

VOL. 1

NO. 34

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 P.M. - 6:00 P.M.
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

I am sure all hon. members would like to join me in expressing sympathy to the family of a former Legislative Librarian who served this House for a lengthy period of time, and I refer to Miss Elizabeth Jeffers who passed away on Monday, November 19, at Carbonear.

Miss Jeffers was the Legislative Librarian from 1949 to 1966, and served in that capacity under three Speakers, Mr. Speaker Sparkes, Mr. Speaker Courage, and Mr. Speaker Clarke. With the concurrence of the House, I would like to extend an expression of sympathy to her family.

ORAL QUESTIONS

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the hon. the Premier. In view of the disturbing and conflicting stories which are coming from a variety of sources with regard to the future of the Come By Chance oil refinery, I wonder if the Premier is in a position to give an assurance that under no circumstances will the mothballing, as it has come to be called, of this refinery cease at the end of the present year? I think he is aware that that report is widespread in my constituency and I guess elsewhere at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I was not aware of any comments today or yesterday on it, but undoubtedly I can appreciate that a number of comments might be rampant or a number of rumours might be rampant in the district of Bellevue, given the fact that the Come By Chance oil refinery facility is in that constituency.

As the Leader of the Opposition knows, and I guess everybody in the House knows, there have been fairly extensive negotiations between ourselves and the receiver and ECGD on this matter

Premier Peckford: over the last number of weeks. And we are into a sort of negotiations with them right now. It is our understanding that - and I do not know who put out this rumour, I do not know if it was the receiver or who it was, who made some offhanded comment in the last couple of weeks about it, but from all of the information that we have we are not aware that mothballing costs will suddenly end on the end of December.

But we are talking to the people in ECGD, and the receiver, Peat, Marwick, about the whole matter presently. And as soon as we have some definitive answers we will pass them along to, first of all, the Leader of the Opposition as the member for the area and to the hon. House.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

A supplementary. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON:

My comment referred - perhaps I ought to have been a bit more specific - to a statement, I believe as recently as this morning, quoting the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) as saying, and I believe it was in quotes, "Only as a last resort would mothballing be considered or indeed the disintegration of the plant," that is, the disassembly of the plant. I am sure if the hon. minister was misquoted he will be glad to say so, but what I really am getting at at the moment is I think it would make matters a lot simpler and a lot more effective for the people of the area, and I guess for all of Newfoundland, if we knew with clarity that the government itself would insist that this facility not be allowed to, in a sense, rust away, let us say, at the end of the year or at any point in the immediate future.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Perhaps the Leader of the Opposition is confused with the comments that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) made. As I understand the comments of the Minister of Finance, they (Dr. Collins) had to do with selling the facility as scrap. I think the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) indicated that it was only at a last resort that the facility would be sold as scrap; it had nothing to do with mothballing costs. We have tried to keep the people of the area up-to-date on this matter and called some of them into St. John's some time ago, a couple of weeks ago, to meet with the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the President of the Council and others in government to brief them completely on what is going on. Of course, we are very much of the view that the refinery, the facility, has a future and can be made reactivated. I noticed in the paper, I think, yesterday that the Receiver is out again looking for additional proposals, over and above the FAC proposal, so that we can aggressively get on with the job of seeing who is around who might like to reactivate the facility. So we are very much of the view that

PREMIER PECKFORD: the facility is in good shape right now and should be kept that way for an extended period of time so that we can have more time to both look at any new proposals and to ensure that the facility is not just sold as scrap somewhere down the road.

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A supplementary. The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, may I put it to the hon. the Premier that there seem to me to be two aspects to this, one obviously involving ECG and the receivers, and in those circumstances I can understand the legalities of the situation. It seems to me on the opposite side, however, from that is the responsibility of the government to see whether it can in fact, as part of its industrial strategy and job creation, take a separate and distinct approach in terms of trying to generate the interest of somebody in operating the facility. What I am asking is is the hon. the Premier saying that we are now merely waiting

MR. JAMIESON: until the ECGD and Peat, Marwick advertising or promoting or whatever name one wishes to apply to it, see what it throws up on its own, or is the Industrial Department of the Government of Newfoundland itself seeking out and trying to find specific or potential operators for this facility?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, we are working through the receiver and ECGD, who have a fair number of contacts around the world, and a number of initiatives have been made in the last two or three weeks to potential buyers and so on to indicate to them again that proposals will be accepted over and above the First Arabian Corporation proposal. So not only through ads in papers, but a fairly aggressive campaign around the world, internationally, has been undertaken by the receiver through contact with the Government of Newfoundland, through contact with ECGD, to ensure that every possible avenue is explored and any kind of indication by any corporation anywhere in the world has been followed up on within hours of hearing about it. And we do not just wait to hear from somebody else; we, ourselves, go out and try to initiate, through the receiver, additional initiatives to try to find buyers for this facility.

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: To be quite specific, Mr. Speaker, I understand the matter of the receiver and the Peat, Marwick side of it. What I am saying is apart from that - for instance, whatever the hon. the Premier or colleagues opposite may think of, let us say, Petro-Canada or some other agency of the Government of Canada or some help that the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce might be able to provide, apart altogether from what is being done in conjunction with the receivership, surely it is important that the Government of Newfoundland, itself, initiate and say, 'We are going to try to take the lead rather than simply wait until we see what the result is of this separate and promotional campaign.'

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, the first thing, Mr. Speaker, is that it is not sort of separate. So that we do not have people in ECGD, people in Peat, Marwick, people in the Newfoundland Government, going after the same people or whatever, we are trying to co-ordinate our efforts in this affair, because it does a lot more good than all of us going off in our own separate directions.

On the question of Petro-Canada, we have talked to Mr. Crosbie, the Minister of Finance, about this and to other people in Energy, Mines and Resources in Ottawa over the last two or three months about the whole question of Petro-Canada and whether, in fact, it had any interest here on this business of Come By Chance, and, to this date, there really has not been any serious interest shown, even though we have indicated our interest in seeing it happen that way.

So we have been trying to co-ordinate with the receiver all the contacts we know and trying to pool all our resources into ensuring that no stone is left unturned in our desire to get at corporations who in the most preliminary way might be interested in looking at Come By Chance.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I can assure the hon. member and the Leader of the Opposition that every possible avenue is being followed up on in an aggressive manner as of this moment.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) The hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins). Back in 1972 the Moores' administration appointed Burns, Fry Limited and A.E. Ames and Company Limited as the fiscal agents for the Province. Recently, they have been replaced by Dominion Securities Limited and McLeod, Young, Weir Limited and the only explanation we have had so far from the minister is a vague general press release that was issued from the minister's office. Would the minister tell us now why it was necessary to change the government's fiscal agents?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, it was not necessary to change the fiscal agents. It was a matter we took under considerable study. We interviewed all fiscal agents who not only normally visit the Province looking for our business but who also look for business from Newfoundland Hydro. We also made inquiries in other regards as to the particular expertise, the particular orientation, the particular type of business affairs that fiscal agents do that would fit into our requirements. And this was subject to quite extensive study and we decided that the two firms who were appointed subsequently best fitted our need. This was done, I think, in a very professional way, we are very pleased with the results we have so far from the advice they have given us.

MR. S. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman in answering the question said that it was not necessary to change the government's fiscal agents yet the government did change their fiscal agents and I am trying to find out from the minister why such a

MR. S. NEARY: drastic step was necessary? For instance, did Burns, Fry and Ames make a mess of our financial relations in the money markets of the world? But why was it necessary? The minister says it was not necessary, but yet the change was made. Could the hon. gentleman tell us why it was made? Did Burns, Fry do a good job for the government? Did they mismanage the financial affairs of this Province? What precisely happened that the government had to kick them out and replace them with new fiscal agents?

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, as far as I know Burns, Fry did an extremely good job for the Province. I am not aware of any mess or difficulties they got the Province in in any way, but there are a number of these firms available to us, we decided to look over the field, we decided

DR. J. COLLINS: a change would be helpful to us, would be constructive. We might have taken other firms but we decided at this point in time that the two firms chosen best fitted our needs. This was done quite amicably with the other fiscal agents who had previously been our agents. They will be involved in our bond issues, not as lead managers but they will be involved in the syndicate if we do have to go to the money markets. We still feel it quite open to us to go to Ames and Burns, Fry for any advice and we have no reason to doubt that that will be forthcoming. But our main managers, if we should need to go to the money market, and our main advisors in financial matters will be the two firms the hon. member mentioned.

MR. S. NEARY: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman undertake to get for the House the amounts paid out each year in commissions etcetera to Burns, Fry Limited and A.E. Ames Company Limited, a statement of the amounts paid out to these two companies? And also, while the hon. gentleman is answering that question, would he tell us what the people of Newfoundland can expect now in the way of improvements and benefits as a result of this change of fiscal agents?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: On the first point, Mr. Speaker, I can assure the hon. member I will do that just as soon as possible. On the second point, I think the people of Newfoundland can look forward to extremely professional, knowledgeable advice as to what is happening in the money markets of the world; we will go to them when we are looking at the prospects for the economy both provincially and nationally, both in the short-term and the long-term. In other words, they will give us any advice that their expertise allows them to do.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. T. FEDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not the environmental impact studies of the Upper Salmon Development have been completed yet and, if so, if they have been delivered to the government and if the government have had a chance to assess them?

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

MR. L. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I assure the hon. member is referring to certain studies which deal with the migration of caribou and other matters which had not been totally completed before the initial approval was given for the construction of the access road for the project. These studies, some of them will continue throughout the winter to determine the migratory pattern of the caribou during the winter and they will

MR. BARRY: then be provided to Hydro and Hydro, as a term and condition of carrying on the project must make sure that the road, the structures which they put in, that measures are taken to mitigate any such work - measures are taken to mitigate the impact upon the caribou movement. So that although approval for the project has been given, it has been given subject to the necessary changes, or modifications being made to avoid undue interference with the migratory pattern of the caribou herd.

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

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I asked the question because it is my understanding that Newfoundland Hydro has scheduled a public meeting in Bay d'Espoir tomorrow night for the purpose of public discussion of certain environmental studies. In view of what the minister has told us, that some of the studies may not be completed, I ask him now if certain segments of the studies have been done, say, those different from the caribou migrations, and whether in fact that is the purpose of the meetings and if others will be held as the rest of the studies are completed.

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

MR. BARRY: It is this government's policy, Mr. Speaker, to have full disclosure of all matters relating to environmental matters on the Upper Salmon project or any other project. There have been certain studies completed with respect to environmental impacts of the Upper Salmon and, in fact, these studies have been made available to interested parties and are available from Newfoundland and Labrador Hydro, and will be available for discussion with residents in the Bay d'Espoir

MR. BARRY: area, or, for that matter, with any citizen of this Province who would like the information. And I, myself, have had certain meetings. I attended a panel discussion at the university where a group who were concerned about possible interference with any traditional land usage of the people of Conne River, raised questions about the project. So we are prepared to have the information as it is available, presented to the people of this Province for review, for examination, for comment, for criticism and for suggestion.

MR. RIDEOUT: A final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The final supplementary, the hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay, followed by the hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the environmental impact studies of the caribou migration have not yet been completed, I wonder if the minister could tell the House whether or not it is a fact that the original route of the roads, as stated by Newfoundland Hydro, and I assume approved by government, has been changed and that the road is now being built right through the middle of what the local residents refer to as the calving ground of the caribou, is that being done with government knowledge and does it have government approval?

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I do not think the hon. member has his facts straight. Initially there were two choices as to whether a road would go in from the Buchans area or from the Bay d'Espoir area, and the decision had to be made on that. And after some debate and considerable differences of opinion, there was a decision made that the road could and, in fact, should for reasons of costs, efficiency, and technological reasons, go in from Bay d'Espoir. There were concerns raised about the environmental impact of this road, and it was concluded that on balance there would not be serious adverse environmental impact, on the caribou or any other feature of the environment.

Now, one feature of the Upper Salmon project is that the very site of the dam and the canals, which will have to be built to the power house, appears to be at the centre of the migratory pattern of the caribou. Now, there was some allegation or some statement that this is close to the calving ground of the caribou. This is not right in the centre of the caribou calving ground, as far as I know, nor does the road go right through the centre of the caribou calving ground, as the hon. member has stated, to my knowledge.

But where the actual Upper Salmon project is going to be carried out is at the centre of the migratory route. Now there is no way of avoiding that, you know, they tend to funnel up through this area. The best information I have, however, is that with the proper steps being taken, in terms of having the size of the canal, for example, not too steep so that they can get down and across, keeping the roadbed as low as possible so that it does not act as a barrier, taking other steps that are identified and spelled out for Hydro, that the project, itself, will not prove to be an impenetrable barrier and that the caribou can go around it one way or the other or in some places right across, right over the project. And that is the basis upon which the project approval was given, that it could be built in such a way that even though the caribou -

MR. NEARY: Build an overpass.

MR. BARRY: An overpass may not be necessary, but if it should be the way to go, then we can give serious consideration to it. But even though the project itself- it is not just the road, it is where the power house is going, and where the canals and so on are

MR. BARRY: right at the center of the migratory movement, that it can be built in such a way as to avoid undue interference with the caribou herd. That is the information that I have.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). On November 13th of this year, this month, the Greater Lamaline Area Development Association, which is the association which takes in from Point May around over to Lawn including Lamaline, Lord's Cove, Point aux Gaul and Taylor's Bay, wrote to the minister inquiring about rumours that they had heard that the Lamaline depot, highway's depot was to be moved from Lamaline to Grand Bank. To date, the Greater Lamaline Development Area has not had a reply from the minister. My own information is that the depot, while we are standing here, is in the process of being moved and there has been no consultation and the people have not been informed that this was actually going to happen. Could the minister tell me whether or not anybody has been in touch with the Greater Lamaline Development Area to advise them of the move?

MR. NEARY: That is like the letter the Minister of Manpower got from the member.

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I believe I saw a letter a couple of days ago from that group, I do not recall one before. I understand that we are going to move the depot mainly because of vandalism and some damage to some of our equipment in some of the buildings, but there is no real firm decision on that. We have not discussed it with the people in Lamaline and I am not so sure that we would. If there is a great deal of vandalism there and if we can give better service, then I think we would move it anyway.

