

Vol. 1

No. 41

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1982

The House met at 3:00 P.M.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Order, please!

Before we begin the business of the House this afternoon, it is a distinct pleasure for me to welcome to our galleries today the hon. Paul Dawson, Minister of Commerces and Development; the hon. Gerald Merithieu and Mrs. Merithieu (Mr. Merithieu is the Minister of Natural Resources), and Mr. Sean Tobin, who are here attending Marine '82 from the Province of New Brunswick along with a Trade Mission comprised of some thirty-five New Brunswick companies. On behalf of all the hon. members I indeed welcome you to our Legislature today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

STATEMENTS BY MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Labour and Manpower.

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, today I am releasing the report of the Labrador West Dust Study to the public and before releasing the report I wish to inform the hon. members on the findings and recommendations of the study.

Hon. members may recall that the study was approved by government in February, 1979, following evidence of pneumoconiosis among miners who worked at the iron ore mining operations in Western Labrador. Pneumoconiosis, I should point out, is described in the report as 'the accumulation of dust in the lungs and the non-cancerous tissue reaction to its presence'.

Following extensive dialogue with the two mining companies and the two union locals of the United Steelworkers of America, the Labrador Institute of Northern Studies of Memorial University was commissioned

MR. DINN: to co-ordinate the study and an agreement was entered into with the Labrador Institute of Northern Studies to carry out a comprehensive seven point study into the dust problems in the mining operations in Western Labrador. The seven points were as follows:

(I) An independent body be appointed to co-ordinate a comprehensive study into dust problems at the mining operations of Labrador City and the Wabush areas. (II) An independent consultant be engaged to analyze dust level monitoring techniques and results of tests conducted both by government and the mining companies. (III) The independent body referred to in (I) above to arrange for an independent engineering study if company engineering efforts have not achieved sufficient dust level reduction. (IV) An independent consultant undertake a medical reassessment of workers having reported diagnosed cases of dust related diseases.

MR. DINN: (V) An independent ambient air survey of the area be undertaken. (VI) A community health study be undertaken by specialized consultants, with special reference to respiratory diseases; and (VII) If, as a result of the independent ambient air study referred to in (V) and the community health study referred to in (VI) a health hazard exists or is recognized, a complete engineering study of all dust sources in the area be undertaken to enable the design of appropriate control equipment.

The study officially commenced in September 1979 and was completed in July 1982 at a cost of \$2,402,000. The study represents possibly the most major research ever conducted into the subject area in Canada and is expected to draw the attention of the international community insofar as the effects on dust control programmes in the mining and related dust exposure occupations is concerned.

The report consists of a total of 12 individual reports and is organized as follows: Level 1. Two executive summaries, including all findings, conclusions and recommendations of the study at the Iron Ore Company of Canada Operations and the Wabush Mines Operations.

Level 11. Detailed reports of specific points of the study as follows: Point 1. Study organization and administration; Point 11, Inplant dust study; Point 111, Engineering audit; Point 1V, Medical assessment; Point V, Ambient air study; Point VI, Community Health Study.

Level 111, All scientific reports and basic data banks gathered during the study, including statistics, records, computer printouts, etc. This information is being retained at the university for a minimum period of five years.

MR. DINN: Because of the voluminous nature of the complete report, I have provided you with copies of the Executive Summaries as these deal specifically with the findings, conclusions and recommendations. However, additional information contained in the level 11 and 111 reports is available to hon. members. These reports contain highly technical and detailed information leading to the findings and recommendations of the study.

The major finding of the study reveals additional cases of pneumoconiosis at both the Iron Ore Company of Canada and the Wabush operations.

MR.DINN:

In the case of the Iron Ore Company of Canada operations, 17 employees who had not been previously diagnosed or suspected of pneumoconiosis were identified. To put this in better perspective, the following statistics are quoted: The total workforce at IOCC was approximately 2,900; 2,435 employees met the criteria of at least three months continuous employment; 1,946 employees actually participated in the on-site examination phase of the study.

In the case of Wabush Mines, 10 employees who had not been previously diagnosed or suspected of pneumoconiosis were identified. At Wabush Mines the following statistics apply: The total workforce was approximately 700; 617 employees met the study criteria of at least three months continuous employment; 499 employees actually participated in the on-site examination of the study.

The study also concludes that if the workforce and dust conditions remain stable there are indications that an additional 5 to 10 new cases of pneumoconiosis can be anticipated at IOCC each year and 1 to 3 cases at Wabush Mines each year among the previously exposed workforce.

The clinical detection of these cases at a relatively early point in the life of the mining operations confirms the concerns which have been repeatedly expressed by the workers and others and more than fully justify the implementation of the recommendations in the report.

However, it was concluded that present health effects related to dust conditions were confined to occupational exposure only.

Community air quality as

MR. DINN: measured for a one year period was within the yearly guidelines defined in provincial legislation, although frequent short term "upset" conditions occurred. There is no evidence that the general respiratory health of the residents of Labrador City/Wabush has been affected by the mining, processing or waste disposal operations.

The report contains a total of 20 recommendations applying to both the Iron Ore Company of Canada and Wabush Mines operations. The recommendations indicate the measures which companies and government should take in order to control and/or eliminate the sources of dust in the mining operations. Principally these recommendations call for improved and standardized dust monitoring procedures; better medical surveillance of the workforce; improved maintenance and repair of existing dust control equipment; improved housekeeping and the close monitoring of both ambient air conditions and the health of residents in both communities.

MR. DINN:

As stated earlier, the total cost of the study is \$2,402,000 and government through the Workers' Compensation Board has paid the full amount under the authority of Section 62 of the Occupational Health and Safety Act. However, since the commencement of the study my department has consulted with the companies and unions with respect to their share of the cost and I can report that the Iron Ore Company of Canada have to date paid \$500,000 towards the cost of the study and have agreed to pay a further amount. Wabush Mines have not contributed to the study cost as yet and discussions held with senior executives of Wabush Mines this past weekend indicate they are reviewing their position on the basis of the results of the study and will confirm their commitment by December 15, 1982.

The union locals of the United Steelworkers of America in Labrador City and Wabush have been asked to contribute a nominal amount towards the cost of the study. The nominal amount, by the way, Mr. Speaker, is \$5,000 per local.

I believe it is obvious from this report that the Labrador Institute of Northern Studies has done a thorough and extensive job of assessing the extent of the dust problem and I want to commend the Labrador Institute of Northern Studies on behalf of government for their efforts. In acknowledging the contribution to the study, I would also recognize the impressive team of consultants and the study personnel that was brought together to participate in this study. They represent some of the leading scientific professional and technical people in the country. I should also make special mention of the staff of our own Memorial University, who contributed in a major way, and thank the companies and unions for their

MR. DINN: outstanding co-operation
during all phases of the study.

I am confident that with the implementation of the recommendations in the report, the dust problem in the mines in Western Labrador will be brought under control.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, let me simply say that we on this side of the House certainly welcome this study, long overdue though it may be, and I expect many of us would wish - pardon the pun - that there was more dust flying in Labrador West today than there was when the study was initiated. I certainly hope that the fact that there is a temporary turn-down with respect to markets for iron ore will not at all diminish the efforts of the government to ensure that the recommendations of the study are carried out by the companies concerned so that we can make both these mines safe places for the workers involved.

MR. T. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, we certainly welcome this report. We certainly hope, again, that this dust study does not become a further dust problem in becoming the dust collector. We hope, and I want to emphasize that, we certainly hope that the government intend to see that every recommendation is carried out to the Nth degree for the benefit of the workers because the study certainly verifies that there is a health problem. We commend the minister for having the study done and we can only hope now that the recommendations will be acted upon promptly and immediately. It is disappointing, Mr. Speaker, to hear that one of the mines involved, Wabush Mines, has not yet seen fit to come up with their portion of the money, and again we hope that this will be forthcoming. It is the company's responsibility, I believe - both companies - to have shared the major portion of the cost of this study and I certainly hope again that the government will pressure this company into paying their just amount. I am not so sure that the unions should be forced to pay, I am not sure it is their problem, but again the minister has only mentioned a nominal amount and I do not see this as much of a problem. But certainly Wabush Mines should be forced to pay their share of the cost of this study. So, Mr. Speaker, in conclusion we on this side of the House, and I am sure along with all people in Newfoundland and Labrador, welcome this study and hope that its recommendations will be acted upon promptly and immediately.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): Are there any more Ministerial Statements?

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. S. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the

MR. S. NEARY: Government House Leader (Mr. Wm. Marshall) could inform the House how the government intends to deal with the statement on the economy and the financial mess that the administration has gotten us into in this Province in the last year? Could the hon. gentleman tell us what format will be used to make that presentation to the House tomorrow?

MR. WM. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, I will ignore the hon. gentleman's reference to the mess. I wish I could ignore the hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, the government will be presenting an economic statement to the House and this will be dealt with in accordance with the normal way that statements are dealt with, and then the normal business of the House will give adequate opportunity for inquiry into the statement and examination of the statement.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, do I understand from the hon. gentleman that how the government intend to handle this is via a Ministerial Statement procedure? Is that correct? Is it just going to be a Ministerial Statement on this matter or is the hon. gentleman going to ask for unanimous leave of the House to have a statement by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and then a debate on that statement? Because obviously it is going to be a very controversial statement, and we would like to have an opportunity to respond or to ask questions of the minister? Or will it be brought in the form of a mini-Budget or a fullfledged Budget? How does the hon. gentleman intend to deal with it?

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, we will be dealing with the matter. I can say to the hon. gentleman that thanks to the reforms that took place as a result of this party taking over the administration some ten years ago and since, there is now adequate opportunity in this House at all times to debate matters of public importance and, of course, the economic statement is a matter of public importance. I am not going to say at the present time specifically what procedures are available because that is up to the Minister of Finance when he makes his statement tomorrow. If I made certain statements as to specifically how it will be handled I would be tipping the hon. Minister of Finance's hand and I certainly would not want to tip the hon. Minister of Finance's hand, because he is quite capable of announcing these things himself.

MR. MARSHALL: But the thing that I would like to impress, Mr. Speaker, is that we in this government, as we always have, will be bringing the statement of the financial affairs of the Province openly before the public through the people's House, the House of Assembly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MARSHALL: And as a result of bringing democracy back to Newfoundland there will be adequate opportunity, from the rules that have been brought in by this administration, to debate it and examine it as thoroughly as is necessary.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman says out of one corner of his mouth, this is the crowd that brought democracy back to Newfoundland, and then he tells us it is a top secret. It is a secret today, the eve of this statement on the economy, the hon. gentleman tells us it is a secret of how the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) is going to make the statement to the House. Well, perhaps the hon. Minister of Finance can tell us how he intends to make that presentation to the House. Is it going to be in the form of a Ministerial Statement or is the hon. gentleman going to ask leave of the House to debate a matter of urgent public importance? Get your act together.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. NEARY: Perhaps the hon. Minister of Finance can tell us how he intends to deal with this matter. I mean a statement of this magnitude, Mr. Speaker, of this importance warrants more than just a routine Ministerial Statement.

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

MR. MARSHALL: I did not say there was any secret as to how the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) was going to do it. The Minister of Finance was going, I said, to give an economic statement. The Minister of Finance gives an economic statement from the minister; ergo, therefore, it is a Ministerial Statement which will be given. Now there is no secret about it, Mr. Speaker. The only secret is in the minds of the Opposition as to how they will deal with it. What I am trying to point out to the Opposition is that there is adequate and there will be adequate opportunity through availing of the normal rules of this House for the Opposition to discharge its duty, however it foresees its duty, to inquire into the financial affairs. There will be a full revelation of the financial affairs through the established procedures of this House.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: That is not good enough, Mr. Speaker.

MR. MARSHALL: Well, that is too bad.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, Statements by Ministers, let me show hon. gentlemen what the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) is going to force this House to do. Statements by Ministers have now been given a recognized place in routine proceedings. The standard order is specific but considerable latitude has been left to the Speaker to set limits on the participants.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I will remind the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) that we only have thirty minutes for the Question Period. And it appears to the Chair that he is attempting to get into a debate and make a speech

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): on what is certainly an important topic, but I certainly request him to be more specific with his questions.

The hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Well perhaps Your Honour should give the House some directions as to how we should deal with this matter. Is the Government House Leader (Mr. Marshall) aware -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. NEARY: Is the Government House Leader aware that the Speaker can only allow brief comment and a few questions of the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) on any Ministerial Statement? And if the Ministerial Statement, Your Honour, conveys or encourages debate, that the hon. gentleman is not permitted to make that kind of a statement during Statements by Ministers. And, Mr. Speaker, it is not good enough. Can the hon. gentleman tell us, be more specific, can the hon. gentleman be more specific, Mr. Speaker, on how we can debate this matter, a statement on the economy, how the Opposition can debate it tomorrow, not the next day or the day after or under routine business of the House? Will we get an opportunity on tomorrow to debate that statement?

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

MR. MARSHALL: It is not my task or my duty or my inclination, Mr. Speaker, to tutor the Opposition on how they conduct their affairs in this House. But all I have said, and I mean it, is that there is going to be a full revelation of the financial position of this Province by the Minister of Finance. That will be done in accordance with the rules of this House. There will be quite adequate opportunity for the hon. gentleman -

MR. NEARY: When will we get the opportunity?

MR. MARSHALL: I will just give one example, there are many examples but I will just give one example, it is foreign to the hon. gentlemen because they never had a Question Period in the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on.

MR. MARSHALL: This is one area. The only House in Christendom, in the British parliamentary system anyway, certainly, where there was not a Question Period. When we were over

MR. MARSHALL: on the opposite side of the House, if you got up and asked a question-you were not allowed up -but if you managed to sneak up on your feet and some well-meaning minister would get up and try to answer a question,they would be trampled on and told to sit down. There was no question period. So question period is one, but there are many other avenues, Mr. Speaker, there are many other avenues that are available. If there is one thing that this administration is not laxabout it is giving full and complete opportunity forthere to be full revelation of the financial situation of the Province, and a full debate of it by all elected representatives and responsible people in society.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: The hon. Premier picked the right man to be his hatchet man when he picked the hon. gentleman. The hon. gentleman is pooh-poohing this now the same as he pooh-poohed the Ocean Ranger information that was given to him in January of last year that could have prevented anaccident offshore. He is pooh-poohing this the same way.

So, Mr. Speaker, let me ask the hon. gentleman, in fairness to the people of this Province, to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, will the hon. gentleman undertake to have the regular order of business of this House suspended tomorrow so that we can deal with a matter of urgent public importance, namely, a statement on the economy, so that the House will be given an opportunity tomorrow, not the next day or the day after, but on tomorrow to debate this very important matter?

