

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I table in the House, this is what I am doing - this statement, but the only substance of the statement is I am tabling in the House notes relating to a press conference held this morning which contain appended to them, and will be of interest, I know, to hon. members, the telex forwarded to me by the hon. Mark Lalonde in connection with the delay of the power corridor legislation, my response to him that went out yesterday and, also of interest to hon. members, a letter that has been referred to from time to time in the debates of the House - and I am not sure the House has had a copy of it - a letter of October 27th, 1981, from me to the hon. Yves Duhaime and his response to me as of November 18th. There are copies for hon. members as well.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: How does the Opposition react to that? Do we get half the time that the hon. gentleman had outside the House this morning, Mr. Speaker? Is that the way it works? The hon. gentleman tabled quite a comprehensive document so how do we manage to get half of that time, Mr. Speaker? I need some guidance from Your Honour.

MR. MARSHALL: Is you want to react to it, react.

AN HON. MEMBER: His time is up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is the understanding of the

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Chair that the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary), or the gentleman opposite, have half the time of the hon. minister in replying to Ministerial Statements. And I think that is the general rule that has been followed.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Do you mean that I just have half the time that the hon. gentleman just took?

Mr. Speaker, I think probably the best thing for me to do is to react outside the House. The hon. gentleman made the statements outside the House which were outrageous. So, Mr. Speaker, I will have to prepare a statement to the press reacting to the hon. gentleman. That is about all I can do. But I think it is very unfair to table a document of that magnitude, Mr. Speaker, without giving us a chance to respond to it.

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the President of the Council, It is with regard to the economic situation of the Province, particularly among our younger people who are now out of trade school, university, and will soon be getting out of high school, Does the Province have any programme to supplement the Young Canada Works Projects to employ our young people for the Summer?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, what we are doing, what this government is doing and is continuing to do, and not only with respect to the young people but with all jobs, we are very concerned about the economic situation with which the Province is confronted, as I know the hon. gentleman there is. And we are doing everything possible within our resources to foster development in this Province, and that is the answer to his question really.

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to the unemployment situation, which is even more critical among our younger people from the ages of fifteen to thirty, we have a 34 per cent increase in university attendance in the third term. The main reason for this, or course, is students know that they would not find jobs. Now it is going to be even harder. Could the President of the Council inform us whether the government is going to increase come September the \$25 per week for students going to trade schools, particularly now that they are living

MR. HISCOCK: away from home, boarding, where the rent is often as high as \$40 to \$50 a week? Is this \$25 going to be increased in September to keep up with the cost of living?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I am advised that for provincial students that we have replaced that programme so that they can take more effective advantage of the Canada Student Loan Programme.

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, I was not referring to the Canada Student Loans, we are lucky that we do have Canada Student Loans I was looking at the provincial part of the trade school, not Canada Manpower, the \$25 per week, and a majority of the people, unless they have seats under Canada Manpower, cannot go to trade school or Fisheries College on \$25 a week.

The question I would like now to ask the President of the Council and that is university fees are continuing going up and will go up again this Summer. Does the government have any plan to

MR. HISCOCK: increase student bursaries, not loans but student bursaries, to the university students as well as to the trade school and technology students in this Province?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has been absent for a while, but that question has been adequately and fully answered in the Budget and I know that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would be quite happy to respond to it. But in response to his general question, obviously the government is very, very concerned about not just the situation of employment with younger people but with all segments of society and we are trying to do everything we possibly can to do it. One of the major problems, as the hon. gentleman will realize, has been the very high interest rates that are being charged nowadays, the rate of inflation, the general cutback in business nationally and internationally, and these are all situations that are beyond the control of this government. But what we have done in that Budget, which is a Budget - the hon. gentleman was not here for a while but if he had been here he would realize that the Budget was greeted with general acclaim by most of the populace of this Province in that we were able, the only province in Eastern Canada that was able to bring in a balanced Budget on current account and in that Budget we were balancing things and balancing off the individual interests and the social interests. We strove as much as we could to provide for students in all segments of the society. So if the hon. gentleman wants something specific, as I say, it was in the Budget. And I think my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), would be much better versed to respond to any specific questions he has.

June 16, 1982

Tape No. 1343

ah-2

MR. HISCOCK: A final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to the people that are going to be employed by this government this year in the various departments and in the Confederation Building can the President of the Council assure the youth of our Province that they will have a fair chance at these jobs and that these people will not be appointed through political patronage?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. MARSHALL: I do not know really whether that type of question deserves an answer, Mr. Speaker. With respect to those jobs, we provide these jobs in as

MR. MARSHALL: fair a distribution as we possibly can considering all of these circumstances as we do in all of our dealings with matters of this nature. And the hon. gentleman can make insinuations all he wants. The fact of the matter is the hon. gentleman has not got a monopoly over concern for their plight.

DR. COLLINS: Ask him if Mr. Trudeau will be hearing of their plights.

MR. MARSHALL: My colleague says to me, my colleague who has a much sharper tongue than I ever had, says to me that perhaps Mr. Trudeau could give the hon. gentleman some advice in these matters. But, you know, the fact of the matter is the hon. gentleman has no monopoly of concern over these matters. We are extremely concerned with these matters. We are trying to grapple with them as we are trying to grapple with the financial situation, despite our meager resources, and whatever we do our programmes that we have will be administered as fairly and equitably as they possibly can.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Maybe before I recognize the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), I would like to particularly and especially welcome to the galleries forty-seven members from Yesterdsy's Youth Senior Citizens Club at St.Mary's, in the district of St. Mary's-The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the absence of the Minister of the Environment(Mr. Andrews) I asked a question to the President of the Council(Mr. Marshall), and it concerned spraying that is going on around Red Indian Lake in the vicinity of Millertown. And I asked the minister certain questions on that. But I would like for the Minister of the Environment perhaps to



MR. TULK: explain to the House just what herbicide 2, 4, D is?

MR. MARSHALL: Hair spray.

MR. TULK: Hair spray, is it? You need it.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, there is one false assumption; there is no spray going on at this point in time at all. There may not even be a spray programme with 2,4,D this Fall at all. The situation is this. that we were approached and an application filed on March 9 by Abitibi-Price that they wanted to spray 2,4,D. The trade name of the chemical is Esteron 600. The active ingredient is 2,4,D at a rate of forty-eight ounces per acre on 100 hectares in the area of Hungry Hill near Lake Ambrose, approximately thirteen kilometers south of Millertown.

They did file with us, and if the member is interested in all of the details I have them here for him, because I thought he might be interested in them today.

The product that is being used is dioxin free, that is, less than one part dioxin per 100 million parts. And this has been certified with Agriculture Canada.

June 16, 1982

Tape No. 1345

MJ - 1

MR. H. ANDREWS: The application was referred to the first Pesticides Advisory Board meeting for 1982 held on April 30, 1982.

MR. TULK: By the minister?  
(inaudible).

MR. ANDREWS: The Pesticides Advisory Board noted non-target monitoring was identified as being deficient, identified water, soil and air sampling as necessary, and that wildlife monitoring was to be undertaken. The guidelines for this were drawn up by wildlife.

To make a long story short, Mr. Speaker, and I will gladly give all this information to the member, is that we are still awaiting a reply from Abitibi-Price on the conditions of the monitoring programme that we have set down for soil, for wildlife, for spray drift, for water and many, many other factors, the affects on the actual vegetation itself and the affects on other parts of the environment. Until they meet our approval and are willing to monitor the way we want them to monitor and pay for the costs of that monitoring, which is by engaging independent groups, the permit to spray will not be granted.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the information that the minister is giving me but that is not the question that I asked. I asked the minister to explain to the House just what 2,4,D is. I would like to ask him now, perhaps when he gets up again, to explain exactly what 2,4,D is and perhaps tell us if one of the components of Agent Orange, that dreaded chemical that so many of us dread, if one of the components of Agent Orange is indeed 2,4,D.

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

MR. ANDREWS: I am not a chemist, Mr. Speaker,

MR. H. ANDREWS: but with my little knowledge about it, Agent Orange as you know was a code name used for an operation. The active ingredient in Agent Orange was 2,4,5,T, which is not used in this Province or in this country.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I would like again to ask the minister if indeed he can tell us exactly what 2,4,D is and if indeed 2,4,D was the medium used in Agent Orange, the medium of delivery? And if there is any danger to human health? Or is there any other component in 2,4,D that is perhaps dangerous to human health?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, this chemical that is being used here is free of dioxin, which is the concern of most people when you talk of 2,4,D and other such insecticides and pesticides.

MR. NEARY: And herbicides.

MR. ANDREWS: And herbicides.

This product has been passed by  
our

MR. ANDREWS: Provincial Pesticide Advisory Board, also by Environment Canada, by Agriculture Canada and also all groups. It is a very common chemical used throughout Western Europe and throughout North America and many other parts of the world.

MR. NEARY: Is it banned anywhere in Canada?

MR. ANDREWS: As far as I know 2,4,D is not banned anywhere in Canada, no, Sir. The limiting or the dangerous part of 2,4,D if it does contain dioxin is the concern of people. This particular product has less than one part per 100 million. So this is deemed quite acceptable by agencies in Canada and other countries of the world.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): A supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, it seems that the minister is indeed not sure whether there are dangerous toxics in that chemical.

MR. ANDREWS: I am sure there are not.

MR. TULK: Well, why did you not say so a minute ago? But I would like to ask the minister if indeed he has received any complaints from either community organizations or residents of Millertown and how he intends dealing with those complaints. Is he going to ignore them or is he going out and set up some sort of public hearings?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, to date I have not received any correspondence or complaints from the people of Millertown. I would certainly be willing to meet with them if they wish a meeting as such and provide them with all the information that we have. Once again

MR. ANDREWS: I would like to emphasize that permission to spray this small lot of approximately 100 acres, the permission has not - that is, they will be spraying less than 100 hectares, probably more like 100 acres, within this defined lot here. But permission has not been yet given and it is possible that it may not be given.

I would like to also say, Mr. Speaker, that we will have very strict controls on this type of thing in the future as we are having now. This is a new concept in forest management. It is called, in the forestry's terminology, conifer release, which lets the conifers get a better head start in the forests, and hopefully, down the road in the life of the tree, the tree will grow faster and there will be more fibre per acre on an acre of woodland. It all sounds very good in principle. There are a lot of fears amongst a lot of people, in particular wildlife officials, that this type of a programme could damage habitat for animals. For instance, if you did arrive after twenty or thirty years with a stand of solid black spruce and nothing underneath it, your small game rabbit population would possibly be affected, your moose population, this type of thing. Now I am not an expert on that but these are some of the fears. This programme is much more extensive in New Brunswick, where the New Brunswick government have given, I think it is the Irving Group, permission to spray a considerable amount of more

MR. ANDREWS: land over the past couple of years. And for further background information, Abitibi-Price did come to us last year with a proposal for a considerably larger acreage to be sprayed. We requested that they go back and go through the environmental assessment programme for that, and they withdrew their application at that time. Any further applications for large spray programmes would go through the environmental assessment route.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the minister touched on two very interesting components of this whole programme, and that is I would like for him to tell us if he investigated any other ways of reducing the hardwood growth so that the softwoods would grow, and has he investigated what the effect indeed will be, or will he investigate what the effect will be, on the wildlife before he grants a permit to spray?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the whole purpose of such a small-scale programme, to find out that information. And we cannot find out that information until we do a small-scale spray programme. I would not eliminate the possibility, or eliminate the thought of not doing it at all, because I do not think we can live in ignorance if there is a possibility that we could improve forest growth in Newfoundland. On the other hand, we have to be very careful about the side effects of such a programme. And this is what we will indeed be looking at and we have ordered the company to have an independent

MR. ANDREWS: monitoring programme,  
set up at their own expense, suitable for our  
department.

MR. TULK: A final supplementary,  
Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A final supplementary,  
the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Under the Environmental  
Assessment Act, I understand that the minister can  
either say, 'Yes, go ahead and spray', he does not  
have to go through all the procedures of public  
hearings and so on, but in this kind of situation,  
where there seems to be a great deal of uncertainty  
about whether in fact this herbicide spraying should  
go ahead, let me ask the minister a question: Will he,  
before he even allows this small experiment to go on,  
indeed see that public hearings are set up and that  
advisory boards to the minister have adequate access  
to the public and that the public will have adequate  
access to the advisory board and therefore to the  
minister? Will he ensure the House that that will be  
the case?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, the Environment  
Act is being followed, and the proper processes are  
happening here. We do not see, and we certainly did not  
envisage when the act was put in place, that everything  
that happened in the Province would have to go through a  
full environmental assessment statement. As I indicated,  
the proposal by Abitibi-Price, last year, would have  
called for that because it was on a much larger scale,

MR. ANDREWS: on a scale of 4,000 or 5,000 acres. We see this as a very small test of about 100 acres. We are quite anxious to find the affects of it, and I do not see that it warrants a full environmental assessment statement on it right now. But I will say, as I have said to the press already a couple of weeks ago, that if there are applications for major projects similar to this, they will have to go through the full assignment, yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, spraying anywhere in the Newfoundland forest at any time frightens people. The hon. gentleman just made a statement there, I wonder if he could elaborate on it, in connection with the monitoring process. Did I understand the hon. gentleman correctly that he said that Abitibi-Price are being asked to employ independent firms to monitor the spray programme?

If so, who will they report to? Why does not the minister himself undertake to hire these consulting firms and send the bill to Abitibi-Price? We are all in favour of Abitibi-Price paying the bill, but who will they report to? Will they report to the minister's department or report to the company?

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

MR. ANDREWS: They will report to us, Mr. Speaker. We set the guidelines for the monitoring. As a matter of fact, some of the monitoring will be done by our own people because we have some equipment in place in Central Newfoundland that would be suitable for this. We will also accept or reject the people or the companies, the firms, that they might propose to do the monitoring or some of the monitoring. But we have a control over it. We set the guidelines and we can accept it or reject it.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.



MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if he knows what the moose or wildlife population is in that particular area where the spraying is proposed?

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

MR. ANDREWS: No, Mr. Speaker. That is, once again, part of the monitoring programme that will have to be put in place, an inventory of all game in the area before, during and after the spray programme. The same with water sampling - before, during and after; the same with soil sampling and the like. That, generally speaking, is the type of monitoring that we want put in place and that will be done and those questions will be answered.

MR. NEARY: But it is too late after you spray to find out what the moose population is.

MR. TULK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Did I understand the minister to say that he is going to monitor the situation by counting the wildlife there? Now let me ask him a question. If indeed

MR. TULK: he finds that that is one of the heaviest populated areas of wildlife in this Province, will we cancel that programme, will he disallow the permit, or will he indeed allow that wildlife to be used as guinea pigs?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, these are all very hypothetical situations.

MR. TULK: No, they are not.

MR. ANDREWS: I am sure if 500 moose are found on that 100 acres of land, I am sure that I would have a lot to say about that too.

The name of this game is not to live in constant ignorance of what might happen, but to use the tools of science for the best benefit of an industry, in this case the pulp and paper industry, and the loggers of Newfoundland. We want to find out if this chemical can be effective, can increase our wood production in Newfoundland without destroying the environment. If it can do that, fine. If it cannot do that we will have to look somewhere else,

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if he has any information to indicate that good woods management might do the same thing as the chemical?

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

MR. ANDREWS: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this type of programme might be, might be, an adjunct to good woods management. We do not know but we certainly want to find out. I do not want to live in ignorance. We are putting in through the Department of Lands and Forests, and twisting the

MR. ANDREWS: arms of the paper companies who are using our forests, a good woods management regime. This might help but it may not. It is an experiment.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the minister says he does not want to live in ignorance of what that herbicide will do, and I agree with him. But let me ask him this question; presumably the purpose of the spray is to eliminate the overgrowth of hardwoods over softwoods and therefore give us a better production in softwoods. Let me ask him a question: Can he not ask Abitibi-Price to move to some other area, surely there are other areas where that is happening, can he ask Abitibi-Price to move to some other area and do their spraying in an area that is less densely populated with wildlife? Why not? It makes a lot of sense.

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

MR. ANDREWS: Well, unless the hon. member has information that I do not have at my fingertips, I would not assume that that area had any more or any greater moose population than any other.

MR. NEARY: If you do not know you should find out before you spray.

MR. ANDREWS: If you could give me the statistics on that I would certainly take it under consideration - if you can prove that there are more moose there than anywhere else. But that in itself may not be the factor that concerns us here. There are many factors that concern us here; one of the factors is to find out what the effect of such a spray programme would be on moose.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A final supplementary, the hon.  
member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Another question about this year's  
spray programme and that is the spraying for the spruce bud-  
worm that is going on in the Glenwood-Gander area. I under-  
stand from today's

MR. TULK: papers, and perhaps from some telephone calls, that there are some concerned people in Glenwood about this spray programme and in their water supply. They are looking for a meeting with the minister. Could I ask him if indeed he would allow public input into that programme this year before he grants a permit to the Department of Forestry to spray, and if that will be through public hearings or just him going out sitting down and talking to the people?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, there was a lot of public input into this spray programme. Just a couple of years ago there was a Royal Commission and forestry presented a major brief. As a matter of fact, I presented a brief myself to that commission about the concerns in my own area down in Bay d'Espoir on the spruce budworm.

We have, in the area that the hon. member refers to, a controlled block that we have been monitoring since 1977. If you know what a controlled block is, this is a block of land that we want sprayed every year, whether there is a spray programme in place or not, and probably to continue a couple of years after the spruce budworm spray programme is over and hopefully that will be over this year.

I have sent a telegram to the mayor of the town of Glenwood in response to the telegram that he sent me and, if the House would be interested, I think this will clarify the situation as I see it. The telegram reads as follows: "Re: your telegram June 11, 1982, please be advised that the spraying of Block 110 Careless Cove, is an important component of my department's

MR. ANDREWS: environmental monitoring study on the impact of the spruce budworm spray programme on non-target organisms. The studies have been conducted in the same location since 1977. Continuity is extremely important in long-term monitoring studies and movement of the site at this time would result in the loss of five years of valuable data. The purpose of these studies is to determine if the spray programme causes any negative environmental impacts. This environmental monitoring programme is therefore in the interest of the residents of Glenwood, and indeed the residents of Newfoundland in general. To date effects on non-target organisms have been minor. A no-chemical buffer zone of 1.5 kilometers around places of human habitation is considered efficient to minimize the risk of exposing people to the chemical spray. Block 110 has been selected to give a larger no-chemical buffer zone to alleviate concerns of the people of Glenwood. A no-chemical buffer zone of 1.5 kilometers is to be maintained around all community water supplies. Results of water analysis for Gander Lake under the same

MR. ANDREWS: spray regime in previous years indicated that concentrations of matacil were normally below detectable level and, when detected, were well below allowable daily limits set down in the Canadian Drinking Water Standards. Please be assured the health of the Glenwood residents will not be endangered by the spray programme at Careless Cove."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we understand that the type of aircraft that will be used in this year's spruce budworm spray programme is different than the ones used in previous years. And we understand that these aircraft will load on the highways or on the roads somewhere. Now does that mean that matacil will be stored along the - I am not sure if it is woods roads or the Trans-Canada Highway I heard these aircraft are going to land on, these small aircraft?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: Would the hon. gentleman elaborate on that? What kind of aircraft? Where will the matacil be stored? How will it be brought to the aircraft? Will it be brought in tankers or will it be in storage tanks along the roads where it is going to be loaded on the aircraft? Can the hon. gentleman give us some information on that?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Environment.

MR. ANDREWS: As the hon. member probably knows this year the spray programme will be done with smaller aircraft than was used before, aircraft which we consider to be more effective. They will be able to zero in on the target areas more efficiently and have, generally speaking, better aim. And because they are smaller aircraft, they have a limited range. Because they have a limited range, we will

June 16, 1982

Tape 1351

PK - 2

MR. ANDREWS: be using more than the two airports that were used, or proposed to be used last year, that was Gander and Stephenville. For instance, the airstrip in Bay d'Espoir is now being prepared, or should already be prepared, to handle the matacil and the dikes will be put in place and so on. There is a little airstrip, I think, near Springdale which will be used. The dikes are being put there. As a matter of fact in that



MR. ANDREWS:

particular situation the soil is so porous we are hard-packing the soil and then we are lining it with heavy plastic liners. So we are doing everything possible to ensure that no matacil is spilled accidentally at the site.

I am not aware of any plans to have these aeroplanes landing on highways or roads to load up.

MR. TULK:

A supplementary, Mr.

Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A supplementary, the hon.

the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, one of the recommendations of the royal commission was - the first part of the royal commission - that in carrying out spray programmes contingency plans be developed by the Department of Forestry and that they be submitted to the Department of the Environment for approval. I would like to ask the minister if he has asked the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Power) this year for a new contingency plan in the case of accident, spill, or whatever, with matacil.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Minister of

the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS:

Mr. Speaker, we have been working very closely with the Department of Forest Resources and Lands since last year. There will be some changes in procedure, although we were very, very pleased, in general, with the spray programme last year, despite the fact that one plane did have to jettison its matacil through technical - a fire on board and so on. But generally speaking, we were quite pleased. There was very little leakage around the areas where the matacil was handled, if any at all.

MR. ANDREWS: There was some leakage when that plane returned that time from the jettison site, some small leakage on the runway.

I am very happy that we have a plan in action for any foreseeable disaster that might occur, unless another plane crashes.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Could I ask the minister if indeed - one of the problems, as the minister is aware of, is that last year in that spill, that jettisoned load that aircraft was forced to drop, there was a great deal of uncertainty as to where the load actually was dropped, and there is some uncertainty as to whether that load went into the Gander water supply rather than in the area that the minister said. I would like to ask him

MR. TULK: if he has required that in that contingency plan that there be a great deal more certainty, that there be technology brought in to ensure that we are sure where a load will be dropped if it has to be dropped?

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, yes. I would like to reassure the member for Pogo, and once again the citizens of Gander, that no matacil was dropped in Gander Lake last year. Certainly we could not detect it and we have very precise instruments for measuring. We have set in place some minor changes. And I think things such as we have asked the Department of Forestry to do in locating - if the hon. member would be interested - in locating a site, for instance, similar to that jettison of last year, these planes will be equipped. Some have a marker, an orange red flag marker, and hopefully we can have a little radio device on it that has to be jettisoned at the same time to pin point the area as closely as possible, so that when the planes come back over it they will be able to find it.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS FOR WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Public Works and Services.

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would like to table answers to the questions on the Order Paper of May 13th. asked by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) and May 17th. Unfortunately he was not here to get the

MR. YOUNG: information when the estimates were being done. May 17th. again, question no. 78. Question no. 90, May 26th. and May 31st. A bit of reading for him while he is back from holidays.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to revert to Presenting Reports to table two reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. WINDSOR: Two reports, Mr. Speaker, the annual report of the Harmon Corporation and the annual report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other answers to questions for which notice has been given?

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I present a petition on behalf of some approximately 300 residents of St. Brendan's, the island of St. Brendan's in Bonavista Bay in the Terra Nova district. The petition, Mr. Speaker, is requesting the government to look into and correct the inadequate health services on the island, the health services administered to the people of St. Brendan's, an island, Sir, of some 500 people ten miles from the mainland of the Province, ten miles from the terminal point of Burnside on the

MR. T. LUSH:

Eastport peninsula. Mr. Speaker, to give hon. members the gist of the petition, the prayer of the petition I will read directly from it, says: "We the undersigned, the people of St. Brendan's, Bonavista Bay, Newfoundland, do hereby request that steps be taken immediately to insure better and more consistent health services to the people of St. Brendan's by appointing a full-time resident nurse. At present the island is visited once every two weeks by a doctor from Eastport, hence, for the other remaining fourteen days, the island is completely without professional health services. This in our view is a dreadful state of affairs. To ensure more efficient health services to the people of St. Brendan's, we therefore petition the government to appoint a full-time resident nurse immediately. And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray."

