

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY  
FOR THE PERIOD:  
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.  
TUESDAY, MARCH 19, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER ( Simms ): Order, please.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

MR. N. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments of the House's time to clarify a question that arose yesterday during Question Period and on which there were some media reports. I would like to put this issue in its proper perspective. It relates to the water and sewer system for the town of Pouch Cove.

Now I will give you a brief history of the project and what has happened to date. The government of the Province approved a guaranteed bank loan of \$800,000 in 1976 to enable the municipality of Pouch Cove to commence Phase I of the installation of a water and sewer system. As a consequence of a tender called upon the advice of the town's consultant the contract was awarded to the low bidder, Metro Engineering and Construction Limited at a value of \$572,079.50. The contractor discontinued work on the project in October 14, 1976. Upon the advice of the town's consultant and based upon his certification of alleged failure to perform the contract work expeditiously and efficiently, the contract between the municipality and the contractor was terminated by the municipality on December 13, 1976.

The town subsequently instituted legal action against Metro Engineering Limited and the bonding company concerned, U.S. Fidelity And Guaranty Company Limited in order to recover costs associated with the completion of the original contract.

In October of 1977, the government approved a further bank loan in the amount of \$400,000 which together with \$600,000 remaining from the original funding from Phase II enabled the awarding of a contract to M and M Engineering Limited to complete the work remaining to be done under Phase I and to continue

MR. N. WINDSOR: with a further phase of this water and sewer project. The amount of the contract awarded was \$828,219.78.

In June of 1978, a further guaranteed funding was approved by Government in the amount of \$600,000 to undertake Phase III of this project. As a result of a public tender call the contract for this phase of the work was awarded to Construction Management Limited in the amount of \$453,250.

In May, 1979, a guaranteed loan was approved by Government in the amount of \$1,320,000 to proceed with Phase IV of this project and, subsequently, a contract was awarded to M and M Engineering Limited in the amount of \$1,100,000 for this phase of the work.

On November 29, 1979, the consultant was authorized to proceed with the design, including plans and specifications for the fifth phase of work on this project, the scope of the project not to exceed a total cost of \$500,000.

As you will observe from the foregoing, the total amount of funding for this project to date amounts to \$3,120,000, together with a commitment for early design for an additional amount of \$500,000.

Since the problems with the contractor on the initial phase of this project, work has progressed satisfactorily and without serious interruption.

In 1979 the town was awarded judgement against Metro Engineering and the Bonding Company by the Supreme Court of Newfoundland in the amount of \$196,201.25, including costs.

MR. N. WINDSOR: The amount of this judgement has been paid over to the town's solicitors by the bonding company and has been applied to reduce the capital indebtedness of the system. This amount, of course, represents the additional amount incurred to complete remaining work of phase one on the project as a result of the termination of the contract with Metro Engineering Limited. At the direction of the department, in accordance with its stipulated policy, since 1976, the town of Pouch Cove was instructed to impose a connection fee of \$300 against all properties connected to the system now and in the future. As you will observe from the total dollars expended on the system to date, this is a very nominal amount for government to expect the town to recover from each property owner benefiting from the system.

The total estimated final costs of a completed system is \$6,013,000. At the present time this system serves approximately 130 properties. When completed it will serve a total of approximately 400 properties.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, it is very difficult to respond to a statement that I just heard as the hon. gentleman did not have the courtesy to give the statement to our spokesman.

MR. N. WINDSOR: I gave one to your representative of Municipal Affairs.

MR. S. NEARY: If he did, our spokesman certainly has not seen it. But, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman has confirmed really what -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. S. NEARY: I understand the spokesman has a copy. But the minister has confirmed, Mr. Speaker, the accusations - if that is the right word - that have been made by the people of Pouch Cove that they were not fully informed or made

MR. S. NEARY: aware of what was going on. They have not up until the time the minister just read that statement. There has been no explanation to the people of Pouch Cove of why they have to pay \$300 connection fee for water and sewerage. That is more than is paid in any other municipality in Newfoundland.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time that this matter has been raised in this hon. House, and it is not the first time that discussions were held with ministers concerning the activities of Metro Engineering in that particular contract. I believe I had a discussion on one occasion with the previous minister up behind the curtain and at that time it was confirmed to me that there was either hanky-panky or there was political interference, certainly things were not going well. And Proctor and Redfern, the company, the consultants in this particular case, had recommended that Metro not be given any extensions to contracts because obviously they bid low hoping that the government would give them extensions to their contract, and they were there a short time when they pulled out altogether. And I went to Pouch Cove to investigate the situation, met with the former Mayor of Pouch Cove and one or two of the councillors, and there was terrific pressure put on the council at that time to extend the contract, to give Metro Engineering extensions to their contract. I believe the only way to clear the air, Sir - this is a history of the project - I believe the only way to clear the air adequately to the satisfaction of the people of Pouch Cove is to have a public inquiry under the Public Inquiries Act into this -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. S. NEARY: Oh, that is very funny!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

March 19, 1980

Tape No. 458

DW - 3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):           The hon. member's time has expired. If you would like to conclude your remarks, please do so quickly.

MR. S. NEARY:                   - to have an inquiry under the Public Inquiries Act so that the commission

MR. S. NEARY: can send for witnesses, can send for documents, letters and can call witnesses. And I believe this is the only way the matter is going to be resolved to the satisfaction of the residents of Pouch Cove.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. D. Hancock).

MR. HANCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a question for the Minister of Health (Mr. W. House); it is a **serious** question, Sir. Would the hon. Minister of Health inform the House if there has been an outbreak of TB in recent weeks in the area between Admiral's Beach and North Harbour and, if so, how many cases are involved?

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

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I will have to take that question under advisement and inform the House at the next sitting.

MR. D. HANCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: A supplementary, the hon. the member for St. Mary's - The Capes.

MR. D. HANCOCK: I can assure the minister, if he is not aware, that there are four people, approximately three or four people, in hospital at this present time and there are a large number of people involved, borderline cases, if I may refer to them as such, **who** are being treated at home. What action has the Department of Health taken on this matter, if any? **And a few supplementary questions. Have there been any special measures taken by the Department to get this situation under control? You can come back with the answers to these questions tomorrow.**

Also, Sir, the Department of Health committee that is representing that area has been after the public nurse in St. Joseph's and the doctor has been fighting for one there because the one that is stationed in St. Mary's is drastically over-

MR. D. HANCOCK: worked and she cannot service the area as required.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!  
Perhaps the hon. member should ask his question.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Can the minister inform us now if the Department of Health will appoint a public nurse in the community of St. Joseph's in light of the situation that has happened?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. W. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the two questions - the first part of the last question, with respect to **if there are** three or four cases that have been diagnosed, it may not have come to the attention of the Department of Health; it may be, of course, at the hospitals and we did not know it at this point in time. I did undertake that I would have the matter investigated to see if there is any serious outbreak. I do not think two or three cases would constitute a **serious outbreak**. If it was something similar to what we had in Daniel's Harbour last year, I believe twenty or thirty cases, would be a different kind of thing. With respect to the public health nurses in the area, I have been fairly **apprised** on these matters and know something about it. We have a quota of people, generally speaking, that we **apply** a public health nurse to. I do not know the exact number but there has been correspondence and conversation about it. As it now stands it does not qualify but it is still under investigation and I will further talk to Miss Lewis, who is the Director of Nursing, **about the matter**.

MR. D. JAMIESON: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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



MR. D. JAMIESON:

Mr. Speaker, to the hon. the Minister of Health (Mr. House), perhaps I did not hear him correctly, but if he said what I thought he said, namely, that this would not have been drawn to the attention of the Department of Health, my question would be is it not mandatory where a contagious disease outbreak of any magnitude occurs

MR. JAMIESON: that the department is advised immediately that such a situation exists? I was always under the impression that it was.

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

MR. HOUSE: If there is an outbreak to date contagious- what I am saying is it may not have been determined that it is. But as I said I have no information on the matter and I undertook to get the information. Certainly if there is a contagious outbreak there is, but I do not know if two or three cases would constitute that and I do not know if it has been fully determined yet whether there is an outbreak of tuberculosis, and that is what I said that I would get.

MR. JAMIESON: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. JAMIESON: I must say that I find the answer at the very least inadequate. So far as I know even a single case of tuberculosis constitutes a threat, or of any other contagious disease, and therefore should be reported, and, I would have thought, conveyed to the minister. Perhaps in getting the answers, which I would have expected him to have today, but perhaps in getting the answers he would let us know at what point the Health department considers that three or four or five or a dozen cases of TB, at what point it starts to become a matter of concern at the top?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, the report from the Department of Health, of course, outlines a number of cases of tuberculosis a year, and usually there are five or six or perhaps ten spread throughout the Province and, of course, we only find that out, pretty well, when it is so separated as that, we only find it out at the end of the year, pretty well,

MR. HOUSE: because it is not considered a major epidemic. I think since I have been minister, which is just under a year, there have not been any serious outbreaks talked about or reported. I think there was one in the Flower's Cover area previously and one in the Daniel's Harbour area, which I mentioned, that was reported. I do not think that one report would warrant writing the minister and advising, but I will investigate this one because, as the member said, there are three or four cases. I do not know if it has been determined that it is tuberculosis as yet.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Justice, Sir. Would the minister care to tell the House what the position is of the Justice Department in this Province to the precedent-setting decision in a Nova Scotia court that information in search warrants be made public, the public have access to information given in obtaining search warrants?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, having only heard of it, I think, yesterday it would be to answer an important question off the top of my head without sufficient reflection if I were not to take the question as notice and give it some serious consideration.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary question. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister indicate to the House if it is customary, because it has been said in Nova Scotia that this decision would have repercussions in other provinces of Canada, if it is customary for a decision of a

March 19, 1980

Tape No. 460

AH-3

MR. NEARY: Supreme Court in another province  
to then be recognized by the courts in other provinces other  
than the one where the decision was made?

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

I think the general answer to that would be - one is thinking of courts of the same level to use that term, right? Supreme Court of Newfoundland, Supreme Court of Nova Scotia - I think the answer to that would be that it would be, you know, persuasive but not required that it be followed by a court of parallel jurisdiction; that it would be persuasive but it is not binding.

MR. S. NEARY:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell the House, then, if somebody now approaches the court here in Newfoundland to have this information made available and is refused this information - a member of the House of Assembly, the media or the public go for this information and it is refused - what is the minister's position on this matter then? Will the minister uphold the decision not to give the information? Will the minister encourage the courts to give the information? What is the position in connection with that? Because there may be some people who may want to go to seek this information.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, in general, such a decision would be that of the court. As hon. members know, the Minister of Justice is not a member of a judiciary and is not a judge or above the courts, so recourse would have to be through the court system. Now obviously, there is a statutory means of changing the law and that is the supremacy of Parliament, but in this area I was thinking of federal law. So the legislative means would be federal. In terms of provincial law, obviously, if a certain decision is in courts in the provincial area of jurisdiction were not liked or social policy or public policy has altered, then there are legislative means. But here we are speaking federally, so the legislative means would obviously have to be a federal one. But in a specific answer, any legislative means would have to be federal, not

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: provincial. And of course, the Department of Justice is not in the judiciary and, indeed, cannot in law or in fact overrule or alter a decision of the court. So the remedy would have to be quite apart from any statutory remedy that the Parliament of Canada would have - that is a different matter - it would have to be through the court system and appeal, but once that were exhausted, this Legislature or this Department of Justice would not be in a position to overrule the court.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, if I may, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Does the hon. member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) wish to yield?

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile, a supplementary.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not follow the hon. gentleman because in the case of Nova Scotia it was the Attorney General's department, the Justice Department, that fought, challenged the case that was brought on by the CBC.

Now, in Newfoundland if a similar situation arose, if I went, say, for instance, to the court tomorrow and asked for information on the search warrant that was used to come into my office, could that information be made available to me? would the minister's department challenge the right of the court to give me that information? And if so, would the minister tell the House if when the Freedom of Information, Disclosure of Information law has been brought into the Province, will it be made mandatory on the courts to give this information to people the same now as they have access to it in Nova Scotia?

MR. SPEAKER: The question is a bit hypothetical, but if the hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) wishes to respond?

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Well, if the question is hypothetical I will never be able to give a hypothetical answer.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: With respect to the first part, the hon. member will recall that when he asked the original question, I said that it would be really to give an answer on the top of one's head without sufficient reflection to give a substantive answer, so really the first part of his question there--what would be the reaction of the Crown if a person were to apply that information in a search warrant became public, you know, what if anything would be the response of the Crown - that is very similar to the first

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: question and I think it is something would have to be given, you know, reflection and that judgement read and carefully thought out . So I think it would be improper to answer that question because that is really the same as the first question, 'What is the reaction?'

The second part of the question, I forget. Would the hon. gentleman -

MR. S. NEARY: Freedom of information.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Oh, yes, right, the freedom of information. Now, the Freedom of Information Act, the drafted one, which hopefully will be distributed in the House within the next few days, I believe it is being printed now, neither that nor the other two - there are two operative in Canada now -

AN HON. MEMBER: Three.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: - three? No, two in provincial jurisdictions-refer to documentation within the court. It is government information, information in the hands of government departments, and the legislation is not intended to affect the operation of the courts but of the seventeen, or whatever, government departments.

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

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, my question directed to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan). If you allow me, I would like to have a minute to preamble. During the past two years the fishermen in Hopedale, Postville and Makkovik have had a very successful rock cod fishery. Now, there are rumors circulating in those communities that this year the price paid per pound for this species of fish will be practically nil- I think it is something like one or two cents per pound. Last



MR. WARREN:

year the price paid was somewhere in the vicinity of that paid for the ordinary cod fish, whatever the rate for cod fish per pound per size and this was the same thing for the rock cod. This year, I understand, the rate is drastically reduced. Could the minister advise if he is aware of any change in the price of rock cod for this coming season?

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I think the best I can do with that question is take it under advisement and get some information and get back to the hon. gentleman tomorrow. In the meantime, I will check with the Fishing Industry Advisory Board and get some prices on rock cod and also check with the buyers in the general area.