MR. MORGAN: What about Saturday and Sunday?

MR. WARREN: Yes, if you people want to stay here.

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

MR. MARSHALL: Mr. Speaker, this government, as I say, has provided an adequate opportunity for the full debate of every matter that comes before it, and I am not by way of giving undertakings or taking directions from the hon. gentleman there opposite. If the hon. gentleman cannot use the rules of the House in the way in which they have been set out for us -

MR. NEARY: What arrogance! Why do you not let television cameras into the House?

MR. MARSHALL: - that give them an opportunity to examine into the affairs of the Province, to ask questions, to comment and what have you. But I want to again assure the hon. member that, as we have done in the past, we will give adequate opportunity through the rules of this House, the accepted procedures for their to be an opportunity for full and complete examination.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I have a question or two for the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge). The minister will recall that last Spring when the budget was brought down it was announced that there was going to be \$12 million allocated for new facilities for the reorganized high school programme. There was quite a furor throughout the Province among school boards,

MR. LUSH: which expressed deep concern that this amount of money might not be sufficient to take care of the needs for bringing in the high school programme, particularly with respect to school construction. Now, of course, that we are into the first year of the reorganized high school programme, I wonder if the minister could indicate whether any problems have surfaced to indicate that this \$12 million was indeed insufficient to meet the built in requirements for the programme?

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

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, this is actually the second year of the reorganized high school programme. It began in the last school year, 1981-1982, at the Grade X level. It will be fully implemented in the next school year, 1983 - 1984, when the first of our students to complete the programme will graduate from Grade XII.

The programme has been received very well. The total amount of money provided by government to expand high school facilities to accommodate the programme was \$20.3 million provided in three instalments over three fiscal years. In the present fiscal year the bulk of the money, or \$12 million, was provided. The final instalment of \$3 million will be provided next year.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that \$20.3 million of government money was designed to build classrooms to accommodate the extra students who will be in school because of the extra grade starting next year, but also to build what are called programme support rooms such as libraries, multi-purpose rooms for subjects such as art and home economics, as well as laboratories. In fact, about 60 per cent of the money is designed for

MS.VERGE: going to have to have new schools and those are decisions to be made by the church authorities with the money to be provided by government. But it has to be stressed that the pressure on school authorities in Mount Pearl - Newtown and Conception Bay South is not created by the reorganized high school programme. It is created by the overall population growth in those areas. And those areas, Mr. Speaker, are the exceptions. The rule across the Province is student enrolment decline, and this decline is coinciding with the phase-in of the reorganized high school programme, and classroom space which had become freed up because of the decline will be used in part to accommodate the Grade XII students as well as the new facilities being built costing \$20.3 million worth of government money.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I apologize for having said that it was the first year of the high school programme when the minister says it is the second year. But judging from the ignorance on the other side one would have thought it had not begun at all. By the first year we meant, of course, it was the first year there was any retention of students, that it was the first year that we had gone into Grade XII. But, Mr. Speaker, in view of the government cutbacks, in view of the deficit, can the minister assure this House that there will be no cutbacks in the \$12 million that have already been allocated for the grade XII, for the new reorganized high school programme and that there will be no cutbacks in this year to further impede the introduction of this programme?

MR.SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Education.

MS.VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I can give that assurance. The \$20 million of government money for constructions of high schools has already been paid and construction projects are underway using that money. And I have to emphasize that the \$12 million is only part of the government money for new facilities for the high school programmes. It is the second installment and the total being paid in three installments is \$20.3 million and that is over and above government grants for other construction needs. In that category we are providing \$10.8 million this year, so the total government money to the churches for school construction this present fiscal year, which is in the process of being spent, is \$22.8 million. And, Mr. Speaker, to repeat this is the second year of the reorganized high school programme. Students now in grades X and XI are participating in that programme and it will be next year, 1983-84 that the Province will see the first grade XII graduates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. T. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could inform the House as to whether or not there will be any cutbacks in any department in Education in this fiscal year? Will there be any cutbacks anywhere in terms of reduction in programmes, reduction of staff, whether there will be any cutbacks at all?

MS. L. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Finance (Dr. J. Collins) will be announcing to this Hon. House tomorrow adjustments that are being made to the budgets of all government departments and I will be happy to comment on that statement once it is made by my colleague.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Ask her when we will get a copy of the Ministerial Statement.

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

The hon. the member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister can indicate whether there will be any cutbacks with vocational schools throughout this Province, either with respect to staff, support staff, teachers, instructors and programmes? Will there be any cutbacks in those areas?

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I have already answered that question. The Minister of Finance will give his statement tomorrow dealing with adjustments to the budget for the Department of Education and all divisions of the Department of Education, and after that statement is

MS. L. VERGE: made, Mr. Speaker, I will be happy to expand on any of its contents relating to the Department of Education.

MR. T. LUSH: A further supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the minister says that whatever cutbacks or whatever measures that will be taken in Education will be announced tomorrow. It seems as though we have already heard through the news media about some cutbacks, and I wonder if the minister can indicate whether or not there will any cutbacks in adult and continuing education?

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker.

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

MS. VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I am happy for the opportunity to comment on some erroneous reports carried by the news media. There never has been and there is not now any intention on the part of the government or the Department of Education to end the successful programme being run at the Leonard A. Millier Center for handicapped adults to get the equivalent of elementary school and highschool educations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MS. VERGE: That programme is being operated by the Education Department in co-operation with the Department of Social Services, as well as the Canadian Paraplegic Association and the Hub, and it now has about fifty or sixty students. Mr. Speaker, there is one full-time instructor and a number of part-time instructors. That programme will continue. There never has been any intention of ending that programme.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. LUSH: Well, Mr. Speaker, I

MR. LUSH: thank the minister for the answer. I have been asking the questions the wrong way apparently, so I will rephrase my question again about the vocational school. Is there any truth to the fact that the Department of Education plan to have cutbacks in vocational education in terms of instructors and the programmes offered?

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

MS VERGE: Mr. Speaker, I have to say again that we will have to wait for the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) to give his statement tomorrow. It is only a day away and then the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) can ask all the questions he wants about the contents of that statement; because we all know what the statement is and I will be able to elaborate on it and answer all kinds of questions about the budget of the department.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Premier. When I was on my way to the House of Assembly today, I received an invitation to a function tonight. And I want to ask the Premier, in light of the fact that we are cutting back on the sick and the elderly and while we punish people in the Province, many of whom already are below the poverty line, can it be that on the eve of a financial statement which is cutting back on the finances of this Province that there is a cocktail reception between 7:30 and 9:30 tonight at the Fort William room? Can the Premier explain this?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Yes, Mr. Speaker. I wish to thank the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) for asking that question. It gives me a great opportunity to respond.

First of all, I want to go on record in this hon. House, Mr. Speaker, as congratulating the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) and the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) for a fantastic exhibition downtown that I opened this morning.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: It is the first real attempt on behalf of this Province to assert itself in the marine technology business of North America and of the World, and this will be one, to be followed by many others, that we will sponsor over the next few years to ensure that Newfoundlanders and Labradorians get their fair share of the marine technology jobs, the offshore jobs, the fishery jobs, and that we become in the forefront of high technology in the marine field. I am very grateful for the great work that the Department of Development and the Department of Fisheries have done.

So, Mr. Speaker, that, I think, stands us in good stead and is a shining light on what the government is trying to do to enhance our opportunities in the future.

PREMIER PECKFORD: A couple of weeks ago, it came to the Minister of Development's (Mr. Windsor) attention and the Minister of Fisheries' (Mr. Morgan) attention, that we have this great exhibition underway and it is extremely vital and necessary for it to go ahead, but they came to me and came to Cabinet and said, 'This must go ahead, we believe, Mr. Premier; all the contracts have been let and all the work has been done and it is very beneficial anyway for the Province to be involved in it. However, there may be some areas where we should try to cut back and try to demonstrate some leadership in restraint in this Province.' And I said, 'Yes, I think so.'

And therefore as a result of that we have cut back the exhibition in every place we could all through it. Then we decided that the reception should go ahead. A lot of people from all over the Province are here - there are exhibitions from the town of Botwood, from Deer Lake and Pasadena and Corner Brook and Gander and Stephenville - there are a lot of areas of the Province which are taking up the initiative. We have people here from New Brunswick, from Nova Scotia, Prince Edward Island, from all over the world besides Canada. So we decided that we would cancel the cocktail party -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: - we would have the reception, but we would have no cocktails at the reception, to show leadership and restraint.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: I would submit to the hon. member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) that the only spirit that he can show was here in the House of Assembly today.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. member for
Port au Port.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I am glad I
found out that the cocktail party was cancelled, and
perhaps the Premier should have made it public to all those
who received invitations.

MR. NEARY: He cancelled it after I
mentioned it this morning on the radio.

MR. WARREN: That is right. Right on!

MR. HODDER: Yes.

MR. NEARY: After I mentioned it this
morning on the radio.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, I note -

MR. TOBIN: He will not show up now there are no cocktails.

MR. MORGAN: He will not come where there is no booze.

MR. WARREN: You will not
be there either.

MR. HODDER: I note in the Public Accounts
report for the year 1981 that the government has spent
\$237,000.95 on official entertainment. Mr. Speaker, I would
ask the Premier whether we will be cutting back on all official
entertainment which the Province has been hosting in the
coming year?

MR. NEARY: You will have to wait for the Minister
of Finance.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, besides the cocktails
being cancelled, there was some food to be served this evening
as well and that has been cut in half, and that will only
be a tidbit, it will not be a meal or anything like that - that
has all been cut out - to show how leadership in that regard.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, as it relates to other areas of government, of the Legislature, of the work of the Opposition, the work of the Department of Education, the work of the Department of Development, the work of the Department of Justice, the work of the Department of Fisheries, every single area of government has been under scrutiny by the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) and Treasury Board over the last while and tomorrow the Minister of Finance will outline the kind of restraint measures that we wish to institute and how all of us together have to try to participate in that for the benefit of Newfoundland and Newfoundland in the future.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

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

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, I have a question for the Premier. In view of the absence of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) -

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) he has covered up too long.

MR. WARREN: - the Minister of Social Services, I have not seen him in the House the last three days, he may be sick or something.

MR. MARSHALL: You cannot blame him.

PREMIER PECKFORD: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

PREMIER PECKFORD: Is the hon. member for Torngat Mountains asking me a question?

MR. WARREN: Yes.

PREMIER PECKFORD: Well, would he ask his leader to be quiet so I can hear him?

MR. WARREN: You could ask him that.

MR. NEARY: How childish can you get. You talk about arrogance.

MR. WARREN: Mr. Speaker, my question is to the Premier, in the absence of his Minister of Social Services whom I have not seen in the House for the last three or four days, I understand that the Social Services Department announced on October 1 some thirteen changes to be made in the social assistance programme. Are those thirteen changes presently in effect?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD: The Social Services Department, like all the other departments of government, have been under scrutiny. There was an experiment tried by the Minister of Social Services in certain areas of his department. By the way, the Minister of Social Services is not in his seat and the hon. member pointed that out, he did not go on to ask where he was, he just wanted to leave it -

MR. WARREN: I asked the leader.

PREMIER PECKFORD: So of course the Minister of Social Services is not here because he wants to be absent, he is not doing his job as Minister of Social Services and all of that which could be implied by the way the hon. member indicated the absence of the Minister of Social Services. The Minister of Social Services, for information purposes, Mr. Speaker, is the Chairman for Canada of all the Social Services Ministers and is away participating as Chairman for all the Ministers of Social Services in Canada right now. That is where the Minister of Social Services is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PREMIER PECKFORD: The proposals that were put forward by the Minister of Social Services on the 1st. of October have now been reviewed by the Social Services Department. The Minister of Social Services has met with all his regional administrators in all areas of the Province, debated them with social workers, with his regional administrators and now there are some refinements to those regulations which will be going into effect over the next few weeks in line with the statement of tomorrow.

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

MR. WARREN: Yes, Mr. Speaker, a supplementary to the Premier. Could the Premier advise the hon. House now that if a widow has an eighteen year old son living under the same roof with her, is there "x" number of dollars deducted off the widow's cheque each month because this eighteen year

MR. WARREN: old son or daughter is presently living in the same house?

MR. NEARY: Thirty-five dollars.

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

PREMIER PECKFORD: Mr. Speaker, now the hon.

member is falling into the same trap as some of his friends earlier fell into and that is the details of programmes in all the departments - after the statement tomorrow the hon. member will have the opportunity to ask questions of the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey), or in his absence myself, or any other minister who is familiar with it, and we will be able to answer them. Obviously

PREMIER PECKFORD: the kind of detail involving that will become known after tomorrow's statement when the various ministers indicate, under questioning from the Opposition, or voluntarily giving information as it relates to the administration of their departments, and how the statement is applied to that particular department.

MR. NEARY: That will be the day, when they volunteer information.

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

MR. HODDER: Is not the Premier going to answer my hon. friend's question?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!
The Chair recognizes the hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: My question is to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Young). Could the Minister of Public Works please inform this House does the government have a real estate value on Mount Scio House and what is that value?

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

MR. YOUNG: Mr. Speaker, I would prefer if he would p that on the Order Paper. It is not for immediate reply.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the member for Eagle River.

MR. HISCOCK: A question also to the Minister of Public Works and Services. Could the Minister of Public Works and Services inform this House if the Cabinet Ministers are now getting word processors in their offices and if they have them or if they are on order?

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

MR. YOUNG: He will have to ask each individual Cabinet Minister because I have nothing to do with the office votes of the different departments.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a week or ten days ago I wrote the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) and asked the minister if the budget, the provincial part of the budget for the Ocean Ranger Inquiry had been completed and if I could have a copy. The hon. gentleman wrote me back and told me that the budget was not yet finalized. Would the hon. gentleman tell the House now if the budget for the Province's share of the Ocean Ranger Inquiry is finished and if so could we have a copy tabled in this House?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Justice.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, certainly if the budget were completed I would certainly make a copy available to this House, obviously it is public funds and the House and public have full right to it, but the situation now is the same as it was when I wrote the hon. Leader of the Opposition about a week ago, Budgetary discussions are still going on because really one cannot separate the Province's share from the federal share because it is 50/50. So really the whole budget has to be finalized and then it is just divided by half, the cost to both governments. But it is still under formulation, under discussion, under negotiations and not finalized yet. But when it is finalized, certainly I will undertake to make it available.