Mr. Speaker, a simple request; I do not expect that too many people in Newfoundland are required to make such a simple and reasonable request, simply to have a full-time nurse on the island to ensure better health services. At the time of the arrival of this petition on my desk, it was six weeks since the people of St. Brendan's had seen a doctor. Even though the doctor is required to visit, or there is an understanding - I do not know whether it is a requirement - but there is an understanding that the doctor visits every two weeks, of course when we get bad weather the doctor does not visit. So at that particular time, at the arrival of the petition, it was six weeks since the people had a visit from a doctor on that island. So, Mr. Speaker, this indeed is not the kind of health services that people would be expecting to get in 1982. And as I said before, I think the request is reasonable, it is fair to ask for the services of a full-time resident nurse to supplement

MR. T. LUSH: those of the by-weekly visits of the doctor from Eastport. And I might say that that visit is only, I think, lasts just a half day, when the doctor gets there every two weeks it is just for a half day, just for a couple of hours. So there are not too many people in Newfoundland having that level, I am sure, of medical services to them.

So, Mr. Minister -

MR. HOUSE:

How many people did you say were there?

MR. LUSH:

500 people.

So to make the point clear again.

They have a visit from a doctor every two weeks who is there for about a couple of hours and then, of course, left to chance and fortune - and maybe misfortune.

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, I certainly hope that the minister will take this petition very, very seriously and will move to see that the people of St. Brendan's are provided adequate health services, that they are treated equally as other communities in this Province, and that certainly that they can be provided with this minimal service, Mr. Speaker, this very minimal service of being provided with a full-time nurse. Again when the doctor is not on the Island - he is there only one every two weeks - they have to hire the ferry for emergencies. Of course, emergencies are rather relative on the island since there is nobody to determine what an emergency is, and when somebody gets sick they have to hire a ferry, at a great expense to the person hiring the ferry. So, Mr. Speaker, there is every reason why the people of St. Brendan's, I believe, should be afforded the reasonable request that they are asking here so that their children and so that all of the people, the senior citizens, all of the people on St. Brendan's can be assured a more reasonable and a more adequate level of health service. So I certainly hope that the government will take this petition very, very seriously and will certainly agree to accommodate the request of the residents to immediately have a full-time nurse resident on the island of St. Brendan's so that these people can have a level of health service in accordance with other areas of the Province.

Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the petition placed upon the Table of the House and referred to the appropriate department.

MR. HOUSE:

Mr. Speaker, I -

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the minister going to speak? Is the minister going to speak? Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister may possibly speak, he may possibly even say something, which will be a welcomed change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: That is good.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it is good, Mr. Speaker, which is more than I can say about the minister.

MR. HOUSE: None of your smart - alec cracks.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the minister starts his smart alec remarks with me he will get better than he gives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me carry on -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: - if the hon. gentlemen opposite are so indisposed. Let me say that I support this



MR. ROBERTS:

petition, as do my colleagues on this side of the House. The gentleman from Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) has outlined the case eloquently and effectively and I do not need to go over what he said. In the day and age in which we live, and given the type and quantity of medical services available to people elsewhere throughout this Province, the request made by these people who live on St. Brendan's is not unreasonable. It would not be terribly costly. It would not cost the Treasury a great deal of money. We can afford lots of things around this Province, I will not go into them, but we can afford lots of services put on the Public Treasury that are of far less use to anybody than would be the cost of providing the salary of a nurse at St. Brendan's. I suggest to the minister that we should do it. I suggest to the minister that he should take the steps necessary. I could outline for him, I am sure he is probably aware, of places where medical services are being provided in far less demanding circumstances than those which obtain at St. Brendan's.

These people are isolated, on the other end of a ferry service. The ferry service can be irregular because of weather conditions. The people's needs do not occur only when the ferry comes or when the doctor comes, the people's needs occur whenever they occur.

MR. HISCOCK: They are cold and callous.

MR. ROBERTS: I am sorry; My friend from Eagle River said?

MR. HISCOCK: The government is cold and callous, they have no feelings.

MR. ROBERTS: Well I am not going to disagree with my friend from Eagle River when he says the government are cold and callous. I will say that here is an opportunity for them to show that they are not cold and callous, and the way for them to show that, Sir, is for them to accede to a very reasonable and very modest request and that is to provide the nurse for these people at St. Brendan's. Sir, it ought to be done and it ought to be done right away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to rise to support I guess the principle of this petition. The fact is I just want perhaps to make a comment regarding the presentation of petitions. The members opposite, as should open-line programmes and the media, know that petitions are - we have three people to speak on petitions and ordinarily, in some cases, a minister will get up and accept the petition and make a few pertinent remarks.

MR. NEARY: We gave you the works yesterday.

MR. HOUSE: The point was of course, the facts - of course, I still have my Insight magazine, I read it every day.

MR. NEARY: You only can stand and support a petition.

MR. YOUNG: He was reading Ray Guy, He could not -

MR. HOUSE: The fact is, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly take this petition to the department -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: - take it to the department. The fact is of course we do not as much have district nurses now as we

MR. HOUSE: used to have Public Health nurses are more in the field of preventive medicine and we try to locate them for an average of about two to 4,000 people, I think, around the Province. And we do try to provide adequate medical service through district health offices. And, of course, I am sorry to hear that they were six weeks without that kind of service. I will certainly look into that and look into the feasibility of having somebody there, look into that possibility. The fact is, of course, that we have helicopter service for getting people in case of emergencies and with bringing people to the island, if necessary, as well as the regular ferry. So certainly in accepting this I will certainly look into the matter.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Are there any other petitions?

MR. LUSH: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, this petition is of a different matter but certainly again having to do with a government service. This petition, again, Mr. Speaker, is on behalf of approximately 200 residents of the community of Cannings Cove, a beautiful community in the Terra Nova district. And these people, Mr. Speaker, are concerned about the condition of their roads - the road connecting Cannings Cove with Musgravetown, the road leading from Musgravetown through to Cannings Cove, a road, I guess we are talking about some three miles, the road leading from Musgravetown to and through the community of Cannings Cove.

Mr. Speaker, the signatures on this particular petition would represent, I would expect, maybe 80 per cent of the adult population of the community of Cannings Cove. And directly I will go to the petition and it says, Sir, 'We the undersigned, the people of Cannings Cove in the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador,

June 16, 1982

Tape No. 1357

SD - 2

MR. LUSH: do hereby request the provincial government to allocate funds in this fiscal year to upgrade and pave the road from Musgravetown through Cannings Cove.

MR. LUSH:

"This road receives extensive use by school children who are bused daily to and from Musgravetown, by workers who commute to work on a daily basis, by large numbers of residents who conduct their daily routine business outside of the community.

"Additionally, Canning's Cove is rapidly becoming a busy fishing centre. The transportation of this fish requires a good paved road. We therefore petition the provincial government to take immediate action in this matter and your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray."

As I have said, Mr. Speaker, the petition is signed by upwards to and possibly beyond 80 per cent of the adult population of Canning's Cove. And, Mr. Speaker, I think the petitioners have certainly indicated the reasons why they want their roads improved and paved. They mention the fact that children are bused over the road daily to schools in Musgravetown. All of the high school children are bused to the school in Musgravetown so these kids use the road daily for ten months of the year.

Canning's Cove is not a commercial place, so they also do most of their shopping in Musgravetown and Clarenville and other areas around, so the people would have to move out of there to do their daily routine shopping. Then, of course, a large number of people would work in areas close by, in the Terra Nova National Park and in Clarenville and other areas, so all the people have to move out of there to work, with the exception of the fishermen.

MR. LUSH: And the petition makes that point, that Canning's Cove is rapidly establishing itself as a fairly productive fishing centre and over the last five years has made tremendous progress in this area. They make that point in their petition that they think they should have a paved road so that the fish product can go to the markets in a good condition.

And, Mr. Speaker, of course all hon. members are aware of the inconvenience of wallowing in dust and dirt when one is living on a gravel road. And, again, like so many rural Newfoundland communities, Canning's Cove was built along both side of a main road. And these people, with the frustration they go through when the dry weather approaches, the ladies cannot put clothes on the lines, they cannot raise their windows, they will all just smother and stifle in the dirt and the dust that is flying around that beautiful town.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is every reason given, economic reasons and social reasons why the people of Canning's Cove should have their road paved, just a distance of something less than three miles, something less than three miles from the town of Musgravetown through to Canning's Cove.

So, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH:

I hope again that the government will treat the people of Canning's Cove as equal Newfoundlanders, will give them their rights-

MR. NEARY: So have-not will be no more.

MR. LUSH: - the people of Canning's Cove, so that they can go about their daily work, Mr. Speaker, without the problems that are inherent with dirt roads, without the dangers that are inherent, and that they can be afforded a good road so that their school children can be bused to school comfortably and conveniently, so that the workers in Canning's Cove who are working in other areas of the Province can commute to work safely and economically, Mr. Speaker, and so that the fish plant can be given the opportunity to produce, to produce to its maximum, so that the place can become a viable community. So, Mr. Speaker, I conclude by saying that I support the petition wholeheartedly and hope that the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) in rising will be able to give the people of Canning's Cove some good news by saying that there is going to be action taken this year towards treating these people as equal Newfoundlanders and giving them the rights that they deserve.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I place it upon the table of the House and have it referred to the appropriate department.

MR. TULK: Some job there, some member.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Transportation.

MR. SIMMS: Hear, hear! A good minister.

MR. DAWE: Mr. Speaker, as I indicated during the estimates committees, I guess each and every member in this House of Assembly has a just reason to request road

MR. DAWE: improvements in his or her particular district, and it is this government's intention to address itself to these very legitimate concerns and aspirations of the residents all around Newfoundland and Labrador. It becomes in this particular issue, as it is in other areas of social concerns, a matter of funding being available to address itself to what are real, legitimate concerns of the people. And we are continuing to upgrade and improve road facilities and transportation networks around the Province as funding becomes available.

Mr. Speaker, as soon as this Province has the opportunity of participating in this Canadian nation on an equal financial footing with other Canadians, then we will be in a better position to address ourselves more quickly to these very legitimate concerns of the residents that the hon. member represented today, and all other residents of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to stand and speak in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague from the district of Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). Mr. Speaker, I am quite familiar with the town of Canning's Cove. I have driven through that community many times. I drove



MR. CALLAN:

through it years ago when that was the only way that you could cross the Province actually, it was before the TCH was constructed through what is now the Terra Nova National Park - so I am quite familiar. And, Mr. Speaker, after all these years to know that the people in Canning's Cove-hard workers, primary producers, taxpayers, Mr. Speaker, of this Province - have to, as the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) said, wallow and smother in dust - I assume they will get some calcium chloride, I assume that they will get some calcium chloride. But, of course -

MR. NEARY: They might spray 2,4,D on them.

MR. CALLAN: - as we all know, Mr. Speaker, that is just a substitute.

MR. HODDER: Or matacil.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I can also speak from experience in my own district, where we have approximately fifty miles of unpaved or dirt roads. And I grew up on a section of what used to be the Cabot Highway, where traffic from all across the Island had to pass through twenty feet from the house where I lived, and I know what it means to live and wallow in dust. But to have to do so, Mr. Speaker, in this day and age, in 1982, seems a little bit ridiculous. And I believe, Mr. Speaker, that government have their priorities mixed up a bit.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. CALLAN: Last night on the television -

MR. TULK: What priorities?

MR. CALLAN: - the minister was saying that one out of every \$10 that is raised by the government of this Province is spent on maintaining and upgrading our roads and so on.

Mr. Speaker, I understand that there are still approximately 2,000 miles of dirt road in

MR. CALLAN: the Province.

MR. NEARY: A lot of that in St. Mary's Bay too.

MR. CALLAN: In St. Mary's-The Capes, in the district of St. Mary's-The Capes I am sure that the newly elected member knows exactly how many miles there are now. He was quoted earlier as saying that there were 104, I think, or 100 miles.

MR. HEARN: One hundred and twenty-five.

MR. CALLAN: But there are over 100 miles of dirt road in places like in the district of St. Mary's-The Capes. And the people in the galleries, these senior citizens who have worked hard all their lives and paid taxes all of their lives, are like the people in Canning's Cove, Mr. Speaker, who after working hard all of their lives and paying taxes they still, in their twilight years, have to suffer with dust and dirt and lack of a decent paved road.

If I can make one more comparison, Mr. Speaker, it is like the people in the town of Adeytown in my district, where they paved to the last house in Deep Bight, and of course Adeytown being a town of probably a population of 150 people, mostly senior citizens,

MR. CALLAN: because it is a lovely little place to retire, and they also are still there wallowing and smothering in dust. Mr. Speaker, I support this petition, as I have supported many other petitions in the past when it comes to asking that government and the minister who just finished speaking, prioritize. Mr. Speaker, we hear the Premier every now and then talking about the federal government doing something on the backs of Newfoundlanders, on the backs of Newfoundland. Mr. Speaker, I cannot help thinking every time the Premier mentions that sort of an issue that here we have the same thing happening in this Province where roads will be paved this Summer in other parts of Newfoundland and it will be done, Mr. Speaker, on the backs of the taxpayers in Canning's Cove and the half dozen or more communities located in the district of Bellevue and St. Mary's-The Capes and others. Because, Mr. Speaker, it makes a lot of sense, as the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) already said, you know, for social, economical and many other reasons, it makes a lot of sense to give these people a little bit of pavement - fresh fish that has to be trucked over these roads, buses that have to travel over these roads carrying school kids, and all the many other reasons that we can think of. And, as I said, Mr. Speaker, these people are not, if I remember them and I think I do, they are not people who are trusting to the government for welfare and handouts. They are primary producers and they are hardworking men and women.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

I would like to advise the hon. member that his time is up.

MR. CALLAN: Yes, Mr. Speaker. They deserve an improved road and I support wholeheartedly the petition.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Are there any other petitions?

This now being Private Members Day we shall commence with Motion 8, the motion to be moved by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to start as is usually the case by reading this resolution into Hansard:

WHEREAS the fishery is the main thread of Newfoundland's social, cultural and economic fabric; and

WHEREAS both the inshore and offshore sectors of the Province's fishery are in a state of crisis; and

WHEREAS there is no coherent or cohesive policy being pursued by the present provincial government; and

WHEREAS it seems apparent that the present provincial government has neither the desire nor the ability to develop long term strategies or policies for the Province's fishery;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House immediately set as its top priority the development of a comprehensive long term policy for the Newfoundland fishery;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a select committee of this House be appointed to ensure that this policy becomes reality.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of this resolution to the Liberal Party I think is

MR. B. TULK:

clearly illustrated by the fact that we have placed it behind another resolution put forward by the member from Terra Nova (Mr. T. Lush). That resolution, Mr. Speaker, of course, spoke of unemployment in this Province, and that resolution was ably presented by the member for Terra Nova. Unfortunately the government again chose to ignore it and voted against it. We see it as an umbrella resolution and we see that under that resolution perhaps the greatest opportunity we have to lower unemployment in the Province is through the development of our fishery. Now, Mr. Speaker, we want to make it plain though that the group on this side, the people on this side, the caucus on this side are not talking as the Premier talks. We are not talking of solving problems perhaps on the backs of our fisherman, that is keeping low incomes -

MR. R. DAVE:

You had better not say that.

MR. TULK:

Now I know it hurts the Minister of Transportation (Mr. R. Dawe) every time you mention his friend the Premier, but would he be quiet?

The Premier seems bent on keeping the number of fisherman in our boats that are there, and indeed increasing them to any number that he sees fit. It does not concern him too much though, does not concern him too much about the level of income of some of those fisherman.

Mr. Speaker, we on this side would wish to see a stabilized income for our fisherman, an increasing income. We on this side wish to see the government invest funds to insure that we do have a prosperous fishery. Mr. Speaker, we believe that the spin-off effect of further investment in our fishery would be tremendous. Surely one of the historical lessons, one of the lessons of history in Newfoundland is that the prosperity of Newfoundland has depended to a great deal on whether we have

MR. B. TULK: prosperity in the fishery. As the fishery goes in Newfoundland so goes the prosperity of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, expansion in the fishery -

MR. STAGG: What about the (inaudible) to the gills.

MR. TULK: If the toddler now, the fellow that has been trying to get into the Cabinet for the past ten years, and he has finally toddled up to be Parliamentary Assistant, if he will be quiet I will get to that later.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, if there is room for expansion in the fishery, then this government has to do a much better job in marketing - and that is the government's responsibility, the Government of this Province's responsibility - they have to do a much better job of marketing, and of technological development so that we can harvest the fish stocks that are there. They have to do a much better job as a government in improving quality. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, one of the most important areas that we have to improve and change in this Province is

MR. TULK:

an improvement in our attitude towards the fishery. Mr. Speaker, in many cases perhaps the attitude of Newfoundlanders as a people, as a whole, towards the fishery needs to be improved. There is a feeling abroad in this Province, Mr. Speaker, in some quarters of this Province, that the fishermen in this Province get everything for free, that they are subsidized too heavily, that we should perhaps take some of the gifts, that some of those people are saying fishermen get, away from them. Some think that fishermen in this Province are an economic drag. They are blamed for the poor quality of the fish that we have in this Province and many see our fishermen as perhaps fishing only for unemployment insurance benefits. Yet, Mr. Speaker, the real truth in this Province is that there are very few rich fishermen. There are very few fishermen who have made a fortune out of fishing. There are very few fishermen who if given the chance will not improve their success rate.

MR. STAGG: What do you think about Revenue Canada's position?

MR. TULK: If the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) had been around about six months ago and had read his paper instead of yapping off over there he would have found out where I stood in regards to Revenue Canada.

MR. STAGG: All the people here would like to know where you stand.

MR. TULK: They read their paper, unlike the member for Stephenville. I presume they do. Or can the member for Stephenville read? The toddler! No, he cannot.

MR. STAGG: Get up and make that speech.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the UIC system -

MR. STAGG: We cannot remember what you said six months ago, none of us can.

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

MR. TULK: The UIC system in this Province, Mr. Speaker, discourages the efforts of fishermen by lowering the amount received if they get small catches. Mr. Speaker, that is totally unfair. I do not mind saying to the federal government and to this government that perhaps they should get together on this issue and should see that our fishermen's UIC benefits rather than discouraging efforts in the fishery are put in such a way that the best averages of fishermen are used.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some, perhaps even some of the people sitting in this House, will say that regardless of whether the income of fishermen is up, say, in the latter part of the season, in the Fall of the year in the inshore fishery, some say, 'Oh, they should still fish regardless of what that does to their income in the Winter'. Mr. Speaker, I just ask a simple question: Who in this Province will reduce their annual income by working longer? And that is what we are asking our fishermen to do. We are asking them to take a lower income in the Winter just to work longer in the Fall. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, there there is not a doctor, there is not a lawyer, there is not a teacher, there is not a civil servant or there is no



MR. TULK:

other person in this Province that will do that ,yet that is what the present system asks of our fishermen. And that system, Mr. Speaker, is very unfair.

Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the idea that our fishermen are over-subsidized and that perhaps our fishery would be better off if indeed there was less subsidization. Mr. Speaker, that feeling is abroad in this Province and one of the things that is always pointed out to our fishermen is that you get low prices for your fish because our competitors have better quality. Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of our competitors in the world trade in fish. Let us take as the example the Norwegians, Mr. Speaker; the Norwegians are supposed to be one of our strongest competitors in world markets, the strongest competitor on the United States market, for example. And the word usually is, as I said before, that that is caused by the quality of our fish products. Now, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to argue that their product may indeed have a better quality; it could, but I do not believe it does, I do not believe Norway produces a better quality fish than we do. If you ask some of the people who travel to Norway to study the fishery, they will tell you that indeed perhaps the quality of fish in Norway is indeed worse. But the real truth, Mr. Speaker, about why the Norwegians can compete on world markets to their advantage rather than to our advantage, the real truth is that their government is much heavier involved in the subsidization of the Norwegian industry than is the Newfoundland government.

Mr. Speaker, that is another attitude that we seem to have; we seem to have the attitude, as I said, that subsidization is bad for the fishery. Yet,

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the Norwegians, on the other hand, seem to not look at the public funds that they put into the fishery as a subsidization, but rather as an investment. And perhaps that is an attitude that we should use, that we should adopt. I think we should adopt that attitude. For example, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the landed value of fish products in this Province in 1980, the landed value of fish products in Newfoundland in 1980 was \$161 million. The export value of that fish was \$400 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is again, as a former Premier of this Province was fond of saying, that is new dollars, new dollars into the economy, new dollars that go, I would suggest, to pay your salary, mine and perhaps every other salary in this House. And yet, Mr. Speaker, last year the expenditure of the

MR. TULK:

Provincial Department of Fisheries was what in this Province? What was the investment that the Province put into the fishery?

MR. STAGG: \$23 million.

MR. TULK: No, Mr. Speaker, it was not \$23 million. The estimated expenditure last year was \$19,447,800 to be exact. What was the actual expenditure of this government? What was their actual expenditure? Something like \$16 million. The exact figures are \$16,335,000. In other words, Mr. Speaker -

MR. DINN: Smallwood said, 'Burn your boats'.

MR. TULK: Smallwood might have said, 'Burn your boats,' he may have, I am not sure that he did, but you are saying that the fishermen do.

MR. DINN: We are building them instead of burning them.

MR. HODDER: That is why you raised the interest on fishermen's loans.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, as a matter of fact, this government last year estimated that they would spend \$19 million in the fishery, and in actual fact, through the efforts of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) last Fall in that cloak of secrecy that went on and when he had to balance his budget, they cut \$3 million off the fisheries budget and spent something like \$16 million.

MR. DINN: We gave out \$23 million in guaranteed loans.

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, that was in a year in which the industry in this Province was going through its worse year since about 1973, that this government actually spent less in the fishery than they budgeted for.

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, that aside, look at that \$19 million as an investment percentage over what the landed value of our fish was, and you can see that indeed it is a ridiculous investment.

Mr. Speaker, let us ask this government another question, let us ask them another question. If you look at -

MR. CARTER: It is very boring.

MR. TULK: Well the member has a choice. He can leave. This House will not be worse because his presence is not here.

Mr. Speaker, let us ask the government another question. Where do they place among the resource sector of their budget, in their budgetary system, where do they place fisheries? Where do they rank it?

MR. YOUNG: Number one.

MR. TULK: Number one.

MR. HISCOCK: After offshore.

MR. TULK: Let me give them a few figures from this thing here.

MR. DINN: There will be no boat burning.

MR. TULK: Let me give them a few.

In the resource sector of this Province this year coming, the estimates are that the gross expenditure for Mines and Energy will be \$53 million, the gross expenditure for the Department of Development will be \$34 million, the gross expenditure for Fisheries will be \$21 million -

MR. YOUNG: That is better.

MR. TULK: - the gross expenditure for Forest Resources and Lands will be \$30 million.

MR. HODDER: They will pay the salaries.

MR. TULK: The expenditure for Rural, Agriculture and Northern Development will be \$32 million.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let us rank those, let us put them in the order of rank. We see first of all that the government has put Mines and Energy first. We know why that is. Because that is the pipe dreams of the Premier, this offshore oil and gas. Is Fisheries, first? No. Is it second? No. Is it third or fourth? Is the investment in Fisheries by this government third or fourth? The answer is, no. Fisheries is fifth and last, Mr. Speaker. Fifth and last. It occupies fifth place.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh !

