

PRELIMINARY

UNEDITED

TRANSCRIPT

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

FOR THE PERIOD:

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

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 30, 1977

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

I am pleased to welcome to the House of Assembly eleven Grade VII students from St. Francis of Assisi School in Outer Cover. These students are accompanied by two of their teachers, Miss Nancy Wilson and Miss Janet Vivian. I know all hon. members join me in welcoming these students and their teachers to the Legislature.

HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

PRESENTING PETITIONS

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Fortune - Hermitage.

MR. J. WINSOR: Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to present a petition on behalf of the Town Council of Terrenceville and supported by 139 persons from that town. The prayer of the petition is; "We 139 persons over eighteen years of age do hereby petition Her Majesty's Government to institute an ongoing programme of upgrading and paving of all access roads to the communities of the Connaigre Peninsula and the Fortune Bay area, to be completed over the next two years.

"It is becoming increasingly evident that the development and economy of these areas have been seriously impeded due to the inferior quality of all access roads. It is further evident that the economical operation of several fish processing operations has been and continues to be seriously impeded. This has reflected on the income of workers in these plants. We appeal to the Minister of Transportation and Communications for full and understanding consideration of the prayer of this petition."

This is, as I said, on behalf of 139 persons. This is essentially the same petition as was presented by so many others in my district some time ago, and I do not think I need expand any further on the need for improvement in the roads in that area. As a matter of fact, the road to Harbour Breton is just about closed because of soft conditions. It was a very poorly constructed road in the first place. I was hoping to go back to my district on

MR. J. WINSOR: the weekend. I cannot do it by the direct route of going down Bay d' Espoir road and down over the Harbour Breton road, as it is impassable. Therefore I have to go to the Burin Peninsula and take a steamer to Hermitage Bay. This gives some indication of how bad the roads are this time of the year.

I therefore support this petition and ask that it be tabled and presented to the department to which it relates.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. the member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the petition by the 139 persons referred to by our hon. friend, and from the Town Council of Terrenceville for the upgrading and paving of roads on the Connaigre Peninsula. We can certainly see the need for the request which seems to me a most justifiable one, particularly when you realize the conditions over which they have to drive or be transported, goods and persons.

The people there are again attempting to express their feelings and requests for a much needed improvement on the roads in the area. It is something in this year that they are certainly entitled to. It would be interesting to see when the roads programme for the year is announced, if it is announced, if it is detailed. The people there surely have a right to know what will be done this year in part or in whole, and this House is the place for it to be done.

I feel that the hon. member has a right,

MR. NOLAN: as do the people that he represents in the petition presented, to have some kind of a definitive answer on this particular petition, in part or in whole, during this current session of the House of Assembly so that it will not merely be something that is presented here and the people will feel that we here are becoming completely irrelevant altogether and that petitions are a waste of time. The petition system is a very, very important one for the people through their members and through the House of Assembly and through the Press, hopefully. And so it is that I hope we will be in a position this year, as least the government, to do something to bring about the much needed improvements as requested by the town council of Terrenceville in the petition so ably presented by my hon. friend.

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. member for Burin-Placentia.

MR. CANNING: Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my support to this petition and I would like to lay emphasis on the first part of the prayer of the petition that the people present, where they say "upgrade." I noticed in practically all petitions - roads, since I came back to the House, the people say upgrade. You would be expecting them to have a road there already for paving - people looking for paving, but every single petition says upgrade. And Mr. Speaker, I know why that is emphasized or why it comes first before the grading or they mention it first before the grading. Because in my own district, the experience I have had, or the people have had, in the last three years - there has been some paving done, and I do not know if I can demonstrate as well as I saw a lady demonstrating at a certain meeting that I was at not long ago about the roads in her district. But she was facing an audience telling the needs of her district and she said "the roads in my district they are like this" and then she went "and they are like this"

MR. CANNING: Well the highroads in my district have been paved since 1972. Previous to that we always made certain that the roads were upgraded first, there was pavement then built over the roads, as they were. They were dangerous, there were dangerous turns in them. We have had accidents on them. The paving is breaking up because the road was not upgraded. So in supporting the petition of the good people of Terrenceville I would like to lay emphasis on the first part, make certain it is upgraded and for God's sake do not go pouring asphalt in a slap-happy way over the old gravel roads. I support this petition, Sir.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS TO WHICH NOTICE HAS BEEN GIVEN

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I gave an undertaking yesterday to get some information concerning some patients who might have been working at the Waterford Hospital and whether they were paid. The information I have is that there are a number of patients in the Waterford Hospital who are doing some work, and I hasten to add, by their own choice, and some of them are being paid as much as \$5.00 per shift. The medical people tell me, and the management people, that there are some very beneficial side effects from this and that it is being used as occupational therapy and that the morale of the patients has improved and it is a very worthwhile project.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER: Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, a question for the Minister of Municipal Affairs which really grows out of a statement which he is reported to have made - I say that, not because

MR. ROBERTS:

I doubt he made it but because I am not sure whether it was quoted correctly or not. With respect to the grants that the government gives to people buying new homes, the \$600 grant, I am not sure of the technical name of the programme, can the minister tell us whether the programme will terminate on tomorrow, March 31st, the end of the fiscal year?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. DINN: Yes, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, can the minister - obviously the minister cannot tell us what will replace it, but can the minister tell us whether any applications that have been received by midnight tomorrow night will be processed and he might perhaps tell us at the same time, are there many such applications currently being processed?

MR. DINN: Mr. Speaker, the programme was quite successful last year. There were something like 3,029 approved. There is something like 250 left on file right now for approval and if these people move into their homes before March 31st then they will get their

MR. ROBERTS: Or anybody who applies tomorrow if he meets the other conditions.

MR. DINN: That is correct, yes.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment. Would the minister inform the House if Affiliated Marine Metals, the company that the government contracted to collect wrecked cars around the Province, are still functioning or have they ceased to operate or have they gone out of business altogether?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, actually they have not ceased functioning. They suspended operations for about six months, the Winter, due to the fact that they were trying to move many cars that had been frozen in, and in trying to get their equipment there instead of taking the car up the whole thing came apart. But I must say that they are very active, and I believe that negotiations are underway now with another company to export, if you like, some of the mass of cars that have accumulated at the Octagon, some 21,000 to 22,000. So I believe that within the next few days they will start in functioning as per usual.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the original questioner.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House if Affiliated Marine Metals have been paid in advance in anticipation of collecting car wrecks around Newfoundland? And if so, how far in advance have they been paid?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MURPHY: No, Mr. Speaker, we do not anticipate how many cars will be collected in the next year or so. We have paid them monthly on the number of cars that have been collected. And there is a contract price and seventy-five per cent of that amount is paid

Mr. Murphy.

when the car is brought to one of these storage lots, and the balance of twenty-five per cent will be paid when the car has been shipped out of Newfoundland.

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

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the original questioner.

