

PRELIMINARY
UNEDITED
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY
FOR THE PERIOD:
3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.
TUESDAY, MAY 27, 1980

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order, please!

ORAL QUESTIONS:

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

MR. JAMIESON: Mr. Speaker, I have some questions for the Minister of Finance, relating to the Come By Chance situation for reasons which will be obvious. I wonder if the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) could indicate first of all whether his, I think I am stating it correctly, his expressions of optimism with regard to a Petro-Canada takeover are based purely and simply on the report relating to the calibre or the standard of the refinery at the present time, in other words it is not apparently in bad shape, or whether he has had some direct contact with any Petro-Canada spokesman or officials to suggest that they might now be very definitely interested in taking up their options?

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have not had any direct communication with any Petro-Canada officials. I have had communication with our side, the co-ordinating committee, who had met with some individuals from the Petro-Canada organization. But I have also had some discussions with the receiver, Peat Marwick, and when I expressed optimism I was really expressing my own optimism from what I had heard and the information I have had over the months. But I can say that the receiver shares the optimism. In our discussions, without my leading him on in any way, he indicated to me that he has also considerable optimism from the information that has come his way.

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

MR. JAMIESON: In view of the fact that in the past we have had a number of optimistic observations from a variety of quarters, none of which unfortunately have materialized, could I ask the Minister of Finance whether there is a contingency plan against the possibility that Petro-Canada may not in fact on, as I believe it is, the thirtieth of June, exercise its option? Is either the government or the receiver, or whichever

MR. JAMIESON: is the appropriate party, making any sort of tentative plans for where we go from there? Or are we in a sense going to be back to square one with no buyers in sight and the possibility of having to canvass, perhaps, as was done before, the world market which clearly was not a very productive exercise? In other words, if I can rephrase my question, what does happen in the event that Petro-Canada does not exercise its option?

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

DR. COLLINS: Well, just a word of explanation first, Mr. Speaker. I think the Leader of the Opposition mentioned June as the time when Petro-Canada might exercise its option. That is not strictly the case because the intention was that hopefully by June, or shortly after June,

DR. COLLINS: Petro-Canada would decide whether to actually enter into the contract for sale but their option to actually conclude the buying of the refinery, I think, does extend up to later in the year, perhaps up to October or November. So the option is open to them up to that time although the intention and my understanding, my present understanding, is that they very likely will enter into the contract for sale by June or early July and then it would have to go to the Trial Division of the Newfoundland Supreme Court and so on and so forth.

The other part of the hon. Leader of the Opposition's question was the contingency plan. I think it is the determination of this government that the refinery will be rehabilitated if at all possible, if at all almost, I might express it, as being humanly possible. I do not think it would be useful for me to get into the hypothetical situation whereby Petro-Canada was not interested and we had to go elsewhere, but I think I can assure the hon. Leader of the Opposition that this government has always been determined to go that way and we will continue to go that way until the refinery is rehabilitated or it is clearly shown that it is just physically impossible to rehabilitate it, and we do not expect the latter case.

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

MR. JAMIESON: I thank the hon. Minister of Finance. It raises so many questions perhaps I will just simply ask one more and hope that we can have an opportunity later for a more comprehensive exposé of the situation. The question I have is, he mentions that June 30th is not the date, but unless I am mistaken the commitment with regard to the payment for mothballing does have a termination point in it and if, for instance, Petro-Canada is not prepared to make a decision by the end of June, is there implicit in that an extension of the time period and an undertaking that they will continue with some of the mothballing costs beyond that time? And while I am at it and related to that particular question, do I understand from the

May 27, 1980

Tape No. 1824

AH-2

MR. JAMIESON: Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins)
that, for instance, given the fact now that the facility is said to be in quite good shape "better, as I understand it, than many people had thought" that the Newfoundland Government would not in fact contemplate allowing it to be sold for scrap or to be dismantled? Could the minister answer those two questions?

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

DR. COLLINS: At the present time, Mr. Speaker, Petro-Canada is responsible for approximately fifty per cent of the ongoing on site mothballing costs and at the time they do decide to enter into a contract for sale which would be in June, as was mentioned, in June or early July hopefully, then they would be responsible for full mothballing costs. If they decide not to enter into the contract for sale at that time, their liability for continuing mothballing costs clearly would end at that time, they would withdraw their letter of intent. In view of the reported physical and technical or mechanical status of the refinery,

DR. J. COLLINS: I think that government has always had the intention to rehabilitate, and it would only be sold for scrap as the last possible way out. We would certainly hold firmly to that attitude, particularly in view of the information that has come our way as to its state. The selling for scrap is the very last thing that government would have in its mind and would resist it to all possible extents, to the extent that we are, of course, just in a second mortgagee position although we are also the host province and I think we would have more influence because of that than just by being second mortgagee.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment. I understand that a meeting has taken place between BRINEX and the government - the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. L. Barry). I do not know if the Minister of the Environment was invited to that meeting or not. Would the minister tell us now what the story is, what is the status, the position of the uranium development in Northern Labrador now that the government has had an opportunity to discuss the environmental impact study with BRINEX?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: Yes, Mr. Speaker. We are reviewing the report of the board, and the report of the board will be made public within two or three days.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Could the hon. minister inform the House whether or not the minister was invited to attend the meeting with BRINEX that took place yesterday here in St. John's in connection with this environmental study?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I did attend the meeting and there were other government people there and BRINEX and the Atomic Energy Board. But that was just a discussion on the report so there is not any information I can give you from that. It was just an informal discussion with no decisions at all made.

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

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

MR. S. NEARY: Would the hon. minister then indicate if any information was communicated to BRINEX that they could either go ahead under certain conditions or that the environmental impact study had turned down the development of that uranium property? Can the hon. minister tell the House whether or not BRINEX will now go ahead providing they meet certain conditions, or has the project been scrapped indefinitely?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: No, Mr. Speaker. BRINEX were informed that Cabinet had not made a decision of approval or disapproval and they would just have to wait until Cabinet had made that decision and they will be informed accordingly. There was no decision at all made

MRS. H. NEWHOOK and BRINEX was given no indication whatsoever whether it would go ahead or whether it would not.

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

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): I indicated a final supplementary but seeing that there is nobody else to ask questions, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Could the hon. minister indicate whether the report itself states whether or not the project should go ahead? What is it that Cabinet has to take a decision on? Is it whether the project is going to go ahead, whether it will go ahead with changes or under a certain set of conditions? Why the delay? Why has Cabinet not taken a decision?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment.

MRS. H. NEWHOOK: Mr. Speaker, there are several recommendations in the report so Cabinet has to make a decision on which recommendation it will approve, so that has not been done yet.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr.C.Brett) and it relates to the provincial roads programme for this year. The minister has indicated on a number of occasions, the latest time being yesterday, that he was going to reveal this programme and could he tell the House now when and if he is going to do it?

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

MR. C. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, I am waiting for the appropriate time, and I understood it was when you call for tabling of reports. I have it on my desk.

MR. F. WHITE: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. F. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I am delighted the minister has done this, and I assume now that he has informed all the district PC

MR. F. WHITE: Associations around the Province before informing member of this House -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. F. WHITE: -and having that kind of contempt for members.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. S. NEARY: Right on.

MR. MORGAN: All PC (inaudible).

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Are there any further questions?

MR. E. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. E. HISCOCK: My question is directed to the Minister of Transportation and Communications (Mr. C. Brett). With regard to the last provincial election, the Premier announced in Southern Labrador that \$200,000 would be spent on maintenance of the road, and then we found out that it was under the DREE agreement, basically it would be a waste of this money to spend this \$200,000. With the deplorable conditions of the roads in Southern Labrador and waiting for the DREE agreement to come, the minister had a delegation come in and meet with him from Southern Labrador, the councils, Development Association and the Chamber of Commerce and at that point the minister said that so much money would be committed this year for maintenance - Could the minister inform -

MR. S. NEARY: The minister should be committed.

MR. E. HISCOCK: - this House as to how much money -

AN HON. MEMBER: He probably will be if he does not get this list around.

MR. E. HISCOCK: -is going to be committed in this budget for maintenance of the road from L'Anse-au-Clair to Red Bay?

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

MR. C. BRETT: I do not know if the hon. member means there is any money in this or not, but this is a Capital Works programme so it would not be indicated in that. It is very difficult to specify an amount in a maintenance programme for a number of reasons. First of all, I do not know what equipment would be available up there or if it would be necessary to hire equipment, if it would be necessary to hire

May 27, 1980

Tape No. 1826

SD - 3

MR. C. BRETT: extra men. My commitment to the people was that the maintenance crews would do as much work as they could possibly do, and if there were any sections of the road that were worse than others, like in cases where it is flooding and that sort of thing, that special attention would be paid to it. So I could commit, say, \$200,000 or \$500,000 and maybe only \$200,000 would be

MR. C. BRETT:

necessary because maybe they would not be able to spend that kind of money, the maintenance crew that is in the area. So, you know, I can live up to my commitment, which is we will pay special attention to the sections of the road that are in the worse condition.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Could the minister inform this House if his department has any plans of bringing in new equipment where most of this equipment, particularly graders and tractors, are outdated and are breaking down? Does the minister have intention of replacing some of this equipment?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of Transportation.

MR. C. BRETT:

We have ordered, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is \$3.8 million worth of new equipment for the Province this year. No, I cannot tell the hon. member exactly where that will go. It will be scattered all over the Province, I suppose. But I cannot be specific and say that two pieces will go in Southern Labrador and three pieces somewhere else, I do not know. But I know there has been almost \$4 million worth of equipment ordered and it will be placed around the Province.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Eagle River.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

With regard to the depot in L'Anse au Loup which is very small and where basically if equipment breaks down in the middle of the winter, or any weather, it has to be fixed outdoors. Does the Minister have any plans in enlarging that depot so that you can bring the equipment in and fix the equipment indoors?

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

MR. C. BRETT: No, Mr. Speaker, there are no plans to upgrade that depot there and it is not unusual for our equipment to be repaired outdoors. It is happening all over the Province. I recognize the fact that it is probably colder in Southern Labrador than it is, say, in Trinity North. But it is not unusual and we do not have any particular plans to upgrade that depot. I might say that that is not the only one that needs upgrading, there are four or five around the Province that are disgraceful. It is pretty difficult to come up with the several millions of dollars that are needed to do them all.

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

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, I have a question I would like to direct to the Minister of Justice. I have asked the question now on several occasions and I have been expecting some sort of a positive response to my question concerning the prisoner's box that is presently used in our Supreme Court. The Canadian Bar Association - I think the minister is in receipt of a brief from the Canadian Bar Association and it is passing strange but that the first recommendation in connection with the administration of justice in this Province, asks the minister to remove that anomaly in our present process. Another recommendation, of course, was that the Constabulary be expanded to Labrador.

MR. WHITE: Hear, hear.

MR. L. THOMS: But the one that I would like to ask him about is - I mean, could he give me now some indication of what is being done about this particular matter and when we can expect a positive result from it?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, yes, I am aware that the Canadian Bar Association has presented a brief which I have not seen because I had, well, meetings elsewhere this morning so I have not personally had an opportunity to read it. I think the hon. gentleman is referring to a prisoner or an accused being flanked by members of the police.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: We have had discussions with some members of the judiciary in that regard and the practice now upon arraignment is that the prisoner will not be so flanked - that the accused will not be so flanked upon arraignment. We are planning further meetings in that regard with members of the judiciary to eliminate that necessity in all cases unless - or to eliminate that practice, say, in all cases where it is not necessary. We are planning to have further discussions with the judiciary on that matter.

MR. L. THOMS: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A supplementary, the hon. member for Grand Bank.

MR. L. THOMS: I cannot conceive really of almost any situation in our system where this is necessary. A man is innocent until proven guilty and as I have pointed out and as the Canadian Bar has pointed out it really makes a farce out of the presumption of innocence that we have under our common law system. I am wondering - you are saying then that this is something that must be - does this have to be negotiated with the judiciary, not something that you as the person responsible for the administration of justice can do?

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

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, certainly in the way that we are pursuing it we have had co-operation with the judiciary because since our first meeting on it, as I say the practice with respect to arraignment has now been halted. I am not saying that if there were no co-operation that it would not be possible in one's capacity - I think in this distinction as Attorney General to so order. I am not saying that. But I am saying it is a matter which I think can be settled through negotiation between our department and the judiciary.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: I am not saying that, you know, if those negotiations, discussions were not fruitful that it would not be possible to do it otherwise. I am not saying that or really commenting on that. But I feel reasonably confident that it will be possible to eliminate that practice through the medium of discussion with the judiciary.

MR. L. THOMS: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. L. THOMS: Mr. Speaker, this is something that should be eliminated and I think everybody agrees that it should be eliminated. My supplementary question to the minister really is why is it taking so long?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. G. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, first, and I think the hon. gentleman knows this, that I am in basic agreement with him and, as a matter of fact, I think at an earlier occasion when we discussed this used the terms, yes, it certainly does seem to appear to be inequitable and improper and it gives a visual impression and it gives a psychological impression where an

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

accused is flanked by peace officers. So we are in agreement on it. Actually I would hope here that we would have a resolution of that matter within the next few months. I realize that is a relative term. Some could say it is too long or that-- you know, I cannot argue that-- but I would think we would have a resolution of that matter within, let us say, a couple of months.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Education. Does the minister have any indication of whether or not the President of Memorial University has tendered his resignation or is going to submit his resignation in the very near future?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, I have no knowledge of any intention for pending resignation on the part of the President of the university.

MR. NEARY:

A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER:

A supplementary, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

If the President of the university was resigning, would he submit his resignation to the minister or to the Premier or the Board of Regents? Who would he submit his resignation to?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. Minister of Education.