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, their priority then for Fisheries is that in the resource sector of their budgetary system it has to come last. And fourth, of course, comes the second most important industry in this Province and that is Forestry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to return to the Premier's notions of what the fishery should be, and it is coming through in his budget - I wish he were

June 16, 1982

Tape 1366

PK - 2

MR. TULK: in the House - it is coming through in his budget. The government's notion of what the fishery should be is coming through in his budget. Because, you see, it seems to me listening to the other side speak on occasion on the fishery, that they have this romantic notion of the fishery; that where everybody in outport Newfoundland have a fishing boat, they are catching rabbits, and they are shooting moose in the Fall of the year, they are making \$7,000

MR. TULK:

a year, Mr. Speaker- that is the average for a long-liner fisherman in this Province- the philosophy of this government regarding the fishery, Mr. Speaker, seems to be to keep Newfoundland people poor but happy. And that is basically what the Premier said.

I would like to suggest to him, Mr. Speaker, that he is perhaps reading a little bit too much Shakespeare, because Shakespeare could have a field day with that kind of romantic notion.

Mr. Speaker, let it not be said that we on this side do not wish to see more people fishing, but only, Mr. Speaker, if we are willing as a government, and as a Legislature to see that those people have a decent livelihood. And anybody who contends that a longliner fisherman in this Province today, making between an average of \$6,000 to \$8,000 - \$7,000 is the median figure - anybody who suggests that anybody making \$7,000 in this day and age, with a family to feed -

MR. BAIRD:  
figure from?

Where did you get that

MR. TULK:  
you appointed and ignored.

The royal commission that

Anybody who suggests that \$7,000 is an adequate livelihood, Mr. Speaker, are dreaming, they are romantics. If that is to happen, if we are to put more people in the fishery, then this government has to put its money where its mouth is, the fishery cannot be placed last on their resource sector investment spending list. It cannot be done, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, let us look again, and I want to answer a question put forward by

MR. TULK: the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), his favourite question, let us look again at the lack of planning and action that this government carries on in the fishery.

Sometime ago the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and again he is not in his seat today, he has not been there for a couple of days, probably legitimately, but he has not been there, but sometime ago -

MR. RIDEOUT: He is studying fish.

MR. TULK: He needs to study fish.

Sometime ago the Minister of Fisheries came into this House with a Ministerial Statement in which he was upset with the federal minister for trading off 10,000 metric tons of caplin.

AN HON. MEMBER: And well he should be.

MR. TULK: And well he should be. We agreed. We asked him to make his telex to the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) unanimous. We made the statement, I believe, that there should be no fish going out of Canadian waters unless it was caught by Canadians and particularly Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Because, Mr. Speaker, we believe on this side of the House that this term that is being used by both the Province and, in some cases, the federal government, the term 'surplus stock' should not exist in Newfoundland. Surplus stock. a surplus stock of fish in Canadian waters. Mr. Speaker, the Province believes that -

DR. COLLINS: How about silver hake?

MR. TULK: Silver hake? We should be able to catch it and sell it. There should not be a surplus stock.



MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, how is surplus stock defined by this government? How does the minister define it? He defines it as a fish, as a species that we have not traditionally caught or that we do not have the technology to catch. One of those two criteria apply, you know, to surplus stock.

Well, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the question who has control of the rate of technological development in the fishery in this Province?

MR. NEARY: Right on! Hear, hear!

MR. TULK: Who has the control of marketing of fish in this Province?

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. TULK: Who has the control as to whether our fishery develops or not?

MR. DINN: You cannot sell it when it is all given away.

MR. TULK: It is your government and, if you do not know it, you should wake up and realize it.

MR. DINN: It is hard to sell fish when 159,000 metric tons are given away.

MR. TULK: The point that I am making to you is by your own definition, by your own definition, if you had developed technologically in this Province

MR. DINN: How can you sell if they will not let you catch it to sell?

MR. SPEAKER(Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TULK: - there would not be a surplus stock to trade off.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. DINN: The reason we have not got the technology (inaudible).

MR. TULK: You have muffed it. You have been there for ten years and you have muffed it.

MR. NEARY: You are too stunned to get out of your own way over there.

June 16, 1982

Tape No. 1368

ah-2

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY:

You are too stunned to get out of your own way over there.

MR. DINN:

Burn your boats.

MR. HISCOCK:

And buy Russian cars. Buy Russian cars.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, could we have the Yahoo from down in Pleasantville somewhere, he belongs there somewhere, could we have him quite please?

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

MR. DINN:

The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) got more boats than all of you put together.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, is he going to carry on like that or do we have to strap him in the seat?

MR. NEARY:

Go down and collect from the telephone company.

MR. TULK:

Strap him in the seat or kick him out. Give him a flick.

MR. HISCOCK:

That does not say anything for the intelligence of the voters in your district though.

MR. DINN:

You will never get back in Social Services again.

MR. TULK:

Mr. Speaker, they wonder at the intelligence of the voters in the outports voting for Liberals, when they voted for that. They voted for that.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that if this government and its predecessor, the former administration, not the former, former administration but the former administration, if they had developed this Province, especially technologically, there would be no surplus stock and there would be very little for the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) to fool around with. Now, Mr. Speaker, I

MR. TULK:                   went on to ask the minister, in that little interchange that we had, I went on to ask the minister about the trading of our stocks to the Russians, all of this surplus stock. And I heard somebody, as I said before, groan over there that I seemed to be against St. John's. Well, the truth is, Mr. Speaker, that if that 153,000 metric tons of fish came ashore in this Province, St. John's would benefit far more than it is presently benefiting from the Russians bringing their few ships in here, I think it is \$2.25 million a year.

MR. NEARY:                   Putting them on dry dock.

MR. TULK:                   Now, Mr. Speaker, last year this government - my time has just about run out and I suppose I will get back at it, but last year the government, for technological development in this Province,

MR. TULK:

what did they do? They budgeted a measley \$671,000 for development, technological development of our fishery. The shame of it was though that again, through the knife of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), they spent something like \$549,000, over \$100,000 less than the measly \$670,000 that they had budgeted. Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that there is fish out there that this government says is surplus stock?

What did they do in product and market development last year?

MR. NEARY: Nothing.

MR. TULK: The minister, if he were here I would say it -

MR. NEARY: He went down to Puerto Rico for a holiday.

MR. TULK: - the minister is the best travelled minister in North America.

MR. DINN: He did not go to Panama to see John C.

MR. TULK: He is a globe trotter.

MR. NEARY: He went down to Puerto Rico.

MR. TULK: He should join the Harlem Globe Trotters. But what did they budget for marketing last year? Again a measly \$517,000 but how much did they spend?

MR. STAGG: A measly \$500,000.

MR. TULK: Yes, to an industry that is as important as the fishery it is measly. How much did they spend, Mr. Speaker? \$275,000, again the knife of the Minister of Finance.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. TULK: About 55 per cent of what was budgeted for marketing in this Province last year was spent, and that in spite of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we had the worst market conditions in this Province's history in the fishery.

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

MR. TULK: Oh my, Mr. Speaker. I was just getting at it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Environment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, I really cannot get too much enthusiasm about this motion which reads -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ANDREWS: "WHEREAS both the inshore and offshore sectors of the Province's fishery are in a state of crisis." It is certainly true. No truer statement was ever made. I would like to come back in a few moments as to why the fishery is in a state of crisis.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible).

MR. ANDREWS: Stay around you might hear something, learn something.

"AND WHEREAS it seems apparent that the present provincial government has neither the desire nor the ability to develop long-term strategies or policies for the Province's fishery."

Now, I just went down to my office lunch time and I started going through a few things. There is something that was published in 1980, Newfoundland and Labrador Managing All Our Resources, a considerable piece of information in there about the fishery, setting a course for Newfoundland for the fishery, six volumes written by Newfoundlanders for the Government of Newfoundland. This is the policy and there is a policy, and for those members who, on the other side of the House, have never taken the time probably to read

MR. ANDREWS:

this, or to understand the importance of the fishery and how we are trying to handle it, this government is trying to handle it, I must give you a few lessons. The essence of the policy of the Newfoundland government is this - highlighted throughout this book - 'Northern cod must be reserved to ensure a middle distance effort to extend it to the extent that it can be harvested by that fleet'. Now, Mr. Speaker, that in itself is a statement of policy with a lot of significance for Newfoundland fishermen. What we are saying there, what the government is saying is that Northern cod, the first access to that should be by inshore fishermen. The cost of catching codfish is a lot less, the unit cost for catching is a lot less than when you use small boats, trap boats, longliners, gill-netters, whatever the case may be, the cost is a lot less than these multi-million dollar draggers, although there certainly is a need for the multi-million dollar draggers in areas where you want to have seasonal fish plants. Along and hand in hand with that policy there is also a policy of encouraging the construction of what is commonly called middle-distance fishing boats and this programme is well underway right now.

We also say, 'Where within the total allowable catch a surplus to inshore effort can be clearly shown to exist, it must be reserved to offshore effort landing into Newfoundland ports, primarily for distribution to processing plants which now operate on a seasonal basis. Once again, Mr. Speaker, when this Northern cod is taken by vessels from Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, or vessels that have traditionally fished off the Scotia shelf or the gulf and now find it convenient to say that they had traditional fishing grounds off the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, when fish

MR. ANDREWS: is taken by those vessels and brought to mainland ports in Canada, I think we are into a very serious situation. Equally, and probably more devastating, is the continued trade-off that is happening with the Northern cod to foreign countries. This certainly has to stop. All trade off may not have to stop, but I think there has to be meaningful consultation with the Government of Newfoundland so that we can know what the federal authorities are thinking, so our plans can go hand in hand with them. It is no sense for them to - sometimes it is certainly worthwhile to trade off. Grenadier, for instance, is a species that has very

MR. ANDREWS:

little commercial value in this Province. It may in the future, but at the present time I would be quite willing, if I was the Minister of Fisheries for Newfoundland, to trade off a lot of grenadier for some other benefit that Newfoundland may get, or Canada, certainly. But this indiscriminate trading and permitting foreign nations to take fish, in particular caplin - a lot of our fishermen are very worried about the amount of caplin being caught and the amount squid, which is the bait fish for our codfish and other food fishes that we sell on the market.

Here is another policy position of the provincial government. In addition to problems associated with the Northern cod, there is a further problem associated with the management of offshore fish stocks in the Grand Banks area. When the current Law of the Sea Conference was commenced some years ago, Newfoundland took the position that in order for Canada to protect the fish stocks upon which the Province's fishermen depend, it would be necessary for Canada to extend its jurisdiction not merely to the 200 mile limit but to the edge of the Continental Shelf. And this is a very important point, because we find ourselves, in Canada, as the only country in the world where a 200 mile economic zone does not include the whole Continental Shelf. It would be precedent setting for Canada to take the action, but I think that the world community would accept it. And if we do not have that control over the whole Continental Shelf, there is going to be, as we see now, a very difficult problem in managing the fish stocks as they migrate from the tail and the nose of the



MR. ANDREWS: Bank, back and forth inside the 200 mile limit. The fish do not understand the boundary line, as some of the captains of the ships, I think, that fish there too do not recognize it.

This is a very important one and something that from the time of the inception of the Law of the Sea Conference was a position that Newfoundland took. Now Newfoundland's initial fears are being realized, when certain countries engage in indiscriminate fishing on the nose and tail of the Bank just outside the 200 mile zone. The action jeopardized the stocks upon which our offshore trawler fleet have traditionally depended. And you talk to any trawler captain or any trawler fisherman along the South Coast who fishes those areas and he will reinforce that statement. That is a statement of our position, of our policy. This is a very detailed document, Mr. Speaker.

The second WHEREAS in this motion, WHEREAS the inshore and offshore sectors of the Province's fishery are in a state of crisis, relate back to a lot of these issues, issues that we have very little control over. Now, we do have control over, and it has been said in this House many times, control over a significant part

MR. ANDREWS: of the fishing industry. We have control over licencing of fish and over the plant operation, whether a plant gets a licence or not. This government is dedicated to the continuance of the fishery, I think, which was proved in this last six or seven months when we, through the taxpayers of Newfoundland, helped over seventeen fish plants reopen, seventeen fish companies - I think there are more than seventeen individual plants - seventeen fish companies reopened and thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders back to work.

I know in my own district, the fish plant at Burgeo and the fish plant at Ramea are working great guns. On the other hand, the federal government decided in its own wisdom, or greedy wisdom to avoid the issue by appointing the Kirby Task Force which did the tremendous thing of opening one fish plant in one Newfoundland community over the past six months. And that is obviously an attempt by the federal government to come in the back door and nationalize and socialize the fishing industry of Newfoundland, by putting it in the management of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, which I think most fishermen, and certainly the industry in Newfoundland would be deadly opposed to.

MR. NEARY: Who opened Grand Bank? Who opened Gaultois? Who opened St. Anthony?

MR. ANDREWS: A little bit of money from the Province, I would say. A little bit of money from the Province, I would say, Sir.

We are opposed to nationalization of the fishery. We will help, and we have helped over the past six to eight months. Fish companies which got themselves in trouble because of market conditions and because of conditions beyond their control, because of lack of fish, because of high interest rates, factors

MR. ANDREWS: that they had no control over, we have helped them along. In some cases we have taken an equity position in the plants, others, most of them, it has been a guaranteed loan that they have to repay.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: We believe that independent fish companies can run their businesses a lot better than government being involved. And the proof of that is also in my own district, Mr. Speaker, in the community of Burgeo, where the transfer of the fish plant was finalized this Spring, with some taxpayers' money in there to sweeten the deal, for National Sea Products. It is my understanding that productivity in that plant - productivity and quality control has improved by almost 100 per cent since the government withdrew its financial involvement in that plant.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. ANDREWS: The workers are a lot more happy, the management is happy, and hopefully the company can make a profit. Certainly it is not the position of any government to stick its nose into a business that is so complicated and that needs such expert management as the fishing industry. We should be there to help when times get bad and beyond the control of the processor or the fisherman,

June 16, 1982

Tape No. 1373

MJ - 1

MR. H. ANDREWS: things beyond his control, high interest rates, low market prices in the United States, low fish stocks, low catches, low landings, the whole works just crowding in upon him. We should be there to help out for the benefit of the fisherman and the workers in the plant and the Newfoundland economy in general. And that is what we have been doing.

MR. STAGG: We are not competing with companies.

MR. ANDREWS: We are not competing with companies.

In companies where we have taken an equity position, we have also taken a position on the Board of Directors of those companies and that position on the Board of Directors gives us a very close monitoring of the companies' financial affairs.

MR. L. SIMMS: It is better than burning your boats, is it?

MR. ANDREWS: It is better, indeed, than burning their boats.

We are very worried, Mr. Speaker, about the seasonal nature of the Newfoundland fishery and, as the hon. member from Fogo (Mr. B. Tulk) talked about, the low earnings of the Newfoundland longliner fishermen and small boat fishermen. Their earnings are too low, but a lot of those problems, once again are beyond his control altogether. If he has to deal with 20 per cent money, or 18 per cent money, selling into a market where the price of fish has not improved in three or four or five years for some products, it is a desperate situation. I would hope that the Kirby Task Force will come up and face that serious problem. That is a very heavy financial dilemma that I do not think this little Province with our half a million people could possibly undertake, that is some kind of a subsidy directly to the fisherman. But it is something that is going to have to be considered, no doubt.

June 16, 1982

Tape 1373

MJ- 2

MR. H. ANDREWS: Marketing, of course, always comes up as a factor whenever we talk about the problems of the fishery.

MR. TULK: What about quality?

MR. ANDREWS: Our quality, coming from our Newfoundland fish plants now, is reputed to be very good quality. The quality has improved considerably over the past numbers of years. I think our product mix leaves something to be desired. We still may be putting out a cheaper product, even though the quality of that product is good. I refer to such items as cod blocks, instead of putting out the finished product, which

MR. ANDREWS: is a little bit difficult if you get into cooking, because of the tariff on that in the United States.

But we have developed many new products in our fish plants in Newfoundland. I guess Fishery Products have led the way, That company has probably led the way in this Province, along with National Sea who are a very good marketing organization also.

I think that is probably the answer to a lot of our problems. When you look at the manufacturers of soap and detergents and things like that, and toothpaste, you will find that it is basically the same product, Soap detergent may be - a company like Colgate - Pamolive might manufacture thirty or forty different products.

MR. CALLAN: Are you talking about the phosphorus out of Long Harbour now?

MR. ANDREWS: Pardon?

MR. CALLAN: Are you talking about phosphorus?

MR. ANDREWS: Phosphorus.

MR. SIMMS: Stop harrassing the hon. member, he is making a good speech.

MR. ANDREWS: That is what I refer to as a product mix, it is to get as much of the market as you can. And in the sense confuse the customer. The quality is a little bit satisfactory.

But because of the history of poor quality, Mr. Speaker, coming from this Province and Nova Scotia and the other Maritime Provinces too, we find ourselves in the position now that American buyers will pay forty to sixty cents a pound more for Icelandic and Norwegian fish without looking at it, because there are still some places and some areas and some plants that do produce a not

MR. ANDREWS:

so good quality of fish.

The American buyers when they buy Scandinavian products, know they are getting a good product. So there is still a lot of work to be done there. But by and large we have certainly come a very long ways.

Product development: As I said, I see the role there for product development as a major role that the Province can help out in. With all due respect to what the Opposition have been saying about the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), he has been promoting Newfoundland fish. He is in Alberta right now. The first fish ever flown to California from Newfoundland came out of a trip that he took down there a little while back.

MR. NEARY: That is not true, they have been flying it out of my district for fifteen years.

MR. ANDREWS: I do not know, they may be flying it out of your district-to California?

MR. NEARY: To California.

MR. ANDREWS: Oh, I see. Well we have a bigger order this time.

MR. NEARY: From Stephenville to California for about fifteen years.

MR. ANDREWS: The order is increased considerably.

MR. HOUSE: Not true, not true.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman does not have a clue to what he is talking about. The market was out of Leading Ticks, there was an unlimited market fifteen years ago. The only thing was that Air Canada would not give them a rate, that was the problem.

MR. ANDREWS: That was the problem. The air rates now seem to be quite acceptable to most of the - of course, the great advantage to flying fish is that the cost of producing the product is considerably less than going through the process of freezing it and storing it, and the dollar return is substantially higher because you are presenting the customer with a much better product. Those are some of the - I see my time is just about out -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. ANDREWS: - Mr. Speaker. There are some of the things that I would like to talk about.

MR. HOUSE: A very good speech, one of the better ones.

MR. ANDREWS: This motion here, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support it because its main thrust is that this government does not have a fisheries policy. We have, I think, the most refined, well thought out, and documented fishery policy in North America today, certainly for all



MR. ANDREWS: the Canadian provinces. There has been no government do as much work. This is just some of it I have here, there is more of it in my briefcase. This is just some of it, and this policy is being put in place as quickly as possible. We have to get in a position where we can sit down and talk to our federal counterparts in areas where we cannot begin policy because we are not informed by them and we disagree largely to some of their policies. And when we can reach some type of an agreement there, and I do not think that that should be very difficult, I think you will see great things happening in the Newfoundland fishery.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker, in supporting this motion about the fisheries, the main thread of Newfoundland's social, cultural and economic fabric, there is no question that it is the main fabric of our society

MR. HISCOCK: and it has been for over 400 years. With regard to that, Mr. Speaker, there are some myths in this Province-and I will try to address a few of them in this speech today - that I think need to be overcome. One of them is, of course, that Canada owns the 200 mile limit. We have a lot of people in this Province who feel that Canada owns the 200 mile limit. No country in this world owns 200 miles. There is a 200 mile economic zone that was agreed upon at the Law of the Sea Conference in Caracas and Venezuela. The former member for Burgeo - St. George's, and also the former Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Donald Jamieson, as well as Mr. Romeo LeBlanc and Allan MacEachen, the Minister of Finance in Ottawa now, were three people who fought to have this law passed. One of the reasons why, of course, was the sea line of the district of the member for Burgeo-St. George's at that time and also with regard to the lifeblood of the Province. We found ourselves at a time where Russians were coming in more and more, Japanese were coming in more and more, also East Germans, Poles and Spaniards. Spain probably and France have an historic right on the Grand Banks, more so than any other country.

So what we are seeing now in this Province, where again I find that the attitude of this government is continually encouraging our people to accept their propaganda, to accept their ignorance. And one of the ignorant things we are perpetuating on our people is that we own the 200 mile limit. And when the federal government allows West Germany to take 10,000 metric tons, somehow or another it is a crime that they are taking 10,000 metric tons of Canadian fish. It is not Canadian fish, it is in the 200 mile economic zone

MR. HISCOCK: that the sovereign states of the world have decided, because of proper management, we should have some rules and regulations on. The same thing with the Northern cod when Japan comes in there or Russia, fishing.

I think, Mr. Speaker, in fairness to our people in the rural areas of our Province who do not get as much media exposure from t.v. and newspapers and print, that it is incumbent upon elected representatives, particularly the government and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), to bring this argument home, that we do not own the 200 mile limit, it is an economic zone. With regard to that, Mr. Speaker, in this 200 mile economic zone, the Minister of Environment (Mr. Andrews) said that we should extend it to the tail of

MR. E. HISCOCK: the Grand Bank and the nose of the Grand Bank, which goes out 400 miles. And there is no question about it, that the fish do not know the difference and keep swimming back and forth. But I do know if the world international community would accept Canada's position of going 200 miles. As it has gone now there are some countries in the world that do not agree with this now. The United States, for example, do not accept that the Northwest Territories and the Passage are in Canadian waters. They look upon those as international waters, and that is the reason why, of course, they sent the Manhattan up in 1967. So, we in our situation, it would be a good idea to extend it to a 400 mile limit, or even more than that, up to the nose and the tail of the Grand Banks, but again, can we get Russia, the United States, Great Britain, France, Spain and China to agree with this? And the answer is, of course, no. So what we are faced with is management. And how do we say to these countries that this is a resource that our people in this part of the world depend upon and need to manage? It is our life style and it is the social, cultural and economic fabric of our country and our Province, Newfoundland and Canada. And, of course, there is no question that they will realize it and they will respect it. But does that prevent Spain from saying - who has fished over here for over 400 years, the bass, long before the English, long before the French - from saying 'Okay, you want the 200 mile economic zone, but do you not think we have traditional rights, because we have always come over here?' And, of course, the answer is yes, if we look at the international laws. But in this House we say, 'No, it is our fish, it is our surplus and they cannot have it.' So what happens to our fisherman in the rural areas? They get emotional, they get on with the government's Newfoundland nationalism

June 16, 1982

Tape No. 1377

MJ - 2

MR. E. HISCOCK: and say, Yes, such and such about Spain, such and such a thing about France and about Russia.

With regard to the other part, Mr.

Speaker -

DR. COLLINS: (Inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK: If the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would only allow me to continue, instead of, Mr. Speaker, talking across the floor of the House. I do not ask for very much, Mr. Speaker, in this House, but I do ask that the Minister of Finance keep to his figures and try to do something about the economic situation in this Province, and I will try to do something with my twenty minutes in this speech.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to the 200 mile limit, what has happened is when Canada extended the 200 mile limit, somehow or another we are now told by the Conservative administration, who are the same people who have been around for the past ten or twelve years, that they were instrumental in getting Canada to extend it to 200 miles. Well, I, for one, have always been in the position, I do not care who takes the credit, or who takes the praise, we have the 200 mile limit, it is not perfect, and it needs to be improved.

