

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 28, 1979

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

With respect to the matter raised late yesterday afternoon concerning the bar not being placed during division, I would like to make the following comments.

First of all, in most other parliaments the bells ring continuously and on a continuous basis and when they stop of course it indicates that the time has expired and that also is the time when the Sergeant-at-Arms will place the bar. But, of course, we do not have this particular system in our House so we therefore go by tradition. And traditionally, the bells ring at the beginning of the ten minute allotted time, which was previously three minutes, and when the ten minutes have expired the bell is rung once more to signify conclusion of the time; then the bar is placed.

This is the tradition and in fact it was the way it was conducted during a division held a few days ago on the amendment proposed by the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). And I think what really occurred yesterday was because of the changes now to our Standing Orders which allow agreement prior to the ten minute expiry, and in fact there was an agreement after only a few moments, perhaps was a slight oversight on my part and the bell simply was not rung the second time.

This, I can assure hon. members, will not happen again and, having discussed the matter with the Sergeant-at-Arms, I am confident that there was no danger of anyone entering the Chamber as he was quite prepared to do his duty if it became necessary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I had planned to ask some questions this afternoon on hydro development and I hope that you would recognize me later, if perhaps the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is in the House. In the interim, may I direct a question to the hon. House Leader? With regard to the matter on which I think there was general agreement between us on both sides, vis-a-vis the matrimonial property act and the publicizing of it, has any decision been made by the government as to which department will be responsible for co-ordinating and in a sense preparing the material and will it be centered in the Department of Justice or in some other agency of the government?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I might say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition, the hon. Minister of Mines and Energy was out of town yesterday and I am hoping he will be back in later on before the Question Period.

MR. NEARY: Is he down in Bay d'Espoir?

MR. MARSHALL: I think a lot of people are probably down in Bay d'Espoir today. But in response to the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question, the act is under the administration of the Department of Justice and it is planned

MR. MARSHALL: at the present time for the Department of Justice to take charge of all operations with respect to the Act, including the publication of it. Now they may require expertise outside of the department in order to do it effectively because this is not a normal task of the Justice Department. But in answer to the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question, it is the Department of Justice.

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: Well, the hon. Leader of the House anticipated my supplementary. With the greatest respect to the Department of Justice and all of its skilled and learned worthies, I suspect they are not the best people in the world for drafting something which can be read with ease and understanding by the majority of the ordinary residents of this Province, including myself. In that light, therefore, may I ask is it the intention of the government, for example, to perhaps enlist the assistance or engage the services of some kind of professionals and also, indeed, if I might be so bold as to presume to say so, perhaps the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) and some of her people?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, certainly, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Minister of Education, who has had a leading part in the formulation of this bill and knows the bill much more fully, I think, than any other member here and is certainly more responsible for putting it together, will be taking a part. But, as I say, the ultimate responsibility is with the Department of Justice. I will agree with the hon. Leader of the Opposition that they are not geared, the Department of Justice is not geared for the dissemination of information of this type, and we are certainly going to have to address ourselves to this particular problem, because the government is very concerned that all aspects of this bill, insofar as they change the current status quo, that every reasonable effort is taken to assure that all of the 150,000 families in the Province are fully aware of the content and the import of the bill

Mr. Marshall: itself.

MR. JAMIESON: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): A supplementary, the hon. Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. JAMIESON: In that connection, since we are now at the
end of the month of November, which for all practical purposes means
that the clock is running on this measure so that there are really
seven months, and if one excludes, I suppose, a fair number of weeks
between now and, say, the second week or so of January, what is the
current state of the preparation of the material? Is there anything
in place? Or can the hon. House Leader tell me when the public will
get, in a sense, its first exposure to this kind of information? Because
it seems to me, and I think he would agree, that there is no point in it
only becoming familiarized to the public on the 24th. of May or something
next year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, despite the fact that the bill
has passed third reading and only awaits the assent of His Honour The
Lieutenant-Governor which will be, you know, very shortly, it does
not come into effect, of course, until July 1. So that is a six
month period.

 But I will agree that it is necessary for
this information to go forth to the public as quickly as possible.
Now there have been general plans formulated. There have been

MR. MARSHALL: discussions with respect to a leaflet, if I am using the correct word, with a direct mail out to all families in the Province, and I expect that this will be one of the means by which the information will be disseminated. And also, of course, there is consideration given to broader media coverage with respect to it. So in answer to the specific question of the hon. gentleman, I can only tell him that we are fully aware of the necessity to publicize this bill, to put it in as simplistic language as possible, and to cover as fully as possible the import and intent of the bill. The actual specific mode of carrying out this intention has not yet been formulated, but I do expect between now and the end of December that it will be ongoing and on its way and very shortly thereafter our specific plans will be brought into effect with respect to it.

MR. JAMIESON: A final supplementary.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Really, Mr. Speaker, more by way of a suggestion, but I will phrase it as a question: May I suggest to whoever is going to be responsible, that the information would at some point, in addition to simply stating the facts, set up a series of hypothetical but nevertheless real situations so that people can examine it and say this is the category into which I fit. It is a technique that has been used quite successfully by various governments with regard to income tax, for instance. Would the hon. the House Leader take that under advisement so that we can say to a person if they read this material or if they hear it on whatever medium it is used, this is the one that relates to me and this is what I must do?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: I thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition for the suggestion. We certainly will take note of it and of course any other suggestions the hon. Leader may wish to make because after all he

MR. MARSHALL: has an expertise in communications, in the communications field that I do not think any of the rest of us in our private life has. So that and any other suggestion he may care to make we will certainly take into consideration.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Hon. member for LaPoile followed by the hon. member for Tornjat Mountains.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), and the reason I am asking the question I am sure that all other members have been swamped with telephone calls and letters from social assistance recipients, from widows and orphans and sick people and crippled people who cannot cope with the cost of living and are wondering if there is going to be

MR. NEARY: any increase for people on social assistance in the foreseeable future, Has the minister allocated any of the \$150 million that Premier Lougheed was kind enough to give the hon. gentleman recently? Will any of that be allocated for an increase in social assistance payments to people who are forced to live on social assistance in this Province?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the borrowing carried out recently was, as was stated, for three specific purposes. One was for Newfoundland Hydro? Well that clearly does not fit into the category, I suppose, strictly speaking, not in the immediate future, of those on social assistance. Ultimately, of course, in the long run, it is to make sure that our hydroelectric costs and our hydroelectric generation is kept within the needs of the Province.

Another loan was for the NMFC, and this was to finance various municipal projects to which the government is committed in the current year, and that clearly also does not apply particularly to those on social assistance.

The final loan was the \$50 million which is to be used for general budgetary purposes, particularly, I suppose, for capital funding, but nevertheless, that is to be used for the current fiscal year, 1979 - 1980. In other words, it is to service the residual amount required by the 1979 - 1980 Budget, and that Budget did include an increase in the payments to those on social assistance. If I remember correctly, the increase was something in the order of 7 per cent over the previous year. Now it will not be too long in the future when we will have to consider the Budget for the coming year, 1980 - 1981, and I have no doubt that the hon. the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) will be putting forward a plea for his vote, which will take into consideration the demands made upon his department.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: In other words, I would assume from the hon. minister's answer that the answer is 'no' and it is going to be a very black Christmas for a lot of people who are unemployed and forced to live on social assistance in this Province. It is rather

MR. S. NEARY:

unfortunate and tragic indeed. I would like to ask the hon. minister if his colleague, the Minister of Social Services (Mr. T. Hickey), has asked for additional funds to take care of single men and women, single Newfoundlanders who now do not qualify for social assistance, who are forced to, say, live at home with their parents, who are unemployed, or forced to live off their parents? The government so far has refused to give them any assistance. Could the minister tell us if his colleague has asked for any additional funds to look after these young men and women?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the Department of Social Services has quite a number of programmes available to it, and there is one, certainly, that is of a very flexible nature that the hon. minister has available to him to take care of, shall we say, unusual circumstances or emergency circumstances or unforeseen circumstances as they arise. I would not like to take away any prerogatives from the hon. Minister of Social Services in how he will dispose of those funds but, certainly, there is a sum available to him to take care of unforeseen, unusual or new emergency needs in social assistance area.

MR. S. NEARY: Final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Final supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact then that the hon. gentleman has answered in the affirmative that the Finance Department has given the minister a grant or an allocation to look after single able-bodied men and women in this Province, would the hon. gentleman undertake to find out what the Minister of Social Services is doing with this money, because he is not paying it to single able-bodied people in this Province? That is one part of the question, and the other part of the question I wanted to ask the hon. gentleman is if he could tell us whether the government is giving any consideration to basing social assistance payments on the

November 13, 1979

Tape No. 142B

SD - 2

MR. S. HEARY: cost of living, if the cost of
living goes up people on social assistance would

MR. S. NEARY:

automatically get an increase in their allowances, has the government given any consideration to that formula?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, a correction: I did not say that the government had given a vote particularly for distribution to single men or those unemployed single persons. I did say that the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) has available to him use at his discretion in terms of emergency services. In regard to the latter part of the hon. member's question: each year there has been for some considerable time an increase in the monies going to those on social assistance to individual people requiring social assistance in the various categories. The increase each year is related to the increase in the cost of living. Now I did mention the figure of 7 per cent and I believe the cost of living this year is predicted by some people to go up perhaps 9.3 per cent or something of that order. So the two figures do not quite jibe, but on the other hand that 7 per cent had been set some considerable time ago and I think it was anticipated that that would approximate the increase in the cost of living at the time.

So really the answer to the hon. member's question is that the increases in social assistance are, as far as can be done, related to the increase in the cost of living.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question will be addressed to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. Brett). Probably if I am allowed I will preamble a little on the beginning. I received a telegram signed by five companies that

MR. WARREN: operate air services in Labrador, that come December 31 the Ministry of Transport will be ceasing clearing the snow from the Goose Bay airport.

Now, this is going to cause grave danger to the coastal residents from Nain to Mary's Harbour because these aircraft are used for medical evacuation, police protection, passenger transportation and food and freight traffic. I am asking the minister, if he has not already done, would he be in contact with his counterpart in Ottawa - I understand there are good relationships between ministers on the provincial scene and on the federal scene - to see if he will have a change of heart and not stop MOT from clearing the snow this winter?

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

MR. BRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, this came to my attention yesterday and I have not had an opportunity to discuss it with the staff or anybody else, but I share the member's concern. What he is saying is very true. I guess this being completely a federal responsibility the most that I can do is get in touch with my federal counterpart in Ottawa, Mr. Mazankowski, which I will do. I can assure the hon. member that I will be in touch with the federal minister, probably not today, now, but tomorrow certainly, and ask that that section of the runway be kept open.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is, if by chance the federal minister in Ottawa is not as gracious as our provincial minister, would he consider using some of the equipment that the provincial Department of Transportation and Communications has in Goose Bay, Labrador, to assist those airlines if this arises, if the federal does not see fit to keep this portion of the airstrip open? Would there be consideration given

MR. WARREN:

to having some of the
provincial equipment used? Because, after all, it is a really grave

MR. WARREN:

matter and it is of very much concern for all portions of Labrador, in particular to medical evacuation and police protection and also passenger traffic?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I am sure we would be very happy to do just that if we had the equipment. Unfortunately the only thing that could clear the runway would be snow blowers. The most that we could do with our graders and our dozers would be to sort of plow the snow up and, you know, it would continue to pile up and when it got so high then we would not be able to do anything with it. You would need some equipment to blow the snow away. And because we do not have equipment like that, then our forces would not be able to keep the runway clear. This means that it is going to have to be done by DOT or not at all.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary, the hon. member for Torngat.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my final supplementary is that - maybe I will try another angle - is that MOT are saying it is because of funds, that is the reason they are closing down the portion of the airstrip. Now, we all know that there is sufficient equipment there, the property of the federal government, and if they are going to close it down because of lack of funds, would our minister look into the possibility of having this equipment probably transferred over to the provincial department, just for this winter, to make sure that any dangers does not happen concerning the lives of the people?

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

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I hesitate at any time to take on the responsibilities of the federal government. But at the same time I realize that this particular topic is very important,

MR. BRETT: this particular section of runway.
Rather than making a commitment that we would pay for it, or operate the equipment that belongs to DOT, I would rather make the commitment that I will do what I can to encourage the federal minister to do it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
My questions, in the absence of the Minister of Health (Mr. House), are for the President of the Treasury Board and they have to do with the current status of negotiations between the employers on one hand, in one sense or

MR. E. ROBERTS: in some instances that is the government, in other instances it is hospital boards, and on the other hand the employees who work in the Province's hospitals who I understand are represented almost entirely by either NAFU or CUPE, different locals of each of those two unions. Could the minister tell us, at least to begin with, where we stand on the negotiations and specifically or in respect of how many institutions strike notices have been served upon employers? Could we begin by seeing where we are with that and perhaps at the same time the minister might tell us where we are with response to the suggestion, which I believe came from Mr. Locking, the spokesman for one of the unions, that the government might make some further efforts to try to get talks resumed or if in fact they have been resumed, try to get them moving again?

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) The hon. President of the Treasury Board.

MR. H. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say we are very concerned about this whole situation. We are watching it extremely carefully. We do have notices at the present I think from some seventeen institutions, basically pretty well all of those represented by NAFU, CUPE are just starting or have just started or about to start, in some cases, taking strike votes in the hospitals which they represent and it will be two or three weeks before all of these are finalized and we have a position from these particular institutions.

MR. E. ROBERTS: No real doubt though?

MR. H. WINDSOR: Perhaps not, but we are not to pre-judge what the members just will vote on any particular strike vote.

MR. E. ROBERTS: (Inaudible)

Is that correct?

MR. H. WINDSOR: Yes. As far as the efforts being made, we are doing everything that we possibly can. We have not had any requests from Mr. Locking for a meeting. Certainly we are available at any time of the day or night to meet with the union if they feel they would like to sit down and do some negotiating.

MR. A. FOELTIS:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (SINN):

A supplementary, the hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. E. FOELTIS:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I accept, of course, the minister's statement that there was been no request from Mr. Locking, but I am surprised because I believe I have heard Mr. Locking on the radio, and I thought there was a piece in this morning's issue of the Daily News in which he indicated that he had made a request for the minister's good efforts or good offices to try to put things back together. However, there will be another time for that.