MR. WARREN: A supplementary.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my supplementary is that I further understand that it is because the market for the salt rock cod is pretty low at the present time. However, I am just wondering if the rate is low for rock cod in the salted state. Could the minister look at the feasibility of having a similar project undertaken as with the salmon and char, of having the rock cod shipped in its frozen state which I understand the market down in the Southern part of the United States is just tremendous for - rock cod in its frozen state.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will take these points and questions under advisement and get back to the hon. gentleman tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): The hon. the member for Stephenville followed by the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. STAGG: Yes, Mr. Speaker. thank you very much for recognizing me. Mr. Speaker, on the weekend I was quite interested in reading in the Western Star an advertisement, really, looking for individuals or companies that held minerals in this Province. I noticed in that advertisement that there is an advertisement seeking the ownership of the company or the individual who owned the oil fields on Shoal Point - this is a question for the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry), by the way, Mr. Speaker, I am inexperienced in this question asking procedure - also on the St. George's coal fields and in Flat Bay and in Aquathuna. I wonder if the minister would indicate the House what the purpose of this advertisement is. It says it is under the Mineral Holdings Impost Act but there is not very much explanation there. I wonder if the minister would indicate to the House what the purpose is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. STAGG: It is important to hon. members. They should be asking the question, not me.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!  
The hon. the Minister of Mines and Energy.

MR. BARRY: Mr. Speaker, I wish we had intelligent questions like this every day.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: You would not guarantee intelligent answers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY: It would as long as it was not directed to that side of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the

Mineral Holdings Impost Act poses a tax on mineral lands and if the tax is not paid then the property ultimately, after adequate notice, would revert to the Crown. And this Act will have the, over a period of time, beneficial effect of bringing back to the Crown areas which are held under fee simple grants, in many cases, the owner of which is no longer able to be identified or found.

In this case the list of names being advertised is to permit the

MR. L. BARRY:

Department of Finance to make contact so that they can explain fully the implications of the act. It is not, as I understand it, a notice of forfeiture, but it is to assist the Department of Finance in making contact with the owners of these particular mineral lands for the Department of Finance to provide the information as to the effect of the tax not being paid.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. L. BARRY:

And ultimately, if the tax is not paid, these lands would revert back to the Crown.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

My question is directed to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan). We are now at the tail end of the seal fishery, particularly in Coastal Labrador and the Northeast Coast where the fishermen pursue the seal fishery in the Fall as well as the Spring, and basically, the trouble is with markets. For example, in the Straits area last year they got \$2 a pelt and the going price was something like \$30 or \$35. Are the minister and his department coming up with any programme to encourage the fishermen along the Coast of Labrador and the Northeast Coast to pursue the seal fishery, particularly since the herd is now increasing rapidly? Also, does the minister have any programme or will he bring in a programme of research with the point of view of keeping these pelts? Because if they get them in the Fall, you have to wait, with the freeze-up, until C.N. boats come in late June or early July. Is the minister having any programme that will look after this problem, encourage the fishermen to get into it and also a programme to look after the quality and keep the quality of the pelts?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, I must say that is a good question in connection with what can be done. I am not in a position to indicate what can be done because I am not sure what can be done, but I will endeavour to look into the situation and determine if the fishermen

MR. J. MORGAN: can find markets at the time they kill the seals, in this case, the Fall of the year.

With regard to a programme of education, just a few days ago in talking to a firm at Dildo that is buying the seal pelts, they have now embarked themselves on an educational programme. There is a booklet out that just came on the market a few days ago called Seals. It is a coloured brochure and it is outlining to the fishermen detailed explanation as to how to handle the seals when they are killed and how to store the pelts, etc. I will be meeting with the company again and there is a possibility we could acquire that booklet at the Department of Fisheries and make it available to all the fishermen who prosecute the seal hunt. That could be assistance, at least, in getting good quality.

As for the market for the seals in that part of the Province, I will endeavour to talk with the officials and see what can be done for next year.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): The hon. the member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My question is for the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett). I want to ask him about his intentions or his department's intentions with regard to one of the major trunk roads in this Province, the Badger-Buchans trunk road, forty-seven miles, that, as he knows, has been deteriorating over the years to the point where now it is disintegrating in front of the eyes of the people travelling that road. And the condition

MR. G. FLIGHT: of the road poses a threat to the safety of the travelling public. Does the minister intend to have any preventive maintenance or any reconstruction done on that road in the foreseeable future in this fiscal year?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, one of the biggest problems we have in the Department of Transportation and Communication at the moment is the breakup of some of the major roads in the Province. The life of pavement, any pavement, is approximately fifteen years, twenty the maximum, and weather conditions in Newfoundland reduces that, in some cases, to ten. And in addition to the more than 2000 miles of unpaved road, we have this problem of paved roads breaking up. And we recognize it as a major problem but we also recognize that it is going to take many, many millions of dollars and unless we can get control and ownership of the oil off our shore, then there is going to be many, many years before we will be able to do all the work that is necessary to be done to the Trans-Canada Highway and other major trunk roads.

And really I could not tell the hon. member if anything will be done this year or not until the budget is brought down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. G. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. the Member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. G. FLIGHT: In view of all the acknowledgements that the minister made, I wonder if he would acknowledge that it is indeed a fact that the reason the major trunk roads in this Province are breaking up is because of the total lack of preventive maintenance and the total lack of concern that this government have had this last eight years with regard to maintenance of those roads. Would he

MR. G. FLIGHT: acknowledge that that is indeed a fact?

And a supplementary, Mr. Speaker, is that in view of the fact -

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please. The hon. member has already asked for one supplementary.

MR. G. FLIGHT: That was my preamble.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Pardon? Oh, that was your preamble. If you have a question I would direct you ask it.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Would the minister agree that in view of the fact that school buses carrying children, school children from Grade One up, twenty-one miles on that road, would he look at road restrictions or what have you so that the road will not break up any more than it is already breaking up and looking at the risk to the safety of the school children and the buses travelling twenty-one miles to school and back from school?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member had an awful lot to say but I do not know if I really got his question or not. It is most unfortunate that I cannot control the wind or the rain or the frost or the snow or anything of that nature:

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh:

MR. C. BRETT: Therefore I most certainly cannot guarantee that the roads will not break up. I certainly cannot. I can guarantee him that we will do whatever preventive maintenance that it is possible to do with the amount of money that we will have at our disposal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, Hear!

MR. G. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. the Member for Windsor-Buchans, followed by the hon. the Member for Grand Bank.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, it indeed is most unfortunate that the Minister cannot control his department by way of maintaining the roads in the conditions we have a right to expect them to be maintained in.

MR. G. FLIGHT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Yes, I would direct the member to ask his question.

MR. G. FLIGHT: Well, Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that the Buchans - Badger road

the condition of it and the state of deterioration is indicative of what is happening to all the major trunk roads in this Province, as he acknowledged, but would the minister be opposed to looking at a DREE agreement, to looking to Ottawa for funding under the same kind of agreements we have under the Trans-Canada Highway; to have a crash program on rebuilding of those major trunk roads—and I think of the Baie Verte Highroad and I think of the Buchans-Badger Road and the Lewisporte road -

MR. LUSH: the Terra Nova Road.

MR. G. FLIGHT: - is the minister considering putting a



MR.FLIGHT: proposal to DREE or to the federal government for cost sharing so that we can rebuild these roads before they are totally gone and we have to look at a complete rebuilding programme?

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

MR.BRETT: The minister will consider every means at his disposal to get his hands on any money that might be around.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR.NEARY: I have a supplementary for the hon. -

MR.SPEAKER: A supplementary. The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: - Minister of Transportation and Communications, Sir. Did I understand the hon. gentleman correctly when he made a statement inside and outside of this House that this was the worst Winter in recent times, that this was the worst Winter in twenty-five years? Was the hon. gentleman quoted correctly, that this is the worst Winter we had in Newfoundland in twenty-five years or in recent times? did the hon. gentleman use the two terms? Was the hon. gentleman quoted correctly?

MR.SPEAKER: Is this the hon. member's question?

The hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR.BRETT: Yes, Mr. Speaker, the minister was quoted correctly.

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

MR.THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Justice (Mr.Ottenheimer)

MR. THOMS: and maybe the Minister of Recreation (Mr.Dawe) could also listen and maybe would like to respond to the question. Many members of this hon. House, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MORGAN: You cannot ask a question of two ministers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Order, please!

MR. THOMS: I just asked the -

AN HON.MEMBER: It is a double-barrelled question.

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. member has a question to pose to the Minister of Justice.

MR.THOMS: To the Minister of Justice,and I have asked the Minister of Recreation (Mr.Dawe) to keep his ears open, Mr.Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, many members of this hon. House, of course, have children and some hon. members, I know my friend from Humber West (Mr.Baird), has a son who plays senior hockey in this Province. Last Saturday or Sunday, I believe it was, we saw an episode take place in Gander when the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Mrs.Newhook)was making a presentation before the game had started,and a brawl and a fight broke out in the hockey rink.

MR. MORGAN: Were you there?

MR. THOMS: No,I was not there but I can read,unlike the Minister of Fisheries (Mr.Morgan).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

AN HON MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: And a fight broke out. And after that a member of another team accused a certain other team of actually bringing into the Province a goon, somebody whose sole purpose it was to intimidate the other teams in the Province. Now my concern is, like other members of this House -

March 19, 1980

Tape No. 466

AH-3

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. THOMS:

I am just trying to -

MR. SPEAKER:

I know the hon. member has concern, but would he ask his question because he only has about two minutes.

MR. THOMS:

I have three sons playing hockey and as I say this is a concern of mine, Mr. Speaker. My question is to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer), would he consider undertaking, as his counterpart did in Ontario, an investigation into violence into hockey in this Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: Maybe the minister can get an apology.

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, actually it is the first I knew of these incidents in Gander.

MR. JAMIESON: Being the hockey player you are.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER: But certainly I will endeavour to get what information is available on it. With respect to the more general question of violence in hockey, and competitive sport in general, I suppose, although hockey seems to be the area in which it most frequently -

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: If the hon.gentleman from Windsor - Buchans (Mr. Flight) will allow me.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. FLIGHT: (Inaudible).

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Is the hon. gentleman finished?

Certainly violence in hockey, and I am not aware to what extent it is a problem, certainly if it is not a great problem now but if there is an incidence of it could become a greater problem. If it became assault then, obviously, it comes within the Department of Justice. If it is poor sportsmanship or whatever, then, obviously, it would come within another department. But I will certainly bear - and I think this is all the hon. gentleman could expect me to do now - bear in mind what he has said, try to get what facts I can with respect to the incidents which the hon. member refers to as having happened in Gander and endeavour to find

MR. OTTENHEIMER: out whether this is the kind of problem which requires surveillance and perhaps prosecution or whether on, the other hand, it is maybe the kind of problem that sports organizations should be more cognizant of. But certainly I will bear in mind what he said and see what I can find out about what apparently took place at Gander.

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

I am sure hon. members would like to join me in welcoming fourteen young members and their leaders from the Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, Y.M.C.A. who are visiting St. John's on an exchange programme organized jointly by the Y.M.C.A. of Canada and the Secretary of State. We hope their visit will be enjoyable and informative.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!  
I should also like to acknowledge the presence in the gallery of a former member of the House of Assembly for St. George's, Mr. Alex Dunphy.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!  
MR. NEARY: A point of privilege of the House, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of privilege of the House. The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to submit briefly that the hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications in answering an oral question that I put to him during the Oral Question Period in this House - and I have to raise the matter at the earliest opportunity and I wish to raise it now - that the answer to the question of whether or not this has been the worst

MR. NEARY: Winter in twenty-five years or in recent times -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER(Simms): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - in Newfoundland is misleading and incorrect and I raise the matter, Sir, because hon. gentlemen should not be irresponsible in giving answers to members of this House, that I have here in front of me, Sir, reports dating back to 1967 right up to 1980 from the Weather Office indicating - and there are thirteen years shown on this sheet and eight out of the thirteen years were worse than the present year. Worse than the present year, eight out of the thirteen.

MR. MORGAN: (inaudible) control the weather (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I raise the matter because, as Your Honour knows, hon. gentlemen cannot be flippant or give irresponsible answers to questions in this House or mislead the House, whether they do it deliberately or otherwise. And I raise the matter because the hon. gentleman shrugged off his responsibility, of not being able to cope with the situation by blaming it on the weather.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: In actual fact I should like to lay this on the table of the House to prove my case. If Your Honour thinks that I have a case, that the privilege of this House has been breached, I am prepared to move the appropriate motion.

MR. SPEAKER: To the point of privilege.  
The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: That is not a point of privilege. Beauchesne, page 11, "A question of privilege ought rarely to come up". The hon. member is just usurping the time of the House by raising spurious points of privilege that have no foundation whatsoever.

I would indicate to Your Honour, though, that the hon. gentleman, when he was raising his point of privilege, indicated that the hon. minister was misleading the House. The words were couched in terms that could be directly interpreted as being deliberately misleading the House. I refer you to Beauchesne, Mr. Speaker, page 108, "To mislead is out of order". So the hon. member is out of order in making his point of privilege, and there is no point of privilege.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: With respect to the point of privilege, I do not believe I need to contemplate this at too great a length. There is no prima facie case established here and I would rule that there is not a point of privilege but merely a difference of opinion with respect to the weather.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I want to -

MR. NEARY: (inaudible) when you give answers like that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, I want to table the answer to a question asked orally in the House yesterday concerning the approval by the federal government of

PREMIER PECKFORD: money under the Rural Bus Transportation in the Atlantic Province, a federal programme to assist rural bus transportation in the Atlantic Provinces. The total for Atlantic Canada is about \$4 million and there is a \$1 million amount made available to Newfoundland and the first application to be approved under the programme was from Conception Bay, the Fleetline Bus Company of Holyrood. Other applications are in from Corner Brook, the Port au Port Peninsula, Placentia and Trinity Bay and the indications that we have from the federal authorities is that all six of those applications will be approved in this fiscal year. I will table this in written form, and hence only



PREMIER PECKFORD: that company's application was approved.

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for St. Barbe (Mr. T. Bennett) in a question the other day wanted to know the cost of re-seeding on the Trans-Canada Highway. I have some figures here. The prices varied in the four areas that were done. The area from Chance Cove to Arnold's Cove cost \$1.39 per square meter and we did 38,700 meters there; the Trans-Canada Highway from Arnold's Cove to Goobies, we did 42,300 square meters at a cost of \$1.32 a square meter; from Terra Nova Park to Glovertown, 70,000 square meter at a cost of ninety-five cents a square meter; and then Glovertown to Gambo, 35,000 square meters at a cost of \$1.35 a square meter. The average cost was \$1.20 per square meter and if you break that down into feet, which was what the hon. member was requesting, the average cost would therefore be twelve cents per square foot. I do not have the total dollars it cost.