MR. NEARY: Supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Supplementary, the hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, that seems to be very peculiar since the commission is functioning and has been functioning now for the last few months and been holding

MR. NEARY: public hearings in the last couple of weeks. Is the hon. gentleman telling the House that they are not aware of what the final budget will be for the Ocean Ranger Commission of Enquiry at this particular point in time? I managed to get some figures from Ottawa. Is the hon. gentleman telling the House that he does not know how much pay or salary the provincial appointees will be paid, how much the legal counsel that is being appointed by the Province will be paid? Is that what the hon. gentleman is telling us? Or does the Ocean Ranger Commission of Enquiry have a blank cheque as far as the Province is concerned?

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

MR. OTTENHEIMER: Mr. Speaker, the Ocean Ranger Enquiry budget has to be approved by both the federal government and the provincial government.

MR. NEARY: Ottawa has already approved theirs.

MR. OTTENHEIMER: There has been no final approval of the budget by this Province. Now what the federal government has done I would not necessarily be privy to, but there has been no final approval of the budget for this fiscal year by the Province. That is all I can say there. Obviously money has been expended, but there is no final budgetary figure for this fiscal year. I cannot give that figure because it is not known.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The time for Question Period has expired.

PRESENTING REPORTS BY STANDING AND SPECIAL COMMITTEES

MR.SPEAKER (Russell): The hon. Minister of Culture
Recreation and Youth.

MR.SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, in accordance
with Section 15 of the Arts Council Act I want to
table the annual report of the Newfoundland and
Labrador Arts Council for the year ending March 31,1982.

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ORDERS OF THE DAY

MR.SPEAKER: It being Private Member's Day,
we shall proceed with Motion No. 7, which was moved
by the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr.Hearn).
I think that the hon. member for Port Au Port
(Mr. Hodder) adjourned the debate last week. He spoke
for seven minutes and he has thirteen minutes left.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker,

MR. HODDER: the fishing industry in this Province is a very sick creature indeed.

MR. NEARY: Hear, hear!

MR. HODDER: Even the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan), as late as this morning, on the public airwaves acknowledged the fact that we were in desperate trouble with three fish companies in financial straits from which they may not recover.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, which we are debating today, is timely indeed, as it comes at a time when we are facing the worst crisis in the fishing industry since 1968.

Mr. Speaker, why is it that this government, which is primarily responsible to the people of the Province, which is responsible to the fishermen of the Province and to the Newfoundland people as a whole, that this government has allowed the fishery to fall into such a state? If we look at the policy papers which have been put forward by the Department of Fisheries, their plans and their statements since 1970 when they first took power, one would find no consistent policy -

MR. BAIRD: Joey would not (inaudible) remember?

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, if I might, I would like to be heard in silence.

This government has now been in power for ten years. I make no apology for anything that happened before, but I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that there has been no consistent policy. There was probably more of a consistent policy and philosophy before this government took power than there is at the present time.

MR. HODDER: One merely finds in the past ten years, and I have been here for some six of those, that the government has reacted from crisis to crisis on a day-to-day basis.

Now, at the present time, the great hope is the Kirby Task Force. The minister has made no comment on the Kirby Task Force, except to tell us that he has information as to what it says. He said that here in the House when he spoke on Private Members Day, the last day when we were speaking. But, Mr. Speaker, I think I can predict what the minister's actions will be. The minister will embrace the Kirby Task Force and its recommendations because he is hoping, and probably knows, that it will offer relief to the situation which we now experience. But,

MR. J. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, when the political pressure comes on the minister - because change always brings political pressure and change always brings discontent, and there will be discontented people in this Province once the findings of the Kirby Task Force are made public, and the recommendations and the decisions, which the federal government will make. There will be discontent in this Province. There will be some people who will feel it is the right thing but there will be upheaval - at that time, Mr. Speaker, I predict that the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. J. Morgan) will then turn on every flaw and follow the winds of change, because the minister has demonstrated over the past three or four years that he always reacts to what is happening at the time, but has never had a consistent philosophy as to where he wants to go and what he wants to do with the fishery in this Province.

Mr. Speaker, it is my belief that this Province, Newfoundland and Labrador, must have a long term strategy, one that is not only formulated but debated at length and which has the support of the fishermen, of the Fishermen's Union, of the processors and all of the people who are involved with the fishery in this Province. We often talk about how important the industry is but we very often treat the fishery with contempt. I believe that the fishery can and must be the salvation of the Province, and I think that the leaders of this Province, the government of this Province, must put the fishing industry as a number one priority. I do not believe the Premier when he says that the oil will cure our fishery, that we will take revenues from the oil and use them to improve the fishing industry in the Province. That approach is wrong. The fishery must stand on its own feet. It cannot be subsidized,

MR. J. HODDER: it cannot be helped from outside sources. We must implement policies and controls which will work in the fishing industry. We have the product, we have people who are able and willing and who wish to harvest that product, and we have the markets, Mr. Speaker. We have all the ingredients for a successful industry. We have all the ability that Iceland, which is a country that has successfully lived and has one of the highest standards of living in this world and their primary industry is the fishery, and we have the same tools at our fingertips. However, we must do something that we have not been doing; we must pay particular attention to the fishery. I see it in my own riding, which is a fishing area, where the Province has totally, absolutely neglected the fishery. We have neglected the markets, which I think, Mr. Speaker - forgetting the superfluous as far as the neglect in the fishery is concerned like trying to give the fishermen a good return on his dollar—we have

MR. HODDER: not in this Province developed marketing and marketing strategy or tried to develop markets.

MR. NEARY: Right on.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, let us look at the recent history of the fishery. In 1968 and 1969, and in 1974, 1975, and at the present time, the prices dropped in the United States, and the markets dried up, and inventories each one of those times has happened at present, have built up. On both occasions in the past, Mr. Speaker, the response was to bail out the fishing companies.

MR. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HODDER: Surely, Mr. Speaker, we have learned our lesson.

MR. NEARY: Things have not changed in thirty-five years.

MR. HODDER: I can remember as a small boy, Mr. Speaker, listening to the news-or as a young man, I suppose, going to the University-listening to the news of how the government, and it was not this government at the time, was bailing out the fishing industry; but this government has bailed out the fishing industry. They did it in 1974 and 1975.

MR. NEARY: Still is.

MR. HODDER: But, Mr. Speaker, if we simply follow that course again we will be forced in the next five years into the same situation. Why is it that by the Minister of Fisheries' (Mr. Morgan) own admission last Wednesday when I accused him of having no marketing strategy and having no Marketing Department, when I brought up in an off-the-cuff speech about my efforts to have some smelt which were being caught on the West Coast marketed, and I tried to find the Marketing Department it was not in the book, I phoned

MR. HODDER: the deputy minister and he gave me a name, and they came back and said I should find a market myself and gave me a list of names. And, Mr. Speaker, the minister's response around five minutes to six on last Wednesday was that that must have been more than three years ago.

Mr. Speaker, what we reap now is what we have sown. For the past ten years we have been allowing things to go by, we have been drifting from crisis to crisis. You know, Norway and Iceland together, both countries, Norway and Iceland together have only five exporters of fish products, while in my district and in the surrounding areas we have National Sea, T. J. Hardy, Clearwater Sea Products, Bay St. George Fisheries, there is another one over in St. Georges, and we have Pike's Limited, which I am not sure about, but all of those companies are involved in marketing, in foreign marketing. But yet in the successful countries they only have five companies in all of Norway and all of Iceland, both very successful countries on the world markets, with only five companies that are in the export business. Yet, Mr. Speaker, you can pick any

MR. HODDER:

little jut of land or any bay in this Province and you will find six or seven processors.

Mr. Speaker, all of the companies in my district, all six companies that are buying fish in the district of Port au Port, are buying fish from a total population of somewhere around 25,000 people and not one of them - except perhaps one of them may - has the expertise to do the marketing.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, if this government has ever given any consideration to consolidated marketing such as we see today in Norway and Iceland, or have we thought of anything like the Saltpish Corporation, which has operated since it was formed and marketed salt fish products in this Province without any government assistance at all?

I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, if the fish companies in this Province have demonstrated that they can market their product successfully, and I believe that perhaps we should do something along the lines of the Saltpish Corporation.

I also very much like the idea that the Newfoundland Fish, Food and Allied Workers, the Fishermen's Union have when they have on a number of occasions made proposals whereby we set up an agency which would buy from the fishermen and then distribute to the various buyers in the Province.

Mr. Speaker, surely something of a logical nature must be done with the fishery. In addition, I feel, Mr. Speaker, that we have to limit the number of processors' licences which the provincial government have given out in this Province. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, why they do it, but every time

MR. HODDER: a community decides that they want a processors' licence and starts clamouring for it, they give it out, and then, when the plants cannot hire or the plants cannot process the fish, they say, 'Well, the federal government is in charge of the quotas and it is their fault.' But, Mr. Speaker, if the fish is out there then we can catch it; if it is not there, someone has to limit the fish. We just cannot go out and do what has been done in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and clean the fish out so that the stocks cannot regenerate themselves, or have not shown a tendency to regenerate themselves in the past four or five years.

MR. HODDER:

So, Mr. Speaker, when we put fish plants in areas, and then when people start crying because they do not have processing jobs, or there are no jobs for them, and then blame it on the federal government because of the quotas, what we have done in the first place is to set up a false economy, set up false hopes in people and a waste of money by putting the plants there.

Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) should realize that there is only so much fish out there. And he must realize that over the years he is guilty, as he is the one who has given the licences to plants in every part of this Province. As I stated before, Mr. Speaker, when I was talking about the Bay St. George area of the Province, there are only 25,000 people in the area, and yet we find that no one who is connected with the fishery in that area of 25,000, not one person is making a good living, not one person is above the poverty line. There may be one person in the whole of Bay St. George who happens to be a scallop fisherman who has a licence - who may be above the poverty line as far as his earnings are concerned.

In my district, National Sea has a plant in Piccadilly - and I use this only as an illustration - they hire people from the surrounding areas to process the fish, yet it is only a break even operation. They now have a situation where they hire only for stamps. And yet in that area we have the T.J. Hardy operation who is buying fish in Fox Island River and shipping it out. We have Pike's Limited there, who seem to be operating on DREE grants because whenever the DREE grant runs out they seem to go down. Clearwater Fisheries are there. They are wonderful.

MR. HODDER: Here we have a plant - you see, business only goes where it can make money, and if they cannot make money they leave. People are not in business in order to have a deficit. They are in business to make profits and I believe in that, Mr. Speaker. I do not know if gentlemen opposite believe in it, but when the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) allowed Clearwater Fisheries to go in on the Port au Port Peninsula and take away the most lucrative fishery that we have and ship it off to the Bedford Basin in Nova Scotia, then, Mr. Speaker, I feel that a great blow was struck at the one industry that we had.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

MR. HODDER: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I must inform the hon.

member that his time has elapsed.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker, that is highly irregular since usually I get a note to let me know that.

MR. STAGG: We will give you about one minute.

MR. SPEAKER: You have already had several minutes extra now.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave. By leave.

MR. SPEAKER: By leave?

MR. BAIRD: No.

MR. HODDER: Mr. Speaker -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Leave has not been granted.

MR. FAIRD: Carry on.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! By leave. The hon. member has leave.

The hon. member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the member for Humber West (Mr. Baird), and the member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) among others.

Mr. Speaker, we have a number of small fishermen, people who have dreams and aspirations, around the Province, people who are struggling to keep their plants going, but Mr. Speaker, the falseness of the whole situation is that there is just not the population base, nor the resource base for the number of licences that have been given out.

MR. HODDER:

Perhaps, Mr. Speaker, when you see a situation where the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) allows a company like the Nova Scotian company, Clearwater Lobsters, to go in and take the most lucrative fishery away and to take it over to Nova Scotia, perhaps he must believe the Premier's statement, which he made during the 1980 fishery strike and lockout, that he would rather have 20,000 Newfoundlanders making \$5,000 a year than 10,000 Newfoundlanders making \$10,000, because that is precisely what is happening in many areas of this Province. And when I fight for expansion and when I go and sit down at National Sea headquarters and I say, 'I want this plant expanded. It is the only industry in this particular area of the Province. I would like to see it expanded.' And they look at me and they say, 'Well, we have not made a profit in the last five years.' And I say, 'Well, why have you not made a profit? Have you not got a fishing operation?' 'No. We just cannot get our hands on all the fish and we cannot make a profit with the number of people who are supplying us.' We have had Clearwater Lobsters come in and take the most valuable species away. We have a Minister of Fisheries who allows a DREE grant to go ahead in Fox Island River for T.J. Hardy to put a water supply in so they can supply ice, and then T.J. Hardy neither processes nor supplies ice to the fishermen. No, Mr. Speaker, that is government planning. Mr. Speaker, we must insure that the -

MR.MORGAN: I understand he needs leave of the House in a unanimous way to carry on debate.

MR.SPEAKER (Aylward): That is correct.

MR.CARTER: It was given unanimously. Take it away.

MR.MORGAN: It is withdrawn, Mr.Speaker.

MR.NEARY: No. No. No.

MR.MORGAN: It is withdrawn, that is what I just said.

MR.SPEAKER: Leave is withdrawn. The hon. Leader of the Opposition on a point of order?

MR.NEARY: No.

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

SOME HON.MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR.TOBIN: Mr.Speaker, I would like to commend my colleague from St.Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) for introducing this resolution that is indeed important to all of Newfoundland and certainly to my district.

I would like to say that I believe the hon. member for Port Au Port (Mr.Hodder) is certainly confused as it relates to the fishing industry and the fishing problems in Newfoundland. The deep-sea fishery in the Province, Mr.Speaker, the fishery in general, I guess, is in real trouble. Several plants are now closed and fears are being expressed that others may follow suit in the near future. The problems surrounding this industry are as complex as they are numerous and there is no simple solution to them. However, in order to deal with them I believe the problems must be identified, and in doing this it is surprising to find out that

MR. TOBIN: plants are being closed and hundreds of people are being thrown out of the work force not because of the worldwide economic crisis, not through mismanagement on the part of the operators, and certainly not through any lack of effort on the part of the Provincial Department of Fisheries. The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker,

MR. G. TOBIN:

that the main cause of the problem is a shortage of marketable species of fish which can be landed economically.

The district that I so proudly represent, Mr. Speaker, that great and historic fishing district of Burin - Placentia West, is the heart of this Province's deep-sea fishery. For hundreds of years Burin Peninsula fishermen voyaged to the Grand Banks to reap the rich harvest of the deep, and, together with the women folk who toiled long and hard on shore to process the fish, laid the foundation of the prosperity which built and developed so many of the famous peninsula fishing communities. It was those same people who pioneered the deep-sea fishery as we know it today.