Let me go on with another aspect of it. We were told earlier, I believe by the Minister of Health (Mr. House), possibly by the President of the Treasury Board (Mr. Windsor), that the process whereby employees could be designated as essential under the terms of the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act had not begun. I understand that there has been a ruling from the Labour Relations Board that individual employees must be designated, that Neil Windsor or Ed. Roberts can be designated as being an essential employee and not the minister of this or the member of that. Now if that is the situation - I do want to wait until I get - no, I do not begrudge the minister checking or getting information to or from his colleague but I do want to have his attention - if that is the situation, perhaps the minister might tell us whether that is still the situation. It certainly was as of a week or so past, could the minister tell us whether he proposes to cause the employers - in some cases he speaks for them, in other cases they are boards who are independent corporate entities - whether he intends to cause the employers to apply? Because, of course, Mr. Speaker, as the minister will agree, the situation which could conceivably face this Province, and which some will say is likely will face this Province, is that at some point over the Christmas season the hospital support employees -

MR. E. ROBERTS: as I understand it every single hospital in this Province will be in a position where lawfully they can go on strike. And at present, and if Your Honour, would bear with me for a second, if no essential employees have been designated, then we are left with the situation where the only people available to provide services in the hospitals, assuming there are no picket lines crossed by CUPE or NAPE members, will be doctors, nurses and possibly a few X-ray and laboratory technologists. I am not sure where they fall in the collective bargaining, you know, who speaks for them in the collective bargaining sense. So could the minister tell us where we stand on this whole question of essential workers because the obvious danger is that at some point over Christmas or in the New Year we could

MR. ROBERTS: have a lawful strike which would close effectively every single hospital in this Province?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. the President of Treasury Board.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Yes, Mr. Speaker, that is accurate. We could, indeed, have a strike which would close all the hospitals, and as it relates to essential services, there is no provision, actually, for essential employees in this case. They are not covered by the particular piece of legislation, so there are no essential employees designated at this point in time. The hospitals have been negotiating with the unions to designate certain people as essential but it has to be by co-operation.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry, "It has to be" ?

MR. N. WINDSOR: With their co-operation.

MR. ROBERTS: There is nothing in the legislation?

MR. N. WINDSOR: No. We are asking them to co-operate and to designate individuals within a hospital to show us exactly which people they will be prepared to leave in to provide essential services. In many cases, this has been worked out reasonably satisfactorily.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you, Sir. The minister's answer literally astonishes me. It is not often that any of us is astonished by an answer, but it literally astonishes me. The minister is telling us that the legislation which the government brought in several years ago, and which the House adopted, has no provision for the designation of essential employees? Is that a correct statement? I mean, I do not quarrel, but I want to be sure I understand.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, the legislation does provide for that, but these particular employees do not come under that particular piece of legislation, they come under the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act.

MR. ROBERTS: The minister has lost me, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) A final supplementary, the hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Thank you.

It is not that he has astonished me now, he has confused me.

The workers in hospitals are certified by virtue of the Public Service Collective Bargaining Act, is that correct?

MR. N. WINDSOR: That is what I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that there is nothing automatic there at the moment. There are no designated employees.

MR. ROBERTS: I know there are no designated employees because my understanding is some action has to be taken by the employers to the Labour Relations Board. But the Labour Relations Board - now this is not my supplementary. I just want to be sure I know what I am talking about and then if the minister knows what he is talking about we will all go on from there.

The Public Service Collective Bargaining Act has in it a provision which says that the Labour Relations Board upon - and I notice the minister's colleague, the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) is nodding acquiescence, so I assume so far what I have said is correct - that employers may apply - and there is no restriction on what employees may be designated as essential. Anybody the Labour Relations Board deems to be essential is deemed to be essential and, therefore, loses the lawful right to strike. Now if that is the situation then that is at variance, Mr. Speaker, with what I understood the minister to say. Will the minister tell me, first of all, if my understanding is correct? And I think it is, and I notice his colleague, the Minister of Labour, is nodding acquiescence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: Well, let me ask the question. I mean, that was just to try to get some grounds laid out, because, you know, if I am wrong, I am wrong, and it would not be the first time and it will not be the last time.

MR. NEARY:

You are right on.

MR. ROBERTS:

I think on this one I am right on.

Will the minister tell us whether any steps are going to be taken to go through the procedures - because we are only a month away from the time when we could have every hospital effectively closed. And I will say to the minister, from what I recall of the halcyon days when I was Minister of Health, in the far distant past when things were done better and differently, if these workers withdraw their services, it will result, Mr. Speaker, very quickly, in every single hospital in this Province ceasing to be able to provide anything like acceptable or normal services. So what is going to be done about this essential services end of it?

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the Minister of Labour and

Manpower.

MR. DINN:

The hon. member is absolutely correct,

of course

Mr. Dinn:

Applications have been made to the Labour Relations Board over the past few years to get people designated as essential employees in cases of strikes.

MR. ROBERTS:

And the LRB do have the power

under the law?

AN HON. MEMBER:

Oh, yes.

MR. DINN:

And the Labour Relations Board does have the

power.

MR. ROBERTS:

So I did not need to be astonished.

MR. WINDSOR:

No, no. I said that they are not designated now.

MR. DINN:

But the fact of the matter is what the minister has said is true also in that they have not been designated, and the problem has been is that every time there is a request to the Labour Relations Board it is challenged through the courts.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What?

MR. DINN:

Yes. It goes from the Labour Relations Board, the challenge is made from that, an appeal is made to the courts, and we have never been able to arrive at a formula whereby people can be designated as essential. We have gone through several processes now, one is by job, the other is by designating the employee by name, and so on, and every time an essential employee has been requested by the hospitals or institutions or whatever -

MR. ROBERTS:

The employers.

MR. DINN:

- the employers, yes, it goes to the Labour Relations Board and has been challenged, and has been appealed, and, of course, the last discussions that I have had with the Chairman of the Labour Relations Board and with people in the department, we have arrived at a position where we do not believe that it is possible to get anything like designation of essential employees in case of this upcoming strike.

MR. ROBERTS:

Well, let us face it, it is ineffective to put it kindly in this instance.

MR. DINN: That would be relatively kind.

MR. ROBERTS: What is being done about it?

MR. NEARY: The government has not done its homework.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

We have about forty seconds left, time for one quick question.

MR. DINN: The hon. member asked what is being -

MR. ROBERTS: If none other of my colleagues rise, I would simply ask the minister, what is being done about it? I mean, are the government going to sit dumbly back and just watch the whole thing go to the Hades in a hand cart?

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated earlier we have had numerous discussions, the hospital boards with the unions, particular locals responsible in these hospitals. And there have been serious ongoing negotiations-for what?-I guess two or three weeks, even since the possibility of a strike loomed. The Minister of Health (Mr. House) indicated, I think a week or two ago, every possible step has been taken to provide for the most unfortunate circumstance that there may be a strike. And negotiations have been ongoing with these people to designate, as I indicated earlier this afternoon, in many cases hospitals have already designated too, the people that they would be prepared to leave on the job to provide these essentials.

MR. ROBERTS: (Inaudible) unions.

MR. WINDSOR: The unions rather, yes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for Oral Questions has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. POWER: I would like to table The Canada Games Park Commission Annual Report and financial statements taking in the period from August 1978 to the 31st. of March, 1979. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

NOTICES OF MOTIONS

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): The hon. President of the Council.

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

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Finance.

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) I think it was on November 21, requested some information in regard to fiscal agents, I wish now to table an answer.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER: Motion No. 3, adjourned debate, the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker, I would like to continue on for a few minutes with the remarks I was making the other day about the fishery and I would like to go on with a little more serious mood, I suppose, from the last day. I would like to, without sounding too much parochial, I would like to tell this House about a small plant up at Placentia that was built by the Area Development Association and developed into a real success story.

In 1977 the association launched an all-out drive to expand the facility. Through the co-operation of the provincial Department of Fisheries, with the assistance of Canada Works and the Small Craft Harbours a new slipway and gear storage site and bait depot and maintenance shop were constructed at Jerseyside, a new dock and site on Red Island where 80 to 100 people return every Summer to fish. Locals of the association are constructing new docks at Freshwater, Dunville and a new dock is funded for Fox Harbour this Winter.

Now, expansion of the plant at Jerseyside is best shown by comparison of these figures. In 1976, 1,430,000 pounds of fish were processed; in 1977, 1,730,000 pounds; in 1978, 4,430,000 pounds, eighty-five people were employed; in 1979, to date, 5,200,000 pounds of fish and 110 people were employed and approximately 2 million pounds of dogfish. Now, some of this dogfish, I understand, came from my hon. friend's district up there on the Burin Peninsula and from other parts of Newfoundland, but there is a great market for it and it is being shipped to England and also to Germany.

Now I think there is in fact I am sure there is, a great market for fish not only in America but in the Japanese market. I have a little book here Canadian

MR. W. PATTERSON: Fish for Japan. I do not know how many non. members opposite have received this book, or members on this side, but the book is published by the Canada Japan Trade Council, it is non-profitable trade association. I have copied a few things from the book which I think are of interest to us here and also to the fish processors in Newfoundland.

The introduction of the book says,
"Canada became the world's leading exporter of fish in 1978, moving up from third spot the previous year by means of an almost 40 per cent jump in export sales which reached a new high of 1.1 billion. Japan was Canada's second most important client for 1978 fishery shipment, taking 22.3 per cent of the total value of such exports. The U.S. ranked in first place, buying 49.2 per cent, and France was third with 5.2. The only other large 'overseas' markets were in West Germany and the U.K. Between 1976 and 1978 the value of fish product sales to Japan increased from \$77.5 million to \$245.4 million. These are expected to approach \$500 million in the early 1980's. It is fairly a dynamic new element in Canada's export business with Japan". It says, "Table 1 gives details of Canadian fish product export to Japan in 1976. In 1976 it amounted to \$77,476,000 and then in 1977 it went \$142,064,000; in 1978, \$245,404,000." Now deepsea fishing

MR. PATTERSON:

not only provides a nutritional source but also a livelihood for many. When Canada and the US decided that negotiations at the Law of the Sea Conference would not reach a speedy conclusion, both countries decided to follow the example of Peru and others by declaring a 200 mile economic zones off their shores. The actual demarcation of these zones is still a subject of bilateral negotiations between Canada and the US, but the implications for other nations have been obvious since 1977. Of 129 independent coastal states, 66 have declared the 200 mile economic zone. By mid-1978 all but a dozen of the rest were contemplating following suit. The reason for this rush to extend the marine jurisdiction was based on several arguments. One, the long range deepsea fishing fleets together with local fishermen had over-exploited many individual species. This practice is similar to clear cutting timber since both reduce the capital stock of the resource. The 200 mile zone gives an opportunity to the coastal nations, and especially Canada, to control fishing so as to enhance the long run size and extent of the marine resource. As the capital or breeding stock accumulates on the marine banks, larger catches will again become possible.

"Number two; the 200 mile economic zone gives control to the coastal nations of undersea mineral and hydrocarbon resources. While this is an important consideration for the Law of the Sea, it is beyond the scope of this presentation.

"Three; the 200 mile economic zone permits the setting of quotas for the allowable catch by traditional foreign fishing fleets operating within the zone. These have usually meant a stated reduction in the size and catch and also a requirement to take fewer young fish. This is not only for conservation purposes but also to allow domestic fishermen to gather their share of the allowable catch within the 200 mile economic zone. The coastal nation must police the zone to make the quota system work."

And then they go on to explain management of a common property resource." This is of course a well

MR. PATTERSON: known problem with the common property resource. It involves over capitalization of the fishing fleet. This was the case with the long-range fishing fleet of Japan and the Soviet Union and others. Too many vessels were chasing too few fish leading eventually to over-fishing. The same phenomenon could occur in the Canadian fishing industry if too many large vessels are attracted into the newly reserved 200 mile economic zone."

Now I am sure my hon. friend from Placentia West (Mr. Hollett) knows far more about the fishery than I do, coming from an area where the deepsea fishery, dragger fishery has been a year-round business for years and years and years. I will be anxiously looking forward to hearing his comments on this and I would be glad to provide him with a copy of this book if he does not already have one.

"The same phenomenon could occur in the Canadian fishing industry if too many large vessels are attracted to the newly reserved 200 mile economic zone. Indeed, the economist's pessimistic forecast would be for an expansion of crews and vessels, gradual over-fishing, falling price of fish and in the end bankruptcies and no improvements in the incomes of individual fishermen.

"This is the scenario that Canada must seek to avoid by insuring that expansion of the domestic fishing fleet is rational, that new species are sought as well as traditional and endangered species, and that new export markets are found that will sustain the price of fish in light of low consumption rates in North America. North American coastal waters contain between one quarter and one third of the world's most productive fishing grounds. These are now contained within the US and the Canadian 200 mile economic zones, but the most productive fisheries by far lie in the sub Arctic and temperate zones. Access either directly to these grounds or to the harvest from these grounds is of major interest to fish consuming nations such as Japan."

Well, there are many institutional organizational and financial burdens to overcome.

MR. PATTERSON:

"The outlook for Canadian East and West coast marine exports to Japan of new traditional species is excellent. It should be optimistically appraised in light of recent projections by the the U.N.Food and Agricultural Organization. Canada is the potential big winner from the 200 mile economic zone enforcements. Japan, on the other hand, will move away from self-sufficiency and being a major exporter to becoming the world's largest seafood importer by 1985.

"Evidently, prices must continue to rise to bring about supply/demand with the key strong position of the Japanese yen vis-a-vis the Canadian dollar. Canada will continue to offer the highest prices not only for additional fish species, but also for those items not consumed in great volume in North America. While the prospects of an excellent export market seem to be in view, the real question is whether Canada will bank these export winnings or squander them in a flurry of poor fishery organization and inadequate marketing."

That is where we are in Newfoundland today. I am glad that the Premier there has seen fit to take a look at certain projects that were in the fire, so to speak. I think we have to stop and look and find out where we have been and where we are going.

I think my time is just about up. As I have said, I will gladly give this book to my hon. friend over there.