#### PRESENTING PETITIONS

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

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of 228 students from the communities of Three Rock Cove and Mainland in the district of Port au Port.

The prayer of the petition, Mr. Speaker, is, "Whereas the road from Lourdes to Mainland is twelve miles long and whereas the road badly needs upgrading and is known to be the worst road in the district of Port au Port, and whereas students from Grade III to Grade VII numbering 245 must make the return trip daily, we the undersigned students from the communities of Mainland and Three Rock Cove petition the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to upgrade and pave the road from Lourdes to the community of Mainland."

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, in speaking in support of the petition I might point out first that the name Mainland is sometimes confusing, but it is the English equivalent for the community, as the residents there call it, Le Grande Terre. And at one time the residents of this particular community lived in a place called Red Island, and that was during the days when the West coast was controlled by the French government and they lived on this small Island where they processed the fishery and they looked to the mainland of Newfoundland or the Great Land. Over the years they left the Island and then moved to the mainland and for many years they were isolated, and it was only about ten or fifteen years ago that the road was any more than a path, and I suppose about twenty years ago you pretty well had to walk over the hill from Lourdes with your sack of flour.

MR. F. STAGG: It was upgraded during 1972 to 1975.

MR. J. HODDER: I might say to the member for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) that the major upgrading that was done on that road was done in 1976 when \$100,000 was spent on the road due to the pressure put on by the present member for Port au Port.

But anyhow, Mr. Speaker, the materials used on that particular road have been of notorious bad quality and I might say that when the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett) speaks about the roads that are needed in this Province and the number of roads that each district needs and one thing and another, I would say this, that the unpaved roads in the district of Port au Port are the worst unpaved roads in the Province. I have travelled most of the Province, I have travelled quite a bit of the Province this year, I have seen a lot of the unpaved roads in the Province but I have seen nothing to equal it. And my contention that I make here, Mr. Speaker, is backed up by the Sullivan Transportation Report,

MR. J. HODDER: which singled out the Port au Port Peninsula as being an area where massive road construction and road upgrading needed to be carried out.

Mr. Speaker, during the past two years the weather on the West Coast has been notoriously bad. We have had no consistency in the weather and the roads have been heaving and we have three or four Spring break-ups throughout the year. And this, I suppose, as many other roads across the Province, has made these roads pretty near impassable four and five times a year. The Premier of the Province was there during the last election and I believe he was given a ride over the road and he agreed with the people of the area at a public meeting that the road certainly was one which needed upgrading and which he would be looking into to see what could be done.

The communities of Mainland and Three Rock Cove are some of the fastest growing communities in the district of Port au Port, particularly Mainland. The number of new houses, the number of families moving back, and the number of students that attend from Grade III to Grade VII, 228, would attest to the growth of that community because in the last few years -

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) Order, please! The hon. member's time has expired.

MR. J. HODDER: I did not even get a one minute notice, Mr. Speaker. Could I -

MR. SPEAKER: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave.

MR. J. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, the school was closed out there a number of years ago,

MR. J. HODDER: and they only have kindergarten and Grades I and II there. But economically, the community is growing back. It is doing very well. It has a fish holding area there at the present time and some of the fish companies are coming in and dragging the fish off the Peninsula and taking them to Port aux Basques, but there is a large catch there. Not only that, they have a Winter fishery as well, and more and more people, as weather permits with the type of harbours we have there, are pursuing the Winter fishery and more and more are getting heavy trucks going over this road.

Now this road, Mr. Speaker, is no different from the other two roads in the district. We have two other roads, the road to Fox Island River and the road to Black Duck Brook. Both of these roads are scraped out on bedrock with no foundation, with very poor material, and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that these roads must be upgraded immediately, this year, and paved very soon, because the situation in the district now is that the economy of the district is being held back because of poor road transportation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. the member for Stephenville.

MR. F. STAGG:

Certainly, I would like to take this opportunity to support the petition so ably presented by my colleague in the adjoining district of Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder). I believe that the records will show that sometime between 1972 and 1975, I, too, presented petitions of this very nature for the upgrading and paving of these roads. Unfortunately, this work has not proceeded, but one must remember that this particular road is approximately twelve miles in length and in order to do the job properly and not to do half a job, it requires a massive amount of money because it is a road in which the base is not particularly secure and it needs materials imported from outside the immediate area.

I would consider this road to be an industrial road, as my hon. friend indicated, and it also should be

MR. F. STAGG: contemplated in future DREE negotiations as part of a road system to connect the Cape St. George community with the mainland, and it certainly would be quite a worthwhile expenditure of funds. I certainly support it.

Also in connection with what my colleague from Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) indicates about the growth of the community of Mainland, this is one of the communities, Mr. Speaker, that was designated for resettlement some ten or twelve years ago and the people of that community very strongly resisted it. I must say that one of the first things that I did when I was elected in 1971 and 1972 was to make sure that that did not happen. The people in that area have shown that they had no intention of leaving and, certainly, government will in due course, I am sure, make sure that their prayer in this petition is answered.

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Private Member's Day, Motion No. 6.  
The hon. the member for Burgeo -  
Bay d'Espoir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, this motion, without deriding the other motions that are going to be presented in the House during this session, I believe to be one of the most important ones. And it has nothing to do with important issues of the day, the Quebec and Labrador hydro situation and the big money-maker for us down the road, which, of course, is gas and oil. But this motion affects probably more people than any of the other issues in Newfoundland today. The motion refers to approximately 500 communities along the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, communities that have suffered drastically from over fishing, and that is over fishing by not vessels belonging to those communities or vessels even from anywhere in Newfoundland, but vessels largely of European origin and vessels that are classified as trawlers. There is a move afoot within certain areas of the Canadian fishing industry

MR. H. ANDREWS: to have those European vessels replaced by Canadian vessels - Canadian vessels that have the capacity to freeze at sea and, in some cases, process at sea. Some of these licences have already been issued, fortunately only a few, about eleven or a dozen or so.

MR. H. ANDREWS: The principle behind this motion, Mr. Speaker, I believe, is to eliminate now, as soon as possible, any further developments of freezer trawler activity and to concentrate the effort in the fishery along the Northeast coast of Newfoundland and that stock that is biologically known as the Northern codfish to leave it for the inshore fishermen of Newfoundland and Labrador. And there are a lot of good reasons why it should be left for the inshore fishermen and for our middle distance fleet. First of all, I believe the pure economics of it, Mr. Speaker, called for the fact that it is a lot cheaper and more efficient to catch codfish by our traditional methods, by our cod traps, by our gill nets, hook and line fishery than it is to build a \$12, \$15 or \$20 million freezer-trawler that burns fuel like it is going out of style even if they belong to Newfoundland and even if they fished out of one of the 500 communities here that we are talking about.

The fishery is still the largest single employer in Newfoundland and of that the inshore fishery has the greatest percentage of fishermen. We are talking here of attempting to preserve a traditional lifestyle and, besides the economics of it, this, I think, is very important. It is not for us as a House to impose a style of living for Newfoundlanders, but I think it is upon us to give Newfoundlanders the choice whether or not they want to live in a so-called traditional lifestyle in a Newfoundland outport, or move to a larger city or move to the mainland, but at least give Newfoundlanders the choice and, thank God, we still have that opportunity in Newfoundland today. Unfortunately, the decision whether or not a Newfoundland is going to remain in his outport home is not an easy one to make because of the scarcity of fish over the years.

MR. H. ANDREWS:

We have to build up that cod stock, we have to rebuild that cod stock so that there will be an option, a greater option than Newfoundlanders have today.

Historic rights to the fishery:

I think, Mr. Speaker, without a doubt we can claim that we have historic rights to that fishery and there has been some discussion on whether or not we have exclusive historic rights to the Northern cod. Not being a lawyer, but with the little research that I have done, I think that we can claim, that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians can claim that they do have historic rights to the Northern cod. Except for some random trips back in the 1800's and a few random trips in 1979 and 1980 by fishermen from Nova Scotia in particular, the codfish on the Northeast coast of Newfoundland and Labrador has been fished exclusively by Newfoundland and Labrador fishermen. And if you are talking of 100,000 metric tons, I am sure Newfoundlanders and Labradorians took 99.9 per cent of that. There was never a sustained or continued effort by any other Province of any other region of Canada to fish that codfish.

Freezer-trawlers; if that policy is introduced by the Canadian Government will give these vessels the right to fish within twelve miles of the coast of Newfoundland, within twelve miles of some of these very 500 communities we are referring to here, take that fish on board, take it to Nova Scotia, take it to New Brunswick without any processing other than the fact that the head is chopped off and the guts are ripped out. And if you extend that policy, if you extrapolate on that in theory you could have fish plants processing Newfoundland codfish in Thunder Bay or Toronto and Toronto Island, and I certainly do not think that that is what is meant by this Dominion of Canada and this Confederation. We certainly would not want to go to Thunder Bay and start hoarding



March 19, 1980

Tape No. 470

DW - 3

MR. D. JAMIESON:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

A point of order, the hon. the  
Leader of the Opposition.

MR. D. JAMIESON:

To the hon. gentleman, it is a  
courteous point of order. I ask him to forgive me for  
leaving the House during his maiden speech because I have  
a delegation that is waiting for me and I wanted to explain  
that so he would not think I was walking out on him. I am  
sorry.

MR. H. ANDREWS:

That is all right.

MR. SPEAKER(Butt): The hon. the member for  
Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir.

MR. ANDREWS: -Along those lines, of  
course, Mr. Speaker, if that fish does leave  
Newfoundland waters and passes along through the  
Strait of Belle Isle or down around the South coast,  
the Burin Peninsula of Newfoundland, heading for the  
mainland we, in effect, will lose thousands of  
processing jobs outside the potentially thousands of  
jobs in fishing, and there are thousands of jobs that  
can apply to this. Because, I believe, in terms of  
processing, and this government is committed to  
changing this, we have only touched the surface of  
what we can do in the processing of fish here in  
Newfoundland.

So all these things, I  
think, Mr. Speaker, should support this motion. Here  
in this case, as opposed to our claims on offshore  
oil and gas, when we are as a government claiming  
ownership, Mr. Speaker, we are not claiming ownership  
here as much as a principle of historic right, and a  
right to have input into management. Newfoundland is  
not claiming that it owns the cod fish or any fish in  
the sea, but I think it is very important that  
Newfoundland in another part of this motion calls for  
co-operation in a management regime.

I remember in my own  
personal career, not too long ago, meeting a man in  
Montreal who lectured me for about one half hour on the  
type of fishing vessel that we should have in Newfoundland,  
the type of inshore boat that we need. And he sounded  
very interesting but I thought there were a couple of  
flaws in what he was saying. I asked him when he last  
visited Newfoundland. "Oh", he said, "I have never been  
to Newfoundland". And this was a senior federal

MR. ANDREWS: government bureaucrat responsible for very important decisions in the management of the fishery of Newfoundland.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Name him. Name him.

MR. ANDREWS: No, I will not name him because I cannot remember his name, if you want to know.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. THOMS: That is honesty anyway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS: Yes, he was a very important member. But the so-called mainland experts can be good, they can be good, especially if they bring money, but this particular gentleman, I am sure, would not contribute very much to the development of the Newfoundland fishery.

The developments that have taken place in the Newfoundland fishery come largely about because of the input of Newfoundlanders. And when we are talking about control over the fishery, I think we should all remember that the 200 mile economic zone that is in place now was brought about largely by the pressure of the Newfoundland fishing industry, including the Fishermen's Union which was just newly being formed then, and by an organization called the 'Save Our Fisheries Association' which was organized about eleven or twelve years ago by Mr. Gus Etchegary who is with Fishery Products now. And I believe that was the beginning of the pressure to get the 200 mile economic zone. And that 200 mile economic zone was declared by Canada largely on the basis that we have to protect the inshore fishing communities along the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. On that basis the rest of the world accepted Canada's claim to the 200 mile economic zone. And if we can get the rest of the world to accept

MR. ANDREWS: and acknowledge the need to protect those communities, I am sure we must be able to get the Government of Canada to also accept the need for the protection of those communities.

This might come down to confrontation. I do not think it will, Mr. Speaker, because I believe the principles that apply here apply to a lot of other resources in Canada and they apply - I am sure that the people who have resources on land do not have that argument, number one, we have certainly seen that with mineral resources. With resources such as forestry and agriculture there is no argument whatsoever. But here is a resource that just happens to be off our doorstep and happens to be in the water. I am sure if it were in the Great Lakes or a great lake that was surrounded by one province there would not be any argument as to who should fish it.

MR. ANDREWS: The policy recently announced by the federal Minister of Fisheries, Mr. LeBlanc, that there would be a ban on larger vessels, over sixty-five feet, indicates that the federal government may be changing its policy regarding freezer-tractlers, and I hope this is the case and perhaps the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) can elaborate on that a little bit more later on in the debate, but this looks like a fundamental change in the freezer-trawler policy. I do not think it is as much a policy change that we are looking for as a change in the principle of management because policies will come and go as governments come and go and there might be on occasion a need to change policies now but, I think in principle on this point, the principle must be changed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Order, please!