MS. VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, as far as I know the correct procedure would be that the President would resign to the Board of Regents. who, as I understand it, originally engaged him and who in fact are now employing him.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I also have a question for the Minister of Education. Some time ago in this House we discussed or passed a private member's resolution, something to the effect that the government be encouraged to review and read the curriculum, the books that are in the curriculum, with a view to coming up with more Newfoundlandia in the

MR. LUSH: curriculum, more text books related to the Newfoundland culture and heritage. I am sure that the minister is getting lots of feedback as the ministers are reading the curriculum, I am wondering whether or not the minister might not be getting some complaints with the lack, particularly in view of the efforts towards a renewed federalism, whether the minister is not getting some feedback with respect to the lack of Canadian content in our curriculum from the ministers now who are reading about the curriculum?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I cannot say that I have received any input on the specific question of Canadian content in the curriculum in our schools. There has been widespread discussion in our Province about provincial content or material relating to the history, heritage and current lifestyles of the Province and of course the Province is part of Canada. I can

MS. VERGE:

tell hon. members that significant progress has been made in recent months in incorporating in the curriculum some excellent new learning materials pertaining to the Province. These materials include the unit for Grade X social studies on the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador which is presently in use in high schools throughout the Province. That was a book published by the Extension Service of Memorial University. And, also, the anthologies of Newfoundland literature for junior high schools are now being completed for use in our schools next year.

And, of course, as we work on the expanded curriculum for the reorganized and expanded senior high school programme, there will be opportunities to include content pertaining to the Province and the country and this would range from Newfoundland history, economic geography, the Canadian legal system. But in answer to the specific question, I have not had input about Canadian content as distinct or at a greater or more inclusive term than Newfoundland content.

MR. LUSH:

A supplementary, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER(Simms):

A supplementary. The

hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH:

Well, Mr. Speaker, in

view of the recent efforts toward the renewed federalism and unity in Canada, I am sure the minister is certainly aware of the importance that schools, that young people can contribute toward this unity. So in view of this tremendous importance of Canadian unity, would the minister undertake to have a study done to ensure that there is sufficient Canadian content in

MR. LUSH: our school curriculum?
Because I would suggest that there is a tremendous lack of Canadian content in the school curriculum provincially, in this Province and, indeed, in many other Provinces throughout Canada. So out of this great Canadian concern, would the minister certainly look into this to ascertain what is the level of Canadian content in our Newfoundland school curriculum?

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I am reasonably satisfied that appropriate reviews have taken place and are now in progress.

MS L. VERGE: These include the review of the high school curriculum and the junior high school curriculum as part of that reorganization planning process, and also the complete review of the social studies curriculum from kindergarten through to senior high school. In those reviews, I am satisfied that that whole question of pertinent and relevant content has been considered. But I will certainly undertake to bear that in mind as future ongoing reviews are proceeded with.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, a final supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): A final supplementary, the hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, in view again of these tremendous efforts in the last few weeks and the concentration on renewed federalism and on Canadian unity, would the minister not agree that one of the greatest places, one of the most important places, one of the most significant places to start this whole movement towards Canadian unity is in our schools? And certainly the minister must undertake to look again with renewed vigour into establishing whether or not this Province has sufficient Canadian content into the school curriculum.

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

MS L. VERGE: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would agree that the time is appropriate to look at this process with renewed vigour.

MR. SPEAKER: Any further questions?

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Finance, Sir. Would the hon. gentleman inform the House whether or not the government have taken the major step, the big decision of allowing beer to be placed in cans, allowing tinned beer in this Province?

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

DR. J. COLLINS: I think I shall be forced to take that under advisement, Mr. Speaker. I do not believe we have, but I will undertake to check it out with the Liquor Corporation. To my knowledge, we have not, but I will have to check it out.

May 27, 1980

Tape 1831

EC - 2

MR. S. NEARY:

A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

A final supplementary, the hon.

the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

While the hon. gentleman is checking it out, could he also check out, if they have taken the step to allow beer to be sold in tins in this Province, what will be done to protect the environment against these cans being flung out the window of cars and left around the roadside and in parks and so forth? Will the government be taking any emergency steps to see that the countryside is not littered up with these tins? - that is, if the government has taken the decision to allow beer to be sold in cans in this Province.

May 27, 1980

Tape No. 1832

AH-1

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

DR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I am sure my hon. colleague the Minister of Consumer Affairs & Environment (Mrs. Newhook) will be very interested in that aspect of things, but I certainly will undertake to enquire as to what plans are afoot and I will consult with my hon. colleague.

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

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. John's North.

MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I would like at this time to table the design instructions and blueprint for the new flag.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Further reports. The hon. the Minister of Transportation and Communications.

MR. BRETT: Mr. Speaker, as I promised yesterday I will now table the -

MR. THOMS: And the day before that and the day before that.

MR. BRETT: Does the hon. member want it? Do you realize the time it takes to do this?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. BRETT: If I could have some quiet over there, Mr. Speaker, I would like to table the Canada Works Programme for the department for this year. It is made up of the DREE programme, the Trans-Canada Highway programme and the provincial programme. It is all added in there.

MR. MORGAN: The total package.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): Order 4. Concurrence motion on the Resource Committee. The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. MARSHALL: Before we commence, and this is under Standing Order 120, it has been agreed in order to attempt to test and see if these concurrence debates can become more meaningful and effective, to use the same rules with respect to debate as we use in Committee on the estimates, that is, each member will be allowed to speak for ten minutes and then he would have to yield to another member. And I know the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) will be glad to know that a member may speak again and again once somebody else intervenes. So that is the general rule and we will observe that, Mr. Speaker, now and compare it to the procedure last year, and I know then that the Standing Order Committee, having seen it and gotten the opinions of all members of the House, we will then see whether we will ingrain this change into the Standing Orders.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, in accordance with our tradition of open covenants secretly arrived at and openly announced, let me simply say that is the agreement which the hon. member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) and I have arrived at on behalf of our respective - I was going to say clients - our respective caucuses.

MR. ROBERTS: It is Standing Order 121, by the way, Your Honour would have an interesting time holding this debate under Standing Order 120, but it is Standing Order 121 and the arrangement, I understand, is arrived at in an effort to try to improve the concurrence debates and I think it is the Committee of the Whole on Estimates Procedures and Rules. With the significant exception that Your Honour will preside in the Chair as opposed to the Chairman at the table. Having said that, I guess it is ten minutes - and the other wrinkle is that there are no fifteen minute statements, just ten minute statements back and forth across the House and hon. gentlemen may speak more than once and I predict several will probably speak more than once.

MR. SPEAKER (Simms): So it is agreed then that the speaking time will be ten minutes per member at any one time. To begin, the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I presume the first department we are doing is Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development. I believe the departments that come under this Committee are Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development, Lands and Forests, Fisheries, Mines and Energy, Tourism, and Industrial Development. Is that correct, Your Honour?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, perhaps for the sake of the Chair, I do not know if we are dealing with a specific department or all of those departments as it applies to the Resource Committee.

MR. MARSHALL: We are dealing with the report of the Committee, Mr. Speaker, that relates to the six departments that the hon. member has related to.

MR. SPEAKER: So any of those six departments.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: The sense of the motion is surely that the report of the Committee be concurred in.

MR. SPEAKER: Right.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lapoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, first of all let me say that I am gradually making a bit of progress in getting the estimates returned to the floor of this House where they should be debated, in this House, and not out in the boardrooms, not, as I said before, down in the dungeons of the old Colonial Building. One of the reasons we are in this House is to pass estimates. Actually that is the main reason we are in the House, to pass estimates. It is a debating forum. Once you stop debating and passing estimates in this House then you may as well shut the House down. So in changing the rules of the House last year, the government gave themselves a free ride as far as the estimates are concerned.

Now this year they have realized the error of their ways and they have allowed now to have a three hour debate in the House, not in Committee of the Whole, I might point out, there is a vast difference in Your Honour sitting in the Chair. But the same rules, the same rules, I understand, as Committee of the Whole will apply now in these three hour debates. Well, that is a bit of an improvement.

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

I think that has already been resolved and I would remind the hon. member now that we should be debating the concurrence report of the Resource Committee, not the rules of how the debate should go.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: No, Your Honour, but I just wanted to say in passing, in my few preliminary remarks, that it is about time that the government came to its senses and brought the estimates back to the House. Because the same rules now apply and so it is very difficult now to be irrelevant because we have ten minutes on six departments. So, Mr. Speaker, we are making a bit of progress, not quite to my satisfaction yet. I think it was evident this year that the committees

MR. S. NEARY: broke down, that the press were not covering the committee meetings, there were too many meetings, the House was meeting, there were too many meetings going on, the meetings were not scheduled properly and there was a complete breakdown in the committee system. So it is about time now that we got things back on the rails again. So we are making a bit of progress.

And I hope now, Mr. Speaker, that after this the government will admit man-fashion that they were wrong in moving the Estimates off the floor of this House and that they will bring the Estimates back to the House of Assembly where they should be debated.

Now one matter that I want to deal with that I think is rather urgent has to do with the Department of Fisheries. I have a lot of questions to ask ministers in connection with these various departments, but the first point I want to deal with involves the approval by the Fisheries Loan Board of loans to fishermen in this Province to purchase fibreglass longliners. These fibreglass longliners, and I believe there are over twenty- there were twenty-two or twenty-four longliners purchased by fishermen who had their loans approved by the Fisheries Loan Board. They were purchased via John Leckie and Sons who bring these boats, these fibreglass longliners from Nova Scotia. And I am told, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of these fibreglass longliners that are made in Nova Scotia is \$40,000 and \$50,000 more than longliners made in this Province. \$40,000 or \$50,000 more! And yet the minister tells us and has told us on a number of occasions that the boats from now on would have to be purchased in Newfoundland.

MR. S. NEARY: Now, that is bad enough, Mr. Speaker, that is bad enough to know that the Fisheries Loan Board gave out loans to these fishermen, approved loans for these fishermen to buy these longliners from John Leckie and Sons who took the fishermen and the government and the Fisheries Loan Board to the cleaners. But what is far worst than that, Mr. Speaker, is that I am told that these boats are not seaworthy. Now how do I know that? How do I know it? Well, I have here in front of me a letter that was written to one of the purchasers of these boats in Bridgeport in Notre Dame Bay, written by the Ship Safety Branch of the Federal Department of Transport. And this was only a fluke that this was found, Mr. Speaker, and all these boats are of the same design. I am told they are leaking, the engines have given out in them because they have become corroded because of leaks, they are in on the slipways, they are not seaworthy and the Fisheries Loan Board is demanding the payments from the fishermen.

And I am told also, Mr. Speaker, that the Fisheries Loan Board inspector approved of these boats. Just listen to this: this one was caught accidentally and they are all alike, all twenty-odd, twenty-two, twenty-four or twenty-six. It says, 'Dear Mr. So-and-So' Following an inspection of the subject vessel by surveyor Jack Oake at Durrell, April 25th., 1980 I have to inform you that no safety certificate can be issued by this service because of the potentially dangerous keel cooler arrangement. Mr. Oake has recommended the following alterations to the system:

May 27, 1980

Tape No. 1834

DW - 3

MR. S. NEARY: remove existing system entirely,
replace hull fittings with heavier bronze sleeves at least a
quarter of an inch thick having a much wider shoulder and
with an adequate nut and washer on the inside; the cooler
pipes should be fitted closer to the hull and be supported
in at least three positions; the cooler ends should be
fitted with metal shrouds properly fastened to the hull;
a perforated metal casing should be fitted between shrouds
to protect cooler lines." And

MR. NEARY: then it goes on to make other recommendations. Mr. Speaker, you might say what the Safety Branch of the Department of Transport are saying - what they are saying, Mr. Speaker, is that the boat is unseaworthy and she practically has to be built, rebuilt, from the keel up. And can you imagine the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and this government and the Fisheries Loan Board sitting by knowing, Mr. Speaker, because it has been brought to their attention, knowing that there are twenty-odd skippermen plus their crewmen, seventy or eighty Newfoundlanders risking their lives going out in these boats that are not seaworthy, because of loans approved for the purchase of these boats from John Leckie. And the only way you can get the loans approved, I am told, is if the boats were purchased from John Leckie and Sons.

Why do they have to cuddle up to John Leckie and Sons? Why does the government have to kowtow and cater to John Leckie and Sons? And that is not the only instance, Mr. Speaker, there are other instances involving engines I am sure my hon. friend from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hancock) will have a goat during these ten minute sessions. But it is absolutely scandalous, Mr. Speaker, it is scandalous.

I would like to see this whole matter investigated of these fibreglass boats. Now there is a fibreglass boat, Mr. Speaker, - and there is only one, I believe, of its kind in this Province - brought in from Nova Scotia that does not have these deficiencies, these defects and it is working out fairly well. But there are over twenty of these boats, twenty-two, twenty-four or

MR. NEARY: twenty-six fibreglass boats of the design that I just mentioned in this Province that are unseaworthy and yet the Fisheries Loan Board have not seen fit to investigate it. All they are doing is demanding their payments from the fishermen who were conned by a crowd of slieveens and forced to pay about \$40,000 or \$50,000 or \$60,000 more for that boat to John Leckie than they would have had to pay for a similar boat constructed in this Province, and that is not good enough. That is not treating our fishermen in a decent, upright manner and I want to hear the minister comment on that because some of these boats are still in on shore being repaired and may go back in the water again and I want to find out what the minister is doing about this very serious and very dangerous situation.

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

MR. F.B. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries did not respond to the first question put to him by my colleague from LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I hope he sees fit to respond after I have a few words about the Department of Fisheries.

Sir, I am hoping that the Minister of Fisheries today, very shortly, after I am finished, will level with the people of this Province with respect to its overall policy of expenditures in this Fisheries Department. The minister is very aware of the fact that we have an extremely bad unemployment situation in the Province at the present time and have had for some time, and the administration over the years, the present P.C. administration have done everything to encourage

MR. F.B. ROWE: people to enter the fisheries to try and solve that particular unemployment problem. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we have in this Province an overcapacity for catching in the fisheries in this Province.

MR. MARSHALL: Burn your boats.

MR. F.B. ROWE: And the snarky member for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) comes in with the brilliant suggestion, burn your boats. Well, I would say to the hon. the member for St. John's East, Mr. Speaker, that it was not anybody on this side who, over the last four or five or six or seven or eight years, were telling every body to get into the fisheries, young people, middle-aged people and old people, and encouraging new entrants to the fisheries when they should have the research staff both from the federal government and from their own department to indicate to them that we have an overcapacity for catching fish in this Province. And to make matters worse, Mr. Speaker, we have an overprocessing capacity in this Province.