It says, "Canadian Fisheries Policy: The federal government has made two major pronouncements on fishing policy. The first was in 1975, a policy for Canada's commercial fisheries. This policy enunciated twenty-five major strategies of which the seven most important were:"

I am sure the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) had some input in this since it was in 1975 the policy was formulated. They say, "(a) obtaining control over the fish resources throughout the 200 mile zone; (b) increasing knowledge of stocks throughout

MR. PATTERSON: increased research;
(c) basing allowable catches on economic and social factors and not on the maximum sustainable biological yield. Applying entry control in all commercial fisheries. Co-ordinating and rationalizing development of fleets and providing for withdrawal of excess capacity. Providing for rehabilitation and the enhancement of replated stocks. Removing subsidies, encouraging entry to the fisheries."

I think my time is up.

AN HON. MEMBER:
hon. gentleman.

Oh no, I will hear the

MR. PATTERSON:

Thank you.

"In 1977, there was a second block of policy announcements for the Atlantic fisheries. Several broad policies were announced and there were ten important points: (a) the fishing fleet and its capacity must meet the available resource. (b) there is a need to ensure an economic climate in which the owner or prospective buyer will make decision on replacements or additions based on his confidence in the future viability of his enterprise in the industry. (c) the resource needs of the inshore fishery must be safeguarded. (d) individual ownership of vessels will be encouraged. (e) the need for a federal credit institute to finance fisheries development and phased out assistance programmes will be pursued. (f) every effort will be made to improve Canada's access to world fish markets through the fisheries bi-lateral agreements, market and development. (g) short-term development arrangements and vessel charters between the private sector or government and the foreign fishing interests will have to satisfy the criteria of significant benefit to Canada. (h) cost of vessels should be based on world prices for equipment. (i) installation of infrastructure to improve fish quality and utilization will be encouraged. Fisheries should not be encouraged to solve social problems arising from causes other than

MR. PATTERSON: the fishery. Generally speaking, the federal government is much encouraged by the prospects for Atlantic fish business, a great contrast to four years ago when it appeared that the industry might go fin up."

MR. PATTERSON: I am sure there are others who would want to speak on this and I do not want to take that time away from them, and as I said, I would gladly make this book available there to my friends. And again I would like to congratulate that group up there in Placentia; it is all free work they are putting into this Area Development Association. And this has been a most successful year up there with 110 people employed and they have processed over 5,200,000 pounds of fish. I might add that this plant is operated by the Newfoundland Quick Freeze. It is leased by the Newfoundland Quick Freeze from the Area Development Association.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, it is obvious that Private Member's Day is not one that attracts a great deal of interest even when one is talking about such vital a subject as the fishery. But I think there may be a couple of reasons for this. One is historical. I said to somebody not too long ago that I would not be a bit surprised if somebody looked in the history books if they would not discover that the day after John Cabot's report reached England that the seas around Newfoundland were teeming with fish, the rows started over management and jurisdiction. And certainly our history indicates that we have had an unrelenting battle either between the fish merchants and the fishermen or between ourselves and foreign nations, and indeed even between various Canadian provinces, so that perhaps this is a subject on which indeed there is not a great deal more to say, and perhaps most of us are in a way resigned to the idea, as the Premier commented recently, to the fact that fish in Newfoundland is clearly and unmistakably an ongoing subject for discussion and debate, as it ought to be.

I do, however, want to say a few words this afternoon, trying to keep within the time limits that have been allocated under the rules and because I do want to do that

MR. JAMIESON: I am not going to cover the waterfront, as it were, if that is an appropriate phrase in these circumstances, but merely touch on two or three items in relation to the fishery which I think are of key importance and to which I would like to direct the attention of members opposite and indeed to everyone who is connected with the fishing industry.

I wish there were time to discuss in some detail the references to exports made by my hon. friend from Placentia (Mr. Patterson), because of course this is one of the key and tremendously important questions for the future. I hope that we will not be carried away by the euphoria of the most recent report which seems to suggest that we can double the market. Because you have to look at the qualifying phrases that are in that document before you realize that if we are going to, and I quite agree that the potential is there, that if we are going to really increase our export potential between now and 1985 we are going to need to do a great many things, very few of which, so far as I can see, are actually in place at this moment.

I should say also, as an aside, that I hope that the Government of Canada is going to be very effective during these next days and weeks in negotiating with the European economic community. Because if there is any real and immediate potential for increase it is in the nine member nation group of that particular organization. It is not going to be an easy task, and I repeat that I could utilize all of my time in explaining why. But I just caution that we should not, in this as in so many other things, simply assume that because certain trends appear evident at the moment, that the fishery is off and running, as it were, and that we no longer need to be concerned about it.

I believe that the prospects are good but let us not delude ourselves that there are a lot of hazards along the way, and among these, for instance, is the fact that of course the United States, which is our principle market at the present time, has

MR. JAMIESON: gained its own benefits from the
200 mile limit and as a result there is a revived interest among
American fishermen and consequently considerably more resistance
in very effective lobbying groups against further concessions and
intents on our part

MR. JAMIESON: to get a larger share of that important American market. Those hon. gentlemen opposite and on this side who from time to time have said that it is important that we diversify more are absolutely right, because we are in a very dicey position as long as we have such a heavy reliance upon the United States market.

My hon. friend has made reference - and I cannot resist commenting on it although I had not intended to when I arose - to the potential in Japan, for instance. I happen to know how difficult it is to break the tariff barriers that exist with regard particularly to fish products in Japan. I think we can do it with certain specialty items like caplin and squid and, of course, we are already starting to make a dent there, but let us not, again, assume that this is a continuing and a growing thing where each year we are going to see our fishermen benefiting more and more from these specialized species. Which brings me to the second point that I want to mention, and it is really that in a sense, although it is no fault of my colleague who put down this motion, it is really almost out of date even before we debate it, Mr. Speaker, because what it talks about in part, at least, a development programme for Newfoundland and Labrador fishing industry to 1985, has been proposed by the government. And, of course, when that resolution was put here, that was the case.

You will recall the document which I showed in the House a few days ago, Fish is the Future. It is a very, very specific piece of work backed up by - and I have received all of the copies, things like the Kellogg report which cost an enormous amount of money. And I do not know how many other surveys that were commissioned and carried out over the last four or five years so that we were assuming at the point when this resolution was submitted, which was back in July or August, that the fisheries strategy was in fact in place. Now we find that only a few days ago in answer to a question by me, the Premier said that they were reviewing it once again. So has the clock started on the five year programme, as we had every right to expect given the documentation

MR. JAMIESON: that was prepared for this House, or are we in fact talking about five years beginning at some stage in the future? Now I emphasize once again that, of course, I have said that we have been talking fisheries for 500 years and reviews will be constantly necessary, but there is one thing which this industry needs today more than it needs almost anything else and that is a degree of stability, a degree of assurance about the policy patterns which are going to be followed by the various provinces, including this Province, and the federal government, so that, indeed, they can do their own planning. Because let me assure hon. members that whatever governments seek to do that in the last analysis the impetus, the drive for the next five years or ten or fifty for that matter, the growth in the fishing industry, the biggest single part of it is going to come from the fishermen themselves and it is going to come from the companies and the various other organizations and not altogether or even totally through government action. And consequently, therefore, I think it is a dereliction of duty that the government has not in fact put into place a very specific programme, or having put one in place, more correctly, has now turned around and said, 'Well, by the end of the year we are going to have reviewed this again and there may be changes.' I am sure that the hon. the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) is probably quite pleased to hear that there has been some lessening of ardour for the superport at Harbour Grace and that right now we find that this almost centerpiece of the strategy of a year or two years ago is now being seriously questioned, not by us, but by those who have the responsibility for carrying out this particular project. I happen to, I think, know something about the background on this and can say entirely in a non-argumentative fashion that there is grounds for me to say, 'I told you so.' Because there were many, many reservations expressed about this kind of project away back two or three years ago when it was first advanced - not about the idea of a central point

MR. D. JAMIESON:

in distribution indeed much of that is going on already, but nevertheless this centrepiece is now becoming more of a side issue than really the sort of, in a sense, key element in the strategy. But be that as it may, I think the most important thing for the governments to do, here and in Ottawa, is to develop a strategy, say this is what it is, and then stick with it. That is the thing that is necessary. That has been the problem and, incidentally, to the degree that there is guilt associated with it, I suppose I have to accept some of it. But in any event I do know that there is a very great deal of importance now in saying this is the way it is going to go and that is how we are going to proceed. And you can be reasonably certain that barring unforeseen circumstances, or acts of God, or whatever the case might be this is what is going to happen in the fishing industry.

Now the next point that I want to touch on is the issue of Northern cod. And here once again, as with all of the subjects that are covered in this resolution and in the speeches of Hon. members, you could devote all the time that we have to this key issue. It is a bit ironic, I guess, that over the 300 years of history I do not remember ever having heard that particular expression, 'Northern cod' until about two or three years ago. In other words, it suddenly became the in thing to talk about the Northern cod stocks. I grew up hearing about the Labrador fishery and the northeast coast fishery, but there was never this direct association with a particular body of fish, if that is the appropriate term, and there was never the kind of argument that we are hearing today. But there is no question, in my mind, that there is an historical claim that Newfoundland has on what is now described as the Northern cod stocks that, whatever the jurisdictional issues may be, whatever the arguments may be between the government here and the government in Ottawa - and clearly the controversy on that particular issue is now over - whatever the arguments may be, the historical case is clear and unmistakable and, if I understood the Premier rightly, I agree with him in what he said the other day that the argument for Newfoundland having a prior claim and a special

MR. D. JAMIESON: attachment to those stocks on the Northeast coast and in the North is unquestionable in my judgement. I do not believe that any Government of Canada ought to, in the name of retaining jurisdiction, ought to try to allocate that stock in any way other than to ensure that it first and foremost is maximized for the benefit of the inshore fishermen of Newfoundland or whatever; if not all for that purpose then certainly for Newfoundland based, Newfoundland associated aspects of the fishery. I am not sure what the legal ramifications would be of going to court on an argument of that kind. But the case in history is so strong that I think that we, on this side would certainly be prepared to argue the prior claims and the prior rights of Newfoundland to that particular stock.

Having said that, by the way, I am somewhat concerned because we have not heard all of the details about references in the paper presented some time ago on bilateral issues between Canada and Newfoundland - that is, between the Government of Canada and Newfoundland - some concern on my part about what I think is described as concurrent jurisdiction. Now, once again, I am no lawyer but I have had a hell of a lot of experience in terms of negotiation and the like and I suppose the most hazardous kind of thing you can have, if I understand the words correctly, is concurrent jurisdiction, because if you run into a situation in which there is a stalemate, you have no capacity, no ability to resolve the question. It becomes all the more difficult, it seems to me, when, implicit in what is being said, is the fact that the same kind of concurrent jurisdiction would have to be extended to the Maritime Provinces, if not on Northern cod, as I said a moment ago, because of the historical background, then on a lot of other species in a lot of other areas. And so, therefore, concurrent - I do not know whether it can involve more than two; I am not certain if the word is capable of being extended to involve four or five or six governments,

MR. JAMIESON:

but I can assure whoever the successors are to hon. gentlemen opposite, and I do not mean that in the political sense because I say it is going to be so long in being resolved that the chances are that very few of us will be here, that it would in my judgement be extremely difficult, extremely difficult to have a situation in which constitutionally you would have five governments at least, including the government of the nation as a whole, all trying to get their share of the action under this concurrent jurisdiction. It would be far more logical, it seems to be far more sensible in the long run, for Newfoundland to assert some kind of special claim, or some kind of special right with regard to Northern cod, and then let the rest of it stay where it is in the hands of indeed the federal government, with consultation. And by the way, I have to say in defence of my former colleague, the Minister of Fisheries of Canada, Mr. LeBlanc, that the idea that there was no consultation is of course probably more politically inspired than anything else because there are gentlemen in this House this afternoon who know that there were a great many consultations that took place. And in the final analysis, you recall the history of the last twenty-four months or so, it was indeed the fact that the minister nationally did not have to share "concurrent jurisdiction" that enabled him to assign some eighty per cent of the Northern cod to Newfoundland when all of the Maritime Provinces were arguing about it.

So, therefore, all I am issuing here is a caution, a friendly caution, that we not be too sticky on these constitutional questions until we ask ourselves what the reaction is likely to be to that kind of an action. Incidentally it is interesting, and, by the way, a little worrisome, that the document to which I referred which is a list of the issues between the federal government and this government in Newfoundland, talks about the concurrent jurisdiction, the necessity for constitutional amendment, but after that says quite specifically that on any matters where there is disagreement, the

MR. JAMIESON:

Federal Minister of Fisheries

shall in effect, and I am paraphrasing, have the ultimate authority. It is going to be interesting to see what happens over the next year or two if there is in fact some serious problem that emerges because there is a clear concession in that document with regard to the ultimate rights. So what we are doing here I suppose is, in a way, throwing ourselves on the mercy of the federal minister, or hoping that the negotiating process, or the consultative process will resolve all of the problems. I merely hope that it does.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have been advised there are only a few minutes left and there are several other questions that I would like to touch on but I will do one at least because, once again, it is immensely important in relation to the export question which was raised many times during this debate.

You know, the conventional wisdom in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, has always been that upgrading was the answer and for many, many years I went along with this belief in exactly the kind of routine way that I suppose the vast majority of people in Newfoundland did. I assumed that somehow or other, if we had the capability of doing so, that upgrading would be comparatively simple. I have discovered since - wiser and older, if you like - that even if the tariff barriers that were always used as the argument are removed, and I suspect that over time they will be, that even if this happens, then we are going to be in a situation where the structure of the industry, as it exists at the present time, is such that the majority of the processing plants in Newfoundland, either already have upgrading facilities of some significant size in the United States - National Sea, Nickerson; I am thinking of them in particular.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Fishery Products.

MR. JAMIESON:

Fishery Products, and I think the Lake Company as well and that is the big four if you want to call it that. So that even if tomorrow, by some miracle, you suddenly had an absolutely open door into the United States with the most upgraded product there was, I cannot see how it is going to be to the

Mr. Jamieson:

I think it is likely to come in new species, perhaps dogfish, which the hon. member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson) talked about. All kinds of new species are coming on the market where it may very well be possible for us to do it through the incentive kind of route. But I assure hon. members, once again, and we will look back on this debate at some point in the future and I think I will be proven to be correct, that if we rely upon the market forces themselves then we will not get the level of upgrading that we are hopeful of and desirous of, and which, indeed, I guess, the government is committed to, and it will not come either, by the way, through incentives. Because if the incentives alone were enough, the hundreds of millions of dollars that have been put into the fishing industry by governments at both levels over the years would have done it by now to a much higher degree or a much greater degree than has in fact happened.