MR. ANDREWS:

The principle of local preference is well established not only in Newfoundland but in the rest of Canada, and we see it in the fishing laws of Newfoundland where codtrap berths in one cove in Newfoundland are exclusive to that cove or that harbour, we see it in bays in Newfoundland, and bays in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, where fishermen who live in that bay have first preference to the fish in that bay, and we see it at present in Canada too with interprovincial preferences. I will come back again to the herring in the Bay of Fundy or the scallops on George's Bank. I do believe that they belong to the fishermen of Nova Scotia. They have the first crack at them. If there is any left over, if there is a lot left over give them to other Canadians-or other Nova Scotians, and then to other Canadians and then to foreigners if we cannot catch it all. And that is written into the Law of the Sea agreement also. So we were talking about the recognition of the first right of catching, I believe that would be a way

MR. ANDREWS: to put it, and we would like to have this recognized as a fishery management policy or principle. I think one of the reasons why the Southwest Coast herring was decimated in the 1960's was because there was not a good management policy on behalf of the federal government and the provincial governments. We had a fleet of herring vessels fishing in New Brunswick, PEI, Quebec, then down to Newfoundland and up the Bay of Fundy, they roamed at will, at random, and there was an assumption that just because there was a lot of herring on the Southwest coast of Newfoundland in the Fall of the year, there must be lots of herring here all the time. But this is not the case. The federal government, I believe, was warned at the time of the dangers that over fishing could have, but the reason why there was over fishing at that point in time was because of outside pressure from fishing interests outside of Newfoundland, largely at that time British Columbia and Nova Scotian interests. Outside pressures and poor management, Mr. Speaker, can be a very dangerous thing. I have heard rumours now that some of the management people in Ottawa are talking about the cod trap; they are very concerned about the fact that there are a lot of small codfish that come inshore to Newfoundland every year about that big, eleven inches, twelve inches. It is a very difficult thing for the processors to handle, but I believe that probably the processors should look at a better marketing regime for that small cod, but that is another point. But for people in Ottawa to talk off the top of their head about even eliminating the cod trap in Newfoundland, they must remember that the cod trap is the basis of the inshore fishery in Newfoundland and you just cannot eliminate it unless you have a substitute for it. It is all right for these gentlemen to talk about eliminating it, take it away. I know in many cases it is a nuisance but they better come up with something better before they do that.

March 19, 1980

Tape No. 472

AH-3

MR. ANDREWS:

I come back to recognition of provincial rights again and this business of the Atlantic salmon is in the news in recent days. The federal government has recognized the right of the province or the region where salmon originate from, that they belong to the fishermen and to the rivers of those provinces. They have eliminated, for instance, drift net fishing on the Southwest coast of Newfoundland in favour of the right of New Brunswickers,

MR. H. ANDREWS:                   mainly the Miramichi people, to catch those salmon, because the federal government believes that those salmon belong to the Miramichi River. Whether you agree with that or not, in principle the federal government believes that those fish belong to New Brunswick. So it certainly would be a lot easier for the federal government to agree that the codfish off the coast of Newfoundland, off the Northeast Coast and the Coast of Labrador, certainly belong to Newfoundlanders, especially considering the fact that those codfish do not migrate inter-provincially. There is one area, probably, of dispute, but it is certainly not a dispute from the point of Newfoundland, and that reflects in my own district, Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir, as a matter of fact; Mr. Speaker, the Burgeo Bank and Banquereau, these banks have historically been fished by both Nova Scotians and by Newfoundlanders and there is an intermingling there, the balance from year to year switches back and forth, but I would say, on the whole, Newfoundland probably loses out more than the Nova Scotians gain. But I do not think that is a problem to be contested because Nova Scotians have certainly an historic right of fishing there in those areas and in the Gulf of St. Lawrence on the Newfoundland side also, and I believe we can live with that.

  If the federal government recognizes the right of Newfoundland to have some management input into the Northern cod and cod as a whole, I do not think that that erodes the federal government authority in any way. We are not asking the federal government to give us ownership, we are asking the federal government to listen to us - to listen to Newfoundland and to listen to any other province, to let us have some input into the management, that we, living on the spot, recognize the importance of decisions that are made in Ottawa or decisions in many cases, Mr. Speaker, that are made in Halifax. And I believe in my own heart that the decision to send freezer-trawlers into the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador was largely made in Halifax and that the federal government have been pressurized for the past numbers of years to change that policy and to send vessels there, and to permit licences for freezer trawlers.



MR. H. ANDREWS: It is not our fault in Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, if the Nova Scotians have a limited fishing resource. They just do not have such a big area as we have in Newfoundland and Labrador. We have the Grand Banks, we have the whole Northeast Coast and the Labrador Sea, some of the finest fishing ground in the world, certainly the finest cod fishing ground, and in total size and area, it is substantially larger than the Scotian Shelf.

AN HON. MEMBER: The Gulf of St. Lawrence

MR. H. ANDREWS: The Gulf of St. Lawrence, we traditionally fish that, too.

This is a problem for Nova Scotians, Mr. Speaker, it is not a problem for Newfoundlanders. We have the fish, we have the fishing area. When I say we have the fish, we have to let the fish stocks recover, and if we do not let the fish stocks recover, there is going to be nothing for anybody anyway. What I see as a very big danger here, Mr. Speaker, is, when these freezer-trawlers get their foot in the door and a company builds one freezer trawler or two freezer trawlers and they are permitted a certain tonnage of fish - and these vessels cost a lot of money, \$15 million or \$20 million - and with the tonnage allocations they have now, there is no way that these vessels can make a profit exclusively on Northern cod, so then they go crying to the federal government again, 'We invested \$20 million in this vessel; it cannot pay. Now you have to give us a higher quota.' And that can continue on and on forever until once again there is no codfish left for the inshore fishermen in Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. ANDREWS: So we must prevent the door from even being opened. I think there is a small crack in the door now, but I think that crack can easily be closed.

The principle of tradition - and once again, I am not being a lawyer, but I will throw this out for the lawyers in the House, the hon. gentlemen - the principle of tradition is recognized in international law as well as in national law.

March 19, 1980

Tape 473

EC - 3

MR. H. ANDREWS:

I just quoted a few references to the idea of tradition and exclusive right of fishing and preferential right of fishing.

MR. H. ANDREWS:

In 1949, the Government of Norway and the Government of the United Kingdom fought a court battle in the Hague where Norway argued - excuse me, where Great Britain argued all the greatest principles of law, that the Norwegians could not close off areas from headland to headland, or island to island, and keep the British out and keep them outside the three miles of that. But the Norwegian Government argued a case that they had coastal communities completely dependent on the cod fishery and those simple arguments, those simple arguments that got us the 200-mile limit, also won that court case for Norway in 1949.

And Mr. Speaker, I only have one minute left but I would like to quote also the commitment from the government -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave, by leave!

MR. H. ANDREWS:

- the government of Canada, as far back as 1948 in letters to questions raised by Mr. Albert Walsh, who headed the Newfoundland delegation, from the Prime Minister, Louis St. Laurent, quoted on the fishing industry in Newfoundland. He said, "It is understood that the policy as to trawler licencing in Newfoundland will be based on securing the maximum efficiency for the Province's fishing industry and the welfare of its shore communities." So I believe in 1948, Newfoundlanders were concerned about the welfare of their inshore fishing communities. And that question was asked to protect our fishing communities and the Government of Canada in 1948 replied that it would protect our fishing communities. And I think on those principles, Mr. Speaker, this resolution should meet with the approval of this hon. House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): The hon. the Member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, first of all may I start off by saying that at this point, having heard the remarks by the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (H. Andrews), that at this point in the debate we are in total support and agreement with the principle and the intent of his resolution. But, Sir, I must point out that, having listened very carefully to the mover's remarks, that I detected a fairly substantial departure in his support of the resolution as compared to the composition or the wording of the resolution itself - a fairly substantial melting down, if you will.

For example, I wrote it down as the member said it, that 'He is not claiming ownership, he is not claiming ownership but some say some sort of management jurisdiction.' Now, when I first looked at this resolution, Mr. Speaker, I had my hesitations as to whether or not I personally would be able to support it. However, having heard the member and his explanation of it, I repeat that we will support the principle of this resolution and the intent of it and I believe the hon. member to be quite sincere in his support of it.

Let me say, Sir, starting off that I do not think this type of Private Member's resolution is really in the spirit of a Private Member's resolution on Wednesdays where we have basically a government member or backbencher getting up and moving and supporting a motion which is really asking the government or the House of Assembly to support a government stated policy. Or to put it another way, asking this House to give the government's policies or policy statements or the government itself a few pats on the back. That is really not the spirit of Private Member's resolution. It is Private Member's Day and this Private Member's resolution happens to be one of the three stated policies of the government as it

MR. F. ROWE: relates to the Northern cod stock. But, Sir, we are, as I repeat again, in support of it because it is a motherhood issue to start off with, Obviously that is not the only reason, but we support it with some anticipation because we are not quite sure what mother we are supporting in this particular case and I only have to refer, Mr. Speaker, to the hon. member's Private Member's resolution whereby -

MR. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to be heard in silence please.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please!

MR. T. LUSH: We listened in silence.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, if you look at the Private Member's resolution, it says very clearly that this hon. House supports the position of the Province which recognizes the exclusive right of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to fish Northern cod. Now that is a very straightforward statement which, by the way, I did not really hear supported in the hon. member's remarks. They were somewhat watered down. And I suspect why they were watered down, because that is one mother that has been held up in front of this House at the present time with regard to the Northern cod stock. Another policy, or another mother, if you will, Mr. Speaker, was the one contained in the remarks by the Premier last Friday on page four of his statement in the Address In Reply. This, of course, leads us to the realistic and I quote, Mr. Speaker, 'This of course, leads us to the realistic contention that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians must have first call on the Northern cod stock'. Then I will go over a few lines, 'This kind of contention is not based on any selfish motive but rather on the principle of traditional historic rights which we believe should apply to the extraction of resources throughout all of Canada and if this kind of a reasonable, equitable principle is applied, then justice will not only be

MR. F. ROWE: done as it relates to the Northern cod stock but will be done for Nova Scotians, New Brunswickers, Prince Edward Islanders and people throughout the nation who can make such claims.'

So, Sir, that is another stand on the Northern cod stocks which is different, which is quite a bit different, Mr. Speaker, from the first resolve here in the hon. member's resolution which says, 'That this House recognizes the exclusive right of Newfoundlanders and Labradorians to fish Northern cod.'

Then we have the third mother, Mr. Speaker, contained in the Throne Speech and it says this, 'My government will articulate a set of principles which it believes should in the interim direct the federal government's management of the fishery resources in the waters adjacent to the Province'. Then further down, 'The fishery resources of the seas adjacent to the Province should be exploited by residents and landed in the Province and subject to the historic pattern of fishing by other Canadians.'

Now if I can fit these three mothers into one matrix, if you will -

MR. STAGG: In one what?

MR. F. ROWE: One matrix.

MR. T. LUSH: M-a-t-r-i-x.

MR. F. ROWE: Right. Send the hon. gentleman over a dictionary there. If we can fit all of that together, Mr. Speaker, you can see why we can easily support this particular resolution. However, I think it is incumbent upon the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to define exactly what their policy is. It is the one that is stated in the Throne Speech? Is it the one that is stated in the Premier's Address In Reply to the Speech from the Throne, or is it the private member's

MR. F. ROWE: resolution? Because the wordings in the three different cases are different, the wordings are different.

MR. T. LUSH: Significantly different.

MR. F. ROWE: But I must say that the hon. member in presenting his resolution did to my mind back down on the dogmatism - there is some other word that I am looking for - the dramatic aspects of his particular resolution because he does not want to be trapped, as his predecessors have been, into a confrontation with those who can best help him, namely, those people in Ottawa.

Now, Sir, there is another thing that I find kind of strange about this particular resolution and I am speaking more, I might add, Sir, to the wording of the resolution

MR. F. ROWE: rather than in response to the hon. member who spoke in moving the resolution. And it is this, I think the timing of this particular resolution is quite untimely or inappropriate in the sense that contained in the Throne Speech is some mention of a White Paper and I quote, Sir, from page five again in the Speech from the Throne, "There has not been since Confederation a full debate on the proper management regime to be applied to this Province's fishery. Consequently, my Government will be presenting to this hon. House a White Paper on the development of our fishery and it will invite comments from the various sectors of the fishery and the public as a whole upon the manner in which our fisheries can best be managed."

Now, Sir, I would recommend that the hon. member read the Speech, Mr. Speaker. This is why I say, Sir, that the timing of this particular resolution is untimely because if there was ever a case of putting the cart before the horse this is an example of it.

MR. F. STAGG: (Inaudible)

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, before you took the Chair I asked that the hon. member opposite - better still, he has disappeared physically as well as vocally -

MR. T. LUSH: He might come in around the other door. Watch, see, he is taking his own chair.

MR. F. ROWE: Sir, the second reason why I find this particular resolution to be untimely is that we have had in fact a change in government on the Ottawa scene and we have had the original Minister of Fisheries, Romeo LeBlanc, we have him back in that particular portfolio and everybody on this side and everybody on that side realizes that Romeo LeBlanc's philosophy as far as the fisheries, not only where Newfoundland and Labrador is concerned but throughout the whole of the Atlantic Provinces, is quite in keeping with the best interest as explained by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews).



SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. F. ROWE:

Now, Sir, I would like to relate

again to some of the specific wording in the particular resolution put forward by the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. H. Andrews). In the first 'WHEREAS' I hardly need refer to it now since the member has himself modified that particular 'WHEREAS'. The 'WHEREAS' says, "The northern cod stocks have historically been fished exclusively by fishermen from the Northeast and Labrador Coast of this Province, and have been the lifeblood of some 500 communities along those coasts," I was going to take issue with that particular 'WHEREAS' saying it was complete nonsense, it has not been fished exclusively by the fishermen from the Northeast and Labrador Coast, but the hon. member did correct that himself and said that there has been fishing taking place by other Canadian Provinces and indeed by other foreign countries.

Sir, the last 'WHEREAS' -

MR. F. STAGG:

Recite it.

MR. F. ROWE:

I thought -

MR. F. STAGG:

I am psyching the hon. member

out (inaudible)

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird)

Order, please! The member has the

right to be heard in silence.

MR. T. LUSH:

Name him.

MR. F. ROWE:

The last 'WHEREAS', Sir, as far as

I am concerned now is not necessary. The last recital, in order to accommodate the member for Stephenville (Mr. F. Stagg) is not necessary whatsoever, "AND WHEREAS the Federal Government's Freezer trawler policy, if implemented, would seriously undermine the economic benefits flowing to our fishing communities." Well, Sir, since this resolution was brought before the House we have had the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) already make an announcement freezing the freezer-trawlers. So it goes without saying that the federal Minister of Fisheries is already on the same wave length with the Newfoundlanders

MR. F. ROWE:

and Labradorians in that respect.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear.

MR. F. ROWE:

Sir, another point is I am sorry

the member from Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. H. Andrews) with his great experience in the fisheries, working with the CBC, did not or would not or could not define the Northern cod stock. Now I would like to hear from the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) or from somebody on that other side just exactly what the Northern cod stock is. What is it?