MR. F. ROWE:

an overprocessing capacity which probably explains the reason why it is difficult for agencies such as DREE and other agencies to justify the expenditures of money for the building of new plants throughout the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador. But in its zeal or in its attempt to solve the unemployment problem in this Province, partially—especially the previous Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Carter, went overboard in encouraging people into the fisheries and indicated to the Province that the fisheries was the salvation to the unemployment problem in the Province.

And, Mr. Speaker, to add insult to injury we also have an endangered number of species in this Province. So here we are on the one side encouraging people into the fisheries and on the other side working completely against that; we have an overcapacity for catching, we have an overprocessing facility, if you want to call it that, and we have endangered stocks.

Now, what I would like for the minister to indicate to this hon. House or whatever we are in now—I guess the House, yes—what I would like the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) to indicate to the House, Mr. Speaker, is this, what is the government's total fiscal policy with respect to the fisheries especially as it pertains to the new programme that was announced over two years ago, or approximately two years ago, a programme called The Fisheries-Strategy For The '80s, a five year programme, another one of these famous five year programmes, which would have cost in the order of \$500 million. And when I asked the logical question, where is the money coming from for this \$500 million, five year fisheries programme for the '80s, I was told that \$250 million would come from the government, presumably the federal and the provincial governments, and the other \$250 million would come from private enterprise or the private sector. And we have seen this year in the Estimates a token vote, I think, of about \$1,000 for that particular programme, a token vote, Mr. Speaker. Last year we saw \$100,000, presumably for the superport in Harbour Grace. This year we saw \$1,000—am I correct in that?

May 27, 1980

Tape No. 1836

SD - 2

MR. MORGAN: \$100,000.

MR. F. ROWE: How much?

MR. MORGAN: \$100,000.

MR. F. ROWE: \$100,000. If Mr. Speaker will bear with me,

Aha! I thought I was bad in not remembering, the minister should remember.

"Fisheries Development Corporation of Newfoundland - The functions of the Crown corporation are to co-ordinate development of a primary landing and distribution centre for offshore landings to seasonal processors and to co-ordinate the lease or charter of foreign vessels for landings to underutilized fish plants." That presumably is the superport.

This year \$1,000, and my understanding was that the superport would cost in the order of something in excess of \$60 million. Last year, Mr. Speaker, you might be interested in knowing that the token vote last year was \$100,000, and that was surely a token vote and when the Estimates were revised, zero dollars. So presumably not one cent was spent on that last year, yet we were told last year that site preparation and acquisition of land was going on for that

MR. F. ROWE: particular primary landing and distribution port. Now I think, Mr. Speaker, it is time for the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) to level with the people of Newfoundland and, particularly, level with the fishermen of this Province, and indicate to them whether they have in fact abandoned the five year fisheries programme which was to cost somewhere in the order of \$500 million - level with the people whether they have abandoned the primary landing and distribution port concept for Harbour Grace, and tell them exactly what the government's fiscal policy is with respect to expenditures in the area of the fisheries, taking into consideration the overprocessing capacity, the overcatching capacity and the numbers of endangered species throughout the Province so that people are not hoodwinked into getting into the fisheries and finding out they cannot get loans from the Fisheries Loan Board, finding out they cannot get licences, finding out that there are just too many fishermen already in the fishing industry, people finding out that there are not enough plants operating full-time or part-time throughout the year. So, Mr. Speaker, in good faith I do ask the minister to answer these questions and I hope he does not see fit to say that all this is pending agreements with Ottawa and that kind of a thing. When that fisheries programme was announced by the former Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Walter Carter, with great fanfare at the Holiday Inn - T.V. cameras, colour brochures and what have you - we thought that was going to be the answer. Well, it had to be the answer, it had to be the government's policy. I am simply asking, What now is the government's policy? Have they abandoned that particular Strategy for the '80s? Have they modified it or adopted it - or have they scrapped it altogether? I think the people of this Province, through this House, Mr. Speaker, deserve an answer to that question.

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, in responding to a couple of the comments made by Opposition spokesmen, I first of all would like to say I would like to congratulate the members of the Committee who dealt with the Estimates, the Resource Policy Committee. I felt that they

MR. J. MORGAN: did a very commendable job in handling the Estimates of different departments of resources. In fact, the participation of the Opposition members also was quite heavy during the Estimates, I know, on Fisheries, and that shows the interest of the various members in the resources of our Province, in the development of our resources.

I want to comment briefly on some of the comments made this afternoon, first of all, in connection with the fibreglass boats that were purchased by the fishermen through loans by a loan board in the past, and I think it was mentioned they were bought through John Leckie Limited here in St. John's and the boats are built in Nova Scotia.

I think that has been now somewhat if not totally alleviated, whereby the regulations that I announced last week in the Legislature, and are now being sent to all fishermen, point out that in the future only fibreglass boats built within the Province will be financed through the Loan Board. Now, there are a number of companies building fibreglass boats. There is one down in Argentia, there is one in Stephenville and there is one out here at Octagon Pond. And to date, I am not convinced that these companies can accommodate the fisherman, although I have made it a regulation that now if they are financed through the board they must buy the boats built here in our Province, but only if these boats built at Argentia and Stephenville and in St. John's are to the satisfaction of the fisherman can we make that regulation really stick. It is quite unfair in my view to tell a fisherman, 'Look, you must buy boats built within our Province,' if at the same time, these boats are unsatisfactory to the fishermen. Now, there is an ongoing study commenced last Fall by the Fishing Industry Advisory Board as to the cost of boats and engines here in our Province as compared with the cost of boats and engines in Nova Scotia. That study is now being finalized and reports will be made some time in June. If that report shows, for example, that the same boat with the same specifications can be built in Nova Scotia more cheaply than it is

May 27, 1980

Tape 1837

EC - 3

MR. J. MORGAN:

built here, especially if it is a wooden vessel - and I met last week with the Boatbuilders Association and I said to the Boatbuilders Association members, 'If that study shows that you people here are building boats and the fishermen are paying too much for

MR. J. MORGAN:

these boats in comparison with what they could buy the same boat, the same specification, the same design for in Nova Scotia or somewhere cheaper, well, why should we force these people to buy these boats through you people whether they are wooden or fibreglass?" So right now the fishermen cannot be financed by the Loan Board bounties or grants and in loans to go over and buy boats from John Leckie unless these boats are built here in our Province and they are built to the satisfaction of the fishermen. And that will overcome the problem that, I recognize, I fully recognize existed in the past, as was brought out by the member for LaPoile (S. Neary), that these boats were not found to be satisfactory to the fishermen after they purchased these boats.

However, of course, the onus and responsibility was on the fishermen. They had to go out and get the boats, - search out the boat -

MR. S. NEARY: Where were your inspectors supposed to be ?

MR. J. MORGAN: - and then the loans had to be approved. And when a new boat is financed, it is inspected by the people involved in the inspection division of the Loan Board.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. J. MORGAN: And then at the time it is inspected, a brand new boat, if it is found meeting the approval of the fishermen and the inspector, it is financed. Now, in this case the boats that were built through the company in Nova Scotia, of course, as I mentioned that is now in the past. They will not be able to be financed. If a fisherman in the future wants to buy a Nova Scotian fibreglass vessel, he now-

MR. NEARY: You cannot brush it off like that.

MR. J. MORGAN: - he now has to go through the banks on his own, with no financing from the Loan Board and no subsidization.

MR. J. MORGAN: of the interest cost and buy his vessel on his own. We will not finance him. And if there is a problem in connection with the boat's design as built for a fisherman through any company like John Leckie, the dispute, in our view, is strictly between the fisherman and the company that is supplying that vessel -

MR. NEARY: No, that is not (inaudible)

MR. J. MORGAN: -because the vessel was found to be seaworthy at the time it was built.

MR. NEARY: By your inspector.

MR. J. MORGAN: At that time it was built -
If I could have some order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): Order, please! The hon. minister wishes to be heard in silence.

MR. J. MORGAN: When the boat was inspected by the inspectors it was found then to be seaworthy, then to be of meeting the approval -

MR. NEARY: That does not make sense (inaudible).

MR. J. MORGAN: - and then when later on down the line when C.S.I., the Canadian Steamships Inspection regulations were applied, if then they were found not to be seaworthy, that is a different matter altogether.

MR. NEARY: Well, that is what happened.

MR. J. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, that -

MR. NEARY: Your inspector passed it and the safety people did not.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! I think the hon. member asked some questions. The hon. the minister is now trying to give the

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): answer. I think he should be given that right.

MR. J. MORGAN: That problem was a problem that existed in the past and hopefully will not occur in the future.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, what about the fishermen who are stuck with the boats ?

MR. J. MORGAN: In fact, it will not recur in the future. Now, Mr. Speaker, before I go any further, I sat in this House this year and I have heard - you see, it goes to show inconsistency of the Liberal Party in their policy on resource development. For example, today a member stands in the House and says there is over-production in the harvesting sector. 'There is too much out there in the harvesting sectors, overcapacity.' The same hon. gentlemen are continually saying in the House, 'We need more loans for fishermen, we need more new boats, we need bigger boats, some more new engines.' And now today he stands in the House, the official spokesman for the Liberal Party on fisheries matters, and says there is an overcapacity in the harvesting sector. Well, Mr. Speaker, if there is an overcapacity in the harvesting sector why should we be issuing any more loans for bigger boats and better boats, and more engines? And we are doing that.

This year we are spending \$22 million to help better provide fishermen in the harvesting sectors to improve the harvesting capacity. So now the Liberal Party is saying 'there is overcapacity in the harvesting sector, there is too much because you are trying to solve the unemployment problem by bringing the fishermen in and getting them to go to work, by fishing.' Well, Mr. Speaker, the Liberal Party policy is obviously in conflict with the Liberal Party policy in Ottawa, because in Ottawa they recognize, and I agree with them,

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. LeBlanc's policy, I agree 100 per cent with the policy; the policy is that there is an overcapacity in the harvesting sector on the South Coast, on the Southwest Coast and on the Western part of the Province.

However, there is not an overcapacity of the harvesting sector on the Northeast Coast of Labrador and along the East Coast of Newfoundland. And that is what Mr. LeBlanc is saying now. That is his policy and I agree with that. But until we see what is going to happen to the fish stocks in the Gulf of St. Lawrence in particular and on the Western part of the Province until we see that, we have to be careful with any further expansion of the harvesting sector.

But, Mr. Speaker, in the meantime we are going to process loans for fishermen to help them get better equipped in the harvesting sector, the Northeast Coast, and we are going to do that this year to the tune of \$22 million and we are going to carry

MR. MORGAN: on developing the harvesting sector along the Northeast coast. So I am hoping in the future that there will be a verification with regards to the policy position on fisheries from the official from the Liberal party because now it is confusing. Now, Mr. Speaker, if I only had time, and I have not got time, there are only a few minutes left to talk about the processing sector. If I had leave I could carry on. Can I have leave to carry on on the processing sector?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no.

AN HON. MEMBER: They do not want the information.

MR. MORGAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, I will say again that the fishermen are totally confused by the policies coming from the Liberal party because they are saying on one hand, "No more boats. No more fishing. It is too much now. It is an overcapacity for harvesting," and at the same time they are demanding more loans for fishermen. And I am saying, Mr. Speaker, that our policy is to develop the fisheries in a rational, planned way and we are going to proceed in a rational, planned way in the fishery to make sure it is properly developed in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: (Simms) The hon. member for Trinity-Bay de Verde.

MR. F. ROWE: Mr. Speaker, what utter nonsense -

MR. FLIGHT: Tripe.

MR. F. ROWE: - and lack of logic on the part of the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) by dragging in this red herring. The hon. Minister of Fisheries never ceases to amaze me, Mr. Speaker, how he escapes answering a very sensible question by dragging some stupid, red whale across the floor of the House of Assembly. He gets up and he says, "I express, as do federal people and as do provincial people in both governments, the concern over overcapacity to the catch, overcapacity to process endangered species," And the minister says there is a terrible inconsistency there because we are asking for more money for the Fisheries Loan Board. They are not at

MR.F.ROWE: all related, Mr. Speaker. For example, you can be looking for money for loans for expenditures to improve boats, to modernize boats, to build different types of boats and replace boats, replace engines, but it does not necessarily mean, and in fact it does not mean that every cent from the Fisheries Loan Board goes into the purchase of an additional boat. Anyway, I am not going to try to answer that kind of stupid logic. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the minister once again to answer the fundamental and basic question put before him and that is this, Where does the government stand with respect to the \$500 million fisheries five year programme enunciated, televised, put on glossy brochures, sent out to people all over the Province two years ago. What has happened to that plan and what is the status of the primary landing and redistribution port that was designated for Harbour Grace? We had hon. members opposite last year tell us in this House that the purpose of that \$100,000, which was reduced to zero dollars, the \$100,000 estimated for the landing and redistribution port for Harbour Grace was to be spent for what? The answer was acquisition of land and site preparations. Coincidentally, just before the election. That was the purpose of it. Now if we were told that in the House, that land was being acquired and there was site preparation going on I would like to know where the money came from because it is not listed there in the estimates, the revised estimates for last year, in this year's budget. That \$100,000 was reduced to zero dollars. And this year's gross expenditure is the great sum of \$1000 out of an estimated cost of in excess of \$60,000. Now the minister is winking away over there. I can see what is going on in his mind-if he has a mind.

AN HON. MEMBER:

What mind?

MR.W.ROWE:

Probably that is what I can see. That is probably why it is so simple to see, Mr. Speaker. But the problem is he is going to get up now and twist around and say we are either for or against the superport in Harbour Grace. Well, I can tell the minister now that the very moment that that superport

MR. F. ROWE:

for Harbour Grace was announced I had some severe reservations about it.

MR. STIRLING:

And still do.

MR. F. ROWE:

And I still do.

MR. STIRLING:

Bill Patterson.

MR. F. ROWE:

And the hon. member, for different reasons, from Placentia (Mr. Patterson) -

AN HON. MEMBER:

Bill Patterson.

MR. F. ROWE:

- really socked it to them. But he had a different reason. His reason is if you are going to have a superport in this Province why not use facilities, or some of the facilities, already in place in Argentia. Which I would say was a reasonable thing for the hon. member for Placentia to argue for. But I am telling hon. members opposite, and my own colleagues, whether they agree with me or not, that a superport, one superport for this Province is utter foolishness. It defies logic. And I advocated, for the want of a better expression, a series of many superports. I do not know what other names you want to place on it but obviously, you know, ports serving different regions of the Province, the West Coast, Labrador, the South Coast, the Northeast Coast and what have you. You know a number of major ports. If there is a need for landing and redistribution, I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that it would better be done through a number of primary landing distribution ports throughout the Province rather than one single one. So let us not hear the minister get up here now and say that we are against Harbour Grace, or we are for the superport. We are not against Harbour Grace. We are not for the superport. We are for a series of mini superports, for the want of a better expression, distributed around the Province to serve the areas.

