Breton. And these plants have been continually raking up the fish stocks, and it really makes one wonder how long more they can last.

But the fisheries, Mr. Speaker, has played in the past an important role in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and I think in the future it is going to play an even greater role. Because I really feel that if we are to survive we have to depend upon the fisheries, and the best possible means of getting this great natural resource from the sea.

Now the motion says, Now Be It Therefore Resolved that this hon. House urge the Minister of Fisheries and the Environment of Canada to undertake a review of the Fisheries Management Plan of the Federal Government to give greater flexibility and provide greater opportunities for side trawler fishing options and to reconsider a request by the Newfoundland fishing industry that special assistance be given to side trawler operators.

Mr. Speaker, over the past couple of years, and in particular I am thinking now of a visit that the hon. Minister of Fisheries made to the district of the Bay of Islands a little more than a year ago: At that time we met with some of the captains in the area, and they seem to think, and I think the minister recalls this, they seem to feel that there are lots of things, we are referring to redfish, and they are also referring, I remember at that time, to herring, they gave me the impression, and perhaps to the minister as well that we should not pay too much heed to the

Mr. Woodrow:

scientists what they were saying. Of course, at that time the quotas were cut down very drastically. And when you come to consider in fact as the hon. mover of the motion said that speaking of the Canadian redfish quota for 1976 it was exhausted by September of that year. The old fashioned side trawlers used extensively in the redfish fishery were not suitable to fishing other types of fish.

Now I do not know, Mr. Speaker, if the fish stocks were really, if the quota was really exhausted or if it was simply -

MR. WOODROW: if the scientists thought that they should cut down on it, but I believe in all honesty and sincerity we have to go by what the scientists say. When I was questioning yesterday in the House the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture about the danger of contamination to the water supply in the city of Corner Brook when they do the spraying over there, one of the reasons he gave was that environmental experts have told us that even if the spray falls over the water supply there would not be any danger of contamination. I am bringing out this point because I am asking myself the question, Who are we to blame? Who are we to believe? We have to put our faith in somebody so -

MR. NEARY: Put our trust in the Lord.

MR. WOODROW: Put our trust in the Lord is right, but the point I am trying to bring out is this, that I think we have to go along with the scientists when they say that we have to watch and have to be careful so that we will not take all our fish out of the sea, in fact, and there will not be any left.

But maybe what the federal government could do to help us would be to pump more money into research. And I think they should always keep reviewing their position, the position of research.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young) - Order, please! I would ask the hon. gentlemen on my left to lower their voices. I could hardly hear the hon. member.

MR. WOODROW: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think they should keep on reviewing. There is so much research done on oil and gas, in fact, money for research spent in other areas of Canada, especially in the western provinces. I feel that the federal government should also spend more money on fisheries research, because it is not only important for us here in the province of Newfoundland and Labrador, but also in the provinces of Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick. Perhaps we may have to blame ourselves - I mean the federal and the provincial governments

MR. WOODROW: have to blame themselves for not having a better management plan. With the increase today in scientific knowledge and the like there is no end, in fact, to what should be done to try and find out more about our fisheries. Looking back, in fact, over the old days, and I believe the member from Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. J. Winsor) mentioned this - if he did not mention it today he mentioned it before - that there are so many species of fish that were never put to good use. I am thinking especially of the flounder. There are so many of them just - they were taken up out of the sea and put back there again.

Mr. Speaker, I do not think, in fact, I have too much more to say about this.

Mr. Woodrow:

I am sure there is probably others in this hon. House who would like to have an opportunity of talking about it. But I feel sure that the hon. Minister of Fisheries is in contact with his counterparts in Ottawa and he will do everything in his power to see that we get the best things possible from the sea. In other words, that we not only have fish in a scientific way, but that we also have to be careful, in fact, not to over harvest it. Therefore I would say that it certainly would do no harm for us to review the fisheries management plan of the federal government; in fact, it is up to us as a Province, I suppose, to keep reminding them of it, and come up with what is best for our Province and the other provinces.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude by saying that I am certainly going to vote in favour of the motion. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Is the House ready for the question?

All those in favour "Aye".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young): Contrary minded "Nay".

SOME HON. MEMBERS: "Nay".

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): I declare the motion won.