The fish plant, Mr. Speaker, at Burin began processing frozen filets for export in the early 1940s. This marked the beginning of a new and higher level prosperity and it saw the introduction of the deep-sea trawlers which eventually replaced the stately banking schooners. In those days it would have been impossible to envisage the day when there would be a shortage of fish on the Grand Banks. They were the most prolific fishing grounds in the world and could have met the total requirements for eternity.

Mr. Speaker, in the postwar period, after Newfoundland's entry into Confederation with Canada, control of the deep-sea fishery was transferred from St. John's to Ottawa. Unfortunately, the significance of this industry was not recognized by the Canadian Government and the deep-sea fishery was totally neglected.

It was not long until hordes of vessels - Russian, German, Polish, Japanese, Spanish, Portuguese, British and others - swarmed onto our traditional fishing grounds

MR. G. TOBIN:

and began to rape the fish stocks.

It was not until 1961, when a Conservative Government in Ottawa, Mr. Speaker, the Conservative Government led by John Diefenbaker, that introduced the Canadian Shipbuilding Subsidy Programme that Newfoundland fish companies received any assistance. This programme made it possible for trawlers and plant operators to construct new vessels in order to compete with the foreign fleets. The programme was highly successful; 50 per cent of the capital cost of new trawlers was paid in the form of subsidies by Ottawa. Shipyards which had been experiencing hard times began to flourish. The steel industry in Canada also flourished, as did the manufacturing of equipment necessary to equip these vessels. A very large portion of the subsidy was returned to the treasury through the income and other taxes generated by the employment and business which resulted from the programme.

MR. TOBIN: In 1966, Mr. Speaker, the Canadian Liberal government under the leadership of Mr. Pearson began to phase out the subsidy-with disastrous results. Today there is a real need for the re-introduction of a ship building subsidy to replace aging and obsolete trawlers. And, Mr. Speaker, on that point I wonder where the hon. member who represents the district of Burin - St. George's, who represents the same riding that I represent when I speak of the Marystown Shipyard, where has he been? I understand that there is, on the desk of the federal minister responsible, a report for some time relating to the subsidies of trawlers and it has not been released. And I think Mr. Simmons should certainly stand up and make his colleagues realize that there is a place in Newfoundland, if the rest of Canada is not prepared to do it, and that we certainly are the fishing capital of the world and subsidies such as this should be brought in right away.

Mr. Speaker, just to emphasis that point further, today Canada is the only major fishing nation in the world which does not offer substantial financial assistance to its shipbuilding industry for the construction of modern low-cost trawlers. This can only be construed as neglect on the part of the Canadian Government, which appears to center its interest in Quebec and the industrial centres of Ontario.

When considering the plight of our fishery today, it is evident that the neglect was not confined to the shipbuilding sector. The greatest neglect was the failure of the federal government to take action against the foreign nations which had depleted our fish stocks. It was not until 1977, after some fish species had become commercially extinct and other had come close to it, that the Canadian government eventually declared a 200-mile fishing limit. Had the federal government heeded the warnings

MR. TOBIN: and acted upon the pleas by the Newfoundland fishing industry ten years earlier, many of today's problems would not even exist.

When Ottawa did finally wake up to the fact that the East Coast fishery was in trouble, did it take the appropriate action to rebuild the industry in a sensible and businesslike manner?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No.

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, the answer is a clear cut no. Instead it chose the industry partly for a trade off tool with foreign countries and partly as a political tool to enhance the political fortunes of its own party members.

MR. STAGG: The hon. member took care of them.

MR. TOBIN: What was that?

MR. STAGG: The hon. member took care of them and their party fortunes.

MR. TOBIN: I think we all took care of them, Most of them should be taken care of. Although, Mr. Speaker, I must say, I see two hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House who I know are concerned about the fisheries, more concerned than their leader.

Having declared the 200-mile limit, the government immediately allocated substantial quantities of fish to foreign nations. This was a trade off to ensure markets for Western grain and Ontario and Quebec industrial products. The traditional Gulf of St. Lawrence, Mr. Speaker, which the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) alluded to earlier, the fishing grounds for trawler fleets from the Southwest Coast of Newfoundland, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia, were placed out of bounds. The consequence of this action was a concentration of these vessels on the Grand Banks, where the quota became exhausted very quickly. Even before the advent of the worldwide recession two years ago, fishing companies were finding it difficult to make ends meet. With the rapid

MR. TOBIN: rise of interest rates, fuel and other costs, the situation has now become impossible. Plants, Mr. Speaker, at Ramea, Harbour Breton, Gaultois and my own home town of Trepassey have now been forced to close. Plants elsewhere are threatened with closure. Given the 83,000 tons of cod now allocated to foreign fleets by the Canadian Government -

MR. STAGG: How much?

MR. TOBIN: Eighty-three thousand tons.

MR. STAGG: Eighty-three thousand tons!

MR. TOBIN: Eighty-three thousand tons of cod is now allocated to foreign fleets by the Canadian Government. Mr. Speaker, if this were not the case, several, if not all of these plants, would be open and operating today and people, Mr. Speaker, well over 1,000 Newfoundlanders would be employed instead of receiving U.I.C. or welfare payments.

MR. STAGG: That is right.

MR. TOBIN: That is right.

Mr. Speaker, some will argue that fish plants are a provincial responsibility and that the provincial government is responsible for providing the necessary financial assistance to help them out of their difficulties. Mr. Speaker, we all know what the provincial Department of Fisheries has done for the fish plants in Newfoundland over the past number of months and years, but the problems that these companies are experiencing are caused through federal action and inaction.

MR. STAGG: Right.

MR. TOBIN: For Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, to continue to pour money into an industry without first ensuring the federal government has revised its fishing

MR. TOBIN: policies, would be like continuing to pump air into a tire without plugging the hole.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that the federal government has two major areas of responsibility which it must live up to immediately, and I mean immediately. It must once and for all cancel permits for foreign fishing vessels' efforts in our waters, except where it can be proven conclusively that the catches are surplus to our own requirements, and it must also provide financial compensation to the fishing companies for the damage already caused by the federal government's short-sighted and unfair policies.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: For those of us who have the mistaken impression, Mr. Speaker, that marketing efforts by the Newfoundland industry are at fault - and the member from Port au Port (Mr. Hodder), Mr. Speaker, just demonstrated again, he got up and he spoke all day, Mr. Speaker, and every time one of them stands up, 'marketing' is all you can hear, Mr. Speaker, 'the problem in the fishery is marketing.' Well, let us look at the facts. Let us look at the facts, Mr. Speaker. The quality of Newfoundland fish has risen to the point where it is considered by many U.S. buyers to be superior to that of our main competitors, Iceland and Norway.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: There is absolutely no problem in selling high-grade Newfoundland fish on the American market. The problem is the availability of sufficient quantity to meet the market requirements.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Right on!

MR. TOBIN: As far as the European market is concerned, there is little hope that we will ever sell any substantial quantity of fish to the EEC countries as long, Mr. Speaker, as the Canadian Government permits them to take fish from our waters. The so-called trade off which permits foreigners to take 83,000 tons of fish in exchange for access to EEC markets is in my opinion a very, very bad joke, a deep joke, a sick joke.

In actual fact it provides for 4,000 tons - I think, Mr. Speaker, we should listen to this - it provides for 4,000 tons of import to EEC countries at a 4 per cent tariff and 6,000 tons at a 6 per cent tariff. Any further quantity is taken at the rate of 15 per cent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when this is compared with the agreement between Iceland and the EEC, which permits duty-free imports of Icelandic fish, and Norway, which is charged at only a rate of 3 per cent, it can be seen how crazy our so-called agreement is.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG: What a joke! Tell it like it is.

MR. TOBIN: It has to be remembered too, Mr. Speaker -

MR. STAGG: Never give it away.

MR. TOBIN: -when we compare this, Mr. Speaker, it has to be remembered that Iceland permits no foreign fishing whatsoever within its jurisdiction, within its 200-mile limit. And here, Mr. Speaker, there is more

MR. TOBIN: more foreigners out there,
I would suggest, than there are Canadian boats.

In closing -

MR. STAGG: They made the British back down.

MR. TOBIN: What is that?

MR. STAGG: They made the British back
down.

MR. TOBIN: Yes, they made the British
back down, but what is the Canadian Government doing, Mr.
Speaker? What is the Canadian Government doing? Here we are
competing for markets with the Icelandic people in the EEC
countries -

MR. SIMMS: Ask your friend on the other side.
He can answer it.

MR. TOBIN: I am sure, Mr. Speaker, my
friend on the other side does not know. I just listened to the
speech from the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder) and he
referred to the grave problem in the Newfoundland fishery, Mr.
Speaker, being the marketing problem. Mr. Speaker, we all
know what -

MR. STAGG: The biggest problem with the
Newfoundland fishery is Liberals in Ottawa.

MR. HODDER: We need good quality products
and good marketing.

MR. BAIRD: But now we have no fish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, we have superior
quality to that of Iceland, The greatest problem, Mr. Speaker,
like my colleague for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) just said,
to the fisheries in this Province is the Liberal Government
in Ottawa, supported, aided and abetted, Mr. Speaker, by the
five Liberal MPs from Newfoundland and to some extent, Mr.
Speaker, probably to a larger extent, by the eight sitting
Liberals in this House.

MR. HODDER: What about Mr. McGrath when he was Minister of Fisheries? What did he do?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, this government will stand up and fight for Newfoundland, will stand up and defend Newfoundland's rights, Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: - regardless if it is a Conservative or a Liberal Government that is in Ottawa -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: - and that is not what the Liberals can say in this House.

MR. TOBIN: That is not what they can say, Mr. Speaker. Who has heard of Mr. Simmons, Mr. Rompkey, Mr. Rooney, Mr. Baker?

MR. STAGG: What was the other fellow's name?

MR. SIMMS: Rumpkey.

MR. STAGG: What was the other fellow's name?

MR. SIMMS: Tobin.

MR. STAGG: Tobin, yes.

MR. TOBIN: I would not dare say it, Mr. Speaker! I would not dare say it! I left that for my colleague from Stephenville (Mr. Stagg) to say, because, Mr. Speaker, I hate affiliating disasters with the name of Tobin, Sir.

However, Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me say that I was very much encouraged by the fact that the Minister of Fisheries for this Province, my colleague, the hon. Mr. Morgan, who is one of the greatest friends, Mr. Speaker, that the fishermen of this Province have ever known -

MR. STAGG: I would like for you to repeat that.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Do you want me to repeat that? Well, Mr. Speaker, I have no difficulty whatsoever, have no compunction whatsoever in saying that I believe that the Minister of Fisheries in Newfoundland today is one of the greatest friends that the fishing industry, the fishing people and all the people of Newfoundland related to the fisheries have.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: Mr. Speaker, let me say that I was encouraged, to say the least, that my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) and his federal counterpart, Mr. DeBane, who, Mr. Speaker, has just been appointed, and all indications are that he could be a very good Minister of Fisheries. We have suffered, Mr. Speaker, we have been dragged through a trouble period in the last few years with LeBlanc; it was a lost cause as far as the people of Newfoundland were concerned. But I believe, Mr. Speaker, that Mr. DeBane appears to be heading in a good, clean-cut direction as it relates to the fishing industry, and I have great belief, Mr. Speaker, and great faith in the interest demonstrated by the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) in the Newfoundland fishery. I think he is a sincere individual. I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Terra Nova will rise and I am sure that he will have no difficulty whatsoever in expressing his interest in the Newfoundland fishery and supporting the resolution put forth by my colleague.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: However, Mr. Speaker, I made reference to the meeting of my colleague, the Minister of Fisheries, and Mr. DeBane, and I was delighted to know that they held such congenial meetings during the weekend. And I trust that all of the problems that I have addressed will be dealt with. It is my hope that the prosperity of the Burin Peninsula, which the residents have worked so hard to build with centuries of hard work, will be preserved. Mr. Speaker, if it is not, here is one individual who will want to know the reason why.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Terra Nova.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I am not sure that the hon. member for Grand Bank (William Matthews) will be so pleased when I have finished my speech as he seemed to be before I began.

MR. STAGG: Grand Bank is the fellow there with the beard.

MR. LUSH: From Placentia.

MR. TOBIN: A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order, the hon. member for Burin-Placentia West.

MR. TOBIN: In case the hon. member for Terra Nova does not know the geography of Newfoundland, Mr. Speaker, does not know the area that the members here represent, I would like to inform him that I represent the district of Burin-Placentia West and will be just as pleased with his speech when he is finished as when he starts, because he is not going to say anything anyway.

MR. SPEAKER: There is no point of order.
The hon. member for Terra Nova.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, it is rather amusing to listen to members opposite talking about that great fighting spirit for Newfoundland, their ability to stand up for Newfoundland and fight and fight. Well, Sir, there is certainly every indication that they are great fighters, that they are great fighters with the federal government and showing Newfoundlanders that they stand up for Newfoundland, that they are willing to go through anything to stand up for

MR. LUSH: Newfoundland, and if you do not support them, of course you are unpatriotic, that you are not a Newfoundlander. Well, Mr. Speaker, they are great fighters. But the problem with the fight is that they are fighting the wrong battles. They are continuously barking up the wrong trees and attacking the wrong issues. And one can look over the past three or four years and try to evaluate what all of this fighting has brought about. And it has brought about a big zilch in terms of developing the economy of this Province. And, Mr. Speaker, it is a favourite tactic of this government to fight battles, but they are fighting the wrong battles, of course, and it is all for a very political reason: these are diversionary tactics. It is to divert the attention of the people of this Province away from the real problems which we face, away from the performance of this government, because they do not want the people for one moment to think about the performance or the record of this government. So it is great to be able to deflect and divert the people's attention away from the real problems which face this Province, Mr. Speaker, this is certainly a resolution, again, which attempts to do that, to divert the people's attention away from the real problems of the fishery. Because, Mr. Speaker, this resolution does not get at the substance of the problem which we face in the fisheries today, it does not get at the substance and the quality of the decisions that need to be made to improve our Newfoundland fisheries.