MR. NEARY: Would the minister tell the House then if in

the next couple of weeks, as the minister indicates, the car wrecks that are piled up in various parts of the Province will be brought into St. John's and stockpiled at the Octagon ready to be shipped, you know, the wrecks that are piled up now in various parts of the Province along the highway?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MURPHY: All I say is brethren let us pray that we get transportation, but these cars that are piled in at the Octagon are not at this time ready to be shipped. I think there are some 7,000 that have been flattened and were put on the wharf down at the army docks and which were supposed to be shipped on November 10. But the company at the time diverted the ship. Instead of coming into St. John's to take these cars, diverted it into Daniel's Harbour to take a load of concentrate, and since that time the waterway - what we call it - has been frozen, and naturally up to Montreal. But we hope now with the new contract that things can be arranged where we have something like a few thousand flattened and ready for shipment on the West Coast. I think at Salmon Cove there are 700 or 800 that have been flattened, and various other areas of the Province where there have been cars flattened and ready waiting for transportation to ship out. But nothing has been paid in advance. We pay them on a monthly basis - the cars collected, so much per car.

MR. NEARY: One final supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A final supplementary.

MR. NEARY: The minister indicated a few moments ago that Affiliated Marine Metals has not been functioning for six months. Well then have they been paid a monthly stipend? And the minister mentioned a new contract there a few moments ago. Would the minister care to table the new contract if there is indeed a new contract? And also tell us whether the government is responsible for shipping or is the company responsible for shipping? Why the government is concerned about the shipping out of the cars? That is the responsibility of the company, I understand.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, if I may, I do not know who said six months. If I did, I said it in mistake really. I think it was the past six or seven weeks that they have suspended.

They operated up until January, and there is no new contract yet formulated. They are still operating under the old contract. And, as I say, I do not know if there is anything else I can add. But I would like to correct if I said the past six months, which is wrong. The past six or seven weeks was what I meant to say. I am sorry if I misled the House on that.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor - Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Would the minister indicate where this Affiliated Marine Metals have functioned in this Province outside of the immediate St. John's Area? What towns or communities outside of the immediate St. John's area has this company collected wrecks, flattened them and got them stockpiled? Or has it served any purpose outside of St. John's?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. minister.

MR. MURPHY: I would like to be able to submit a list of all the places where they have been. But off the top of my mind I know that in the West Coast and the Corner Brook area,

Mr. Murphy:

and as I said in the Salmon Cove area I think they worked over there, and they have gone - and this is in the immediate area of St. John's if you like-Torbay, and the Goulds wherever. There were a lot of cars accumulated and instead of towing them in to stow them in at the Octagon they flattened them, brought their flattener and whatnot to the place and flattened them and when transportation does come they will be transported right into St. John's.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: The hon. member's crash project.

MR. MURPHY: Pardon?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY: But I do not know really if - you know, there are many places, but right off the top of my head quite frankly I do not know, but I will say this that over the total period there are some 22,000 to 23,000 wrecks that have been collected from various parts of the Province, and this might be a few out in different areas and towed in and brought into the Octagon. And I might add this before the member from Conception Bay South (Mr. Nolan) gets up, that we are having some, I will not say dispute, but representations from the town of Paradise because we know it is a very unslightly mess and we pledge to do everything in our power to try to process these and get them the heck out as soon as we can.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: One more supplementary. Would the minister undertake to have that company render the same services in the immediate Central Newfoundland area, Grand Falls, Windsor as they are seeming to be doing in Corner Brook or St. John's, because we pay the dollar too, Mr. Speaker, and up to now we have not seen any evidence that this company is functioning at all.

MR. MURPHY: We certainly will when we start to move cars out definitely. And just to put the position in the clear, in a municipality the council are responsible for bringing these cars

Mr. Murphy:

to a central location, like in the city of St. John's, just for example, the council is responsible for collecting cars within the city limits and storing them at Robin Hood Bay. The cars that are in at the Octagon have been picked up perhaps down on the Old Broad Cove Road or perhaps places on the Southern Shore where there was no council as such. But the first responsibility, and I might point this out now, Mr. Speaker, in a municipality is for the council to collect cars from streets or anything else and put them in a proper waste disposal site like, as I say, Robin Hood Bay or a waste disposal site like, say, Salmon Cove where they were stored, or any other area of the Province. Actually the government is not going to go into any municipality and start a street to street collection of cars because there would not be enough money in the mint, really, to pay for that project.

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I will hear the hon. member from Conception Bay South's supplementary and then the hon. member from LaPoile's supplementary.

MR. NOLAN: A question for the Minister of Consumer Affairs on this issue, and that is since the government of the Province through the extra dollar charged for licences is obviously subsidizing the company concerned, what, if anything is the government doing to assist the municipalities to transport them to a central position?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. MURPHY: I do not like to say that that dollar is subsidizing any company, I think it is subsidizing the car wreck removal because - and I will just challenge any member of this House if they can collect a car in any part of the Province for \$1 and bring it to Robin Hood Bay I will make the contract now for 15,000 or any other waste disposal.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. MURPHY: But what we did do we collected something like \$190,000, I believe, I am subject to correction,

AN HON. MEMBER: but how much are they being paid for these cars?

MR. MURPHY: - in 1976, and we spent \$360,000, so you know there is no subsidy to the company there.

MR. ROBERTS: Treasury Board will not welcome that.

MR. MURPHY: The company have been paid as far as I understand something like \$27.50.

AN HON. MEMBER: A car?

MR. MURPHY: A car, to collect them and bring them into - and I might just say this and it is information that I came by during the past few months that the investment in this company has been something like \$360,000 for this flatterner and whatnot. So when you look at this type of thing it is not all, you know -

AN HON. MEMBER: Degrading.

MR. MURPHY: - cherries or honey or whatever you might like to call it.

MR. NOLAN: What about the municipalities?

MR. MURPHY: The municipalities?

MR. NOLAN: What did the municipalities get to help bring them to a central point?

MR. MURPHY: I suppose they get the taxes of the citizens and then it is up to them. If a guy puts a car outside his door and expects the other taxpayers to transport it to a dump or wherever it might be - I think that the council should take action on the person who dares leave his car in some place, And as a matter of fact I asked only yesterday to have our legislation reviewed, and if we can prove actually that the car belongs to someone and it is placed in a position anywhere and we consider it to be a nuisance or pollution we will definitely ring them and make them darn well pay for it.

MR. ROBERTS: Sure well -

MR. NOLAN: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I have indicated that I will recognize the hon. member from LaPoile for a final supplementary and then I will recognize the hon. member from Lewisporte.

---

MR. NEAPY:

In the event, Mr. Speaker, that the minister does impose a penalty on those who leave the car wrecks, make them pay for moving the wrecks, will the dollar on the licenses then be dropped, that the vehicle license holders in this Province will no longer have to subsidize Affiliated Marine Metals?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister.

MR. MURPHY: I do not know where this subsidizing Marine Metals comes in, Sir, quite frankly. They are subsidizing a government plan to rid this Province of something over the past twenty odd years where there were some 25,000 or 26,000 car wrecks just strewn around the countryside. And Affiliated Marine Metals is not being subsidized. They have a business deal with this government. Whether it is good or bad it can be argued but do not think that any person who is paying one dollar is subsidizing any individual or any company. They are subsidizing the government.