In the long run it is likely to take some kind of prohibition on the part of Newfoundland, I suspect, because the jurisdiction, I think, rests within the Province, some kind of prohibition against the export of fish products except at a certain level of production or something of that nature. If we are really going to maximize, and we mean what we say, then that is going to be the case.

One last point I would like to make, and that has to do with the spinoffs. Once again the theory, the theory advanced by the government, is an entirely logical one, and nobody could argue with it, that in order to maximize the whole total output of the fishery then we ought to be able, for example, to do more shipbuilding, that it is ridiculous, I thoroughly agree, to have Newfoundland companies, Canadian companies buying vessels in foreign countries when we have shipyards in this country and in the constituency of my hon. friend for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Hollett) capable of doing it. But let me assure you, Mr. Speaker, that here once again the economics, and I invite hon. members who are interested to look at them because

MR. JAMIESON: they are available quite readily to most people who are interested, the economics are such that without a tremendous change in the approach, probably principally of the federal government to the whole question of bounties or that type of thing, it will not be possible for these yards to compete on any kind of a consistent basis. It may be that one or two may do so because they have a linkage with the fishing industry - I believe the National-Nickerson Group has that kind of situation and there may be a capacity there for them to do something - but for the ordinary fish processing company to buy its trawlers or to get its vessels here in Canada will require significant changes. And by the way, I think that those changes - I note the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is in the House; he might want to have some of his people do a little work on this because I do not believe that the conventional approach of saying it is 25 per cent or 15 per cent or something of that nature on cost is going to be the answer - I think it has got to be something new and imaginative such as a higher rate of tax write off, something of that nature, because the yards will not be able to compete successfully under the standard formula. And the reason is simple - and I will not take very long to go into this because it is a complex subject - the reason is simple, that the minute that we increase the ante, shipbuilding yards in these other countries just jack it up that much further. So if it takes 25 per cent to get it built in Canada, the Japanese will say it will be 40, or the Spanish will say it will be 50, or they will do something so that the sheer formula of bounty or grant or subsidy is not going to turn this around.

Consequently I make this point because I worry sometimes that we may be coming too optimistic about the opportunities which are unmistakably there in the fishery, but which will call for an enormous amount of work

MR. JAMIESON: and real skill on the part of, not only the unions and the fishermen and people like that, but governments and anyone who has a deep interest in the fishery, to see that we get our way and skate our way around the hazards which are there at the same time as the opportunities.

May I, with the indulgence of the House, make one last point, and that is that underlining the change that is taking place in the fishery has been the new dramatic change in the representation through the labour union and the like. And I would recommend to hon. members opposite that in addition to providing, and I notice the Minister of Labour (Mr. Dinn) is here,

MR. JAMIESON: and I believe he might be prepared to agree with me that unless the trade and the unions meet other than in confrontation across the bargaining table, if that is the only time when the representatives of these thousands of Newfoundlanders and their employers get together, we will not get the kind of relationship, the kind of co-operation that is going to be necessary.

Now, one or two organizations already exist, on paper at least. I have the impression that they are not - nobody's fault, perhaps - but they are not working as effectively as they should be. But one of the things which will be, I believe, imperative in the next three or four months - and I do not envy whoever it is that is going to have to arbitrate with regard to the whole new negotiating stance that is going to be taken by both the companies and the union - but that the unions be given sufficient information that they can believe what is being said to them about the costs and the receipts and the prices which the processors are getting.

I have represented the South Coast riding for thirteen years or more, and the biggest single difficulty - and I am sure it is the same in other parts of the Province - is that they do not trust the figures when they are given to them, if they are given to them at all, by the processing companies.

Now, I believe once again that there is - I would have to refer to the records to be certain - but I believe that there is the bare bones of a provision somewhere now in the legislative cubbyholes which provides for this kind of thing. But the government has its own ways, and certainly the federal government has its ways of getting at the data, getting at the information. And I would recommend on an urgent basis to this government, whenever it gets a new Minister of Fisheries or in the review that is now underway, I would recommend that it take as a priority the provision of some mechanism whereby we can eliminate this mistrust between the companies and the unions when it comes to the question of pricing, the question of overhead, the question of cost. This is where it always bogs down, and it is

MR. JAMIESON: extremely difficult to resolve.

I emphasize once again, Mr. Speaker, that I appreciate the tolerance of the House in terms of giving me what I am sure was more than five minutes, but in any event, I will not indulge it any further. There are many other things that I would like to say, but this resolution calls for a full debate on fisheries and I am sure that in the weeks, months and years ahead there will be many more opportunities and that, I hope, will give me a chance to say some additional words on this subject. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (SIMMS) The hon. the Minister of Finance.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

DR. J. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words in this debate, and I see the applause is not deafening. Now the reason for that may well be that it may be thought peculiar that someone from one of the St. John's ridings speaks on the fisheries. Well, of course, one cannot support that sort of thought. Anyone in Newfoundland certainly has not only the right but also the interest to speak on the fisheries. In my own case, I come from a very important fishing district. Now this may be news to some people, that St. John's South is a very important fishing district. My district, Mr. Speaker, I think contains the largest fish plant in the Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about Marystown?

DR. J. COLLINS: Well, that may be. I grant the hon. member that, that Marystown may be larger, but I think it is probably a short head. The National Sea plant on the Southside employs something of the order of 500 plant workers. I think they will probably land and process something like fifty million pounds of fish this year. There are something of the order of six or seven trawlers working out of the plant. So this is a sizeable and very important undertaking. And, of course, it is well in the tradition of the harbour of St. John's. Historically, I suppose if one put all history together, the harbour of St. John's saw more fishing going on than any other part of Newfoundland, Marystown included, if one looks at it in a broad historic sense.

DR. J. COLLINS: Another factor, I think, that may be forgotten in terms of St. John's and the fishery is that clearly here we have the biggest market in the Province for the locally landed fresh and consumed fish. Now it is not exploited nearly to the degree it should be.

MR. HOW. MEMBER: Nova Scotia.

DR. J. COLLINS: Yes. We certainly do not serve ourselves well in that way, but the potentiality is there and there is, in actual fact, quite a thriving amount of business going on not only at the Southside fish plant but also at the small boat harbour at Quidi Vidi and from the nearby communities in terms of locally consumed fresh fish in the city of St. John's.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to cover one or two points. One of the points that was brought up by a number of speakers, I believe, and, I think, by the Member who opened the debate, was the question of whether this administration is really looking too much towards offshore oil when we think of the ocean out there.

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I want to go into that a little bit and perhaps also associated with that is the thought that we are running a risk in terms of the fishery by pursuing this because of the dangers of pollution and the danger of general disturbance of the fishing effort.

Well now, Mr. Speaker, I think one has to look at this in a very factual way. I would like to, just before making the point in that regard, just to look at a few facts and I might mention that there has been a fair bit of general talk, I think some of it perhaps bordering on rhetoric but nevertheless some good remarks in the policy area, too, made in this debate, but there has not really been a very factual nature put forward with the exception of my hon. friend from Placentia who actually did bring in quite a number of factual data. I would like to throw a little bit of factual data into the pot too, Mr. Speaker.

I have a few figures here. The total landings in 1975 were 272,000 metric tons, this is landings of all sorts of fishery; in 1979, the figure was 397,000 metric tons. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is an increase of 46 per cent in that period from 1975 to 1979, that is a very significant increase in the landings of fish in this Province.

MR. S. NEARY: Thanks to the 200 mile limit.

DR. COLLINS: The 200 mile limit was clearly a very large factor in it, no one gainsays that. Now, Mr. Speaker, at the same time the total value of the landings went from \$48.3 million in 1975 up to \$114 million, that is the value of the landings in 1979. That is an increase of 135 per cent. Now, on those two figures—the total landings going up 46 per cent, the value going up 135 per cent,—it would seem that, you know, we almost have to look in no other direction for our salvation.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think one has

DR. COLLINS: to look at another figure to see if that is so. In 1977, there were 16,000 licenced fishermen in the Province. Now, this is not to say that all the licenced fishermen prosecuted the fishery for the whole year or even for perhaps an appreciable part of the year, but nevertheless there were 16,000 federally licenced fishermen in the Province. In 1979, there were 30,000, that is this current year, there are 30,000 licenced fishermen in this Province - a remarkable increase.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if you look at those figures, in other words, if you take the figure that was applicable in 1977, on an average basis that works out roughly \$5,000 per licenced fishermen in terms of the landed value of fish. It is a very average figure and it is probably not of itself too meaningful except if one uses it in comparison with something else. And the comparison is this, that in 1979, even with that increase in the amount of landings, even that marked increase in the value of landings, but at the same time with the marked increase in the number of licenced fishermen, we find that that average figure goes down to \$3,800. In other words, Mr. Speaker, we cannot, even if we would like it, even if we wanted to and even if our hearts were in that direction - and I suspect they are - we cannot depend on the fishery alone for our salvation. We will just soon run out of the capability of supporting the numbers of people who have to find employment. So, we do not have a choice really between offshore oil and any other activity, but I just want to confine my remarks at the moment to the oceans. We do not have a choice really to say we will either have the fishery or we will have the offshore explorations for hydrocarbons. We have to have both. If we rely on one, we will not achieve the objective we want for our people; we have to have both. Now, this is not to say that we must not pursue these both extremely carefully, clearly we must; I mean, it would be foolhardy to the extreme to pursue offshore hydrocarbon exploration in such a manner that it would

DR. COLLINS: seriously work to the detriment of the fishery. This is what government management is all about. We have to do them both; we cannot rely on just the one.

Now, Mr. Speaker, another subject I just want to touch on because there was some criticism raised on it, and that is in regard to the Fisheries Loan Board. It has been stated, it has been confirmed by government that the Fisheries Loan Board has had difficulties in this current year, it has had very serious difficulties. I am not intimately knowledgeable with the workings of the board, but I bring forward this point, Mr. Speaker. We have had this marked increase in the number of fishermen and at the same time we have had a very, very marked increase in the number of licensed fishing vessels of all sizes. I do not have early figures, but even in this past year there has been an increase of 2,000, from 16,600 registered vessels in 1978 to 18,700 vessels in 1979. And if my memory serves me correctly, in the 1975 period, I think, there was something of the order of 9,000 to 10,000 registered vessels. So we have had an extremely rapid increase in the demands put on the loan board and in the resources available to it and on the management expertise available to it. Hon. members will remember that we wished to involve those engaged in the fishery, not just civil service, not just businessmen, not just bankers or accountants or whatever. We also wanted those who were engaged in the fishing industry to have something to do with the management and allocation of funds available to the board. This is not an excuse, but it is just a factor, I think, that has to be borne in mind. There has been such an expansion of the fishery, encouraged by this government, desired by all our people, an expansion in the fishery in terms of not only the fishermen but also the boats, of course, they had to use to prosecute their occupation, that the loan board was put under tremendous pressure, and it was clearly such a tremendous pressure that its organization did not allow it to handle it in an efficient manner and government is now in the process of rearranging the management and

DR. COLLINS: the organization of the board so that it will be able to discharge its duties in a better fashion in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the question of jurisdiction came up, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition alluded to this, and I must say that I welcome—and I think I read him correctly—I welcome his support and I am sure all of this side of the House welcomes his support for the thrust towards the use of the northern cod for Newfoundlanders. There may be some differences in the approach by the two sides of the House in terms of this, but I think it is welcome to hear, it is good news to hear that the hon. Leader of the Opposition and his party essentially supports that the northern cod should be used not only for the inshore—and I think I interpret his remarks correctly—not only for the inshore fishermen of Newfoundland but indeed for Newfoundlanders in total, that this should be the main concern in whoever has the jurisdiction to allocate the northern cod, that should be their main concern, that this Province, which historically has had the right to prosecute that fishery and indeed to the limits of its capability did prosecute that fishery in terms of the Labrador fishery and so on, that this will continue in the future, and that is welcome.

Now I would just like to bring up one other example where it is so important to pay attention to the jurisdiction in regard to the fishery. Hon. members will understand that on the George's Bank there were negotiations between the United States and Canada over the fishery in that area down there.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) oil.

DR. COLLINS: Well, oil comes into it too, and the line is going to be important in that regard. But just dealing with the fishery, that this was important to both nations. Now a deal was struck and this deal was welcomed. I must say that during the deal the Province of Newfoundland requested that they be allowed to have some status in the negotiations, be it as an observer or whatever, and that was not given

DR. COLLINS: to the Province of Newfoundland and
I think it was most unfortunate. This is the point I am trying to make.

MR. JAMIESON: Would the hon. minister yield -

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

MR. JAMIESON: - just for a comment or a question?

I simply want to say to him that I think if he looks at the record
that the conclusion at the end of the request between Newfoundland

MR. JAMIESON: and the Government of Canada for status in those negotiations, it was mutually agreed that it was not desirable. I can give all of the reasons and I believe some of them came out in private conversation to which one of your colleagues was privy the other evening, but I can assure you that it was not - I hope the implication was not that we refused. They knew all the information but it became wiser to stay out.

MR. SPEAKER(Sinms): The hon. the Minister of Finance.

DR. COLLINS: Yes, I clearly accept that. The point I am making is that the approach was made. It did not come off. Whether it was refused - and the hon. the Leader of the Opposition says that it was not refused, and I certainly accept that - it was mutually decided not to ahead with it, I still make the point that this was must unfortunate because when the deal was struck down there, what did we find? We found that the Nova Scotians and the Maritime provinces in particular, they let all the cod go, they were quite happy to be left with the scallops.

Now, that in my mind raises a question; why would they disregard the cod down there, and there were many fishermen in the Maritimes who said that this was a mistake, why were they quite happy in letting the cod go? The Fishery Minister in Nova Scotia said, "This is a great day for our Province when this deal was struck." So there is no doubt about it, that officially they were quite happy to have a cod allocation. And I suspect that they were looking elsewhere for a cod allocation. They were quite happy to let the cod allocation go down there so they could get a very large share of the scallop fishery because they had the eye on our Northern cod. I think this is where, if we had observer status, at least, we would have been able to raise the red flag.