It being Private Members Day Motion 10.

The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, it is now 5:30 and, you know, we have already managed to dispose of two resolutions. I am quite prepared - I did not expect to get into this resolution today but I am wondering in view of the Press reception at 6:00 o'clock whether the mood of the House is such that we might adjourn a few minutes early now for the purpose of the Press reception, perhaps we could get into this early next week. If so - well I will move the adjournment of the debate and see where it goes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Is it agreed that we call it 6:00 o'clock?

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: I just made a motion now.

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, let us carry on with the Private Members Day, Sir. Why chop a half an hour off? Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman is not ready I will carry on with the debate.

MR. MARSHALL: No, no, no, I am quite ready. I just asked -

MR. NEARY: Well the order has been called and the hon. gentleman has no choice now but to get up and introduce his resolution or let it go by default.

MR. MARSHALL: I move the -

MR. NEARY: I am satisfied to lead off if the hon. gentleman is not ready.

MR. MARSHALL: Well I just moved the adjournment of the debate, that is all. The House -

MR. NEARY: No, Mr. Speaker, I do not see why the House should adjourn.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, I mean it is in order -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: - for anyone, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for St. John's East.

MR. MARSHALL: It is in order for anyone to make a motion, I mean I did it very humbly, very timidly. If hon. gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) does not like it he can vote against it, so I just, you know, make the motion, make it by way of suggestion; if they do not I will go on. I do not care.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Young): A motion to adjourn is always in order.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is debatable.

MR. NEARY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I see no reason for the debate to be adjourned at this particular time. The hon. gentleman is not moving the adjournment of the House, the adjournment of the debate. And Your Honour has already called the Order of Business and the House does not rise until 6:00 o'clock on Private Members Day, and if the hon. gentleman is not ready and is not prepared to carry on

Mr. Neary:

with the debate, then I would say the hon. gentleman should withdraw and let the debate go on.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order please! All those in favour that the House now adjourn.

MR. NEARY: It is not the House, Mr. Speaker,

AN HON. MEMBER: The debate.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The debate.

MR. MORGAN: The debate, adjourn.

MR. NEARY: Yes, what happened -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MARSHALL: Move the debate adjourned if you want to, you know.

AN HON. MEMBER: What happens if the debate adjourned?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, on that point of -

the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I know is sort of recognizing that we have got a half hour left, but the member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) is a reasonable member of this Legislature. We have got a function at 6:00 o'clock and most of us got to get back to our offices. There are other functions on later on in the evening which are not debatable at this moment, so I wonder can we sort of have - what is it? - a congeniality that might prevade the inner sanctums of this particular Chamber at the moment.

AN HON. MEMBER: resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Since when did the hon. gentleman start being nice?

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): My understanding is that to adjourn debate we must go on to the next order of business or if not we must call it six o'clock.

MR. NEARY: That is right, Your Honour.

MR. MARSHALL: Sir, anyone can move the adjournment of the House, any member can.

MR. CHAIRMAN: All those in favour that the debate adjourn, 'aye'.

MR. NEARY: No, I am against it, Mr. Speaker. The hon. gentleman has had three and-a-half months to prepare himself to introduce this resolution.

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): Order, please! All those in favour 'aye', contrary minded 'nay'. I rule that the 'ayes' have it.

MR. NOLAN: A standing vote.

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): Order, please!
My understanding is that they are calling a vote on whether the debate should adjourn.
The motion is that the House do adjourn.

MR. NEARY: No, Sir. No, Sir. No, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): There has been a division called, call in the members.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, may I ask a question?

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): Order! Now we have to have a standing -

MR. NEARY: No question?

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): Is the House ready for the question?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, before your Honour puts the question, Sir, the member for -

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): Order, please! All those in favour -

MR. NEARY: This is completely out of order, Sir. The whole thing is completely out of order, Sir.

MR. NEARY: The member for St.-

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. J. CARTER: Order! Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): Order, please! Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman should know the procedure.

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): Order, please! Order, please!
My understanding is that all those in favour that the debate adjourn, please stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Find out what is happening about it before Your Honour puts the question.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour please stand.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: The whole thing is out of order.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sit down! Sit down!

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): Order, please! The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: It is out of order.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Sit down!

MR. NEARY: What kind of a shambles is this House getting into?