MR. NEARY: They are subsidizing P.C. Party leaders.

MR. MURPHY: If we do not collect it there is another \$200,000 that will be spent on removing car wrecks.

MR. NEARY: It is true.

MR. MURPHY: If this House does not want these wrecks removed, they want to leave them on your doorsteps it is all right with me as the minister involved with it. It does not bother me quite frankly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Lewisporte.

MR. WHITE: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Rural and Industrial Development. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could bring us up to date on the situation with respect to a barrel making factory in the Province. It has been considered for quite some time and I wonder if it is still going on.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural and Industrial Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, there are three or four enquiries about barrel making, two were before DREE and to this date there is no concrete decision made on any particular company. Is the hon. member thinking about

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Lewisporte particularly?

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

MR. WHITE: A supplementary. Mr. Speaker, I knew that three sites were being considered, Stephenville, Exploits and Lewisporte, and I was just wondering if the minister had made a definite decision on either particular site.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural and Industrial Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the applications were almost entirely of a different nature. The gentleman from Lewisporte had a rather small, we thought, practical type of local industry that could be gotten off the ground and we were very positive towards that industry. We worked with the Newfoundland and Labrador Development to help them but I have not had an update on that for a number of weeks. But that was a small and a sort of a cottage industry. The Lewisporte one - that is the Lewisporte one.

The other two both were DREE applications. The decision regarding one particular industry in the Exploits area it was concluded, after the analysis by the Newfoundland and Labrador Development Corporation, that they did not have the market outlet for the product, for the capacity that they had envisaged, with the machinery that would be necessary, the capital outlet required to justify the size of the industry they had in mind. We were prepared, working with that company, to assist them to travel to Iceland and a number of other countries to identify an outlet, we know there is a market, so they could justify the level of capital expenditure. So at this stage that is the procedure being followed for that particular group of business people.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Health. I wonder if the minister could tell the House what basis or what criteria is used by government to decide whether or not to give financial assistance to any area of the Province to buy an ambulance?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I have not got the programme before me but I

MR. COLLINS:

will try and give the hon. member the answer. I will certainly get a copy of the ambulance programme brochure. It is my understanding however that in some areas we do donate, I suppose, if you want to call it that, or we provide - not donate - provide an ambulance to a community or to a Lions Club or some responsible group within the community. That ambulance is provided to them by the department, and there is also a mileage subsidy paid. There are areas of the Province again where private enterprise sometimes gets involved, an individual or whatever and purchases an ambulance where there is also a provincial subsidy. The exact amount of the subsidy I would not want to say as I might not be right. But there are two sets of criteria to be used. I will certainly get the pamphlet which outlines the programme for the member.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, maybe the minister misunderstood the question, or I did not frame it properly. What I would like to know is how does this department decide whether or not to assist a particular area once an application comes in to ask for an ambulance? What criteria do you make that decision on?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, I misunderstood the member obviously. That does pose a bit of a problem for us. I might say, Mr. Speaker, however, that we are more than pleased and people in Newfoundland

MR. H. COLLINS: I am sure are more than pleased and have readily accepted the ambulance programme which we have put in place, that is the road ambulance programme that is over and above the air ambulance programme.

I suspect that we have reached the point now, where it needs some regulations in terms of the number in any given community. That is under active negotiation with the Public Utilities Board, with the hope that in the very near future we will have proper regulations provided to determine if indeed another ambulance might be needed in the community where one already exists. We do not think it is a job for the Department of Health to undertake and the Public Utilities Board seems to be a proper and appropriate place to have it done and that is under negotiation now.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: I hope the Minister of Health will pardon me but I am not getting the answer I am looking for. Let me give him an example. For example if two ambulances already exist in a community and an application comes into government to provide a third one, and assuming those two ambulances are owned by private industry, private investors, does the government give very much consideration to providing that third one out of public funds? That is the type of situation I am talking about?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: That is what I am alluding to, Mr. Speaker, and it is very difficult for us in the Department of Health to be able to make those decisions. And bearing in mind that that problem is now arising in some places, not too many places but in a few places it is becoming a bit of a problem. I suppose it could be considered in the context that if there is a drug store in a community should the government permit another drug store to come in. I do not think that that is a good analogy but it could very well be. But after recognizing

MR. H. COLLINS: the problem, Mr. Speaker, as I have indicated, we are negotiating now with the Public Utilities Board to put into place some proper regulations so that applications for ambulances can be dealt with properly and also that the operation of the vehicles can be properly regulated.

MR. SPEAKER: The final supplementary.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, I wonder if the minister could tell the House when his department receives applications for financial assistance towards getting an ambulance, whether first of all any effort is made to encourage local investors to provide that service rather than the government going forking out \$12,000 or \$14,000 for an ambulance whatever it is? Is there any effort made to stimulate local people to invest into that kind of service?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. H. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, so that there will not ever be any chance of anyone accusing us of political interference, I always give those applications to a very good man in charge of the programme, who is Mr. John Lundrigan. I will certainly take that matter up with him.

MR. RIDEOUT: Conflict of interest.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Eagle River.

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, a question for my old hunting colleague, the Minister of Tourism. In view of the unusually mild weather on the Labrador Coast and the fact that only 150 out of the usual 2,500 caribou have been taken, and additionally that the people have got to travel 600 miles by snowmobile to get their caribou, could the minister indicate whether he considered extending the caribou hunting season until April 30th.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Tourism.

MR. HICKEY: Mr. Speaker, all things being equal, it seems like a reasonable request. I cannot give the hon. member an answer right

MR. HICKEY: now but certainly I will be prepared to discuss with my staff the possibility of that and unless there are reasons, as I said, as to why we cannot do it, then certainly we would be prepared to consider and hopefully go along with it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, the question I have is for the Acting House Leader, I guess, or perhaps probably the Premier, it is a similar question to the one that I asked last year about this time, is government satisfied with the performance of the Ombudsman?

MR. RIDEOUT: The Premier had better answer it.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I think it is up to the government to comment on whether we are satisfied or dissatisfied with the Ombudsman, or the Auditor General or any of these people who have an independence. If you are asking me personally I have heard no comments or criticisms to the contrary.

MR. CALLAN: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: The original questioner.

MR. CALLAN: Mr. Speaker, again the question I asked last year about this time, has any thought be given yet to widening the framework under which the Ombudsman works? I am sure that there are an awful lot of people in this Province who do not know when or where to go for help from the Ombudsman.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: Mr. Speaker, I do not know if the question is directed at you, Sir, or myself, but as far as the government is concerned we appointed the Ombudsman to cover the governmental duties, to cover the various roles of government and as far as I know he is doing that.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, the hon. member for Conception Bay South.

MR. NOLAN: For the hon. the Premier in reference to the Ombudsman.