MR. HISCOCK:

And with regard to that, let us see what has happened. When we got the 200 mile limit, we thought it was going to be the end of all our problems, just like Hibernia is supposed to be the end of our problems, just like completing the Trans-Canada was supposed to be the end of our problems, and also Come By Chance and Linerboard and Grand Falls and Corner Brook when they were built. And what happened? There were unlimited loans, our fishermen encouraged to get into longliners, encouraging them to get into other boats. And with regard to that, in the election of 1979, the former Minister of Fisheries bankrupt the Loan Board in such a way that they had to replace the members of the Loan Board with another loan board. That was the fishery policy, buy the people boats in the election and let a person have a longliner, got into overfishing, got into a number of policies that led to the actual problems that we have now, Mr. Speaker, in the fishing industry.

And the other part, Mr.

Speaker. What happened? It was the processing licences. If you were a supporter of the P.C. Party and you wanted a licence, a processing licence, if you gave a generous donation it was not too hard, Mr. Speaker, to get a processing licence. And there are some independent people in this Province, processors, who believe that if you have \$10,000 or \$15,000 it is quite easy to get a crab licence.

MR. NEARY:

That is right.

MR. HISCOCK:

I, for one, do not necessarily agree with this, but this is what some of the people are saying. I, for one, hope that it is not true.

MR. NEARY:

I hear that \$25,000 is the price of a crab licence.

MR. HISCOCK:

But with regard to the

MR. HISCOCK: processing sector now, Mr. Speaker, we see it glutted. We see now H.B Nickerson and Sons closing down their plant in Lewisporte only to consolidate it in Charleston in the Triton area. We see that happening all over the Province. Why? There is no doubt about it, that the government's intentions were well meant, that they wanted to give jobs to the people in Lewisporte, and they wanted to give jobs to other people all over the Province, but there was no policy, no concrete policy of looking at the fishing industry in its entirety. It is a piecemeal approach. And I do not care if the Minister of the Environment(Mr. Andrews) or the Premier comes in with stacks upon stacks upon stacks of books and reports of what they are going to be doing. We have heard about the five year plan, and another five year plan, and another five year plan, and we know what has happened to those. So with regard to policy in the fishing industry, there is no policy as such, it is piecemeal.

And with regard to one thing that I would just like to say, when the Minister of Fisheries(Mr. Morgan) said the government here has given \$15 million to the fishing industry from the Provincial government, through the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, I would like to inform the residents of this Province and of this House and of the gallery that the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation is funded 90 per cent by the federal government -

MR. NEARY: Right on!

MR. HISCOCK: - just like the Department of Rural Development is funded 90 per cent

MR. HISCOCK: by the federal government.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HISCOCK: And with regard to the annual report, Anchor Inn Arctic Seafood Fish Plant at Dildo - \$400,000; Newfoundland Development Corporation, 90 per cent of that is federal money. The Fleur de Lys Fish Plant - \$800,000; 90 per cent of that federal government. Hawkes Bay Fisheries \$250,000 ; P. J. Janes and Son canning \$500,000. Again all of this that the government holds up and says look what we are doing for the fishing industry, look what we are doing for the fishery here in Newfoundland, look what we as the Provincial Government is doing, we find out it is coming from the Labrador Development Corporation and Ottawa by way of Ontario , British Columbia, and Nova Scotia and Alberta and other provinces which are putting in 90 per cent of it . Again I do not care where the money comes from or where the credit goes, as long as we are actually expanding those industries and making them viable. But I do think it is important for propaganda to go to both sides and that is, of course, that the money that the Provincial Government is giving, in actual fact is brought in from the federal government, a Newfoundland stamp put on it by a Newfoundland department or programme, thereby getting political patronage as a result.

One thing that I would also like to deal with, and I think it is our total responsibility and I think it says something of us as a Province, after 400 years we still do not even know how to sell fish. There are some people who would even say we do not even know how to catch it, that we have not improved our technology over the ages, that we still produce a poorer quality of fish than Iceland and Norway. I remember the Federal Fisheries Minister, Mr. Romeo LaBlanc, when he was in L'Anse-au-Loup in my district and he announced \$13.5 million for a coastal



MR. HISCOCK: Labrador fishing programme. He said he was a little bit upset when he attends International Fishing Conferences and has to tell these conferences that countries farther away from the American market can actually get the fish into the American market and get a higher price for the quality than Canada who is right on the doorstep of the American market. And that has to be answered by two or three things it has to be answered by the policies of this government and the past governments, not only this government but the past governments, it has to be answered by the Union in this Province and past Unions, and it has to be answered, also, by the fishermen themselves. A lackadaisical attitude,

MR.HISCOCK: and anything is good enough as long as I get enough money to see me through the Winter approach. Marketing: I cannot see why, when we have a university, we cannot take ten or fifteen or twenty top students in the BA programme, put them on to a MBA programme, if we have to send them to Princeton, Yale or Harvard or over in Europe anywhere, train them in several different languages and then get them in the marketing and send them on over to Europe and get them into selling for us instead of taking a piecemeal attitude and allowing seven or eight fish companies in Newfoundland to go and try to sell their fish as a person would try to sell things on the streets of New York or any other large city, having no more planning than that. The answer, Mr. Speaker, to it is marketing. We have no marketing approach not only with our fish but with our agricultural products, with our Tourism or whatever, we have no packaging and we have no marketing. And if we had a marketing approach, Mr. Speaker, in a rational way we could go into the American markets, we could try to lobby Congress and the House of Representatives there to lower their tariffs in trade off for other things, in trade off for other things, and go to the European economic community and have our own skilled, qualified people who are versed in three or four languages, have them as lobbyists to try and convince, like the environmentalists did with the seals -and we found out what the environmentalist Brian Davies could do with a bit of pressure and a few hundred thousand dollars. If we had those in various parts of the world and took an aggressive approach with the Canadian government, with the Canadian Embassies in these countries, then we might be able to break into new markets. But, no, Mr. Speaker, the attitude

MR. HISCOCK: is that we cannot give away surplus fish. And if we give away surplus fish, then there is something wrong.

MR. NEARY: Why do you not go out and kiss the Premier's picture?

MR. HISCOCK: So the answer to that is, Mr. Speaker, if we catch all the fish that we possibly can catch in Twillingate and Fogo and coastal Labrador and St. Anthony and Burgeo and Ramea, if we catch all the fish that we can possibly catch and give all the longliners a wage because of the price of fish, and also the fishermen, but we have no markets for it, what happens? What happens is what happened in the 70s, and that is the bottom went out of the market, we had to form the Canadian Saltfish Corporation to buy the fish and sell it off to third world countries.

MR. HISCOCK: And a lot of the third world countries, by the way, Mr. Speaker, did not particularly enjoy getting salt fish when they much preferred to get rice or wheat. But that is what Canada basically did, sent it over to them and said, 'Here is protein'. And we know really, if we look at it, we know what salt really does to the diet.

With regard to the other part of the stockpiles, Mr. Speaker, if we do not get into the markets of the United States and into Europe, and we do not learn to compete with Iceland and Norway, then there is nothing that we really can do if our product is of a low quality. The reality is in the United States they want cod blocks because of the tariff. So we have to do something about the tariff. The reality is also in the United States that the younger people much prefer to buy McDonalds, Burger King, Kentucky Fried Chicken or pizza and it is actually cheaper to buy some of these things that it is to buy fish. And if we are going to break into these, then we need to work with the federal government, not take the attitude, as this government has been doing for the past three or four years, of saying, 'We want co-operation' but then lambaste the federal government when they give a trade off of squid and when they give a trade off of caplin or when they give a trade off of cod. The answer is more complex, and if we really address the question, maybe we, as a country, could become great and find more international markets for not only our fish but our wheat and other products. Also, with regard to our own Province, we could learn to expand our fishing industry, we could learn to expand our tourism and our agriculture.

MR. HISCOCK: But the answer to this, of course, is not, Mr. Speaker - we do not get that.

MR. TULK: Not with this crowd.

MR. HISCOCK: So with regard to the other questions. Spain, particularly with regard to the 200 mile limit, in many cases has ignored it. When Mr. Trudeau, the Prime Minister of Canada, was over in Spain, that was one of the questions that Mr. Trudeau picked up with King Carlos and he ended up saying to him, 'We need more control over the Grand Bank, the 200 mile limit, and Spain, itself, is not following international law the way we see it'. But the Spanish King said, 'But we have been going over there for 400 years and fishing and why should you change the rules of the game now?'. And with that, through a trade off, hopefully we will get the Spaniards a little bit more under control.

The Russians now have basically said that they are not going to enter into a fishing agreement with Canada again. If that is the case, they can basically breakdown and we could end up seeing an end to the 200 mile economic zone within Canada. And so could East Germany follow and Poland follow.

MR. HISCOCK: So it is not a reality, it is something that is put there. And maybe the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) would much prefer a gun-boat style of diplomacy. So it is very complex, Mr. Speaker, when we even have the city of St. John's saying, 'Allow the Russian fleet to go off with the Northern cod and fish on the Grand Banks, because we want the synchrolift here in St. John's. Or Gander says, 'We want Aeroflot to continue to land in Gander'. So even in our own Province we see the complexed reality of trade offs. And if Moscow can see Gander and St. John's competing with the rural areas, then they can say, "Well, obviously we asked for an extra quota and of course we are going to get it, because they need that \$6 million in St. John's or that \$10 million in Gander".

MR. DINN: If they gave over the fishery we would not need it.

MR. HISCOCK: So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the other part, and in closing, the Kirby Task Force - I regret again there has to be a task force set up by the federal government. We have been waiting for this Royal Commission on the fisheries. When we had problems with the fishing industry strike, what did we do? We had a Royal Commission and we are still waiting for it. But with regard to that, at least we have the plants in Gaultois and Grand Bank and St. Anthony opened.

MR. SPEAKER(Aylward): Order, please!

MR. HISCOCK: So, Mr. Speaker, in closing I would hope that this government will co-operate not only with industry, not only with the unions, not only with the National Government but with our fishermen in this Province and try to find some concrete solutions to our serious problems.

MR. NEARY: Right on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for St. Mary's-The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: Mr. Speaker, representing the great fishing district of St. Mary's-The Capes, the great P.C. fishing district of St. Mary's-The Capes.-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: - I feel it is an honour and a duty -

MR. NEARY: That is only for the time being.

MR. TULK: That is a temporary state.

MR. HEARN: Twenty years. - a duty to stand up and speak to any resolution on the fishery.

MR. HEARN: It is a bit ironic that down here we have a bunch of people who profess to know so much about the fishery, and that includes the hon. members on this side, while in the galleries today we have men who have had more salt water go over them than we will ever see in a lifetime.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HEARN: Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be much more beneficial for us, and perhaps for the Province in general, if we were there and they were here. However that is not the case and it is up to us to go on.

MR. NEARY: They must be your constituents.

MR. HEARN: Certainly. In the years since these people were fishing, there has been a tremendous transition in the fishery. And as my hon. colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) just mentioned, fishing technology has exploded in recent years. And I am not sure I agree with him when he said I am not sure whether that is for the better or not. However, there are a few things he said that I certainly do not agree with and perhaps are not quite factual. When he talked about the 200 mile zone, we have to realize that the coastal state has the right to harvest any fish within the 200 mile coastal zone. The only way anyone else will have any access to that fish is if the coastal state cannot harvest the fish. I am quite sure, and I stand to be corrected, that we have reached the end of the various phase out agreements with the other countries who are fishing inside that zone with the exception of, perhaps, France.

The Canadian Ambassador to the Law of the Sea Conference in Geneva, Alan Beasley, made a statement where he said that the power of control should be in the hands of the coastal state. Now I am



MR. HEARN: sure that is something that Newfoundland has been saying quite often, when we realize that we have so little power over our own fishery. Mr. Beasley, by the way, made that statement on a film on the Norma and Gladys, and I am surprised that all the hon. members have not seen such an interesting and entertaining and informative film. I am wondering what is happening to the culture of our great Province.

The resolution at hand to a certain point is good and I fully support it. The first two parts where it says, 'WHEREAS the fishery is the main thread of Newfoundland's Social, Cultural and economic fabric', and I wholeheartedly agree, 'AND WHEREAS both the inshore and offshore sectors of the provincial fishery are in a state of crisis,' fishery everywhere, of course, is in a state of crisis. But then it goes on to say, and here is where we start disagreeing, 'WHEREAS there is no coherent or cohesive

MR. HEARN: policy being pursued by the present provincial government and; WHEREAS it seems that the present provincial government has neither the desire nor the ability to develop long-term strategies or policies for the Province's fishery. You know, I ask, Mr. Speaker, where are there no coherent or cohesive policies? The Province is trying to do something about it. We have the federal government moving in without precedent, moving into St. Anthony, giving a \$200 million six-month bail out to the plant without even consulting the Province, the same time - that is supposed to be a big deal because the federal government did it - the same time the provincial government has given in loan guarantees \$20 million to twenty Newfoundland fish processing firms to reopen thirty-seven fish plants around this Island. And many of these fish plants, Mr. Speaker, are in my own district. The plants at Admiral's Beach, at Branch and St. Bride's have been reopened thanks to money, guaranteed loans, from the provincial government.

It is the policy of this government, Mr. Speaker, it is committed to the maintenance and the development of the fishing industry for all the people in this Province. And we can go back to 1980, when the provincial government suggested some of the controls that it should have, and here is where we started developing the five year plan for the fisheries, a good solid plan with which all Newfoundlanders could identify. But, of course, Uncle Ottawa said, 'No, we will give you very few controls. You cannot control anything that will help you whatsoever. We are the boss. We will tell you what to do. Consequently, be good little boys now and do as we say'.

It was suggested by the provincial government that licencing inshore fishermen and their boats

MR. HEARN: would come under the Province. And any hon. member representing a fishing district realizes the problems that we run into with fishermen who are confused entirely with the licencing programme. Young people trying to break into the fishery - a fellow who has a twenty foot boat and something happens and he gets a good deal on one that is twenty feet six inches, and he cannot get a licence because he is moving up, you know, that is idiotic. A fellow has a longliner and his engine gives out, the guy next to him has a boat he is not using but because it is two feet longer he is not allowed to use the boat without going through all kinds of appeals. Mr. Speaker, this is idiotic. It is just one of the idiotic ways that the federal government works in relation to the fisheries programme in Newfoundland.

Negotiating, the sharing of the TAC among themselves. If provinces cannot agree the matter must go to arbitration. We know how much we have in the TAC, the Total Allowable Catch, we know. All we have to do is look at the statement that came out from the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan)

MR. HEARN: some time ago, when we say, once again without any knowledge whatsoever, 103,360 metric tons of fish within our 200 mile limit being given away to the Russians, 10,500 metric tons of this was for caplin. Any fisherman around the island will tell you that one of the big concerns right now is the lack of caplin. I talked to people today who said caplin used to roll in on our beaches, we do not even see them anymore. And then, of course, we have the present disease that is affecting the caplin, that is hurting the catch once again. Along with that, we had 5,000 metric tons of squid given to Cuban fishermen, and, of course, an offer of 14,700 metric tons of squid to the Japanese. Now, you know, this is proper handling of the total allowable catch? What say has Newfoundland got in its own fish, fish that swim within our 200 mile coastal zone? Where is the total control? Where is the control in the hands of the coastal state here, Mr. Speaker? Then it goes on to say about setting local quotas for bays and certain sections of our coast. Talk to our herring seiners, the fishmen who depend upon the herring fishery, upon the caplin fishery within our bays. Ask them what control the Newfoundland government has in relation to total allowable catch. Ask them how fair they think the total quotas are in some of these cases? Licencing fish plants: Thank God they left us with that control. We even had to licence St. Anthony so they could get it off the ground. Approving the harvesting plans for fish companies: Of course, that is the biggest joke of the century. Inland fisheries and fish farming: Thank God we have some control over that, and it is one of the few phases of the fishery in Newfoundland that is successful and properly managed. Mr. Speaker, the state of the fishery in Newfoundland is as it is not because we do not have any coherent policies, it is simply because we have absolutely no control over our policies. We have a request in the final BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the government set up a select committee.

MR. HEARN: In 1980 we had a royal commission of enquiry into the fishery, we now have the Kirby Task Force. We have all kinds of studies, Mr. Speaker, but we have very few results. The fishermen, I am sure, are not - and that includes provincial studies. I will knock anybody who has anything to do in a derogatory way with the fishery. We have so many studies that the fishermen are wondering, you know, Is there going to be a study tomorrow morning to tell us how we are going to shove out our dories, toward the sun or against it?

Mr. Speaker, the Provincial Department of Fisheries is doing a magnificent job in handling the fishery within our control and, as we know, very little of it lies within our control. It is like trying to properly develop a piece of property that a landlord owns and you are just there for a little time and you do not know when you have to move, and you are not allowed to do anything with it. That is the position we are in right now, Mr. Speaker.

To hear the hon. members across the House talk, you would think that the forty-four of us on this side of the House were over here taking things into our own hands. You would think we were doing whatever we want to do. To hear them talk, you would think that we are an arrogant bunch over here.

Mr. Speaker, all we are doing is carrying out a mandate, a mandate that we received on April 6th., a mandate we received in spades from the People of Newfoundland to stand up for their rights and privileges, and that includes the proper development of the fisheries. Why were forty-four elected to this side of the House on April 6th., Mr. Speaker? Why did 61 per cent of the people of Newfoundland vote for this party? Why did 94 per cent,

MR. HEARN: and I will repeat that, 94 per cent of the electorate in St. Mary's - The Capes get out to vote? And I am sure that is a record in the district, 94 per cent. I know the charisma of the two candidates involved certainly helped. But I am sure, Mr. Speaker, it was because they were concerned. They are concerned about the jobs that are not available, they are concerned about the fisheries, they are concerned about the roads that are not paved, the roads that my hon. friend from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) mentioned earlier, the condition of which I have mentioned to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) over and over, and the roads about which we will be doing something within the next couple of years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: They are concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the lack of facilities that cannot be provided, cannot be provided because we are not able to take advantage of our own resources, and that includes the fishery. They gave us a mandate, Mr. Speaker, to fight for their rights, and that included some say in the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, they gave us that mandate so that we can fight for better conditions for them, so that they can have the place in the sun that they want, that they hope for and that they do well deserve. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

The hon. the Member for Stephenville.

MR. F. STAGG: Mr. Speaker, I do not think that I can match the enthusiasm of the previous speaker, and certainly not the enthusiastic reception that he received from his constituents, and I would presume that that enthusiastic reception from his constituents mirrors the great job he did in getting elected in St. Mary's-The Capes in the last election, and, as he indicated, he is going to be there for at least the next twenty years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: And I think, Mr. Speaker, the kind of coherent and reasoned policies that he has put forward in the argument here today, is consistent with the kind of policies that we as a provincial government have been putting forward for a number of years. My own history in this House goes back to 1971. I was first elected to the House of Assembly and I sat here from 1971 to 1975, and again from 1979 to the present. And during the time from 1972 to 1975, there was constant reference, almost every Private Member's Day, to resolutions, arguments on resolutions put forward by members on this side of the House asking for the federal government to exercise its jurisdiction and to take the initiative in declaring a 200 mile limit. Now we see mountains of propaganda put forward by the federal government in recent years indicating that it was solely and wholly as a result of their initiative that the 200 mile limit was declared. Well, Mr. Speaker, let it be

MR. STAGG: recorded, and let me remind you again that this House of Assembly and this government, the P.C. administration of Brian Peckford and the P.C. administration of Frank Moores were consistent in their perseverance and their ultimate success in shaming, first Jack Davies, the Minister of Fisheries and Environment for Canada, and then the hon. Romeo LeBlanc into finally taking the initiative as far as the 200 mile limit is concerned. Now, hon. members opposite would have us believe that the provincial government has no consistent policy and that it has not developed any reasonable programmes for the fishery. Well, Mr. Speaker, constitutionally and under the terms of union, we have a very strong problem or a very difficult problem with regard to controlling that resource and hon. members opposite have not dealt with that in the least. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has chosen to side-step the very serious issues that confront the Province. As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker was in the House at that time, was Speaker during those days when numerous resolutions went before the House, there was strong and consistent debate on the policy of the provincial government that was finally, finally, reluctantly endorsed by the federal government and I expect that the then Minister for External Affairs (Mr. Jamieson) might have had something to do with it. It is to his everlasting credit, it is to Mr. Jamieson's everlasting credit that he was finally able to bring his cabinet colleagues around to the realization that they had to take some initiatives so far as the declaration of the 200 mile limit is concerned, and I will certainly not detract from that. But it took an awful long



MR. STAGG: time, Mr. Speaker. There were emergency debates in the House, there were normal debates in the House, and it was something that was referred to in every Budget Speech and in every Throne Speech, and it was consistently part of all argument put forward by hon. members on this side of the House for many years, and it continues to be a very important part of our reason for being in this House of Assembly. Mr. Speaker, I think that we have to look at the facts, look at the facts so far as how the federal government has exercised their mandate with regard to the offshore resources. Now, there have been- well,

MR. STAGG: in 1981 a total of 159,435 metric tons of fish, various species, were given away by the federal government to other nations on this Earth. Codfish, for instance, there were 76,275 metric tons of codfish given away. No royalties paid, no nothing paid to the Newfoundland Government or to the Canadian Government, simply given away, foreign fishing fleets allowed to catch these resources.

MR. CALLAN: They were traded off.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) says they were traded off. What did we receive in return, Mr. Speaker? I will leave it to him to indicate what we received in return for the 76,275 metric tons of fish that were given away in 1981. And by the calculations of the Department of Labour and Manpower, that constitutes 1,372 man years of employment. Mr. Speaker, that is a very significant lack of foresight on the part of the federal government, on the part of the colleagues of my hon. friends opposite. The sponsor of this resolution, by the way, Mr. Speaker, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), has no interest in hearing these figures, has no interest in knowing that 1,372 man years of employment were taken away from Newfoundlanders last year, Mr. Speaker, last year when we had a real problem with the resource shore plants in this Province. There was a problem with having given away the fish, then we also gave away our markets for our own fish and it is a real problem. But the member for Fogo, Mr. Speaker, the sponsor of this resolution has no interest in hearing these facts. And redfish, Mr. Speaker, 56,000 -

MR. TULK: It is garbled so I am going to read it until it is picked abroad.

MR. STAGG: If it is garbled it is because the garberators from the opposite side are intervening unsuccessfully, Mr. Speaker. Redfish, in 1981, 56,600 metric tons of redfish. Do you know how much that is? That is about 120 million pounds of redfish given away, 1018 man years of employment given away to the Poles, to the Bulgarians, to the Japanese, and whomever else, and the Spaniards, and the Portuguese.

MR. TOBIN: And the Commies. The Commies.

MR. STAGG: Flounder, 10,560 metric - and the Communists. I forgot the Russians. I forgot the great friends of Mr. Trudeau and his fellow travellers, the Russians. - tons of flounder. Translated into jobs, 190 man years.

Halibut, that great epicurean delight, halibut. 16,000 metric tons of halibut, 288 man years. Totalled, Mr. Speaker, in 1981, 2869 man years of employment, gone to other countries because the colleagues of hon. gentlemen opposite, the colleagues of the sponsor of this resolution, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), because they are allowed to mismanage the resource that we forced, we in this House of Assembly, we forced them in the court of public opinion, we forced them to take initiatives in 1976. On June 4, 1976, the 200 mile limit was proclaimed to come into effect on December 31, 1976, or January 1, 1977. We forced them to do it. We forced them to assert -

MR. HISCOCK: No, you did not.

MR. STAGG: Yes we did. The hon. member was not even thinking about getting into politics in those days, he was still floundering around in whatever else he was doing at the time. Well, there were people here who preceded the hon. member, let me tell you.