MR. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. THOMAS: The minister says that there has been no firm decision made, however. I spoke with the superintendent, the regional superintendent of highways at Clarendville who advised me that a definite decision has been made and the highway's depot is, in fact, being moved at this present time, that is as of today. Now, the closest hospital to the Lamaline area is thirty miles away, school buses are going some sixteen miles to take children, could the minister tell me if and when the depot is moved how they are going to service that part of the Burin Peninsula? From where they are going to service it and so on?

MR. SPEAKER: (Sims) The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRET: Mr Speaker, there would be no change in the service. It would make no difference whatsoever whether you put your station in Grand Bank or whether the station is in Lamaline. Obviously, if they are in Lamaline they have to travel to Grand Bank and if they are in Grand Bank they have to travel up to Lamaline, so it would not make any difference to the service.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Minister of Health (Mr. House). There was a television programme recently that talked about an insulation which has very dangerous side affects, is the Minister of Health aware of that problem?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I am aware of it, I am aware of the programme he talked about and I am aware, too, that the national Minister of Health is aware of it and is looking into it.

MR. L. STIRLING:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING:

The question came as a result of a number of constituents who have recently used this particular insulation. The question is, does the Minister of Health intend to put out any kind of public release to warn people who are in the process of having this installed, that there is some question about it? Does the Minister of Health intend to do anything of a public nature?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, we are aware of these matters and that is sort of a national thing, it is a national programme really, the insulation programme is national, and it is a concern of the minister and we are awaiting any further directions from National Health. And if we think it is necessary at that time, we will circulate to people in the Province.

MR. L. STIRLING:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING:

Mr. Speaker, this is a very serious question.

It was first brought to light about a week ago, And the Minister of Health, the federal minister, suggested that nobody do anything without first contacting him, and it is a very serious question. Right now there is a crew in my particular district on behalf of one of the constituents and he has his house partially completed. And there should be some immediate decision made by the Department of Health to tell people to hold off or stop or to do something

MR. L. STIRLING: in the meantime because this is a very costly proposition. Does the Minister of Health intend to take no action at until the federal minister does something about it?

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, as I have stated, we will take action if it is necessary and we have to find out first if it is necessary. We cannot take this action just stemming from a radio or a television programme. I stated that it is being investigated and we will take the action if necessary.

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I indicated a final supplementary. I see no one else standing. The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: There is some conflict between his first answer and the last answer, Mr. Speaker. The first answer I got, the understanding was that he had been in touch with the federal minister and now I would like to ask the provincial minister whether or not, in fact, he has been in touch with the federal minister and what advice has the federal minister given him.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, when I mentioned we were in touch with the federal minister and the federal department about that, they had been in contact with this Province, yes.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, this really is a very urgent matter and he has not given us an answer.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
I should, perhaps, point out to the hon. member for Bonavista North, (Mr. Stirling) for your benefit, that there is a procedure, if the hon. member is not satisfied with an answer, that you may wish to follow.

The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry). I requested an answer some time ago, asking that it be laid on the table of the House. My question is: It has been some time now since Dr. Angus Bruneau submitted his report on a feasibility study of the port of Lake Melville. Could the minister tell us if the report will become public and when should the public expect copies of the report?

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

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, this was an internal report prepared as one part of an ongoing study for the Lake Melville area. We are looking at various ways in which industry might be attracted to the Lake Melville area and this is in conjunction with an overall Labrador transportation plan and development plan generally. We hope to have various aspects of this study put together for a report, the base of which can be released sometime in 1980, but the work has not yet been totally completed.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: There is time for one short supplementary.
The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am just wondering how many reports are we going to have while this House is sitting?

MR. BARRY: It is a five year plan.

MR. WARREN: It must be a five year report plan probably. My supplementary is, in view of the minister's recent statement concerning the icebreaker Franklin which I understand is in service over in British Columbia somewhere - and he says it is very doubtful if this icebreaker would be making a trip into Lake Melville this Winter - in view of his statement, will there be any other icebreaker available? If not, is the whole idea scrapped, or what?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy for a short answer.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, since my statement, I have received additional information on the icebreaker Franklin. This icebreaker received severe damage when attempting to come through, I think it was the Northwest Passage trying to come East, and had to return to Victoria, had to be repaired in the shipyard. I understand repairs have now been completed. She is on her way to St. John's through the Panama Canal, is expected to -

MR. NEARY: She is going to pick up John C. on the way.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: - No, I do not think she will pick up John C. on the way along.

MR. NEARY: She will pick up Frank D. (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BARRY: The Franklin is now expected to arrive in St. John's around December 5th to December 7th, and although the federal Minister of Transport, Mr. Mazankowski, could not give me a commitment at the time we made the original request because of the uncertainty as to whether repairs would be completed in time, I will, in light of the new information, be approaching him again and I still hope that we will be able, now, to obtain federal approval to have icebreaker facilities provided in Lake Melville over this Winter.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms)

Order, please!

The time for Oral Questions has expired. I should perhaps point out to hon. members today that some of the questions and answers were rather lengthy. I notice both sides nodding in agreement but I would not want you to think that the rule has been ignored.

I am sure hon. members would wish to welcome to the gallery until quite recently, a former member of this House and now the newly elected member of Parliament for Burin - St. George (Mr. R. Simmons).

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. S. NEARY:

Answers to questions.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I thank the hon. the member for LaPoile. Question 47 on August 15th, 1979, I hereby table the answer.

MR. S. NEARY:

What about the one I asked you yesterday. You were going to give me the answer today

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the Premier agreed yesterday to get me some information in connection with grants and subsidies to fish plants and the hon. Premier told me he would have the information today. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman are we going to get the information today or are we not?

PREMIER PECKFORD:

To that point of order, I do not think, Mr. Speaker, that is a legitimate point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

To the point of order; I would rule, as I have many times in the past for the benefit of the hon. member for LaPoile, that that is not a point of order, legitimate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

ORDERS OF THE DAYMR. SPEAKER:

Motion 2.

The hon. member for Trinity - Bay de Verde.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. F. ROWE:

Mr. Speaker, I understand that I only have twenty minutes to introduce this particular Private Members' Bill and I hardly have time to list off the topics that we should consider under this bill in that particular time limit. Therefore, Sir, I will not mention the preamble to this particular bill but just simply read out the resolution itself, "That this House fully debate all aspects of the fishery in order that the government may be directed to develop a strategy for the fishery in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador which would be in the best interest of all involved with the fishery and in the best interest of the Province as a whole".

Now, Sir, that may appear to sound like motherhood and it is a very wide-ranging type of resolution. Now, Sir, at the particular time back in July when I moved that Private Members' Bill, I did it in the sincere hope and wish, as did my colleagues, that all members of this House of Assembly would, in fact, allow a wide-ranging debate on all aspects of the fishery. The reason, at that time, Sir, was very simple. Up to that point in time, around July and for the preceding year or two, there were numerous and monumental announcements and statements made by the previous Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Walter Carter, and the administration on matters regarding the fisheries of this Province.

It would take me, Sir, a full twenty minutes to just list off the headings of the announcements that were made by the previous Minister of Fisheries regarding the fishery development in this Province. To give you an example, Sir, this pile

MR. F. ROWE: here represents simply the news clippings of the statements made by the previous Minister of Fisheries and the administration as far as fisheries programmes were concerned. There were some other thirty-seven major announcements made by the Minister of Fisheries.

Now, Sir, these announcements were so numerous, so confusing, so redundant, so contradictory over the past year or two, that it would have been just as well, Sir, if the Minister of Fisheries, or somebody, had to have held up the Rorschach ink blots and asked the Minister of Fisheries to give his first impressions of what he saw. And that was the genuine reason why we moved this particular motion in the House of Assembly, to give all members of the House of Assembly an opportunity to debate the announcements that were being made inside and outside of the House of Assembly by the previous Minister of Fisheries and the previous Premier, and ~~the present Premier without benefit of debate. This was~~ a sincere and genuine concern on our part.

But the reason now, Sir, has completely changed. Since the last election it seems as if we have had a complete moratorium on any actions or any announcements, or any interests, or any emphasis on the fisheries. And the Premier can get up all he wishes and say that we are trying to divert the administration away from the emphasis on the fisheries to that on oil and gas, but the fact of the matter remains, Sir, that this administration, since the last election, has dropped the emphasis on the fisheries and switched completely to oil and gas and this is having a severe psychological impact upon the fishermen of this Province, and the people who are interested in the fisheries of this Province.

MR. F. ROWE: So, Sir, the first reason when I originally moved the motion, was that there was such a multiplicity of announcements being made by the previous Minister of Fisheries, and by the administration opposite, that I simply wanted to give every member of the House of Assembly an opportunity to comment on these various announcements. Now, the reason is quite the opposite. It appears as if the hon. members opposite have dropped their emphasis on the fisheries. We have a part-time Minister of Fisheries, no reflection on the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), but the matter is he does have a portfolio, which is an important one, and onto that has been added the fisheries portfolio. We have a part-time Acting Minister of Fisheries whereas before, the previous Premier suggested that the fisheries was so important that he himself, the Premier of this Province, felt that he should handle the portfolio of the Fisheries Department, the previous Premier, Moores.

And then we went through a whole series of fisheries ministers, Cheeseman, Collins, Crosbie, Carter, and I am sure I am missing - and Moores - a number of them.

AN HON. MEMBER: The gear scandal.

MR. F. ROWE: And now we end up, Sir, close to 1980, with a part-time Minister of Fisheries. I think, Sir, that the government should be held accountable for this great de-emphasis on the fisheries because there are too many questions to be answered.

Sir, for example, I asked the Premier just yesterday or the day before, I cannot remember now, this is Wednesday so it had to be yesterday or the day before, what the status of the Fisheries Development Corporation of Newfoundland is? That is the corporation to co-ordinate the development of the primary landing distribution centre,

MR. F. ROWE: and the Premier replied and admitted that the status of the Newfoundland Fish Corporation, or the Fisheries Development Corporation of Newfoundland for the primary landing and distribution centre and the superport, that the progress on this five year plan is dependent upon a reassessment of the fish stocks in the Northern waters and of the catching capacity of our trawlers. Sir, an unbelievable admission.

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes. And why is it unbelievable, Sir? Because this year

Mr. F. Rowe: we have only \$100,000 voted for the superport or this Fishery Development Corporation of Newfoundland. One year ago last week, this time last week was the first anniversary of this great conference, Fish Is The Future, wherein Mr. Walter Carter delivered his great speech at the Fisheries Seminar and we had the strategies and programmes for the fisheries development. One year ago last week was the first anniversary of this great five year programme, costing \$500 million, \$250 million to come from the government -

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: Let the hon. member wait! \$500 million over a five year period, that is, \$100 million a year; \$250 million to come from the two levels of government and \$250 million to come from private enterprise.

And what do we see in the Budget this year, Sir? \$100,000, .2 per cent of the total amount that was estimated for the building of this superport and the whole five year programme concept. Sir, I found it absolutely incredible that after the Provincial Government set up the Canadian Kellogg Corporation, and Provincial Government Authorities, ~~it took them two years and \$420,000 to complete a study before this~~ five year programme was announced, \$680,000 was spent to conduct a study before this five year programme was announced. A hundred or so fishermen were dragged in and asked to look at that for twenty-four hours, less than twenty-four hours and approve of it, and it was announced, no debate in the House of Assembly.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shameful!

MR. F. ROWE: And \$100,000 in the vote this year, and the Premier tells us after the expenditure of \$680,000 by the Kellogg Corporation and the Provincial Government Authorities, the fisheries authorities, two years of study \$680,000, that now they are looking at the superport concept in view of the fact that they have to assess the fishery stocks in Northern waters and they have to assess the catching capacity of the trawler fleet and the fishing industry in general. What an admission on the anniversary of that great fisheries announcement, without getting into, Sir, the fact that nobody in this House of Assembly

Mr. F. Rowe: had the opportunity to put five minutes worth of debate into that concept. It was announced over in the Holiday Inn, hon. members on neither side of the House had an opportunity to represent the views of their constituents, of the fishermen, of the fish plant owners, of the fish plant workers, or of anybody, of the businessmen of this Province. It was a fait accompli.

And now, Sir, we are wondering whether, in fact, the departure of one Walter Carter represents the departure of that five year plan. That is one question that I would like the hon. the Premier to answer during this debate, whether there is any coincidence between the departure of Walter Carter and the impending departure or abandonment of this five year plan concept?

AN HON. MEMBER: The member for Placentia -

MR. F. ROWE: Because, Sir, we certainly did not have the opportunity to debate it. The member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) raised some very good questions. And I was out in Harbour Grace before 450 people, Sir, where I dared to ask a few questions about the superport, and I was practically booed out of the place, booed out of the place - ~~450 people stacked hall to support this Nordee agreement which~~ I am happy to say I was instrumental in having the government drop, whereby a foreign country would have taken over one of the major assets of the fishing industry in this Province. But, Sir, that is a question that has to be answered, the whole concept of The Fish Is The Future Five Year Programme, and the whole business

MR. F. ROWE: of the five year programme and the superport concept.

Sir, the second of a hundred and some odd items or topics that I could raise in introducing this bill is the situation with respect to the Fisheries Loan Board. Sir, it was reported that \$54 million worth of loans had been approved in the past two years, that is \$48 million more than had been approved in the previous twenty-three years by the Fisheries Loan Board. It has been reported, but nobody on the government side has denied it, nor supported it, or agreed with it. But we want answers. There is a terrific backlog, Mr. Speaker, a fantastic backlog of applications before the Fisheries Loan Board. Loans have been approved, fishermen are out looking for boats, having boats built and no money is available to them. Young people have entered the fishing industry, have had loans approved and now no money for their boats. And new people have entered the fishery and have applications in and have had no word back from it.

There have been accusations of political influence coming from people on the board and then somebody had the gall to blame the fishermen for approving too many loans, making it too easy. And Mr. Carter, before he departed, Sir, suggested as a result of a question I put to him on August 9th., that the Fisheries Loan Board should get extra funds to take care of this particular emergency.