This government, Mr. Speaker, always come out with simplistic solutions to problems. I was not aware until today that the only problem with the fisheries in Newfoundland is the Northern cod stocks. That is the only problem. It seems as though if we were to get that problem solved then everything in the fishery would be just fine. And, Mr. Speaker,

MR. LUSH: they were doing something, stalling for time, bringing in new structural changes, new studies, and royal commissions. Mr. Speaker, was it not amusing just last week when the Premier condemned the Prime Minister of Canada for setting up the study on the economy of Canada. 'It was not necessary', he said, 'another study'. And the government opposite have become experts at setting up studies and royal commissions, but it is okay when they do it. The Prime Minister of Canada was described as being stupid and doing this for political purposes when he did it. Every chance, Mr. Speaker, every opportunity that the hon. gentlemen opposite can get the chance, Mr. Speaker, is to try and put a knife into the backs of the federal government people, and this is just another attempt. Mr. Speaker, nobody in Newfoundland doubts the importance of

MR. T. LUSH:

the Northern cod stocks to the fishermen of this Province, nobody doubts that. But, Mr. Speaker, we would like to see the government going about it in a sensible manner of negotiating with the federal government and trying to come up with some system of managing the Northern cod stocks, some system of control control.

MR. L. HEARN:

What kind of control?

MR. LUSH:

That is what I would like to

know. I have not heard hon. members talk about the system. I just have not gotten into the substance, but I will get there.

Mr. Speaker, it is just another attempt to undermine the federal government. And the hon. member asked a good question because it is his side, it is the government that has brought in this motion, but to this date we have not heard one suggestion about the Northern cod as to the kind of stand they want the federal government to take. It says "BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this government request the federal government to adopt a much more reasonable stand as it relates to the matter." What is the reasonable stand, Mr. Speaker? Is it a joint committee? Is it joint consultation? What is the reasonable stand, Mr. Speaker?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Give it away! Give it away!

MR. LUSH:

Mr. Speaker, they are getting hot now because they know I am telling the truth. They know the real purpose for this resolution. They know the real purpose for this is to undermine Mr. Speaker, the federal government. To try and put a wedge between the Liberal party, the provincial party and the federal party, that is the intention of it, Mr. Speaker. That is the intention of this resolution and, as I have said before, Mr. Speaker, it does not get to the substance of the problems experienced in the Newfoundland fishery. But, Mr. Speaker,

MR. T. LUSH: it again gives them the opportunity to duck out from their responsibilities. It is a cop-out, Mr. Speaker. It is another in their schemes of laying blames on the shoulders of others. As I have said, for the first four or five years it was to lay blame on the provincial Liberal Government. Now, in the last two or three years, they have a new whipping boy. It is the federal Liberal Government, 'That government that is out to undermine Newfoundland, that is out to grab everything they can from us, that wants to take our oil, that wants to take our fisheries, that wants to take our forestry.' Mr. Speaker, that is their impression. What they have done, Mr. Speaker, they have been a more divisive factor in Canada than any other present day government. Mr. Speaker, what they have done is to arouse the animosity and the hatred of Newfoundlanders. They have aroused, Mr. Speaker, the basic and the most banal instincts that we have. This is what they have done, Mr. Speaker, that they have

MR. LUSH:

not done a thing, Mr. Speaker, in terms of developing the economy of this country, of this Province. They have not done a thing. They have only been a divisive factor both in this Province and in Canada as a whole. That is what has been going on, Mr. Speaker, giving the impression that the Federal Liberal Government is up there to grab everything from Newfoundland, the trio, Mr. Speaker, of Mr. Trudeau, Mr. Lalonde, and Mr. Chretien.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: That has been the impetus, Mr. Speaker, that has been the substance of every move by this government, that has been the impetus and that has been the substance of everything that they have done, all political, Mr. Speaker, nothing for the economic benefit of the people of this Province, fishermen or otherwise.

MR. TOBIN: I think you are a Liberal.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the way to solve this problem is through negotiations. I know this government know nothing about negotiations. They demonstrated that, Mr. Speaker, with their own workers, the teachers of this Province. They have demonstrated they know nothing about negotiations. All they know anything about, Mr. Speaker, is confrontation, conflict, denegration, that is all they know anything about. Fighters, Mr. Speaker, fighters, that is what they are, great fighters; but they are doing a lot of shadowboxing, Mr. Speaker, a lot of shadowboxing and they are not getting anywhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as I said this resolution does not get to the substance of the problems in the Newfoundland fisheries, it does not get to the substance and quality of decisions that need to be made, the public decisions that need to be made to improve the fisheries in this

MR. LUSH: Province. It is just another one of their schemes in the furtherance of their battle with Ottawa. This power struggle, Mr. Speaker, and this is all it is, and come at a very appropriate time, Mr. Speaker, in the last two or three years when this government has not been doing anything, and it is a great way, it is a great method to divert the public attention away from the performance and the record of this government. And that is all it is for, Mr. Speaker. They have some great motherhood issues and Mr. Speaker, they are continuously trying to back us over here into a corner of supporting the federal government.

Just look through the resolutions, Mr. Speaker, I ask you just look through the resolutions. Every resolution introduced by every member opposite got that twist on it, Mr. Speaker, in an effort to put a wedge between hon. members here and our federal colleagues, that is what every resolution does. Just read them down through, Mr. Speaker. "We urge the federal government," "we request the federal government." The federal government, Mr. Speaker, who has not done one thing for this Province.

MR. STAGG: That is true.

MR. LUSH: What did they do this year?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: How many millions will they spend in the fisheries this year?

MR.LUSH: How many millions? \$20 million maybe, \$30 million maybe, \$40 million maybe, \$50 million maybe, \$60 million maybe, \$65 million. That is what they are going to spend this year, in the area of \$65 million. That mean, mean government Ottawa, that government that is trying to grab everything away from this Province, they are going to spend \$65 million in the fisheries this year, \$65 million is what they are going to spend. And, Mr. Speaker, every time there has been a crisis in the fisheries in this Province, the federal government have come through and bailed us out. They did it in 1968, they did it in 1974, and they are coming forward again in 1982.

MR.TOBIN: And so they should because they are the ones who gave the fish away.

MR.LUSH: And, Mr. Speaker, 'They do not do anything for us.' They are only spending, in addition to the \$65 million that they put into the fishery, they are only spending another approximately \$70 million in job creation in this Province this year, approximately \$140 million in the fishery and in job creation programmes. And, Mr. Speaker, the list can go on.

MR.STAGG: What about the motion?

MR.LUSH: The motion, Mr. Speaker, we will get to the motion. There is nobody on the other side discussed it yet, but I will discuss it for this side. There is nobody on the other side who discussed this motion, Mr. Speaker. But, Mr. Speaker, if I were to present this motion I would have said, 'Be it resolved that both levels of government, the provincial government and the

MR. LUSH: federal government, develop a more harmonious , a more conciliatory stand with respect to the Northern cod stock! That is the kind of motion I would have presented, Mr. Speaker, but not honourable gentlemen opposite because they want to make their political Brownie points. They want to build up the hatred a little more throughout this Province, they want it to build up a little more hatred, they want it to

MR. LUSH: build up a little more animosity, they want it to build up a little more hatred against the federal government. That is what they want it to do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. STAGG: What do you want to do?

MR. LUSH: They want it to try and further alienate the people of this Province from the people of Canada. That is what this resolution wanted to do, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: That is not true. That is not true.

AN HON. MEMBER: You are not going to have enough time.

MR. RIDEOUT: One minute left.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, the problems of the fisheries in this Province can be solved and they can be solved by this provincial government.

MR. STAGG: No, that is not true.

MR. LUSH: They can be solved by this provincial government, working co-operatively, working harmoniously, Mr. Speaker, with the federal government. And I believe that this provincial government should have some say with respect to the Northern cod stock. I believe they should -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUSH: - but this motion does not say that. This is to condemn the federal government, that is all, Mr. Speaker. But I believe there should be consultation between both levels of government affecting the Northern cod stocks in this Province, and I think our spokesman said that we would recommend a joint management committee, Mr. Speaker, with respect to development of the Northern cod. And that is what we believe, Mr. Speaker, in that respect. We believe that there

MR. LUSH: should be some consultation. But consultation has to be both ways, Mr. Speaker, it has to be both ways. Consultation is not going out and saying, "Do you agree with my proposal?" That is not consultation. That is not negotiation, Mr. Speaker, "Do you agree with my proposal?"

MR. RIDEOUT: It is certainly obvious you do not agree.

MR. LUSH: So, Mr. Speaker, I do not agree with this resolution because its purpose is not to develop the fisheries in Newfoundland, its purpose is to enhance, Mr. Speaker, its purpose is to enhance the image of the PC Party in this Province. That is what it is for. It is not to improve or develop the fisheries in this Province. If it were it would have been worded accordingly, Mr. Speaker. If so it would have been worded accordingly. If this resolution, Mr. Speaker, was looking for our support it would have been worded in a way where we could have supported it.

MR. RIDEOUT: You are not reading it.

MR. LUSH: But, Mr. Speaker, it was worded intentionally, it was intentionally worded so that we would not support it, just as the Premier worded the resolution, Mr. Speaker, to be wired to the Prime Minister last week, just the same as that was worded. Because if the Premier wanted us to support that motion he would have worded it appropriately.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, my colleagues have outlined the problems in the fishery, the problems that are outlined by everybody that I know in the fishery, marketing and processing.

Now, it is good news to know today that we have no problem with marketing. It is good news today to know that we have no problems at all with marketing, Mr. Speaker, that we can market all over the world. I always thought that our marketing was too restricted to one market, to the U.S. market, and that we were not selling our fish in the quantity that we should to other European countries, to Japan and Africa, Mr. Speaker. But it is good to know that we have these market problems solved. But, Mr. Speaker, no one knowledgeable in the fisheries is saying that today. No one knowledgeable is saying that we have more than enough markets for our fish. Nobody is saying that.

MR. MORGAN: Why are the plants closing? There is no fish for the plants! How stupid are you!

MR. LUSH: There are too many plants, Mr. Speaker, too many plants, too many fishermen.

MR. MORGAN: Why did the plant close? No fish!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I do not happen to subscribe to that. That again is another very political issue. If I were dishonest I could go out and say, 'Yes, I would rather see 20,000 fishermen making \$5,000 a year than 10,000 fishermen making \$10,000,' but I am not going to be that hypocritical, Mr. Speaker, I am not going to be that hypocritical. This is why I say this resolution does not address the problems in the fisheries today, Mr. Speaker. It does not address the problems in the fisheries today, far from it.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, we have to look at the supply, we have to look at the quantity of fish that we have and gear that supply to the numbers of people who can prosecute the fishery; but this government believes in an open policy, everybody get out and prosecute it. That is their policy, Mr. Speaker. They have identified two problems in the fisheries today and they are great Motherhood issues, great vote getters but they do nothing to develop the fishery. Problem one is the Northern cod, because this is a way, again, where they can batter, Mr. Speaker, and belt and beat the federal government; the other one is the licencing system, so that again they can bash and beat and batter the federal government. Mr. Speaker, they do not talk about any of the areas under which they have jurisdiction. They do not talk about marketing, they do not talk about processing. Do not talk about processing, that is not a problem, Mr. Speaker.

MR. TOBIN: I spoke on marketing, I spoke on processing, I spoke on harvesting.

MR. LUSH: They do not talk, Mr. Speaker, about trying to expand the responsibilities of the Canadian Saltfish Corporation to come in with some sort of an idea for fresh and frozen fish in this matter, do not talk about that because marketing is not a problem. Well, Mr. Speaker, the fishermen of this Province are going to be delighted to know that marketing is not

MR. LUSH: a problem. And many of the experts in the field of fishing today are going to be delighted to know that there is no marketing problem.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): Order, please!

I would like to inform the hon. member that his time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: By leave.

MR. LUSH: Mr. Speaker, I just want to say in conclusion that with political will and with political courage this government can solve the problems which we experience in the fisheries today, that they can improve the fisheries, but as long, Mr. Speaker, as they are only concerned about the next federal election, as long as they are only concerned, Mr. Speaker, with undermining the Liberal MPs in Ottawa, then they will never get anywhere. And the people of this Province will not believe them, they are losing their credibility day after day. People are beginning to see all of this brainwashing and all of this indoctrination, they are beginning to see it for what it is. But, Mr. Speaker, with political will and courage they can improve the fisheries in this Province.

Thank you very much.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward): The hon. member for Fortune - Hermitage.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, I wish to support the motion moved by my colleague from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. STEWART: And, Mr. Speaker, I might add for the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush), who really spoke around the motion, therefore mostly for his benefit I think I should read the motion.

MR. DOYLE: That is right. That is right.

MR. STEWART: It reads: 'WHEREAS the development of the inshore fishery is the only realistic way of solving rural Newfoundland's unemployment problems; and WHEREAS Federal Government policy on the inshore fishery is detrimental to this effect, especially as it relates to the harvesting of the Northern cod stock; BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this Government request the Federal Government to adopt a much more reasonable stand as it relates to this matter.'

I am sure that is pretty straightforward, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SIMMS: That is not fed bashing, is it?

MR. STEWART: Not really.

Mr. Speaker, I represent a district that is totally dependent on the fishing industry and therefore it gives me great pleasure to support this motion. The fishery has been the mainstay of the economy of Newfoundland and Labrador for centuries, managed properly it can be our economic base for generations to come. In the two decades, Mr. Speaker, after we joined Confederation, the fishery in Newfoundland underwent a tremendous decline. Offshore foreign fishing fleets using large factory trawlers almost wiped out our inshore fishery, a fishery on which, Mr. Speaker, hundreds of settlements in rural Newfoundland and Labrador depended. Under the Canadian Constitution the fishery comes under the jurisdiction of the federal government. When Canada declared the 200-mile limit a few years ago it seemed that our fishery had been saved. Fish stocks started to increase in size and today the inshore fishery - although I might add, Mr. Speaker, this is a very bad year - the fishery along the coast of Newfoundland and Labrador is growing more and more prosperous. However, ours is the only Province which has no say in its major industry. Even though the provincial Fisheries Department and the Fisheries

MR. STEWART: Loan Board spend millions of dollars every year, all the power over the fishery really rests with the federal government in Ottawa.

MR. DOYLE: It is in the Constitution.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, even though we may not have much jurisdiction, this government has shown our concern and commitment to the industry. For years the provincial Fisheries Loan Board has been the main source of financing for fishermen who need to purchase boats and gear. The Province has maintained a Fisheries College and has committed itself to the construction of a world class Institute of Fisheries and Marine Technology.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

AN HON. MEMBER: Look at the empty benches they have over there.

MR. STEWART: I know. Knowing all the good points I was going to bring out, the Opposition all left, I agree

MR. DOYLE: They knew you were coming.

MR. STEWART: That is true. They knew I was coming on next.

MR. TOBIN: They are not interested in the fisheries.