In most jurisdictions where they have had ombudsmen for hundreds of years, such as Sweden and so on,

Mr. Nolan.

it is normal for the Ombudsman to make recommendations to the House of Assembly where he has run into problems in attempting to fulfill his requirements as provided under the act. What recommendations have been made by the Ombudsman, if any, that we know of as yet to help him with his situation up to this moment? For example, the Ombudsman also has reference to the press where he has a problem. And I am not aware, for example, where he has acted upon this proviso that is provided in every other jurisdiction. So what recommendations do we have from the Ombudsman to help him and improve his position as it now stands?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Premier.

PREMIER MOORES: I appreciate the member's knowledge on the subject, Mr. Speaker, and I suggest he read the Ombudsman's report of last year when he covered that subject.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, a supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognize the hon. member for a supplementary.

I think I should point out so that the line of questioning does not leave any hon. member's - or at least for the information of hon. members - and that is that the Ombudsman, of course, is an officer of the House of Assembly and is not responsible to government but is responsible to the House of Assembly. With respect then to questions regarding the Ombudsman, I would think, you know, in that they might relate to any facilitating legislation that would be passed then obviously that is an area, but I think hon. members should bear in mind that the function of the Ombudsman in itself, and its performance is not an area in which he was responsible to a minister. I make that distinction. I am not saying that there are not questions that might be related to certain governmental functions of facilitating legislation or that kind of thing. But for the performance of his official functions, it is to the Legislature and not to a minister.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: One additional supplementary, and then I will recognize the hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to address a supplementary to the Minister of Health. And the minister will recall that the Parliamentary Commissioner asked for amending legislation of the Waterford Hospital Act last year to enable him to look into the Waterford files. Can the minister tell the House whether such legislation has been prepared and when we can expect to see it tabled?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Health.

MR. COLLINS: Mr. Speaker, that request has been analyzed and considered by the Department of Justice. Just what the situation is I am unable to say now.

MR. RIDEOUT: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I did indicate that that would be a final supplementary, but that will not preclude hon. members from coming back to it perhaps later. As I have indicated I recognize the hon. gentleman for LaPoile next.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I want to put a question to the Minister of Fisheries in connection with rumours of Booth Fisheries pulling out of Fortune and talks that are going on over new ships and so forth for Booth Fisheries in Fortune. Could the minister set the record straight on this matter?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, there is no truth to the suggestion that Booth Fisheries are pulling out of the Province or indeed want to pull out. They are having problems with respect to their catching effort, and that is something we are having talks with that company about, but certainly Booth Fisheries have a lot of faith in the future fisheries of our Province, and they want to be part of it. My deputy minister met with the officers of

Mr. W. Carter.

that company on Monday in Montreal at which time they discussed certain areas of concern to the company, and the matter is pretty well in hand. But I repeat the company is certainly not contemplating pulling out of the Province nor did they give any indication that they intend to in the future.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary question, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary by the original questioner.

MR. NEARY: Is the minister in a position yet to make

Y a statement in connection with Harbour Breton? What is going to happen to the fish plant there?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

Y MR. W. CARTER: No, Mr. Speaker, not at this time.

MR. NEARY: A supplementary, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary.

Y MR. NEARY: When can we expect a statement from the minister in connection with the Harbour Breton fish plant?

MR. W. CARTER: Soon.

MR. NEARY: But how soon, within a day, a week?

Y MR. W. CARTER: Very soon.

MR. NEARY: This week?

MR. W. CARTER: Very soon.

MR. NEARY: Will there be a statement this week?

MR. W. CARTER: Very soon.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Conception Bay South followed by the hon. gentleman for Windsor - Buchans.

Y MR. NOLAN: A question for the Minister of Fisheries.

I attempted to contact his office this morning hopefully to give him notice - I hope he got word - and that is concerning the destruction of the fishing stages in St. Phillips. Apparently someone has

Mr. Nolan.

taken it upon themselves to burn the darn things down  
and the equipment down there. And now the fishermen there -  
I am sure the minister is familiar with this by now - find  
themselves in a bit of an untenable position. There are not  
a lot of fishermen,

---

MR. NOLAN:

but what are there are now in a bit of a difficult problem. One is what knowledge does the minister have of the situation? What if any requests has he received and is he prepared or can he do anything down there to help in this problem that they have? I will have to hold the other part of my question for the Minister of Justice on this for a later date.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Fisheries.

MR. W. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, I am aware of the fact that five, I believe, private fishing stages were destroyed by fire a few nights ago. People from the Department of Fisheries have visited the area, talked to the fishermen. I think there are two full-time fishermen in the area and probably five or six or maybe more part-time fishermen or moonlighters whatever you want to call them. Certainly we are looking at it and what can be done will be done. But certainly in an area where you have but two full-time fishermen I do not think that would warrant too great an expenditure. But certainly we are looking at it. If we can find some way to assist, we will.

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, my question is for the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations. About a month ago the minister in answer to a question indicated that he would be making a statement in this legislature with regards to what the government's attitude was or their intentions were with regards to the implementation of the recommendation of the Buchans Task Force. That was over a month ago, Sir, and we have not heard a word. So if the minister -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

The hon. gentleman should proceed directly to his question. One may give the information that is necessary to make the question intelligible but further comments are out of order.

The hon. member for Windsor-Buchans.

MR. FLIGHT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So would the minister now indicate please as to exactly what the government's intentions are with regards to the Buchans Task Force?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Mr. Speaker, first of all a month ago or five weeks ago I did not say that the Minister of Manpower would, I said that the Minister of Manpower may or each individual minister from a departmental point of view, either one of them might. As I understand it now the departments have been since I said that and, I presume, are still looking at the recommendations as they pertain to each individual department. I would assume that when the ministers are prepared insofar as each departmental policy is concerned in respect of the implementation of the items contained in the Buchans Task Force Report, they would do so or they would pass them along to me. I have not received any yet so I would assume they are going to be doing it from a departmental point of view.

MR. FLIGHT: A supplementary.

MR. SPEAKER: A supplementary, original questioner.

MR. FLIGHT: Mr. Speaker, one of the prime recommendations in the Task Force Report was that the minister or Cabinet would appoint a Buchans Development Corporation. Now, what action has been taken on that recommendation? Is there going to be appointed a Buchans Development Corporation? And if not, why not?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. Minister of Rural and Industrial Development.

MR. LUNDRIGAN: In answer to that question, first of all I am a little bit surprised that the member has so little confidence in the future of Buchans and the positive aspects that were -

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

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

I cut off the hon. minister - I do not think he had completed his answer - to point out to him that in general the same rules apply to answers as to questions.

The hon. Minister of Rural Development.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Mr. Speaker, the last thing I want to do is be provocative, Sir. The hon. gentleman should refer to the remarks by the

MR. LUNDRIGAN:

Minister of Mines and Energy of recent weeks and recent months about some very positive aspects of development in his area, in Buchans, and I think they should bear repeating maybe in the House on the proper occasion.