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible).

MR. F. ROWE:

I am shattered. I am shattered.

But I want the minister to get back and inform the House, Mr. Speaker, as to the government's policy with respect to the \$500 million five year fisheries programme for the '80s. Has

MR. F. ROWE: Walter Carter's bluff been laid to rest? Has the government modified that \$500 million election bait? Has the government abandoned that \$500 million election bait? Are they going to have another five year programme? Are they going to have another series of Kellogg studies costing in the order of - how much did it cost? \$661,000, the studies cost, if I remember correctly.

MR. MORGAN: Half a million dollars.

MR. F. ROWE: In excess of \$600,000 it cost the government to get Kellogg and Provincial Government agencies to come up with that five year programme, which in itself was going to cost \$500 million, and not a squeak -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. F. ROWE: What is going on, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt) Order, please!

MR. F. ROWE: And not a squeak from the government, not an apology, not an explanation, nothing!

MR. THOMS: Arrogance!

MR. F. ROWE: Nothing whatsoever from the minister or from the Premier as to this great fisheries \$500 million five year programme, not an utterance. Instead of that the minister gets up and says, "Here is the Opposition now talking about overcapacity of the processing, overcapacity for catching, and they want more money for the Fisheries Loan Board." How illogical can you get, Mr. Speaker?

Now I ask the minister once again to try to control himself this time, cool it down a bit, control himself and answer a very simple straightforward question, and that is what is the status of the government's five year fisheries programme? And, more specifically, what is the status of the \$61 million or \$62 million primary landing and redistribution port that was designated for Harbour Grace? Has land been acquired in Harbour Grace, or has it not? Has site

MR. F.B. ROWE: preparation gone on in Harbour Grace or has it not? How much did it cost? If it did cost anything, under what department of government would it fall in the budget? Because it was revised to zero dollars last year for that corporation which was in charge of the alleged primary landing and distribution port. So I hope the minister will see fit to answer the question, Mr. Speaker, and not get on with his foolish politics.

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

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, because of the short time last time I was going to comment on the processing end of the fisheries and tie in the central port concept which was looked at as the result of a study carried out a couple of years ago in Harbour Grace.

May I say, first of all, that right now in the Province, Mr. Speaker, we have around 181 processing facilities. Out of these facilities, I would say maybe fifty-something are feeder plants, feeder plants working into a larger operation where there is actually processing, filletting, taking place. And now we see a situation in our Province whereby we are going to have to be careful in adding to that, we are going to have to be careful in allocating any further licences for processing because right now, out of all the plants we have in the Province, there is approximately 45 per cent maximum capacity, 45 per cent capacity of all these plants are being utilized and, of course, these are utilized most of all in the short inshore, mid-shore fishing season. And because we have all these plants we have to be careful

MR. MORGAN: in allocating further licences and developing further fish processing facilities. And I agree with the hon. gentlemen in the Opposition that there may be an overproduction, if you want, or overcapacity in the processing end.

I agree with that and that is the reason why I am somewhat at a loss to understand what one of the companies I am now in dispute with, from Nova Scotia, H.B. Nickerson and Sons in particular, I am at a loss to understand what their policy really is in our Province because they are having new facilities here left and right, all over the Province, spending millions of dollars, to the tune of \$25 million last year, or in the last eighteen or nineteen months, and investing substantial amounts in one or two processing facilities like, for example, in Triton up in Green Bay, approximately \$7 million, a planned expansion for Lewisporte, a further \$7 million or \$8 million, and Dildo \$4 million or \$5 million, in Charleston, Bonavista Bay, another \$4 million or \$5 million, Jacksons Arm - and, of course, that is just Nickersons. National Sea expansion in LaScie, National Sea expansion at Arnold's Cove, the operations in Burgeo, all these are operated by one company at the top, Nickersons, who own National Sea - they operate two separate companies - and they are increasing substantially their processing capacity in our Province at a time when we do not have raw material for the existing plants.

How are we ever going to keep these plants operating longer per year? That is the question that is always in the back of my mind. And if you have a facility out in Dildo, Trinity Bay, valued at, say, \$7 million or \$9 million and it is operating for three or four months of the year, it is

MR. MORGAN: difficult to justify how that plant is going to make a profit. In fact, I would say it will suffer a loss.

And we have to find some way of a continuity of supply to keep these plants operating longer year-round, year-round if possible. But if not year-round, at least seven or eight months of the year. And how could we have a plant in Lewisporte, for example, operating seven or eight months? You are not going to have it from the inshore - mid-shore fishery because by the end of September the inshore - mid-shore fishery is practically over and it starts - when? - say in May month.

MR. WHITE: No, January. It starts in January.

MR. MORGAN: Well, the inshore fishery on the East coast does not start in January.

MR. WHITE: It does start in January.

MR. MORGAN: It does not start in January.

MR. WHITE: It does.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, the inshore fishery along the Northeast coast of the Province does not start in January. It starts much later than January, it is more like May month for the regular inshore fishery.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is the ice fishery (inaudible) you want.

MR. MORGAN: Now the question of supplying - the ice fishery is not going to supply a plant the size that Nickerson is planning for Lewisporte with a supply of raw material to keep it going. There is no question in my mind that is impossible. So

May 27, 1980, Tape 1841, Page 4 -- apb

MR. MORGAN: what we are saying is
to get a continuity of supply of fish for these fish
plants we have to find some means of a supply

MR. J. MORGAN:

of raw material. And back when Mr. Carter was Minister of Fisheries with the then government of the day looked at a central port concept of landing fish and having it distributed to a number of fish plants in a certain radius, if you want to call it that, from Bonavista to Trepassy. And they would have the fish landed from where? The Northern cod, the offshore. Now, the Northern cod, we call it the Northern cod, the offshore fishery, here we are right now with a maximum quota of 45,000 metric tons placed on that resource. That fish was caught up by the middle of - was closed down when? If I recall around the end of April or the first week in May this year. It closed down, no more fishing in the offshore, because the quota had been reached, and certain parts of that quota have been taken and landed in Nova Scotia. And if the increased harvesting in Nova Scotia comes over next year and takes more than was taken this year, it means it will be closed down earlier next year in the offshore. So it means a lack of supply of raw material for the existing plants, so even if we had this big port concept, a big port over in Harbour Grace right now, if we had it right now, there would be no point in having it there because there would be no supply of fish from the offshore to land in that port.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Right on.

MR. J. MORGAN:

And until we can see what is happening to the offshore fisheries and the regeneration of the stocks out there, in my view the central port concept is not feasible. So we have to wait and see what is going to happen to the regeneration of the stocks. Then maybe down the road, maybe three or four years time - and according to scientists the stocks are coming back to the point where the boats were catching, when they closed down the Northern cod, by the way, for the information of the members of the House, when they closed the Northern cod, they were catching ten tons of cod per hour and some of the skippers of the boats said they never saw anything like it before, so much cod in the offshore.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Where was that?

MR. J. MORGAN: It was not on the Hamilton Banks, it was South of the Hamilton Bank area; it was in the 3KL area. And they were fishing that cod and it looks very promising that the regeneration is occurring, but until we can see the regeneration of the stocks and the migration to the inshore and mid-shore grounds to enable a larger quota offshore, there is no fish out there to land in any central port to be shipped or trucked around to the various plants around the Province. And that is the only answer in getting these plants-and I fail to see what H.P. Nickerson & Sons are up to because I can not understand why they are putting all this money in seasonal plants when they know there is no supply of raw material there.

Recently on the St. Barbe coast, for example, they called a meeting down there; people were complaining why DREE turned down assistance for the Nickerson's plant costing about \$9 million. And someone asked them the question, 'How are you going to keep this plant going longer than three or four months?' And the answer to the question - it was not a senior official, but some official from the company said, "We will take some of that controversial Northern cod and land it in our plant in St. Barbe". Fine, no argument whatsoever. That is exactly what we are saying to the companies in Nova Scotia: 'If you have your plants here, any fish you catch out there in the offshore, why take it all the way back to your own plants in Nova Scotia when it could be more feasible for you to land your fish closer'- in this case in Newfoundland-'in our own plants, your own operations and supply jobs for Newfoundlanders?' That is exactly what we are saying.

So the same goes for Triton, the large plant in Triton; the same goes for the large plant proposed for Lewisporte and other places along the Northeast coast. And the only answer to get these plants going, operating longer, is to have a supply of fish from the offshore after the inshore-mid-shore fishery is over.

Now, I have got to comment about these quotas and the licencing of fishermen before my time is up, because

MR. J. MORGAN:

the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. S. Neary)

I think, sometimes during debates in the House had mentioned the fact that the fishermen in Nova Scotia were going to cut off the Newfoundlanders from fishing in Nova Scotian waters if the Minister of Fisheries here did not stop the confrontation with his counterpart in Nova Scotia. Well, let us look at it very closely now and I want to emphasize what I am saying now is factual information. Last year, Mr. Speaker, Newfoundlanders took from Nova Scotia or mainland waters, designated

MR. J. MORGAN: mainland waters, in areas designated by the federal government, Newfoundlanders took 25,000 metric tons of fish. But on the other side of the coin, Nova Scotians took from Newfoundland waters, designated by the federal government as Newfoundland waters, they took 35,000 metric tons of fish. So nobody is saying now, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Nobody is saying, Mr. Speaker, that there is not a need for inter-action between provinces. We both agree, Nova Scotia and ourselves, there is always going to be inter-action, Nova Scotia fishing here and Newfoundland fishing there, back and forth across the Gulf operation in particular, but the Northern Cod means to Newfoundlanders, it was because it was always historically fished, traditionally fished by none but Newfoundlanders, Mr. Speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: Do not be so foolish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, if the Liberal Party wants to say to us, 'We want the source of livelihood for the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland, leave it. Do not stand up and protect it, forget it, if it wants to do that. But what we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is this, that the Northern Cod means the same to Newfoundland - and always did - as the scallops mean to Nova Scotia. And, Mr. Speaker, when you send Newfoundlanders to fish the scallops traditionally, historically fished by Nova Scotians, send Newfoundlanders to Nova Scotian waters to fish for scallops, then, Mr. Speaker, I think that Nova Scotia would stand up and say -

MR. S. NEARY: Here we go again!

MR. J. MORGAN: - 'Look, this has always been historically fished, traditionally fished by Nova Scotians. Why are you suddenly coming now? Because it is lucrative?'

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN: What we are saying, Mr. Speaker, is -

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. J. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, please call order.

MR. SPEAKER (Butt):

Order, please!

The hon. minister's time has expired.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. J. MORGAN:

On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

On a point of order, the hon. the

Minister of Fisheries.

MR. J. MORGAN:

Mr. Speaker, my point of order is this.

During my comments, and I have limited time to make them, the fact that I was interrupted a number of times by people who are now intending to speak, surely, Mr. Speaker, in future in this kind of debate where there is limited time, it is important for all members when they speak to be heard in silence.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

There is no point of order.

MR. SPEAKER:

I do not think there is really a point of order, but a very good point brought forward for all hon. members to take heed of.

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I want to get back to this very, very serious matter that I raised about fibreglass boats. The answer given by the minister was a brushoff. The minister said, 'Forget the past. We have new regulations now, we have to forget the past.' So these approximately twenty-two fishermen who are stuck with these boats, and the Fisheries Loan Board demanding their money, you have to forget about them, write them off. These boats, Mr. Speaker, were approved by the inspector from the Fisheries Loan Board. They were certified as being seaworthy by the Ship Safety branch of the Department of Transport, when in actual fact they were not seaworthy. There had to be major, I submit, major changes made to these boats. Now, why were they approved? That is what I am asking. Why was it so easy to get an application approved by the Fisheries Loan Board to buy one of these

MR. S. NEARY: boats from John Leckie, brought in from Nova Scotia, that cost, I am told, around \$106,000 when they could have been bought in this Province for \$60,000? Why was that, Mr. Speaker? Why did the department, why did the inspectors recommend - why did the Fisheries Loan Board recommend to the fishermen, 'Look, if you want to get a boat approved quickly, buy one of those longliners from John Leckie, a fibreglass longliner'? Now, why were they told that? Why were they sucked in by the people on the Fisheries Loan Board? Why were they sucked in? I want to know, and why are they now being punished and they have to pay the penalty?

AN HON. MEMBER: I think you will not say that outside the House?

MR. S. NEARY: I just said it on television, in case the hon. gentleman wants to watch it tonight. They were sucked in, the fishermen were, and there is something going wrong, Mr. Speaker. There is something that went wrong, and the fishermen are not the ones who should have to pay the price. This was discovered through a fluke, a pure accident, when this man down in Bridgeport in Notre Dame Bay had trouble with his fibreglass boat that I spoke about, of that particular type. She was leaking. And he went to look for his Safety Inspection certificate and, lo and behold, he discovered there was no certificate, although the minister's -

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) Department of Transport (inaudible).

MR. S. NEARY: No, not this particular boat. But the minister's inspector approved it. And why, I want to know. I am not particularly concerned that there was no certificate on this particular boat, because it was a godsend that there was no certificate, because there are approximately twenty-two boats like this in the Province.

MR. NEARY: The others were approved and had their certificates passed by the inspector from the Fisheries Loan Board and passed by the Ministry of Transport, when in actual fact they are exactly the same boat, the same boat as this one, and this one had to undergo before they could get a certificate, after they discovered she did not have a certificate - had to undergo major repairs, practically rebuilt from the keel up, and yet the other boats are the same, exactly the same. They are either on the slipways now, they are either in the water on the slipways being repaired or they have been abandoned.

MR. HOLLETT: Twenty-two of them.

MR. NEARY: Over twenty-two of them. And I am asking the minister to explain it, to give us an explanation of it, to investigate it, to find out why the inspector passed these boats as being seaworthy, why the Ship Safety Branch of the Transport Department, the coast guard gave a certificate saying they were seaworthy when in actual fact they are not seaworthy, proven by this letter that was written to this gentleman in Bridgeport.