MR. STEWART: True.

In January, 1982, the Province submitted to the federal government a request to undertake a comprehensive fisheries programme aimed at upgrading port infrastructure. This programme would concentrate on fishing facilities and infrastructure at a total cost of \$144 million.

MR. DOYLE: How much?

MR. STEWART: One hundred and forty-four million.
To date

MR. D. STEWART:

the Province has received little or no reaction from the federal government as to its acceptability -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Shame, shame!

MR. STEWART: - Mr. Speaker, and it is unlikely that any reaction will be forthcoming until such a time as the Kirby Task Force has completed its work.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to say a few words about the now-famous Kirby Task Force, which was appointed by the federal government to look into the problems of the whole fishing industry in the Atlantic Provinces.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. L. SIMMS: Mr. Speaker, tell them to be quiet.

MR. STEWART: I might add, Mr. Speaker -

MR. SIMMS: Name them, Mr. Speaker! Name them!

MR. STEWART: - this task force must have lost substantial credibility when it became involved in the bail out of the fish plant at St. Anthony, in the district, I think, of a federal Cabinet Minister.

MR. DOYLE: Is that right?

MR. STEWART: That is right.

MR. DOYLE: Who would that be?

MR. SIMMS: Rumpkey!

MR. STEWART: Since then, Mr. Speaker, this same federal task force rejected applications for financial assistance from other financially troubled Newfoundland fish processing firms, including plants in my own district of Fortune - Hermitage.

Not only that, what this federal government task force refused to get involved in with the

MR. D. STEWART: specific but major problems in the provincial fishing industry, leaving the provincial government having to assist on its own over twenty-five Newfoundland fish processing firms by means of over \$29 million in loan guarantees to enable these companies to reopen thrity-seven plants all around the Province in 1982.

Mr. Speaker, contrary to what the member for Port au Port (Mr. J. Hodder) said earlier in his comments, the provincial government has provided financial assistance, because as a provincial government we are firmly committed to the maintenance and development of our fishing industry for all the people of our Province. Now, Mr. Speaker, just to give an example of some companies which received financial assistance from government in 1981 and 1982, I would just like to outline a few of them: P. Janes and Sons Limited, Hants Harbour - Jackson's Arm - number of plant employees 650, total amount of assistance \$1,300,000; Greenspond Fish Processors Limited - Greenspond - 150 plant employees, \$450,000; The Lake Group Limited - Bide Arm, Englee, Bonavista, Fortune, Grand Bank, Gaultois, Cook's Harbour, Baine Harbour, 2,500 employees, \$5 million

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STAGG:

This government?

MR. STEWART:

This government.

MR. DINN:

What did the feds put in?

MR. STEWART:

They did not put anything

in. William J. Burton Newfoundland Limited, Brig Bay, eighty employees, \$150,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STEWART:

Newfoundland Food Processors

Limited, Petty Harbour, 120 employees, \$150,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STEWART:

Triton Seafood's Limited,

Triton, 300 employees, \$1,500,000. Ocean Harvester's Limited, Harbour Grace, again money guaranteed by this government, 800 employees, \$2,500,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STEWART:

John Penney and Sons Limited,

Ramea, on the South Coast, 390 employees, \$3,300,000. Eric King Fisheries Limited, Burnt Islands, 130 employees, \$150,000.

MR. DOYLE:

Had the federal government done

their share we would not have to close down now.

MR. STEWART:

Mr. Speaker, the comment

that the hon. membe just said, 'Had the federal government done their share we would not have to close down now.'

MR. DOYLE:

That is right.

MR. STEWART:

Tors Cove Fisheries, Tors Cove,

300 employees, \$50,000; Fishery Products Limited, Harbour Breton -

MR. DOYLE:

In the hon. member's district.

MR. STEWART:

- in my district, a guarantee

of over \$100,000.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. STEWART: Cape Pine Fisheries, Witless Bay, Petty Harbour, 340 employees, \$1,850,000.

MR. ANDREWS: Yes, boy!

MR. STEWART: Atlantic Fisheries, Admiral's Beach, Dildo, 316 employees, \$617,000. And the list goes on and on. But one more should be mentioned, Fisheries Products Limited, two replacement trawlers; this government guaranteed \$14 million for the replacement of two trawlers.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. TOBIN: When the federal government are sitting on a subsidy programme for trawlers, supported, aided and abated by the Liberal phonies here.

MR. STEWART: True.

Mr. Speaker, the fish plants -

MR. TOBIN: Go back to your plant in Trespassey.

MR. STEWART: Mr. Speaker, the fish plants on the South Coast of this Province depend heavily on the deep-sea fishing efforts and the quotas allotted by the federal government, especially as they relate to quotas for the Gulf region. The small quota allotment for 1982 has seen a shutdown of the fish plant at Harbour Breton and surrounding communities. And just to give an example of the hardships being experienced by the residents of Harbour Breton and surrounding communities, I would like to read a part of a letter sent to the new Federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane) on October 7th. 1982, which really shows some of the concerns being expressed by residents in my district. And a part of it reads " The evoked shutdown of its Harbour Breton operation by Fishery Products several months ago has brought the economy of this town to a virtual standstill and many residents face despair and court bankruptcy. Construction and investment has come to a complete halt. Presently all facts point to a full production in January 1983.

'However, indications are that by

MR. STEWART:

"June of 1983 the plant will experience another low productivity level, similar to what the town is faced with today. This situation is totally unacceptable. Meetings with government and Fishery Products have been ongoing for quite some time, and the main thing learned from these meetings is that the problem is not financial but rather lies with fish quota restrictions in our area. These quotas must be changed if we are to see full production at the Fishery Products Plant at Harbour Breton.

"The present situation is aggravated by the lack of available species that we depend on which are now lost to other fleets in other areas. The lack of cod and redfish is a very important factor, particularly during the last six months of the year. Harbour Breton and surrounding communities have played a significant and stable role with the inshore fishery and it makes a great contribution to the plant's viability. However, the inshore fishery is not enough to maintain the plant's opening for a twelve month operation. The residents therefore request that you, the federal minister, initiate action to develop plans to provide the plant at Harbour Breton with a better resource share, review fleet requirements to catch the fish and to put the community on a more stable basis."

MR. SIMMS:

And what was his reply?

MR. STEWART:

This is from the LOL Lodge of Harbour Breton and to date I do not think they have even received a reply from the federal minister-which is standard.

MR. SIMMS:

It should be brought to the minister's attention or something.

MR. STEWART:

It definitely should.

MR. STEWART: Anyway, Mr. Speaker, factors really beyond any control made the past year critical for the fishing industry. Weakened market conditions, high interest rates, and really a failure of the inshore fishery in certain areas contributed to an unprecedented cost-price squeeze for most fishermen and processors.

Although, Mr. Speaker, being from the South Coast, where the large fish company draggers depend more on the Gulf region, Sydney Bight and Grand Banks for their supply of raw material, I realize, being from that area, that the survival of our inshore fishing industry depends largely on the availability of Northern cod.

MR. ANDREWS: That is right. That is right.

MR. STEWART: And really that means, Mr. Speaker, the survival of Newfoundland.

MR. SIMMS: Right on.

MR. TOBIN: The federal government has to get a policy of allocating quotas.

MR. STEWART: Exactly. So, Mr. Speaker, it is vital that Newfoundland gain control forever over the harvesting of the Northern cod stock because of the impact that this resource has on our economy.

That point, Mr. Speaker, is also dealt with in great detail in the provincial government's resource management plan. The Northern cod stock is the sole basis of our cod fishery from Cape Chidley to Cape St. Mary's and contributes almost 60 per cent of the total inshore fishing effort. The Northern cod resource, for all practical purposes, has been fished exclusively from Newfoundland and Labrador, except Mr. Speaker, in recent years when it was raped by foreign flag freezer-trawlers.

MR. SIMMS: Shocking.

MR. STEWART: The Northern cod must be reserved for the inshore and longliner fleets.

MR. STEWART: If these vessels cannot harvest all of the quota, then the surplus must be reserved for the offshore fleet who will land and process their catches in Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, the long and short of this is that while we may only have a lamb's share of the fishery jurisdiction, we certainly are shouldering the lion's share of responsibility.

MR. ANDREWS: You can say that again!

MR. STEWART: In concluding, I would just like to say that the fishery is more than just a business to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador, it is and will always be our way of life.

Thank you.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HISCOCK: Mr. Speaker.

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

MR. HISCOCK: Thank you kindly, Mr. Speaker.

I do congratulate the speaker from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) who just spoke. I do believe it was a good speech.

MR. WALSH: His district is Fortune-Hermitage.

MR. HISCOCK: Fortune-Hermitage, I apologize.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. HISCOCK: If I may, Mr. Speaker, I realize there is only one of this side and I would not mind having time to speak if members could be quiet for a little while.

As I was saying, with regard to the Fortune-Hermitage district, there has been a half decent speech but again, unfortunately, as the government have forty-four seats, it has been a little bit too political.

MR. HISCOCK: We are finding, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the debt of this nation of \$20 billion and \$70 million here in our own Province, that whatever way it is, with regard to the banks and with regard to the private companies, unless we get rid of more rhetoric and have less political throwing the balls back and forth and blaming it on this one and blaming it on that one, we are not going to pull this country or this Province or these companies out of the mess that they are in. And I, for one, as I said before, am not going to be going back and forth on this matter because it does concern the lifeblood of our province. But I will point out several things, that most of these companies are one company towns. And the letter from Harbour Breton, from the L.O.B.A. which said it is a one company town - so is St. Anthony, so is Labrador City, so is Grand Falls, so is Buchans, and unless the provincial government and the federal also, start looking for a greater base in diversifying the economy in some of our larger centres, we are going

MR.HISCOCK: to have these continual upheaval in bad times and we are going to see a great hardships as we have seen with regard to St. Lawrence, we have seen it with regard to Bell Island, we have seen it in other areas - Goose Bay. And if we continue to rely on just one primary resource, then the end result of course is we are going to be in a lot of trouble when we fall on hard times as we have. But with regard to the development of the inshore fishery it is the only realistic way. I represent a fishing district and I believe very strongly that the fishing industry is the backbone but it is not the only answer. Tourism is also an answer. We have to get back more to agriculture, we have to get back more to other independent ways of life. We also have to get involved with more marketing of manufactured goods, we also have to look at other areas. And looking at all these resolutions when they were brought in,I was wondering if they were only brought in at the time because of the Royal Commission that was here by the government and also because of the Kirby Task Force. When the House opened the last time it was a rather hot issue. If these were not put on the Order Paper more for political embarrassment than they were for in actual fact finding solutions, Now, of course, we find out that the solutions are not forthcoming and that the problem is more severe than it actually was at that time. The interest rates have gone down but the markets have not gone up. We still find out that we cannot compete with Iceland, we still find out that Americans prefer to eat hamburger, chicken

MR.HISCOCK: or other forms of non-fish diets because they are cheaper. We find also that Americans are now not concerned with eating one hundred pound cod blocks that are in storage for five or six months. They much prefer to have fresh fish that is flown out of Stephenville into California and other areas. So we are finding lifestyles are changing and if we want to blame that on the federal government then we can. If we want to blame that on the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) here in Newfoundland we can but the reality is that this Province - if fishing is the backbone of our Province, we have to be very innovative , we have to find new ways and we have to be leaders in the world. We find now, Mr. Speaker, that down on Pier 17 we have a marine exhibition.

MR.BAIRD: Pier 2.

MR.HISCOCK: Pier 2. With regard to that, Mr. Speaker, I believe it is the first exhibition that we have ever had in our 400 year history. Is it no wonder that we are in the trouble that we are in? Also in regard to our fishing, are we trying to find new markets or are we not? As happened with the fish strike, instead of trying to find solutions with it what did the provincial government do? Set up a Royal Commission and get rid of the hot potato and have an enquiry. Well maybe

MR. HISCOCK: the federal government has done the same thing by having the Kirby Royal Commission. Maybe that is the purpose of it. But whatever the purpose of the Royal Commission, or whatever the purpose of the Kirby Royal Commission, both of them were to study a severe, very sick industry which has gotten even worse. Now, Mr. Speaker, we are finding out that our mining industry is in trouble, our forest industry is in trouble, our manufacturing industry is in trouble. And not only that, but now this Province and this county and the world is in financial trouble. We may call it a recession but in actual fact we can call it a depression. As I said, we can have all the political points we want but that is not going to put bread on a woman's table down in Harbour Breton, or not going to get the people in Labrador City back working, or in other areas of this Province.

But with regard to other parts, I want to point out, that are within our own jurisdiction: Safety. We have heard about the federal subsidy on the draggers. What about the dragger fishermen who come from Harbour Breton, who come from Trepassey, who come from Fortune and Burin who are saying, 'Yes, it is important to have safety on the oil rigs but what about safety in the Northern cod when we go fishing for them?'. This is within the provincial realm of jurisdiction. And what have we heard on this resolution? I hope that the member from St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) when he gets up will address this, that not only have we got to catch the Northern cod but we have got to give the security to the women and children of these men who go up there to pursue their living in the dangerous waters, that they also have to be protected. We have not heard one word from this provincial government on that. We have also found out that it had to come from the fishermen themselves who are concerned.

MR. HISCOCK: So, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the jurisdiction of the Northern cod, if we get total jurisdiction we still have that safety problem. And with regard to the jurisdiction of the Northern cod, I have to ask myself the question, 'Are we going to look after the jurisdiction of the Northern cod like we look after the crab licenses? Are we going to look after the jurisdiction of the Northern cod like we looked after the loan board during the 1979 election?' And now we are paying the piper's tune because of the high interest on that probably approximately \$11 million that was overspent. Is that how we are going to run the Northern cod?

So, with regard to the Northern cod and protecting it, there are some things that I would like to say as a person representing Coastal Labrador.

MR. E. HISCOCK: I agree that Fortune - Hermitage needs their fish plants running, I agree that Trepassey needs their plants running, I agree that Harbour Breton needs it, I agree that St. Anthony needs it, but is anybody on that side looking at the idea that there should be more processing on the Labrador coast itself? Of course not. We need more over-the-side draggers, sell the fish off of Makkovik, sell the fish off of Black Tickle, sell the fish off the Northern areas of Natashquan. All the idea is is to continue to take out of the Northern areas of our Province. And I hope, Mr. Speaker, when we are talking about having a viable economy in St. Anthony, Trepassey, Harbour Breton, Fortune and in Burin, we also look at it from another point of view, instead of having the foreigners rape the cod stocks like they did on the Grand Banks and we get control over the Northern cod, we may find out that it is ourselves raping one area of the Province against the other. Because if you allow, Mr. Speaker - and we found that last year - if we allow the companies to have their own way, they would have everything caught up within two to three voyages and then allow the plant workers in the rest of the areas in the plants to be out of work and that is no answer and we need, in actual fact, a greater control over that. But with regard to the hardship that the member spoke about and wrote the federal Minister of Fisheries (Mr. De Bane): I wonder what about the widow who finds out now that she cannot afford to pay the oil bill, or a widow on welfare who cannot afford to pay a food bill? What about the married couple, who, for whatever reason find themselves on welfare and find out that they got to give up their apartment and move in with their in-laws or friends? What about those hardships? We never did those, I do not think, even in

MR. E. HISCOCK: Commission Government days.