As to a development corporation, Mr. Speaker, there is hardly a community in the Province that is not looking for a development corporation. We have in the Department of Rural Development thirty-one Rural Development Associations. And a lot of these Rural Development Associations, I might add, they are growing and expanding and there will be new ones in 1977-1978 and that kind of trust is one that I would commend to the hon. member. Secondly, as far as a development corporation being the panacea or the answer for a region, I think that a lot of people perhaps overstate the importance of this as the only angle to development.

The initiatives by the Minister of Mines and Energy particularly, initiatives by all ministers- there are a number in the government who have a specific relevancy to the Buchans area - I feel that over a period of time will certainly be very influential in having positive development in the Buchans area. And I do not think the member should get hung up on the development corporation as the answer to the problems.

ORDERS OF THE DAY:

MR. SPEAKER: It being Private Member's Day, the adjourned debate on motion 1, adjourned I believe by the Minister of Public Works.

MR. ROUSSEAU: Yes, Mr. Speaker, I believe I have about fifteen minutes left on the resolution. Last week I spoke, last Wednesday for about half an hour and laid out some of the problems as I saw them in Labrador, some of the individual items that we saw as problems mainly in the Western part of Labrador and I would think that these problems, of course, in some instances would flow over to the rest of Labrador.

As I suggested last week, I do not know whether it is a tangible thing or an intangible thing we are looking at, I would like to address myself to that for a moment. I think we know there are a lot of tangible needs in Labrador the same as there are on the Island part of the Province but in some areas of Labrador there are tangible things needed and I mean by the tangible things the services that are needed to make life a little more tolerable for people who live there in more isolation in some parts of Labrador than in others. These things certainly would go a long way. I think that the psychological feeling that people have in Labrador about being able to get outside of the Mainland part of the Province and back to the Island part of the Province right now is a difficult thing for them. The only way they can do it is by air. And I suggested in this House that in the past few years an air fare for a family coming out for a Summer vacation would be anywhere from \$1,000 to \$2,500 return, depending on the number of people in the family.

We must always remember, Mr. Speaker, in this instance that this money is net money. It is not gross money. I think there is one thing that very much upsets the people in Western Labrador and I think this applies to them there more than anywhere else in Labrador, and certainly more than anywhere else in the Province, that the streets up there are paved with gold and everybody is a millionaire and that is far from the true facts of the case.

The alternative from flying is by train to Seven Islands and then you have to drive through Quebec, New Brunswick and Nova Scotia and take the ferry to get back to the Island part of the Province.

MR. ROUSSEAU: That is a large cost, Mr. Speaker, and as I mentioned last week, five of my constituents, or four of them because one of them paid the fine, cannot drive through the Province of Quebec because they were served with a summons for working in the Mount Wright area a couple of years ago. I think one very important psychological thing that could happen to the people of Labrador would be a commitment to open that part of the road between Labrador City, Wabush and Esker. That would be very important as a temporary measure right now so that the ferry that operates out of the Goose Bay - Happy Valley area could bring the people of the Island part of the Province back to the Island part of the Province.

The alternative in even the more immediate term there might be the use of rail car ferry service from Labrador City - Wabush area to Esker via the iron ore company's rails. But again you meet some problems here because the Iron Ore Company of Canada and Wabush Mines are in the iron ore business and, of course, that is their first priority, and to find uses for the trains outside of that is a very difficult proposition.

I think that a commitment as a priority to that and, hopefully as I say, in the immediate term the use of the rail car ferry service from Labrador City, Wabush to Esker, and then the ability to drive over a road that was maintained from Esker to Goose Bay - Happy Valley area to take the ferry, the more long-term commitment, the question of, of course, opening that forty to sixty miles of road between Labrador City, Wabush and Esker that would allow the people who wanted to get back to the Island part of the Province a link with the Island part of the Province.

Of course there are -

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, Sir, but we do not have a quorum in the House.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please! I will ask the Law Clerk to count the House.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I am informed a quorum is present. The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! The hon. minister is having difficulty having his remarks heard by hon. members, The Hon. Minister of Manpower And Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: So, Mr. Speaker, I am speaking about the tangible things that we all know from our district point of view that we need. I would hope and I would think, I would think rather than hope I think, I would know that the hon. member from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) and the hon. member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan) and the hon. member from the Straits (Mr. Roberts) and myself know what these things are that we need in a tangible way, the services that we need, that the people talk to us about, that the people bring to our attention, I think are in our minds and could be transixed to paper without too much trouble.

For my own district right now I think we have been studied to death probably a little more than everybody else with the industrial enquiries and the human rights commissions and right now we have two enquiries going on, two which are very important to the people of Labrador West, I hope eventually to the people of the Province as well. The McCarthy Commission studying occupation and health and safety at the Iron Ore Company of Canada, and the Bartlett Commission which is looking at hiring practices in the Labrador City-Wabush area. These studies are going along concurrently, and one would hope that the recommendations that arise from these studies would go far in making life a little more tolerable again, probably in a combined tangible and intangible way. But these are not really the problems that I think are suggested by the motion by the hon. member from Eagle River. I think that he would agree, as my three other colleagues from Labrador would agree, that the people in the House of

Mr. Rousseau:

Assembly who represent districts, the members are well aware of the needs of their district in a tangible way.

From an intangible way I can stand up here and I have no hesitation in saying whatsoever that there is certainly a feeling of separatism in Labrador. There is no question about that. None whatsoever. I certainly do not need a study to know that. And I would hope that the forty-seven members of the House who do not represent Labrador would listen to the four members from Labrador and we will tell you without equivocation that there is a feeling of separation in Labrador. That I do not think is a topic that would meet with any resistance in coming to a conclusion between the member from Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), the member from Eagle River (Mr. Strachan), the Leader of the Opposition representing the Straits, and myself representing the Western part of Labrador, Menihek. There is that feeling there. And I would assume that the other forty-seven members who have at times past—Mr. Speaker, I find it very difficult, last week also, you know, to try and talk. To know that what you are saying is important and it means something to you and to try and get over the lull, and the speeches and the talking in the corridors it is a very — look I feel for Labrador, I am trying to say something if nobody else does that is their prerogative, but at least, you know, there could be some quietness.

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please! I am sure all hon. members will certainly respect the wish of the hon. minister in his request that silence be observed and this would apply, of course, to the House and to the hallways in the vicinity of the House. I would ask the constable if he would ensure that those outside of the House maintain reasonable silence.

The hon. Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations.

MR. ROUSSEAU: I do not know about the other members, everybody is saying we are always irrelevant in the House, I am starting to feel irrelevant to the House. I made a statement here on the Auditor General's report the other day and two or three times I was

Mr. Rousseau:

interrupted for noise, and today it is difficult.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: ... Oh, oh!..

MR. SPEAKER (DR. COLLINS): Order, please!

MR. ROUSSEAU: So anyway - oh yes, I was saying that the four members from Labrador know that there is a feeling of separation.