MR. F. STAGG: I think it is cod that is in the Northern area.

MR. F. ROWE: You think! Now this is precisely the point, The hon. the member for Stephenville thinks. Well, I would suspect that if the hon. the member for Stephenville went out fishing in his seventeen foot yacht from Stephenville, if he has one, he might indeed jig a Northern cod stock, because there is nothing to say that the Northern cod stick to the so-called Northern cod - wherever that is - Northern cod boundary.

MR. T. LUSH: Limits.

MR. F. ROWE: Is it the Hamilton Banks? Is it the whole of the Northeastern cod stock? Does it include the Grand Banks? If it does, what is a P.E.I. cod? What is a New Brunswick cod? What is a Quebec cod? What is a Hamilton Bank cod?

MR. F. STAGG: Are we going to (inaudible)?

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, how often do I have to ask to have the hon. member just keep quiet?

MR. T. LUSH: He is getting worse than the hon. the member for Bonavista South (Mr. J. Morgan).

MR. SPEAKER (R. Baird): It is the first time the hon. member did ask, but he has the right to be heard in silence.

MR. F. ROWE: No, that is five times, Mr. Speaker.

MR. T. LUSH: Name him, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. ROWE: And next time I will ask to have him named.

MR. HODDER: The House would be better off if he were thrown out, Mr. Speaker.

MR. F. ROWE: I would like hon. members opposite, Mr. Speaker, to define before they support such a resolution, to make it crystal clear what they mean by the Northern cod stock, because I suspect that it is a rather difficult thing to, in fact, define.

Another question, Mr. Speaker, and these are questions I am hoping the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) and the mover of the motion when he closes the debate on this motion will see

MR. F. ROWE: fit to answer, I would like to know what they mean by 'shared resource management jurisdiction' with the federal government. That is contained in the second resolve of this particular motion, that 'this hon. House supports this Province's position of shared resource management jurisdiction with the federal government.' Does it mean the setting up of a committee? If so, what would be the composition of such a committee? Does it mean further consultations, which we have always advocated' that there should be more two-way consultation between the Province and Ottawa with respect to the management of any of our fish stock in this particular Province?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, the last resolve in this particular motion asks that this hon. House urge the federal Government of Canada to accept the position of this Province in regard to these vital matters. Now, Mr. Speaker, again I am not being picky, but this is an important resolution. What are the vital matters? What are the vital matters, because we have a Private Member's resolution which says exclusive right on the one hand, we have the Throne speech which talks about the fisheries resources of the seas adjacent to the Province should be exploited by residents and landed in the Province subject to the historic patterns, and we have another thing said by the Premier in his Address in Reply. So these five basic questions have to be asked, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (Said) Order, please.

MR. F. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to relate to another subject that could quite easily come under this particular resolution during debate, and I would like hon. members opposite to answer it. . Number one, how do you identify a cod stock? How do you identify a cod stock? I have always maintained, and I will continue to maintain, and I have spoken publicly in rural parts of Newfoundland, in Northeast Newfoundland, in Southern Newfoundland, out on the West Coast, and in the House of Assembly that if jurisdiction over the fishing stocks were handed over exclusively to the provinces that we would have a fish war within twelve hours on the Atlantic seaboard.

March 19, 1980

Tape 477

MB - 3

MR. F. ROWE:

We would have a fish war because, Sir, there is no way to identify a P.E.I. cod, a Nova Scotian cod, a Quebec cod, a Labradorian cod, an Island of Newfoundland and Labrador cod, or any other kind of a cod. You cannot fence them off, you cannot tag them and you can only have sensible consultations between the provinces and the Federal government, and .

MR. F. ROWE: I suspect that this is what the hon. member is probably trying to get at when he talks about shared jurisdiction, I do not know, but I would like the hon. member or somebody opposite to define exactly what they mean by this particular business of shared jurisdiction.

Sir, another question I would like the hon. members to answer -

MR. T. LUSH: We are supporting this resolution.

MR. F. ROWE: We are supporting the resolution, Mr. Speaker, -

MR. HODDER: It is just so badly worded;

MR. F. ROWE: - but we are raising questions that need to be asked and I ask this question -

MR. HODDER: It turns your stomach, it is so badly worded.

MR. F. ROWE: If we, in fact, had exclusive rights to the so-called Northern cod stock, if the Labradorians and the North-East coast fishermen, if in fact, they had exclusive fishing rights to the so-called Northern cod stocks, would or would that not jeopardize the fish plants and the fisheries on the South and Southwest Coast? I ask the question: Will it or will it not?

MR. STAGG: No.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HODDER: The clown, the government clown.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, in this Province we have cases where bays are fighting against bays over fisheries. Bays are fighting against bays. If we claim exclusive jurisdiction over certain part of the fisheries on the Atlantic Seaboard, might not Nova Scotia claim total exclusive fishing rights off the Scotia Shelf? Off Cape Sydney - is it? - or wherever they fish -

MR. HODDER: It is where the fellows from Port aux Basques and Rose Blanche go over to Margaree.

MR. F. ROWE: It is here somewhere, Mr. Speaker,

MR. HODDER: In Rose Blanche, where I grew up they fished off Nova Scotia.

MR. F. ROWE: Yes, Sydney Bite, The Scotia Shelf, Sydney Bite, and the Southern part of the Gulf. The whole Gulf of St. Lawrence, even the Straits of Belle Isle. When I had the honor, Mr. Speaker, of serving the district of St. Barbe North, I can remember the great fight that was going on between the Labrador fishermen and the Newfoundland fishermen on the Island portion of our Province. So if we cannot have agreements between people within the same Province, what would happen if we start claiming exclusive fishing rights for a certain part of this Province when it comes to fighting with the other Atlantic provinces of this particular nation?

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

MR. F. ROWE: I would not permit anything from the hon. member, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. F. ROWE: He has already had his contribution or lack of it. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I may have leave I would want to make a couple of other points..

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. F. ROWE: Because I say that we are in support of this particular resolution and I sincerely and honestly have a few very important questions that I hope will be answered. Sir, one of the problems that we have here in this Province is what I call the fishery unemployment syndrome and it works something like this - and I am sure all hon. members are aware of it - we have a vicious problem in this Province, unemployment, and the word has gone out, Sir, that we must return to the fishing boat. And the governments have adopted policies of increasing the fisheries, whether it be massive announcements for trawler fleets, new boat building

MR. F. ROWE:

programmes, the announcements of new fish plants and what have you. These two things have occurred and now at this point in the game, Mr. Speaker, we actually have an over-capacity to fish in this Province, an over capacity to fish, a fishing over-capacity. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, we have an over-capacity to process. We have a processing over capacity whereby some of our plants are closed down too many months of the year. Too many of our trawlers and longliners are tied up too many months of the year and on top of that, Mr. Speaker, even if they were all utilized we have the fundamental basic problem, does the stock exist? Even if we could use all of our catching capability, even if we could use all of our processing capability do we have the stock to maintain these two capabilities? And that is the most worrisome problem that this Province has to grapple with and contend with. And the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) should know this, over fishing, catching capacity, over processing capacity, people being asked to go into the fisheries,



MR. ROWE: boat building plans going on all over the Province, and we do not know the status of our stocks. The result is -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ROWE: I am gone over my time, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker knows that - with the consent of the House, by leave.

The serious question is that we have rushed into, and I am trying to be as honest and sincere as I can be because it is a very popular thing to stick up a fish plant here, give a guy a longliner here, let them have all the longliners, let them have all the fish plants that they want, but the fact of the matter is do we have the stock to sustain it? I think the government is realizing at this point in the game this very important factor. They not only do not have the money to hand out for the building of these longliners, They have realized the difficulty with the stocks, they have realized the overprocessing capacity and we have many young Newfoundlanders who are planning to go into the fisheries who are finding themselves back at square one on Unemployment Insurance or back on Social Services.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I hope I have done a reasonable job in raising some, what I consider to be, very important questions that this resolution, in fact, raises in itself.

MR. WALSH: Gerry MacLoughlan.

MR. ROWE: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have already indicated to the hon. gentleman on the other side that at this point in the game, unless hon. members want to become provocative on the other side and turn it into a political red herring, I have a note here where I could have been provocative, as a matter of fact, but wisdom was the -

MR. STAGG: Let us have it.

MR. ROWE: No, I would not want to -

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Order, please! Is the member now concluding his speech?

MR. ROWE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) would let me, I am trying to conclude my speech. I hope the hon. member for Stephenville does get up, Sir, and make a contribution to this particular resolution without interrupting

MR. ROWE: other hon. members when they are trying to do so.

Well, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would like to say that at this point in the game we do support the principle and the intent of the resolution, but I would hasten to add there are an awful lot of questions that we would like answered. Now I have put some of them forward and I hope they will be answered before the end of next Wednesday.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: (Baird) Hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, first of all I say I am pleased to stand to support this resolution, and I will say before I get involved in any comments that I think that Mr. Wick Collins was so right a few days ago - I saw an article and I kept it, an article which said - and I very seldom agree with Mr. Collins but in this case I have to agree with Wick Collins - 100 per cent - in the article placed in The Daily News I think it was last week. I will quote a section of his article. He is talking about questions in the fisheries, and he says, "One sure way to send the members rushing from the House of Assembly and the media from the gallery is to make a speech in the House on fisheries", and I will tell you this afternoon is to me a typical example. He is so right. He is ever so right. The fisheries are so important to our Province, so important to the economy of our Province and the future of our Province, and there is not one press person in the gallery. Hopefully, they have listened to the two speeches made this afternoon, because the mover of the resolution made an excellent speech, and the Opposition spokesman on fisheries also made a good speech on fisheries this afternoon, non-partisan, based on good points. I am willing to bet that tomorrow very little will be said in the media about this important debate on the management of a cod stock which is so important to many communities, approximately 500 communities, along the Northeast Coast of our Province. So Mr. Collins is right on when he says if you want to drive people away from the House, including the media, make a speech on fisheries.

March 19, 1980

Tape No. 479

GH-3

MR. BARRETT: (Inaudible) \$300 (inaudible) Pouch Cove.

MR. MORGAN: So, maybe I will talk this afternoon -  
that is a good point. If we talked about some possible controversy  
in Pouch Cove or something, it would be headline news in some of the  
stations, especially the TV stations, in particular the CBC. Anyway -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. MORGAN: - I am not too concerned about it, because  
the fact is I think the important thing is that we as members can get  
the messages back to our respective ridings about what is happening  
in the House, and we do not need certain media to do it for us.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: Now, as was pointed out by the last two speakers, the mover and the spokesman for the Opposition, this is an important resolution. We are talking about what and how it is going to affect the Province of Newfoundland. And in basic simple language what it means is we have a cod stock out there now that was overcaught years ago. It was plundered, in fact. Not overcaught, plundered by the foreign nations, raped, off the shorelines of our Continental Shelf.

And finally, when the federal government, and I will sure give credit where credit is due, the federal government upon much urging from this Province and from the Members of Parliament from this Province, and from the Newfoundland Government here, and the Newfoundland Legislature - all members of this Legislature supported the resolution back in, I think, 1975 - 1976 so it was we as Newfoundlanders who urged the federal authorities to put forward the position of declaring, eventually, at a Law of the Sea Conference, the 200 mile economic zone. And now we have the right to manage the stocks, these fish stocks within the 200 mile economic zone and it is of the utmost importance that we properly manage these resources. And that is the reason why we are so concerned when we see only two years after a 200 mile zone is declared, and we see a possible rise in the fish stocks, the Northern cod stocks, that we see these quotas being set - 25,000 metric tons for the foreign nations, 45,000 tons for the Canadian trawler fleet and the remaining amount of approximately 110,000 tons to hopefully migrate inshore to supply the fish source to the inshore fishery and midshore fishery along the Northeast coast of our Province.

I firmly believe that

MR. MORGAN: these cod stocks - and the question was asked, 'Well, what is the Northern cod stock?' Well, the Northern cod stock is the area that runs up the Northern end from Cape Chidley down to the Southern end of the Avalon Peninsula in areas known as 2J, 3K and 3L. These zones are the Northern cod stock zones and these are the areas that we depend on for the migration of the stocks to come in shore.

This allocation of 25,000 metric tons for the foreigners is, in my view, an artificial allocation, an artificial quota. The federal government has been saying, and the federal authorities in particular, we need that allocation of 25,000 metric tons to bargain or negotiate with the foreign nations for two reasons: Number one is to develop markets in these countries like Spain and Portugal and Germany in particular, and Russia, and number two is to try to persuade them to properly manage the stocks outside the 200 mile limit. So they are using these 25,000 metric tons as a negotiating power on the Northern cod and we think it is artificial. Back fifteen years ago, if you look back in the catching records of the Northeast coast, Newfoundlanders around sixteen or seventeen years ago, to be exact, were catching 240,000 metric tons, 255,000 metric tons one year in that period, 255,000 metric tons of cod. What were they catching it with, schooners going to the Labrador? Catching it with trap-skiffs? With cod-traps? There were very few longliners like we have now, the modern, equipped longliners. But it shows that even then the catching capacity and ability was there to catch 250,000 metric tons. Right now the allocation of 45,000 plus 25,000 metric tons for the Canadian trawlers.

MR. MORGAN: and for the foreign nations is, in my view, wrong. It is wrong and we should not allow any activity in the Northern cod zone until we can see what is going to happen to the cod stocks. Now that the 200 mile limit is there there is no longer the plundering by the foreign nations. Let us see what will happen to the stocks. Will they regenerate to the point where one day again we will have 250,000 metric tons caught by the inshore, midshore fishermen?

And the hon. gentleman for the Opposition is right when he says that right now we have an overcapacity of the harvesting sector and overcapacity of the processing sector.

MR. J. MORGAN: but we would not have an over-capacity of the catching or harvesting sector if we had the stocks to catch. The fact is, the stocks have not been there. Last year, South of Cape Freels the cod trap fishery was almost a complete failure -

AN HON. MEMBER: There was no revenue going into it.

MR. J. MORGAN: - it was a complete failure at least from there right around the South coast. If it was not for the squid fishery and the mackerel fishery and a couple of other species like caplin -

AN HON. MEMBER: The herring.