June 16, 1982

Tape 1390

TM - 2

MR. STAGG:                    There were numerous resolutions  
and there was a strong lobby from this administration to  
bring some sanity and reality to the fishing industry. And  
at that time, of course,

MR. STAGG: the foreign nations were raping the resource. So what is the problem we have today, Mr. Speaker? We do definitely have a problem in the managing of the resource, because we, at the provincial level, lack the jurisdiction to get at the problem. And I need only point to our management of the offshore resources, the system of regulations which were put in place by this Province, which are the envy of all other jurisdictions in the world who are concerned with these things, and the very detailed and professional attitude which the Province has towards its offshore mineral resources. Of course we are in the process now of attempting to keep the dogs at bay on that one. But it is the sort of thing that this Province has demonstrated in no uncertain terms, that we are quite able and willing and we are desirous of looking after that major resource. Make no mistake about it, it is the policy of this government that eventually we will be the equal of Quebec when it comes to licencing. It may come as quite a realization. It came as an astounding realization to me a few years ago when I found out that Quebec has had its own licencing policy since about 1926.

MR. TULK: That shows how informed you are.

MR. STAGG: Yes. I will admit that I did not know it. And I would submit that the hon. member just learned it.

MR. TULK: No way. I have seen it.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member just learned it because I just told him. In any event, Mr. Speaker, whether or not -

MR. NEARY: Aeroflot coming down in Stephenville. In Stephenville, Aeroflot.

MR. STAGG: Aeroflot goes into Stephenville, yes.

MR. NEARY: The Harmon Corporation  
trying to promote the Russians.

MR. STAGG: Right. Aeroflot goes into  
Stephenville, yes. I agree they go into Stephenville.  
I would give up Aeroflot going into Stephenville, Mr.  
Speaker, if we could get the Russians off the Grand Banks  
and we could start exporting the fish resources and catch  
them all ourselves. I would give up a few flights of Aeroflot  
into Stephenville, do not you worry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the problems  
that we have had with this resource over the years, it is  
something that is a - I guess history is being made insofar  
as the management of this resource is concerned. But it  
is inevitable, Mr. Speaker, it is going to take a long time.  
It is something that we cannot ignore. It is a debate that  
is repetitive. In many cases it might be considered to  
be redundant or even boring. Some of the speeches made in  
this House are boring, Mr. Speaker. Of course none of mine  
fall into that category. But some of the speeches made on  
the fisheries are boring. But nevertheless -

MR. TULK: Was mine?

MR. STAGG: The hon. member has only made four  
or five speeches in the House. He is going into his fourth  
year in the House now, he has only made a few speeches and

MR. STAGG: it took him quite a while to get his feet wet but he is coming along, he is coming along. At least the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) talks about the fishery now, give him a few more years and he will actually understand something about it.

MR. TULK: Do not be so foolish.

AN HON. MEMBER: (Inaudible) more talk about it than you ever made.

MR. TULK: I hope I am not as long as you are (inaudible)

MR. STAGG: Now, Mr. Speaker, I will say that there is an inevitability, there is an inertia, there is a momentum which is gathering as far as this Province is concerned. It is essential that we have more control over that major resource, the offshore fishing effort, consistent with our inevitable control and management and ownership of our offshore mineral resources. The two must go hand in hand. And there is an inevitability about it, if it is not settled in the courts, if it is not settled in the courts then it will be settled in the ballot box, and if it is going to be settled in the ballot box, I suggest sooner rather than later. And in that regard, Mr. Speaker, I commend the efforts of the ad hoc group which are at present in Canada now, they are trying to bring down the Federal Liberals and entice some of the federal M.P.'s to have some courage and bring down the government, absent themselves from votes or whatever so that we could get a federal election. If we can get a federal election and we can turn the government back to the people who should rightfully have it, the Progressive Conservative Party

MR. STAGG: at the federal level, and we can revert to the, initially as far as the offshore is concerned, to the Peckford/Clark position enunciated in September 1979 -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: -then we could also commence and conclude a reasonable arrangement with regard to the offshore fishing effort, because it is something that both levels of government have to participate in. It is something that no one level of government should have a monopoly on. Absolute power is not consistent with the federal system, it is not consistent with the spirit of Confederation, it is not consistent with the Federal Constitution which was signed recently and negotiated over a couple of years.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) voice, boy.

MR. STAGG: It is the sort of thing that requires a calm and reasoned and responsible and Canadian solution. And, Mr. Speaker, I say here that it is inevitable, it is inevitable that such a solution will be arrived at. There are temporarily occupying



MR. F. STAGG: the halls of power in Ottawa, a group of people who are opposed to that type of sharing of responsibility, the sharing of jurisdiction and power with regard to major resources, and in our case this argument today is in the form of an argument on the fishery.

MR. NEARY: What did the Tory James McGrath say?

MR. STAGG: What did Mr. McGrath say? We expressed ourselves in no uncertain terms when Mr. McGrath fudges on the issue of the offshore. We expressed ourselves in no uncertain terms, we did it reluctantly, but we would do it again. And we were not afraid to do it. We did not scurry around behind our hand and say something like, 'I would not trust Mr. Lalonde as far as I could throw him,' and then hope to retract it and hope to have it attributed to someone else, we came right out front and we indicated that we disagreed with the policy as put forward by Mr. McGrath. Well, he had only been in office for a very short period of time, and it was an area in which there was some disagreement. I certainly have hope for the future, in that it will be a -

MR. DAWE: Do you remember the Law of the Sea Conference? Canada said itself that the only way a policy can be sensible is if the coastal state manages the resource. That is an exact argument.

MR. STAGG: That is true. I am prompted by my colleague from St. George's who indicated that at the Law of the Sea Conference, which pre-dated and precipitated Canada's declaration of the economic zone, that the only way that a fisheries policy will work is that the control of the resource rests with the coastal state. Now in this case, of course, the coastal state is defined by Canada as the coastal state being Canada. Canada, on the other hand, is a federal state which has ten Provinces and it has twelve constituent parts.

MR. STAGG: And the history of Canada is such that only when both levels of government are involved with matters that cross over from one jurisdiction into another, only when a consistent and coherent and honourable solution is found to these difficult problems, can there be a proper development of the resource. So, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to vote for the resolution as put forward by my friend from Fogo. It makes very little sense for him to take up the time of the House deploring the inaction or whatever of the provincial government, while in the totality of his speech he did not make any reference to the poor stewardship, the lack of

MR. STAGG: stewardship of his federal colleagues. I am not voting against him, Mr. Speaker, and I predict that the motion will fail.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. PATTERSON: Hear, hear! Great speech 'Fred'.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I wanted to take four or five minutes to make a few comments on the resolution put forward by my colleague from the historic fishing district of Fogo (Mr. Tulk). I spent a year on Fogo Island. About twenty years ago, I guess it was, I was on Fogo Island as a school teacher, down in the town of Stagg Harbour.

MR. STAGG: Stagg Harbour?

MR. CALLAN: No relation at all with the member who just sat down. But, Mr. Speaker, the resolution, and it is hardly necessary to read the WHEREASES BE IT RESOLVED that this House immediately set as its top priority the development of a comprehensive long-term policy for the Newfoundland fishery, and; BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a Select Committee of this House be appointed to ensure that this policy becomes a reality.' Now that second part, Mr. Speaker, I rather doubt. That there will be a Select Committee set up by this House to look into and delve into and to ensure that this policy becomes a reality, I rather doubt that a Select Committee will be set up. We have had many, many resolutions previously, and I cannot remember one resolution where the end result was that a committee was set up. We have heard lots of talk about it, Mr. Speaker, where suggestions have been made that committees be set up to travel around the Province, committees consisting of members on both sides of the House, that would travel around the Province investigating and obtaining briefs from, and getting input from the various people associated, and who can tell this committee about the problems and the cures for the fishery. I rather doubt that this committee will be set up. Mr. Speaker, the district of Fogo, as I just mentioned, is a fishing district, but the district that I also represent is a fishing district

MR. CALLAN: in many respects. We have in South Dildo, for example, three fish plants side by side, Actually there are four plants side by side in South Dildo, but one of them is the - even though it is not a fish plant, it is associated with a different sort of fishery, a fishery, I believe, that has seen the end of its days. And I refer, of course, to the Carino plant in South Dildo, the only plant in all of Newfoundland and Labrador where fishermen from all over the Province can bring their seal pelts and sell them, and, of course where the seal pelts are partially, at least, or have been traditionally, cured before being transhipped to Europe where, of course, the bulk of the processing takes place.

And, Mr. Speaker, there are many problems associated with the fishery in this Province. And I remember - even though I was only passively interested I was never directly involved in politics, in talking to some hon. members on both sides of the House since I came here first in 1975, I found out in chatting with them, for example, perhaps over dinner, especially when we used to have these night sittings that many of the members here now, and formerly, were associated with politics in some form or other long before they decided to get into the elective politics and therefore become actual members of this House of Assembly.

But I remember back in 1970 and 1971, 1972 when the former Tory premier was rising to fame -

MR. NEARY: Now they are going to take him into court, the former Tory premier.

MR. CALLAN: - that one of the big platforms, Mr. Speaker, one of the big platforms in former Premier Moores

June 16, 1982

Tape 1395

TM - 2

MR. CALLAN:

campaign -

MR. NEARY:

He is going to court now, for  
building a house.

MR. CALLAN:

- in his campaign, on the road  
to becoming the Premier of this Province, which

MR. CALLAN: he succeeded in doing, but one of the big platforms was that the problem with the fishery in this Province is that there is far, far too little processing done in this Province and the way to create employment and the way to put this Province on the road to prosperity was to have, if not 100 per cent, at least a much larger portion of the processing and so on done in this Province.

MR. CARTER: How much would we be eating then in this Province?

MR. CALLAN: Well, that is true.

MR. NEARY: Now they are trying to put poor old Frank in jail.

MR. CALLAN: That is true. I do not know how often we would have to eat fish on a daily basis, in the meantime, to consume all that would give us an adequate market for our fish and fish products. But, Mr. Speaker, as I said, there are many problems associated with the fishery in this Province. Speakers in the debate earlier today, like the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) - I mention these two specifically, because I do not believe that the other speakers had very much to say of a substantial nature.

MR. NEARY: Filling in time.

MR. CALLAN: Just filling in time, I believe. But there are many, many problems and some of these problems, Mr. Speaker, have to do with marketing. Marketing, I suppose, is probably -

MR. NEARY: The number one problem.

MR. CALLAN: - the number one problem.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. CALLAN: You know, from listening to hon. members from the government side of the House of Assembly, and in particular listening to the Premier and listening to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), you would think that

MR. CALLAN: the major problem with the fishery is lack of jurisdiction on the part of this government. That is the impression you get, that Ottawa has too much control and that is why the fishery in this Province is in such a mess. But, as we all know, especially members of this House, Mr. Speaker, this, for the most part, is political propaganda. It is not based and founded on fact, it is just political propaganda that is pumped out through the regular Friday morning Ministerial statements that hit the weekend press and so on.

Marketing, Mr. Speaker, is the biggest problem, I would say, associated with our fishery. There are other problems obviously. Some of them have to do with jurisdiction and

MR. CALLAN: we saw that, as somebody mentioned just now, even when the Minister of Fisheries was the hon. James McGrath who was of the same political stripe as the people then and now in power in this Province. The same jurisdictional problems were evident during Mr. McGrath's reign, a short reign.

MR. NEARY: He said last week in Halifax, the federal government must have the supremacy in the fishery.

MR. CALLAN: Obviously, Mr. McGrath cannot be all wrong and neither can the hon. Romeo LeBlanc be all wrong, or, if I can make reference to a third party, Mr. Speaker, a third party involved, very much involved with the fishery in this Province, in addition to the federal and the provincial governments, Mr. Speaker, we have a third party and, of course, I am referring to, the Fishermen's Union. I have here in front of me the latest edition of the Union Forum, a booklet containing - I do not know how many hon. members have read it, this newest edition. On page 5, which is actually the first page of any reading because the first four pages are mostly all advertising and so on, on page 5 we have listed the union's submission, the brief that the union in this Province submitted to the Kirby Task Force. And as I was reading through the half a dozen - actually there are seven recommendations that the union passed on to the Kirby Task Force. Some of it, Mr. Speaker, is echoing, is reminiscent of what the provincial government has been saying and what some former speakers here this afternoon have been saying, but in that, Mr. Speaker, we agree. I remember listening



MR. CALLAN:

earlier, to  
the member for St. Mary's - The Cabes (Mr. Hearn), and I  
totally agree and I am sure that all members on this side  
of the House of Assembly totally agree. You know, it is  
silly when a man has a twenty foot boat and that if his  
motor breaks down or something and he wants to go and use  
the one that is twenty and one half feet that the federal  
regulations will not permit him to do so. That is silly and  
crazy. But, Mr. Speaker, if we can think back a year or  
two, you know, there were no regulations,

MR. CALLAN: somebody had to make a move, Mr. Speaker. And a couple of years ago the federal government took the plunge and they started what I think will result in, perhaps a year or two from now, will evolve into a good and sensible set of regulations. You know, the federal government had to lay down some rules. They had to ascertain, because the provincial government did not know nobody in the provincial government knew how many fishermen are there in this Province, how many full-time, how many part-time and so on. So the federal government, as I said, a year or more ago, you know, started to ascertain how many fishermen do we have, and of the fishermen that we do have, how many are full-time and how many are part-time, how many are school teachers on a regular basis and so on.

So, Mr. Speaker, jurisdiction is a problem, there is no question about that and we agree. We agree, Mr. Speaker, on both sides of this House, I think, we agree that the time has come and is perhaps long overdue when the jurisdictional problem should be settled. And whether that means that the federal government has to give some on their side as well as perhaps the provincial government giving some leeway, it needs to be settled.

MR. NEARY: I have never seen 'Carter' as quiet as he is today.

MR. CALLAN: It is raining today so he is not out in his savoury patch.

MR. NEARY: No, the Premier has him muzzled, gagged.

MR. TULK: Yes.

MR. CALLAN: But, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned marketing, jurisdiction and catching capability, or catching ability. There is obviously a third problem that we have in the provincial fishery. But, Mr. Speaker, if I can mention one other problem that we have, and I am sincere about this

MR. CALLAN: and I am not getting into personalities at all, I do not mean to, what I will be talking about, Mr. Speaker, is not the personality but the way that this man is handling the job. I think one of the biggest problems that we have in the fishery in this Province today is the minister himself, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) himself. Mr. Speaker, I think it is recognized by everybody

MR. CALLAN: that Walter Carter was a good Minister of Fisheries -

MR. TULK: Oh, everybody loved him.

MR. CALLAN: - and he went a long distance, Mr. Speaker, in trying to cure some of the ills that existed. But, Mr. Speaker, when you have a Minister of Fisheries as we have in this Province and have had for the last couple of years, when we have a Minister of Fisheries who for the sake of something to say really, and to be critical of the CBC last week said, you know, 'the fishermen's broadcast that I listen to on a regular basis, the fishermen's broadcast' he said 'the people who are associated with the fishermen's broadcast on the CBC never come to ask advice and to ask for information from my officials.'

MR. NEARY: He was only on thirty-nine times.

MR. CALLAN: And then, of course, when the CBC did a little bit of research they discovered, number one, that the reason that they could not have anybody on from the Minister of Fisheries' department is because everybody that went on had to be screened by the minister and quite often the minister was not around to yes or no. And, of course, the other thing that we discovered was that quite contrary to what the minister had said, he was only on a couple of times in a couple of years, he had been on thirty-nine times in eighteen months.

MR. TULK: All he was trying to do then was cover up for the Premier?

MR. NEARY: But these are the sorts of statements, Mr. Speaker, made by the Minister of Fisheries, and some of them also being made by the Premier, which are wrong, which are wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many members

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: I had that note. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many members remember, about a year ago the Premier was on the airways and his rebuttal to the problem with the issuance of licences for fish plants, his

MR. NEARY: rebuttal was 'Well, the federal Government built these fish plants, or they gave out loans and grants and so on so that these fish plants could be built'. Nothing, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth. I started just now to mention some fish plants in my own district, and I am sure that if I went up, just up one side of the Trinity shore that I can mention a half a dozen fish plants that had no help from the federal government. But quite to the contrary, they had lots of help and we saw it here today, Mr. Speaker, I think somebody earlier made reference to it, it is there black on white—that is in the first half of the book, in the other half it is black on blue.

MR. NEARY: Four in my district had no help from the provincial government.

MR. CALLAN: That is right. But the Premier and the Minister of Fisheries.

MR. CALLAN: they are both responsible, they are both responsible, Mr. Speaker, for making erratic, irrational and partly true, untrue statements. The Premier has gotten away with a lot of these statements, Mr. Speaker. The Premier has gotten away with a lot of them.

MR. NEARY: Irresponsible.

MR. CALLAN: And why somebody has not picked him up, I do not know. But he has gotten away with a lot of these statements. And, of course, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is continuing, because the Minister of Fisheries loves to be in the press so much than whenever he is home, whenever he is home in this Province he has a press release, I think, every day that goes over his head.

MR. NEARY: He swings high and lo.

MR. CALLAN: And obviously anybody like the Minister of Fisheries who has his mouth open so much has to be shooting out some foolish nonsense and we saw it. And the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, did not even have the common decency to either come into the House of Assembly, or publicly apologize to the people, the crew associated with the Fishermen's broadcast on the CBC Radio. Never even had the decency to apologize.

MR. NEARY: He went up to Toronto to check on his St. John's licences.

MR. CALLAN: So, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate -

MR. NEARY: He is not getting a licence.

MR. CALLAN: - I reiterate and I repeat what I said earlier, that even though I acknowledge, as other members have already done, that there are several and there are many problems associated with the fishery in this Province, I believe that one of the biggest problems

MR. CALLAN: that we have in the fishery today stems from the minister himself and his approach, his fighting approach, his fighting approach in meetings with the Federal Minister of Fisheries -

MR. BAIRD: The fighting Newfoundlander, Sir.

MR. CALLAN: - and his fighting approach in dealings with the union which represents all the fishermen and the fish plant workers' in this Province, and of course, his erratic, irrational and untrue statements like the one that he made last week about the CBC Fishermen's broadcast. Mr. Speaker, I was going to get into the Fishermen's Forum and the Fishermen's Unions brief to the Kirby Task Force, but I received a note I think about five minutes ago, that my time was up. Perhaps on another time, Mr. Speaker. Well, Mr. Speaker, I will -

MR. NEARY: By leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. NEARY: By leave. Carry on until six.

MR. CALLAN: - I will be - No. The member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) is anxious and he will have ten minutes now and have another ten

June 16, 1982

Tape No. 1401

IB-1

MR. CALLAN: next Wednesday so that is -

MR. CROSS: I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. CALLAN: Well, that is great. We will all get out ten minutes early and that is good, especially for the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the resolution.

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

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, given the lateness of the hour, but close to six o'clock, I have a few remarks I would like to make. I would like to make them in their entirety in the one speech rather than have a broken one, so would it be in order if I adjourned the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) has adjourned the debate.

The Chair will deem it to be six of the clock and I will leave the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow, Thursday.



I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JUNE 15 and 16, 1982

QUESTION: Mr. Hodder (Port au Port) to ask the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:  
The cost of renovations to Minister's offices in the fiscal years 1979, 1980 and 1981.

ANSWER: There were no major renovations to the Minister's offices during the fiscal years 1979/80, 1980/81, and 1981/82. However, \$6,211 was expended for purchase and re-finishing of furniture as well as interior renovations to offices. The cost of these items is as follows:

1979/80	- Furniture	\$2,381	
1980/81	Furniture	\$1,206	
	Supply and instattation of vinyl wall covering	\$400	
	12 gals. paint @ \$10 per gallon	120	
	Paint labour	200	
	Supply and installation of carpét, 86 sq. yds.	1,204	
	@ \$14 (Estimate only, carpet was included in larger contract)		
	Re-finish office furniture	<u>700</u>	<u>3,830</u> \$6,211
1981/82	- NIL		

MAY 13/82

QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

QUESTION # 34: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) to ask the Minister of Public Works and Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following informatic

List of names and salaries of Executive Assistants, Parliamentary Assistants and Public Relations Specialists appointed to the Minister's staff for the fiscal years 1979, 1980 and 1981.

ANSWER:

Special Assistant to the Minister, Mr. Clyde Mercer, commenced employment on April 8, 1979. Mr. Mercer's salary for 1979 -'80 was \$21,786.00; 1980-'81 was \$24,248.00 and 1981-'82 is \$30,653.00.

No other Executive Assistants, Parliamentary Assistants or Public Relations Specialists served the Minister's staff of the Department during the years 1979, 1980 and 1981.

MAY 17, 1982

QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

QUESTION # 76: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) to ask the Minister of Public Works and Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) The number of buildings at Pleasantville owned by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador or its agencies or crown corporations.
- (b) The present usage of these buildings
- (c) To whom they are leased
- (d) Their rental per annum
- (e) The total square feet in each unit rented

ANSWER:

Attached is a list of all buildings at Pleasantville owned by the Department of Public Works and Services. This list shows the occupants of each building, the annual rent received where this is applicable and the square footage area of each building.

PLEASANTVILLE BUILDINGS

Building No.	Present User	Leased To	Annual Rent	Square Footage
532	Fisheries College (Dormitory)	N/A	N/A	23,566
566	Girl Guides	Same	1.00	5,410
588	R.C.A.F. Association	Same	1.00	5,200
801	Dept. of Health	N/A	N/A	27,765
810	Dept. of Culture, Rec. & Youth	N/A	N/A	12,500
812	Boys Home (Carpenter Shop)	N/A	N/A	2,300
	Cadet Leagues	Same	1.00	1,200
851	Dept. of Forest Resources & Lands	N/A	N/A	
	Dept. of Culture, Recreation & Youth	N/A	N/A	8,651
901	Dept. of Justice (Fire Commissioner's Off.)	N/A	N/A	12,934
	Various Government Depts.	N/A	N/A	
902	Nfld. Farm Products Corp.	Same	1.00	12,422
904	Dept. of Public Works & Services (Central Heating Plant)	N/A	N/A	6,254
905	Nfld. Farm Products Corp.	Same	1.00	18,339
906	Nfld. Farm Products Corp.	Same	1.00	7,666
907	Nfld. Farm Products Corp.	Same	1.00	
	Dept. of Public Works & Services (Warehouse)	N/A	N/A	
908	Dept. of Culture, Recreation & Youth	N/A	N/A	6,000
909	Dept. of Education	N/A	N/A	15,500
910	College of Trades & Tech.	Same		
951	Dept. of Education	N/A	N/A	6,153
954	United Sail Works	Same	3,674.60	1,934
1042	Dept. of Culture, Recre. & Youth	N/A	N/A	7,440
1043	Mayor Avenue Wash & Dry	Same		2,747
1044	Dept. of Recreation, Culture & Youth (Parks Division)	N/A	N/A	4,668

Building No.	Present User	Leased To	Annual Rent	Square Footage
45	Dept. of Culture, Recrec. & Youth (Parks Division)	N/A	N/A	4,668
148	McDonalds Welding & Febrication Ltd.	Same	2,789.80	1,073
150	Dept. of Culture, Recreation & Youth (Records Centre)	N/A	N/A	16,886
151	Dept. of Social Services (Girls Home)	N/A	N/A	12,522
154	Dept. of Social Services (Girls Home Gym)	N/A	N/A	12,522
102	Vacant (scheduled for demolition)			
133	American Legion	Same	1.00	8,020
134	Kue Engineering Ltd.	Same	8,040.00	8,020
135	Dept. of Transportation	N/A	N/A	8,020
141	Dept. of Transportation	N/A	N/A	8,020
170	Dept. of Transportation	N/A	N/A	72,690
171	Dept. of Transportation	N/A	N/A	1,568

QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

QUESTION # 77: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) to ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works and Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) The number of buildings at the St. John's Airport owned by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador or any of its agencies or crown corporations.
- (b) The present usage of these buildings
- (c) To whom are they leased
- (d) Their rental per annum
- (e) The total square feet in each unit rented

ANSWER:

Attached is a complete listing of all buildings owned by the Province at the east side of St. John's, Torbay Airport, together with the names of the occupants' annual rental, where this is applicable, and the area of the buildings.