MR. RIDEOUT: That is why they got rid of him.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, the Fisheries Loan Board is in a complete shambles, chaos, and I think, Sir, there is something here that warrants a full-fledged enquiry into the operation of the Fisheries Loan Board and why it

MR. F. ROWE: is in the total mess it is in and why we have the fishermen in the total confusion that they are in as a result of the activities of the Fisheries Loan Board over the past year or two.

Now, Sir, I would like, Mr. Speaker, to point out a number of topics that I would like to have hon. members allude to before I take my seat because I understand I only have about a couple of more minutes. But, Sir, I would like for somebody to explain to this House how we can have the fish and chips kid coming down here before the last provincial election - Mr. McGrath said, "I have the fish, Mr. Crosbie has the chips". Well, he has the chips like a poker player and he wants to keep them. And we were told, "Elect a Provincial PC Government here to co-operate with the Federal PC Government in Ottawa and all these problems with respect to jurisdiction over fish will be solved automatically."

Well, Sir, I need not remind ~~the hon. members that fish are not in the Registry of Births of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador, of Nova Scotia, of PEI, of Quebec or New Brunswick, and the ministers and the Premier should have realized that before they made such irresponsible statements suggesting that all of our problems could be solved with respect to jurisdiction over the fisheries by simply electing two PC governments, one in Ottawa and one in Newfoundland and Labrador.~~

Sir, I would like hon. members to allude to the compatibility between oil and gas exploitation and a continuation of the fisheries, with the preservation of the inshore fisheries, particularly as it relates to the Northern cod stocks. I would like hon. members to allude to the fact that the Small Craft Harbours Division does not have a cent at the present time and are not supporting

MR. F. ROWE: Canada Works projects. I would like hon. members to allude to the over-the-side fish sales, a good temporary measure but there should be something, a long-term plan so that we will not have to have over-the-side fish sales. I would like hon. members to allude to freezer trawlers off our Coast, to the consequences of the 200 mile limit off the United States where eighty per cent of our fisheries market is. Once they start developing their own fisheries, Mr. Speaker, I would submit that we will have to start developing markets in the European Countries and other countries of the world.

We have to look at the possible consequences of the multi-national corporations creeping into this Province, gear damaged by whales, Sir, obviously I do not have enough time to

MR. F. ROWE: even read out the list of topics that I would like to have discussed on this particular bill, but may I conclude by simply saying this, that it is a sincere desire on our part, in moving this particular resolution in the hope that hon. members of this House will support it so that everybody on both sides of the House will have a full-fledged opportunity to debate all aspects of the fisheries in this Province because it is probably the single and most important aspect of the economy of this Province. And there have been so many announcements made without benefit of debate, with a sudden switch and a moratorium, with no announcements and no apparent interest in the fisheries, that I think every member of this House should have an opportunity to debate this particular thing fully, and I sincerely hope that the members opposite will accept this bill in this particular spirit and will support it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I have seldom heard quite

~~so much trash put together in twenty minutes and I have to confess that although~~
I realize it is somewhat unparliamentary -

MR. NEARY: Savory is for vegetarians -

MR. J. CARTER: The hon. member should be struck by lightning for making a remark like that. At least then we could say he died of the clap.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I was saying, I have never heard so much trash put together in twenty minutes, a disjointed attack on two of the finest federal ministers that Canada has ever had and just a complete misunderstanding of the whole problem. I do not really blame the hon. member, he is mired in misinformation and wallowing in error, as usual.

But there are some points that should be remembered. The first thing is that this government is certainly not

MR. J. CARTER: neglecting fish for oil and gas.

It is a red herring - pardon the pun - that the members are trying to have the public believe. What has happened, Mr. Speaker, is that the fish stocks have to be limited; there has to be a quota established, which has been established, and the fish stocks are quietly multiplying. Now fish do not write editorials

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) fish do.

MR. J. CARTER: But the fish are there quietly multiplying and the most reliable yardstick for that is that the size of the fish is increasing. I am told that as a fish population is decimated, the average size of the fish decreases, and the size of codfish has been decreasing for the last twenty years, I suppose. But only lately, it seems to have registered a slight increase in average size, not enough yet to relieve our fears that the stocks are not seriously depleted, but it does give us some cause to hope.

Now, unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, when Canada took control of the 200 mile limit, she did not take control of the Continental Shelf. Now, the Continental Shelf sometimes extends ~~beyond the 200 mile limit and sometimes inside the 200 mile limit.~~

The problem there is that the offshore caplin stocks, which apparently are not related to the inshore caplin stocks, the ones that come in to our shores every June, sort of drift in and out of our jurisdiction, in and out of the 200 mile limit. In fact, they spend as much time outside our jurisdiction as they do inside, and foreign fleets can quite legitimately come and scoop them up when they are outside our jurisdiction. There is not a thing we can do about it. So the only defence that we have, the only bargaining point, is to offer them some quota rights inside our 200 mile limit in exchange for them accepting a quota on the deep-sea caplin stocks so that these extremely valuable fish will not be decimated, because once they go, they break the food chain and all other stocks will vanish. And this is why the foreign fleets come close to our shores and are welcomed and allowed and given a quota, why the Russian fleet is accepted into Canadian ports,

November 21, 1979

Tape 1249

EC - 3

MR. J. CARTER:

why the Spanish and Portuguese fleets
are still given rights, and some other fleets. There is an

MR. J. CARTER:

additional reason to, Mr. Speaker, and that is that some of these countries belong or are on the fringe of the third world and Canada gives very little in the way of foreign aid and this is a type of foreign aid that we should give. I do not think we should feel to selfish about it. We are blessed with a very wealthy resource just of our shores and it is only right and proper that we should share some of it with the less fortunate countries of this world.

There is some hope that some of the problems of controlling the life cycle of certain types of fish will be solved. I think there is an article in the Evening Telegram today that some progress has been made with salmon hatcheries and young salmon fry. It is quite possible that the problems of lobster hatching will be solved and we can look forward to very well stocked lobster beds. But for the hon. members opposite to get up and just use this as an excuse to tear into governments, both provincial and federal, I think is unworthy of them and I hope when the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) gets up we will hear the first statesman-like speech of his life. It will be a revelation but we are all looking forward to it and I am sure in a few moments he will get to his feet and praise our two ministers, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Goudie) and the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and the new conservative government that looks now, since today's news, to be in power for a considerably long period of time.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird)

The member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, it is becoming increasingly obvious, Sir, that members on the opposite side of the House, as indicated by the gentleman who just spoke on behalf of the government, know very little and care less about the fishery in this Province. Most of them represent urban districts in the Province, districts that are located on the Trans-Canada Highway, are not familiar with the fishing industry and could not care less about it. My hon. friend, the

MR. NEARY: member who introduced this private members' resolution is absolutely correct when he states that this government is being and has been for the last couple of years, pushed in the direction of oil. All they can think about is oil and all of other natural resources, including our most basic industry, the fishery, is being neglected, downgraded and overlooked by the government.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to congratulate my hon. friend for introducing this resolution at this very important time in the history of Newfoundland when we are talking so much about offshore oil drilling and the possibility of a commercial strike of oil and gas. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are hearing so much about oil and gas these days that Newfoundlanders, especially the fishermen in this Province, are beginning to believe that there is nothing else the government is concerned about. Nothing else counts in this Province except oil and gas. Everything else is being pushed in the background and everything else is being neglected. That is the policy that this government has been following now for the last two or three or four years and probably more so since the oil sheik ~~himself, the born-again Premier of this Province, took over from the~~ Moores' administration. This gentleman, when he was Minister of Mines and Energy, managed to make his mark in this Province talking about offshore oil and gas and his policy today in that direction is more pronounced than it has ever been and the fishermen are beginning to feel, like all other Newfoundlanders, that they are being left out, that the government is not looking after what it has, that everything is being shoved aside by the newly-born oil sheiks in Eastern Canada.

Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House, I think I can speak for all members, we hope that there is commercial gas and oil off our shore.

MR. S. NEARY: We are not knocking the drilling for oil and gas but we want to remind the government that there are natural resources in this Province that are just as important as oil and gas, even though oil has been referred to as black gold, the renewable resources, the principle one of which is our fishery.

It is a frightening thought, Mr. Speaker, it is a frightening thought indeed to realize, for people of this Province to realize, that with all of the activity offshore, with all the oil tankers that are passing our coast every day, that a major oil spill, a blowout in one of these wells, if indeed oil is there or an accident off our coast could wipe out the fishery overnight, could wipe it out in total or in part. Our most basic industry, something that has given our people a livelihood, practically the whole population of the Province year in and year out for almost 500 years, could be wiped out overnight by a major oil spill or even a medium sized oil spill.

MR. THOMS: The Minister of Mines and Energy says that is a chance we have to take.

MR. S. NEARY: ~~The minister says that is a chance,~~ that is a chance we have to take. Well, it is too big a chance to take and it is about time, Mr. Speaker, that the government told the people, especially the fishermen, the plant workers and the plant owners in this Province the real truth. And the truth is, Sir, that there is no technology available today, no technology available on the face of the earth even though the government, this government here, have told, have said inside of this House and outside of the House and the Canadian Coast Guard has reiterated what this government has said and the oil companies have also said it, that they have spent millions of dollars on the latest technology available in the world to try and cope with a major oil spill off the coast of Newfoundland but the technology is not available. Everybody forgets the little footnote and the 'but' that is thrown in. There is no technology available on the face of the earth to cope with an oil spill off the coast of Newfoundland, whether it be from a tanker or

MR. S. NEARY: from a blowout in one of the wells.

That was confirmed to me recently by the Canadian Coast Guard and yet the government plows on foolhardily, putting all their eggs in one basket, gambling Newfoundland's future on the offshore without issuing an ultimatum to the oil companies and saying to the oil companies, "Look it here Mr. Imperial Oil or Gulf, whoever is doing the drilling, 'if you in any way damage the environment, if you pollute the waters around this Island or around the coast of Labrador, if you in any way destroy our natural habitat or damage our natural habitat, then you are going to have to suffer the consequences". I have not hear that kind of an ultimatum from the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs. Newhook) or from the Premier of this Province who seems to be cuddling up to the oil companies and is being pushed into the world of oil by the big oil magnates and by influences outside of this Province, from Aberdeen and other parts of the world.

MR. STAGG: That is irrelevant.

MR. S. NEARY: It is relevant, Sir. Pollute our shores and you destroy the fishery.

MR. THOMS: Our fishery is irrelevant, is it?

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the statement I just made is not a exaggeration, it is a statement of fact., We saw an example last year when the Kurdistan broke in half in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and as I said in this House before, if the wind and tide had been in the direction of Newfoundland the fishery in the Gulf, on the Southwest corner of the Province, especially on the Burgeo Banks, would have been drastically affected, it would have been disasterous for the fishery on the Southwest coast. Fortunately, the wind was in the other direction,.

Mr. Neary: and we did not get the effects of the Kurdistan accident until the Spring of the year when the salmon fishermen put out their nets. In the Summer when the fishermen started fishing, the inshore fishermen along the Southwest Coast started to get these big blobs of black substance in their nets, these big blobs of sticky gooey oil that ruined their gear and their nets, and that affected the bird sanctuary down in Cape St. Mary's, where it got into the feathers of the birds, and immobilized the birds, they could not fly, and they either starved to death or smothered in the oil.

MR. STAGG: That is irrelevant.

MR. NEARY: And the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) says, that is irrelevant.

And government, Mr. Speaker, has continued to sidestep this issue. And if the hon. member for Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) proves nothing else by bringing in this Resolution, it gives us an opportunity to stress and lay the emphasis on the potential, the possibility of wiping out our fishery or drastically affecting the fishery by an oil spill off our Coast with all the activity that is going on in offshore drilling, and all the activity of ships moving back and forth through the Gulf of St. Lawrence and passing our shores everyday.

It is absolutely scandalous the way the government have gotten away with it. It is criminal the way they have sidestepped this issue. Mr. Speaker, as I say, I am not knocking the offshore, because it is going to go ahead anyway, no matter what I say in this House. The oil companies with their big lobby and the so-called intellectuals over at Memorial, and the pseudo experts that are springing up all over the place, and the consultants that are selling their wares to the Newfoundland Government, they are carrying on such a lobby that no matter what I say or we say in this House, they are going to go ahead with their programme and their projects anyway.

But, Mr. Speaker, one thing that I contend is this, that the government should have the courage to come out and say to the people of this Province, yes, we are cuddling up to the oil

Mr. Neary: companies and we are being pushed into the world of oil, and we are going to become the oil sheiks and the oil kingdom of the Eastern Seaboard of North America, but we have to tell you what price you may have to pay, what the consequences might be. The consequences might be that you might wake up some morning without a fishery in this Province. You might wake up some morning and find that the waters around this Island are polluted, and our wildlife, and our bird life are being threatened or wiped out by an oil spill. These are the consequences, Sir.

And, Mr. Speaker, if the government wants to proceed along the road, if they want to carry on their policy of putting all their eggs in one basket and not worrying about anything else but oil, then they should warn the people and tell the people of this Province what price they may have to pay for the offshore drilling that is going on at the present time. As I say, Sir, the government seems to be putting all its eggs in one basket, and it is gambling Newfoundland's future on oil, on a commercial discovery offshore. And every man and woman and child in this Province should realize that apart from the social and economic upheaval that this will cause in Newfoundland, that there are risks involved, ~~our whole environment could be polluted.~~

So while the Premier and the government are gambling, they should point out to the people of this Province the consequences of this gamble. Now, I do not want to dwell too much on that, Sir, although I could take a whole week to talk about pollution, to talk about the potential pollution, the possibility of wiping out our fishery. But it is a very difficult thing to do in twenty minutes in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, and there are other things that I want to toss out for the consideration

MR. S. NEAPY: of members, apart from the pollution problem which is there. It is real! Government should not bury its head in the sand, it should face up to this problem in a fashion and tell the people, tell the people what the consequences might be. Never mind trying to do a snow job and a con job! Well, turn on your television and your radio, and the press swallow this up, they take it hook, line and sinker, some twirk, twillick, some jerk coming in from Aberdeen, outside of this Province and saying, 'Oh, Newfoundlanders, do not make offshore rigs in Newfoundland. My advice to you is, do not make offshore rigs in Newfoundland, make them somewhere else because you are going to have a labour shortage in Newfoundland'. Just imagine, Mr. Speaker, some jerk coming in and telling us, and our Province with record unemployment, we never had so much unemployment in our whole history, do not make oil rigs in Newfoundland make them somewhere else because you are not going to have the labour - only five minutes left here and I have so much to talk about - there is going to be a shortage of labour in Newfoundland. What kind of foolish nonsense is that? But it has happened, I heard it. The hon. gentleman was there - paid his \$100 and sat in on that seminar with the other oil shieks. All they needed at that seminar was their turbans.