MR. J. MORGAN: - and the herring there would not have been a successful fishery last year. If we had been back in the days when they were depending almost on the codfish Last year's fishery would have been a complete failure in many areas of the Province. So it goes to show that the cod stocks are not migrating inshore and that is the reason why we feel that these cod stocks have got to be properly managed. And I was quite concerned, in fact, this administration was quite concerned when we heard when Mr. McGrath was minister about the policy of allowing the conversion of wetfish trawlers, existing wetfish trawlers to be converted to freezer trawlers and possibly to go on to become factory freezers, factory ships. That if - as mentioned by the mover of the motion - if that occurs the door is open, The door is open now, it was and I will not know the details until I meet with Mr. LeBlanc next week hopefully. We are arranging a meeting now through the - making contact with Newfoundland's minister in the federal Cabinet to get some meetings arranged up there. And I am hoping that what Mr. LeBlanc said a couple of days ago means that there will not be a conversion of wetfish trawlers to freezer trawlers. His policy or statement made is not really clear as to what he means by

MR. J. MORGAN: not allowing any replacement of existing vessels more than sixty-five feet. I am hoping it means that these conversions that were talked about when Mr. McGrath was there, from wetfish to freezer, will not be allowed and the freezer trawler licenses already issued for new vessels to prosecute the fishery in the Northern cod area for the non-traditional species will also be cancelled. Because we have concerns not only over the cod stocks, we have concerns over the other species like, for example, the species of squid and caplin in particular. Of course, our concerns have somewhat now been alleviated over the fact that at the last NAFO meetings in Toronto it was agreed there would be a complete ban on the fishing of caplin within the 200 mile limit. So our concerns there now are somewhat overcome.

But these conversions of these to freezer is of major concern to us and we do not want to see any activity at all in the Northern cod stocks zone until we know and understand what the stocks will do with regards to regeneration. We feel that these stocks should be allowed to build and should be the source of supply by means of migration each year for the inshore-midshore fishery. And I talked a few days ago with the Fish Trades Association of Newfoundland and I put forward that situation to them. I met yesterday with Nickerson's from Nova Scotia for about three hours - the Nickerson Company, of course, is a major firm now. They have now acquired major control of National Sea, they have spent, for example, \$25 million in this Province in the last eighteen months, a major investment by, in this case, two companies; National Sea and Nickerson's, which is really owned by one, Nickerson's Limited of Halifax.



MR. J. MORGAN: But first the Fish Trades position was that we do not want to get involved in the freezer trawlers, we feel that the only answer, if ever we can get out in the Northern cod area, is to use wet-fish trawlers.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Would the hon. gentleman permit me?

MR. J. MORGAN: Sure.

MR. D. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. D. JAMIESON: Would the hon. gentleman permit a fast question just so we will know we are talking about the same things? Could he give us a definition of what he means by - and what we ought to be all knowing as being a definition of a freezer trawler? Is it merely one that freezes on board and not factory ships or can it involve both? Would he indicate that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. J. MORGAN: The freezer trawlers, of course, that is the point we are discussing with the Trades and the freezer trawlers - if they are going to get involved in freezing it they want to bring it in wet and freeze it on-shore, if they have to freeze it at all. If they have to freeze it, for example, one part of the year for processing in another part of the year in the off season they would freeze it on shore. But the freezer trawler that we talked about coming out from Nova Scotia, are freezer trawlers that would freeze it out on the fishing grounds. And, of course, the factory ship is where they will process the fish and freeze it processed, the processing will take place on the ship and then it will be frozen after that, that is the factory ship. But

MR. MORGAN:

the freezer trawlers; the Newfoundland Fish Trades Association says that we are not going to get involved in freezer trawlers. They prefer to carry on with the wetfish trawlers and they would like to have some kind of an arrangement for a constant supply of fish to the fish plants which we now have which is only about 40 per cent utilized, 40 per cent of the total capacity of the plants and there are more plants coming on stream. Nickerson's yesterday, for example, mentioned they were going to be building a new plant in Lewisporte double the size that is there now. They are going to be building a plant in St. Barbe, building a new plant expansion, further expansion in Dildo, a further expansion in Charleston. And the very first question I asked them, and I think it has to be clarified, "What is your intention and where is your supply of raw material going to come from? Is it your intention to build a plant with a large capacity and we already have an excessive capacity now not being used, to eventually come back and say to the federal authorities and to us in the Province, 'Well, we have got to get these plants utilized so we need freezer trawler licenses or trawler licenses to go offshore in the Northern Cod?' And they clarified it somewhat by saying, "We do not have a freezer trawler license". Out of the fourteen that were issued over the last two or three years, they have not gotten one, National Sea or Nickerson's. And I said, "Well that is fine, you have not one to date but will you be pursuing the idea of getting one?" And they told me, yes they would be. And I said, "Well, it flies in the face of the Newfoundland policy. We believe that stock outside, until it builds up to a point where we can see the extra quotas for other than the midshore, inshore migration, until we can see that we might have to say to you that if you build plants in Newfoundland, processing plants, because of the plants we have now, we might have to say to you that you will get from

MR. MORGAN:

us processing licenses with conditions stipulated to them which, for example, in Lewisporte could be a condition which will say to Nickersons, "Go ahead with your 20 million pound capacity plant, which they are talking about building there - and the one there now is 12 million, they have a deal made with the local operator Northcott - and we will issue a license to process in that plant with a condition, the condition that the raw material will come from the inshore and midshore fishery of the Northeast coast". And when we thrashed it around they agreed that that would be to their satisfaction because they are confident that the stocks will rebuild. And with the new policy announcement of Mr. LeBlanc yesterday, day before yesterday, on the weekend, that he is going to allow an increase in the catching effort on the Northeast coast by vessels up to sixty-five feet, which is primarily inshore and midshore waters, that is an excellent policy, and I have to say that we are quite pleased with that statement. Because placing a freeze on all groundfish licenses in Atlantic Canada - I think it was time to look at what was happening. There was an overabundance of catching effort. It was getting up to the point where it was saturated. I think Mr. LeBlanc is right in looking at it. But he recognizes, as we do, that there is a need to increase the catching capacity on the Northeast coast of Newfoundland and Labrador. So he is saying he will allow new entrants on the Northeast Coast and he will allow replacement of vessels and new vessels up to sixty-five feet.

So we are saying to companies of that nature, forget that offshore activity, we do not agree with it. We want you to emphasize on accommodating

MR. MORGAN:

the inshore and midshore fishery. And that is what these companies will be doing. And we have control over them. They know it as of yesterday. We have control over them, as big as they may be in the Atlantic region we do have control because we control that license that they have to get from us to process the fish and we can stipulate to them where that raw material will come from. As of yesterday they know it in no uncertain terms and I think they will indicate, probably publicly before too long, that they will not be pursuing the idea of freezer trawlers or even attempting or trying to get a freezer trawler license. But of course, as I mentioned, with Mr. LeBlanc's statement made a couple of days ago that there will be no freezer trawler licenses, as I mentioned, and that the ones that have been issued will be cancelled. That is what I am hoping he means by his statement. I will be getting detailed information from him over the next few days.

Now, the question was mentioned about shared jurisdiction, what do we mean by shared jurisdiction.

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

MR. MORGAN: Go ahead.

MR. JAMIESON: Just before he moves on to the next point again a quick question. Is he free to say whether the companies argued, as I have heard them argue, that some of that fish, in fact, does not come inshore at all, that indeed trawlers are necessary for some of it because it is out on the outer fringes and the like and it is not, in fact, part of the "inshore fishery"? Did they get into that?

MR. MORGAN: No, Mr. Speaker, we did not get into that because I always recognized from

MR. J. MORGAN: all the scientific information that we have in the Department of Fisheries that the Northern cod stock, they do migrate inshore every year and the breeding part of the Northern cod, of course, in the Hamilton Banks area that is known and proven by scientists where they go and spawn in the Hamilton Banks area and they migrate inshore every year right down to the Northern cod zone.

MR. D. JAMIESON: (Inaudible) that area.

MR. J. MORGAN: Right. So there was no question, as far as I am concerned, that that is happening and there is no proof otherwise it is not happening.

Now, speaking about shared jurisdiction, the point was mentioned by one of the speakers and I think it was the Opposition spokesman on Fisheries, we feel that looking at Section 95 of the BNA Act and that section gives the right of both levels of government to make laws with regard to a specific subject. And we see no reason why there should not be shared jurisdiction on the fisheries. We are not saying that we want total control over the fisheries, over all aspects of it, but we would like to have shared jurisdiction. For example, there is no reason why the Federal Government could not have control over surveillance of the 200 mile economic zone and no reason not to have control over international negotiations at the federal level of government. But on the other side of the coin, there is no reason why we should not have, and we feel we should have, paramountcy or jurisdiction in this case over determining of provincial quotas, the division of these quotas, establishing harvesting plans, licencing of provincial boats and licencing of provincial fishermen.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. J. MORGAN: There is no reason why we can not have that control. It can be worked out under the BNA Act and we are saying there is no reason why we should not have

MR. J. MORGAN: shared jurisdiction. We are saying at the present time we want that but if we can not get that, and hopefully we will one of these days, but if we can not get it, in the meantime, at least we can have a method of consultation with us, the Province, on these matters I just mentioned.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Meaningful consultation.

MR. J. MORGAN: Meaningful consultation, not to be told after the fact the decision is made and what is your opinion on it.

MR. D. JAMIESON: (Inaudible)

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I have limited time and I have only one minute to go so I will -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave, by leave.

MR. J. MORGAN: - but the shared jurisdiction, I think, is a thing we should look at - the two levels of government over the next while.

The resolution, as I mentioned, Mr. Speaker, is a very important one and I am sure, at least I am hopeful now from listening to the comments of the official spokesman on fisheries for the Opposition that they will vote with the resolution and support it. I was intending to make some more points on the fishery but I was hoping to make a speech in reply to the Speech from the Throne on Fisheries and outline some of the things we plan to do and some of the changes we are making in Fisheries but getting back to the Northern cod and my closing comments, we say that despite what the - I noticed a few days ago where the - despite comments of this nature from the Fisheries Council of Canada, who will hear my views in no uncertain terms in May when I meet with them, a comment, "These fisheries, the Northern cod stocks off Newfoundland form a national resource which belongs to all Canadians and the Federal Government should manage on behalf of all Canadians." That was the Fisheries Council of Canada. Of course, I noted also that around the same time that same statement was made in their monthly bulletin, they came out strongly opposing the

March 19, 1980

Tape No. 483

SD - 3

MR. J. MORGAN: appointment of Romeo LeBlanc  
as the Minister of Fisheries.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

MR. J. MORGAN: So that means that they are wrong,  
in my view, in this case. They are wrong in both of their comments,  
They are wrong in this issue, on this being a resource that should  
be a national resource and belonging to all Canadians. And they  
are wrong, of course at least I am convinced they are wrong, in  
their comments on Mr. LeBlanc. And I think his latest move, the  
last few days has borne me correct somewhat on that.

So it is a resource that is  
the lifeblood of the Northeast Coast and any media that does not  
comment on the statements made in this debate, or any MHA who  
represents a fishing district on the Northeast Coast who does not  
support that resolution is not doing justice to the people who  
live in his district.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. MORGAN: That is the reason why I am convinced that -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: That is the reason why I am convinced that every single one here that I look at across the floor, I think that this debate will not be a partisan debate. It is a debate where we stand up for our rights as Newfoundlanders to make sure that down the road, as I mentioned, we will again be catching in the inshore or midshore fishery along the Northeast Coast of our Province - 250,000, 260,000, maybe up to 300,000 metric tons. We caught 90,000 last year. We can increase the catching capacity. If need be we will be doing so next year with the Loan Board's activities, better equipped vessels and as long as the freeze on the groundfish does not take in the Northeast Coast. So we can expand further, if necessary, the harvesting sector. We are convinced that we can catch that Northern cod when it migrates to inshore. There is no need whatsoever of any offshore activity on the Northern cod, and one of these days I think that the migration and the catching effort along the Northeast Coast will show, the catching of it itself will show, that the Northern cod stocks can regenerate if they are managed properly. If we allow the continuing policies of setting artificial quotas and giving in to foreign nations for reasons I mentioned earlier, just to get bargaining power, to make sure they manage the stocks outside the 200-mile limit properly, in accordance with the wishes of NAFO and the wishes of our country, not to bargain away our Northern cod stocks for that purpose and not to bargain away our Northern cod stocks for markets, because I am convinced in talking to the Fishing Industry Advisory Board that we can go out and get markets without bargaining off our cod stocks.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MORGAN: We can go out and get markets.

In fact, we are looking now at going into the East Block countries and that is where the big markets are. We are convinced of that. We will be going in there and going in in no uncertain terms. We



MR. MORGAN: will be going in there in a big way and we are convinced we can get markets in there. So there is no need to trade off the cod stocks for that purpose.

My closing comment, I again congratulate the member here for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) in bringing in this resolution, and I am looking forward to the resolution being passed unanimously in the House of Assembly.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. JAMIESON: Once again a question, if the hon. minister will permit, because we have a looseness about definitions. I mean, I talked about freezer trawlers as to whether they were factory ships or not, so I think it will help the debate if we all know that we are talking - on the same terms of reference, as it were.

For years we have used the expression 'Northeast Coast'. Does the hon. minister in a sense define that - for instance, is Trinity Bay part of the Northeast Coast? Do Conception Baymen who go North and have gone North for years to fish in Labrador - I think it is not a facetious point, but what are we actually talking about when we say 'Northeast Coast'?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, that is a good question and a good point. We keep referring to the Northeast Coast but, of course, the Northern cod zone takes in right from Cape Chidley in the North right down to the Southern part of the Avalon Peninsula. It is the whole Eastern, the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland, the Island portion, the Eastern part of Labrador and the whole Eastern part of the Province. It takes in this total area, as I mentioned earlier, known as - and they are set by NAFO - they are known as areas, refer to these cod stocks as 3K, 3J and 3L, and that is the total Northern cod that lies off the Eastern-Northeastern part of the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador portion. That is the total source of inshore cod, and if last year was any indication of the migration we have reason to be concerned, because last year, as I mentioned, there was almost a complete

MR. MORGAN: failure South of Cape Freels. Any member here from districts along these areas can verify it, but South of Cape Freels the cod fishery was almost a complete failure.