We have a government now that is going back and are ruling high on the roost worse, in actual fact, than it was in the depression days. And if it was not for unemployment insurance and if it was not for some of the other social benefits - Canada Pension Plan - then this Province and this government would tell the people, 'Let them eat cake.'

MR. S. NEARY: That is right.

MR. HISCOCK: 'The oil is coming and when the oil comes, tighten your belt a little longer, and everything will be okay. And when we get control over the Northern cod, then everybody down in Harbour Breton, in Burin and in Trepassey will have jobs. 'No, you will all of the jobs. Not only that but you will have more jobs than you can shake a stick at.' That is what we are asking about and we are waiting for.

But one little part, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to address is in regard to the Northern cod. I hope the Northern cod comes back in such quantities, and the fish on the Grand Bank comes back in such quantities as it was back in the days of John Cabot, when you could go and put the basket over and bring in the fish. I hope that we manage it that much. I hope that both levels manage that area. But I am more and more, upon reflection, becoming convinced that I am opposed to over-the-side sales. The longliner fishermen in my district go down to Black Tickle and use it, but I am beginning to ask myself the question: That is okay for my fisherman

MR. HISCOCK:

and the longliner fishermen themselves, but what about the plant workers? What about the workers? And is this government doing anything with research and, instead of building a new Confederation Building, instead of building all the things that this government is putting up - monuments to themselves - would it not be better to have floating fish plants?

MR. NEARY:

Right on.

MR. HISCOCK:

Build four or five fish plants and move them up to Makkovik when the fish congregate in that area and you have forty or fifty or sixty longliners, and then when that glut goes, would it not be better to move it down to Indian Tickle, then move it down to Black Tickle, and then go to Port aux Choix and go out to Torbay and have our people on these plants?

MR. NEARY:

The first plant in Port aux Choix, by the way, was a floating fish plant.

MR. HISCOCK:

Exactly. Fishery Products did have two. Fishery Products did have two, Mr. Speaker.

MR. NEARY:

The Bell Island ferry (inaudible).

MR. HISCOCK:

And I would ask, Mr. Speaker, if this is not an answer to our glut and a solution to part of it.

But with regard to the problem of our fishing industry now, a lot of this has to be laid at the doorsteps of the fish companies, not the provincial government, not the federal government, but at the doorstep of the company, who expanded too fast, too large, and were too greedy, and found out that they over extended themselves in loans, could not pay their debts on their loans because of high interest rates, just like Dome Petroleum, and just like other larger companies that were beginning to get greedy, and

MR. HISCOCK: what we find, Mr. Speaker, is that now the federal and the provincial governments are asked to bail these companies out. It is poor management, Mr. Speaker.

We have heard in this House that small is beautiful and the idea that the small fish plants that are operating have been fairly successful by the guarantee and loans once they are opened up. Maybe, Mr. Speaker, that is an answer. Maybe the answer is in the royal commission and in the Kirby Task Force, to break the monopoly of some of these large companies controlling the one company towns. Because it is being reported, whether it is true or not, that St. Anthony could not make a viable paying proposition under Fishery Products but now are in the black. Maybe instead of one company owning a dozen more towns - not plants because they own the towns, they control the economy - instead of that maybe we need more breaking down of this monopoly, and maybe we also, Mr. Speaker, with regard to the fishing industry, what we find out is that companies themselves have gone and fought with each other for a share of the American market and the European market, instead of having one marketing board going in with people - and I have been saying this since I have been elected - that we should have skilled people from the Department of Commerce here at the university, trained in German, trained in Japanese languages, trained in French, Portuguese, and Russian, our own Newfoundlanders, to go over and work for marketing ourselves, and do it that way. But no! What are we doing? We are not doing anything. We are allowing Fishery Products to go their own way. We are allowing the Lake Group to go their own way. We are allowing National Sea to go their own way. And Nickerson's to go their own way and

MR. HISCOCK: independents. And that is not the answer, Mr. Speaker, I would also add now that, let us say, the federal government does come to the rescue and bails them out with the help of the Provincial Government; let us say that we get control of the Northern cod; let us say that the federal government says, Okay, you can have it all: Is that going to be the answer? Is that going to be the answer to our fishing industry? No, because the private enterprise has to share their responsibility in the market place and they are not living up to it, Mr. Speaker. Private industry is not living up to the market. I also feel with regard to the short-term gain with the union by feeling that they can make more money for the longliner fishermen and get more money for their union themselves, I think in the long-term, maybe it was okay in the short-term, but now this short-term policy has become a long-term policy and maybe it is very detrimental to our own Province.

I do not like the idea of seeing all the Northern cod area that is fished, that is caught in Labrador to have to come down to Brigus and Cupids and Catalina to be processed and dried, or a bulk ship going into St. Anthony and raw bulk taken to Portugal or to Spain to be dried over there. Those are the things, Mr. Speaker, that I disagree with. It might be okay for the union to get more fees out of that, it might be okay for the union to get more fees with regards to catching the mackerel, it might be okay for the short-term of the longliner fisherman himself, but it is not going to be okay for the longliner fishermen's brothers that live

MR. HISCOCK:

in other areas of the Province.

And I think, Mr. Speaker, instead of getting up and criticizing and saying, 'Oh, where is Romeo, where is Romeo?' and then saying on one side of the mouth that 'we are going to work with the Federal Minister of Fisheries' (Mr. De Bane), the new minister, and then get up and say that he has not even answered the letter. Do we want the Minister of Fisheries or the Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) here to be answering letters that are coming in by the thousands or the hundreds of thousands? Do we want them to be answering the mail and sending them saying we are working on it? Or do the people down in Harbour Breton and Fortune and other areas of the Province want the ministers to work not in answering letters on energy, but to go and find more markets, to go and find new solutions. That is where I think the people expect leadership. If they do not answer, if they do not get back to the person right away in a month or in two weeks, as long it is a solution that the Kirby Task Force and this Royal Commission in finding new markets and marketing process and research. And I for one, Mr. Speaker, I feel that this country is in a serious economic situation.

We have the Minister of Finance (Dr. Collins) going to make an economic statement with regard to the severity of it tomorrow. We may laugh here and carry on, by the way that is eight, and called Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs, and called the Muppets, and we may have our laughs here back and forth kidding each other, but there are a lot of people out there who are writing these letters, there are a lot of people out there who are rather concerned about the economic condition. And why we toss the debating points back and forth, let us remember that this country is in a severe economic danger and also this Province. And what

MR. HISCOCK: we need is more co-operation between not only both levels of government, we need more co-operation and trust in the private enterprise and also, Mr. Speaker, among each other. And if we do not get that, Mr. Speaker, the answer is not to get more jurisdiction over the Northern cod, the answer is not to get more jurisdiction over anything because there will be nothing there to administer it if we do not have any money. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS: Mr. Speaker, I am quite delighted to be able to speak in support of this resolution which has been so ably put by my colleague, the hon. member for St. Mary's-The Capes (Mr. Hearn) and which has been so ably supported by my colleagues, the hon. members for Burin-Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and Fortune-Hermitage (Mr. Stewart). Mr. Speaker, in replying to a point made by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) about the safety of trawlers, I would like to advise him that the safety of trawlers and whether or not they are fit to go to sea and fish in the Northern waters is directly the responsibility of the CSI under the jurisdiction of Transport Canada, and this Province has nothing to do with it.

Mr. Speaker, there should be no question from anyone who sits in this House that there should be a greater allocation of the Northern cod for the inshore fishermen of this Province who are being denied the right to make a decent living because the federal Liberal Government is giving away such a large portion of our Northern cod stocks. They are giving these stocks away, Mr. Speaker. For instance, Mr. Speaker, they are giving it away to the EEC countries who take 9500 metric tons of Northern cod per year from our waters.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) investment in our Province

MR. MATTHEWS: I would like for the hon. Leader of the

MR. MATTHEWS: Opposition to remain quiet, Mr.

Speaker, because I think of the near tragedies that we had and the ones we had last Winter were duly responsible - I think he is responsible for most of the wind that we have experienced in the Province. So I will ask him to be quite.

MR. NEARY: That is really low class.

MR. MATTHEWS: It is quite ironic, Mr. Speaker that this federal Liberal Government is giving away our fish stocks to the EEC countries, the same countries who are presently attempting to block the importation of our seal products and are consequently trying to eliminate our seal fishery.

I say, Mr. Speaker, that if the federal Liberal Government was worth its salt and had any intestinal fortitude, then it would cancel any agreement it has with these countries and keep our stocks for use by our inshore fishermen, trawler men and plant workers and consequently keep them employed.

Mr. Speaker, it is quite ironic that we have a federal government who is supposed to be looking after the interests of this Province, but yet they are giving away to other countries instead of looking out for their own.

I think also, Mr. Speaker, that I should make reference to the statement as made by the Prime Minister a few days ago. And I really thing sincerely now, Mr. Speaker, that it is much to his dismay that this Province is still an integral part of this great country of Canada. Mr. Speaker, fish plants all over this Province have been forced to close because of an inadequate supply of fish. Inshore fishermen are being forced to give up fishing because of the poor inshore fishery. Both problems, Mr. Speaker, are directly related to the generous giveaway attitude of the federal government.

MR. MATTHEWS: Mr. Speaker, the only conclusion I can come to is that it must be Liberal chemistry that makes the hon. members of the Opposition and the five Liberal MPs in Ottawa, who are supposed to be representing the interests of the people of this Province, so emphatic about giving away to others while our own are suffering. And I might make reference here, Mr. Speaker, and talk about resource and fish stocks, and I am totally convinced that the hon. members of the Opposition do not want us to have any control over any resources that are on our constitutional shelf, whether it be the fish or the oil -

MR. NEARY: On our Constitutional Shelf. That is right.

MR. MATTHEWS: Continental Shelf.

I apologize to the hon. member.

MR. NEARY: Get it straight.

MR. TOBIN: He does not know where it is anyway so you have no need to apologize. He does not care where it is.

MR. MATTHEWS: Mr. Speaker, I am more than concerned with this attitude and this issue because, as you know, I represent one of the largest and most historic fishing districts in this Province and, indeed, Atlantic Canada. The fact is supported, Mr. Speaker, by the fact that in 1979, 40 per cent of our Province's offshore catch was landed on the Burin Peninsula.

Mr. Speaker, the offshore fishery combined with the inshore fishery has sustained and enhanced the growth of numerous smaller communities throughout our Province and has resulted in a way of life that I feel is unique. While the offshore has provided us with reasonable affluence, year-round employment and an industrialized life style, the inshore fishery compliments this by allowing for survival of many of our smaller communities and also providing tremendous social and cultural benefits and, of course, a decent living for so many residents of this Province.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) said that no member from this side had any suggestions as to what should be done about the fishery problems. What I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, is that this Province be given a say in resource management. Who else would know in what way the resource should be managed for the benefit of the fishermen and plant workers in this Province but our own Newfoundlanders?

MR. MATHEWS:

I would also like to say, Mr. Speaker, that licencing is another area in which this Province should have some say. With reference to licencing, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to point out an individual incident in the town of Fortune. A fisherman there has owned a longliner for eight years. The man has been disabled for the past two years because he had brain surgery. He has had several offers to sell his longliner but he cannot sell it because of hinderance from the federal Department of Fisheries and Oceans, who will not permit the transfer of the licence of the boat.

MR. TOBIN: That is shameful! That is shameful!

MR. MATTHEWS: I mean, if that is not shameful what is? Here is a gentleman who owes money to the Fisheries Loan Board, is surviving on social assistance because of an illness, yet he cannot sell his boat because federal Fisheries and Oceans will not transfer the licence of the boat.

MR. TOBIN: That is the crowd from the Prairie Provinces and meteropolises.

MR. MATTHEWS: So then someone said, 'Why should we give this Province any say in resource management and any say in licencing?' I think, Mr. Speaker, that that is self-explanatory as to why we should have some say in the resource management and in licencing.

With resource management, Mr. Speaker, this government for years has been advocating that we extend the 200-mile limit to take in the Nose and Tail portions of the Grand Banks. Of course, this action, Mr. Speaker, would eliminate foreign fishing in this area and ensure a supply of fish for our trawlers and consequently supply the South Coast plants which have been referred to by my hon. colleagues from Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) and Fortune - Hermitage (Mr. Stewart) that are in great difficulty. And they are in great difficulty, Mr. Speaker, because of the lack of supply of fish. I have sat down, Mr. Speaker, on numerous occasions with the major fish companies, with delegations and the companies have informed us that it is because of the lack of fish that they have had to close the plants in Harbour Breton, St. Lawrence, etc. And, of course, if the Nose and Tail of the Grand Banks were protected, the supply of fish would be available for our plants and consequently they could remain open for a longer period of time throughout the year.

Also, Mr. Speaker, another

MR. MATTHEWS: problem is that each year Newfoundland fish companies are given lower quotas in the Gulf while other provinces are allowed to harvest in this area at will.

MR. NEARY: Name them.

MR. MATTHEWS: Of course. Quebec and Nova Scotia. But not Newfoundland. Again, Mr. Speaker, poor Newfoundland, you know, stepped on once again by the almighty powers of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, I have very little difficulty in supporting -

MR. NEARY: He does not know what he is talking about.

MR. TOBIN: He does know what he is talking about.

MR. MATTHEWS: - this resolution, Mr. Speaker. And I would like to say to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) here that, as I said before, you do not have any desire to see this Province control any resources on the Continental Shelf, whether it be fish or oil. And it is just a few short weeks ago when you got all your press after returning from Ottawa, when you talked about the better offer on the table, that it was there if we went back, but I am telling you that the press has picked up what the better offer in Ottawa was, Mr. Speaker. The better offer that Ottawa has for this Province was the offer to the hon. gentleman to put him in the Senate when he retires. And that is going to do very little for the people of this Province.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MATTHEWS: I think once again, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman has demonstrated his lack of concern for the people of this Province. He does not give one hoot about them. All he is concerned about is himself, and, of course, the people of this Province fully realize what he stands for because I do not need to repeat what they showed him on April 6 with what he has left over there and the vote that he won by, forty-two votes and only -

MR. NEARY: You are as neurotic as the Premier.
You are well-intentioned, well-meaning but you do not understand.