Also, it was not just those two species involved. I think there was a total of twenty-eight species involved some of which are important to us. For instance,

DR. COLLINS: redfish is one of the species involved there and this is the species that ranges widely, including into our area.

The United States achieved a very large allocation of redfish down there and not the Canadian side. This again might, in fact, turn out to work to our disadvantage. I am merely trying to emphasize the point that the jurisdictional question has to be very carefully followed, had to be looked at in all possible guises and we would be ill-advised if we did not keep our guard up on the jurisdictional question to the maximum degree.

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

MR. JAMIESON: I hope you would agree this is an informal afternoon.

DR. COLLINS: Surely.

MR. JAMIESON: May I just ask the hon. member if he is aware that that treaty has not yet been ratified by the United States and that, indeed, the likelihood of it being ratified in the immediate future is extremely remote? I make the point because it does reflect on the whole bargaining process that went on - and it is in answer to his question; he said he wondered why certain allocations were made and so on. It was a negotiating process and the American fishermen are applying extreme pressure and it is doubtful, I am told, whether there will be swift ratification of it. I just wanted him to be aware of that fact if he was not.

DR. COLLINS: Yes, I was aware that it had not been ratified. Now, whether it will be or not is another matter. I believe, also, it is renewable in something like ten years anyway. So, I mean, there is clearly some protection there but I still think my point is valid.

Another figure that might be helpful here is to understand that we still have a very large

DR. COLLINS: foreign offshore effort in the Canadian jurisdictional waters. In 1978, there was a total of nearly 400 - there were 397 - foreign offshore vessels prosecuting the fishery in our area, in what might be called the Newfoundland area of the offshore area.

In 1979, that has improved somewhat. There were 277 licences in this current year so there is some improvement there. But there still is a very large offshore effort out there and our aim, of course, is to reduce that to the absolute minimum.

Mr. Speaker, the last point I should like to make is this; who ultimately will and should own the fishing effort in this Province? Now, it obviously would be very desirable for Newfoundland ownership to be paramount, but it is not going to be easy to achieve that. The way things are going, it seems to be a further and further dream. Development in this Province, I suppose, if one looked at the broad terms, is going to depend upon our hydro, our offshore it is going to depend on our mining and it is going to depend on our forest industry, leaving

DR. J. COLLINS:

aside the fishery for the moment. Now all these are very expensive to develop. There are tremendous investments involved in all these, except for perhaps some parts of the forestry, but certainly in mining, certainly in hydro, certainly in the offshore.

The investment that is required for any of these is so huge that it is unlikely that there will be much of a Newfoundland handle on any of it, with the exception I suppose of hydro. On the other hand, our other major resource, that is the fishery, really lends itself to multiple small investments, small investments that can be handled in the Newfoundland context. And I think that this is the way we have to approach it. We have to try to encourage on a multiple small basis Newfoundland investment in the fishery. Now if we do not do that what will happen otherwise? If we do not do that we can clearly see the day when what is almost now the multi-national in the fishing industry will take over. And we are seeing that increasingly now. We see that with National Sea. We see that with Nickerson.

MR. NEARY: Is that your government's policy to (inaudible) multi-national - (inaudible).

DR. J. COLLINS: The aim and objective of government policy is to encourage Newfoundland ownership, but we have to recognize it is extremely difficult to counter these influences that are posed against us. And I think it would not be acceptable to Newfoundlanders to go the traditional way, which was to subsidize merely a few small "Newfoundland organizations" such as the Lake group, such as the Monroe group and so on. I do not think it would be acceptable if we subsidized those to the degree that they could face up in competition to National Sea and so on. We have to go the other route of subsidizing, encouraging, stimulating the many small fishing enterprises that are still present in our Province. But we have to add this proviso, we just cannot leave them at that, if they are to compete they will

DR. J. COLLINS: have to be formed into consortia and, in particular, they will have to be given considerable back-up in their merchandising clout. This is an area perhaps that we have not paid attention to to the degree we should. We are doing quite well in harvesting, I suppose, we are not doing too badly in terms of processing, but we really have not put our backs into merchandising, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson), I think, made this point too, that we will not break into other markets unless we do much better than we have been doing in the merchandising aspect of things.

With those remarks, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add to this debate and all I can say about the motion itself is that this has been a very useful series of discussions. We have now covered the field and I do not feel there is much need to go further with it.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for Torngat Mountains.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to speak in support of this resolution. Looking at, "Therefore be it resolved that the House fully debate all aspects of the fisheries," Mr. Speaker, I do not see anything at all wrong with that resolution. I believe it is high time that this House did sit down and fully debate the fishery which is of the most concern to most Newfoundlanders in this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to learn that the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) does have some connections with the fishery, having represented St. John's South which has the second largest fish plant in the Province.

During the past provincial election we heard the name coming up more than once, the name of Fish and Chips. Now we do not have a fish minister as such in this House, but probably

MR. WARREN: it is a grave concern. Now, the minister himself is saying that. And the hon. member who brought in this resolution is saying exactly the same thing and that we should debate it. So if a member on the opposite side of the House is saying that it is a mess, why should we not debate it?

Mr. Speaker, there were indications and indications expressed by the member for Placentia (Mr. Patterson), that fish is very important to our Province. And unfortunately, this white paper that came out for a five year plan has not been debated in this House and I believe it is high time that we as members, representing fifty-two districts in this Province, should sit down and debate the vital item that is important to the lives of people in this Province and that is fish.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to dwell a little on the Loan Board because to me it is more than in a mess, it is in shambles.

MR. R. MOORES: Now.

MR. WARREN: It is complete turmoil.

MR. R. MOORES: Hear, hear!

MR. WARREN: You know, I wrote to the Acting Chairman of the Loan Board on October 2, asking for information. He could not even send back any information to me. And it was just basic information. Only just last week I wrote, on November 19, asking for a simple question, how many applications have been submitted from residents in the Torngat Mountain district for loans? How many applications are on file that have not been approved? And I got an answer back saying, "We acknowledge your letter, we will pass it along to the Acting Minister to see what we can do". And this was from the Acting Chairman of the Loan Board.

Mr. Speaker, just to reiterate some other things that are going on with the Loan Board and the bounty applications and so on. A member of the Provincial Department of Fisheries went into Cartwright on April 19, seven months ago, six or seven months ago, and measured a boat belonging to a fisherman who was planning to prosecute

Mr. Warren: the fishery there in June. That boat was measured up and all indications were it qualified for the bounty application. You know, that man has not to this day received a reply from the Loan Board.

MR. MOORES: Now.

MR. WARREN: He has not received as much as a reply saying that we got your application.

Mr. Speaker, the Premier there some time ago brought out a press release and he noted that there are almost 32,000 licenced fishermen in this Province, an increase of 11,000 over the past two years. I think the big question we should ask is, of those 32,000 fishermen, how many are real fishermen? How many are real licenced fishermen? I know people who got fishing licences to go out and catch fish for the winter, are they qualified fishermen? They got a licence. And this is what the Premier is saying here, 'licenced fishermen'. There are several hundred people in my district alone who can go out and catch fish for their own consumption and they need a licence to do this. Is this what the Premier is calling licenced fishermen?

Mr. Speaker, the Premier also said in this release, "At present there are 600 applications still on file, involving approximately \$30 million". Now, the fishermen in this Province, in Labrador and on the Island portion of the Province, are not receiving any correspondence back from the Fisheries Loan Board. You know, there are fishermen who have as high as \$4,000, \$5,000, \$6,000 and \$7,000 tied up in the Loan Board. It is just left with the Loan Board. The fishermen's money is left with the Loan Board.

MR. WARREN: It would be okay if they were going to invest it for the fishermen and allow the fishermen to get 7 per cent or 8 per cent interest on it, but it is just lying there. Is the Loan Board using this money to finance the Loan Board itself? And here are the fishermen, in cases, having to go to social assistance in order to get along month by month because their money is tied up in the Loan Board for the past six or seven months. And this is happening, Mr. Speaker, and it is a very serious case.

I had a call not too long ago from a fishermen saying, 'Will you contact the Loan Board for me and tell them to send back my money. I need my money for this month. The money is tied up since last April.'

Mr. Speaker, I have only about a half hour and I am sure that if I want to go right on through the fisheries it is going to take much longer than a half hour.

I want to mention that the gear subsidy programme was announced by the former Minister of Fisheries on August 9th. Now one time in this hon. House, shortly after that, I mentioned this same gear subsidy programme. Incidentally, this is the first such programme that has been introduced for fishermen in Labrador. Fishermen on the Island portion of the Province had gear subsidies before. But there is one grave concern expressed in this whole philosophy of gear subsidy. What it is doing is telling the fishermen, 'Look, we will subsidize a new gill net for you, we will subsidize a new cod trap for you, but we will not subsidize the limit that goes in your cod trap.' Or say, for example, this year - and I think we are all aware of it - that there are many, many whales in our waters around the Island. And a whale goes through a fisherman's cod trap and probably does \$300 or \$400 worth of damage to the twine and headings and lead ropes and so on. Now, do the fishermen have to throw away all of that cod trap in order to qualify for a subsidy on a new cod trap? That is what this subsidy gear programme is saying. And, you know, it does not make sense - more or less, 'Throw away all the fishing gear you have now and we will help you with new gear.' But no fishermen in this Province throw away

MR. WARREN: their old gear, they mend their gear. If they need new rope for their gill net they will buy the new rope, but this subsidy does not include that. So how in the heck is this subsidy going to help the fishermen? It is okay for a new fisherman just starting, but what about the fishermen who have worked by the sweat of their brow for the last ten or twelve years to make ends meet?

MR. NEARY: Oil is all they are interested in.

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I think there is definitely too much concentration on oil. All we hear about, in fact since June 18th after we got sick and tired of fish and chips - all we hear about is oil and no chips.

AN HON. MEMBER: And no oil.

MR. WARREN: And no oil either.

MR. NEARY: Right. There is more oil in the base pan of the wife's car.

MR. WARREN: I agree with that too, Mr. Speaker.

I have a book here, Labrador Resources Advisory Council - Policy on Fishery in Labrador. I want to quote from this book. It says on page one that the people want a living developed. 'All the people on the coast are dependent on the fishery.' Now this was a quotation from an LIC seminar in 1978. You know, 95 per cent of the residents from Nain down to L'Anse-au-Clair have to depend on the fishery for survival because there is no other major industry in that area. Now, all they want is recognition, Mr. Speaker, and that is not happening.

By 1974, draggers from foreign countries fishing off the Hamilton Banks pretty well depleted the fish stocks. From 1972 to 1974 there were less than 2,000 quintals of fish caught all along the Labrador Coast because the Hamilton Banks was just cleaned out by foreign draggers

MR. G. WARREN:

and longliners from other parts of the country. Mr. Speaker, since then we have had the 200 mile limit come into effect and it has been a godsend. And only now are there indications that the fishery is returning to the Hamilton Banks. But on the other hand we can also see at the same time multi-national companies coming up towards the Grand Banks. We can see the Wickerson's, the Fishery Products and so on coming up there and not giving the inshore fishermen the opportunity to reap the harvest.

MR. D. JAMIESON: You cannot catch the same fish twice.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, that is true as my hon. friend the Leader of the Opposition says, "We cannot catch the same fish twice", and fish do have tails. Mr. Speaker, just to tell you that in a small community of forty-two fishermen-I just want to illustrate to you what was happening with national companies, large companies. This summer at the prime time of the fishing season, seven days the fishermen went in there and had to go back and sit on their fannies because there was no salt supplied to the fishermen, no salt in the area, not a crumb of salt. And fishermen lost seven days of the best fishing in many, many years.

MR. S. NEARY: Where was that?

MR. G. WARREN: In Rigolet, just outside of Lake Melville.

And here were the fishermen who were making a half decent living and right in the middle of the summer, bang no salt! Now to make matters worse as of today the fish that was caught in Rigolet during the summer is still there left in storage and there is no salt brought in there for next year's operations. Now this is what you mean by companies not giving a damn about the small fishermen. Mr. Speaker, the illustrations that I am throwing out now are enough in themselves to have this House debate the whole philosophy of the fishery in this Province.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, we can go on and on. We have heard this government during the past three or four years, the Minister of Fisheries coming up to Labrador and saying "Look, boys you fellows have to get into the longliners, that is what you have to do, get into the longliners". We had a fisherman in Gain this Summer who went and purchased a longliner 14 odd thousand dollars, it was a second hand one, he applied to the loan board and the loan board said, "No, we cannot finance you because she is over thirty-five feet". Now, I have not seen a longliner yet under thirty-five feet and here is the government on one hand saying, "Look, get into the longliners", and on the other hand the loan board is saying, "No, boy we cannot do anything because your boat is over thirty-five feet."

Mr. Speaker, my colleague for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) spoke last Wednesday concerning the national companies moving into his area. We had indications this Summer that fishermen could not come and unload their fish to a private fish plant or into the government fish plant because of multi-national companies being in there tied up to the wharf and it was playing havoc with ordinary fishermen. Mr. Speaker, I can go on and on. I am going to quote something that was said in 1976 by Don Snowden from Memorial University and this concerns the Southern portion of the Labrador coast. He says, "It is one of the richest areas of the mid-North and they are insignificant in the immense resource extraction that goes on in the sea off their coast". Now, this was said in 1976 and we know today that the multi-national companies know this, this is true, but the ordinary fishermen are not given the opportunity to harvest the products.

Mr. Speaker, in this white paper
on page 29

MR. WARREN: I do not know what the purpose of it was but - I do not think anyone else does really - but it says on page twenty that approximately 200 people are working at fish processing in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, there are approximately twenty people working at fish processing in Labrador because there is no fish processed in Labrador, the fish it taken to other parts of this country and sent down to the United States to be processed. There are not 200 workers. There are 200 workers in the fish plants. There are 200 workers there helping to clean the fish but there are not 200 workers helping to get that fish ready for the table.

Mr. Speaker, this government has said time and time again that we need bigger fish plants. In Nain and Makkovik this past Summer we were unable to cope with the fish coming in because the fish plants are inadequate. We have fishermen in Davis Inlet who had to throw away their fish. There were over 8,000 pounds of salmon, a very delicate fish, that were graded number 2. Why was it graded number 2? Because of this government. That is exactly the reason why. Because this government operated two fish plants in Northern Labrador but they did not have ice. The ice was not available to keep the salmon frozen until it got to the fish plants.