MR. BARRETT: North, the same thing.

MR. MORGAN: Part of the Northern area was the same thing as we mentioned in the Fogo area, that if it was not for the species like squid and mackerel last year the fishery would have been a complete failure. That is reason for us to believe and to be concerned, to be concerned that we must allow the cod stocks offshore to regenerate and eventually come back inshore. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. STAGG: Now we are going to have a good speech from the Opposition.

MR. HOLLETT: Well, at least you recognize it in advance. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure and with your permission I would like to report to the House that I thought that the hon. member from St. John's West (Mr. Barrett) and his good wife were most able representatives of the government last Saturday at the official christening ceremonies in Marystown,

MR. HOLLETT: and I would like for everybody to know they did a super job and they are welcome back anytime they care to come.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I treat my people well.

MR. HOLLETT: Congratulations!  
Mr. Speaker, in referring to the resolution from the hon. the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), I think my colleague, our official spokesman on fisheries defined some of the things that we did not like about it, although like our spokesman, I support the resolution in principle. I must say, also, I am a little disappointed that it was not more far-reaching, not only in relation to the Northern cod but I thought the very least it should encompass is all species of fish within that area. Whereas the Northern cod was the lifeblood of that particular area many years ago, I think if we analyzed the landings in that area now that the cod itself is probably still king but the totals of poundage in other species, I suspect, far surpasses the cod, and possibly even in dollar value as well.

But being a member from the South coast, and as a resident of that coast I cannot accurately define South or Southwest coast. I would have thought he would have been even a little broader and in his resolution included all the fish and all the species that are traditionally fished by Newfoundlanders and Labradorians.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, I can assure this House that the same concern for the future of the fisheries is expressed in every coastal community

MR. HOLLETT: in this whole Province.

It is just to me, for us to have to stay within the confines of a very narrow resolution -

MR. P. WALSH: You can go ahead, boy.

MR. HOLLETT: Thank you.

It certainly limits the debate, certainly limits the comments but I think that the previous speakers had the privilege to wander from the resolution. Mr. Speaker, with your privilege I would like to do the same thing. And like the Minister of Fisheries said, I have no ambition to be partisan with the fisheries, it is too big an issue, it is too important to the future of Newfoundland. And even in the Throne Speech it was classified as being the future in Newfoundland from the employment factor and, I still believe, from an economic factor in spite of proposed or hopeful oil and gas.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT: Now, Mr. Speaker, as I recollect there is one thing that stirs me, stated by the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan). When he was asked to define the Northern cod stock he stated that it went from Cape Chidley to Cape Race. And he also went on further to say that there should be no offshore or dragger fishing, I assume, or any other types of boats over sixty-five feet should prosecute that fishery in the future, or in the near future until such time as stocks regenerate to the stage whereby it would be viable.

MR. MORGAN: (inaudible) additional (inaudible)

MR. HOLLETT: Oh, you did not say additional. In other words, the trawlers and the larger ships in this Province today will still have the right to

MR. HOLLETT: fish the Northern part of the Grand Banks. Because certainly this is one of the most important areas.

MR. MORGAN: (Inaudible)

MR. HOLLETT: Fine. Also in relation to the Northern cod, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the minister said that hopefully the fish would come ashore. You know, that is so true. If we examine the landings on the Northeast coast since the turn of the Century, I think we all know, and certainly the records will substantiate, that many years in the past have been either blank or near blank when apparently fish stocks were in abundance. And if we base the whole future of that area on simply inshore and near offshore boats, we will certainly have limitations. And at the same time we are trying to encourage or find a method whereby all the plants in that area can work twelve months of the year. Certainly there have to be plans for backup, there have to be plans to bring fish into that area in case there is a failure. And it does not have to be a failure in the fishery it just could be a poor Fall weather-wise. So we have to look at all Newfoundland if we are going to look at the Northeast coast as being productive from an onshore basis twelve months of the year. Nobody can accurately predict the ice floes, water temperatures, if the fish will come ashore, if the trap fishery will be a skunk all over Newfoundland, literally speaking, as it was last year.

To me it is irrational for a motion like this to be so definitive and so vague and not be specific. Because the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, he knows how specific we have to be in planning projections and incorporate all the best that we have in the fisheries now plus whatever new inventions, new incentives or anything else we can apply.

March 19, 1980, Tape 485, Page 4 -- apb

MR. HOLLETT: And I am sure he will be  
the first one to say that if this Province is going to  
prosper in the field of fisheries, it has to be a

MR. HOLLETT:

co-ordinated effort by everybody, federal government, provincial government, processors, fishermen and all and sundry, it has to be a co-ordinated effort for all the Province. The area, Mr. Speaker, which I represent; we have had fish plants operational on a twelve month basis back since 1942 and it has been relatively consistent but only because the larger boats in that area had the freedom to roam our total Continental Shelf and in some cases, I might add, down as far South as Cape Hatteras which is now of course U.S. waters.

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat concerned about the true meaning of this resolution. I am also concerned about our beliefs or even, in some cases, if we have any in relation to our scientific community, which I have said in this House last year and I will repeat, I feel that Canada has the best marine biologists, the best oceanographers anywhere in the world. And I was happy to hear the minister refer to those people with the respect which they should be accorded. And I cannot resist a comment made by the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) when he said - I cannot quote it verbatim but certainly inferred that decisions for the future of the fishery in this Province are still being made in Halifax. Now either, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member is out of touch or certainly did not do his research. We have a Regional Director of Fisheries, federally, in this Province, a gentleman whom I know personally, I have worked with and is held in very high esteem all over this country, by the name of Mr. Cowley and he answers only to the minister and not to anybody in Halifax. And I am sure if the hon. Romeo LeBlanc was here today he would say that Mr. Cowley is one of the best

MR. HOLLETT:

people he has on staff. I would expect him to say the best.

MR. ANDREWS:

If the hon. member will let me explain that part I did not say that, I said fisheries policy.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member wish to answer by leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir by leave. He has the right to answer.

MR. ANDREWS:

What I said, Mr. Speaker, is fisheries policy not government, influencing the government from Halifax not in St. John's. I am referring to the large fish companies based in Halifax. I am not putting down Mr. Cowley.

MR. HOLLETT:

Mr. Speaker, I will accept the explanation but I am not sure of the large companies. There is only one company I am aware of based in Halifax that has operations in Newfoundland which is National Sea and, of course, National Sea is owned now by Nickerson which is in Sydney. So -

MR. MORGAN:

(Inaudible) said so as well at meetings that they have a spokesman in the Legislature in Halifax who is the official spokesman as an MHA and as an employee of that company. It shows their power.

MR. NEARY:

It has thirty odd over there. (Inaudible) twenty-nine or thirty here.

MR. WALSH:

Twenty-two or twenty-three over there (inaudible) promoting the big companies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!



MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

The hon. member has the right  
to be heard in silence.

MR. HOLLETT:

Mr. Speaker, if I could make  
a suggestion possibly to all, is that I think the fisheries  
to Newfoundland is too important to drag anybody or anything  
in from Nova Scotia.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HOLLETT:

At the same time, Mr. Speaker,  
I would like to say that I know and I think we all know,  
that we have to work in harmony with the Province of Nova  
Scotia in order to have the ability to totally develop our  
own fishery because the interchange amongst fishermen,  
amongst companies and certainly amongst the regulations  
it has to be in many fields co-ordinated.

The hon. minister referred  
to section 95 of the BNA Act and also in that particular  
section - I do not know how many

MR. D. HOLLETT: people receive the APEC news letter or had the full details in minutes that were held at Acadia University last Summer, in May actually, when the Atlantic Fisheries were thoroughly discussed. And there was a bulletin out in their newsletter in September and a subsequent bulletin now, and I think we should all read it, the heading states, 'The fish a federal or provincial animal'. And I was happy to see heze, and I am not sure who represented our Province there, a Newfoundland and Nova Scotia proposal, it was a joint proposal between Nova Scotia and Newfoundland, And the hon. the minister himself, he ticked off some of the jurisdictional areas that should be federal and should be provincial. He referred to the federal being responsible for international negotiations, surveillance. He did not mention that it was also agreed that the federal government be empowered and retain international enforcement, basic research, applied research to determine global quotas, quality standards for exports and licensing of foreign vessels. And, of course, there were a couple left out that the Provinces - like aquaculture and others.

Mr. Speaker, I would recommend as food for thought the outcome of that fisheries conference that was held at Acadia University last Summer.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I think for the record, also, I should state that in relation to the trap fishery the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) inferred at least that the federal government was trying to phase out the trap fishery which we all know is, if the fish are there, the most productive way to catch them and the cheapest and handled properly is as good a quality product as we can find elsewhere. But I think it is also fair to say that the federal government in conjunction with the provincial government and a lot of fishermen, have been conducting experiments over, at least, the last three years to try and improve, not only the efficiency of

MR. D. HOLLETT: the trap but also design a trap so that the small fish will escape. I mean we all know that if we continue to catch the small cod in the numbers that we are and those cannot grow to the five year age to re-produce, then we ourselves will always be cursed and be damned for being our worst enemy in literally slaughtering millions of babies a year. And this is happening and it is quite factual that the companies themselves have not the capability nor does the marketplace require fish of this size and the quality that would come from that type of fishery.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when we look at the fisheries, I guess, in the total context of this Province, and we look at provincial jurisdiction vis a vis federal jurisdiction, when we look at the squabbles that have taken place in the last three or four years and the ones that are ongoing now, just to name a few - maybe most people do not realize that the Placentia Bay cod is a local stock, -

AN HON. MEMBER: It is not.

MR. D. HOLLETT: It is.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) stock.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Yes, it comes in counter-clock ways in the Spring and goes out in the Fall and Winter and spawns in what is known as a gully. And you will get a lot of discontented fishermen in that section of our Province because they know that the dragger fishermen, our own dragger fishermen just mop up on that cod stock in the Wintertime. You go up along the coast further and the hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) has a very, very lucrative inshore fishery in his riding, very prosperous fishermen, hard-working fishermen, they work all Winter and Summer. In his area there are many local stocks. You could go on further West to the hon. member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) and

MR. D. HOLLETT: the hon. member for LaPoile  
(Mr. Neary) where, in my opinion, some eight years ago the  
fishermen -

MR. S. NEARY: There is no Northern cod  
stock allowed in my district.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Oh, but they come.

MR. S. NEARY: They were banned according to the hon.  
(inaudible)

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. D. HOLLETT: But, Mr. Speaker, where there  
is a group of fishermen who, I think, eight years ago re-  
quested the federal government to box off an area where no  
gill nets would be allowed, there

MR. HOLLETT:

is only a hook and line fishery and a very limited entry to small trawlers, **that** fishery was and still is one of the most lucrative in this Province. So, therefore, we have to ask the question once again when we look at the future of the fishery, does the gill net have a future in this fishery, in this Province? I for one believe that it should be banned. You go anywhere in this Province in the Summertime, or when fish are in the spawning process and you cannot jig them, you cannot catch them on trawls but they will catch them in those mono-**filament nets and most** of the fishermen will say, 'Boy, I do not know how long it is going to last because we are getting all the breeders. **and** when you are getting the forty, fifty, eighty pound fish, doing it year after year after year and those fish do not get a chance to spawn, the eggs **do** not get a chance to hatch, how can we have a future in the fishery? And we have wondered why the landings are going down hill. There have been many estimates in relation to the number of those gill nets that are still ghost fishing. It goes up to 50,000 all around this Province.

MR. MORGAN:

It could be forty years or forty-five.

MR. HOLLETT:

The minister is correct. There have been many experiments done and it is estimated, Mr. Minister, I believe that those nets will fish up to forty years and will catch up to 30,000 pounds each per year. And still we go and we set out more and we lose more. It is preposterous to me that the Legislature here, in Ottawa and elsewhere have not taken a much firmer look at this particular fishery. I know, Mr. Speaker, it will mean a hardship to some fishermen now. I am sure both levels

MR. HOLLETT:

of government can accommodate those fishermen financially and help them into getting into other fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, one could go on about salmon and one could go on about offshore but I do have a real concern about freezer trawlers. You see, Mr. Speaker, freezer trawlers are not new to this Province. They were first introduced - as a matter of fact, the first one that fished out of any port in North or South America did sixteen years ago in Burin named the Zeeland. That boat is still equipped to freeze at sea. In Catalina the Saragosa, the largest freeze at sea ship in Canada today has been fishing for eight years minimum. And if we look towards the future, when we look at full employment, hopefully, I cannot conceive how in this Province, without some freeze at sea capability under tight control, this can ever happen. I think it was the member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) who referred to the large stern trawlers as gobblers up fuel, the price of energy and everything else. We all accept that. As a matter of fact, on a ten to twelve day trip they could consume up to 15,000 gallons. But let us assume that ship gets 300 miles offshore and it has five bad days, weather days and cannot fish. Then to extend the trip and let us say they have to have, say, two days good fishing first, they have this fish aboard, five days non-fishing, so two days after that they have to leave the Banks to come in with a quarter load. It certainly makes much more sense for that boat to stay out an extra two or three days, freeze at sea what it caught in the first instance and bring the rest in as iced fish.

Also, for underutilized species, it is my opinion that if we are ever going to utilize the

MR. HOLLETT:

plant capacity in this Province, we not only have to find the markets behind the Iron Curtain, in the South East rim and elsewhere but the underutilized species in the interim, while our regular stocks are being regenerated, we are going to have to fish those, find markets and if we are going to do that, Mr. Speaker, we are going to have to have freeze at sea capabilities. We cannot get in to the offshore squid, and if the scientists are right this stock does not come to shore, unless we have boats that can freeze at sea because the species itself will not be in marketable condition when it gets ashore. The same thing applies to many other species. So whereas the minister is quite accurate in saying that there should be no freezer trawlers that are going to unduly displace the inshore fishermen, I think he should reconsider and look at the possibilities of freeze at sea boats to do as I have suggested plus many other uses.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, the deep sea fishery is not new in this Province, it has been here for 400 years, I will suggest it will be here for another 400 years. There is nobody arguing.

MR. S. NEARY: If we do not have an oil spill.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Well, oil spills notwithstanding, that will come up later. And notwithstanding saying that, I am the first to recognize that the inshore fishermen have to be given priority in the Province within certain areas, certain stocks and certain species. They are the largest number, they are the future and the minister briefly touched on, and also the member from Burgeo Bay d'Espoir (Mr. H. Andrews) about the splicing of communities and people and a way of life.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) Order, please! The hon. gentleman's time has expired.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave?