I think that

MR. ROUSSEAU:

what the people in Labrador are crying out for is a hand across the water. The people in Labrador West as I am sure the people in the rest of Labrador want these public services. I said last week that the one important thing we must remember about the people of Labrador is that they feel there should be no discrimination against the people of Labrador because they do not live or inhabit the Island part of the Province. They should not be discriminated against by reason of the fact that they reside in Labrador. I think that is a very important basic principle that we should accept.

That being accepted and accepting the fact that there is indeed the feeling of separatism up there - the people feel that they are just not relevant to the Island part of the Province, and I gave a few examples last week. You know the little one about the Lottos. All of the sudden everybody is selling them and nobody in my area had them. I do not know about the other parts of Labrador. Maybe minor small things but they are things that agitate the people on the mainland part of this Province.

So accordingly I must say that I am not in favour of a Select Committee of the House. I am in favour of one thing very strongly, Mr. Speaker, I am in favour of the forty-seven members of the House, if I might say that, or the ones who visit Labrador back and forth, but I say the forty-seven members of the House listening to what the four members from Labrador say about Labrador, to accept the fact that indeed there is a feeling of alienation. There is a feeling of frustration. There is a feeling of frustration as I mentioned last week with the license plates, when you are one dollar short and all of the sudden the whole kit and caboodle goes back to the mailer's address on the Labrador and then they have to be sent down again and somebody cannot operate a car for a day or a week or a month. That being the case and accepting the fact that there is that feeling then it is time the government did something about it.

Now the hon. Leader of the Opposition mentioned a few things the other day. I can mention a few things. I think that government

MR. ROUSSEAU:

presence in Labrador of a meaningful nature - and I am not talking about junior officials of government who are unable to make decisions but senior level departmental people that are on the Labrador who can make decisions in respect of people. If somebody cannot get a license plate then somebody can say, "Here is a telegram or an official receipt saying, you have paid and therefore you can drive a car instead of having to do without one for a week or a month or a day." Somebody who can make decisions, somebody who could tell people what they want to hear, the news of what is going on in government, the questions they want answered, somebody of that type all across Labrador, and I think we would have gone far in at least showing the people of Labrador that somebody cares about the feelings they have, that people here on the Island part of the Province are prepared to reach out and help them, that people on the Island part of the Province are prepared to share part of the dollars that are given out with the people in Labrador so that they may have improved services.

I am afraid that down the line if we do not accept this - and we have been talking about it for a while - somewhere down the line there is going to be a lot of trouble. I would hope that the members of this hon. House of Assembly, as well as the people on the Island part of the Province accept that, not as a possibility but as a fact of life. And hopefully that in support from the forty-seven members who do not represent Labrador and from the 550,000 in the Province, the people especially who live on the Island part of the Province, the acceptance of the problems and frustrations, the alienation that people feel in Labrador and the understanding that they are not being difficult, they feel they have been neglected, they feel that the time for neglect is over, that they are no longer naive now, that they know that things are going on, so stretch out the hand and look for the help, to see the help coming, I think, will go a long way to help relieve this feeling of frustration, alienation and that tendency that we have towards separatism. And I can assure hon. members of this House - and hon members I hope would believe what I am going to say - and the people of this

MR. ROUSSEAU:

Province, that we are not going to close our eyes and the feeling of alienation, separation and frustration is going to go away. It is not. It can only be handled in an intangible way. And unless the people in Labrador feel that something is being done to alleviate these feelings, then it is going to come to a real crunch soon and that is going to be too late.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Mr. Speaker, in rising I have a few words to say in this debate. I do so knowing full-well that a great deal has already been said. We have heard from members in this House in this debate that have a lot more experience in the affairs of Labrador than I do, and they know more intimately the problems of Labrador than I do or probably than I ever will.

The debate, Sir, I believe, having listened to it for the past five or six weeks has been for the most part an eloquent debate. I believe it has been a sincere debate by most members on both sides of the House. There has been a few exceptions, of course. There has been a couple of exceptions when it tended to fall into political debate but I suppose that is to be expected. After all we are politicians but by in large, I believe, it has been an excellent debate and a sincere debate as the motion, says gravely concerned about the state and the sentiment of public opinion in Labrador. That is the guts of the motion to me and that is the part of the motion that appeals to me and means the most to me.

The concerns of the people of Labrador, Sir, I believe have been articulated very well by my colleague from Eagle River, by the member from Naskaupi, by the member from Menihek and also the Leader of the Opposition, the member from the Straits of Belle Isle. He drew it to a logical conclusion last week and he made some positive suggestions as to what should be done to offset this feeling of sentiment or public sentiment that presently exists in Labrador.

Now, Sir, though much has been said on this particular motion, I feel that it is incumbent on me as a member of this House of Assembly, and I believe on all members, to give our

MR. RIDEOUT:

thoughts for a few minutes to this particular motion. Because, Sir, we are addressing today in 1977, a situation, a problem that without being overly dramatic or without being any way at all emotional, I believe we are addressing a problem that will determine the type of problems that we will have in Newfoundland and Labrador far into the future. That is why I believe it should be of vital concern to every member in this House. And, Sir, we must be realists, we must face the fact that problems do exist in Labrador, problems that I believe can be overcome but problems that must be faced. If they are not faced now, if the problems in Labrador, and we all seem agree on both sides of the House that they are there, if the problems in Labrador are shelved, if they are allowed to grow or fester, they will continue to re-occur and they will continue to haunt generations in this Province far into the future.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

MR. NEARY: I hate to interrupt the hon. gentleman, but there is no quorum in the House again, Sir.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): A quorum is present.

The hon. member for Baie Verte - White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I was saying, Sir, that the problems that we face in Labrador today cannot be put away and forgot about and cannot be shelved, because if they do, I believe they will continue to reoccur and haunt the future generations of this Province for a long, long time. And that is why I am concerned about the feelings that presently exist in the part of our Province that we refer to as Labrador. That is why that as a member of this House I want to ensure that solutions to the problems in Labrador are found. I believe that we, as elected members of the people, ought to seek out those solutions. Let it not be necessary, Mr. Speaker, for future generations in this Province to say that the Thirty-seventh General Assembly of this Province failed in our duty to the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.-

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: - that we failed to recognize that there are growing problems in Labrador and that we failed to deal with them. Let it not be said that we are afraid to face reality, because that is very easy to do, Sir, shove it under the carpet, put in on the shelf and hope that it will go away. But I do not believe that those feelings that are presently existing in Labrador will go away. So let it not be said that we are afraid to face reality, those of us who are in this House, that we refuse to ask ourselves the difficult questions that must be asked, that we refuse to make the painful and difficult decisions that must be made to preserve this Province as we know it, and indeed, Sir, as we want it to be. No, Sir, I say let us face the situation in Labrador squarely, face it honestly and confront the problem as we see it in Labrador now. And the first fact to realize is that there is currently

Mr. Rideout.

a strong feeling of dissatisfaction in Labrador. You do not have to be an expert on Labrador Affairs, Sir, to realize that. I visited Labrador twice in the past twelve months, and I hope to go down there again very shortly. But in those two visits in the people I talked to and people in all walks of life the easiest thing in the world to pick up is that there is a strong feeling of dissatisfaction in Labrador.