Mr. Speaker, this was brought to the attention of the provincial Department of Fisheries during the Summer. We have fishermen in Davis Inlet who had to wait days for the collector to come there with that ice and this caused the salmon to become number 2, and to be dumped in the long-run.

Mr. Speaker, we came a long way during the past years in fishery development, in the whole fishery programme in Labrador. I must compliment the present government. They did do a lot to help with the fishery but there is still much, much more to be done.

MR. NEARY: What did they do?
MR. WARREN: Well, they built the two fish plants.
MR. NEARY: Oh no they did not.
MR. WARREN: Oh yes.
MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon.
MR. WARREN: Well, they increased them, they improved them, but not enough.
MR. NEARY: I was the one who built the fish plant in Nain and started the one in Makkovik.
MR. WARREN: Yes, you started the one in Makkovik but they finished it, see.

So, Mr. Speaker, the fish plants are there. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) may have started the fish plant in Makkovik but this government has finished them up to the point that they are still not adequate. What is am saying, Mr. Speaker, is regardless of how much you do there is still much, much more to be done. Until we can sit down in this House and stand up in our turn and debate the whole philosophy, the whole policy of fishery development in this Province - we get up on this side of the House time and time again and say, 'Look, all you fellows are concerned about is oil.'

If we pick up a magazine there are thirteen pictures of the Premier in an oil rig. I do not see thirteen pictures of the Premier with a fishing outfit on.

MR. NEARY: No, that is right. Hear,hear!
MR. JAMIESON: Do not encourage him.
MR. WARREN: Probably next month we will.

It is amazing the number of phone calls we get and I am sure the government members get also. People are more concerned with other problems than with oil and the major concern is the fishermen.

As the Premier said, there are 32,000 fishermen. Let us base that on a family of four. That is nearly one-quarter of our population depending on the fishery.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I think my time
is pretty well consumed.

MR. NEARY: By leave.

MR. WARREN: I will just stop now. I
have a few other things to say but I believe that I -

AN HON. MEMBER: Carry on.

MR. WARREN: - will forget about it.
I want to bring up one other
item that is very important and it does concern the fishermen.
From Nain down to L'Anse au Clair, of the 95 per cent *who* are
fishermen 70

MR. G. WARREN: per cent are fishermen who use outboard motors and small boats. This is the way they fish, with small boats and outboard motors.

Now, this has been a tradition for years and years and they are going to continue it because this is where they are most comfortable, in the small boat, a twenty-two foot boat, probably, or twenty-five foot boat with a twenty or thirty or fifty horsepower outboard motor.

MR. NEARY: And one man maybe (inaudible) and his

MR. G. WARREN: And usually one man and his wife, probably, helping him. Now, what I am getting at is that the Loan Board, when it was operational and that is some time ago, would give loans to anybody with an inboard motor. Anybody with a diesel motor or a gasoline motor or inboard motor would be able to obtain a loan from the Loan Board. But no fisherman can obtain a loan, or could in the past - no one can now period - could obtain a loan for an outboard motor to prosecute the fishery. Now, I am going to throw this open as a suggestion and as a sincere suggestion for the fishermen, in particular along the Labrador coast, who depend on an outboard motor for their livelihood, that if the Loan Board is reactivated at least consideration should be given to fishermen who use outboard motors to prosecute the fishery. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER: (Mr. Baird) The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. H. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a few remarks concerning this resolution. I feel, Sir, that after two days of debate concerning the fisheries, I am sure

MR. H. YOUNG: we could go on, Sir, during the full term of this session and there would still be something to be said about the fisheries. I feel that after two days of debate the resolution itself is totally useless. And the other day I was listening to the member for Trinity-Bay de Verde and his remarks on radio. It, Sir, was the same old negative attitude of the Opposition concerning the fisheries, it was the same negative attitude that they used when the joint ventures were in, it was the same negative attitude as when Nordsee was discussed and now it is the same old negative attitude as they used with the distribution centre or, as some like to call it the superport.

I was listening to the member from Torngat Mountains concerning the fisheries. I understand that the hon. gentleman worked with the Department of Fisheries on the Labrador Coast and I trust that some of the problems he had down there, he tried to iron out while he was working with the department.

What is concerning me, Sir, about the landing facilities in the Harbour Grace area and the negative attitude of the Opposition, is that one must realize now that there are 10,000 metric tons of fish being landed in Nova Scotia and that will probably increase over the next three or four years. I feel that we in Newfoundland, regardless of where the superport goes, we must have landing facilities. And in today's paper, Sir, it says that Canada can more than double fish exports by 1985. And it says here, Sir, 'By 1985,' said the report, 'the TAC for Canadian cod will be 680,000 tons with all but 20,000 tons of this located on the East coast. The TAC for the Northern stocks will be in the range of 350,000 to 400,000 tons an estimate which has recently been revised upward to this level on the basis of recent data on stock recovery.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that we as a Province

MR. YOUNG: rubber factory, or the chocolate factory, or the battery factory, or the glove factory, and one could go on and on. I have no intentions of fooling the people of Harbour Grace. The people of Harbour Grace were fooled once before when Birdseye came there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who owned it?

MR. YOUNG: Pardon?

MR. NEARY: Who owned it?

MR. YOUNG: Birdseye?

MR. NEARY: Yes. Who was responsible for that?

MR. YOUNG: Joey was responsible. 17,000 people in Harbour Grace and 20,000 people of Port de Grave.

MR. NEARY: Frank Duff Moores.

MR. YOUNG: Frank Duff Moores sold it out. He was made to sell out. He was told to sell out or they would close him up.

MR. NEARY: No. Do not be so foolish boy.

MR. YOUNG: And you were a part of the government of that day.

MR. NEARY: Do not be so foolish boy.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. NEARY: That is where he made his money. That is where he made his killing.

MR. YOUNG: He made it by the sweat of his brow.

MR. NEARY: Yes, no doubt about that.

MR. YOUNG: Look, if anyone is successful in business the hon. member is dead opposed to him. That is one thing about the hon. member, if you are successful in business in this Province the hon. member is up gabbing about you, and calling you down to the dirt.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. YOUNG: The hon. member never earned a dollar by the sweat of his own brow I do not suppose in his life.

MR. NEARY: I am not out chiseling the poor people in times of sorrow. I am not out chiseling.

MR. YOUNG: That is a profession and I am proud of it.

MR. NEARY: Enjoying the -

MR. YOUNG: I am proud of it.

MR. NEARY: (inaudible) raised the high cost of dying in this Province. The hon. gentleman knows all about that.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, the fish plants in the Conception Bay area, Sir, only work about -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh;

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

MR. YOUNG: - four to six months a year and I feel that there must be work nine or ten or eleven months. I have no arguments with my colleague from Placentia (Mr. Patterson) when he expressed his opinion concerning the superport in Harbour Grace. He has read the Kellogg Report, I have not. And he got his own opinions concerning the oil refinery in Come By Chance. He is at liberty on this side, the freedom we have to get up and speak how we like and when we like. We are never told what to do.

Now, Sir, I am proud that the money has been spent by this government since 1972, since I have been a part of this government, in the fisheries. I would say it is about ten times, probably, ten times what was spent, more than that, I suppose, in 1971 and 1972.

MR. DOYLE: Fifteen times. Fifteen.

MR. YOUNG: Fifteen times, the hon. member tells me. The budget in 1971, the Minister of Fisheries of that day -

MR. DOYLE: \$2.5 million.

MR. YOUNG: - I suppose it was about \$2.5 million. What is it today?

MR. DOYLE: \$29 million.

MR. YOUNG: \$29 million.

MR. NEARY: Every fish plant in Newfoundland, except Arnold's Cove, was built by a Liberal Government.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I think the best thing for me to do, instead of going arguing with the hon. member, I would like to close my remarks, Sir, by quoting from the bible. Now, Sir, this is from the new English version and it is from Matthew VII, verses 1 to 5. Now, Sir, this will sum up the attitude of the Opposition.

"Pass no judgement and ye will be not judged. As you judge others so will yourselves be judged. And whatever measure you deal out to others will be dealt back to you. Why do you look at the speck of sawdust in your brother's eye with never a thought for the great plank in your own? Or how can you say to your brother, 'Let me take the speck out of your eye,' when all the time there is a plank in your own.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).

MR. YOUNG: You hypocrites. First take the plank out of your own eye and then you will see clearly to take the speck out of your brother's."

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, whether I am going to be judged or not I certainly feel that the matter of the fishery in this Province -

MR. NEARY: He is probably getting your measurements while you are standing up there.

MR. HOLLETT: - in this Province is worthy of taking that chance. And I find it somewhat disappointing, through this debate, that there is a lot of reference back to the '60's, '70's, early '70's, last year even.

MR. NEARY: Step into the '80's.

MR. HOLLETT: I think that if we are going to make progress in the fisheries in this Province we have to look towards the future.

SOME NON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT: And I use that expression deliberately. And I might say, Mr. Speaker, that for a person who represents, if not the largest fish producing district in this Province, certainly very close to it, I am certainly very proud to be in a region that on a per capita basis produced more fish than anywhere else in this Province, or probably Atlantic Canada. We do not look upon fish with any negative attitude. To us it has been a way of life since the first settlers. We have not deviated from the fisheries since that time. And I might inform this House that everybody who lives in that region and on that Coast are very, very proud of the accomplishments that we have made

MR. HOLLETT: and those of us, the few who visit there or care to visit, can see what hard work : economic progress can be derived from a well thought out and a well implemented fishery programme. I might say that compliment individual fishermen and companies who functioned in that area during the years. If they had to wait for the guidance of government in the total sense we would still be back in the 1920s. The people on that coast have worked and worked hard and they deserve every credit that can be given them either orally, financially or in any other manner. As a matter of fact, I am quite proud here this afternoon to have in this House a gentleman who is probably, certainly in my opinion, one of the most innovative thinkers in the fishing industry, who has done more probably as an individual in the fisheries than any other one person that I have had the pleasure to call a friend and he is sitting right here in the gallery.

Mr. Speaker, this is the type of person who made the fishery. Mr. Harvey Major.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT: Who started in from Petites and worked his way up the hard way like most people did on that coast.

MR. STAGG: Tell us more about it.

MR. HOLLETT: If you would like to know, the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), I would be only too proud to tell you about it. Born in Petites, worked hard, fish plant manager, Fishery Products, Booth Fisheries, boards of directors, innovation in relation to fishing equipment, types of boats, a helper to all the inshore fishermen, Danish seining and I could use up the twenty minutes on the gentleman if you would care for me to and be quite proud to do it.

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. HOLLETT: That is right. And I am glad to see him here.

MR. STAGG: Is he a PC?

MR. HOLLETT: I am not aware of the gentleman's politics. He probably would not have been quite as successful in his job if I did know.

MR. NEARY: Any party would be glad to have him.

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, in relation to the fisheries and even in relation to the remarks that the hon. Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) made, I am quite happy to know that they have the second largest fish plant in St. John's. I am also very proud to know that the majority of the crews who land all the fish to keep the industry going come from our region. And the other point, Mr. Minister, he is a man, if you have not met him then I recommend that you do, he is a Captain Kelly from a little place called Beau Bois. It was either last year or the year before his boat landed more fish than any other one boat in Eastern Canada, 9.5 million pounds.

DR. COLLINS : Who did you say it was again?

MR. HOLLETT: Kelly, Captain Kelly from Beau Bois. Those are the types of people who are not just in St. John's or on the Burin Peninsula but in Nova Scotia, in PEI and the New England states. And even back in the years gone by when there were draggers in Harbour Grace, they were also crewed by men from that coast. They are the guts of the deep-sea fishery in this Province. They keep it all going Winter and Summer. They are the ones that insure that on the Burin Peninsula alone we have close to 3,000 full-time, year-round workers in our fish plants and I am happy to say are earning high wages and have a very, very good way of life which they are all proud of.

MR. STAGG: How much do they make on the average?

MR. HOLLETT: Plant workers, \$12,000 or \$15,000. Deep-sea fishermen, in excess of \$20,000. Shore fishermen, all inclusive in excess of \$20,000. It is a good way of life, Mr. Speaker. And this is why I would like to make a few comments in relation to the Minister of Public Work's (Mr. Young) comments on the Harbour Grace abortion. To me the idea of one port - and those of us who have taken the trouble to study the Kellogg report, it is quite clear the recommendations,

MR. HOLLETT: What I consider our prime product, anywhere from 10 to 12 to 16 cents a pound less than is being paid for products from Iceland and Norway and those countries. It is because the best quality in this Province - and a lot of the plants produce good quality - is mixed with the average. Unless we can get every plant up to a high average then the companies in this Province are going to still lose that 'x' number of cents per pound on each pound of product exported. If the fish has to trucked long distance into a large freezing plant in Harbour Grace, the quality has to deteriorate. It would deteriorate again, to a certain extent, when it is defrosted. Therefore, we will be shipping, to a great extent, an inferior product again, and to me and to a lot of people in this Province it makes a lot more sense to regionalize the freezing process. If it is in Argentina, as is presently, if one has to be on the Burin Peninsula, another one elsewhere where there is an abundance of fish in a glut period and otherwise, there is no problem at all to ship it to a central point after it is processed and frozen or frozen and transported, because it will not deteriorate while it is frozen in the transportation stage. So, I think this problem has to be looked at quite seriously, and I am in full concurrence with my colleague from Placentia, that if this superport concept goes ahead as outlined in the Kellogg Report it is going to mean that in areas that have traditionally relied totally on the fisheries in this Province it will detract from the initiative, the quality of the product and the way of life, and I do not think anybody here would like to see that happen.

Mr. Speaker, I should point out that I am no expert in the fisheries, but I have worked with it and lived with it directly and indirectly all my life, and certainly I am quite proud to be associated with most things that are good in the fisheries. I find it somewhat amusing even now to see tender calls for 'x' boats to experiment, you know, to experiment, to do the same things, the same type of fishery that was proved successful back in the early fifties.