MR. J. CARTER: You were there.

MR. S. NEAPY: No, I was not there, Sir, I could not afford the \$100.

But, Mr. Speaker, there is another matter I want to talk about before the guillotine, before this new rule that we have where members are only allowed to speak for twenty minutes, before the guillotine, the axe falls on my head. I want to talk about the new policy of Brother McGrath up there in Ottawa, of opening up the Gulf to the big draggers and the big trawlers which is going to drastically affect the inshore fishery in that Province. And, Mr. Speaker, I have talked to some of the companies who will be the beneficiaries of these draggers getting into the Gulf. I have talked to one principal of Fishery Products who is very concerned. He said, 'Sure, we are going to benefit by it, we are going into the Gulf, we are going to send our draggers in there and

MR. S. NEARY:

we are going to catch the fish, but in my opinion the gulf is being overfished. Just imagine one of the principals of a company that is going to benefit by opening up the gulf to the draggers, who probably lobbied for it, will say to me privately, 'I am very concerned about the gulf, it is being overfished: And it is being overfished and it is going to drastically affect the inshore fishery in that area which is unique in Newfoundland because it is year-round.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have to switch because I only have a couple of more minutes, but there is a matter that has been setting the devil in me for some time and setting the devil in Newfoundlanders along the Southwest coast of this Province, and that is what is going on in St. Pierre. I cannot put my finger on it, I do not know what it is, but Newfoundland fishermen and plant owners are very concerned about foreign draggers and ships fishing inside our 200 mile limit. There are not allowed to put their catches ashore in Newfoundland so they go down to St. Pierre and put their catches ashore, transship it and send it off to wherever its going. It is time the government took a look at that situation to see what is going on in St. Pierre. I am told, Mr. Speaker, that the activity in St. Pierre is out of this world. They cannot do it in Canada, they cannot do it in Newfoundland, they go to St. Pierre and do it and it is time we imposed penalties on these foreign draggers and ships that are going down to St. Pierre and transshipping their fish back home to whatever country the draggers and the ships are from.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would assume that my time is almost up. I wish I had a few hours or a few days to talk about the fishery. But the fishery is being neglected, Sir, the government have no fishery policy, they are flying by the seat of their pants at the present time, and a costly example of that is the Fisheries Loan Board where we are told it went bust because of political interence, because the government spent all its money before the last provincial general election. There is no fishery policy, Mr. Speaker, the government today cannot think of anything but oil! Oil! Oil! Oil! - that is all they can think about. Morning noon and night all you can hear on the radio and read in the

MR. NEARY: newspapers is oil, and all our other natural resources are being neglected, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Harbour Main-Bell Island.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: Your Honour in speaking to the motion put forth by the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe), I would like to say that the estimates of the Department of Fisheries for 1979-1980 are a very clear reflection of the government's confidence in the future of our fishery, and its determination to provide for its continued growth in our Province.

Now, I think that it is fairly obvious, Mr. Speaker, that the government has a definite strategy for the development of our fishery in Newfoundland and Labrador when you take into account the estimates for that department only since 1977.

Your Honour, I would like to ~~reflect for a moment on the amount voted in Fisheries~~ in the estimates of 1977-1978, which at that particular point in time was approximately \$24 million, and that, Sir, up to that moment was the largest ever projected. By comparison the 1976-77 expenditure was \$15.5 million, an increase of approximately \$9 million which was indeed quite a significant increase and one, of course, which the government should be very proud of.

Now, in keeping with that priority that government is placing upon the fisheries development, the amount voted in the Fisheries estimates was increased from \$24,200,000 in 1978-79, to over \$30.5 million this year. Taking into account, of course, the funding of the Fisheries Loan Board, which the hon. member referred to, it will mean

MR. DOYLE: that by the end of the current fiscal year the agency, or that agency, the Fisheries Loan Board, will have provided a total of \$53 million in support of the fishing industry since 1975.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. DOYLE: And that Your Honour appears to me -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) government standing.

MR. DOYLE: That appears to me to be the workings of a very responsible government, dedicated to the preservation of our natural resources.

Mr. Speaker, the fishery is the largest employer in our great Province, apart from government. Now, I stand to be corrected but I feel reasonably sure that it is fairly accurate to state that at the present time there are approximately 27,000 people employed directly in our fishing industry and I am told that it would also be reasonably realistic to state that ~~by the end of 1985, we will have a total of 40,000 people~~ employed directly in the fishing industry. That is by the end of 1985.

In addition, those who hithertofore had been employed only on a seasonal basis, are now finding work on a more permanent level, for a much longer period of time. And that again, in my opinion, is not the workings of a government devoted mainly to the development of offshore oil, it is the workings of a government with a definite plan and a definite goal and a definite policy, to lead the people of Newfoundland into the 1980's.

Now, one of the major development strategies for the fishery is to encourage further processing of our fish before it leaves the Province of Newfoundland.

MR. DOYLE: Now, in keeping with that policy, government has introduced programmes in the past, are presently introducing programmes and I have no doubt that they will be introducing programmes in the future to assist fish processors in the acquisition of new machinery because of the great demand placed upon it.

It is also interesting to note that at this point the government, in order to stimulate future investment in the processing of fish, has raised the level of assistance from \$50,000 to \$150,000 per project in this Province. Again, the workings of a government with a definite plan and a definite policy and a definite strategy for the fishing industry in Newfoundland.

MR. DOYLE: Now, one has only to stop for a moment and reflect on the number of fish plants and cold storage facilities that have been built in our Province in the last five years to adequately assess the degree of importance that the government is placing upon the fishery.

Now, getting down to a more local level, in my district of Harbour Main - Bell Island, alone, one of my constituents had enough confidence in the Government of Newfoundland last year to invest a very huge dollar in establishing a fish plant in Holyrood, and that, I might add, is now employing from forty to fifty people and it is alive and doing well.

Another fish plant is about to be established in the community of Harbour Main in approximately two or three months from now. Again, that demonstrates the type of confidence that the people are displaying in government policy in relation to the fishery.

Now, these two particular plants had to be established because of the growing interest in the fishery in that ~~particular part of the Conception Bay district.~~ And now, the people of Bell Island, through the Bell Island Development Association, have made application for a twenty-five year lease on a federal fisheries shed on Bell Island and they intend to turn that into a small fish plant, as well.

It is absolutely amazing to consider the advancements of the fishery over the last five years when you consider that in my district, between the communities of Marysvale and Holyrood, only a few people could be counted as fishermen five years ago, and today - just a few years later - we have approximately 200 to 250 people who are actively and directly employed in the industry on a part-time and a full-time basis. That is an indication of an encouraging forecast for the fishery in years to come.

It might also be interesting to note at this point that the Budget of 1969 - 1970, the Department of Fisheries

MR. DOYLE: Estimates totalled \$3,801,400. That was in 1969 - 1970. Now, in 1970 and 1971 it went even lower - \$2,307,000. Again, that is quite a comparison when you take into consideration the fact that the government of today voted in approximately \$29 million in the 1979 - 1980 Budget, and that, in my opinion, is a very clear indication of a definite plan and a definite strategy for the Newfoundland fishery.

So, in summation, I would like to say that it is indeed encouraging to be associated with a government whose interest in the fishery is not demonstrated by empty promises but it is demonstrated by a genuine and a deep-rooted concern for the fishery here in Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the member for Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think it is significant that the member speaking for the other side in reply to this very important resolution, maybe the most important resolution that we are going to debate in this present sitting of the House - I think it is significant that there is no Fisheries Minister to reply, that the part-time Fisheries Minister (Mr. Goudie) is not in the House, and that the Premier, who has taken it on himself to act as Fisheries Minister any time a question is asked, does not consider this resolution important enough to be present in the House or to enter into the debate and that when we get involved - the lead off speaker on our side is our fisheries spokesman, a member who represents a great fishing district, as do many of the people on this side of the House, who is the lead off speaker the now Acting Minister of Fisheries? Who is the person who responds on behalf of the Government to the lead off position? The hon. member who is in charge of the savoury farm, the member for St. John's North (Mr. Carter).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh;

MR. BARRY: Do you have something against farming?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please;

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, I will gladly yield if the Minister of Energy would now like to make a fisheries speech, if he would like to jump up and speak on behalf of the government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for Bonavista North continue.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I thank the hon. member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, back in 1975 this government had the opportunity - I was a member of the government at the time - had the opportunity of putting a position to the federal government, a very forceful position to the federal government which was at that time engaged in negotiations at the Law of the Sea Conference. And the position that was being taken by the federal government of the same political stripe as hon. members opposite, is that all we need go for in our Law of the Sea negotiations is a 200 mile economic zone, that that will be satisfactory, that that will be sufficient, that that will protect the fish stocks of this Province from the over-fishing, the raping by the foreign fishing fleets that was going on at that time. We had the figures in front of us. We saw what was happening to the fish stocks of this Province because of the over-fishing and we did not need any great scientific experiments on research in Ottawa or anywhere else, all you had to do was go out on the stage head and talk to the fishermen, go down and talk to the dragger crews when they came in in Marystown or anywhere else around the Province, and you would find that the fishermen knew, the fishermen of this Province knew that the fish stocks were threatened, they were threatened with extinction, going the way of the dodo bird. And what was going on in Ottawa at that time? I am pleased to see that the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) just outside the chamber because the hon. Leader of the Opposition was at that time a member of the Liberal government which took the position that a 200 mile economic

MR. BAREY: zone was sufficient to protect our Newfoundland fish stocks. Now, Mr. Speaker, I had the opportunity at that time of introducing a motion and by coincidence the then Leader of the Opposition, the present member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), the then member for the Strait of Belle Isle, the Leader of the Opposition at the time supported and, in fact, we put out a joint resolution - and I was just trying to get the precise wording of the resolution, but basically we submitted, jointly from this House at that time that it was necessary for the government of Canada to insure that not just a 200 mile economic zone but control of the continental margin, the continental margin which means that the tail of the Grand Banks, the Flemish Cap and all that great fishing area outside of the 200 mile economic zone would be under Canadian jurisdiction and control.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that did not come about. We saw a mealy-mouthed Canadian delegation at the Law of the Sea Conference back off from going for jurisdiction over the full continental margin and they accepted a 200 mile economic zone. Mr. Speaker, that Law of the Sea Conference is not yet over. Thank God we now have a government in Ottawa which I know will fight for Canadians, for Newfoundlander's proper protection as far as the tail of the Grand Banks, as far as the Flemish Cap, as far as the hundreds of square miles. There is an area outside the 200 mile economic zone,

Mr. Barry: hon. members opposite may not know, an area larger than the landmass of this Province, Island and Labrador. There is an area, a fishing area outside the 200 mile economic zone larger than the landmass of this Province. And the Canadian Government said, "That is all right, we do not need to go for jurisdiction over this. We will be able to control that in some vague way. It will not be economic to have foreign fishing fleets out fishing there."

And what happened? What has happened? We all know what has happened we saw it this Summer, the Spanish fishing fleets were out there destroying the stocks on the Grand Banks. What was the result? The result is that there is nobody able to fish out there for cod right now on the Grand Banks, they had to close it.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. BARRY: The stocks are being - that is right. That is right, and we better watch the Northern cod stocks just as much as we had to watch what was happening on the Grand Banks -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: - when we had to standby helplessly and see a ~~Liberal Government in Ottawa let the foreigners do what they liked outside of the 200 mile economic zone.~~

Now, I would like to see hon. members opposite get up and state what their position is, and state whether they agree with the present Leader of the Opposition in accepting that Canada should not have jurisdiction outside the 200 mile economic zone.

MR. MORGAN: Let us hear the official position of it.

MR. BARRY: Is that what hon. members opposite believe?

MR. MORGAN: Let us hear the official position of it.

MR. BARRY: Is that what hon. members believe? If they do, then I hope they will explain to the people of this Province why it is that they accept that position? Because anybody, anybody involved with the fishing industry in Newfoundland knows that it is crucially important to this Province that we have control outside the 200 mile economic zone. It is of tremendous importance to protect and to preserve the

Mr. Barry: cod on the Grand Banks, the flounder. There are more species out there that -

AN HON. MEMBER: Than oil.

MR. BARRY: Maybe, maybe than there is oil, we will see! We will see! I will tell you, we will never accept that Canada's jurisdiction with respect to the mineral resources of the seabed extends merely to the 200 mile limit. Our position with respect to mineral resources as with fish is that we must have jurisdiction out to the edge of the continental margin.

MR. MORGAN: It is not the Liberal policy they have in Ottawa.