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): Those against - Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The whole thing is a shambles.
The motion is out of order.

DIVISION

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications, the hon. the Minister of Forestry and Agriculture, the Hon. the Minister of Health, the hon. the Minister of Rural and Industrial Development, the hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy, the hon. the Minister of Justice, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, Dr. Farrell, the hon. the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations,

DIVISION CONTINUED

the hon. the Minister of
Education, Dr. Collins, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Goudie, Mr.
Cross, Mr. J. Carter, Mr. Woodrow, Mr. Marshall.

Those against the motion:
Mr. Canning, Mr. Strachan, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Callan, Mr.
Flight, Mr. Rideout, Mr. MacNeil, Mr. Neary.

MR. SPEAKER (YOUNG): I declare the motion won.

MR. SPEAKER (MR. YOUNG): The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: A question of information if you would,
Mr. Speaker.

MR. STRACHAN: Waiting for a change of referees. He does not
like that there.

MR. NOLAN: I do not want to get the bodies mixed, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: My question is really on a point of information
hopefully, Mr. Speaker, and it is this, that since the hon. member
for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) rose, allegedly to address
himself to the motion which was tabled in his name on the Order
Paper, my question is - and that is referring to legislation
compelling private enterprise to provide pensions for employees -
since he rose to speak to this, Mr. Speaker, the question is does
the House recognize that he rose to speak to this; therefore
on next Wednesday, if we do not continue this afternoon, do we
drop this or is he now only permitted to speak in closing the
debate on this particular motion? Do we now consider in our
precedents, whatever they may be, Mr. Speaker, that he has
already addressed himself to this motion even though he may not
have gone into any real discussion on it although he did mention
pensions and so on.

It is merely a question that I would like to have
answered, Mr. Spaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The point raised by the hon. gentleman to my
right is quite straightforward. I was not in the Chair when
the original procedure developed. As I understand it the hon.
member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) rose to speak to
motion 10 and moved the adjournment of the debate. That motion
was then voted on and by majority was affirmed. Correct? The
motion was affirmed. If the motion to adjourn the debate is
affirmed the hon. member does not lose his right to speak when
it is called again. If the motion is negated, and that happened
once last year as hon. members may recall rather late in the night,

MR. SPEAKER: if a motion to adjourn the debate is negated the hon. member loses his right to speak.

In this case the motion carried, so when the debate is again called, motion 10, the hon. member may speak. Is it clear? When a motion to adjourn the debate is made, if it comes to a vote, if the question is asked, and it is affirmed, the hon. member does not lose his right to speak. If it is negated he does lose his right to speak. In this case it was affirmed.

MR. NOLAN: May I ask another question, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Let the hon. gentleman put it as a point of order, because strictly speaking -

MR. NOLAN: A point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: You are on a point of order.

MR. NOLAN: All right. Why I raised the point originally was that the gentleman from St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) rose and mentioned order no. 10 and the legislation, and then he went on to look at the clock and so on and talk about a press reception and the like and then we got into the motion of adjournment. I maintain that he addressed himself to this item already, Mr. Speaker, This is why I have raised the situation here now.

MR. SPEAKER: Actually the point is quite clear here. Any time that the hon. member spoke, from when he got up to speak, then that time counts and comes off of the time that he is entitled to. But hon. members will recall this has frequently happened. For example, on the Address-in-Reply, an hon. member might get up and say nothing more than, "I move the adjournment of the debate." When it is called the next time it is not voted on. If any hon. member then says, "Question," that motion must be voted on because when an hon. member says, "I move the adjournment of the debate," it is a motion. In most cases, nobody says "Question," But it is exactly the same procedure.

MR. NOLAN: True, True.

MR. SPEAKER: So here the hon. gentleman moved the adjournment of the debate. The question was called, and that motion was affirmed. If the motion had been negated, he could not speak further.

MR. NOLAN: Do we dissolve the House now, Mr. Speaker?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, on a point of privilege of the House, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I would submit to Your Honour, who was not in the Chair when the motion was made, that the motion made by the hon. gentleman was completely out of order. Your Honour knows that the rules on Private Members' Days are much different than the rules followed on an ordinary sitting of this hon. House. Your Honour calls the resolution put forward by a private member twice, and if the hon. gentleman after hearing the resolution called for twice, when the member's motion is put twice from the Chair and not proceeded with, then Your Honour has no choice but to go on to the next order of business.