MR. MATTHEWS: If you had any intestinal fortitude
you would cross the floor.

MR. TOBIN: We do not want him. We do
not want him. No, sir! One of the greatest assets we have is
the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. NEARY: I put him in the same category as Haig Young

MR. MATTHEWS: Mr. Speaker, it is quite alarming
really to sit here this afternoon and hear the speeches coming
from the hon. members opposite and to hear the bellyragging
that they have done about this government and its stand on
the fishery. We have heard the hon. member for Fortune-Hermitage
(Mr. Stewart) outline

MR. MATTHEWS: the financial assistance that this government has put forward to fish companies in this Province which has prevented the closing of so many of our plants and kept so many workers employed. It is quite sickening, as a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, to know that they cannot stand up for this Province and support a resolution which will mean that if we get some say in resource management, licensing and other jurisdiction of the fisheries our own people in this Province will be able to remain employed and make a decent living.

Mr. Speaker, I am quite proud this afternoon, this evening, to be able to stand here and say that I am totally in support of the resolution that was put forward by my hon. colleague from St. Mary's - The Capes (Mr. Hearn).

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. NEARY: It is very obvious, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentlemen who are speaking on the other side of the House in support of this resolution are, may be well-meaning and well-intentioned but they just do not seem to understand, Mr. Speaker. They are like the Premier, they do not understand and they are making absolutely ridiculous statements. Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that processing is a provincial responsibility, processing of fish.

MR. TOBIN: Processing what?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. NEARY: Once the fish is landed on shore it comes under the jurisdiction of the provincial government and it is in this area -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Burn your boats.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: - Mr. Speaker, it is in this area that the problem has been created. Too many processing plants, too many processing licenses have been issued by this government. There have been no -

MR. TOBIN: Why is the federal government giving away 83,000 tons of cod?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, there are too many fish plants and there is not enough -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, when you speak in this House, unless you are a complete ignoramus, any hon. gentleman who understands the rules of this House would know that if you are going to speak you have to speak from your own seat. Unless you are a complete and utter ignoramus, or you think you are in a bar where you are having a brawl, where you are having an argument over a few beers or something. Mr. Speaker, this happens to be the peoples' House, and members have to observe the rules of the House. This is not a bar-room brawl. And I would submit, Your Honour,

MR. NEARY:

that if the new members do not understand that you are not allowed to speak from somebody else's seat, that maybe what we need is an educational programme. And perhaps Your Honour might undertake to start some kind of a programme to educate the newer members into the rules of the House. It might be a good idea because, Mr. Speaker, this is the sort of thing that has a tendency to lower the decorum of the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear! Hear!

MR. STEWART:

Every time the hon. Leader of the Opposition gets up he lowers the decorum.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, the fact of the matter is that there are too many processing licences in this Province, and what hon. gentlemen are arguing, Mr. Speaker, is that now the Government of Canada, the Federal Department of Oceans and Fisheries, should throw conservation measures out the window. They should forget about conserving the stock. Now, Mr. that is what hon. gentlemen are saying.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

MR. NEARY:

And if that happens, Mr. Speaker, if that happens pretty soon nobody in Newfoundland would be able to earn a living. And, Mr. Speaker, nobody would be able to earn a decent living at the fishery. If you throw caution to the wind and you have no conservation measures that are strictly adhered to and enforced, pretty soon nobody, but nobody in this Province would earn a decent living at the fishery.

MR. NEARY: And the other part of it is this, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. members who have been speaking this afternoon obviously have not consulted with the Premier, because the Premier is aware of why it is necessary to give certain allocations, certain quotas to foreign countries. The Premier is aware of that.

MR. MORGAN: Why give it away if you are not going to get something for it?

MR. NEARY: And the Minister of Fisheries is aware of it. And unless, Mr. Speaker, unless they are complete hypocrites, unless they are hypocrites - political hypocrites I mean - then they would tell their members why these things are being done.

MR. MORGAN: We do not benefit from it.

MR. NEARY: We do not benefit from it.

MR. MORGAN: No, we do not. We are losing this year on the EEC agreement on fisheries. There was less fish bought by the EEC this year than last year when there was no agreement in place.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, last year we had in this Province an investment by the Portuguese of some \$80 million.

MR. TOBIN: Is that true?

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman knows -

MR. MORGAN: Portugal is not part of the EEC.

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman knows that the Portuguese are waiting and willing and able to put another \$100 million into this Province.

MR. MORGAN: Yes, and FIRA. will not let them do it.

MR. NEARY: Oh, who will not let them do it?

MR. MORGAN: FIRA, the federal government agency, will not let them do it.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, we just heard reasons coming from hon. gentlemen who are supporting this resolution of why they will not do it.

MR. TOBIN: Why? What did I say?
What did I say? Tell us now.

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The hon. gentleman who just

MR. NEARY: took his seat said that the federal government is giving away fish that should be caught by Newfoundland.

MR. TOBIN: Yes, right. Right.

MR. NEARY: I see. Well now, Mr. Speaker, how about the Portuguese? How about if they want a couple of thousand metric tons and they are prepared to invest \$100 million in this Province, would that be a fair trade? Would it be giving Newfoundlanders an opportunity to find employment and to earn a dollar and support their families?

MR. STEWART: You do not understand.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

MR. NEARY: The trouble is, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier is withholding information from his backbenchers, and that is why I said in the beginning that they do not understand. If they understood they would not be making the ridiculous statements they are making.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the fishery is in a pretty serious financial condition. Three companies are in very, very serious financial straits. Nickerson's, Fishery Products and the Lake Group are in a very, very -

MR. MORGAN: What about John Penney and Sons?

MR. NEARY: Well, I include them with the Lake Group. And the hon. Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) has made a statement that the federal government must help financially to bail out their companies. Now, the hon. Minister of Fisheries of this Province knows that that is provincial jurisdiction. It is provincial jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker, and the Minister of Fisheries and the administration in this Province are faced

MR. NEARY: with one of two decisions: They can either let the companies go under, let them go bankrupt, let them go belly up and then try to pick up the pieces after; or they can do that or they can keep pumping money into these companies. And we are talking about large sums of money.

MR. MORGAN: One hundred and fifty million dollars.

MR. NEARY: We are talking about more than that.

MR. MORGAN: What would you do?

MR. NEARY: I am not the government. If I was the government I know what I would do. It is time that the government started governing.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would like for the Minister of Fisheries to tell this House and to tell the people of this Province which strategy he has adopted. Does he intend to let these three big companies go bankrupt and pick up the pieces after, or does he intend to pump some more money into these companies so that they can continue to operate? Let me ask the hon. gentleman this: Has the hon. gentleman had a financial feasibility study done on these three companies?

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, he did!

MR. NEARY: No, he has not, Mr. Speaker. So I doubt very much if the hon. gentleman is in a position to tell us what plans the provincial government has for saving these three companies. We know that the Kirby Task Force is doing a financial study on these companies. We know that. We know that it is going to take two or three more months for that study to be completed. But, Mr. Speaker, this is provincial jurisdiction and I would like to ask the

MR. NEARY: administration what plans they have to salvage these three companies and what plans they have put -

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Order, please!

I would like to draw the attention of the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) to our Standing Order 53 (3) which on the second day of the debate says that the Chair should call on the mover of the motion to close that debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

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

MR. HEARN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am reminded of the Scotsman's bottle when he looked in it and said, 'All good things must come to an end'. It is amazing that a resolution that was supposed to have been kicked around this past six years drew so much attention. It is also sort of amazing how everybody seems to know what this resolution is designed to do except myself-and I was the one who proposed it.

This resolution, Mr. Speaker, was not designed to solve all the problems in the fishery. It was just designed to take one step in the right direction. Now as far as I know from involvement in the fishing industry, there are three basic steps involved. First of all we have the catching, then we have the processing and then the marketing. But first of all we have the catching. So in order to solve some of the problems we are faced with today, Mr. Speaker, we started at the beginning. Not like the hon. members, who are used to doing things backwards, and want to solve the problems in the marketing first and then the processing before you worry about the catching. But, boy, if you do not catch it you cannot process it or you cannot market it.

MR. HODDER: Yes, but if you catch it and you cannot market you are in a worse situation.

MR. MORGAN: That is not the problem. You do not understand. There is no fish to catch, my boy.

MR. HEARN: Mr. Speaker, this resolution was called a partisan resolution simply because we start where we should start, at the beginning. You know, when we use the word 'partisan' I am reminded of the remarks made yesterday evening in the House by the hon. member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock) when he stated that this government had tampered with the issuing of a liquor license in my home town of Trepassey. I suggest to the hon. members that they do what they did last year. Last year the same hon. members were kicking up because of a problem with the stadium in Trepassey. Eventually they came up, some of them at least, members of the Public Accounts Committee, including the interim Leader of the Party (Mr. Neary) across the way, and they saw the facility in Trepassey. Not only did they think it was a good facility. The hon. Leader of the Opposition, interim Leader of the Opposition stated he would recommend it as a design for any small town around the Island. I suggest to the hon. members that if they want to talk about the issuing of a license in Trepassey where they know not of what they speak, that they come up and see the building where the new establishment will be housed and see the person who is the owner of the establishment, and then check the other establishments that had applications in and then they will see it was given honestly and fairly, without any political involvement and that includes that of myself. However,

MR. HEARN: I do not really see how they could accuse us of political interference in Trepassey or partisan decisions because there are not Liberals enough up there to make any political decisions on.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: It was just the other day, Mr. Speaker, that four out of the five active workers that they had in the last election, four out of the five active workers came and pledged to support me in the next election. They had to support the candidate this time because, being an hon. gentleman, as he was, they owed him personal allegiance. Now they said they will support me. The fifth was an outside organizer whom I have not seen since.

MR. LUSH: Name them. Name them.

MR. HEARN: The hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Neary) seems to wonder about my status up in Trepassey, says, 'Anybody can get elected once. Getting elected a second time is the important thing'. Seeing that he has already left Bell Island to go to the South Coast or up to the Port aux Basques area, Burgeo-LaPoile, and seeing that he is within forty-one votes of defeat, undoubtedly he is going to be looking for another place. Well, I suggest to him if he wants to a quick exit from politics to come down to St. Mary's-The Capes next time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: Getting back to the resolution, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Terra Nova (Mr. Lush) who, I must say, spoke exceptionally well, very, very entertainingly, however, he said that this resolution does not get at the substance and solution of our problem. The hon. member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk), the cod critic said our resolution is a smoke screen. It is not intended, this resolution, Mr. Speaker, was never intended to be a smoke screen or neither was it intended to put something on the floor whereby we could go bashing the federal government. It was intended to start discussions on the problems that we face

MR. HEARN: in the Newfoundland fishery, to start at the beginning, at the catching efforts. Mr. Speaker, it is not a smoke screen resolution. It is a spark to ignite some fire under some of the members here, and I feel it has done this. We have heard during the past two days of discussion on the resolution, some tremendous suggestions and ideas, some common sense approaches from both sides. And I would like to give special credit to the member for Eagle River (Mr. Hiscock). I thought he had an excellent speech with some very, very pertinent points and, of course, some excellent points from the members on our side. If we can start, Mr. Speaker, and do something about working on these suggestions, the suggestions that have been put forth, then perhaps we can get something done to solve the problems that face us today.

But let us start, Mr. Speaker, not with number three or number two, let us start at number one, then pick up on number two and number three. I admit, we all admit, there are problems also in the processing sector, all kinds of them. There are problems in the marketing sector. But the primary problems exist in the catching sector. You know that goes, Mr. Speaker, right from the large trawlers, the offshore trawlers, down to the fellow in his sixteen footer with his hook and line, who is out there using his hook and line the same way as the members opposite use the open line.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. HEARN: I am reminded, Mr. Speaker, of the story of a tourist -

MR. CALLAN: Are you talking about Bas's open line?

MR. HEARN: No, the Liberal open line.

Mr. Speaker, I am reminded of the story of a tourist who visited our area last year and, stopping on the side of the road, he looked out at the many little fishing boats fishing around a place called Renews Rock in the district of the hon. the member for Ferryland (Mr. Power). One of the local chaps happened to be standing by the side of the road and he said to him, "My good man, what method of fishing are those fellows using out there?" And the fellow said, "Well, my good man, it is like this, they have a hook and line, there is a cod on one end and a fool on the other". And when the hon. members are talking to Carl Sterrett that story covers it perfectly.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the hon. members for their contributions to the resolution. I feel that we have heard a tremendous amount of expertise. However, as I have mentioned before, I feel the real expertise in the fishing industry comes from outside this House, not necessarily from the owners of large corporations or large companies but from the fishermen, the people who work in the fish plants and the people involved in the other forms of transportation, etc., who are down where the problems exist. Once we get to the point, Mr. Speaker, where we all start listening to them and working on those problems, then eventually we can say that we have made the right start in solving these problems in the Newfoundland fishery.

I once again suggest that this resolution that I have submitted to the House was done simply to discuss one of the problems, one of the problems only of the fishing industry in Newfoundland, that is the catching factor. I did not introduce it to cause or set up a smoke screen for fed bashing. I introduced it so it could be discussed honestly

MR. HEARN:

and sincerely, and to a certain extent it was. There were a lot of good points came out in this House because of this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I will go over it once again for the record. It says:

'WHEREAS the development of the inshore fishery is the only realistic way of solving rural Newfoundland's unemployment problems, and we have all admitted it is; and

'WHEREAS the federal government policy on the inshore fishery is detrimental to this effect especially as it relates to the harvesting of the cod stock, and to a certain extent it is;

'BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that this government request the federal government to adopt a much more reasonable stand.'

Request the federal government to adopt a much more reasonable stand; that to me is not fed bashing, it is a realistic step in solving part of the grave problems that are facing us. Then we

MR. HEARN: can pick up, as I said, on the others, the processing and eventually the marketing. One step at a time, Mr. Speaker, is the way this government moves and I am proud now to move this resolution.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (RUSSELL): Is the House ready for the motion?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

MR. SPEAKER: All those in favour of the motion "Aye". Those against "Nay". The motion is carried.

This being Private Member's Day the Chair will now deem it to be six o'clock. I leave the Chair until three of the clock tomorrow, Thursday.