MR. BARRY: And the continental margin covers the continental shelf, the slope and the little rise before it slides off into the ocean depths. Now, we have had a government in the past in Ottawa that has been more concerned with preserving Canada's image as some great international nice guy than a government that is interested in promoting the interests of Canadians. Now, as Newfoundland Canadians I want to see hon. members opposite get up and denounce the position taken by the previous Liberal Government in Ottawa, denounce it! If you have the courage of your conviction, get up and denounce it because that was a dastardly, dastardly, I say, Mr. Speaker, step for a government in Ottawa to take - to let the foreigners do what they wanted to do outside the 200 mile economic zone. We see already in less than - what, four years? - we see overfishing and stocks threatened with extinction. If they had listened at the time, Mr. Speaker, to the position that we put to them we would not have had that problem. And I would like to just briefly to quote, Mr. Speaker, from a speech I made on March 6th., 1975, more than four years ago, Mr. Speaker, more than four years ago we attempted to bring this to the attention of a federal government, a federal government that closed its ears in Ottawa. They would not pay any attention to this - and you wonder at times why it is that the ordinary person in the street gets frustrated when he cannot get his views known to government. Why do they get frustrated? Well, Mr. Speaker, when you look

MR. BARRY: and you see in the record of debates of this House of Assembly, you see hon. members getting up from both sides of the House and even with a joint, combined resolution supporting Canadian jurisdiction out beyond the 200-mile economic zone we could not get the attention of the clowns that were then in there in Ottawa. We could not get their attention, so how can the ordinary person, the ordinary man in the street, expect to get the ear of government, the ear of the Federal Government, when the combined weight of government and opposition, the combined weight of government and opposition could not get the then government in Ottawa to pay attention? Mr. Speaker, it is enough to make you wonder what is happening, what is happening to democracy. Thank God that there has been a significant change in the last year, and we now have a government in Ottawa on the right track, going in the right direction.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I said on March 6, 1975, why we were supporting this resolution which urged the Federal Government to extend its jurisdiction beyond the 200-mile zone. I said, "There are valuable fish stocks, valuable spawning grounds, outside 200 miles. In some cases, it is necessary to go out in excess of 400 miles, in excess of 400 miles, and I submit, Mr. Speaker, in order to protect the fish stocks the way they should be protected. Also, Mr. Speaker, we believe they should be more aggressive in maintaining the rights which we believe Canada now has: It was not a matter of going and asking for rights which Canada did not have as far as the jurisdiction was concerned, and we refer to the same thing with respect to the minerals of the seabed, again out to the edge of the Continental margin. We asked them to take a more aggressive stance,

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, we asked them to modify their position with respect to fisheries, to take a more aggressive stance to make sure that the fish stocks were protected. Mr. Speaker, that was not done. Now, the information was there. Everybody in this House had obtained the information from his constituents, from the fishermen and women of this Province, they knew what was happening to the fish stocks. Whatever the egg-head scientists in Ottawa were saying about how much fishing there could or could not be, the fishermen of this Province knew that it was being overfished, and we made a joint submission to the federal government and we did not get action. Mr. Speaker, I ask all hon. members, and particularly members on the other side, to get up and denounce the action taken by the previous government at the Law of the Sea Conference and support a more aggressive stance by the Federal Government that is now in place in Ottawa, a more aggressive stance to ensure that Canada's jurisdiction over fisheries ~~extends not just to 200 miles but to the edge of the~~ Continental margin, because only in this way will our fish stocks be protected.

Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Point of order, the hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make absolutely sure that the hon. member for Mt. Scio (Mr. Barry) still has his twenty minutes to speak. He was merely speaking then by leave of the hon. member, so he still has twenty minutes, I would like that clarified.

AN HON. MEMBER: Agreed.

MR. J. CARTER: By right and not by agreement.

MR. SPEAKER: I am prepared to hear some more debate on the point of order. The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling), do you wish to speak on the point of order?

MR. STIRLING: No, not on the point of order. I agree that I did give leave for the member to speak and I leave the point of order to the Speaker's ruling. I thought that he was -

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) I understand from your comments that there are no objections and that your understanding is that the hon. member would still have his twenty minutes? Is that agreeable?

MR. STIRLING: Mr. Speaker, just for clarification -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North. Order, please!

MR. STIRLING: Are we on the same point of order or have you ruled?

MR. SPEAKER: No, I have not ruled yet.

MR. STIRLING: On the point of order, it was a question of misunderstanding. I was agreeing that I had yielded and, in my personal view, had no objection to the member having his full twenty minutes.

MR. SPEAKER: ~~Okay, we will leave it at that~~ for the time being and it will give me an opportunity to do some research and see whether or not that is, in fact, what the ruling should be. The hon. member for Bonavista North, then, may continue.

On a point of order, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: Forgive me, and it may be even a little brazen on my part to say so, but I wonder if in Your Honour's deliberations on this question

MR. D. JAMIESON: it might be useful for the future if the question of an intervention of that type if we could not get something specific so that we would all know on both sides if an hon. member yields for a question or something or other of that sort just exactly what does happen. I think it would be an important general ruling from Your Honour.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Simms) To that point, the hon. President of the Council.

MR. W. MARSHALL: To that point, Mr. Speaker, I think it is a moot point really as to whether the hon. member for Bonavista North has, in fact, ended his speech at the particular time because usually when you yield you usually just yield for question not yield for a speech and the hon. member has already now consumed a certain amount. But we are not going to insist on that, Mr. Speaker, being a government that is always interested in hearing what the Opposition says, I just put it on the record now so that in future instances where it occurs it will not be deemed that we have slept on our laurels or our rights.

MR. SPEAKER: Having heard the debate on the point of order, the first one, I believe, I deferred. This particular point; I will admit to hon. members that I have, in fact, been trying to do some research in the last ten or fifteen minutes on both those points and I will be prepared to give a ruling on it at a later sitting so that we do have a precedent for sure. In the meantime, everybody has agreed the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) may continue and the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) may be able to speak later on if there is no change in the ruling.

The hon. member for Bonavista North.

MR. L. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I do thank the Minister of Mines and Energy for making a speech on fisheries. I am delighted that he takes the position that he does about the offshore. I believe the egg-head scientists that he refers to are still in Ottawa and I will be interested in the comments

MR. L. STIRLING:

that the federal people

may have to make about those egg-head scientists that he referred to.

I concur with his concern about extending the limit beyond the present limit. However, Mr. Speaker, today I would like to talk about something not under the control of the federal government, something under the control of the provincial government

MR. WARREN:

Which ones are they ?

MR. L. STIRLING:

— something that the provincial

government can do something about and I agree it is completely in line with the comments that the member for Harbour Main, Bell Island (Mr. Doyle) mentioned in which he was pleased that there were no grand statements or grand comments being made that were not backed up by substance. Now, I asked the Premier yesterday, in his role as Minister of Fisheries, and I am pleased that he is back, about the state of the Fisheries Loan Board.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What

MR. STIRLING:

I think the best way that I can

maybe get a message across is in the same light that the member for Mt.Scio

(Mr. Barry) said, "when people are out there wondering how can they have some impact on government", Maybe I can have some impact on government

if I try to give to this House of Assembly the same language that a fisherman used himself. "Dear Sir, I need some help and I hope you will try and help me. I sent in an application to the Fisheries Loan Board for a loan, to get a boat built and I have not heard a sound since, that is over a month ago," This letter was dated September 28th. "I know people that have loans and are not even fishermen. I have been a fisherman all my life and I need a new boat. I do not know anything but fishing and you know there is not much work on this coast. I think the government should try and help the fishermen that are fishermen," -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, Hear.

MR. L. STIRLING:

- "help the fishermen that are

fishermen first

MR. L. STIRLING:

"before they give new ones loans as they are doing."

MR. WARREN:

They do not know the difference.

MR. L. STIRLING:

I think that is worth repeating

Mr. Speaker, in the words of a fisherman himself . "I think the govern-
ment should try and help the fishermen that are fishermen first before
they give new ones loans as they are now doing."

MR. WARREN:

They do not know the difference.

MR. L. STIRLING:

"I want to get this boat built for to

start fishing next season!"

AN HON. MEMBER:

Safe enough.

MR. STIRLING: "But if I do not soon get this loan—it is in his hand writing and I am sure you will appreciate that I have to take some time in reading it—if I do not soon get this loan it will be too late for the time the boat is finished the fishing season will be half over, and that is no good on this coast. . If you do not get started early here the best part of the fishing season— I called the Loan Board and they said they have not had a meeting yet. So if the way they do this it is no wonder they are short of money. If a man cannot get a boat until the middle of the fishing season, he cannot make money enough to pay on his loan."

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear;

MR. STIRLING: "I hope you can help me. I do not know who else to turn to. I need this boat or else I have to go on welfare and I sure do not want that."

MR. WARREN: I doubt if he (inaudible)

MR. STIRLING: "I cannot afford to buy one myself.

~~Please try to what you can for me. I can give three men a good living,~~
and also keep those working in the fish plant. Hoping to hear from you soon, Raymond Howell, Wesleyville." I wrote Walter Carter, October 5th, asking him if he would look into this matter—and I have replied to Mr. Howell—who was then the Minister of Fisheries, who has now received his just rewards. October 21, Mr. Speaker. "First of all I would like to thank you for answering my letter and trying to help me. Well, I have not heard a thing from the Fisheries Loan Board yet—October 21. I do not know what is taking them so long. At least they could let a man know what is going on. They say that all the applications have to go before the board. Well, that is not true. I know a fellow who went in St. John's for a loan to buy a boat, and he has everything fixed up. So what is going on?" maybe a reference to that political interference that a board member mentioned. — "Why can they not have a meeting? That is over two months ago. Does it take that long for a group of people

MR. STIRLING: to get together. The fishermen of this Province is giving them a job. The government better look after the fishermen and better than that, or else, there will not be any fishermen in a few years time."

MR. WARREN: Right on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear;

MR. STIRLING: "I wrote Mr. Peckford a letter a month ago. Now, he did not even answer my letter."

AN HON. MEMBER: What?

MR. STIRLING: "I do not know what is wrong. Nobody cares about the poor man. If I had a million dollars in the bank, I would not have any trouble getting a loan for a boat. I do not know what to do. I have not done a thing this Summer, could not get a boat, no work, no UIC this Winter, all because some lazy people who have plenty and the poor fishermen of Newfoundland paying them and have to do without it. It will soon be too late to get a boat built for next Spring. It is no good after the fishing season is half over on this coast. If you do not get fishing early, you only have a couple of months, then it is all over. ~~so you cannot get fishing the first of May, then that is the best time~~ the year. After August month the weather turns bad. So you can see what I am after. I want to get ready for early Spring. If they do not soon have a meeting, it might as well call the Loan Board off and let all the fishermen lie down and see what happens to Newfoundland. I hate to bother you again but I do not know who else to turn to. No one will answer my letters. I thank you again. Sincerely, Raymond Howell."

It ties in with the point that the Minister of Mines and Resources made.
The average person says - "How can I get through to that government."

AN HON. MEMBER: Without any trouble.

MR. STIRLING: Minutes ago, before speaking, I had my office call the Fisheries Loan Board. She - the most senior person that she could locate - she spoke with Elenor Vitch in that office - the man still does not have any approval - and she explained that there is a freeze on all loans from the Fisheries Loan Board, and nothing will be done until the Premier lifts the freeze.

AN HON. MEMBER:

shocking?

Is that not shocking? Is that not

MR. STIRLING:

fisherman himself, because there are hundreds of people, hundreds of fishermen, saying

MR. STIRLING: the same sort of thing.

Mr. Speaker, the other subject that I would like to cover in the time that I have left, also was from a group of fishermen. This was in August. "We are bona fide fishermen in Bonavista Bay. In late July and August of this year, whales were very abundant in our fishing areas, and we experienced substantial losses of gear. At present, many are unable to continue fishing in a manner that allows us to earn a living." And they came up with some recommendations. To me they were sound, sensible recommendations. Here are their recommendations: (1) The government establish an emergency financial assistance program to compensate fishermen in Greenspond and Salvage for gear loss through whales this Summer; (2) The government in consultation with the union establish an insurance program for whale damage to fishing gear to be in effect by next season; (3) The government assist fishermen by dragging fishing areas in Greenspond and Salvage for ghost ~~nets taken by the whales.~~ (4) The government establish a program so that seriously injured whales entrapped in fishing gear can be destroyed by appropriate authorities and the carcasses of dead whales processed. Four sensible, reasonable suggestions. I took that material signed by dozens and dozens of fishermen - Greenspond and Salvage - and I know the member from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) also took it up. I wrote the then Minister of Fisheries - and he wonders why he did not get elected - the then Minister of Fisheries, and I sent a copy of the petition - I could not present it as a petition in the House because they had sent me a photocopy, not the original signatures - I sent it to the Minister of Fisheries. The Minister of Fisheries in September writes back to say, "This is government policy", that is what he says, "I have for acknowledgement

MR. STIRLING: your letter of 14th September with attached copy. There are many in other communities who suffered similar damages. I am now conducting a full survey of such damage preparatory to a meeting which I will be having shortly with the Hon. James McGrath, at which time the prospect of Federal compensation to fishermen for gear damages will be discussed." And he goes on talking about a Gear Insurance Program, "The matter will be pursued with Mr. McGrath and, hopefully, some mechanism will be set in place for next year. I have passed it to my Deputy Minister for his consideration and appropriate attention." Two things, Mr. Speaker, two things that this government has some control over. This is not something that we have to go up and fight with Ottawa about and march on Ottawa, although that is fine, we all do it. We all are looking for better fishing controls off the coast, but in these two areas, the Fisheries Loan Board and in Gear Insurance Replacement, those are commitments in existence by this government, and that the frustration of fishermen all over this Province, so ably put by Mr. Howell, a fisherman, is that you promised us, you promised us the great revival of the fishery and there has been a great revival of the fishery, and now there is no money backing it up. There is no money that lets the person, after getting all of this excitement, going back to the communities - as the Premier said, restoring this way of Newfoundland, saying 'yes, you want to be a fisherman, it is a honourable course'. I was proud of the way he spoke the other day when he talked about how things had changed, when he was so pleased, now, to have people proud to be the son of a fisherman. But, as this fisherman says, when he tries to get a boat, when he is encouraged and makes an application

MR. STIRLING: for a loan and goes through all the rigmarole and does not even get an acknowledgement - started in August and not even an acknowledgement - are you acknowledging it today?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I am sorry, you are wrong there, I have to interrupt you. There is a response back to Mr. Howell, on the question, by me when he wrote me. I have a copy of it here to show -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: I accept that, Mr. Speaker.

MR. J. CARTER: Retract, retract.

PREMIER PECKFORD: October 23rd.

MR. STIRLING: Would the Premier be good enough to table a copy?

PREMIER PECKFORD: I will when I get up to speak.

MR. STIRLING: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

I do accept the fact that Premier certainly intends

MR. STIRLING:

great things, but it not enough just to have intentions, it is not enough just to make great speeches. You have now got 800 applications, as I understand, in which people were told, do something about this industry. And, Mr. Speaker, the gear insurance replacement programme has been promised by this government for so long people just do not believe them any more. And I know the Premier is concerned to make sure that people have some belief. And the Throne Speech said that we will be accountable. Two things in the Throne Speech, his determination to be accountable and his concern for the way of live in Newfoundland. Well, those two things are brought together, Mr. Speaker. It is not enough to get the expectations up in fishermen, that yes, we have now reached the stage where we are going to support fishermen, and then because too many applications come in just to not provide the extra funds. It is a disgrace, Mr. Speaker, that a Minister of Fisheries was not immediately appointed. Either that or the Premier himself should have taken on the job as Minister of Fisheries because it is the most important job in all of this government, yesterday, today or the future. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I will not delay the House very long but I could not let this opportunity go by without saying a few words on this resolution, the guts of it being:

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this House fully debate all aspects of the Fishery in order that the government may be directed to develop a strategy for the Fishery in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador which would be in the best interests of all involved with the Fishery and in the best interests of the Province as a whole.