MR. SPEAKER: That is right.

MR. NEARY: That is the rule, Sir, on Private Members' Day. No member, Sir, can stand up in this hon. House and without even making an attempt to introduce his resolution and move that the debate be adjourned. It is not parliamentary, Sir. It is completely out of order. If it is allowed to create a precedent in this House, it is going to make a complete shambles out of the Private Members' Day, because any time any member wants to, Mr. Speaker, he can stand in this hon. House on Private Members' Day and move that the debate be adjourned. And, Mr. Speaker, I submit, Sir, that Your Honour take a few minutes, because there is a very dangerous precedent being established here on Private Members' Day, and look over this. I think the whole thing should be completely overturned and forgotten that it ever happened.

MR. MARSHALL: On that point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, I will hear the hon. gentleman, yes, on a point of privilege, raised by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary).

MR. MARSHALL: On the point of privilege raised by the hon. member for LaPoile. The simple fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that two Private Members' motions were disposed of today. I had not expected this to be called. I think it is much more important that there be effective debate in this House than the - what I would call - the childishness and what is now really the challenging of the ruling of the Speaker by the hon. member for LaPoile. And if the hon. member for LaPoile and the members of this House would prefer this type of childish political one-upmanship to effective debate of a real resolution, as far as I am concerned, that is of interest in this Province, well, you know, let it be. But I think this has gone far enough.

MR. SPEAKER: I am in a position to make a ruling on that, and I believe the whole matter may be based on misunderstanding. The motion that the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) made was a motion to adjourn the debate. There is no motion before the Chair to adjourn the House. The Standing Order with respect to the adjournment of the House, the Standing Order is very clear for the procedure on Wednesday. It is Standing Order 7. It says what will happen on Wednesday, "At the hour of 6 o'clock on Wednesday Mr. Speaker adjourns the House without question put." And a motion to adjourn the House previous to 6 o'clock, if there was not unanimous consent, would be out of order and the Chair could not take it. The Chair could not accept a motion to adjourn the House. However, a motion to adjourn the debate, that is the one that has followed, and that motion was in order, was carried in the affirmative, and now the procedure is that I call the next item on the Order Paper, the next Private Members' Resolution. Where I think the problem came is that a motion to adjourn the House is out of order, but a motion to adjourn the debate would not be out of order. Now when that will be called again I do not have to decide now. That I frankly do not know at the moment.

MR. NEARY: Sir, I draw Your Honour's attention to page twenty-two of the Standing Rules of Order down at the bottom of the page.

MR. SPEAKER: Page forty-two?

MR. NEARY: "When a private member's notice of motion shall have been (a) Twice called from the Chair, and not proceeded with, it shall be dropped, provided that it may be placed at the foot of the list on the Order Paper upon motion made after due notice."

MR. SPEAKER: Page forty-two?

MR. NEARY: Page twenty-two, Sir, down at the bottom of the page, Section 38, I think it is, of the Standing Rules.

MR. SPEAKER: Right. When a private member's notice of motion ———.

MR. HICKMAN: Mr. Speaker, if I may?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. HICKMAN: Standing Order 38 — may I direct Your Honour's attention to the fact that

MR. HICKMAN: this motion was not called and has not been called twice from the Chair, It was simply called, whereupon the mover of the motion, the hon. member for St. John's East, rose in his place, made a very few remarks and then moved the adjournment of the debate and that is where the matter stood. But there has been no calling of the motion on two occasions by the Chair, which may or may not have the affect that in the event that no hon. member moved to speak it, to support it, may or may not result in it moving to the bottom of the Order Paper, or dropping it for that matter. But that has not transpired.

MR. SPEAKER: The point under standing order 38(A) if it is twice called from the Chair and not proceeded with it shall be dropped provided that it may be placed at the foot of the Order Paper by motion made after due notice. But of course what this refers to and what a decision is not necessary on now is where on the Order Paper it should appear.

MR. SPEAKER: That is not a matter on which the Chair or the House needs a decision now, That is a matter to which I shall have to give some thought.