DR. COLLINS: Are you going to table that letter?

MR. NEARY: No, I am not going to table it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Well, I will take the man's name off of it and then I will table it.

MR. MORGAN: Find me a copy of it.

MR. WHITE: Give it to the minister.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I will certainly give it to the minister. Because, Mr. Speaker, there are approximately twenty-two of these boats floating around Newfoundland that may not be seaworthy. There was a five year warranty with these boats incidentally. I want to know, Mr. Speaker, I want to know why it was so easy in the first place, why the minister's people associated with the board made it so easy for fishermen to get applications approved from John Leckie. Why it was so easy. And they said, "Look boy, if you want to get a boat, you want a longliner, put

MR. NEARY: in your application for one of these fibreglass longliners, through John Leckie, that we bring in from Halifax and your loan will be approved just like that." Why was that? And why were they approved? Why did they get their certificates as being seaworthy when in actual fact they were not seaworthy as proven by the recommendations that were made in this letter to the man in Bridgeport before he could get a certificate for his boat. He had to make major changes to his boat.

It is a wonder somebody has not been lost and could be lost yet, unless the minister is prepared to investigate it instead of brushing it off as he did a few minutes ago, sloughing it off by saying, "We now have new regulations. We are not concerned or interested in the past." Well, I am interested in the past, Mr. Speaker, and I want to know why Mr. Walter Carter approved - bypassed the Fisheries Loan Board and approved the construction of boats for fishermen in St. Mary's Bay without them being inspected, and when the inspectors went out they said, "How come this boat is - she is almost built and we did not even know she was being built?" Now, what kind of an inspection can they do on a boat like that? How many cases like that do we have where Mr. Walter Carter picked up his phone and approved of the loan and then it was discovered later on that there was no loan -

MR. THOMS: Shame! Shame!

MR. NEARY: - and that the inspector had not been notified to go out and inspect the boat, and that happened down in St. Mary's and The Capes.

MR. STAGG: It is not happening now.

MR. NEARY: No, well, maybe it is not happening now, but what do you do? Do you sweep the past under the rug?

MR. STAGG: We know it is not happening now.

MR. NEARY: Well, I do not know if it is or not. We have never been able to get a satisfactory explanation of what happened to the Fisheries Loan Board, that was blamed on the fishermen who were on the Board. But I am concerned right now about these fibreglass boats.

MR. NEARY: I think the minister owes it to the fishermen who were sucked in, duped, conged. There is more to this than meets the eye, Mr. Speaker, more to it than meets the eye. If I was the hon. gentleman I would not shrug it off. I would not brush it off by saying, "We now have new regulations and what happened in the past, that is it, it is unfortunate, there is nothing we can do about it", because the fishermen put themselves in the hands of the Fisheries Loan Board inspector and the inspectors of the Transport Department. The fisherman was not the one who had to certify whether the boat was seaworthy or not. He said, "Yes, she looks like a good boat, like the type I want, and if she meets all the CSU specifications I would like to buy her" -

MR. WARREN: Probably the inspector was looking through the window of a car.

MR. NEARY: - and the inspectors in twenty-one or twenty-two of these cases said, "She is seaworthy", and through a fluke discovered that one is not seaworthy, exactly the same design, the same specifications.

MR. HOLLETT: (Inaudible) cost?

MR. NEARY: I would say between three and four million dollars that the fishermen now have to pay back when they were just the pawns in some little game that was being played on the inside.

MR. WARREN: The fishermen are gone bankrupt now.

MR. NEARY: And the fishermen may go bankrupt over this as my hon. friend says, but it has to be looked into and it cannot just be shrugged off and brushed aside by the minister, and I demand, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman carry out some kind of an investigation into this, because if he does not somebody else will, I can guarantee him that.

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

MR. ANDREWS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I imagine we are still on the Department of Fisheries. I do not know what the rules of the debate are, if we can wander to other departments, but I would like to make a few comments on some of the things that have been said this afternoon.

First of all, there is, I think -

May 27, 1980

Tape No. 1844

GH-4

MR. STIRLING:

Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: (Butt)

Point of order, the hon. member for

Bonavista North.

MR. STIRLING:

I think the member has brought up a very good point. We are debating the Estimates of all the resource ministers and it is supposed to be a question and answer. I am glad to see the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) has just arrived.

MR. L. STIRLING: Can we get the other ministers in as well? Because the questions, you know, there are three colleagues on this side wishing to get up and the member made a very good point that it seemed like it was only either Forest Resources and Lands or Fisheries we could ask about. The Minister of Tourism, Recreation and Culture (Mr. Dawe) is not here. So could we get all the ministers in so that we can have a discussion and a question period?

MR. SPEAKER (Butt): There is obviously no point of order.

The hon. member for Burgeo -
Bay d'Espoir.

MR. H. ANDREWS: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that there are some very serious issues to be faced in the whole realm of the fishery today and were brought up by the Opposition spokesman for Fisheries and by the minister. I think if both of those two gentlemen listen to each other speak that there is common ground here for agreement. Number one is that the stock resource is not unlimited.

SOMEHON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. H. ANDREWS: That is understood, that has been well understood by the fishermen of Newfoundland for so many years now, certainly understood by this government and, I think, by everybody on both sides of the House. Unfortunately we ran into some difficult situations here when the federal minister in one case, Mr. LeBlanc or our own Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) -

MR. L. STIRLING: Mr. McGrath.

MR. H. ANDREWS: Mr. LeBlanc at the present moment.

MR. H. ANDREWS: - is put under pressure by groups of fishermen or so-called fishermen or pressure groups from different sections of the Province to increase fish quotas because they think the quotas are too low, with no scientific reasoning or backing or knowledge behind that. That is a very difficult situation. I must comment and praise the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) for not giving in to such pressure as that. Because the first step that is taken in that regard, I think, will lead to some very serious consequences for the whole fishery. Herring in total might be insignificant to our fish stocks and our fish exports, but if we ever to start to tamper with cod, redfish, grey sole and all those other species I think we could be in very serious trouble.

There are probably too many fish plants in Newfoundland. I would say that we have probably half as many fish plants, establishments than we need. I think we could cut them probably by 50 per cent. Now, I say that with this in mind, that a license to operate a fish plant is not just a license to operate a small fish plant, it can be a license to operate a large fish plant. My understanding is, talking with some people in the fish trades just a few days ago - now we will come back to the subject of herring - that there is one fish plant on the Northeast coast of Newfoundland that if the herring catching seasons were changed slightly to permit the flow of herring to that plant, that that one fish plant could handle and produce and manufacture all the herring products that we ship out of Newfoundland right now. That is that one establishment.

MR. H. ANDREWS: If there are too many licenses we have another dangerous situation on our hands because, as I just said, these licensed fish plants, even though they may be small in 1980, will continue to grow and fish businessmen being like any other fishermen, will want to enlarge their business and increase their production. I think this is a very serious thing that we must watch very carefully.

How you regulate that. I know licensing of plants and extensions to plant facilities are controlled by the Province, and I would ask our Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) to keep a very close eye on this. One the reasons why this situation, I believe, has come about in Newfoundland is because of the overcatching of fish in Nova Scotia which encouraged Nickersons and National Sea, over the past two years or eighteen months, to move into Newfoundland and establish themselves in places where our own fish processors did not think it was economic, for the past few years, to establish. And that has set in a change-reaction

MR. ANDREWS: where our own local processors are reacting to the movement of these multi-national corporations into Newfoundland and they are trying to grab their own little piece of pie. A large corporation goes into one cove, one harbour, and if you watch the map one of our local processors goes into the next one to try to maintain a piece of the action so that they will not be swallowed up, and that is a logical thing for them to do. It is a very serious thing, Mr. Speaker.

There was some discussion here today about the Northern cod stocks and this once again comes back to the whole business of who is going to control the quotas. I do not think there is any doubt in anybody's mind that the federal authorities, with their expertise in this, should be the ones to set the total allowable catch. However, in a situation where we had, just in St. Lawrence, which comes to mind, in the harbour of St. Lawrence where there was a quota set without any regard for what type of gear that that quota should be caught with, two or three large mobile herring seiners came in and in two days, I understand, took the entire quota. That quota could have been caught, my understanding of it is, by forty or forty-five fishermen just building up in St. Lawrence with fixed gear, with a few gill nets and could have extended that season, possibly, for several weeks.

This is where I think the Province - backbenchers on this side, backbenchers on the other side, the member who represents St. Lawrence in this case, should have had some way to have an input, to say, 'No, do not bring in those large vessels,

MR. ANDREWS: particularly in this case, set it aside for the inshore fishermen in their small boats and dories mainly, as I understand it in the St. Lawrence area, 'and extend that season'.

This is what this government refers to as shared jurisdiction. It is not an attempt to set the quota, it is an attempt to have some local input. In this case it would be a lot of local input from the member and I imagine that would be, in this case, the member for Grand Bank (Mr. Thoms).

So, Mr. Speaker, these are serious things and I am glad to see that our Newfoundland and Labrador Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is working in close harmony, to date, with the federal Minister of Fisheries. We have in Newfoundland, that could possibly be affected by the Northern cod, the increase in the effort from Nova Scotia, and I am not denying the Nova Scotians the right to catch fish in areas where they traditionally caught fish, we have the danger that 5,000 Newfoundland fish plant workers could be out of work, or 1,200 deepsea trawler fishermen. It is a dangerous situation. I think the key word and the watch word here is to maintain the status quo.

MR. STIRLING: Getting ready.

MR. ANDREWS: If we do not maintain the status quo the catching capability of other Provinces in Canada to take the Northern cod is much more than our own is. They can take it under - if you just look at the geography of Canada you can sail a ship to the Lake Head, you can sail it to Toronto Island, you could theoretically have trawlers coming from Thunder Bay, steaming down the St. Lawrence Seaway, out through the

MR. ANDREWS: gulf, out through the Strait of Belle Isle and catching our Northern cod and taking it back. I think that is a situation that we must watch very carefully, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I believe the comments that just came from the member for Burgeo - Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews), it sounds like he is in the running for next Minister of Fisheries.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
Before the hon. member proceeds, and I know he would like me to do this, I would like to welcome to the gallery on behalf of all hon. members the District Governor of the Atlantic Provinces Kinsmen Clubs and the National Director of the Kinsmen Clubs of Canada.-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Richard Lavanier from Dartmouth, Nova Scotia and Mr. Ross Rowe from Ontario accompanied by their wives and the Convention Chairman, Mr. Frazer Reid from here in St. John's. We trust your Atlantic Provinces Convention will be a success and that they will enjoy it.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STIRLING: With the agreement of my colleague, I am sure that for the rest of the evening the Speaker will be on the best of behaviour because he is a former National President of the Kinsmen Club and I am glad that we now have somebody -

MR. SPEAKER: As he is always, of course.

MR. STIRLING: - watching. As he is always, impartial and such a good Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

Holiday Inn tonight.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

MR. SPEAKER (Simms):

Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

of mine pertaining to the fishery and the budget that was recently passed.

And stay out of the

Hear, hear!

The hon. the member for

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

There are some concerns

MR. G. WARREN: A few days ago, the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) distributed a brochure called Fishing Vessels Assistance Plan. Now, Mr. Speaker, I skimmed through this brochure and I found to my dismay, that effective May 1st, there is no bounty on boats under twenty-five feet.

MR. G. WARREN: That was last Fall.

MR. WARREN: Now, yes this has been effective since last Fall. I agree with the minister but however, the minister said last Fall when he became Minister of Fisheries that he would consult where possible, when possible and how possible with the fishermen of this Province.

AN HON. MEMBER: He also said he was going to cut back on (inaudible)

MR. G. WARREN: However, I am afraid - I cannot understand what consultation he had with the fishermen in Labrador. Ninety per cent of the fishermen in Labrador - this brochure does not include Labrador.

MR. E. HISCOCK: North of Henley Harbour it is twenty-two feet.

MR. G. WARREN: Okay, well, this brochure is incomplete.

MR. E. HISCOCK: North of Henley Harbour -

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, the minister - if I could find out from the minister if this brochure applies to Labrador not.

Does it apply to Labrador or not? Could the minister

MR. MORGAN: (inaudible) come under that.

MR. G. WARREN: Okay. If it does not, Mr. Speaker, I fail to understand why the minister would come out with a brochure that is half complete.

Last year the Department of Fisheries operated two fish plants in Nain and Makkovik and I think it was something in the vicinity of 300,000 pounds of different species were caught. 300,000 pounds of different species were caught. And it was sold to a broker who subsequently

MR. G. WARREN: took it down to the United States. Now, I learned from reliable sources that although the government has not been paid their \$39,000 because the company has gone bankrupt, I also learned that this fish is still lying in sheds down in the United States and for some unknown reason, and I would like for the minister to clarify if it is true or not that this fish is not of the best quality, that the fish is not of the best quality because I am sure if this is the case, if this is the case, the fishermen here in my district would love to know if this is the problem because they, in the past, have produced fish in the best of qualities. So I am just wondering if this is the problem that this fish is not sold.

Mr. Speaker, sometime ago, I spoke to the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) pertaining to the Fisheries Loan Board. Now, I think the minister is sympathetic to questions that are posed to him. That in Labrador we have a fishing season of a maximum and I will go from Henley Harbour North, a maximum of probably three and a half to four months, and a fisherman up there would probably make only one quarter of the wages that an average Newfoundland fisherman would make. However, the same criteria pertaining to the Loan Board applies to a fisherman who has to fish under those extreme circumstances.

MR. E. HISCOCK:

Shame! Shame!

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, back in December 1978, the Provincial Department of Fisheries appointed a fishery representative in Happy Valley - Goose Bay responsible for the whole Labrador Coast. In due course this gentleman resigned to enter political life and from the time that that representative resigned to enter political life, it took four months to recruit another representative - a very recent representative for Labrador. Now, that representative, also, within the matter of six months resigned his position and went with one of the big fish

MR. G. WARREN: companies. And now it has been close to four months since that gentleman resigned and there is not, as of today, no regional representative for Labrador. Now, this government is saying they are concerned. They are concerned. Out of fourteen months they have had seven months without any regional fisheries representative and the burden has to lie on a secretary in an office in Goose Bay.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that if this government and in particular the Department of Fisheries, are going to address the problems pertaining to the fisheries in Labrador, I suggest that ~~the~~ number one criteria is for the Minister of Fisheries (J. Morgan) and this government to make sure that there are adequate staff in Labrador to carry on with the projects.