This is a very, very relevant resolution, I suppose, at any time that it comes up in this hon. House, whether it be 1920 or whether it be 1980. I think the House could do a lot worse than debate this resolution every year on all aspects of the Fishery, so that members on both sides of the House can get an opportunity to both express their broad concerns as it relates to the fishing industry in the

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Province and as it relates, particularly, to their own constituencies where almost all of us have some interest in the fishery because a fair number of our constituents prosecute the fishery. So it is a big area. And I have heard some of the debate that has gone on and some of it I have missed because of meetings in the hallways out here or downstairs but I did not want to let it go past.

Let me first deal with the hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) and the comments that he made relative to answers to correspondence and so on, which I feel very strongly about, and, therefore, I want to tell the hon. member that Mr. Howell, whom the hon. member mentioned, Box 47, Wesleyville, Bonavista Bay, ACG 4RO who wrote me a letter, a copy of which is right here, Mr. Speaker, September 29, was received in the Office of the Premier on October 2, going over the question of his longliner and so on and his application. I replied to Mr. Howell and he must have the letter by now. It is almost a month old now, the letter that I sent out to him. I do not know if it got caught in the mails or not but here is a copy of the letter. October 23 was when the letter went from here.

MR. STIRLING: (Inaudible) matter as far as Mr. Howell is concerned. When he wrote me the letter on October 21st. obviously he said there was something like a month in between. He would not have received the Premier's reply because it was not until October 23rd. Just to correct that.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes. It was a little bit less than a month. I try to as much as I can, even though there are hundreds of letters coming in, to get responses out within a three week period and I think that just barely catches the three week period. I did respond to Mr. Howell as I had to all the fishermen around the Province who enquired about the present status of the Loan Board. So that sort of takes care of that. And I have given the answer to Mr. Howell which I have given to members in this House over and over again. And I have also contacted the Fisheries Loan Board on behalf of Mr. Howell to indicate, to make sure that they get answers out so that he knows where he stands in relation

PREMIER PECKFORD:

to it. At least that is some consolation, that there is some response, some so-called, "Bureaucracy" which very often is impersonal and unresponsive to individuals around the jurisdiction which they are supposed to serve.

The whole fisheries matter outside of Mr. Howell and Wesleyville, the whole question of the fisheries, is one that we could spend a lot of time on and I am sure that a lot

PREMIER PECKFORD:

of people in this House who could get up and discuss it for hours at length and not really repeat themselves all that much. And there is one that I have gotten involved in over the last five or six months much more deeply than I had hitherto for in other years as a member of the House, or as a minister of the government and it is one that I feel very, very strongly about. And in recent years, as we all know, the fishery has become to be a very, very viable part of the Newfoundland economy so much so now that the new middle class, yea, almost the upper class, of many parts of rural Newfoundland are fishermen. And as I have said on a number of occasions this is a welcomed change from the past where the fishermen very often were looked upon as being somewhat less than average and were not a part of the real system that went on in the community. The merchant was powerful and a few of cronies and they almost paid the fishermen the kind of wages that they wanted to pay them and the fishermen had very little power. All of that has changed and the fishermen, both as fish plant workers, as trawlermen, as captains, as fishermen in the boats, have changed that around. You have fishermen around today with \$100,000 boats, ~~\$300,000 boats, \$400,000 boats. They are businessmen in their own right.~~ they have become of age and they are about their business prosecuting a very lucrative industry in our Province, a very lucrative resource. And one time the squid and the herring and the mackrel were not a viable operation or were not seen to be, and there were few markets for it. Now there is a multi-species thing around ^{so} we have a very valuable fishery here right now and, hopefully, the markets will maintain themselves and the fishery can continue to expand and the volume of fish and all of the rest of it.

But there are three or four areas of the fishery that I would just like to touch on. I can separate it into three or four parts, I suppose. One is, for example, the processing sector, that area of the South coast and now the Northeast coast where we have seasonal fish plants in Port au Choix and in other areas in the St. Barbe area where fishing is being prosecuted and where the processing plants are working almost the whole year round. You have in the processing sector some plants

PREMIER PECKFORD: that are working twelve months of the year and you have others where they are working three or four months. And I think that an objective of any person involved in leadership in the Province today must set as their objective that we must get additional processing of our raw fish in Newfoundland, that it must even be increased, that we must maintain the existing processing plants on the South coast and so on and we can depend upon the gulf and other areas for some off-shore landings to keep the plants going all the year round. And we must increase the amount of processing that occurs on the Northeast coast and try to extend the period that these plants can remain open. Of course, to do that, that links you almost directly into the whole question of the Northern cod and the Hamilton Banks stock and to ensure that boats fishing that stock off shore, if in fact, there are boats that will fish that off shore once the surplus has been determined by scientists, that that is landed in the Province and in that part of the Province where processing now only happens for three or four months of the year. If ever we are going to continue to have a Newfoundland like we even have today, and where you are going to have a very viable Fogo Island, where you are going to have a ~~viable Twillingate or a Comfort Cove where you are going to have Wesleyville~~ area or Catalina area that is going to have to fish all the year round, then you have to have access to a stock and that happens to be, in our case, the Northern cod or the Hamilton Bank. You must have that! Otherwise, you always say that we have reached now the plateau to which we cannot go up to another higher plateau of fuller employment than we have at the present moment. There is no question about that. We will reach a stage in the next couple of years where the amount of herring that can be taken in a given bay and the number of fishermen, as it relates to mackerel, as it relates to turbot, as it relates to cod and all of the other fish, that the inshore fishery will be taking care of for all intents and purposes. And after that has been taken care of, and you have enough fishermen to accommodate the amount of fish that is coming inshore and it is steady and fairly constant, given the fact that there is going to be some variations in volumes every year due to factors beyond any of our control, but under a normal set of circumstances you will reach that point and then to expand any further to ensure that

PREMIER PECKFORD:

La Scie plant, or Englee plant, or St.

Anthony or all the way down the East coast or on the Labrador coast stays open longer, you are going to need access to offshore supplies, if in fact, it can be demonstrated reasonably that the inshore fishery will not be negatively affected, and there is a surplus there that

PREMIER PECKFORD:

has to be caught by midwater or offshore trawlers. Otherwise, you can always look upon an Englee or a Conche or a St. Anthony, to have the kind of cyclical employment pattern that it has at the present moment or will have in the next two or three years, because you will reach your maximum of inshore capacity there with the numbers of fishermen you have and all the rest of it. So that is one area, the whole processing area, where, as an aim, as an objective, we must try to see that additional, enough fish, raw material, fish is brought ashore to maintain what we have now in Burgeo and Ramea and all the South coast plants. We must be able to stabilize that, manage the resource to allow that; that is one thing. We are at that now and we must maintain that. If we can improve it, well sobeit, that is all the better. But secondly, along those lines, we must on the East, Northeast and Labrador coasts expand the time of year that processing can occur, and we need more volume ~~to do that and that volume can only come from an increased~~ inshore fishery effort, which we are now involved in, with more boats and more fishermen and multi species, many, many species, but over and above that, if it can be determined that a surplus to the inshore is available, that that must come ashore in Newfoundland to expand the time that these plants can remain open, so that we can reduce our unemployment rate, increase our wealth, and all of us will be better off. That is a critical, vital issue that a lot of people - I do not know about in this House, but in Newfoundland - do not understand in the long term. It is not being anti Canadian, it is being pro Canadian; because the better off Newfoundlanders are, the less will the Federal

PREMIER PECKFORD: Government and Canada have to pay into us. Less unemployment insurance will be paid out in Fogo, less unemployment insurance will be paid out in Englee, less in Conche and all the way along the coast, and as we get better off, so does Canada become better off. Therefore, I get somewhat disturbed when I hear people trying to label comments that I make or me personally or the government as being somewhat closeted and with our heads in the sand when it comes to talking about access to a fishery resource which is the lifeblood of Northeastern Newfoundland, Eastern Newfoundland and Labrador coast. And if we are going to have any attempt - we are not going to find oil or gas in every cove and bay in Newfoundland; I hope we never do find it in every cove and bay in Newfoundland - the fishery must remain the foundation of the economy of all those places for the long term. Fogo cannot go, Fogo must remain. The people of Fogo Island have proven over the last two or three years with a reasonable amount of fishery resource that they can be a very viable, thriving, vibrant society where they are, where they are. That means continual good inshore fishery based on the proper management of the Northern cod, and if there is fish surplus to what the inshore fishermen can take, that must be caught by midwater or offshore vessels that land in Seldom, that land in Joe Batt's Arm, so that the people of Joe Batt's Arm and Fogo are working longer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: That policy came from the Liberals.

PREMIER PECKFORD: I do not care where the policy came from. It does not make any difference. You can put what colour you like on it, I do not care what colour - I am talking about a Newfoundland policy, a Newfoundland policy.

PREMIER PECKFORD: That is number one on the fishery. One is the whole business of processing and how that - The second point is contained in the first and is that our first priority must be, has to be, unless you want to totally change the face of Newfoundland - and I take it we do not want to do that - that the present demography the present population distribution around the Province is the kind of thing we want to continue to have, with some minor modifications here and there along the way. Obviously there might be a change in Grandois or there might be a change in Fischot Islands or whatever, okay. You know, we can all see those as realistic. Then, if you are going to have that, the priority must be on the inshore fishery, because if you eliminate that - I mean, the thought can kill us just to start with so it is hardly needed for me to go on to explain why, because if

PREMIER PECKFORD:

you eliminate that, you eliminate fishermen, you eliminate people. So any compensating factors would have to overcome that are just impossible. I mean, you just cannot do it. So your inshore fishery has to be your first priority and then you build on your inshore fishery. You build on it with access to surplus stock which comes about because you manage your stock properly offshore. So that is the kind of way you have to go.

Thirdly - and this brings me to the current point -

MR. JAMIESON: What point number three? I did not quite get point number two.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Point number two which really should have been point number one is the inshore fishery thing -

MR. JAMIESON: Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD: - which was a part of the first point. I got to the processing when I should have gotten to it secondly. Number one is your inshore, especially as it relates to your East, Northeast and Labrador. You build on your inshore from there based upon first access to this surplus which everybody says is going to happen in 1982 or 1983 or 1984 on the northern cod, and which, if managed properly, will give us a fairly large volume of fish which can be used in our plants along the East and Northeast and Labrador coasts.

Thirdly, we must as Newfoundlanders, I think, make a fundamental decision as it relates to how we interrelate with the federal government who, regardless of who is there - I do not care who the Prime Minister is - as Newfoundlanders as to how we are going to jurisdictionally manage or otherwise manage the fishery, from a licencing point of view primarily and from overall management of stocks which are off "our" shelf, the extension of our land mass, not to be Newfoundland orientated, but that have been traditionally our fish as Newfoundlanders and as Newfoundland Canadians or Canadian Newfoundlanders, however you want to put it. Because that is critical, that is absolutely critical. As somebody said - and I only got the last

PREMIER PECKFORD:

part of it - there is still a strong, strong feeling that the only people who should have anything to do with the establishment of licencing and policy, management of resources around Newfoundland are a bunch of bureaucrats and scientists who reside in Ottawa and it cannot be done there. And what we have said as a government - and I think it is a very reasonable position to take - is that we are not saying, you got it all and give it to us because we want it all. We are saying, let us share the jurisdiction. There are certain things which are national in scope over which the national government must have ultimate and arbitrary jurisdiction, if you will, no question about it, and we have got to determine those. But there are other areas where we, as Newfoundlanders, should have a large input and some jurisdiction over it. Licencing is one. We should have a large say over licencing. No question on the herring and on the mackerel and on the squid in the different bays and over the shrimp and the fuss over that down on the Labrador Coast. There are a lot of areas which are unique to the bays even over which we can do a better job, over which you then, as parliamentarians in the House of Newfoundland, can have some real say. And now you get up and present petitions and ask questions and put resolutions on the paper and they are meaningless in the sense that we can get it off our chest and express our aims and objectives for our Fishery, but that is as far as we can go. We cannot put any laws into effect. You cannot criticize the Deputy Minister of Fisheries or the Minister of Fisheries or the Premier for our licencing policy because we do not have any control over it. And what is even worse, we have very little consultation on it. It is policy and then we are told about it. And unless we get that kind of change, which is sharing of power on a resource which is traditional to Newfoundland, and if Ottawa and Canada wants to stop throwing \$400 million or \$500 million in here a year and are serious about regional disparity, whoever the government is, then they are going to have to look at the unique, again, at the special, again, situation that we find ourselves in, we are strange

PREMIER PECKFORD:

enough, or whatever you want to call it, to be special on a whole bunch of issues.