MR. SPEAKER: By leave.

MR. D. HOLLETT: Mr. Speaker, if that happens I think it will be a reflection on all of us. I have been saying for years, when I was Vice-President or Vice-Chairman of SOFA, I said it when I was President of the Federation of Municipalities, every opportunity I had, that I feel that those of us who live in urban areas, semi-urban areas, we owe a responsibility to the people who live in the smaller communities and the rural communities in the general sense I do not know if we have ever stopped to look at it in this aspect that, let us assume all those people left the 500 communities referred to and there are more than that in this Province, all decide to converge on Corner Brook and St. John's, Grand Falls, you know, let us box them up, then I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we would be a very, very hungry Province in the total sense. Unemployment would go way up, we would have nobody left in this Province, Mr. Speaker, to harvest our natural resources whether it be in fisheries, in the woods, in mining or any other aspect of our natural resource. And I think it is incumbent on all of us to ensure that the people



MR. D. HOLLETT: who live in those places by choice  
get at least the basic service required to live decent lives.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. D. HOLLETT: The services are provided so that  
the children will feel proud to grow up there and remain there  
knowing that they are in constant contact with the mainstream of  
what is happening in our Province and our country. I think it is  
incumbent that we do have adequate water and sewerage, a decent  
wharf to tie a boat onto, a decent school for a child to go to and  
certainly in this day and age there is no excuse for not having  
two or three channel television, radio stations, phones with  
instant communications that we have.

So, Mr. Speaker, if we are going  
to talk about the fisheries and I can go on for hours, if we are  
going to talk about the fisheries in a general sense it is more than  
just fish because I think it is agreed that the federal scientists  
some years ago made one big mistake, and the only client they had  
was the fish, They forgot about the fishermen. Then, if we pursue  
that I feel, regardless of how hard we all work collectively, what  
our great ambitions are for the fisheries, it will come to nought  
because it is a profession, a profession those who are in it now  
are proud of and I think all of the rest should be equally as proud  
of them. Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. PECKFORD: Heave it out of you now.

MR. NEARY: No resettlement.

MR. W. PATTERSON: No burning your boats.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, oh!

MR. W. PATTERSON: No resettlement, no \$40 million  
fishery programmes, nothing like that, right down to business.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Grand Bank.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Now if you want facts you can have facts, either way, on the fishery or on your past record, it is entirely up to you gentlemen.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. W. PATTERSON: Whichever way you want it. It is on the menu.

MR. FLIGHT: Set another.

MR. W. PATTERSON: Right there, whichever way you want it.

I would like to congratulate the mover of this resolution. It is an excellent resolution and I am sure all hon. gentlemen opposite will support it. I would also like to congratulate the various speakers opposite, particularly my friend from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. D. Hollett).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. PATTERSON: I think he should be in the front benches over there.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. PATTERSON: At least, if they were to move him four or five feet he would be that much closer to us and eventually he will probably come the rest.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. W. PATTERSON: He represents a district - the home of the deep sea fisherman - they have tried to imitate that in other parts of Newfoundland but they were very unsuccessful.

MR. PATTERSON: If you want men to man the draggers and the trawlers you go down on the Southwest Coast and you will pick them up.

There are many aspects of this Northern cod fishery that I am not too familiar with, I must say, and I suppose there are many more in this House like me. The paper that was presented last year, a position of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador on the harvesting of the 2J, 3KL cod stocks. It is an excellent little paper, and it covers the entire field of why the Government of Newfoundland had to take such a strong stand last Fall. It is not very pleasant to have to go to war in your own camp, but sometimes it is necessary to do that.

There was some discussion here this evening on what constitutes the Northern cod stock and where does the stock come from and where does it go. For generations, according to this paper here, that stock complex which is now called the Northern cod has supported the Newfoundland fishery from Cape Chidley to Cape St. Mary's. In more specific terms, it represents the cod stocks in ICNAF's statistical areas of 2G, H, J and 3K and L. The component of this stock complex, which is of immediate importance to this seminar, is 2J, 3KL stock, as it is to this stock that this paper is addressed. Then it goes on with the landings. Newfoundland's landings of cod from 2J and 3KL stock in 1978 represented more than 20 per cent of the total fish landings in the Province and almost 60 per cent of total cod landings. These Newfoundland landings represented 97 per cent of the total Canadian cod landings from this stock. In fact, Newfoundland cod landings from 2J and 3KL have historically ranged between 98 per cent and 100 per cent of the Canadian total catch up to and including 1978. The fact that in excess of 60 per cent of the total inshore fishing effort in this Province is based along those sections of coast, which directly depend on 2J and 3KL cod, further illustrates the importance of this stock to Newfoundland. That is why we took the stand last Fall when they were talking about issuing licences, which would have amounted to, possibly,

MR. PATTERSON: ninety freezer trawlers going into that stock. 'Furthermore, the Province's processing capacity is deployed according to the same pattern. Approximately 70 per cent of the total processing capacity is based in these areas, and this is expected to increase to 75 per cent in the next year as expansion to plants currently under construction are completed.' Down further it says, 'it takes little imagination to envisage a catch level of 300,000 metric tons by an expanded inshore fleet using modern vessels and technology, nor does it take much imagination to see the development of vibrant, social, economic conditions in the coastal communities of Labrador and Northeastern Newfoundland when fish stocks are rebuilt to proper levels.' If we were not to take a stiff stand on this, I can assure you that within possibly fifteen years there would be many's the deserted community on the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland as deserted as the communities of Placentia Bay, where people were encouraged to leave their homes. It says, 'the decline of the fish stocks which supported our communities and the disastrous economic impact which followed is now history, but it is a history which must be kept constantly in view and which must not be repeated. In retrospect, the decline can now be seen to have begun in the late 1950's and accelerated rapidly in the years from 1961 to 1968, with the rapid build-up in foreign offshore effort directed against these stocks. In 1961 and 1968 period landings from this stock increased to 800,000 metric tons. Newfoundland landings, which in the post Confederation era reached 200,000 metric tons in 1954, stood at 114,000 metric tons in 1969 and declined to a meagre 36,000 metric tons in 1974, a decline of almost 70 per cent. This decrease was brought about by the uncontrolled fishing in these areas concerned.

The social and economic dislocations were nothing short of catastrophic. The number of full and part-time fishermen declined by more than 50 per cent during the period. The economic base of whole communities disappeared and, in some instances, the communities themselves disappeared. This resulted in intolerable levels of unemployment, combined with out-migration, reductions in earned

March 19, 1980

Tape No. 490

GH-3

MR. PATTERSON:

income and greatly increased dependence

on the transfer of payments.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What document is that?

MR. W. PATTERSON:

That is the paper on the position of the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador on the harvesting of 2J and 3KL cod stocks. This paper was presented at the Government Industries Seminar on Northern cod, August 28 in Corner Brook. It is an excellent paper and I would say that every member should get it and read it. It should come as no surprise, therefore, that these communities, the fishermen and the plant workers who live in them and the government which represents them take the position that they must be the primary beneficiaries of the rejuvenated fish stocks. Their historic reliance on these stocks is fact. They have no other resource to support them and they are not in any position to be generous. The introduction of the new international management measures through ICNAF in 1974, and the subsequent extension of Canadian fisheries jurisdiction to 200 miles in 1977, has permitted rebuilding of the stocks to begin. Federal resource projections indicate that the total allowable catch will climb between 350,000 and 400,000 metric tons by 1985, and 170,000 metric tons in '79. So it is a very lengthy paper and I would certainly recommend that all the members should go through it.

Mr. Speaker, representing the district steeped in a long and a productive fishery, and having closely followed the development of our fishing industry over the years, I would like address a few remarks on two issues of major concern to our fishermen.- the salmon and the Northern cod stock fisheries. Mr. Speaker, we are slowly coming to realize that the oceans have become a global puddle where a ripple on one side creates an effect on the other. Fisheries is no longer a raffle or a lottery where one draws a number at random today in hopes of a fantastic pay-out tomorrow. Fishing is continuing to become a computerized industry and the modern fishermen are equipped with sophisticated electronic equipment that can locate and predict an abundance of fish. Seated in safer, faster, and more efficient vessels they plot strategy with their growing research data. No longer do our fishermen cast their nets randomly on the sea like

MR. W. PATTERSON: their fathers before them. While these developments appear logical for countries concerned with the problem of ensuring a continuing supply of cod, haddock, halibut and the traditional species traditionally exploited, what effect have multi-lateral agreements and improved technology had on the salmon fished only in rivers by sportsmen and by inshore fishermen? It has been known for centuries that salmon spent only a brief time in the rivers then disappeared mysteriously into the sea. It was a long time, however, before the discovery was made as to where they went but few recognized the international implications in the salmon migrations. This changed in 1950 when word leaked out about a new fishery for the Atlantic salmon near Greenland and the possible discovery of the hidden sea pastures where the salmon congregated to feed. Beginning with a modest catch of 132,000 tons in 1960, the Greenland fishery exploded to 6 million pounds, or approximately 880,000 salmon by 1971, most of them taken in drifting nets up to eighteen miles long. Can you imagine? How could the salmon survive? While numerous agreements have been negotiated and conferences held over the past ten years, the time has come to take a firm stand to put salmon on a more stable and a rewarding basis. This message has been obvious in the Province as catches have steadily declined since 1975, with the Federal government shortening the season and restricting certain areas to fishing. Indeed, during the last season where restrictions did not apply the salmon fishery was a dismal failure. Mr. Speaker, it is time to correct the condition which brought about the species to the very sorry condition it now finds itself.

MR. W. PATTERSON: These conditions are high seas fishing for salmon, overfishing for species right here in Canada, management of the resource on the basis of inadequate statistics, poaching on a large scale and distribution of spawning streams by pollution and other industrial developments. For Canada the urgent problem is the wholesale interception of our salmon off our coast. This problem is also applicable to our caplin stock and I am very pleased with the recent announcement on the caplin ban inside the two hundred mile limit. We are being seriously affected by the West Greenland fishery.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. W. PATTERTSON: Thanks to ICNAF agreements ten years ago, this particular fishery has been conducted under certain limits, the limit of one thousand one hundred and ninety-one metric tons per year. However, about half of this total is, without doubt, Canadian and predominately Newfoundland salmon. Discussions and negotiations continue among various countries which support the concept of a new international treaty on salmon. The role of the conservation community has been to impress upon all governments the urgency to act. While the Federal Government is initiating programmes and measures aimed at bring the salmon stock back to levels of abundance, and enjoyed by people of the Atlantic region in the past years of this century, much more needs to be done on immediate basis. We need improved research and statistical information on catches, increased surveillance and enforcement of poachers and the development of regional and international approaches to the salmon market. Mr. Speaker, we want and need a new international agreement to protect and multiply the Atlantic salmon, we deserve one now in order to manage our Atlantic salmon intelligently in our global puddle. It is a bitter irony that now, that man's knowledge of the mystery of the salmon has reached unprecedented heights, this knowledge has been used for the most part to bring this



March 19, 1980

Tape No. 492

RA -2

MR. W. PATTERSON: noble species to the brink of  
doom.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. W. PATTERSON: It is our collective duty to  
ensure the necessary and painful steps are taken to preserve and  
enhance this great species for future generations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. PATTERSON: Mr. Speaker,

MR. NEARY: What does all that mean?

MR. W. PATTERSON: Without this - I will explain it  
to you in baby talk, that is what Joey used to tell us. Mr. Speaker,  
without this government's constant vigilance I fear that a similar  
fate will befall the cod in the area commonly called the Northern  
cod stock. These stocks have traditionally been the basis of our  
fishery, throughout communities from Cape St. Mary's to Cape Chidley.  
Cod bred in the Northern cod stock areas such as the Hamilton, Bell Isle  
and the Funk Island and the Ritu Bank and Northern section of the  
Grand Banks, forms the very lifeblood of our inshore fishery throughout  
the Province and it is for this reason that we must and have taken a  
serious definite stand on Provincial jurisdiction of the total resource.  
The Federal Government, and particularly mainland companies seeking  
access to the Northern cod stocks, have been put on notice that our  
Province will not tolerate any interference with the Northern cod by the  
large freezer trawlers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. W. PATTERSON: We cannot compromise this position.  
Without full control of these stocks, the inshore middle distant  
fleets operating more than five hundred communities in bays and coves  
around the Province would be seriously affected. Representing an area  
totally dependent on the inshore fishery, I fully support the stand  
taken by the Newfoundland government.

AN HON. MEMBER: No good (inaudible).

MR. W. PATTERSON: No, I am not afraid to take a stand,  
do not worry about Patterson. That our fishermen must, who's livelihood

depends on the efficient management of the Northern cod stocks, also defend our position and I sincerely hope all men opposite do likewise. I was therefore particularly pleased that the Throne Speech addressed itself to this major concern, especially in firm direct and decisive tones. Like Alberta, which has full control and management of agriculture and oil, and gas, Saskatchewan with potash, Ontario with its minerals, so must this Province exert its historic and traditional right to the Northern cod stock. We must defend and protect our interest off our shores as the government of any Province would defend the mainstay of its economy in society . We cannot

MR. PATTERSON:

allow thousands of tons of cod to be taken by companies for processing outside this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. PATTERSON: We must allow the stock to rebuild to catch any surplus with our own fleet capability thereby keeping the fish within the Province for the maximum benefit of our people. We must explore and pursue every avenue available to ensure that our marine resource, which is the very foundation of our existence, is developed in the Province in the interests of the Province. Mr. Speaker, in the weeks and months ahead difficult and challenging decisions will have to be made in the long-term interest of the fishing industry. I wish to pledge my support for the direction taken to date, an all important Northern Cod Stock issue on which our entire rural fabric is dependant. Any deviation from our traditional right to control and harvest the stock is simply unacceptable and will, I believe, be met with sever -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I am so overcome with the eloquence of the hon. gentleman, Sir, I wonder if we could call it six o'clock. I do not know what to say. And besides that we have Sheila's Brush outside and it is going to make it very difficult. So I would like to move the adjournment of this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed to call it six o'clock?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed. It being six o'clock then, this House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at three of the clock.