TORBAY BUILDINGS

Building No.	Present User	Leased To	Annual Rent	Square Footage
1	Dept. of Culture, Recreation & Youth	N/A	N/A	7,600
2	School for Deaf	N/A	N/A	16,200
3	Petroleum Directorate	N/A	N/A	600
	Police Benefit Assoc.	Same	1.00	5,000
	Sealand Helicopters	Same	1,260.00	1,260
5	Vacant (to be removed)			
10	Dept. of Justice	N/A	N/A	4,800
11	Dept. of Culture Recreation & Youth	N/A	N/A	15,350
	Avalon Archery Club	Same	1.00	
12	Dept. of Health	N/A	N/A	6,114
19	Dept. of Municipal Affairs	N/A	N/A	
	Dept. of Forest Resources & Lands	N/A	N/A	9,859
	Dept. of Culture, Recreation & Youth	N/A	N/A	
22	Dept. of Public Works & Services	N/A	N/A	750
24	S.P.C.A.	Same	1.00	930
25	Dept. of Culture, Recreation & Youth	N/A	N/A	27,200
26	Dept. of Public Works & Services	N/A	N/A	1,954
38	School for Deaf	N/A	N/A	12,200
41	Fisheries College (Fire School)	N/A	N/A	2,878
43	School for Deaf	N/A	N/A	15,600
44	Dept. of Fisheries	N/A	N/A	10,800
	Various Gov't Departments	N/A	N/A	
46	Various Gov't Departments	N/A	N/A	21,400
47	Motor Registration	N/A	N/A	2,050



Building No.	Present User	Leased To	Annual Rent	Sc Fo
48	St. John's Lions Club	Same	1.00	4
49	Needle to An Anchor Warehouse Ltd.	Same	6,868.80	!
Hanger 3 (leased from Dept. of Transportation)	Department of Transportation	N/A	N/A	4:

MAY 17, 1982

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

QUESTION: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) asked the Minister of Public Works and Services what involvement the Government had in providing for land involved in the construction of the new Newfoundland Hotel.

ANSWER: There was a parcel of land to the east of the present Newfoundland Hotel building which was included in a right-of-way but to which title was unclear. Normally, title to all rights-of-way within the city of St. John's belongs to the city.

To facilitate an absolutely clear title to the land, the Minister of Public Works and Services signed a document indicating that this Department did not have any interest or claim to the land in question.

MAY 26, 1982

QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

QUESTION # 90 Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) to ask the Minister of Public Works and Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following information

List the amount of vacant space in Government buildings outside of St. John's.

ANSWER: A perusal of Government records indicates that there is no vacant space in buildings owned by the Department of Public Works and Services outside St. John's.

MAY 31, 1982

QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

QUESTION # 101: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) to ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works and Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) The cost to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to operate the Newfoundland Information Service; listing:
  - (a) the salaries of all employees;
  - (b) the cost of equipment used by N.I.S.
  - (c) the cost of electricity on a yearly basis;
  - (d) any other expenditures, such as travel, etc.
  - (e) the method used to select staff

and

- (2) The details of criteria set by the Ministry as to the use of N.I.S. by Members of the House of Assembly, and the Order in Council under which they were issued.

ANSWER: The salaries of the present employees of Newfoundland Information Service is as follows:

- (a)
  - (1) Director - \$30,244.00
  - (2) Information Officer - \$16,493.00
  - (3) Clerk Typist II - \$12,000.00
  - (4) Two Clerk II (Information Officers) Front Desk, Confederation Building - \$12,250.00 each.
- (b) The cost of equipment used at Newfoundland Information Service is \$52,600.00 per annum.
- (c) There is no separate electricity cost for this Division.
- (d) The annual travel bill for the Division is approximately \$1,200.00.

QUESTION # 101 (Cont'd):

- (e) The method used to select staff for Division is that prescribed by the Public Service Act for selecting employees for the Provincial Service.

PRELIMINARY  
UNEDITED  
TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

3:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 16, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I table in the House, this is what I am doing - this statement, but the only substance of the statement is I am tabling in the House notes relating to a press conference held this morning which contain appended to them, and will be of interest, I know, to hon. members, the telex forwarded to me by the hon. Mark Lalonde in connection with the delay of the power corridor legislation, my response to him that went out yesterday and, also of interest to hon. members, a letter that has been referred to from time to time in the debates of the House - and I am not sure the House has had a copy of it - a letter of October 27th, 1981, from me to the hon. Yves Duhaime and his response to me as of November 18th. There are copies for hon. members as well.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: How does the Opposition react to that? Do we get half the time that the hon. gentleman had outside the House this morning, Mr. Speaker? Is that the way it works? The hon. gentleman tabled quite a comprehensive document so how do we manage to get half of that time, Mr. Speaker? I need some guidance from Your Honour.

MR. MARSHALL: Is you want to react to it, react.

AN HON. MEMBER: His time is up.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

It is the understanding of the

ORAL QUESTIONS:

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the President of the Council, It is with regard to the economic situation of the Province, particularly among our younger people who are now out of trade school, university, and will soon be getting out of high school, Does the Province have any programme to supplement the Young Canada Works Projects to employ our young people for the Summer?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, what we are doing, what this government is doing and is continuing to do, and not only with respect to the young people but with all jobs, we are very concerned about the economic situation with which the Province is confronted, as I know the hon. gentleman there is. And we are doing everything possible within our resources to foster development in this Province, and that is the answer to his question really.

MR. HISCOCK: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: With regard to the unemployment situation, which is even more critical among our younger people from the ages of fifteen to thirty, we have a 34 per cent increase in university attendance in the third term. The main reason for this, or course, is students know that they would not find jobs. Now it is going to be even harder. Could the President of the Council inform us whether the government is going to increase come September the \$25 per week for students going to trade schools, particularly now that they are living



MR. HISCOCK: increase student bursaries, not loans but student bursaries, to the university students as well as to the trade school and technology students in this Province?

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman has been absent for a while, but that question has been adequately and fully answered in the Budget and I know that the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) would be quite happy to respond to it. But in response to his general question, obviously the government is very, very concerned about not just the situation of employment with younger people but with all segments of society and we are trying to do everything we possibly can to do it. One of the major problems, as the hon. gentleman will realize, has been the very high interest rates that are being charged nowadays, the rate of inflation, the general cutback in business nationally and internationally, and these are all situations that are beyond the control of this government. But what we have done in that Budget, which is a Budget - the hon. gentleman was not here for a while but if he had been here he would realize that the Budget was greeted with general acclaim by most of the populace of this Province in that we were able, the only province in Eastern Canada that was able to bring in a balanced Budget on current account and in that Budget we were balancing things and balancing off the individual interests and the social interests. We strove as much as we could to provide for students in all segments of the society. So if the hon. gentleman wants something specific, as I say, it was in the Budget. And I think my colleague, the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), would be much better versed to respond to any specific questions he has.

MR. MARSHALL: fair a distribution as we possibly can considering all of these circumstances as we do in all of our dealings with matters of this nature. And the hon. gentleman can make insinuations all he wants. The fact of the matter is the hon. gentleman has not got a monopoly over concern for their plight.

DR. COLLINS: Ask him if Mr. Trudeau will be hearing of their plights.

MR. MARSHALL: My colleague says to me, my colleague who has a much sharper tongue than I ever had, says to me that perhaps Mr. Trudeau could give the hon. gentleman some advice in these matters. But, you know, the fact of the matter is the hon. gentleman has no monopoly of concern over these matters. We are extremely concerned with these matters. We are trying to grapple with them as we are trying to grapple with the financial situation, despite our meager resources, and whatever we do our programmes that we have will be administered as fairly and equitably as they possibly can.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): Maybe before I recognize the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), I would like to particularly and especially welcome to the galleries forty-seven members from Yesterday's Youth Senior Citizens Club at St. Mary's, in the district of St. Mary's-The Capes.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, yesterday in the absence of the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews) I asked a question to the President of the Council (Mr. Marshall), and it concerned spraying that is going on around Red Indian Lake in the vicinity of Millertown. And I asked the minister certain questions on that. But I would like for the Minister of the Environment perhaps to

June 16, 1982

Tape No. 1345

MJ - 1

MR. H. ANDREWS: The application was referred to the first Pesticides Advisory Board meeting for 1982 held on April 30, 1982.

MR. TULK: By the minister?  
(inaudible).

MR. ANDREWS: The Pesticides Advisory Board noted non-target monitoring was identified as being deficient, identified water, soil and air sampling as necessary, and that wildlife monitoring was to be undertaken. The guidelines for this were drawn up by wildlife.

To make a long story short, Mr. Speaker, and I will gladly give all this information to the member, is that we are still awaiting a reply from Abitibi-Price on the conditions of the monitoring programme that we have set down for soil, for wildlife, for spray drift, for water and many, many other factors, the affects on the actual vegetation itself and the affects on other parts of the environment. Until they meet our approval and are willing to monitor the way we want them to monitor and pay for the costs of that monitoring, which is by engaging independent groups, the permit to spray will not be granted.

MR. B. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the information that the minister is giving me but that is not the question that I asked. I asked the minister to explain to the House just what 2,4,D is. I would like to ask him now, perhaps when he gets up again, to explain exactly what 2,4,D is and perhaps tell us if one of the components of Agent Orange, that dreaded chemical that so many of us dread, if one of the components of Agent Orange is indeed 2,4,D.

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

MR. ANDREWS: I am not a chemist, Mr. Speaker,

MR. ANDREWS: Provincial Pesticide Advisory Board, also by Environment Canada, by Agriculture Canada and also all groups. It is a very common chemical used throughout Western Europe and throughout North America and many other parts of the world.

MR. NEARY: Is it banned anywhere in Canada?

MR. ANDREWS: As far as I know 2,4,D is not banned anywhere in Canada, no, Sir. The limiting or the dangerous part of 2,4,D if it does contain dioxin is the concern of people. This particular product has less than one part per 100 million. So this is deemed quite acceptable by agencies in Canada and other countries of the world.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): A supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, it seems that the minister is indeed not sure whether there are dangerous toxics in that chemical.

MR. ANDREWS: I am sure there are not.

MR. TULK: Well, why did you not say so a minute ago? But I would like to ask the minister if indeed he has received any complaints from either community organizations or residents of Millertown and how he intends dealing with those complaints. Is he going to ignore them or is he going out and set up some sort of public hearings?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, to date I have not received any correspondence or complaints from the people of Millertown. I would certainly be willing to meet with them if they wish a meeting as such and provide them with all the information that we have. Once again

MR. ANDREWS: land over the past couple of years. And for further background information, Abitibi-Price did come to us last year with a proposal for a considerably larger acreage to be sprayed. We requested that they go back and go through the environmental assessment programme for that, and they withdrew their application at that time. Any further applications for large spray programmes would go through the environmental assessment route.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the minister touched on two very interesting components of this whole programme, and that is I would like for him to tell us if he investigated any other ways of reducing the hardwood growth so that the softwoods would grow, and has he investigated what the effect indeed will be, or will he investigate what the effect will be, on the wildlife before he grants a permit to spray?

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

MR. ANDREWS: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is the whole purpose of such a small-scale programme, to find out that information. And we cannot find out that information until we do a small-scale spray programme. I would not eliminate the possibility, or eliminate the thought of not doing it at all, because I do not think we can live in ignorance if there is a possibility that we could improve forest growth in Newfoundland. On the other hand, we have to be very careful about the side effects of such a programme. And this is what we will indeed be looking at and we have ordered the company to have an independent

MR. ANDREWS: on a scale of 4,000 or 5,000 acres. We see this as a very small test of about 100 acres. we are quite anxious to find the affects of it, and I do not see that it warrants a full environmental assessment statement on it right now. But I will say, as I have said to the press already a couple of weeks ago, that if there are applications for major projects similar to this, they will have to go through the full assignment, yes.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, spraying anywhere in the Newfoundland forest at any time frightens people. The hon. gentleman just made a statement there, I wonder if he could elaborate on it, in connection with the monitoring process. Did I understand the hon. gentleman correctly that he said that Abitibi-Price are being asked to employ independent firms to monitor the spray programme?

If so, who will they report to? Why does not the minister himself undertake to hire these consulting firms and send the bill to Abitibi-Price? We are all in favour of Abitibi-Price paying the bill, but who will they report to? Will they report to the minister's department or report to the company?

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

MR. ANDREWS: They will report to us, Mr. Speaker. We set the guidelines for the monitoring. As a matter of fact, some of the monitoring will be done by our own people because we have some equipment in place in Central Newfoundland that would be suitable for this. We will also accept or reject the people or the companies, the firms, that they might propose to do the monitoring or some of the monitoring. But we have a control over it. We set the guidelines and we can accept it or reject it.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TULK: he finds that that is one of the heaviest populated areas of wildlife in this Province, will we cancel that programme, will he disallow the permit, or will he indeed allow that wildlife to be used as guinea pigs?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of the Environment.

MR. ANDREWS: Mr. Speaker, these are all very hypothetical situations.

MR. TULK: No, they are not.

MR. ANDREWS: I am sure if 500 moose are found on that 100 acres of land, I am sure that I would have a lot to say about that too.

The name of this game is not to live in constant ignorance of what might happen, but to use the tools of science for the best benefit of an industry, in this case the pulp and paper industry, and the loggers of Newfoundland. We want to find out if this chemical can be effective, can increase our wood production in Newfoundland without destroying the environment. If it can do that, fine. If it cannot do that we will have to look somewhere else,

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if he has any information to indicate that good woods management might do the same thing as the chemical?

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

MR. ANDREWS: I would suggest, Mr. Speaker, that this type of programme might be, might be, an adjunct to good woods management. We do not know but we certainly want to find out. I do not want to live in ignorance. We are putting in through the Department of Lands and Forests, and twisting the

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): A final supplementary, the hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Another question about this year's spray programme and that is the spraying for the spruce budworm that is going on in the Glenwood-Gander area. I understand from today's



MR.ANDREWS: environmental monitoring study on the impact of the spruce budworm spray programme on non-target organisms. The studies have been conducted in the same location since 1977. Continuity is extremely important in long-term monitoring studies and movement of the site at this time would result in the loss of five years of valuable data. The purpose of these studies is to determine if the spray programme causes any negative environmental impacts. This environmental monitoring programme is therefore in the interest of the residents of Glenwood, and indeed the residents of Newfoundland in general. To date effects on non-target organisms have been minor. A no-chemical buffer zone of 1.5 kilometers around places of human habitation is considered efficient to minimize the risk of exposing people to the chemical spray. Block 110 has been selected to give a larger no-chemical buffer zone to alleviate concerns of the people of Glenwood. A no-chemical buffer zone of 1.5 kilometers is to be maintained around all community water supplies. Results of water analysis for Gander Lake under the same

June 16, 1982

Tape 1351

PK - 2

MR. ANDREWS: be using more than the two airports that were used, or proposed to be used last year, that was Gander and Stephenville. For instance, the airstrip in Bay d'Espoir is now being prepared, or should already be prepared, to handle the matabil and the dikes will be put in place and so on. There is a little airstrip, I think, near Springdale which will be used. The dikes are being put there. As a matter of fact in that

MR. ANDREWS: There was some leakage when that plane returned that time from the jettison site, some small leakage on the runway.

I am very happy that we have a plan in action for any foreseeable disaster that might occur, unless another plane crashes.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER(Russell): A supplementary, the hon. the member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Could I ask the minister if indeed - one of the problems, as the minister is aware of, is that last year in that spill, that jettisoned load that aircraft was forced to drop, there was a great deal of uncertainty as to where the load actually was dropped, and there is some uncertainty as to whether that load went into the Gander water supply rather than in the area that the minister said. I would like to ask him

MR. YOUNG: information when the estimates were being done. May 17th. again, question no. 78. Question no. 90, May 26th. and May 31st. A bit of reading for him while he is back from holidays.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): The hon. Minister of Development.

MR. WINDSOR: Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to revert to Presenting Reports to table two reports.

MR. SPEAKER: Is it agreed?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER: Agreed.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR. WINDSOR: Two reports, Mr. Speaker, the annual report of the Harmon Corporation and the annual report of the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation.

MR. SPEAKER: Are there any other answers to questions for which notice has been given?

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I present a petition on behalf of some approximately 300 residents of St. Brendan's, the island of St. Brendan's in Bonavista Bay in the Terra Nova district. The petition, Mr. Speaker, is requesting the government to look into and correct the inadequate health services on the island, the health services administered to the people of St. Brendan's, an island, Sir, of some 500 people ten miles from the mainland of the Province, ten miles from the terminal point of Burnside on the

MR. T. LUSH: those of the by-weekly visits of the doctor from Eastport. And I might say that that visit is only, I think, lasts just a half day, when the doctor gets there every two weeks it is just for a half day, just for a couple of hours. So there are not too many people in Newfoundland having that level, I am sure, of medical services to them.

So, Mr. Minister -

MR. HOUSE: How many people did you say were there?

MR. LUSH: 500 people.

So to make the point clear again.

They have a visit from a doctor every two weeks who is there for about a couple of hours and then, of course, left to chance and fortune - and maybe misfortune.

MR. ROBERTS: Is the minister going to speak? Is the minister going to speak? Well, Mr. Speaker, the minister may possibly speak, he may possibly even say something, which will be a welcomed change.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HOUSE: That is good.

MR. ROBERTS: Yes, it is good, Mr. Speaker, which is more than I can say about the minister.

MR. HOUSE: None of your smart - alec cracks.

MR. ROBERTS: Now, Mr. Speaker, if the minister starts his smart alec remarks with me he will get better than he gives.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me carry on -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. ROBERTS: - if the hon. gentlemen opposite are so indisposed. Let me say that I support this

MR. ROBERTS: Well I am not going to disagree with my friend from Eagle River when he says the government are cold and callous. I will say that here is an opportunity for them to show that they are not cold and callous, and the way for them to show that, Sir, is for them to accede to a very reasonable and very modest request and that is to provide the nurse for these people at St. Brendan's. Sir, it ought to be done and it ought to be done right away.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HOUSE: Mr. Speaker, I just want to rise to support I guess the principle of this petition. The fact is I just want perhaps to make a comment regarding the presentation of petitions. The members opposite, as should open-line programmes and the media, know that petitions are - we have three people to speak on petitions and ordinarily, in some cases, a minister will get up and accept the petition and make a few pertinent remarks.

MR. NEARY: We gave you the works yesterday.

MR. HOUSE: The point was of course, the facts - of course, I still have my Insight magazine, I read it every day.

MR. NEARY: You only can stand and support a petition.

MR. YOUNG: He was reading Ray Guy, He could not -

MR. HOUSE: The fact is, Mr. Speaker, I will certainly take this petition to the department -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HOUSE: - take it to the department. The fact is of course we do not as much have district nurses now as we

June 16, 1982

Tape No. 1357

SD - 2

MR. LUSH: do hereby request the provincial government to allocate funds in this fiscal year to upgrade and pave the road from Musgravetown through Cannings Cove.



MR. LUSH:

And the petition makes that point, that Canning's Cove is rapidly establishing itself as a fairly productive fishing centre and over the last five years has made tremendous progress in this area. They make that point in their petition that they think they should have a paved road so that the fish product can go to the markets in a good condition.

And, Mr. Speaker, of course all hon. members are aware of the inconvenience of wallowing in dust and dirt when one is living on a gravel road. And, again, like so many rural Newfoundland communities, Canning's Cove was built along both side of a main road. And these people, with the frustration they go through when the dry weather approaches, the ladies cannot put clothes on the lines, they cannot raise their windows, they will all just smother and stifle in the dirt and the dust that is flying around that beautiful town.

So, Mr. Speaker, there is every reason given, economic reasons and social reasons why the people of Canning's Cove should have their road paved, just a distance of something less than three miles, something less than three miles from the town of Musgravetown through to Canning's Cove.

So, Mr. Speaker,

MR. DAWE: improvements in his or her particular district, and it is this government's intention to address itself to these very legitimate concerns and aspirations of the residents all around Newfoundland and Labrador. It becomes in this particular issue, as it is in other areas of social concerns, a matter of funding being available to address itself to what are real, legitimate concerns of the people. And we are continuing to upgrade and improve road facilities and transportation networks around the Province as funding becomes available.

Mr. Speaker, as soon as this Province has the opportunity of participating in this Canadian nation on an equal financial footing with other Canadians, then we will be in a better position to address ourselves more quickly to these very legitimate concerns of the residents that the hon. member represented today, and all other residents of Newfoundland and Labrador.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, I want to stand and speak in support of the petition so ably presented by my colleague from the district of Terra Nova (Mr. Lush). Mr. Speaker, I am quite familiar with the town of Canning's Cove. I have driven through that community many times. I drove

MR. CALLAN: the Province.

MR. NEARY: A lot of that in St. Mary's Bay too.

MR. CALLAN: In St. Mary's-The Capes, in the district of St. Mary's-The Capes I am sure that the newly elected member knows exactly how many miles there are now. He was quoted earlier as saying that there were 104, I think, or 100 miles.

MR. HEARN: One hundred and twenty-five.

MR. CALLAN: But there are over 100 miles of dirt road in places like in the district of St. Mary's-The Capes. And the people in the galleries, these senior citizens who have worked hard all their lives and paid taxes all of their lives, are like the people in Canning's Cove, Mr. Speaker, who after working hard all of their lives and paying taxes they still, in their twilight years, have to suffer with dust and dirt and lack of a decent paved road.

If I can make one more comparison, Mr. Speaker, it is like the people in the town of Adeytown in my district, where they paved to the last house in Deep Bight, and of course Adeytown being a town of probably a population of 150 people, mostly senior citizens,

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Are there any other petitions?

This now being Private Members

Day we shall commence with Motion 8, the motion to be moved by the hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Fogo.

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, I would like to start as is usually the case by reading this resolution into Hansard:

WHEREAS the fishery is the main thread of Newfoundland's social, cultural and economic fabric; and

WHEREAS both the inshore and offshore sectors of the Province's fishery are in a state of crisis; and

WHEREAS there is no coherent or cohesive policy being pursued by the present provincial government; and

WHEREAS it seems apparent that the present provincial government has neither the desire nor the ability to develop long term strategies or policies for the Province's fishery;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that this hon. House immediately set as its top priority the development of a comprehensive long term policy for the Newfoundland fishery;

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that a select committee of this House be appointed to ensure that this policy becomes reality.

Mr. Speaker, the importance of this resolution to the Liberal Party I think is

MR. B. TULK: prosperity in the fishery. As the fishery goes in Newfoundland so goes the prosperity of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, expansion in the fishery -

MR. STAGG: What about the (inaudible) to the gills.

MR. TULK: If the toddler now, the fellow that has been trying to get into the Cabinet for the past ten years, and he has finally toddled up to be Parliamentary Assistant, if he will be quiet I will get to that later.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, if there is room for expansion in the fishery, then this government has to do a much better job in marketing - and that is the government's responsibility, the Government of this Province's responsibility - they have to do a much better job of marketing, and of technological development so that we can harvest the fish stocks that are there. They have to do a much better job as a government in improving quality. Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, one of the most important areas that we have to improve and change in this Province is

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the UIC system -

MR. STAGG: We cannot remember what you said six months ago, none of us can.