Now if we close our eyes to that, Sir, if we shove that under the carpet and forget about it, then I would say that that feeling that presently exists, that is there now, and that I believe all members of this House will readily admit it is there, if we do that, then we are asking for greater problems down the road than perhaps many of us realize. I picked up that feeling in the couple of trips I have made down to Labrador, and I picked it up loud and clear. The Newfoundland presence is being felt less and less by the residents of Labrador today. Labrador faces problems that are unique onto itself, I would suggest, problems of such great magnitude that it is probably difficult for us living on the Island part of the Province to comprehend, to comprehend the realities that do indeed, in fact, exist in Labrador.

We have 50,000 people living in Labrador, occupying an area of about 110,000 square miles -

AN HON. MEMBER: How many?

MR. RIDEOUT: About 50,000. Well somewhere around there, 47,000 or 50,000 are the figures that I have been able to come up with.

MR. ROUSSEAU: About 35,000 to 39,000.

MR. RIDEOUT: Well, I have been misinformed by the member for Eagle River.

MR. RIDEOUT: So anyway, Sir, the figure is somewhere between probably \$35,000 and 50,000 - let us put it in that category. Now that is an area of about three times -

MR. STRACHAN: The actual figure or the census figure is 32,000. This year it was 32,000 and there is question now that these census figures are totally wrong.

MR. RIDEOUT: Okay.

So anyway it is an argument there about one way or the other. But approximately 50,000 people living in an area of 110,000 square miles. That is the point I wanted to get to. That is an area about three times as large as the Island part of the Province, but with a population of only about one-tenth the size of the Island part of the Province. Now that, Sir, indicates to me immense problems of transportation, immense problems of communications, of supply, of services, of all the things we living in the Island part of the Province take for granted, and indeed we complain very quickly about should there be any disruption in any of those services, transportation, communications or whatever. Now added to this immense geographic problem, we must face the fact that Labrador is not all alike. You just cannot talk about Labrador as one geographic land mass, because it is not all alike. While the people in all parts of Labrador may very well face common problems, and I believe they do, they face common problems of isolation and transportation and communications and so on, those problems magnify themselves in varying degrees in different parts of Labrador. So that brings another problem when we look at the Labrador situation. I see Labrador - as an outsider looking at Labrador - I see it basically as three regions; the coastal region, the Happy Valley - Goose Bay region and the Labrador West. And each of these regions I would suggest perceive, for example, transportation problems in a different light, each of the three of them.

MR. RIDEOUT: The man stuck for twenty-one days in Nain, as I have heard my colleague talk about so many times for example, or elsewhere along the Coast will see an entirely different set of transportation problems than will the man living in Goose Bay - Happy Valley, whose chief concern is the ever escalating cost of air fare and a whole different set of transportation problems altogether.

I just use that example to show that there are different problems within different regions of Labrador. But, Sir, the overall problems of Labrador still remain. They still must be dealt with and it is to this that we must turn our full attention. There are different problems in different regions but the overall riding problems in Labrador are the ones that we must face.

Sir, there are those in Labrador who believe, and I am convinced of this, there are those in Labrador who believe that the true destiny of Labrador is not necessarily linked with that of the Island part of this Province. That is problem number one that we must address ourselves to. This view of a separate Labrador has gained a new respectability because of the recent national events. It is now more acceptable than ever to preach the separatist cause. I do not believe there is any doubt about that.

Again, I do not share that view. But again we cannot pretend it does not exist. To do that is to court disaster with the future of this Province as we know it and the future of this Province as we can envision it to be. I do not intend to do that and I do not believe that this House will do that. Well, let me say, Sir, that the preachers of separatism, or the separatist cause in Labrador are not young radicals. In the couple of trips that I have made down there, I have talked to the young as well as the old and the conclusion that I have come to is that

MR. RIDEOUT: the preachers of separatism in Labrador cannot be disregarded as the young, full of fire and brimstone radicals.

Let it not be thought, Sir, that only a few are afflicted by the separatist conviction. It would equally disastrous for us to do that because it is just not so. Some of the most ardent believers that the future of Labrador is not necessarily tied in with the future of Newfoundland, some of the most ardent believers in that thought are the most respectable members of the Labrador community and those of us who do not realize that are going to be in for a rude awakening one of those days if we just let it drift by.

Some of them are the most respectable community leaders, some of them are the most respectable businessmen in the Labrador region, and some of them are people with a great deal of credibility in Labrador. I do not believe, Sir, there is any doubt about that and we should never lose sight of the fact. We should never toss it off as just being the idea of a few. Some very credible people in Labrador talk separatism those days. We must recognize that.

So, Sir, let us not shrug it off as the misbegotten objective of a few dreamers. That is not the case so let us not allow ourselves, or let us not allow the dreams that the dreamers dream to become the final goal of the disenchanted and the frustrated and the isolated populus in Labrador. Let us not kid ourselves with that thought because if we do we are in for a disaster and a rude awakening.

So what do we do, Sir, as a Province? How do we overcome this threat to the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador as we know it today and as we want it to remain? The first thing, Sir, is to be completely honest with ourselves. The first thing is to admit that the problem exists, to admit that the problem is real, that it is not the figment of anybody's imagination. That is the number one objective I believe. Lest we do that we are

MR. RIDEOUT: out in left field.

Once we have done that then we must set about finding solutions to the problem that we now recognize as there. That should and ought to be done in the closest possible consultation with the people of Labrador. After all with the people who are so directly affected by it, with the people who have this feeling that all of us over the last five or six weeks have been articulating. There should be the closest possible consultation with those people in finding the solution to the problem that is there right now.

There has to be a free and an open dialogue between the people of Labrador and the representatives of the one institution in this Province that has the authority and indeed the responsibility to implement the changes needed to turn around the public opinion and the feelings that exist in Labrador today. There has to be a free and open dialogue between those people and this institution, this House of Assembly, the only institution in the Province that has the authority or the responsibility to implement any of those changes that might turn around public opinion or public sentiment in Labrador.

MR. RIDEOUT: Now, Sir, that in context is the representatives in this House. A Select Committee of this House as called for in the motion, that is what we would be. I believe that the solution may well be in some form of regional government for Labrador. I believe that. I do not know if the people of Labrador believe it, but I believe that is probably an alternative. A regional government that would look after the regional interests of Labrador, a regional government elected by the people of Labrador to look after in Labrador the day to day needs of the people living there.

I could go into some detail on the regional government, I expect, because it appeals to me. That has already been done by the Leader of the Opposition, last week, and I do not propose to waste the time of the House on it. Let me just say that this could be a great experiment, this regional government idea for Labrador. It could be a great experiment. If it works out it could well be the answer to problems facing other areas of the Province, for example, the Northern Peninsula, the Burin Peninsula and probably other areas of the Province. This Labrador experiment; a great experiment in participatory democracy could go on in Labrador if we so wanted it, and if the people of Labrador wanted it, an exercise to bring government closer to the people, an experiment that if successful would mean that Labrador would be giving more to the rest of the Province than just its resources, as vast and as rich as they are and as vital to our economy as they are. They would be giving more to Newfoundland than just their resources, they would be the testing ground for a new participation in democracy. It would mean that Labrador could well be the testing ground for a revolution in the government structure of this Province.