MR. NEARY: I will accept Your Honour's ruling on that.

MR. SPEAKER: So the hon. members, I hope, are familiar with what has happened, There is nothing irregular or a breach of procedure; it has been somewhat complicated but there has been nothing irregular, It has been unusual but not improper. Standing Order 38 (A) referres to where the motion will appear on the Order Paper, I do not need to -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman would permit - I do not need nor does the House need to know that at this moment. The motion that was made was not a motion to adjourn, which would have been improper unless there were unanimous consent; the motion that was made was in order and it was voted in the affirmative and

MR. SPEAKER: what I am now required to do is to call the next order on the Order Paper or the next Private Members' Resolution.

AN HON. MEMBER: That is right here.

MR. SPEAKER: Then I am going to proceed.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman -

MR. FLIGHT: A point of order, if it is necessary. But it is strictly a point of clarification because I am concerned about the Private Member's motion my hon. colleague has coming next as I am with the motion from the hon. member for St. John's East. And the point of clarification that I want, Sir, is that if the issue presented, the motion presented by my hon. friend for Baie Verte-White Bay is called now, will that be the motion called next Wednesday or will the government have the right to recall the motion from the hon. member for St. John's East?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, I can answer the second part of the hon. gentleman's question immediately and that is of course that on Private Member's Day the government do not call any motions, the Chair calls them. Now I will have to decide and inform hon. members on the placing of resolution - what is now resolution 10. I will have to make a decision on that, I cannot tell hon. members now where what is now resolution 10 will appear or what number will be given it.

AN HON MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: Right, and if it does not appear to be much justification in adjourning the House to that because it is not a matter of immediacy, it does not affect what happens now anyway. What happens now is to proceed to motion 11.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. member.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, before proceeding to the next item on the Order Paper, in the interest of the good conduct of the

DR. COLLINS:

business of the House I wonder if Your Honour would ask hon. members if we could consider it six o'clock by unanimous consent?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman has asked whether there is unanimous consent to consider it six o'clock. I understand that there is not. Therefore I call Motion 11. Hon. member for Baie Verte- White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, this has come as much of a surprise to me as to the hon. gentleman from St. John's East -

AN HON MEMBER: We are always ready.

MR. RIDEOUT: I cannot say that I am always ready, Mr. Speaker, nor will I make an effort to adjourn the debate before six o'clock seeing the wrangle that we just went through.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: I will call it six in a little while if my colleagues do not mind. I will introduce the motion at least.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes, we may make a motion to adjourn the debate and you people will vote against it. Anyway, Mr. Chairman, the motion as it stands on the Order

Mr. Rideout:

Paper in my name reads as follows; it has been so long since it was placed on the Order Paper I will have to read it to familiarize myself with it as well as to hopefully familiarize other hon. members of the House. And it says: Whereas Industrial Health and Safety is and ought to be the concern of every worker in this Province; And Whereas it is recognized that many thousands of workers in this Province work in environments that are potentially hazardous to health; Be It Therefore Resolved that this House urges the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to immediately constitute an Occupational Health and Safety Authority within the Department of Manpower and Industrial Relations; - Now, Mr. Speaker, that obviously should read, since that particular department has been changed since I placed this motion on the Order Paper, it should read the Department of Manpower and Labour, I do believe that is the new title of that department. (b) That this Occupational Health and Safety Authority assume total responsibility for the health and safety of workers; (c) That existing legislation and all agencies related to worker health and safety be consolidated under this Occupational Health and Safety Authority; and (d) That the Government, in structuring this new Occupational Health and Safety Authority, at the same time set by statute (i) strict new standards of operation to apply in all work-places in this Province, (ii) Threshold Limit Values that reflect medically acceptable tolerance levels, and (iii) ensure that all such regulations will be constantly reviewed in light of new information and technology.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that particular motion that is placed on the Order Paper by me on Opening Day back last February is, I believe, one of the most important motions ever placed on an Order Paper in this House since I have been here. Because I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, there is one member in this House who will admit to himself or publicly that occupational health and safety is not one of the biggest issues and one of the greatest crises facing our people in this Province that work in industrial areas. I am thinking particularly of Baie Verte, Labrador City and the Wabush area, Buchans, St. Lawrence,

AN HON. MEMBER: ERCO.