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

MR. TULK: The UIC system in this Province, Mr. Speaker, discourages the efforts of fishermen by lowering the amount received if they get small catches. Mr. Speaker, that is totally unfair. I do not mind saying to the federal government and to this government that perhaps they should get together on this issue and should see that our fishermen's UIC benefits rather than discouraging efforts in the fishery are put in such a way that the best averages of fishermen are used.

Now, Mr. Speaker, some, perhaps even some of the people sitting in this House, will say that regardless of whether the income of fishermen is up, say, in the latter part of the season, in the Fall of the year in the inshore fishery, some say, 'Oh, they should still fish regardless of what that does to their income in the Winter'. Mr. Speaker, I just ask a simple question: Who in this Province will reduce their annual income by working longer? And that is what we are asking our fishermen to do. We are asking them to take a lower income in the Winter just to work longer in the Fall. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, there there is not a doctor, there is not a lawyer, there is not a teacher, there is not a civil servant or there is no

MR. TULK: Mr. Speaker, the Norwegians, on the other hand, seem to not look at the public funds that they put into the fishery as a subsidization, but rather as an investment. And perhaps that is an attitude that we should use, that we should adopt. I think we should adopt that attitude. For example, Mr. Speaker, if you look at the landed value of fish products in this Province in 1980, the landed value of fish products in Newfoundland in 1980 was \$161 million. The export value of that fish was \$400 million. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is again, as a former Premier of this Province was fond of saying, that is new dollars, new dollars into the economy, new dollars that go, I would suggest, to pay your salary, mine and perhaps every other salary in this House. And yet, Mr. Speaker, last year the expenditure of the

MR. TULK: Now, Mr. Speaker, that aside, look at that \$19 million as an investment percentage over what the landed value of our fish was, and you can see that indeed it is a ridiculous investment.

Mr. Speaker, let us ask this government another question, let us ask them another question. If you look at -

MR. CARTER: It is very boring.

MR. TULK: Well the member has a choice. He can leave. This House will not be worse because his presence is not here.

Mr. Speaker, let us ask the government another question. Where do they place among the resource sector of their budget, in their budgetary system, where do they place fisheries? Where do they rank it?

MR. YOUNG: Number one.

MR. TULK: Number one.

MR. HISCOCK: After offshore.



June 16, 1982

Tape 1366

PK - 2

MR. TULK: in the House - it is coming through in his budget. The government's notion of what the fishery should be is coming through in his budget. Because, you see, it seems to me listening to the other side speak on occasion on the fishery, that they have this romantic notion of the fishery; that where everybody in outport Newfoundland have a fishing boat, they are catching rabbits, and they are shooting moose in the Fall of the year, they are making \$7,000

MR. TULK: the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), his favourite question, let us look again at the lack of planning and action that this government carries on in the fishery.

Sometime ago the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), and again he is not in his seat today, he has not been there for a couple of days, probably legitimately, but he has not been there, but sometime ago -

MR. RIDEOUT: He is studying fish.

MR. TULK: He needs to study fish.

Sometime ago the Minister of Fisheries came into this House with a Ministerial Statement in which he was upset with the federal minister for trading off 10,000 metric tons of caplin.

AN HON. MEMBER: And well he should be.

MR. TULK: And well he should be. We agreed. We asked him to make his telex to the Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) unanimous. We made the statement, I believe, that there should be no fish going out of Canadian waters unless it was caught by Canadians and particularly Newfoundlanders.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TULK: Because, Mr. Speaker, we believe on this side of the House that this term that is being used by both the Province and, in some cases, the federal government, the term 'surplus stock' should not exist in Newfoundland. Surplus stock. a surplus stock of fish in Canadian waters. Mr. Speaker, the Province believes that -

DR. COLLINS: How about silver hake?

MR. TULK: Silver hake? We should be able to catch it and sell it. There should not be a surplus stock.

June 16,1982

Tape No. 1368

ah-2

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR.NEARY: You are too stunned to get out of your own way over there.

MR. DINN: Burn your boats.

MR. HISCOCK: And buy Russian cars.Buy Russian cars.

MR.TULK: Mr. Speaker, could we have the Yahoo from down in Pleasantville somewhere, he belongs there somewhere, could we have him quite please?

MR.SPEAKER(Aylward): Order, please!

MR.DINN: The member for Pogo (Mr. Tulk) got more boats than all of you put together.

MR.TULK: Mr. Speaker, is he going to carry on like that or do we have to strap him in the seat?

MR.NEARY: Go down and collect from the telephone company.

MR.TULK: Strap him in the seat or kick him out. Give him a flick.

MR. HISCOCK: That does not say anything for the intelligence of the voters in your district though.

MR. DINN: You will never get back in Social Services again.

MR.TULK: Mr. Speaker, they wonder at the intelligence of the voters in the outports voting for Liberals, when they voted for that. They voted for that.

Mr. Speaker, the point is that if this government and its predecessor, the former administration, not the former, former administration but the former administration, if they had developed this Province, especially technologically, there would be no surplus stock and there would be very little for the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. LeBlanc) to fool around with. Now, Mr. Speaker, I

MR. TULK:

what did they do? They budgeted a measley \$671,000 for development, technological development of our fishery. The shame of it was though that again, through the knife of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins), they spent something like \$549,000, over \$100,000 less than the measly \$670,000 that they had budgeted. Mr. Speaker, is it any wonder that there is fish out there that this government says is surplus stock?

What did they do in product and market development last year?

MR. NEARY: Nothing.

MR. TULK: The minister, if he were here I would say it -

MR. NEARY: He went down to Puerto Rico for a holiday.

MR. TULK: - the minister is the best travelled minister in North America.

MR. DINN: He did not go to Panama to see John C.

MR. TULK: He is a globe trotter.

MR. NEARY: He went down to Puerto Rico.

MR. TULK: He should join the Harlem Globe Trotters. But what did they budget for marketing last year? Again a measly \$517,000 but how much did they spend?

MR. STAGG: A measly \$500,000.

MR. TULK: Yes, to an industry that is as important as the fishery it is measly. How much did they spend, Mr. Speaker? \$275,000, again the knife of the Minister of Finance.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. TULK: About 55 per cent of what was budgeted for marketing in this Province last year was spent, and that in spite of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that we had the worst market conditions in this Province's history in the fishery.

MR. ANDREWS:

this, or to understand the importance of the fishery and how we are trying to handle it, this government is trying to handle it, I must give you a few lessons. The essence of the policy of the Newfoundland government is this - highlighted throughout this book - 'Northern cod must be reserved to ensure a middle distance effort to extend it to the extent that it can be harvested by that fleet'. Now, Mr. Speaker, that in itself is a statement of policy with a lot of significance for Newfoundland fishermen. What we are saying there, what the government is saying is that Northern cod, the first access to that should be by inshore fishermen. The cost of catching codfish is a lot less, the unit cost for catching is a lot less than when you use small boats, trap boats, longliners, gill-netters, whatever the case may be, the cost is a lot less than these multi-million dollar draggers, although there certainly is a need for the multi-million dollar draggers in areas where you want to have seasonal fish plants. Along and hand in hand with that policy there is also a policy of encouraging the construction of what is commonly called middle-distance fishing boats and this programme is well underway right now.

We also say, 'Where within the total allowable catch a surplus to inshore effort can be clearly shown to exist, it must be reserved to offshore effort landing into Newfoundland ports, primarily for distribution to processing plants which now operate on a seasonal basis. Once again, Mr. Speaker, when this Northern cod is taken by vessels from Nova Scotia or New Brunswick, or vessels that have traditionally fished off the Scotia shelf or the gulf and now find it convenient to say that they had traditional fishing grounds off the Northeast Coast of Newfoundland and Labrador, when fish

MR. ANDREWS:

little commercial value in this Province. It may in the future, but at the present time I would be quite willing, if I was the Minister of Fisheries for Newfoundland, to trade off a lot of grenadier for some other benefit that Newfoundland may get, or Canada, certainly. But this indiscriminate trading and permitting foreign nations to take fish, in particular caplin - a lot of our fishermen are very worried about the amount of caplin being caught and the amount squid, which is the bait fish for our codfish and other food fishes that we sell on the market.

Here is another policy position of the provincial government. In addition to problems associated with the Northern cod, there is a further problem associated with the management of offshore fish stocks in the Grand Banks area. When the current Law of the Sea Conference was commenced some years ago, Newfoundland took the position that in order for Canada to protect the fish stocks upon which the Province's fishermen depend, it would be necessary for Canada to extend its jurisdiction not merely to the 200 mile limit but to the edge of the Continental Shelf. And this is a very important point, because we find ourselves, in Canada, as the only country in the world where a 200 mile economic zone does not include the whole Continental Shelf. It would be precedent setting for Canada to take the action, but I think that the world community would accept it. And if we do not have that control over the whole Continental Shelf, there is going to be, as we see now, a very difficult problem in managing the fish stocks as they migrate from the tail and the nose of the

MR. ANDREWS: of the fishing industry. We have control over licencing of fish and over the plant operation, whether a plant gets a licence or not. This government is dedicated to the continuance of the fishery, I think, which was proved in this last six or seven months when we, through the taxpayers of Newfoundland, helped over seventeen fish plants reopen, seventeen fish companies - I think there are more than seventeen individual plants - seventeen fish companies reopened and thousands and thousands of Newfoundlanders back to work.

I know in my own district, the fish plant at Burgeo and the fish plant at Ramea are working great guns. On the other hand, the federal government decided in its own wisdom, or greedy wisdom to avoid the issue by appointing the Kirby Task Force which did the tremendous thing of opening one fish plant in one Newfoundland community over the past six months. And that is obviously an attempt by the federal government to come in the back door and nationalize and socialize the fishing industry of Newfoundland, by putting it in the management of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation, which I think most fishermen, and certainly the industry in Newfoundland would be deadly opposed to.

MR. NEARY: Who opened Grand Bank? Who opened Gaultois? Who opened St. Anthony?

MR. ANDREWS: A little bit of money from the Province, I would say. A little bit of money from the Province, I would say, Sir.

We are opposed to nationalization of the fishery. We will help, and we have helped over the past six to eight months. Fish companies which got themselves in trouble because of market conditions and because of conditions beyond their control, because of lack of fish, because of high interest rates, factors

MR. H. ANDREWS: things beyond his control, high interest rates, low market prices in the United States, low fish stocks, low catches, low landings, the whole works just crowding in upon him. We should be there to help out for the benefit of the fisherman and the workers in the plant and the Newfoundland economy in general. And that is what we have been doing.

MR. STAGG: We are not competing with companies.

MR. ANDREWS: We are not competing with companies.

In companies where we have taken an equity position, we have also taken a position on the Board of Directors of those companies and that position on the Board of Directors gives us a very close monitoring of the companies' financial affairs.

MR. L. SIMMS: It is better than burning your boats, is it?

MR. ANDREWS: It is better, indeed, than burning their boats.

We are very worried, Mr. Speaker, about the seasonal nature of the Newfoundland fishery and, as the hon. member from Fogo (Mr. B. Tulk) talked about, the low earnings of the Newfoundland longliner fishermen and small boat fishermen. Their earnings are too low, but a lot of those problems, once again are beyond his control altogether. If he has to deal with 20 per cent money, or 18 per cent money, selling into a market where the price of fish has not improved in three or four or five years for some products, it is a desperate situation. I would hope that the Kirby Task Force will come up and face that serious problem. That is a very heavy financial dilemma that I do not think this little Province with our half a million people could possibly undertake, that is some kind of a subsidy directly to the fisherman. But it is something that is going to have to be considered, no doubt.



MR. ANDREWS: is a little bit difficult if you get into cooking, because of the tariff on that in the United States.

But we have developed many new products in our fish plants in Newfoundland. I guess Fishery Products have led the way, That company has probably led the way in this Province, along with National Sea who are a very good marketing organization also.

I think that is probably the answer to a lot of our problems. When you look at the manufacturers of soap and detergents and things like that, and toothpaste, you will find that it is basically the same product. Soap detergent may be - a company like Colgate - Pamolive might manufacture thirty or forty different products.

MR. CALLAN: Are you talking about the phosphorus out of Long Harbour now?

MR. ANDREWS: Pardon?

MR. CALLAN: Are you talking about phosphorus?

MR. ANDREWS: Phosphorus.

MR. SIMMS: Stop harrassing the hon. member, he is making a good speech.

MR. ANDREWS: That is what I refer to as a product mix, it is to get as much of the market as you can. And in the sense confuse the customer. The quality is a little bit satisfactory.

But because of the history of poor quality, Mr. Speaker, coming from this Province and Nova Scotia and the other Maritime Provinces too, we find ourselves in the position now that American buyers will pay forty to sixty cents a pound more for Icelandic and Norwegian fish without looking at it, because there are still some places and some areas and some plants that do produce a not

MR. NEARY: That is not true, they have been flying it out of my district for fifteen years.

MR. ANDREWS: I do not know, they may be flying it out of your district-to California?

MR. NEARY: To California.

MR. ANDREWS: Oh, I see. Well we have a bigger order this time.

MR. NEARY: From Stephenville to California for about fifteen years.

MR. ANDREWS: The order is increased considerably.

MR. HOUSE: Not true, not true.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman does not have a clue to what he is talking about. The market was cut of Leading Tackles, there was an unlimited market fifteen years ago. The only thing was that Air Canada would not give them a rate, that was the problem.

MR. ANDREWS: That was the problem. The air rates now seem to be quite acceptable to most of the - of course, the great advantage to flying fish is that the cost of producing the product is considerably less than going through the process of freezing it and storing it, and the dollar return is substantially higher because you are presenting the customer with a much better product. Those are some of the - I see my time is just about out -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. ANDREWS: - Mr. Speaker. There are some of the things that I would like to talk about.

MR. HOUSE: A very good speech, one of the better ones.

MR. ANDREWS: This motion here, Mr. Speaker, I cannot support it because its main thrust is that this government does not have a fisheries policy. We have, I think, the most refined, well thought out, and documented fishery policy in North America today, certainly for all

MR. HISCOCK: and it has been for over 400 years. With regard to that, Mr. Speaker, there are some myths in this Province-and I will try to address a few of them in this speech today - that I think need to be overcome. One of them is, of course, that Canada owns the 200 mile limit. We have a lot of people in this Province who feel that Canada owns the 200 mile limit. No country in this world owns 200 miles. There is a 200 mile economic zone that was agreed upon at the Law of the Sea Conference in Caracas and Venezuela. The former member for Burgeo - St. George's, and also the former Minister for External Affairs, Mr. Donald Jamieson, as well as Mr. Romeo LeBlanc and Allan MacEachen, the Minister of Finance in Ottawa now, were three people who fought to have this law passed. One of the reasons why, of course, was the sea line of the district of the member for Burgeo-St. George's at that time and also with regard to the lifeblood of the Province. We found ourselves at a time where Russians were coming in more and more, Japanese were coming in more and more, also East Germans, Poles and Spaniards. Spain probably and France have an historic right on the Grand Banks, more so than any other country.

So what we are seeing now in this Province, where again I find that the attitude of this government is continually encouraging our people to accept their propaganda, to accept their ignorance. And one of the ignorant things we are perpetuating on our people is that we own the 200 mile limit. And when the federal government allows West Germany to take 10,000 metric tons, somehow or another it is a crime that they are taking 10,000 metric tons of Canadian fish. It is not Canadian fish, it is in the 200 mile economic zone

MR. E. HISCOCK: the Grand Bank and the nose of the Grand Bank, which goes out 400 miles. And there is no question about it, that the fish do not know the difference and keep swimming back and forth. But I do know if the world international community would accept Canada's position of going 200 miles. As it has gone now there are some countries in the world that do not agree with this now. The United States, for example, do not accept that the Northwest Territories and the Passage are in Canadian waters. They look upon those as international waters, and that is the reason why, of course, they sent the Manhattan up in 1967. So, we in our situation, it would be a good idea to extend it to a 400 mile limit, or even more than that, up to the nose and the tail of the Grand Banks, but again, can we get Russia, the United States, Great Britain, France, Spain and China to agree with this? And the answer is, of course, no. So what we are faced with is management. And how do we say to these countries that this is a resource that our people in this part of the world depend upon and need to manage? It is our life style and it is the social, cultural and economic fabric of our country and our Province, Newfoundland and Canada. And, of course, there is no question that they will realize it and they will respect it. But does that prevent Spain from saying - who has fished over here for over 400 years, the bass, long before the English, long before the French - from saying 'Okay, you want the 200 mile economic zone, but do you not think we have traditional rights, because we have always come over here?' And, of course, the answer is yes, if we look at the international laws. But in this House we say, 'No, it is our fish, it is our surplus and they cannot have it.' So what happens to our fisherman in the rural areas? They get emotional, they get on with the government's Newfoundland nationalism

MR. HISCOCK: And with regard to that, let us see what has happened. When we got the 200 mile limit, we thought it was going to be the end of all our problems, just like Hibernia is supposed to be the end of our problems, just like completing the Trans-Canada was supposed to be the end of our problems, and also Come By Chance and Linerboard and Grand Falls and Corner Brook when they were built. And what happened? There were unlimited loans, our fishermen encouraged to get into longliners, encouraging them to get into other boats. And with regard to that, in the election of 1979, the former Minister of Fisheries bankrupt the Loan Board in such a way that they had to replace the members of the Loan Board with another loan board. That was the fishery policy, buy the people boats in the election and let a person have a longliner, got into overfishing, got into a number of policies that led to the actual problems that we have now, Mr. Speaker, in the fishing industry.

And the other part, Mr. Speaker. What happened? It was the processing licences. If you were a supporter of the P.C. Party and you wanted a licence, a processing licence, if you gave a generous donation it was not too hard, Mr. Speaker, to get a processing licence. And there are some independent people in this Province, processors, who believe that if you have \$10,000 or \$15,000 it is quite easy to get a crab licence.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HISCOCK: I, for one, do not necessarily agree with this, but this is what some of the people are saying. I, for one, hope that it is not true.

MR. NEARY: I hear that \$25,000 is the price of a crab licence.

MR. HISCOCK: But with regard to the

MR. HISCOCK: by the federal government.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HISCOCK: And with regard to the annual report, Anchor Inn Arctic Seafood Fish Plant at Dildo - \$400,000; Newfoundland Development Corporation, 90 per cent of that is federal money. The Fleur de Lys Fish Plant - \$800,000; 90 per cent of that federal government. Hawkes Bay Fisheries \$250,000 ; P. J. Janes and Son canning \$500,000. Again all of this that the government holds up and says look what we are doing for the fishing industry, look what we are doing for the fishery here in Newfoundland, look what we as the Provincial Government is doing, we find out it is coming from the Labrador Development Corporation and Ottawa by way of Ontario , British Columbia, and Nova Scotia and Alberta and other provinces which are putting in 90 per cent of it . Again I do not care where the money comes from or where the credit goes, as long as we are actually expanding those industries and making them viable. But I do think it is important for propaganda to go to both sides and that is, of course, that the money that the Provincial Government is giving, in actual fact is brought in from the federal government, a Newfoundland stamp put on it by a Newfoundland department or programme, thereby getting political patronage as a result.

One thing that I would also like to deal with, and I think it is our total responsibility and I think it says something of us as a Province, after 400 years we still do not even know how to sell fish. There are some people who would even say we do not even know how to catch it, that we have not improved our technology over the ages, that we still produce a poorer quality of fish than Iceland and Norway. I remember the Federal Fisheries Minister, Mr. Romeo LaBlanc, when he was in L'Anse-au-Loup in my district and he announced \$13.5 million for a coastal

MR.HISCOCK: and anything is good enough as long as I get enough money to see me through the Winter approach. Marketing: I cannot see why, when we have a university, we cannot take ten or fifteen or twenty top students in the BA programme, put them on to a MBA programme, if we have to send them to Princeton, Yale or Harvard or over in Europe anywhere, train them in several different languages and then get them in the marketing and send them on over to Europe and get them into selling for us instead of taking a piecemeal attitude and allowing seven or eight fish companies in Newfoundland to go and try to sell their fish as a person would try to sell things on the streets of New York or any other large city, having no more planning than that. The answer, Mr. Speaker, to it is marketing. We have no marketing approach not only with our fish but with our agricultural products, with our Tourism or whatever, we have no packaging and we have no marketing. And if we had a marketing approach, Mr. Speaker, in a rational way we could go into the American markets, we could try to lobby Congress and the House of Representatives there to lower their tariffs in trade off for other things, in trade off for other things, and go to the European economic community and have our own skilled, qualified people who are versed in three or four languages, have them as lobbyists to try and convince, like the environmentalists did with the seals -and we found out what the environmentalist Brian Davies could do with a bit of pressure and a few hundred thousand dollars. If we had those in various parts of the world and took an aggressive approach with the Canadian government, with the Canadian Embassies in these countries, then we might be able to break into new markets. But, no, Mr. Speaker, the attitude

MR. HISCOCK: And a lot of the third world countries, by the way, Mr. Speaker, did not particularly enjoy getting salt fish when they much preferred to get rice or wheat. But that is what Canada basically did, sent it over to them and said, 'Here is protein'. And we know really, if we look at it, we know what salt really does to the diet.

With regard to the other part of the stockpiles, Mr. Speaker, if we do not get into the markets of the United States and into Europe, and we do not learn to compete with Iceland and Norway, then there is nothing that we really can do if our product is of a low quality. The reality is in the United States they want cod blocks because of the tariff. So we have to do something about the tariff. The reality is also in the United States that the younger people much prefer to buy McDonalds, Burger King, Kentucky Fried Chicken or pizza and it is actually cheaper to buy some of these things that it is to buy fish. And if we are going to break into these, then we need to work with the federal government, not take the attitude, as this government has been doing for the past three or four years, of saying, 'We want co-operation' but then lambaste the federal government when they give a trade off of squid and when they give a trade off of caplin or when they give a trade off of cod. The answer is more complex, and if we really address the question, maybe we, as a country, could become great and find more international markets for not only our fish but our wheat and other products. Also, with regard to our own Province, we could learn to expand our fishing industry, we could learn to expand our tourism and our agriculture.



MR. HISCOCK: So it is not a reality, it is something that is put there. And maybe the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) would much prefer a gunboat style of diplomacy. So it is very complex, Mr. Speaker, when we even have the city of St. John's saying, 'Allow the Russian fleet to go off with the Northern cod and fish on the Grand Banks, because we want the synchrolift here in St. John's. Or Gander says, 'We want Aeroflot to continue to land in Gander'. So even in our own Province we see the complexed reality of trade offs. And if Moscow can see Gander and St. John's competing with the rural areas, then they can say, "Well, obviously we asked for an extra quota and of course we are going to get it, because they need that \$6 million in St. John's or that \$10 million in Gander".

MR. DINN: If they gave over the fishery we would not need it.

MR. HISCOCK: So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the other part, and in closing, the Kirby Task Force - I regret again there has to be a task force set up by the federal government. We have been waiting for this Royal Commission on the fisheries. When we had problems with the fishing industry strike, what did we do? We had a Royal Commission and we are still waiting for it. But with regard to that, at least we have the plants in Gaultois and Grand Bank and St. Anthony opened.

MR. HEARN: It is a bit ironic that down here we have a bunch of people who profess to know so much about the fishery, and that includes the hon. members on this side, while in the galleries today we have men who have had more salt water go over them than we will ever see in a lifetime.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HEARN: Sometimes, Mr. Speaker, I think it would be much more beneficial for us, and perhaps for the Province in general, if we were there and they were here. However that is not the case and it is up to us to go on.

MR. NEARY: They must be your constituents.