MR. HOLLETT: Probably we should put the right perspective on some of the things that have been done in this Province, and let us start with what we know will work. You know, back in those days Danish seining was first introduced to the Western North Atlantic by Newfoundlanders successfully. The first stern trawler in North or South America was into Grand Bank, the very first. We hear a great flap now about freezer trawlers. Well, the first freezer trawler fished in this Province, the name was the Zeeland owned by Fishery Products in Burin about fourteen years ago. There are presently freezer trawlers fishing out of ports in this Province for specific species, such as shrimp, in particular, and for experimental work. I have found it somewhat amusing the other day, and to a certain extent amusing because I just could not believe my ears when the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), the ex-member for Burin-Placentia West, referred to the scientific community in this country as eggheads, that is what he said, 'eggheads.' Now, Mr. Speaker, if that is the thinking of the Cabinet, and I am sure it is not, what he did first, he directly insulted a large group of Newfoundlanders who have worked darned hard to be amongst the top marine biologists and oceanographers, not just in Canada but in this world. I have had the privilege to know a lot of them and work with them over the last eight, ten years. I know how hard they work. They are recognized in the international community in the total sense. They are invited to fisheries symposiums in Moscow, you know, in Denmark. Every one that goes on that has anything to do with the North Atlantic, the Pacific and elsewhere, Canadian scientists are there. If we are going to have a policy in this Province, you know - the Premier said the other day that we should have more input in licencing. I agree, and I can assure you that I could speak for two hours on licencing nonstop, but the fact is right now in this Province that if we are going to have a reasonable and rational licencing policy, we have to depend on our scientific community for the basic knowledge. That comes out of Ottawa primarily. However, we have two scientists with provincial Fisheries, whose job basically

MR. HOLLETT: is to take all this information and compile it and then put it in layman's language so that we can all understand it. And the fact is, Mr. Speaker, that the information they give comes from the eggheads in Ottawa, then eggheads here have to put it in language so that we can understand it, and certainly, if our fishery policy is going to depend on egghead information or information derived from eggheads, then we know right now what our policy is going to be, it is going to be just straight scrambled eggs. Mr. Speaker, for this side of the House, I would like to assure those so-called eggheads that we support fully the efforts of the scientific community that has done so much for our fishery over the last ten years. Sure, we question some of their decisions, sure, we question some of the proposals that they come out with, but we have to start somewhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we talk about the scientific community and we talk about local knowledge and we talk about the total input by fishermen and others, then we also have to talk about what is actually happening in the fisheries now. I, for one, am very suspicious of what is happening to our squid. Information says that there is squid in abundance, but I also think we have to remember that about ten or twelve years ago there was caplin in abundance. And we all know what happened. Last year the caplin fishery was cut off because it was proven, either because of overfishing or a problem of nature, the caplin stocks just went down to literally nil. We know, because of that, what happened to the most lucrative fishery in this Province, the one that will land the most fish and make the fishermen the most money, the trap fishery, this current season - a blank all over this Province.

We do know that the squid is part of the food chain. Now, with the caplin being decimated to the level that it has and all of us working our best to do the same thing with squid, if it happens to that - and then we hear the member for Harbour Grace (Mr. Young) talking about the TAC, then if those stocks are to increase -

AN NON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. HOLLETT: No. If those stocks are to increase, then there has to be a food chain system for the cod and the flounder

MR. HOLLETT:

and other species to feed on to grow.

It is pretty basic, I think, to anybody and I think we have to be looking at all those problems.

Mr. Speaker, while we are on the fishery problem - I would prefer not even to mention it, but because it is directly related - I would like to state emphatically, I am saying here now what I honestly believe, but more important probably, the concern a large group of fishermen, fish plant workers and deep-sea fishermen and owners of companies have brought up to me in the last month, certainly since last Summer. I do not think there is one person in my riding or in this Province who would wish us all other than well in relation to our oil exploration. We all realize what it can mean to our Province. However, after watching the blow in the Gulf of Mexico last Summer and then, it periodically coming up on television, in the papers - I think there was in excess of a million barrels of crude spewed out of the well in very shallow waters in a very warm climate before the best technology in this world today was able to cap it. I shudder to think what would happen if we have a large oil find. I shudder to think, Mr. Speaker, of what would happen if we have a similar blow and especially if that is in February with slob ice, Southeast winds at fifty or sixty miles an hour for two or three weeks, which we often have, with the Labrador current running South down over the Grand Banks. I shudder to think, Mr. Speaker, that the real possibility here is that we could have up to 50,000 Atlantic Canadians out of work - that is the reality of it. And on that basis, I certainly caution this government and everybody else to go very slowly to make sure that this will not happen to our fisheries. Because, as said by the hon. the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) and others, the number of people with a licence, 32,000 - or half that number, to be factual, you know, just in this Province that number of fishermen, the number of onshore workers - I do not know what ratio is used now, if it 3.5 to 1 for the service industry in relation to the fisheries, I would suspect it is that or more - just in our Province alone, if something like that happens, all the oil in the world will not replace it.

MR. HOLLETT:

Mr. Speaker, I can go on and on and on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave!

MR. STAGG: Come over here.

MR. HOLLETT: I would probably have to exchange with the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) if his inference is proper.

MR. STAGG: They do not want me over there.

AN HON. MEMBER: They sure as hell need somebody on fisheries over there.

MR. HOLLETT: But, Mr. Speaker, I would certainly be remiss if I did not express my own feelings on this question of freezer trawlers. I have already said it is not a novelty to this Province. I believe that there is a requirement for freeze at sea capabilities for a specific species and certain type fisheries once again. I do not believe that we need \$15 million boats in this Province, ice reinforced, to possibly go and do, as the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) mentioned earlier, rape the Hamilton Banks, to rape the Northern Cod stocks when it is spawning. I think our conventional wet trawler as it is called, with freezing capabilities, can do an adequate job for the processors in this Province. I do not see where a company can afford to amortize it especially with the prices of construction as referred to by the hon. Mr. Jamieson or the hon. member for Bellevue and supported by the hon. Minister of Fisheries because the price is exorbitant in relation to amortization. I think we would be much better served especially with the energy crisis, if the type of boat that is designed, the wet fish trawler is probably smaller in size than what we are using now, with good catching capabilities. Because we have to remember, even the conventional boat now is consuming something like 15,000 gallons of fuel per trip which drives the cost way beyond any sort of an economic reality. So with the large ice reinforced freezer trawler I can visualize just what would happen. Once again the Labrador Coast could be void of any real inshore fishery. The Northeast Coast could be and many other sections of this Province. And as already stated this afternoon you cannot catch the same fish twice.

MR. HOLLETT:

If they are going to go out and stay for extended periods and catch the fish before it comes within the sixty mile range or the hundred mile range of the near offshore or inshore fishermen the same thing will happen.

Mr. Speaker, I think I have used up my time. There are many others things I would like to speak to but I am sure before this House adjourns there will be ample opportunity. I would welcome hearing from members opposite, how they really feel about the fishery. There is one thing to believe in it, Mr. Speaker, and there is one thing to work for it. But there is the complete opposite I find in some members who just give it lip service. Now to me lip service is not adequate. In full support of every fisherman, every fishing company, everybody is involved directly and indirectly with the fisheries in this Province today because, as indicated by some statistics which I always question, the future in this Province is the fishery, not in the total sense but I will say as far as 75 per cent it is the fishery in all aspects. And we have to work and work hard, we have to co-operate in what is good for the fishery and promote it. And I think we should all reserve the right to question or to debate what we feel is wrong. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (MR. SIMMS): The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am going to get back to the resolution now that is before the House and just say a few words with respect to the government's position concerning this resolution and why the resolution is not in its present form acceptable to the government. We have had a very good debate here in the House from all sides, both sides. There have been many constructive things that have been said in the course of the debate, many constructive observations. And I suppose a bystander listening to the debate and hearing the way the debate has gone, might wonder as to why anyone would vote against the resolution because we have not really been addressing

MR. MARSHALL:

the resolution in the past two days. It has been a beneficial debate with respect to fisheries. But when we vote on this resolution today we carry or otherwise as a resolution of this House a certain statement and that statement is contained in the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde's (Mr. F. Rowe) motion on the Order Paper which reads, the essence of it is: "Resolve that this House fully debate all aspects of

MR. MARSHALL:

of the fishery.' I do not know why that was in the resolution, because he brought in a resolution to debate the fishery, in the course of the debate we are debating the fishery, and then at the end of it he asked we debate the fishery. Anyway, he has it there, "That this House fully debate all aspects of the fishery in order that", now this is the purpose of it, "the government may be directed to develop a strategy for 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". So this particular resolution then, Mr. Speaker, implies that this government has no policy with respect to fishery and it needs to be directed by this House to bring in a policy with respect to fishery for the Province of Newfoundland, and as has been indicated by the speeches, it is not only from this side but from the other side of the House, this government does have a policy with respect to fishery. It has been spoken on for two days. Some of the members there opposite may feel that the policy is inadequate, may wish to change it and wish to alter it, but it has never been challenged in the course of the debate that the government has had a policy. Maybe there are certain members on all sides of the House who think that there should be certain refinements, but, indeed, to pass this resolution would constitute, really, a vote of non-confidence, really, in the government with respect to - so let there be no doubt about that. Now, I do not want to get in at this late date because it has been such a good and it has been such a beneficial debate - I do not want to get into a partisan area but the fact of the matter is I do not see how this government could be - how it could be said that this particular government has not got a fisheries policy. In the 1969, I agree with the member for Burin - no, the hon. member holds up the Oil Week, you see, the thirteen pictures and this is all that the hon. gentleman has got left to talk about now, and this is what he is trying to propogate throughout the Island, that this government does not care one iota about the fishery, that all it is

MR. MARSHALL: concerned about is oil and this is really what they hope to be able to put across to the people of Newfoundland. But I am quite sure that the people of Newfoundland will not accept this because they have seen, over the past seven or eight years, the expenditure in the Fisheries Department of this government increase not by 100 per cent, not by 200 per cent but it has increased 20 times, 20 times, at least 20 to 30 times. Today, I forget exactly the amount but if memory serves me correct it is between about \$30,000 and \$40,000, I believe, this year. In the Fisheries Loan Board, itself, the much maligned now Fisheries Loan Board, the budget for that this year is four times what the total budget was for the Department of Fisheries in 1970-1971. So, this government has, as I say, a very strong policy and the policy has been debated. It meets with the approval of some and it meets with the disapproval of others, but to vote for this resolution, for the government to vote for this resolution would be tantamount to the government voting non-confidence in itself.

Also, Mr. Speaker, the resolution itself is very confusing as well. He says that, the hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde (Mr. F. Rowe) says that we should fully debate all aspects of the fishery in order that the government may be directed to develop a strategy for the fishery. Yet, further up in the resolution, he says that a development program for Newfoundland and Labrador fishing industry to 1985 has been proposed by the government without the benefit of debate in the House of Assembly. Now, does anyone see any inconsistency in that in the very words of the hon. member? He says when he starts off that the government has a policy with respect to fishery up until 1985, but it has not been debated in the House, and then later on he wants to condemn the government because it has no policy in the fishery. The resolution itself does not make sense. As I say, it is confused. Now, I could go in a long harangue on what this government has done with respect to the fishery of this Province, but I think it would destroy the tenor of the debate that has occurred and the very high level and high plane of the debate

MR. W. MARSHALL: that has occurred in the house with respect to this resolution and far be it from me the wish to lower the tone of this House particularly at this late stage of the day. The reason why I am getting up and speaking, Mr. Speaker, on this matter is to point out quite clearly that this government is full-fore for the fishery. The fishery would not be as strong in this Province today but for this government.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: It was this government that got the people in Newfoundland the feeling of pride in themselves once again, the pride with respect to the fishing industry. It was this government that rejected the policy of driving people out of the smaller communities into the larger communities, away from their fishing grounds. It is this government that has adopted a policy with respect to the diversification of the fishery in this Province so that the people of this Province nowadays are making a very much firmer living from the fishery than it was possible in years gone by. It is this government that has opened up negotiations and has seen the necessity of joint jurisdiction in the fishery and that the people of the Province have a right and a need for a say, not only in their own destiny but in the marketing, not only immediately within the bounds of this Province but outside in order to bring it about effectively. And I could go on and on and on. The fishery in this Province as it presently is today is a monument to the Progressive Conservative Party of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL: So the hon. gentlemen there opposite can bring in all the resolutions that they like but I am quite sure that they are very, very much in a minority in this Province today when they ask that the government be directed to bring in a strategy to develop the fishery, as if this government had none. Indeed, the fishery would be non-existent, as I say, today but for the tender, loving care and the resurrection of the fishery in this Province by the Progressive Conservative Party of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. W. MARSHALL:

We stand firm here. The unfortunate part about it is that the news has not got out yet apparently in all of the real smaller, smaller areas of the Province and in certain segments of the Province. But the word is getting out and in the near future we will be able to sweep the hon. gentlemen there opposite who represent really - they are the resettlement party, we are the fishery party of this Province. But we have no intention, Mr. Speaker, of voting for a resolution which is at once in its term confused, that says we have no policy and then farther on it condemns us. It mentions the fact that we have one for 1985 and we no intention of voting for any resolution, no matter how softly it is put before this House of Assembly and no matter how friendly the debate may be, which is going to direct this government to bring in a fisheries policy when it has had one shaped and in effect for some eight or nine years and we will have the opportunity, Mr. Speaker, for the next two decades, to bring in further improvements and refinements on it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS):

Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the said motion? Those in favour, 'Aye', contrary 'Nay'.

I declare the motion defeated.

Motion No. 4.

The hon. member for the Bay of Islands.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. L. BODDROW:

Mr. speaker, we will go now from the fish to the oil because oil is indirectly involved in this motion. As I expect to see the moon raised several times.

Mr. speaker, I would like first of all to read the motion that I proposed on the opening day of the Thirty-eighth General Assembly of this hon. House of Assembly. And it reads as follows:

WELCOMES the actions of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries have given rise to great increases in the price of imported oil coming into Canada; and,

MR. L. WOODRUM:

WHEREAS the world is facing the distinct possibility of severe shortages in the supply of oil in the near future; and,

WHEREAS our energy resources should be conserved for the use of future generations;

BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED

MR. WOODROW: that the Governments of Canada and of the Province be commended for their efforts taken in the area of energy conservation particularly the recent signing of a DREE subsidiary agreement on renewable energy sources; AND BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that both Governments be encouraged to vote even more attention to this critical problem so that consumers of energy in the Province will be assured of stable and low cost sources of energy in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Good stuff. Good stuff.

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, because of the importance of this motion to the Province and to Canada at the present time, I have prepared a text and I will be reading most of it.