MR. RIDEOUT: - Long Harbour. We can go all around the Province, Mr. Speaker, and we can find in all of our industrial centres hazards to the work force. This, Mr. Speaker, is a new thing in Newfoundland. I do not believe we have addressed ourselves as individual members of the House of Assembly or as a government, I do not believe that we have addressed ourselves properly to this particular problem. The motion as I have it down has three or four sections to it, and hopefully next week I would be able to get into a more properly debate on those sections.

But in essence what I am asking is that this House urge the government, not force them or anything of that nature or put them in a corner, but urge the government to set up in this Province an Occupational Health and Safety Authority. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the time has long past for us to do that type of thing.

MR. SMALLWOOD: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: Any member of this House who has done any research at all, Mr. Speaker, into occupational health and safety I believe would be flirting with the pangs of his conscience if he did not agree with that particular motion asking that an Occupational Health and Safety Authority be set up. Any member who has done any research at all, Mr. Speaker, would know for example the recommendations of the Hann Royal Commission in Ontario last year, that recently made its report suggesting this type of authority in Ontario. And Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, is no different from Ontario when it comes to occupational health and safety, neither are the workers in this Province any more immune to the hazards of the work-place than are people in other parts of Canada, particularly I am thinking about Ontario at this present time.

And, Mr. Speaker, last year as I spoke about occupational health and safety as it related to my district, and a number of times that it has come up this year and as I will get into more detail next week, there are sometimes that I wonder if the members of

Mr. Rideout:

the House of Assembly who in past years, back before Confederation and since, if those particular members had before them the oodles and the piles of research material that I have been able to lay my hands on this past year and a half, if those particular members that represented the St. Lawrence area, for example, in this particular House years and years past had before them the information and the knowledge and the research and the expertise that we had before us today, then maybe the tragedy that has hit that particular area of the Province would have been lessened

Mr. Rideout.

to a great degree. And certainly, Mr. Speaker, there is no reason whatsoever for any member of this House who is interested or any member of the government who is interested to be in the dark when it comes to environmental hazards, when it comes to occupational health. There are all kinds of research material available. It is easy for one to lay one's hands on it and all one has to do is to go out and look for it, and there are barrels of it available suggesting what we are facing in this Province. Mr. Speaker, we are very new in the industrial work in this Province. We have only been - with the exception of St. Lawrence - we have only been involved for the past fifteen or twenty years. And the pending tragedy that is down the road for our workers in this Province is not to be smiled at, Mr. Speaker. And in order to avert that tragedy - this is what I have always said, You cannot blame it on anybody; you cannot blame it on the company for ignorance; you cannot blame it on ignorance of the worker; you cannot blame it all on the government - but in order to avert or to lessen the pending tragedy that is facing industrial workers in many centres of this Province we have to do one thing: We have to ensure by legislation and by strict enforcement and control of that legislation that the latest information, the latest technological information, the latest technological advice is strictly adhered to in this Province. And up to this stage, Mr. Speaker, it is my submission that we have not done that. That is where the government has fallen down in Threshold Limit Values for a place like Baie Verte. They have fallen down in the same respect in Labrador City. We have not done that. And, Mr. Speaker, that information is available. The tolerance levels that are acceptable in other parts of the North American Continent and in Europe are available and all we had to do is go and spend a bit of time digging it up, the medical research showing what happens fifteen or twenty or twenty-five years down the road in an asbestos mine is available. It is not a figment of my imagination. It is not a concoction, a fiction. It is available. It is fact. And we have not

Mr. Rideout.

acted on it. There is a division of occupational health and safety in the minister's department which is trying to do something, in the Minister of Health's department. That is no place for them. They are scattered all over God's farm in this Province, Mr. Speaker, in Health, in Manpower and Industrial Relations, under the Workmen's Compensation Board. And the poor worker that comes in suffering from silicosis gets a run around. He does not even know where to go.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to get into more detail on this next week so I move the adjournment of the House, if it is in order.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman cannot call it six o'clock, but he can move the adjournment of the debate. Is it agreed that it be called six o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

It being six o'clock I leave the Chair until tomorrow Thursday, May 26, 1977 at 10:00 A.M.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow Thursday, May 26, 1977 at 10:00 A.M.