I do not beg that question. It is not my fault that providence put us where we are or the way we are built or the way our history was and all the rest of it. But it is a fact, it is a historical fact, it is an economic fact that we will not be any better off unless somebody in their wisdom has the foresight to see that if you want to reduce it from 15.7 or 16 per cent unemployment rate to 8 per cent, which in Newfoundland terms would be zero unemployment, because the guy is always going to go on out and get his rabbits and have his moose. Five per cent is zero unemployment in normal Western industrial countries, so I can only assume that

PREMIER PECKFORD: that eight or ten percent in Newfoundland would be zero, given the different life style that we have. We will never get it below that. If there is any aim to get it even down to eight or ten, that can only be done in the long-term through the fishery on the East, Northeast coast and Labrador coast, with a stabilizing of the fishery that now exists on the Southwest coast. That can only be done if it is done in the long term through the aims, goals, objectives with good input from this House and this government, whatever government is here. Anything less than that you are not going to get it, and we will continue to play games as politicians and as Newfoundlanders over the fishery in our respective constituencies and with the respective fisheries. No question, we will play games until the cows come home, and we all will be old and in our chairs and watching somebody else do it and say to them, 'Boy, I remember when I played that same game'. How good was it at all! We are no farther ahead now than we were then. Which always led me to the conclusion, to the bottom line, which I hate to advocate, that sometimes I get the distinct impression that people would like to keep us dependant, because then they got more control over you, which is an awful thing to say. I hope I am wrong in saying it, but I get that distinct impression sometimes when you are still trying to be a good Canadian by being a good Newfoundlander. That is critical. You can have all the oil and gas, you can have all the uranium mines in Kitts-Michelin, you can have all the other things which will come and go, but if we do not manage and look after the fishery properly and get some better consultation set between both levels of government, we will continue to be subservient, and continue to be half doing it. And the resource, and the fishermen - I am talking about people, the province generally, which is the fishermen - will continue to be that and we will never expand in the way we can. That leads me

PREMIER PECKFORD: perhaps to the final thing, my fourth point will simply be that Newfoundlanders, and I said last night in a speech over at the university, St. John's and Newfoundlanders over the years, we have a lot of poor people and we also have a lot of rich people, almost like a Kuwait on that score. I suppose if per capita you looked at how many half millionaires or millionaires we have in St. John's or around the Province, we have as many almost as per capita, that is one thing we are almost as good as anybody else on. But we have never, the entrepreneur in Newfoundland has never seen fit to put his money into the most natural resource there is around, the one that brought us here in the beginning - the fishery. Now we have the spectacle of watching entrepreneurs from other parts of Canada and the world come in and invest hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars into our fishery, which gives rise to a very serious problem, a very serious problem, because when you have your eggs in three or four baskets, only one of which is in Newfoundland and they get that nice basket here, they have a good argument when they go to where all the power is, in Ottawa, and ask for additional concessions on access to additional stocks in the interest of Newfoundland, they can argue, in the first paragraph and in the last paragraph they throw in there somewhere along the line that it is also going to help other parts of Canada. So we will continue to be fed part of, side on, a bit of the fish while somebody else is getting the bulk of it in some other part of Canada, Not that I begrudge it to them: We do not have capacity to grow wheat here, or to grow apples here. Our resource is something which happens to extend under a bit of water, which is not our fault, which we should have first access to. If we do not realize that these are vital, important aims and objectives that we have to stand up for as Newfoundlanders, then we will be no better of twenty years from now than we are now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear;

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The Hon. Leader of the Opposition

MR. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to speak at this time. I wonder if the Hon. the Premier- I ask a totally non-argumentative question - if he would accept a brief question from me at this time by leave. I was just curious - I will be participating, I hope, in this debate - on the matter of the northern cod stock as being specific and identified

MR. D. JAMIESON:

historically with Newfoundland.

There are others where clearly the jurisdiction, using the Premiers word, is not as clear, I am thinking, for instance - I guess you could call this a hypothetical question but I suspect it could be a real one - if provinces bordering on the Gulf, let us say, were to take some kind of a position in insisting on a preferential spot for them, using the same, in a sense, historical or geographical arguments, I wonder if the Premier has thought that out and how it might be devised.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Number one, no other province, no

Province in the Gulf can make the same case that we can on the Northern cod.

That is number one. We thought this one through and we have done our research on it, historical and otherwise, and that is perhaps the main thing, that they cannot. Even though the argument has been - and I appreciate the Leader of the Opposition's question. It has been thrown at me from three or four areas from Ottawa in recent weeks, thrown straight at me, and that is their bottom line. After every other argument is taken out of the way, you can respond

and destroy it and so it is put to one side

~~because you really beat them; you are down to the last one and here it~~

comes and that is the one. They cannot make that case, number one, that

we can. Number two is we are willing to sit down with the federal authorities and work out arrangements there which will not impinge upon the other Provinces and we think we know what we are talking about when it comes to stock levels, what we can do to have full year employment for Burgeo, Ramea, and Port aux Basques, Isle aux Morts area and all the way along the coast, and not impinge and allow them to use that argument against us with any validity. We have thought this one through and, without getting into the whole specific of it, number one, they cannot give that case; where they can, we are not fishing; where they can, we are really not fishing there. In a couple of other areas where they do not have the same case as we do on the Hamilton Bank and the traditional and historic rights almost exclusively to the Northern cod that we have

where we have had traditional rights in fishing on the Gulf, that we are willing to sit down and work out an arrangement there which will

PREMIER PECKFORD: show that they cannot continue to use that argument validly and we can still have all our plans working. We are fully familiar with that argument.

MR. D. JAMIESON: I appreciate the answer, and, incidentally, if at some point it is on paper in the historical perspective-I am inclined, by the way, to agree with the historical perspective; I am not arguing the point - I would appreciate seeing it. I have just one other brief question with regard to Northern cod stocks or the general fishery along the Northeast coast and the emphasis on inshore. I believe I am quoting the Hon. Premier correctly when he expresses opposition to freezer trawlers. In other words, the structure that he anticipates excludes or virtually excludes utilization of freezer trawlers. Is that a correct assumption?

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, overall we do not see freezer trawlers as being a viable alternative for access offshore to the northern cod, that the wetfish trawler is a far more economical means of bringing the fish ashore and doing what has to be done on shore rather than half offshore and half on-shore, We look upon that as not a way to go, that the wetfish trawler is a far better means to exploit the Northern cod from the way we see it. The other thing is the other Provinces in the Gulf have not advocated right the kind of position, traditional, historic or whatever, as it relates to access to those stocks as we are doing now in Northern cod for obvious reasons, They have never had the capacity, processing or otherwise, so to do and it has been split up on a basis over the years realizing that fact, So in the absence of their aggression or desire to access it, it was split the way it was split without anything. So for that, we can ask the Nova Scotians why, whoever else why they did not, So it has never been an argument. It is now just being used as an argument by mostly the federal bureaucrats who -

MR. JAMIESON: And the Fisheries Council of Canada.

PREMIER PECKFORD: And the Fisheries Council of Canada obviously, because the Fisheries Council of Canada were highly, shall

PREMIER BECKFORD: I say influenced by one group of fish companies who have a vested interest to take certain positions. I think we all know that.

MR. SPEAKER (BAIRD): The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK: I would like to start off by saying to the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) when he ended up accusing the bureaucrats, as the Premier refers to them also, as the people in the policy on the fisheries of the 200 mile limit that they gave us. I do not know if the minister knows that the head of that delegation or the Assistant Deputy Minister now is Dr. Arthur May, a Newfoundlander -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. E. HISCOCK: - the scientific community was the head of it. Also Mr. Blackwood. I hear the Premier as well as other minister saying that one thing in Newfoundland and Labrador, if we are going to obtain any status that we have to go after first class and basically here is an example where we have not only the head of the Canadian delegation but basically having an influence on the International fishing community.
~~So I would just like to finish in that matter.~~

One of things I was quite pleased after this House closed in the Summer that I had the honour and the privilege of returning back to my district and I toured the South coast of Labrador for five weeks, spent more time touring the coast this time than I did in the election. I also just returned again from the Straits. And the Northern cod stocks, of course, is a big topic on their mind right now and I take some credit in influencing policy at the last Liberal convention in Ottawa. I sponsored a motion which said that the Hamilton banks be closed late Winter and early Spring and that was passed unanimously by the Liberal convention in Ottawa at that time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. HISCOCK: Also the Labrador Advisory Council and the combined community councils also said that that should be closed. And I ask this question now, we have a closed season on salmon for breeding, we have it on trout, we have it on lobster and we have it on other fish, but somehow or another the cod do not breed. They do not need it, they multiply too fast they are like rabbits. The Northern cods are the breeding grounds for the Northeast coast of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HCN. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. E. HISCOCK: The fishermen in that area are concerned that this remains the breeding area. Mr. Barry also pointed out that our stocks were almost nearing depletion and we have the example of the Spanish fleet now. All those trawlers are now up on the Hamilton Bank. If you go down on the waterfront now you will see an East German one chartered by Fishery Products to go up soon. When I was flying up to Forteau by way of Labrador Airway into Blanc Sablon, on that plane there were two observers and their job was to go out aboard a Russian and Cuban trawler. In this regard the thing that the fishermen are really, really concerned about is that in the end the same thing is going to happen to the Hamilton ~~bank that has happened to the Grand banks~~

The Premier mentioned something about processing fish until I kept looking at him and he basically ended up mentioning St. Anthony, Conche, Englee, Fogo; not once of L'Anse-a-l'Eau Mary's Harbour, Cartwright, Red Bay, Nain, only after. The Northern cod stocks, it is agreed, belong to the people of the Northeast coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. Yet we have the longliner fleet in L'Anse-a-Loup and there is no wharf there to tie up to. The wharf at Red Bay was postponed for the year. I can take it all down the coast.

MR. HISCOCK: - The Premier said something. And maybe being very young in politics and maybe being idealistic and naive, he ended up saying that we play games, we get up and give our speeches and that and in the end we sit down and we score points and get elected. The fishermen or any other people in the Province are left holding the bag. Probably that is what happens, but for my part when I am speaking on behalf of my constituents I am not playing games.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: I am very, very concerned about the control of the Northern cod stocks and control of the Labrador fishery get into one company and that is H. B. Nickerson's. People really do not realize what is happening in Labrador, and people really do not realize. They have an opening of a fish plant in St. Barbe's, and if you can take this and trace your mind and look at the map of Northern Newfoundland and Labrador, Nickerson's are in St. Barbe, they are opening up a huge plant there.

MR. ROBERTS: No, they are stopped there. They wanted to open it up, but now this project is on hold.

MR. HISCOCK: It is on hold?

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, they wanted to go ahead but (inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: Okay, Harbour Deep, Jackson's Arm and again the Northeast coast. They are in William's Harbour, they are in Black Tickle, and when I was down the coast I found out that they are now going into a partnership with Ben Powell in Square Island. Basically, what is happening while we are going after our policy of oil and energy and getting into other forms of resources, I am wondering if it is not -

MR. STIRLING: Former senior deputy minister

MR. STIRLING: is on their staff, Sandy Roche, the deputy minister.

MR. HISCOCK: Well, as was just pointed out, former deputy ministers are on their staff. Well, that is again, I suppose, entirely up to their people. What I am concerned with is that in the end, while we are looking at the pie in the sky, that in the end what happens is we will wake up and find out that we are back in the feudal system, we are back in the idea of the monopolies. I will give you an example.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: And I will give you an example in Black Tickle. Black Tickle, I tell you, has gone back to the sixteenth or the seventeenth century. In that plant there the ice-making machine was broken down, and I even had to ask myself if it was not sabotage. And I asked that in all sincerity and all out of conscience; I really ask is that the way that the community is ~~actually running. The freezer - not the freezer trawler~~ but the dragger up there - landed a million pounds. It was more profitable for them to take the fish and put it aboard the Portuguese trawler than to turn around and split it and salt it because Nickerson's only get a half a cent a pound, they are a sub-agent. In that regard, four or five people were working on that boat while the people in Black Tickle were unemployed, 30 people ended up working at it part-time. When I went there, with regard to the trawler, at the time tied up to the wharf and I ended up speaking on that, when I got there, what had been done? Bills had been sent out to the people in Black Tickle that they owed the merchant, the fish merchant, bills of \$5,000, \$6,000, \$4,000 that they actually owed. They never see any cash, they never see anything and that is what we are out catering to. Well, I also do not believe

MR. HISCOCK: in being negative but I also am concerned and I am pointing this out out of concern. I am also quite pleased that the provincial government saw fit to bring in a gear subsidy program of 30%, which was quite welcome on the coast of Labrador, quite welcome, but while I was there I found out prices jumped 100 per cent to 120 per cent so they are worse off this year than last year. So basically, again, the merchants end up getting the benefit. I would like to point out, and the fishermen have, and I hope the government takes it upon advisement. It is unfortunate today that the Acting Minister of Fisheries is not here. It is also unfortunate that the Premier, again, maybe he was playing games by basically saying that we score points. If the Premier was actually sincere about the role of fisheries in the Province, we would have a new Minister of Fisheries now instead of an acting one looking after three departments. In regard to the Northern cod stocks, if we do not look ~~after that and if we do not protect those in the sense~~ of closing it for one or two months of the year, then we are actually going to be in great problems. On that part of the coast, Decks Awash had a special issue of the Labrador summer stations, the fishermen's union also had a special issue of the Forum

MR. HISCOCK:

and they are pointing out the problems there. So I say to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador, when you are talking about the Northern cod stocks, when you are talking about getting full employment throughout Newfoundland, do not forget that they are off Labrador and do not forget about the people who are trying to get small boats, trying to get a 35 foot boat with a gurdy because they do not want to get into \$100,000 boats. Do not forget about the fishermen there who are down in Red Bay and want a twenty-two foot boat but the Premier says, no it is stopped and goes for Henley Harbour North. Also, do not forget about that here is a fish plant in L'Anse-au-Loup. For the first time in Labrador's history this year there is a fish plant in L'Anse-au-Loup employed as high as eighty-five people this Summer and, if I am correct, only ceased operation last week or probably two weeks ago. The first time, yet they do not have a dragger's licence and they are trying to get another licence to move up. Yet we let the Russians go up there and we let the Cubans go up there and we let Nickerson's go up there and we let the larger fleets go up there. But here is a local entrepreneur, as Mr. Peckford said, not investing. Here is a local man down in the district of Labrador willing to put money and the government will not turn around and give him a licence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Also down in Labrador - and I do not know if too many people in the gallery really realize this -

MR. BARRY: Would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. HISCOCK: Surely. I will permit a question.

MR. NEARY: Not a speech.

MR. BARRY: I wonder what the hon. member's position is on the shrimp licenses that were awarded by Mr. LeBlanc to other provinces?

MR. HISCOCK: That will be -

MR. NEARY: Now who is playing games?

MR. BARRY: Sir, who is playing games (inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: That to me -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

Why does not Mr. McGrath do something about it?

MR. HISCOCK:

Well, to me, as far as I am concerned, the past -

MR. NEARY:

School boy debater.

MR. HISCOCK:

- things that are made - since I have been elected and going around everybody tries to tie me with what Mr. Smallwood did or tries to tie me to whatever happens. In my own personal opinion, and speaking for the people down in Labrador, they are upset. But they are also upset that you are getting the freezer trawlers and Mr. McGrath wants them up there. They are also upset that Mr. McGrath is giving permission to go. So when you are condemning Mr. LeBlanc, do not be so quick to turn around and pat Mr. McGrath.