AN HON. MEMBER: Do not tell the Speaker about it.

AN HON. MEMBER: The gospel according to St. Luke.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I request to be heard in silence. Will you please come to my aid. Oh Lord make haste to help me.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. member has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. WOODROW: When I think of all the petitions proposed last year by the hon. members opposite and by myself, of course, and they look upon this thing as a joke. It is a serious matter because some of the people in LaPoile may freeze this Winter

MR. NEARY: This is an oil rig.

MR. WOODROW: We are slowly but surely becoming an energy saving nation and, indeed, an energy conscious world. This occurred not by choice but by necessity. That covers a

MR. WOODROW: lot of ground.

MR. JAMIESON: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: It is nice to have the hon. the Leader of the Opposition in such a jovial mood. He will make us all happy at Christmas.

MR. JAMIESON: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: I was going to suggest that he give us his record. He should give all of us a complimentary record.

Due to the considerable reliance on petroleum producing countries outside our country and increasing energy demands at home, prices for petroleum products have soared over the past number of years and will continue to increase in the foreseeable future. A tragic thought.

While Canada's domestic needs can be satisfied as the result of a fairly stable supply within our country, conservation measures must be established and enforced to ensure that our energy requirements can be met further down the road.

Energy conservation, Mr. Speaker, is often a question of attitude. I am thinking at the present time, believe it or not, of the Right hon. Prime Minister, Joe Clark. I do not know how many of us saw him sitting in his living room with a heavy sweater on giving an example to the nation of how we should try to conserve energy. In other words, keep the thermostats down.

MR. JAMIESON: That was because he forgot to take it off.

AN HON. MEMBER: Keep the home fires burning 'Luke'.

MR. WOODROW: I must say I am so happy. I think, really, it is the first time since the hon. the Leader of the Opposition came to the House that he had the opportunity to hear me speak. For my speech on the Speech from the Throne, he was not here. I started to give him some glowing reports and I

MR. WOODROW: I still can, he is one of the greatest Canadians, one of the greatest Newfoundlanders. I, for one, am definitely and really proud of him. I am so proud of his being here now as we give this little speech.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. JAMIESON: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: God bless him. Maybe he was looking for a little bit of attention, who knows?

AN HON. MEMBER: Go on over 'Luke'.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

AN HON. MEMBER: Stand up and the rest of us will be quiet.

MR. WOODROW: Energy conservation, Mr. Speaker, is often a question of attitude. Consumers of energy must

MR. WOODROW: come to realize that the wasteful and often extravagant habits of our modern day society must be altered.

AN HON. MEMBER: What kind of car do you drive?

MR. WOODROW: What did you say, I am sorry? I beg your pardon?

AN HON. MEMBER: What kind of car do you drive?

MR. WOODROW: I drive a 4-cylinder at home in Corner Brook, an 8-cylinder here.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Okay? It is a necessity of my work. I want to continue in the House of Assembly to help the people in the Bay of Islands, I have to keep two cars.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: Very good. Keep the smallest one at home. While this is a lengthy process, as I suppose we are talking about the change in people's attitudes, while this is a lengthy process we have begun to change. We have taken a change in attitude, in other words. Recent studies of consumer response to rising oil prices in Europe and Japan show it takes six to eight years to alter energy buying habits - six to eight years. In other words, you cannot do it overnight. I would submit it could take considerably longer to alter our North American buying habits where they throw away disposable - disposable aids are commonly accepted. Thus, the energy conservation ethic must be instilled in the public as early as possible and, indeed, the process is, I believe, well underway.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: That is it, right you are.

AN HON. MEMBER: Give it to her.

MR. WOODROW: Yes, I am taking my time, you know, I am taking my time. There is lots of time. This is a very important topic, and as my former friend - yes he is still my friend, the former member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir used to say, you know, 'lots of time,' nobody could rush him or anything, you know. Even the hon. member from Bonavista North (Mr. Stirling) cannot ruffle me anymore

MR. WOODROW: He tries a few times but it is nothing. Newfoundland and Labrador, perhaps more than other province, finds itself in an energy squeeze. It is the second poorest province in Canada.

MR. FLIGHT: We need oil.

MR. WOODROW: Now is the time to raise the book, because when we get the oil this is going to be the richest Province, the Alberta of the East.

AN HON. MEMBER: Go get it.

MR. WOODROW: Where is the book, hon. member from - It is the second poorest province in Canada, has the highest rate of unemployment, yet it is faced with the highest per capita energy cost in the country. Our variable climate and often harsh characteristics dictate a fairly high level of energy consumption, this would apply to the hon. member from Torngat (Mr. Warren), because it is so cold, much colder down in Labrador than it is, I am sure, over here in this Province. You would need two sweaters on. Any energy conservation programme must fit our Newfoundland circumstances, which in many ways are unique. In the past number of years a number of important steps have been taken and a number of programmes formalized to ensure that the conservation ethic becomes a way of life in our Province. Now, this is really what is being done, what has been done.

The Province has signed an energy bus agreement. The hon. members have not heard of it? The hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) - energy bus agreement.

MR. NEARY: Is that bust or bus?

MR. WOODROW: No, that is fine - I am not politically violent, They say the Liberals did it, I am delighted to hear it, I am delighted to hear it. In fact, you know, this is - here comes my hon. friend from the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts), he is always glad to see me - ignored me altogether, you know. No matter who did it- it is nice to see you aboard.

MR. WOODROW: The Province has signed an energy bus agreement with Ottawa, whereby Newfoundland administers and operates a computer equipped bus which does on-the-spot energy audits and analyses for government buildings and industrial and commercial applications. Okay? Response to the energy bus programme has been excellent in the

MR. WOODROW:

three months it has been in operation.

MR. NEARY:

Ninety-nine per cent of the people never heard of it.

MR. WOODROW:

I know, I agree with you but it is up to us to go out and tell them those things.

MR. NEARY:

That is what I mean, right.

MR. WOODROW:

The hon. member should be on the radio out in Corner Brook and the one in Port aux Basques telling all those things.

AN HON. MEMBER:

He is. He is.

MR. WOODROW:

Along with all of us together.

MR. NEARY:

I would rather get on and talk about (inaudible).

MR. BAIRD:

I thought you were going to talk about oil.

MR. WOODROW:

Now, this year potential energy savings in the order of \$1.5 million have been identified in a wide-range of public and commercial buildings as well as industry. Well, Mr. Speaker, that to my mind, is a good start and I do not mind saying that I feel that the lights should be off, for example, in this building. You see them swinging night and day. The lights should be off in the Sir Richard Squires Building over in Corner Brook and in the hon. Speaker's district, the building over in Grand Falls as well.

MR. MORGAN:

Let there be darkness.

MR. BAIRD:

And in the freight shed in Port aux Basques.

MR. WOODROW:

Yes, the freight shed in Port aux Basques. We could not do that.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. WOODROW:

Yes. And perhaps we should be more - I had to be economical - I want to look at the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) I am sorry - I had to be economical in my upbringing and in my former profession. I often had to use, as the hon. Leader of the

MR. WOODROW:

Opposition (Mr. Jamieson) knows, maybe a forty watt bulb where I could have easily used a sixty or a hundred watt bulb. So - pardon?

MR. ROBERTS: The member (inaudible) about a building. I wonder would the hon. member permit a question?

MR. WOODROW: Anything at all, we have a few more minutes. I will be glad to get a question from the hon. -

MR. ROBERTS: I came late to the feast in one sense but I thank the hon. gentleman, Mr. Speaker. He spoke of Your Honour's building. I was not aware Your Honour was in the building business but many strange things are done in the land of the midnight sun. The hon. member for Bay of Islands (Mr. Woodrow) was formerly and may still be West Coast assistant to the Premier, and I do not remember. Perhaps he could tell us if he still is. And if so, does that give him a space in the building in Corner Brook? That is what I really wanted to know. Because he talked of buildings and I want to know whether he has space in the -

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible) take it under advisement.

MR. ROBERTS: I would not listen to what the gentleman for Lands and Forests (Mr. Morgan) says. But I mean I asked the question in sincerity, I do not know.

MR. WOODROW: I do not think.

MR. ROBERTS: Hold on now. Is the hon. gentleman still the West Coast assistant to the Premier and if so does he have a space in the building in Corner Brook?

AN HON. MEMBER: But he does not know yet, he does not know.

MR. WOODROW: The hon. member is trying to ruffle me, that is all he is trying to do. It has nothing to do with the present motion.

MR. ROBERTS: The hon. member spoke of buildings.

MR. WOODROW: It has nothing to do with the present motion and he is just - in fact, he will not ruffle my feathers one bit.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: The Province will hopefully continue the task of developing further information programmes aimed at increasing consumer awareness of conservation measures. Well, in fact, I have mentioned a few and perhaps when other hon. members get up to speak they will also mention others.

MR. ROBERTS: Only the minister's hairdresser knows.

MR. WOODROW: I do not mind the hon. member for the Straits of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts). In fact he is a good friend of mine. In fact he is just trying, as I said, to ruffle my feathers a little bit but he cannot do it.

To briefly outline the initiatives in energy conservation.

MR. ROBERTS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Now, okay some more of these. I really feel, Mr. Speaker, it is amazing how this has taken on such an air of gladness. It sort of seems like a joyful occasion. Well, this to my knowledge, is a very important topic.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right.

MR. WOODROW: And I will tell you how important it is. Perhaps some people, in fact, this Winter as I repeat again, God knows they could freeze because of this energy crisis and the like. Now, to briefly outline the initiatives, it is not likely - how long do I have, Mr. Speaker, how many - twenty minutes?

AN HON. MEMBER: Four minutes.

MR. WOODROW: It is not likely I will finish but I will have occasion to close off the debate. In any case to briefly outline the initiatives in energy conservation -

MR. NEARY: Let us call her off.

MR. WOODROW: - the Department of Mines - you would love to -

MR. NEARY: Turn off the lights and all go home.

MR. WOODROW: And hear the trash from you which I have heard for five years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Repeated over and over again. So we are saying something conservative and something, you know, really worthwhile. The hon. member said, 'Close her off.'

MR. NEARY: That is not becoming of the hon. gentleman.

MR. WOODROW: I know. The Department of Mines and Energy has appointed an energy conservation officer whose responsibilities include the co-ordination of the Provincial Government's Internal Energy Conservation Programme providing assistance on energy conservation matters to the private sector in liaison with the federal government and federal job creation

MR. WOODROW: creation projects in the energy conservation field. Number two, the department also has on staff an energy conservation adviser who handles residential conservation and information and information programmes for the department and fulfils an educational promotional role as well.

It is estimated that over 10,000 copies of federal publications have been distributed to service groups -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODROW: A good point - schools and individual homeowners.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: As well, the Province's utilities, more than ever before, are being encouraged to push energy conservation through newspapers and radio ads and bill stuffers, whatever that means.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: Newfoundland Light and Power, for instance, has already distributed 850,000 pamphlets and bill stuffers and provides energy conservation distribution racks at nine offices throughout the Province.

I believe my time is up, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: A couple of - okay, fine.

Of particular importance is the Newfoundland and Canada agreement on the development and demonstration of renewable energy and energy conservation technology.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: This agreement works on \$11,250,000 whereby the federal government will provide 80 per cent of the funds.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Thank God there is not a Liberal Government in Ottawa anymore!

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. WOODROW:

did it.

It is an exciting commitment to furthering projects and programmes aimed at alleviating the Province's dependence upon expensive imported oil and developing advanced conservation technologies in such areas as wood, solar heat, wind, peat waste, heat recovery, etc.

Mr. Speaker, I think I am going to stop here. I think I have to stop because my time is up. I hope we will be able to close off the debate on this before this present session of the House closes. I will have other things to say, pertinent things about the CHIP programme and about the price of oil, etc.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms)

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

the debate.

Mr. Speaker, I move the adjournment of

On motion, the House at its rising stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, November 29, 1979 at 3:00 P.M.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

NOVEMBER 28, 1979

November 28, 1979

QUESTION

Mr. Speaker, would the Honourable 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?

Hon. Member LaPoile:

ANSWER (Hon. Minister Finance)

	A. E. AMES COMPANY LTD.	BURNS FRY LIMITED
2-73	22,300	81,700
3-74	23,800	73,500
4-75	26,000	127,600
5-76	47,400	123,500
6-77	86,700	127,800
7-78	No Canadian issue	
8-79	No Canadian issue	

CANADIAN FISCAL AGENTS

FRY LIMITED

	<u>Management Fees</u>	<u>Underwriting Fees</u>	<u>Selling Group</u>	<u>Sold to Exempt Institutions by Managers</u>	
<u>'2-73</u>					
H	20,000	5,800	7,500	4,000	
J	20,000	5,800	9,000	9,600	<u>81,700</u>
<u>3-74</u>					
K	20,000	5,800	9,000	2,400	
L	20,000	5,800	10,500	-	<u>73,500</u>
<u>4-75</u>					
P	9,000	2,610	2,025	21,600	
Q	15,000	4,350	7,875	7,800	
R	25,000	7,250	13,125	12,000	<u>127,635</u>
<u>5-76</u>					
T	6,000	1,740	2,250	7,680	
U	20,000	5,800	6,000	11,200	
V	18,000	8,700	15,750	20,400	<u>123,520</u>
<u>5-77</u>					
X	18,000	11,400	40,500	-	
Z	21,000	13,300	23,625	-	127,825
	<u>212,000</u>	<u>78,350</u>	<u>147,150</u>	<u>96,680</u>	<u>534,180</u>

CANADIAN FISCAL AGENTS

AMES

	<u>Management Fees</u>	<u>Underwriting Fees</u>	<u>Selling Group</u>	
<u>73</u>	-	4,400	6,000	
	-	4,400	7,500	<u>22,300</u>
<u>74</u>	-	4,400	7,500	
	-	4,400	7,500	<u>23,800</u>
<u>75</u>	-	1,980	1,350	
	-	3,300	4,500	
	-	5,500	9,375	<u>26,005</u>
<u>'6</u>	-	1,320	1,350	
	-	4,400	6,000	
	12,000	6,600	15,750	<u>47,420</u>
<u>'7</u>	12,000	11,400	18,000	
	14,000	7,700	23,625	86,725
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>
	38,000	59,800	108,450	206,250
	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>