Mr. Speaker, earlier one of the speakers, I think it was the member from LaPoile (S. Neary), said inspectors were not doing their jobs. Now, I am not going to say that the inspectors were not doing their jobs.

MR. G. WARREN: I am saying there are not enough inspectors. For example, the inspector for Labrador is stationed in Arnold's Cove, Placentia Bay. Now that is pretty good!

MR. E. HISCOCK: Shame! Shame!

MR. G. WARREN: The inspector for Labrador, who has to cover the Coast from Nain down to L'Anse-au-Clair is stationed in Arnold's Cove, Placentia Bay.

MR. D. HANCOCK: Does he have a helicopter?

MR. G. WARREN: No, he got up there once - I believe he was up there twice last year. For the whole of 1979 he made two trips to Labrador - and for no fault of his own, because he has so large a district to cover and so many communities to go into that he does not have the time to spend in Labrador because there is so much time taken in travelling from Arnold's Cove to, we will say, Davis Inlet in Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the minister if he is advertising for more inspectors he should get on the ball right away and make sure he has inspectors in place who can accommodate the fishermen in the industry.

Mr. Speaker, the minister also said that the Liberal Party is not consistent. Well, I will tell the hon. minister now that if we were in government we would not -

AN HON. MEMBER: Never. Never.

MR. G. WARREN: Oh, yes, the day is coming - not very far away, by the way.

MR. D. HANCOCK: The next election we will.

MR. G. WARREN: The next election - the time is coming, folks! Do not worry, the time is coming, and very, very shortly.

MR. L. THOMS: If the Premier pokes his nose in the district [inaudible]

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, if we were in government - that is a big 'if' today, but it will be a small 'if' tomorrow - the one thing we would be consistent about is that we would know who our fishermen are. That is what this government does not know. This government cannot determine a bona fide fisherman. This government has not in the past

MR. G. WARREN: seven years determined a bona fide fisherman. And until this government can determine who is a fisherman and who is not and make sure that those people who are out in the boats for the sake of jigging squids in the Fall of the year or a few herring in the Spring of the year, make sure that only the fishermen catch these species - then, I am sure that this government will go a long way in satisfying the true, real Newfoundland fisherman.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the answers that I have gotten from this government, especially from the Premier of this Province, blaming the inactivity of this government pertaining to Labrador on DREE. It is DREE's fault for everything that this government is not doing in Labrador.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. G. WARREN: I find it so astonishing, so amazing! We have two fish plants in Nain and Makkovik that are inadequate at the present time to accommodate the species that are caught. Now, if we go into the shrimp, the scallops, the turbot and so on, the fish plants are inadequate to accommodate them. Now, are we going to wait for the federal government to sign DREE agreements in order to bring those fish plants up to standard? We had nine months of Tory administration in Ottawa when the DREE agreements were put in vault nineteen.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would suggest to the hon. the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) that he seriously look at those two fish plants and see that they are adequate to accommodate the species that the fishermen will probably catch this Summer.

One other concern I want to express to the hon. minister is that come September, when you are in Makkovik, Mr. Minister, you are not in Bonavista, you are 1,200 miles North and with that the weather becomes cold. Now, we have fish plant workers working in those two fish plants with absolutely no heat in the rooms at all - no heat at all where the women and men are working. So can the minister see any reason why there could not be some electric heaters or something like that to keep the people who are employed in those fish plants.

MR. G. WARREN: at least comfortable until the fishing season is over? It is not a very large request, Mr. Minister, but it is a serious one, and if you want to make sure -

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

Does he have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. G. WARREN: One minute, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Leave, agreed.

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I will finish off with this. I would like for the minister to assure me today that he will look into this possibility of seeing that those two fish plants, at least the working section, would be heated for the convenience of the workers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. J. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, it is always a pleasure to comment on the fisheries in Labrador because I know that the concerns put forward by the gentleman who just sat down are very sincere ones, having been involved in the fisheries for a number of years himself on the Labrador coast - the processing end and management of processing facilities, so I would like to answer some of the concerns or inquiries.

In connection with the subsidies in Labrador, we do recognize that Labrador is not Bonavista as pointed out by the gentleman from the Torngat Mountains (Mr. G. Warren) and there is need for special recognition of that. And that is why just recently, upon representations from the members in Opposition and my colleague the minister from Labrador (Mr. J. Goudie) we have now changed the subsidization for fishermen's gear whereby up until just about two weeks ago the fishermen were unable to obtain the 30 per cent subsidy for components of gear, it had to be the one structured piece of fishing gear. Well now, that has changed whereby the fishermen North of Cape St. Charles can now qualify to obtain that subsidy and prior to that I think it was North of Cape Rouge. So, that has changed. And, also, with regard to the subsidization on the smaller type boats, the eighteen foot boat to twenty-five foot, we did not take that subsidy off the Labrador coast last year when it was off everywhere else in the Province, and when it came time to make a decision, what we would do with regard to the new programme, we thought that in Labrador the fishermen are now going more and more into larger boats, bigger boats, they are getting more involved in the thirty-five boat and larger.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. J. MORGAN: We are hoping they will because we think that is the kind of boat they want to operate on the coast. And based on that we said, 'Okay, we will take off the subsidy, the subsidy is not there now for the eighteen - twenty-five foot boat. We want to see what is going to happen.' And when I mentioned consultation, I will be

MR. J. MORGAN: only too pleased to listen to fishermen's groups this Summer when I travel to Labrador. I am going to travel the Labrador coast, that is a sincere promise I made to my colleague from Labrador in Cabinet and to the members from the coast in Labrador. I will travel the coast this Summer on an extensive tour with the officials with me because we do have some problems down there and I want to see them first-hand and hopefully get some of them resolved but I am not going to promise I can resolve all of the problems.

But I want to outline for members from the Labrador coast the recent plan we put in place which has not been announced publicly to date. As a result of meetings with the Fishermen's Union, the Saltfish Corporation, Fishery Products and Nickersons, we have now put in place an operational programme for the Labrador coast and it is going to go like this: We are going to lease the the Labrador shrimp company, which is a company formed by the Fishermen's Union, they are holding shrimp licences issued by the federal government, we are going to lease the facilities at Cartwright and at Mary's Harbour to the Labrador shrimp company and Fishery Products has confirmed to us that they will have eight collecting boats this year on the coast of Labrador and Nickersons tell us they will take 75,000 pounds per day.

AN HON. MEMBER: Per day.

MR. J. MORGAN: Yes, per day, fish in Black Tickle - Black Tickle Seafoods. So combining these two operations with the Saltfish Corporation, which is applying to have an operation again in the Smokey area and possibly in one other part of the coast, two boats, they will have a saltfish operation by means of a foreign vessel operating by means of having fish taken onboard the vessel on the coast of Labrador and possibly further processed in saltfish plants somewhere on the Island portion of the Province. Now, I am not in favour of that but if we go along with it - I am not in favour because I want to see as much processing as possible on the Labrador Coast, I want to see that.

So, looking at the operation now, we have a floating barge owned by the Newfoundland government. The union wanted us to lease the barge to them, Fishery Products wanted us to lease the barge to them, and in talking with Mr. Cashin and with Fishery Products,

May 27, 1980

Tape No. 1849

SD - 3

MR. J. MORGAN: the decision has now been made and passed
on as of today to Mr. Cashin and the Labrador shrimp company part of the
union, that we will

MR. MORGAN: operate the barge, and we will make sure there is no discrimination to any fisherman. If he wants to sell to the Saltfish Corporation, he can do it and be serviced at the service centre from our barge, get servicing from there. If he wants to sell to Fishery Products, that is up to him as well. Now, there is no discrimination. There will be fair play for all fishermen, and all fishermen will be getting serviced from that service centre, the barge in Smokey, operating in Smokey. So, we felt that was the fairest way we could go in the Labrador Coast this year, but, of course, the long-term aim is that this year they are looking at processing saltfish in Cartwright. The shrimp company will have a manager-operator - in this case it is the Bay Bulls Seafoods, they have made a deal with them to be the managing operators, and then that managing operator will carry out a saltfish operation in Cartwright, which will be, really, an agent of the Saltfish Corporation and tie in with their operation of the vessel out in Smokey. So, that is the overall plan we have now put in place but, of course, as I mentioned, the objective, at least in the back of my mind, is to get some processing, actual processing onshore.

The companies, Fishery Products and Nickersons, they claim, with eight ships going up collecting from St. Anthony and with the operation of 75,000 pounds a day at Black Tickle, that they are totally and adamantly opposed to any over-the-side sales to foreign boats through the union. Because they have assured Mr. LeBlanc in a telegram and they have assured us in writing as well that, "Look, we feel", and they are saying as a company, "we feel, look, we can definitely handle the markets of the fishermen on the Labrador Coast this Summer, and we are opposed to any over-the-side sales". Why should fish leave, like turbot and cod, leave the waters shipped aboard a foreign vessel going straight to overseas somewhere, like Spain or Portugal in particular, most likely one of these two, when we can handle the fish here? It is difficult for us to have to say to Mr. LeBlanc, "Yes, we agree, go ahead with over-the-side sales in Labrador through the union or somebody else", but in this case through the union, when the companies are saying they can handle the fish.

MR. MORGAN: So we want to see the fish processed. So we are, right now, opposed to over-the-side sales except directly to the Saltfish Corporation. We are opposed to over-the-side sale of fish shipped to a foreign vessel and leaving the waters unprocessed." Mr. LeBlanc has indicated in the last meeting I had with him he would be making a decision in the next few days on that, I am expecting a decision this week, but at least he knows our views in that regard.

MR. WHITE: What is the Fisherman's Union view on that?

MR. MORGAN: The fishermen's union is the one that is applying for the over-the-side sale and -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) development.

MR. MORGAN: No, they want an over-the-side sale in Labrador, they have applied for it, but there is no decision made by the federal minister and the final say is with the federal minister.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible).their part.

MR. MORGAN: Well, I am standing with the fact, and I think my colleagues from Labrador and members of the House will agree, that it is important to have as much as possible of all raw material caught by fishermen in Labrador processed in Labrador. Now, that is a policy that we stand firm on, and we will fight anybody, including the union and anybody else, on that. We want as much as possible. That is the reason why I am not, Mr. Speaker, I am not convinced that the Saltfish Corporation has done enough on the Labrador Coast for the past number of years, and we told them that. They are moving in a vessel, for example, to take fish and salt it in salt bulk aboard the vessel and bring it down to some of the plants out in Port Union somewhere or out in Bay Roberts or somewhere else to be processed. Why has not some action been taken over the past few years, you know, to process in Labrador on the shore there? But, Mr. Speaker, getting on a point - I cannot cover all the points, unfortunately, I have two minutes left but I will say - the part about the field man needs to be appointed in Labrador, I will say that the job was advertised. The applicants were interviewed as of last week and the recommendation is

MR. MORGAN: now on my desk. There are two people who were felt to be qualified and I will be appointing one of these people to that position by the end of next week at the latest. That is to cover the coast. With regard to inspectors, we intend to train that individual, as most of the field men around the Province, as inspectors, put them in the Fisheries College here, train them as inspectors so they will not have to leave the Labrador Coast to seek an inspector, like from St. John's somewhere. The man down in Labrador can do the inspection for the fisherman.

MR. WARREN: (Inaudible) going to be controlling Nain?

MR. MORGAN: The Nain plant and Makkovik plant, Mr. Speaker, in reply to the question, I cannot give too much detailed information on it. I know we have a team in Labrador right now from the Department of Fisheries and they are coming back, I think, it is the middle of next week, the officials, and they will give me a report as to what plan we put in place, and I will be glad to talk with the hon. member outside the Chamber to give him the details when they return from Labrador.

I will say before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, we are concerned about Labrador and the need for further development of the fisheries. If there are policies that are not to the satisfaction of the fishermen and if they want to come to the member in Labrador, the different members down there, and to my colleague in Cabinet - that is who they ought to come to, my colleague in Cabinet - on to me, I will be glad to

MR. J. MORGAN: listen to them and I hope to get further input when I travel the coast this coming Summer.

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

MR. E. HISCOCK: I would like to thank the Minister of Fisheries for some of the things he has said in informing me basically of what is happening on the Coast of Labrador pertaining to my district. I am very pleased, of course, with the settlement the government have arrived at with regard to the barge. One of the things I want to point out and the people in Labrador basically keep asking me the question, why is it that the government always refer to Labrador North of Henley Harbour and policies with regard to Coastal Labrador and places South to L'Anse-au Clair are included in the Northern Peninsula? They feel that basically they should be involved in all one area. And I hope that the minister basically will take it upon advisement and discuss with his officials the possibility of having in future all Coastal Labrador included in one area. I wrote the minister another concern about the Loan Board, basically now being passed over to private banks. While, unfortunately, in Coastal Labrador we do not have banks and the inconvenience of going to St. Anthony or going to Goose Bay and the service that is provided in L'Anse au Loup. So I again ask the minister to continue to look at that and hopefully, maybe, the Loan Board will look after loans for fishermen from Labrador, all Coastal Labrador, and still be administered by the Loan Board itself instead of by the banks. because of the delay in mailing, the delay in processing, the delay in obtaining information. Another one I want to point out and ask the minister is with regard to the seals. North of Henley Harbour you can catch seals the year round, whereas

MR. E. HISCOCK: places South - I have asked the minister to look into that and also look into the possibility of marketing and processing. And then another one I want to ask the minister is what the government has decided with the gear subsidy programme of thirty per cent? The gear subsidy programme North of Henley Harbour, again, and basically he was asked by the fishermen to include this under component parts, and whether this was going to be improved under component parts and whether Treasury Board has made a decision on that? With regard to the boat building programme, the people on the Coast of Labrador feel they should still have the bounty on the twenty-two foot boats. They feel for salmon fishing, as well as other fishing in the area, that the twenty-two foot boat is the most feasible in the sense of gasoline and operation and efficiency and productivity. The twenty-two foot boat is very popular with the fishermen in that area. and yet the government brings in a programme saying twenty-five feet. I would assume the government basically says twenty-five feet and up from the point of view of quantity. The fishermen feel, as I have said, through cost of motors, and cost of gasoline that the twenty-two foot boat serves them much better. So, I would hope the minister will look at this with the view

having that bounty included on twenty-two foot boats up to L'Anse-au Clair not just from Henley Harbour North. With regard to over-the-side sales, I support the minister's views on this and I hope that basically we will not see what happened last year in Black Tickle, not by the union but by the company of Nichersons which had Portugese people employed on their boats and here there were people of the Shore looking for jobs, who could not get jobs. I think we need to get as much processing done as possible in Labrador and basically what we have seen is that either the salt fish goes to Mifflin's in Port Union or Bay Roberts to be processed. I

MR. E. HISCOCK: think with regard to the Quebec border, the Province of Quebec, the North Shore, - as well as Labrador, there is no reason why we can not really have a plant located in Labrador to do this processing and drying itself. And I think, hopefully, one of these companies with the help of DREG may look at this possibility in the future. With regard to other plants in the area I am a little bit upset from time to time that companies like Fisheries Products as well as other companies, look upon the raw resources, of bringing it to St. Anthony or bringing it to other parts of the Island. We have got to increase the standard of living on the Coast of Labrador and the only way we can do this, of course, is by having further processing. With regard to the inspector, I hope that the minister will have new inspectors in the area and that basically they will be based in Labrador. Those are the only comments that basically I want to give with regard to fishery but I am upset that the Minister of Mines and Energy (Mr. Barry) is not here. I wrote the Minister of Mines and Energy and asked that power be established in the community of Pinsent's Arm. Basically he ended up saying it would cost too much to have diesel generators there or to

MR. HISCOCK:

have pole lines there. I ended up asking the minister if it was possible to have some type of innovative programme, whether wind generated or various other types of experiments to have power given to the people of Pinsent's Arm, and the minister basically ended up informing me that we are not into innovation, it is up to somebody to come forward with proposals and then we will look at it. Hopefully, this is not the attitude of the government itself, that basically this government should have some ideas on how to do things themselves instead of waiting for private people or companies to come forward.