MR. BARRY:

I just wanted your opinion.

MR. HISCOCK:

Well, my opinion is that at that time I am sure the Liberal Party here and other people were upset with that and that is my own personal opinion.

MR. NEARY:

Do not be catering to (inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK:

Basically all the plants on the coast need to be upgraded.

MR. NEARY:

Get upset about that.

MR. HISCOCK:

In Decks Awash - down on the Labrador Coast, as I said, they are maintaining two homes, one in the Winter and one in the Summer. Insulation is a problem, they cannot maintain it. They are just beginning to come out really of a depression and say, okay, we finally can make ends meet, we finally can turn around and spend so much money on maybe getting a better skidoo, maybe fixing up the house. Yet what is happening? The government really is saying, we are going to build it up but yet nothing is done. So my concern is with this government; hopefully it is not playing games, hopefully we are concerned with giving Labrador a shrimp license, Cartwright. Hopefully we are concerned with getting the turbot in and developed. But as I said - and I point out now - that basically we have to be very, very carefully that we do not

MR. HISCOCK:

put any community along that coast with a majority of one company. I am not against H.B. Nickersons, and if they think I am I am not, but I do not want to see, as I said, where they are going to be in St. Barbe, Williams Harbour, Black Tickle and Square Islands. And basically what it would be, they would be on the way up to the Northern cod, come on down into Nova Scotia because that is basically in the freezer trawler concept, wanting to bring it back to North Sydney and Halifax and process it and basically tie up if necessary in a storm, in one of their own ports.

But in the two housing programmes, I want to get with that, because as I said they have to move out. Here it is

MR. E. HISCOCK:

now the freeze-up on the Labrador coast and basically they have not had mail within over a week and a half in some places.

I will be presenting petitions but I will just mention one now briefly. Lodge Bay moves back and forth to Cape St. Charles and in Lodge Bay they have to go out three miles down the river to get their supplies from the CN boat, then take up on a speed boat and bring it up to the community. They have to go back and forth across the river on a boat, the children have to go, and this is the way they are brought to school. When it is freezing up, the children are kept out of school and then in the Spring, when it is thawing up, they are also kept out of school. But in that transitional period they are hauled over the ice in a boat so if the boats cracks through the ice at least they are given some safety. And basically now here they are up there cut off and I hope that the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador will be making known to Mr. Crosbie in his Budget to have the airstrips and do more upgrading. Conditions down there, as I said each time I go down there I get more upset -

AN HON. MEMBER:

MR. E. HISCOCK: The Minister of Finance turned around and said I was catering to separatism, I was flaring the flames of separatism. But basically I hope the House will give me the credit, being born in Newfoundland, not living Labrador but teaching there and going around, but give me the credit of having enough sensitivity of going down and listening to the people and be able to come back here and transmit their voice to this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. E. HISCOCK:

- and when I turn around I say something and I point out things that are happening down there, it is basically not for political gain. But the question basically is down there is that in development we probably would be better off with Quebec -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Garbage.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Did I hear garbage?

MR. E. HISCOCK: The point is that is down there when they see what they are to Quebec -

MR. S. NEARY: The member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) is an expert on garbage.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) incinerators.

MR. E. HISCOCK: Quebec has done various things to its fishery and hopefully by the Premier pointing it out will be looking forward to the announcement on DREE, I will be looking forward to the upgrading of the facilities down there. But I give this warning now to them: please be careful of the large companies taking over one particular area of the coast. Also your Gear Subsidy Programme was complimented and enjoyed down by the Labrador fishermen but basically extend it, of new gear extended to parts, why do they need to buy a full net when they only want the webs? So extend that too, upgrade that programme and they will be more than pleased.

Also the other fishermen down there want a 35 foot boat with a gurdy, not the large ones. Also the people on the Straits part are a little bit upset on cutting this line at Henley Harbour. ~~They do not like that the people on the Straits.~~ Okay, they may have the longliners but there is a lot of people down in that part of the country who do not want to get into longliners and want to maintain the smaller boats. And the ones in that area who got good fishing were in small boats of a 22 foot at going out with the salmon or are trawling, so they want to maintain. So if you are going to put a freeze on it from Henley Harbour, I suggest that you do it for all the Labrador coast. So I will be writing you on these things but in the meantime, as I said, we have to very careful.

MR. E. HISCOCK: So basically the fisheries on the Labrador coast on the Northern cod are tied in with the housing, with the communication and with the roads. So I thank you very, very much for listening even if it was a little bit disjointed, because I was a little bit upset with some of the things. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) The hon. member for Placentia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to join in this debate and make a few remarks with regards to the remarks made by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). I can assure my hon. friend there he need not be afraid of Nickerson's, he need not be afraid of Fishery Products, he need not be afraid of the Warehams - because these are the people who are keeping the fishery going in Newfoundland today. Tell the fishermen to go down to the Bank of Montreal, Royal Bank what will

MR. PATTERSON:

he get? If you are a fisherman your credit is not worth two cents -

AN HON. MEMBER: Seventeen per cent interest rate.

MR. PATTERSON: Eighteen possibly and twenty-five.

I grew up in Placentia Bay in the thirties, and it was the Warehams that kept Placentia Bay alive, not the banks. The Warehams supplied the fishermen in the Summer. If he had no fish in the Fall, he could go back in the Spring. Now, with regard to the remarks made by the hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) there, he is concerned about the pollution, about the oil, and I too am concerned about it, but it was not the Tories who put that big monster up in the head of Placentia Bay, the oil refinery, a menace to Placentia Bay and a menace to the fisheries, and if it ever opens again it is going to be disastrous.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: And it was not the Tories who ~~put ERSC up there at a cost of \$15 million to the Province.~~

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: It was not the Tories who said when we had a pollution problem up there when the whales turned belly-up and the codfish turned belly-up, and then the hon. minister for Placentia at the time - he is gone now - he said, "Well, there was an earthquake over in Japan, an eruption in the firey ring of the Pacific caused it". You know, what kind of crap have we got to put up with?

AN HON. MEMBER: Mr. Moores wanted to put another refinery out there.

MR. PATTERSON: I did not favour the refinery. I was not always aligned with Mr. Moores, I am not always aligned with Mr. Peckford, I am my own man. If I think

MR. PATTERSON: the thing is right, I will
fight for it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: It must be unique over there
(inaudible).

MR. PATTERSON: Well, we are all unique individuals.
Someone said, "Rugged individualism brings ragged
individuals", I think it was Tommy Douglas said that.

PREMIER PECKFORD: A great Conservative concept.

MR. PATTERSON: Right.

Now, Mr. Speaker, last Fall I
came out against the Kellogg Report, and I did so primarily
because I had studied that report. I am not against the
superport or a primary landing centre being in Harbour Grace.
I would like to make that crystal clear to the press.
I am not opposed to it being in Argentia or La Scie or
Green Bay or Hall's Bay or Port au Port, if it is good.
If it is good for the Province and good for the community,
~~I think we should have that type of development.~~ But the
architects of the Kellogg Report, they were very cautious
in what they had to say with regard to that development.
They based the whole concept on taking 160,000 metric tons
of caplin, that was it. They said the project was viable,
providing you could take 160,000 tons of caplin. They
said the pin-bone removal of the fish is socially viable.
They said that the frozen cod block is socially viable.
Now, we all have a social conscience, but if you are running
a business, because the business is socially viable
that does not satisfy the banks - the business has to be
making money. So they advised the government to go easy,
go easy on the Kellogg Report, and I am glad that Premier
Peckford has put his foot down on that, because that would
have been one of the greatest catastrophies that ever hit
the fishery of Newfoundland. If it is proven that we can

MR. PATTERSON: take the fish from the Northern cod stocks by wetfish trawlers or factory ships, if it is proven we can do it, well then it may or it may not be all right. The difference in cost in setting up that superport at Argentinia would be \$26 million; that is right here in the Kellogg Report. So why should we go into an area and build wharves and docks and oil lines to the tune of \$25 million extra when we have all these facilities out there lying idle. This is something that should be very, very carefully looked at. The financing has not been arranged for that. Approval of the project by the Canadian Federal Government and a degree of Federal Government support, such support would include financial assistance, licensing of fishing vessels, quota allocations and adjustment of such other regulations as are necessary for the project to prosper, final selection of a fishing fleet and the ownership and management concept under which such a fleet will operate. The provincial government ~~is considering various alternatives which include leasing,~~ co-operative arrangements, chartering, outright ownership, and a combination of options. It is further suggested that provisions of these facilities fall within the framework of the Canada General Development Agreement. Dialogue will

MR. PATTERSON:

be started with the Department of Regional and Economic Expansion to determine the nature and extent of financial assistance that is available." The federal government has not promised one, solitary penny to that project, not one solitary penny. And if we were to be sucked into such an arrangement as I mentioned a minute ago, we would regret it to our dying day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: I am not against development, I have not a thing against Harbour Grace, but the fishery in Newfoundland is alive and well without criticizing the Fisheries Loan Board. They are criticizing it for doing too much, not too little if it overspent. You cannot go down and tell the man who is down the shore with his fishing boat that the Fisheries Loan Board is no good.

AN HON. MEMBER: The money is gone.

MR. PATTERSON: Pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: They got no money. (Inaudible).

MR. HANCOCK: (Inaudible) was wasted.

MR. PATTERSON: Well, where was it wasted?

MR. HANCOCK: Ask some of the people of my district.

That is why I got here.

MR. PATTERSON: That is why you got a synchrolift down in your district last Fall. That is why every fisherman from Point La Hays down to Placentia in the St. Mary's district are all fishing. Last year in Admiral's Beach, millions upon millions of dollars were spent in St. Mary's-the Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: The people down in St. Mary's-the Capes never had it so good. A water line in St. Mary's, a fish plant in St. Mary's, a synchrolift in Admiral's Beach, a water line in St. Bride's, a fish plant in Branch. Not one person in Branch on social assistance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: \$17 million worth of road work went down there.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON:

they took them out of Merasheen, they took them out of Woody Island, they took them out of Red Island and they herded them into ghettos. That is what they did with them.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: What did they get in return. For 2.3 in family they gave them \$2,300 and when these people hit the beaches in Placentia real estate went up and many of them had financed their own destruction. That is the Liberal policy. Do you want to go back to that for the fishery?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No!

MR. PATTERSON: They did not vote Liberal up in Placentia district, they elected Patterson again - and they will elect him again and again.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: You go up to Argentinia where the -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. PATTERSON: ~~government refurbished two cold storages that can~~ handle 9 million pounds of fish, trailers in, trailers out from LaScie, from Harbour Grace, from Grand Bank, day and night, an excellent business is being conducted there and is being managed by Harvey and Company. These are the things we are doing. These are the positive things we are doing.

MR. STIPLING: What about Harbour Grace?

MR. PATTERSON: We are not promising things.

MR. STIRLING: What about Harbour Grace?

MR. PATTERSON: I said a minute ago I have nothing against Harbour Grace, not a thing. I am against the primary landing center until I am convinced as the Premier has to be convinced, that the fish in the Northern stock are available.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: \$35 million spent in Branch, my son.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. PATTERSON: \$35 million spent in Branch.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

I think the debate is beginning to get a little bit out of hand and I would ask members to control their voices and keep them at a much lower level.

The hon. member for Placentia.

MR. PATTERSON: The fishery is important not only to the fishermen and plant workers who are directly involved in the industry but to the Province as a whole.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: "The new dollars that are generated by our fishermen go directly into the provincial economy and have a significant effect on the gross domestic product. For example, in 1978 the gross domestic product reached \$2,633,000,000. The fishing industry alone contributed a total of \$336 million." Now, was that in the Liberal days?

~~No, sir. I will tell you only for the input of the provincial money~~
into the fishery today you would not have that. The fishery is also a major contributor to our employment. In 1978 the Newfoundland labour force totalled 192,000 workers, with the fishing industry providing employment for 30,000, 15.6 per cent of the work force. And if we use the lowest spin-off factor, 1.5 from this employment it means that another 45,000 were supported by the fishery. And yet the hon. members get up and they denounce the fishery; we are not doing this and we are not doing that.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Liberals were always opposed to the fishery.

MR. PATTERSON: They were always opposed to the fishery. They raped Placentia Bay. They took the fishermen out of Isle Valen, they took them out of Southeast Point, they took them out of Petit Fort,

MR. PATTERSON: I am certainly not against development.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) you say it was garbage?

MR. PATTERSON: Well, I did not say it was garbage.

AN HON. MEMBER: Come on over, come on over.

MR. PATTERSON: Total landings of all species reached 456,000 metric tons, which was an increase of 63,000 metric tons over 1977. The value of last year's catch amounted to \$112 million dollars compared to \$86 million the previous year. This addition of \$26 million went directly into the pockets of our fishermen, which increased their annual earnings by thirty percent.

AN HON. MEMBER: Burn your boats.

MR. PATTERSON: The day of burning your boats is over.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear;

MR. PATTERSON: That is over. But I am a bit concerned.

I am concerned, as the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is, with the reopening of that Come by Chance, if it opens, because a tanker's spill in that bay would make a desert out of the Southwest coast.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the drilling off the Labrador?

MR. PATTERSON: That too is dangerous. We have to go out and bring in the oil; we do not have to go out for the fish. The fish will come in to Merasheen, and in to Point La Haye, and Green Bay, and Halls Bay, they will come to every bay. We must concentrate on the fishery, but we have to develop the oil also.

AN HON. MEMBER: And protect the northern cod stock.

MR. PATTERSON: And protect the northern cod stock, there is no doubt at all about that. I have second thoughts on oil. I have made a study on pollution, and I would be prepared to debate pollution here, the sinking of the Arrow, or the Argo Merchant, the Tory Canyon or thousands of other oil tankers, One oil tanker every month breaks apart.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Tell us some more about it.

MR. PATTERSON:

Well, the time is limited now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON:

Next Wednesday I will tell you
more about it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

Order, please! It is six o'clock.

The hon. member has adjourned debate.

On motion, the House at its rising
adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, at three o'clock.