MR. HEARN: Certainly. In the years since these people were fishing, there has been a tremendous transition in the fishery. And as my hon. colleague from Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) just mentioned, fishing technology has exploded in recent years. And I am not sure - I agree with him when he said I am not sure whether that is for the better or not. However, there are a few things he said that I certainly do not agree with and perhaps are not quite factual. When he talked about the 200 mile zone, we have to realize that the coastal state has the right to harvest any fish within the 200 mile coastal zone. The only way anyone else will have any access to that fish is if the coastal state cannot harvest the fish. I am quite sure, and I stand to be corrected, that we have reached the end of the various phase out agreements with the other countries who are fishing inside that zone with the exception of, perhaps, France.

The Canadian Ambassador to the Law of the Sea Conference in Geneva, Alan Beasley, made a statement where he said that the power of control should be in the hands of the coastal state. Now I am

MR. HEARN: policy being pursued by the present provincial government and; WHEREAS it seems that the present provincial government has neither the desire nor the ability to develop long-term strategies or policies for the Province's fishery'. You know, I ask, Mr. Speaker, where are there no coherent or cohesive policies? The Province is trying to do something about it. We have the federal government moving in without precedent, moving into St. Anthony, giving a \$200 million six-month bail out to the plant without even consulting the Province, the same time - that is supposed to be a big deal because the federal government did it - the same time the provincial government has given in loan guarantees \$20 million to twenty Newfoundland fish processing firms to reopen thirty-seven fish plants around this Island. And many of these fish plants, Mr. Speaker, are in my own district. The plants at Admiral's Beach, at Branch and St. Bride's have been reopened thanks to money, guaranteed loans, from the provincial government.

It is the policy of this government, Mr. Speaker, it is committed to the maintenance and the development of the fishing industry for all the people in this Province. And we can go back to 1980, when the provincial government suggested some of the controls that it should have, and here is where we started developing the five year plan for the fisheries, a good solid plan with which all Newfoundlanders could identify. But, of course, Uncle Ottawa said, 'No, we will give you very few controls. You cannot control anything that will help you whatsoever. We are the boss. We will tell you what to do. Consequently, be good little boys now and do as we say'.

It was suggested by the provincial government that licencing inshore fishermen and their boats

MR. HEARN:                   some time ago, when we say, once again without any knowledge whatsoever, 103,360 metric tons of fish within our 200 mile limit being given away to the Russians, 10,500 metric tons of this was for caplin. Any fisherman around the island will tell you that one of the big concerns right now is the lack of caplin. I talked to people today who said caplin used to roll in on our beaches, we do not even see them anymore. And then, of course, we have the present disease that is affecting the caplin, that is hurting the catch once again. Along with that, we had 5,000 metric tons of squid given to Cuban fishermen, and, of course, an offer of 14,700 metric tons of squid to the Japanese. Now, you know, this is proper handling of the total allowable catch? What say has Newfoundland got in its own fish, fish that swim within our 200 mile coastal zone? Where is the total control? Where is the control in the hands of the coastal state here, Mr. Speaker? Then it goes on to say about setting local quotas for bays and certain sections of our coast. Talk to our herring seiners, the fishermen who depend upon the herring fishery, upon the caplin fishery within our bays. Ask them what control the Newfoundland government has in relation to total allowable catch. Ask them how fair they think the total quotas are in some of these cases? Licencing fish plants: Thank God they left us with that control. We even had to licence St. Anthony so they could get it off the ground. Approving the harvesting plans for fish companies: Of course, that is the biggest joke of the century. Inland fisheries and fish farming: Thank God we have some control over that, and it is one of the few phases of the fishery in Newfoundland that is successful and properly managed. Mr. Speaker, the state of the fishery in Newfoundland is as it is not because we do not have any coherent policies, it is simply because we have absolutely no control over our policies. We have a request in the final BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that the government set up a select committee.

MR. HEARN: and I will repeat that, 94 per cent of the electorate in St. Mary's - The Capes get out to vote? And I am sure that is a record in the district, 94 per cent. I know the charisma of the two candidates involved certainly helped. But I am sure, Mr. Speaker, it was because they were concerned. They are concerned about the jobs that are not available, they are concerned about the fisheries, they are concerned about the roads that are not paved, the roads that my hon. friend from Bellevue (Mr. Callan) mentioned earlier, the condition of which I have mentioned to the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) over and over, and the roads about which we will be doing something within the next couple of years.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: They are concerned, Mr. Speaker, about the lack of facilities that cannot be provided, cannot be provided because we are not able to take advantage of our own resources, and that includes the fishery. They gave us a mandate, Mr. Speaker, to fight for their rights, and that included some say in the fishery.

Mr. Speaker, they gave us that mandate so that we can fight for better conditions for them, so that they can have the place in the sun that they want, that they hope for and that they do well deserve. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: recorded, and let me remind you again that this House of Assembly and this government, the P.C. administration of Brian Peckford and the P.C. administration of Frank Moores were consistent in their perseverance and their ultimate success in shaming, first Jack Davies, the Minister of Fisheries and Environment for Canada, and then the hon. Romeo LeBlanc into finally taking the initiative as far as the 200 mile limit is concerned. Now, hon. members opposite would have us believe that the provincial government has no consistent policy and that it has not developed any reasonable programmes for the fishery. Well, Mr. Speaker, constitutionally and under the terms of union, we have a very strong problem or a very difficult problem with regard to controlling that resource and hon. members opposite have not dealt with that in the least. The member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) has chosen to side-step the very serious issues that confront the Province. As I indicated, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker was in the House at that time, was Speaker during those days when numerous resolutions went before the House, there was strong and consistent debate on the policy of the provincial government that was finally, finally, reluctantly endorsed by the federal government and I expect that the then Minister for External Affairs (Mr. Jamieson) might have had something to do with it. It is to his everlasting credit, it is to Mr. Jamieson's everlasting credit that he was finally able to bring his cabinet colleagues around to the realization that they had to take some initiatives so far as the declaration of the 200 mile limit is concerned, and I will certainly not detract from that. But it took an awful long

MR. STAGG: in 1981 a total of 159,435 metric tons of fish, various species, were given away by the federal government to other nations on this Earth. Codfish, for instance, there were 76,275 metric tons of codfish given away. No royalties paid, no nothing paid to the Newfoundland Government or to the Canadian Government, simply given away, foreign fishing fleets allowed to catch these resources.

MR. CALLAN: They were traded off.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) says they were traded off. What did we receive in return, Mr. Speaker? I will leave it to him to indicate what we received in return for the 76,275 metric tons of fish that were given away in 1981. And by the calculations of the Department of Labour and Manpower, that constitutes 1,372 man years of employment. Mr. Speaker, that is a very significant lack of foresight on the part of the federal government, on the part of the colleagues of my hon. friends opposite. The sponsor of this resolution, by the way, Mr. Speaker, the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), has no interest in hearing these figures, has no interest in knowing that 1,372 man years of employment were taken away from Newfoundlanders last year, Mr. Speaker, last year when we had a real problem with the resource shore plants in this Province. There was a problem with having given away the fish, then we also gave away our markets for our own fish and it is a real problem. But the member for Fogo, Mr. Speaker, the sponsor of this resolution has no interest in hearing these facts. And redfish, Mr. Speaker, 56,000 -

MR. TULK: It is garbled so I am going to read it until it is picked abroad.

June 16, 1982

Tape 1390

TM - 2

MR. STAGG:                    There were numerous resolutions  
and there was a strong lobby from this administration to  
bring some sanity and reality to the fishing industry. And  
at that time, of course,



MR. NEARY: The Harmon Corporation  
trying to promote the Russians.

MR. STAGG: Right. Aeroflot goes into  
Stephenville, yes. I agree they go into Stephenville.  
I would give up Aeroflot going into Stephenville, Mr.  
Speaker, if we could get the Russians off the Grand Banks  
and we could start exporting the fish resources and catch  
them all ourselves. I would give up a few flights of Aeroflot  
into Stephenville, do not you worry.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the problems  
that we have had with this resource over the years, it is  
something that is a - I guess history is being made insofar  
as the management of this resource is concerned. But it  
is inevitable, Mr. Speaker, it is going to take a long time.  
It is something that we cannot ignore. It is a debate that  
is repetitive. In many cases it might be considered to  
be redundant or even boring. Some of the speeches made in  
this House are boring, Mr. Speaker. Of course none of mine  
fall into that category. But some of the speeches made on  
the fisheries are boring. But nevertheless -

MR. TULK: Was mine?

MR. STAGG: The hon. member has only made four  
or five speeches in the House. He is going into his fourth  
year in the House now, he has only made a few speeches and

MR. STAGG: at the federal level, and we can revert to the, initially as far as the offshore is concerned, to the Peckford/Clark position enunciated in September 1979 -

AN HON. MEMBER: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: -then we could also commence and conclude a reasonable arrangement with regard to the offshore fishing effort, because it is something that both levels of government have to participate in. It is something that no one level of government should have a monopoly on. Absolute power is not consistent with the federal system, it is not consistent with the spirit of Confederation, it is not consistent with the Federal Constitution which was signed recently and negotiated over a couple of years.

MR. TULK: (Inaudible) voice, boy.

MR. STAGG: It is the sort of thing that requires a calm and reasoned and responsible and Canadian solution. And, Mr. Speaker, I say here that it is inevitable, it is inevitable that such a solution will be arrived at. There are temporarily occupying

MR. STAGG: And the history of Canada is such that only when both levels of government are involved with matters that cross over from one jurisdiction into another, only when a consistent and coherent and honourable solution is found to these difficult problems, can there be a proper development of the resource. So, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to vote for the resolution as put forward by my friend from Pogo. It makes very little sense for him to take up the time of the House deploring the inaction or whatever of the provincial government, while in the totality of his speech he did not make any reference to the poor stewardship, the lack of

MR. CALLAN: in many respects. We have in South Dildo, for example, three fish plants side by side. Actually there are four plants side by side in South Dildo, but one of them is the - even though it is not a fish plant, it is associated with a different sort of fishery, a fishery, I believe, that has seen the end of its days. And I refer, of course, to the Carino plant in South Dildo, the only plant in all of Newfoundland and Labrador where fishermen from all over the Province can bring their seal pelts and sell them, and, of course where the seal pelts are partially, at least, or have been traditionally, cured before being transhipped to Europe where, of course, the bulk of the processing takes place.

And, Mr. Speaker, there are many problems associated with the fishery in this Province. And I remember - even though I was only passively interested I was never directly involved in politics, in talking to some hon. members on both sides of the House since I came here first in 1975, I found out in chatting with them, for example, perhaps over dinner, especially when we used to have these night sittings that many of the members here now, and formerly, were associated with politics in some form or other long before they decided to get into the elective politics and therefore become actual members of this House of Assembly.

But I remember back in 1970 and 1971, 1972 when the former Tory premier was rising to fame -

MR. NEARY: Now they are going to take him into court, the former Tory premier.

MR. CALLAN: - that one of the big platforms, Mr. Speaker, one of the big platforms in former Premier Moores

MR. CALLAN: he succeeded in doing, but one of the big platforms was that the problem with the fishery in this Province is that there is far, far too little processing done in this Province and the way to create employment and the way to put this Province on the road to prosperity was to have, if not 100 per cent, at least a much larger portion of the processing and so on done in this Province.

MR. CARTER: How much would we be eating then in this Province?

MR. CALLAN: Well, that is true.

MR. NEARY: Now they are trying to put poor old Frank in jail.

MR. CALLAN: That is true. I do not know how often we would have to eat fish on a daily basis, in the meantime, to consume all that would give us an adequate market for our fish and fish products. But, Mr. Speaker, as I said, there are many problems associated with the fishery in this Province. Speakers in the debate earlier today, like the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk) and the member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) - I mention these two specifically, because I do not believe that the other speakers had very much to say of a substantial nature.

MR. NEARY: Filling in time.

MR. CALLAN: Just filling in time, I believe. But there are many, many problems and some of these problems, Mr. Speaker, have to do with marketing. Marketing, I suppose, is probably -

MR. NEARY: The number one problem.

MR. CALLAN: - the number one problem.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. CALLAN: You know, from listening to hon. members from the government side of the House of Assembly, and in particular listening to the Premier and listening to the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), you would think that

MR. CALLAN: we saw that, as somebody mentioned just now, even when the Minister of Fisheries was the hon. James McGrath who was of the same political stripe as the people then and now in power in this Province. The same jurisdictional problems were evident during Mr. McGrath's reign, a short reign.

MR. NEARY: He said last week in Halifax, the federal government must have the supremacy in the fishery.

MR. CALLAN: Obviously, Mr. McGrath cannot be all wrong and neither can the hon. Romeo LeBlanc be all wrong, or, if I can make reference to a third party, Mr. Speaker, a third party involved, very much involved with the fishery in this Province, in addition to the federal and the provincial governments, Mr. Speaker, we have a third party and, of course, I am referring to, the Fishermen's Union. I have here in front of me the latest edition of the Union Forum, a booklet containing - I do not know how many hon. members have read it, this newest edition, On page 5, which is actually the first page of any reading because the first four pages are mostly all advertising and so on, on page 5 we have listed the union's submission, the brief that the union in this Province submitted to the Kirby Task Force. And as I was reading through the half a dozen - actually there are seven recommendations that the union passed on to the Kirby Task Force. Some of it, Mr. Speaker, is echoing, is reminiscent of what the provincial government has been saying and what some former speakers here this afternoon have been saying, but in that, Mr. Speaker, we agree. I remember listening

MR. CALLAN: somebody had to make a move, Mr. Speaker. And a couple of years ago the federal government took the plunge and they started what I think will result in, perhaps a year or two from now, will evolve into a good and sensible set of regulations. You know, the federal government had to lay down some rules. They had to ascertain, because the provincial government did not know - nobody in the provincial government knew how many fishermen are there in this Province, how many full-time, how many part-time and so on. So the federal government, as I said, a year or more ago, you know, started to ascertain how many fishermen do we have, and of the fishermen that we do have, how many are full-time and how many are part-time, how many are school teachers on a regular basis and so on.

So, Mr. Speaker, jurisdiction is a problem, there is no question about that and we agree. We agree, Mr. Speaker, on both sides of this House, I think, we agree that the time has come and is perhaps long overdue when the jurisdictional problem should be settled. And whether that means that the federal government has to give some on their side as well as perhaps the provincial government giving some leeway, it needs to be settled.

MR. NEARY: I have never seen 'Carter' as quiet as he is today.

MR. CALLAN: It is raining today so he is not out in his savoury patch.

MR. NEARY: No, the Premier has him muzzled, gagged.

MR. TULK: Yes.

MR. CALLAN: But, Mr. Speaker, I mentioned marketing, jurisdiction and catching capability, or catching ability. There is obviously a third problem that we have in the provincial fishery. But, Mr. Speaker, if I can mention one other problem that we have, and I am sincere about this

MR. CALLAN: that Walter Carter was a good Minister of Fisheries -

MR. TULK: Oh, everybody loved him.

MR. CALLAN: - and he went a long distance, Mr. Speaker, in trying to cure some of the ills that existed. But, Mr. Speaker, when you have a Minister of Fisheries as we have in this Province and have had for the last couple of years, when we have a Minister of Fisheries who for the sake of something to say really, and to be critical of the CBC last week said, you know, 'the fishermen's broadcast that I listen to on a regular basis, the fishermen's broadcast' he said 'the people who are associated with the fishermen's broadcast on the CBC never come to ask advice and to ask for information from my officials.'

MR. NEARY: He was only on thirty-nine times.

MR. CALLAN: And then, of course, when the CBC did a little bit of research they discovered, number one, that the reason that they could not have anybody on from the Minister of Fisheries' department is because everybody that went on had to be screened by the minister and quite often the minister was not around to yes or no. And, of course, the other thing that we discovered was that quite contrary to what the minister had said, he was only on a couple of times in a couple of years, he had been on thirty-nine times in eighteen months.

MR. TULK: All he was trying to do then was cover up for the Premier?

MR. NEARY: But these are the sorts of statements, Mr. Speaker, made by the Minister of Fisheries, and some of them also being made by the Premier, which are wrong, which are wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many members

MR. SIMMS: (Inaudible).

MR. CALLAN: I had that note. Mr. Speaker, I do not know how many members remember, about a year ago the Premier was on the airways and his rebuttal to the problem with the issuance of licences for fish plants, his



MR. CALLAN: they are both responsible, they are both responsible, Mr. Speaker, for making erratic, irrational and partly true, untrue statements. The Premier has gotten away with a lot of these statements, Mr. Speaker. The Premier has gotten away with a lot of them.

MR. NEARY: Irresponsible.

MR. CALLAN: And why somebody has not picked him up, I do not know. But he has gotten away with a lot of these statements. And, of course, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) is continuing, because the Minister of Fisheries loves to be in the press so much than whenever he is home, whenever he is home in this Province he has a press release, I think, every day that goes over his head.

MR. NEARY: He swings high and lo.

MR. CALLAN: And obviously anybody like the Minister of Fisheries who has his mouth open so much has to be shooting out some foolish nonsense and we saw it. And the Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, did not even have the common decency to either come into the House of Assembly, or publicly apologize to the people, the crew associated with the Fishermen's broadcast on the CBC Radio. Never even had the decency to apologize.

MR. NEARY: He went up to Toronto to check on his St. John's licences.

MR. CALLAN: So, Mr. Speaker, I reiterate -

MR. NEARY: He is not getting a licence.

MR. CALLAN: - I reiterate and I repeat what I said earlier, that even though I acknowledge, as other members have already done, that there are several and there are many problems associated with the fishery in this Province, I believe that one of the biggest problems

June 16, 1982

Tape No. 1401

IB-1

MR. CALLAN: next Wednesday so that is -

MR. CROSS: I would like to adjourn the debate.

MR. CALLAN: Well, that is great. We will all get out ten minutes early and that is good, especially for the farmers.

Mr. Speaker, I will be supporting the resolution.

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

MR. CROSS: Mr. Speaker, given the lateness of the hour, but close to six o'clock, I have a few remarks I would like to make. I would like to make them in their entirety in the one speech rather than have a broken one, so would it be in order if I adjourned the debate.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bonavista North (Mr. Cross) has adjourned the debate.

The Chair will deem it to be six of the clock and I will leave the Chair until three o'clock tomorrow, Thursday.

I N D E X

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

TABLED

JUNE 15 and 16, 1982

QUESTION: Mr. Hodder (Port au Port) to ask the Minister of Finance to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:  
 The cost of renovations to Minister's offices in the fiscal years 1979, 1980 and 1981.

ANSWER: There were no major renovations to the Minister's offices during the fiscal years 1979/80, 1980/81, and 1981/82. However, \$6,211 was expended for purchase and re-finishing of furniture as well as interior renovations to offices. The cost of these items is as follows:

1979/80	- Furniture	\$2,381	
1980/81	Furniture	\$1,206	
	Supply and instattation of vinyl wall covering	\$400	
	12 gals. paint @ \$10 per gallon	120	
	Paint labour	200	
	Supply and installation of carpét, 86 sq. yds.	1,204	
	@ \$14 (Estimate only, carpet was included in larger contract)		
	Re-finish office furniture	<u>700</u>	<u>3,830</u> \$6,211
1981/82	- NIL		

MAY 17, 1982

QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

QUESTION # 76: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) to ask the Minister of Public Works and Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (a) The number of buildings at Pleasantville owned by the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador or its agencies or crown corporations.
- (b) The present usage of these buildings
- (c) To whom they are leased
- (d) Their rental per annum
- (e) The total square feet in each unit rented

ANSWER:

Attached is a list of all buildings at Pleasantville owned by the Department of Public Works and Services. This list shows the occupants of each building, the annual rent received where this is applicable and the square footage area of each building.

Building No.	Present User	Leased To	Annual Rent	Square Footage
45	Dept. of Culture, Recrec. & Youth (Parks Division)	N/A	N/A	4,668
148	McDonalds Welding & Febrication Ltd.	Same	2,789.80	1,073
150	Dept. of Culture, Recreation & Youth (Records Centre)	N/A	N/A	16,886
151	Dept. of Social Services (Girls Home)	N/A	N/A	12,522
154	Dept. of Social Services (Girls Home Gym)	N/A	N/A	12,522
102	Vacant (scheduled for demolition)			
133	American Legion	Same	1.00	8,020
134	Kue Engineering Ltd.	Same	8,040.00	8,020
135	Dept. of Transportation	N/A	N/A	8,020
141	Dept. of Transportation	N/A	N/A	8,020
170	Dept. of Transportation	N/A	N/A	72,690
171	Dept. of Transportation	N/A	N/A	1,568

TORBAY BUILDINGS

Building No.	Present User	Leased To	Annual Rent	Square Footage
1	Dept. of Culture, Recreation & Youth	N/A	N/A	7,600
2	School for Deaf	N/A	N/A	16,200
3	Petroleum Directorate	N/A	N/A	600
	Police Benefit Assoc.	Same	1.00	5,000
	Sealand Helicopters	Same	1,260.00	1,260
5	Vacant (to be removed)			
10	Dept. of Justice	N/A	N/A	4,800
11	Dept. of Culture Recreation & Youth	N/A	N/A	15,350
	Avalon Archery Club	Same	1.00	
12	Dept. of Health	N/A	N/A	6,114
19	Dept. of Municipal Affairs	N/A	N/A	
	Dept. of Forest Resources & Lands	N/A	N/A	9,859
	Dept. of Culture, Recreation & Youth	N/A	N/A	
22	Dept. of Public Works & Services	N/A	N/A	750
24	S.P.C.A.	Same	1.00	930
25	Dept. of Culture, Recrea- tion & Youth	N/A	N/A	27,200
26	Dept. of Public Works & Services	N/A	N/A	1,954
38	School for Deaf	N/A	N/A	12,200
41	Fisheries College (Fire School)	N/A	N/A	2,878
43	School for Deaf	N/A	N/A	15,600
44	Dept. of Fisheries	N/A	N/A	10,800
	Various Gov't Departments	N/A	N/A	
46	Various Gov't Departments	N/A	N/A	21,400
47	Motor Registration	N/A	N/A	2,050

MAY 17, 1982

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

QUESTION: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) asked the Minister of Public Works and Services what involvement the Government had in providing for land involved in the construction of the new Newfoundland Hotel.

ANSWER: There was a parcel of land to the east of the present Newfoundland Hotel building which was included in a right-of-way but to which title was unclear. Normally, title to all rights-of-way within the city of St. John's belongs to the city.

To facilitate an absolutely clear title to the land, the Minister of Public Works and Services signed a document indicating that this Department did not have any interest or claim to the land in question.



MAY 31, 1982

QUESTIONS ASKED IN THE HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY:

QUESTION # 101: Mr. Hiscock (Eagle River) to ask the Honourable the Minister of Public Works and Services to lay upon the Table of the House the following information:

- (1) The cost to the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador to operate the Newfoundland Information Service; listing:
  - (a) the salaries of all employees;
  - (b) the cost of equipment used by N.I.S.
  - (c) the cost of electricity on a yearly basis;
  - (d) any other expenditures, such as travel, etc.
  - (e) the method used to select staff

and

- (2) The details of criteria set by the Ministry as to the use of N.I.S. by Members of the House of Assembly, and the Order in Council under which they were issued.

ANSWER: The salaries of the present employees of Newfoundland Information Service is as follows:

- (a)
  - (1) Director - \$30,244.00
  - (2) Information Officer - \$16,493.00
  - (3) Clerk Typist II - \$12,000.00
  - (4) Two Clerk II (Information Officers) Front Desk, Confederation Building - \$12,250.00 each.
- (b) The cost of equipment used at Newfoundland Information Service is \$52,600.00 per annum.
- (c) There is no separate electricity cost for this Division.
- (d) The annual travel bill for the Division is approximately \$1,200.00.