With regard to the Department of Lands and Forests I hope that the minister will basically look at Port Hope Simpson from the point of view of a reforestation programme, as it was burnt out in the past fifteen years and through natural process has not reseeded itself. I hope that the minister will look at this, look at the process of upgrading the road in that area to the forest areas and, also, basically improving the bridge in that area. Because, basically, in that area we are now - Port Hope Simpson was created from the point of view of a woods operation and if something is not done we are going to continue to have a high rate of welfare. There is more welfare in the community of Port Hope Simpson than any other community, probably next to Davis Inlet in the district of Torngat Mountains.

Also, I hope that the Minister of Forestry will look at the possibility of studying and putting a forestry officer in Port Hope Simpson itself and also a forestry officer in the Strait area because now you are getting a lot of Canada Works projects and a lot of the forest products, wood is being cut and as a result it is taking away from the local people who want to build houses or want to use it for firewood. These are basically some of the things that I want to point out in the resources sector of my district, in particular, and, hopefully, all departments with resources development in this government will continue to look at Labrador generally and continue -

MR. NEARY: Tell them about your roads, boy,
tell them about your roads.

MR. HISCOCK: I will bring the roads agreement up in another debate, when it is appropriate. But I would ask the Minister of Forestry now - and I brought it up from the point of view of Labrador itself and this is probably a more provincial comment than a district one, and that is that now that we have forest fires ranging all across Canada for the most case, at least up to Ontario, that I am concerned as weather increases and heat increases in Labrador that basically the same thing may happen in Labrador. I feel, basically, that we do not have sufficient fire protection in Labrador. I feel that it has been the attitude of the government in the past that if a fire breaks out down in Labrador and it is not being commercially used, because we do not have the plants there, then the attitude is, let it burn itself out and then through natural reforestation it will build up again. But as we have in Labrador, it takes so long for trees to grow that I do not think that this government can continue to take this attitude. We need more water bombers down in that area, we need different types of fighting facilities and equipment in it. And, hopefully, we will see the equipment and facilities increase down in Labrador to look after the forest products in there.

So with that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to conclude my observations and comments on the resource estimates and hopefully, as I said, that the government will again continue to give representation and policies towards Coastal Labrador and Labrador generally. Thank you.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I will be very brief but just to reply to the comments made by the gentleman for Labrador in connection with the subsidy. He was out of the House when I gave the information earlier. That 30 per cent gear subsidy programme, the Treasury Board and Cabinet have now approved that the subsidy be applied to all the area north of Cape St. Charles. It still might not be to the total satisfaction of the hon. gentleman but it is better than Cape Rouge

May 27, 1980

Tape No. 1852

IB-3

MR. MORGAN:

as before. And that, of course, now means fishermen can purchase components of gear and get the 30 per cent subsidy.

In connection with the over-the-side sales by companies in Labrador, both Fisheries Products and Nickersons have confirmed to us they will not be involved this year in over-the-side sales or plant extensions, they call them. And Nickersons, in particular, we queried them on that and they will not be involved in plant extensions in Black Tickle. They will be processing everything they possibly can to the amount as I mentioned, 75,000 pounds a day in their plant at Black Tickle.

MR. MORGAN:

I think they have made some improvements since last year in that plant.

I want to make one comment, as pointed out. I have now got a copy of the report or letter that was mentioned by the gentleman for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) and I have to say that it gives me reason for concern because this report was just recent, April 29th. and it came from Transport Canada and it refers to a vessel that was -

MR. THOMS: (inaudible) pork barrel. I think that is a (inaudible)

MR. MORGAN: Mr. Speaker, I am commenting on a matter brought up by the hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). Could I have some silence?

MR. SPEAKER (BUTT): Could we have order please! Silence!

MR. MORGAN: And it is a matter, in my view, that warrants the attention from my level of minister and I will be passing it on and discussing it with the Loan Board Chairman and, in fact, the Deputy Minister of the department. The part that concerns me, it is signed by an official of Transport Canada and it points out that - from Ship Safety Branch - and he is referring here, that they could not issue a safety certificate because of the potentially dangerous keel cooler. And that gives me reason to have the matter looked into. Why it was earlier approved by Transport Canada and earlier approved by the Loan Board inspectors I do not know at this time but I will endeavour to find out by an investigation at my own level as minister and to make sure these boats are safe and determine what can be done for the fishermen if the boats are not safe. Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that is fine. We can dispose of that matter. I had to have two goes at it before I convinced the minister that this matter warranted an internal investigation in the minister's department. I am glad now that he is going to undertake to do that. I hope it will work out to the benefit of the fishermen involved.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know we are spending a lot of time on the fishery but I think we are right in doing that under

MR. NEARY:

this Resource Development Committee because I think it has been evident now for some time that this government has no fishery policy, that they are flying by the seat of their pants as far as the fisheries are concerned. They are carrying the fishery policy around in their vest pocket. It changes from day to day, from week to week and from month to month. And, Mr. Speaker, I was rather intrigued by something that the hon. member for Burgeo-Bay d'Espoir (Mr. Andrews) had to say who has some knowledge of the fishery that he gained in his experience doing the CBC programme, Land And Sea and obviously he came in contact with a lot of fishermen and a lot of problems and did a lot of research on the fishery in this Province. So the hon. gentleman does, I would have to admit, have considerable knowledge, probably more so than the average member of the House of the fishery in this Province. I do not know if the hon. gentleman has actually gone out in a boat himself and fished. He nods that he has. Well, therefore, that makes it all the better, Mr. Speaker. But I believe the hon. gentleman was right on when he said that there are too many fish plants in Newfoundland. And what concerns me, Mr. Speaker, about the situation is that both the federal government and the provincial government have gone ahead full steam, approved the construction of new fish plants in this Province. We have one now under construction down there at Lewisporte and one in St. Barbe -

AN HON. MEMBER:

St. Barbe is in doubt.

MR. NEARY:

In doubt at the moment. And I do not begrudge these people fish plants but there is a question of where their catching capability is going to come from. And, Mr. Speaker, we have arrived at the point in time in our history when both the provincial and federal governments are going to have to slam on the brakes, they are going to have to place at least a temporary freeze on the expansion and new construction of fish plants in this Province until we find out where we are going. That is as plain, Mr. Speaker, as the nose on the hon. gentleman's face, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) -

AN HON. MEMBER:

(Inaudible) support the freeze.

May 27, 1980

Tape No. 1853

IB-3

MR. NEARY:

Support the freeze? No I tell you
what amazes me, Mr. Speaker, is that even though people in high places,
in both the provincial government and the federal government, have felt
this way for some time, nevertheless DREE up there

MR. S. NEARY:

in Ottawa has been approving loans up to, say, within the last several weeks or a few months, have been approving loans and grants for these fish plants. So I have a feeling that one government was sort of putting the other government on the spot and nobody was prepared to take a stand. That is what it seems like to me. I discussed this matter recently with Mr. LeBlanc and I understand, at least the impression I got from the discussions, was that DREE did not communicate with the Federal Department of Fisheries when they were making these loans, They went off and acted on their own without prior consultation with the Federal Department of Fisheries, and so you had one department of the Government of Canada putting another department on the spot. There was an awful lot of political pork barrelling going on in connection with the construction and location and expansion of these fish plants. So, Mr. Speaker, I concur with my hon. friend that the brakes have to be jammed on quickly. And it seems to me now, from what is happening to St. Barbe and Lewisporte and so forth, and it is unfortunate that they have advanced to the stage that they are at now, now, it is questionable whether they are going to get DREE grants or whether they are going to get a license to operate. They have to prove that they have the supply of fish. And I would say that is going to be very difficult to prove. I am of the opinion, Mr. Speaker, that we should have a multitude of small fish plants in this Province, although I do not think the hon. gentleman agreed with that philosophy. A multitude of small fish plants is far better than having large fish plants.

MR. ANDREWS: Some large.

MR. S. NEARY: Some large. You need - yes, I certainly agree you have to have some large but a multitude of small fish plants. Wherever you have a fish plant today in Newfoundland it is just like giving somebody a printing press to print their own money. You have a small fish plant that can keep a whole region going, keep all the people employed, young and old, middle-aged, a fish plant. We have one down in Rose Blanche, unfortunately it is only operating at about 55 or 60 per cent capacity,

MR. S. NEARY: a beautiful little plant, if they had the supply of fish they could keep the whole population of that community employed. Down in Fox Roost, Margaree I went door to door, there was no election by the way, I just wanted to go around and make contact with the people in Fox Roost, Margaree and I found one person who was unemployed and that was by choice. He wanted to become an accountant and he wanted to get into the College of Trades and Technology to become an accountant. Everybody else was employed or in school. Absolutely fantastic Mr. Speaker. Gabe Billard Fishery produces the best quality fish in Newfoundland bar none, all hook and line. And I am sorry to inform my hon. friend, who knows Gabe Billard quite well, that Gabe has finally succumbed to fitting up a dragger. He has finally succumbed, he had no choice, forced into it, everybody around him is dragging and he was a hook and line man as my hon. friend - up to, say, a week or two ago, hook and line, believed in it, would not get into the dragging business although he had drag licenses. Now, he had to cave in and I hope his quality will be as good as it has been in the past. The best quality fish in Newfoundland, bar none, because as members know hook and line fish is the best fish you can get. They do not allow gill nets, by the way, as my hon. friend knows. God help the man who shows up on the Southwest Coast with a gill net, he will be run out of it. They do not believe in it, they do not want them around, they are just a nuisance. But, Mr. Speaker, the time has come now when we have to sit down and review the whole fishing industry. My hon. friend talked about over-the-side sales, the union are for it, the minister is against it. Now, why are union for it in certain parts of Newfoundland? What are the consequences if there are no over-the-side sales? What are the consequences? Can they dispose of their fish? Will they be forced into the hands of the Salt Fish Corporation? What are the consequences of it, that is what I would like to know? If the union think that it is worthwhile and the union members, the union executive, then there must be something to it, there must be two sides to it. What is the other side of the story? The same way with the squid and caplin; the union are arguing that most of the squid and most of the caplin caught during the squid boom and the caplin boom in the last couple of years were caught by people who are not fishermen, caught

MR. S. NEARY: by barbers and taxi drivers and schoolteachers and retired people and the like, and the union are asking to have something done about this. And we are gradually getting near the day in Newfoundland where you will have professional fishermen, where you will not be able to fish for squid or caplin or anything else, any other produce of the sea unless you have a licence. And that brings up another question. What happens to the people who go out and just catch enough cod to salt down for the Winter? Will they have to get a permit or a licence? I hope it never reaches that stage. But the Fishermen's Union now, and the fishermen, are saying, 'Get rid of the moonlighters and the part-time fishermen. We want this to become a full-time occupation.' And I do not blame them for that. So you are going to have a professional fisherman, which is not a bad idea, in my opinion, but in the process, I hope that the federal Minister of Fisheries (Hon. Romeo LeBlanc) will not go to the other extreme and disallow people from putting their hook in the water, going out codjigging to get enough fish to supply their families for the Winter.

There are an awful lot of questions, Mr. Speaker, and I am not finished with it yet. My ten minutes is up. I do not know if we are going to continue on this vein or not. I thought maybe we - and I do not know if it is the right procedure to get into the item by item analysis of the Estimates. Are we allowed to do this? We are in Committee of the Whole, Mr. Speaker, the only difference is that the Chairman is not sitting in the Chair, Your Honour is sitting in the Speaker's Chair. But can we get into an item by item analysis of the Estimates and ask Ministers questions instead of making these ten minute speeches? I would prefer to ask questions and get answers myself, but I would like to get some guidance from Your Honour. I do not know if that is the proper procedure or not. Because there are an awful lot of questions that we can ask, Mr. Speaker, that were not answered at the Committee meeting. So if this is going to be the way that I hoped it was going to be, getting the Estimates back on the floor of the House, that we would run down through the item by item analysis of the Estimates.

MR. S. NEARY: Now, I would like to ask Your Honour, can we do it either way, ten minutes back and forth, or can we just take a minute, ask questions on subheads, get the answers and go on to the next one?

MR. SPEAKER (Baird): To that question. It was understood at the beginning of the period that there would be ten minutes allowed for each speaker.

MR. S. NEARY: I do not know if Your Honour understood me or not. What I was saying was, can we run down through the subheads and ask - Your Honour would call the subheads as the Chairman, because we are in Committee of the Whole.

MR. W. MARSHALL: We are not in Committee of the Whole.

MR. S. NEARY: We are.

MR. W. MARSHALL: We are not.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, the same rules apply as apply to Committee of the Whole, the only difference is that the Chairman is sitting in the Speaker's Chair. Am I right?

MR. W. MARSHALL: If it is a point of order -

MR. SPEAKER: It is not a point of order but a matter for clarification.

MR. W. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, there are two rules, there is a rule of the writ according to 'Neary' and there is a rule according to the Standing Orders. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member has not liked the procedure, but the running down through subheads comes in the Committees themselves, as each one is called and it is passed accordingly in Committee. Under Standing Orders 116 to 125, we are now in the process of concurrence debates, and in accordance with our agreement this morning, each member has ten minutes and the hon. member has ten minutes to make observations which he wishes to, another member may speak accordingly. That is the way in which we do it.

MR. S. NEARY: Well, let it be recorded, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. S. NEARY: - that we are being forced into this procedure, that we cannot get into an item by item analysis. We are being

MR. S. NEARY: forced into it by the government who have the majority in this House.

MR. STIRLING: That point of order, are we still on a point of order or not?

MR. S. NEARY: No, there was never a point of order. It was a point of expertise.

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

MR. G. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I am going to move away from Fisheries and mention Lands and Forests. The Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. C. Power) has been in his seat all evening and has been waiting, probably for someone to start discussing his department, so I figure probably I will take up ten minutes with this department.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am concerned about the economic condition of Labrador in general and probably Happy Valley - Goose Bay in particular.

Two or three years ago, Labrador Linerboard withdrew their services in Goose Bay and I believe at the time when they withdrew services there were some 500 men employed in forestry.

MR. WARREN: Now, at the present time - I could be corrected but - there is a small sawmill operation in Happy Valley-Goose Bay that is employing somewhere between thirty and probably thirty-five men. I am just wondering if the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power) has any plans - I will not say any immediate plans but, probably, they could be within the five-year plan - of increasing the production of timber in Labrador. I just mentioned Happy Valley-Goose Bay, but I would also like to remind the minister that there are two others, two other very important areas in Labrador that are rich, that are very, very rich in timber resources and they are, namely, the Postville area in my district and also, to a certain degree, the Port Hope Simpson area in my colleague from Eagle River's district. As you know, Mr. Minister, at the present day, looking at Labrador in general, in Labrador West, Happy Valley-Goose Bay, the coast of Labrador, and come this July when the big lay-off is taking place in Labrador City and Wabush, the five-week lay-off, I venture to say that 80 per cent - no, I would not say 80 per cent - 60 per cent of the work force in Labrador during the Summer will be fishermen. Now, I am just wondering, has the minister any foreseeable plans to open Postville, for example? In Postville we have a fairly, well, new boatyard, we have a fairly, well, new boatyard, where at any time they can construct two longliners. The Postville boatyard; with manpower, could construct two longliners at any given time. Now, I am just wondering if the minister, through his department and through his office in Goose Bay, with the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) and with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), has considered adding a fourth project inside of Postville, inside of Postville, during the Winter months to cut enough timber probably the first year to carry on with boat construction the next year. Because the Minister of Fisheries said it earlier that people are encouraged in Labrador. I said, oh, it is a larger boat. Now, surely goodness, we do not have to come out to other parts of Canada and to other parts of the Province to get timber or even to get our boats constructed when we have the boatyard there - it has not been in use for the last two years - and we have an abundance of timber, the abundance

May 27, 1980

Tape No. 1856

GH-2

MR. WARREN: of timber inside of Postville and in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, too. I am just wondering if the minister is intending to increase his work force in Labrador in the Postville and Happy Valley-Goose Bay area?

Mr. Speaker, for some time now people have been crying out that we want work, we want work. Now, we can see, and I am sure the hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) can vouch that we can see, not an increase in the work force in Labrador but definitely a decrease. There is definitely a big decrease in the work force in Labrador. It is almost to a saturation point. I would like for the Minister of Lands and Forests (Mr. Power) and also the Minister of Industrial Development (Mr. Barry), because I am sure that the future of Labrador definitely is going to tie into the hands of the Minister of Industrial Development - what is the industrial plan for Labrador, for Happy Valley-Goose, Wabush, Labrador City?

Mr. Speaker, about fifteen years ago, as I am particularly paying attention to the Minister of Lands and Forests, I would like to get his attention

MR. G. WARREN: at the same time because what I am going to say is going to definitely concern his department.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible)

MR. G. WARREN: Yes, what I was saying was concerning Lands and Forests and I know you are going to hear it probably. Anyway, about twenty years ago, I would say, there were five men in Happy Valley - Goose Bay, that is about twenty years ago now, who hauled off the poles that were used for the transmission line across Newfoundland, all of the poles at one time came from Happy Valley, Goose Bay up the Naskaupi River or the Churchill River we used to call it at that time. Now, all of a sudden that is gone. Now, the possibility is still there that this could be investigated and looked into. Inside of Postville there are stick ashigh as sixty feet long that could be used for transmission line poles and poles for telephone companies and so on. So, there are all kinds of chances that the Minister of Lands and Forest (Mr. Power) - we have virgin territory up there that could be utilized for probably the Island portion of the Province but then, again, the number one thing is that employment will be created for resident of Labrador. Because I am scared and I believe the Premier is also, that if we are not careful parts of Labrador in the Goose Bay area, are going to turn into almost ghost towns. I hope that the Federal Department of Public Works do not pull out. I hope that new developments will come in place because, you know, what goes on in Goose Bay does affect my district, it does affect the district of Torngat Mountains and Eagle River because the people in Eagle River and the Torngat Mountains depend on Happy Valley - Goose Bay very, very much. Happy Valley - Goose Bay is the centre of Labrador, it maybe in population wise not the capital but is the focal point of Labrador. So this is why any development that takes place in Happy Valley - Goose Bay is going to have an effect on the coastal region. Because take, for example, outboard motor parts, a simple essential need for fishermen as an outboard motor part, if we are not careful we are going to have the outboard motor shop that is in Happy Valley - Goose Bay closed down because of a lack of a workforce in the area and by doing that the fishermen along the coast are going to have to rely on Charles R. Bell

MR. G. WARREN: in St. John's which is going to take as high as two or three week for delivery so the fishing season is over before you get the part. So this is why I am trying to tie in the whole area of Labrador and the economy of the area at the present time.

So, I would like for the Minister of Lands and Forest (Mr. C. Power) , probably, to answer some of my concerns that I have thrown out to him and see if his department would consider with the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan), to get the boatyard at Postville revitalized and into the construction business where we can maintain a labour force and also be able to have some input in what kind of boats and where the boats are being built that the fishermen on the Labrador Coast will be using.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Minister of Lands and Forests.

MR. C. POWER: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I would like to reply to some of the questions answered by both the member for Eagle River and the member for Torngat Mountains. And maybe just in summary, before I get down to answering the specific questions that you have asked about the Port Hope Simpson area and the Postville area generally and the Happy Valley Goose questions, just some general things that relate to the development of forestry but on the Island part of the Province and certainly on the very important mainland part of our Province in Labrador. There are many, many things taking place, Mr. Speaker, in the forestry sector these days, some of them directly related to the Happy Valley Goose area. But it is very important for all members in this House to realize that government's function, Forestry's function as managers of the forests in Newfoundland, that things like a shipyard in Postville, things like the cutting of poles, things like maybe some of the development of certain industries that may take place in Happy Valley Goose, it is only government's function, from my perspective, to encourage and to make a situation, an atmosphere suitable to that type of development. Our job should not be as government other than through rural development, through the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporations and other aspects that government has to lend money to certain individuals and businesses within the Province,

MR. C. POWER: we, as government, should not be solely responsible for going in and getting individuals set up in business, obviously, there has got to be a certain impetus, a certain direction and a certain initiative that comes from individuals and business persons in the Province to develop certain of those industries which maybe quite possible, as a shipyard might be in Postville, with certain help from the Department of Rural Development, or the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, or from the government through other means of subsidies. But again some of the initial response, or the initial reaction to that type of situation has got to come from the communities themselves where the opportunities exist. In the case of Happy Valley - Goose Bay, where there is a serious social problem developing because of extremely high unemployment and a very serious situation which our government has considered many, many times and which we are looking at practically on a daily basis, again, the future of Happy Valley - Goose Bay from, again, my limited perspective has got to be built up on our renewable resources, the same as all of Newfoundland has got to be built up on our renewable resources. The fact that our fisheries, that we have just talked about for the last couple of hours, has got to be the foundation for the Island part of the Province, to a large degree in Labrador the future of places like Happy Valley - Goose Bay and maybe Port Hope Simpson and others has got to be a combined development of fisheries and, in particular, the forest resources of which there is an abundance in those areas. Uranium developments, mining developments, offshore oil and gas developments are great for a short-term and they can change our economic structure around to allow us to develop fully our renewable resource base, but there has

MR. C. POWER: always got to be in places like Happy Valley - Goose Bay and places like Tors Cove and other places along the Southern Shore, where I am from, that it is the renewable resources upon which you have got to base your long-term livelihood. In Happy Valley - Goose Bay particularly, there is a situation taking place which may alleviate, at least for a short amount of time, the economic problems related to unemployment. The Happy Valley - Goose Bay Development Corporation, and some of the members have just returned from both Oslo, I think, in Norway and Sweden to look into the possibilities of exporting wood to those European countries, particularly in the forms of chipped wood that has been debarked and chipped in Happy Valley - Goose Bay which will create some jobs both in the forestry sector, in the chipping sector and certainly in the transportation. It could develop and bring many, many millions of dollars each year into that community. Again, it is not, Mr. Speaker, an ideal situation because again you are exporting a product that has not been fully developed in Newfoundland. Much better to export pulp and paper products than it is to export chips. And, I suppose, the worst thing that you would want and the least desirable situation would be to export logs just as they are cut from the stump and shipped out unbarked, unchipped and totally unprocessed. Now, in Happy Valley - Goose Bay we have gone through a fairly expensive process, from government's point of view, of hiring some of the best consultants in Canada to examine the possibility of getting a labour intensive industry into Happy Valley - Goose Bay. Unfortunately, the Sandwell Report that has come back with relationship to employment and the development of labour intensive forest product related industries in Happy Valley - Goose Bay has not been

MR. C. POWER: positive. Now, unfortunately, when the study was being done there was a certain number of conditions that were taking place particularly that the study did not know about. Particularly one was the problem of inventories, of keeping inventory on hand for six months of the year. The Franklin proved this year at least that a large icebreaker can go into that area of the world during the winter months. Now, whether a cargo ship can go in there and what assistance it is going to need is a different matter. But at least the Sandwell report did not take into consideration the fact that it was possible to get into Labrador, Happy Valley - Goose Bay during the winter months, therefore, their conclusions, their recommendations based and sent to government are based on the fact of a limited amount of transportation during a very short time of the year when the thing is ice free. That is a very important consideration that may allow the viability of a small waifer aboard unit in there, maybe a small pulping operations there. Also the possibility, and we are working very closely with Industrial Development and the Departments of Mines and Energy, to see if we can get a cheap source of power for a small mill type operation in Happy Valley - Goose Bay. Two basic factors, or two basic reasons why you cannot get a labour intensive forest related industry in Happy Valley - Goose Bay are the travel and transportation problems and the cost that if you pay your blanket rate for electricity then it gets to be too expensive and you cannot basically develop an industry based on that. So you have got to have a cheaper supply of electricity, Mr. Speaker, and you also have to have better transportation during the year. Now, again those persons who were over to Europe from Happy Valley - Goose Bay are going to be coming back to the Government of Newfoundland

MR. POWER:

very shortly with a proposal for us to give them a permit to export in the area of 120,000 cords of wood per year. That will be a significant amount of wood. Again, the problem is that we as a government are going to have to deliberate and decide as to whether we want to get involved in that on the very short-term or the long-term or whether we would like to slow down that little process for the short-term and see if we can create a long-term labour-intensive industry, that would be of a permanent nature to Happy Valley-Goose Bay as opposed to an export operation which of the nature should always be short-term. That is the important consideration. Those persons are coming to Newfoundland to visit with our government in the first week of June and, hopefully, very shortly thereafter some of the members of my department and also certain persons from the union in Newfoundland and from the large paper companies in Newfoundland, are going to be going to Europe to see if they can develop that market further and also the market for the spruce budworm damaged forest in Newfoundland. Again, that will be an important consideration for Happy Valley-Goose Bay which hopefully will alleviate the situation somewhat, not only in Happy Valley-Goose Bay, to make the economic stability of those two communities better but again the subsequent side effects and benefits that will relate to the Coast of Labrador.

With relationship to other things that are happening on the Coast of Labrador; the forest fire situation mentioned by the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) in particular has caused us great concern. We, in Newfoundland, are extremely fortunate, Mr. Speaker, that during these months of the year when we can have a very horrendous forest fire situation that in Labrador we have a fairly late Spring, in Newfoundland we have not had any kind of hazardous fire situation at all. We have lent two of our water bombers to Labrador. As the member for Eagle River knows full well as we do as a government that we would like to have seventy water bombers instead of seven but the cost is pretty well prohibitive to have that type of fleet. We have a much larger fleet than most of the Atlantic

MR. POWER:

Provinces have. We will have two water bombers stationed in Labrador when we get our bombers returning back from Manitoba, Ontario and the one on loan to Nova Scotia. We will be sending one the first week of June to Labrador, depending upon how fast the season gets warm there and how fast the forest fire situation deteriorates. But at least there will be one in Happy Valley-Goose Bay and possibly two very shortly thereafter.

Mr. Speaker, there are other questions that I would like to get into possibly tomorrow that members want answers to. If you want to call it six we will do that tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER (SIMMS): Is it agreed to call it six o'clock.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

The hon. President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, before I move the House rise, after the Resources Committee we will be then going into Social Services. Tomorrow with the concurrence of all members of the Opposition Private Members' Day will be devoted to the - instead of Private Members' motions we will be on the concurrence debates.

I move the House at its rising do adjourn until tomorrow, Wednesday, at 3:00 P.M. and that this House do now adjourn.

On motion the House at its rising adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday at three of the clock.