I believe that regional government for Labrador is a great concept. I believe it would go a long way to arresting and turning around for all time the separatist feelings that presently exist among so many of our people living in Labrador.

MR. RIDEOUT: And above all, I believe it is a concept that will bring closer to our people and make more meaningful for our people the fulfillment of what democracy is all about. We can talk in glowing terms about democracy in this House but when do the people get to become part of that? It is only during an election campaign. Democracy that is alive is what the people in Labrador want so that they can take part in it on a day to day level not have it way up here hundreds and hundreds of miles away in St. John's. They want it close to them, close to the everyday people, close to their problems and close to their needs.

Now, Sir, having said that I have to inject a word of caution. If this idea is to mature, and if it is to become a working reality, then it must be done only after full consultation and only after listening carefully to the people of Labrador. This idea, I would suggest, of regional government in Labrador would be doomed from the start if we threw it on them and said, Here it is. I do not believe in that context it would work.

The people of this Province as a whole, Labrador included, chose Confederation, for example, with Canada only after a full and an open and a lively public debate. I believe the people of Labrador, if they chose regional government, would do it willing only after the same kind of exercise. To have the idea thrown from St. John's down to Labrador, I believe, would be courting failure with the idea, courting failure with an idea that very well could be, Sir, the answer to the separtist feelings that very strongly exist in Labrador today.

AN HON. MEMBER: A failure from the beginning.

MR. RIDEOUT To throw it at them? Yes, I agree it would be a failure from the beginning. We should listen carefully and openly to the views of the people of Labrador. We should go to the people of Labrador. This institution and only this institution can implement any of those changes. We should go to them and say, Look, we have an idea. How do you feel about it?

MR. RIDEOUT: Is it the answer to the problems in Labrador as you see them today, or is it part of the answer to your problems?

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman would permit me I would like to stand on a point of order, Sir. We do not have a quorum in the House and members are supposed to be in their seats, Sir. This is a very important debate that is taking place. Get seat belts for them, Mr. Speaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

When there is a quorum call members have no right to argue back and forth.

Would the Clerk count the House? We have a quorum.

The hon. member for Baie Verte-White Bay.

MR. RIDEOUT: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Obviously this is not a good day for people staying in the House.

MR. MURPHY: I think there are more in the common room.

MR. RIDEOUT: Yes. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I was drawing close to winding up my remarks on this resolution and I was saying, Sir, that I believe that part of the answer to the problems that exist in Labrador may very well be some form of regional government. And I went on to explain that but I was saying that we should not allow ourselves to fall into the trap of throwing that idea down on the people of Labrador without full and proper and open consultation with them. Because it is my firm conviction if we do that, no matter how noble the concept, no matter whether it be the answer or not, it will be doomed from the start. We should listen carefully and openly to the views of the people of Labrador on this matter. We should go to them and say, "Here is an idea. What about regional government? Do you buy that idea? Is there something in it that may solve the problems that you are presently experiencing down there? Is it the answer or even part of the answer? Tell us. Should it be modified? If so, how? Is regional government the answer at all? If so, what form should it take? What should its powers be? How should it be structured?"

We cannot draw that up in some ivory tower in here and then bring it down and slap it on them. Let us go down there and say, "Here is an idea that we have. With your ideas it probably can be modified and with your input, with your ideas we can probably come up with something that will go a long way towards solving the problems that presently exist down there." These, Sir, I believe are vital questions, the vital questions which the people of Labrador must be permitted to answer themselves, not us or any group of civil servants

MR. RIDEOUT:

but they must be permitted to answer themselves. They are questions which, in fact, we should encourage them to answer for themselves, not just a few of them, not just the three or four or four and a quarter, as the Leader of the Opposition refers to it sometimes, members who represent the people of Labrador but the largest number of people as possible in Labrador.

I believe that the best way to do that, Sir, is for a Select Committee of this House to travel Labrador, to travel it widely, not just Happy Valley-Goose Bay, Labrador City or a couple of places like that but to travel Labrador widely, to listen to the views of Labrador and then to recommend a course of action to this House for implementation.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. RIDEOUT: I cannot conceive, Sir, of anyone not supporting this reasonable position. I do hope that hon. members on the government side will support it and I hope that they will support it more than just verbally. I hope that they will support it in a meaningful way, Sir. And that is with their vote in support of this resolution. Mr. Speaker, I support the resolution. Thank you. ✓

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Bay of Islands.

X MR. WOODROW: Mr. Speaker, I would like to say a few words on this very important motion. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, I

MR. WOODROW: cannot say all that I would like to say because I have to leave the House shortly to go to Corner Brook in connection with the arrival of the Governor General in Corner Brook tomorrow. So, however, Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to congratulate the mover of the motion. He certainly did a very able job on it and in speaking about him as a member, I want to say how impressed I have been with the hon. member since I got to know him. When we first sat in the House in 1975—in fact he has added a lot of luster to this hon. House and his very charming accent does something to one. I sort of feel sorry that he has his beard taken off, because I always thought he was a red-head but I think his hair is almost the colour of mine now. I am not going to hold that against him but -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: -but it is something worthy of mention. Now, Mr. Speaker, the motion reads as follows - I think it is important for us to get the motion clear in our heads. "Be it resolved that this House is gravely concerned with the state and sentiment of public opinion in Labrador, and realizing that this has the most serious implications for the future of this Province. Be it further resolved that a select committee be appointed to consider and study all matters pertaining to the state and sentiment of public opinion in Labrador."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - to consider the reports and recommendations that have been submitted to government in recent years and to receive briefs and other representations from municipal councils -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: - native associations and from individuals agencies and groups representing the people of Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Be it further resolved that the said Committee report to the House of Assembly its findings and recommendations with respect to Labrador, including measures which can be taken to improve and ameliorate the role played by the people of Labrador within the Province of Newfoundland and Labrador.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Be it further resolved that the Committee be authorized to sit from place to place throughout the Province, and that it be directed to sit in sufficient places in Labrador so as to enable any of the residents of Labrador to appear before it if they so wish without incurring expense or inconvenience.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible) again

MR. WOODROW: When the vote comes we will know that.

MR. NEARY: Do you have to take -

MR. WOODROW: No, I do not. Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that certainly a lot of thought- a lot of speakers have spoken on this motion. And I must say there has not been too much, say, political flak in it. Maybe a few have tried to use politics, but I think it is too serious a matter for that. It is a very important matter, because we are really dealing, Mr. Speaker, with the lives of people, and we are dealing with the lives of a lot of the people of this Province.

Now I would like to see the day come - and in fact when this comes I am sure Labradorians will be happy - I would like to see the day when this Province could be referred to as the Province of Newfoundland. In fact if that day ever comes then I feel that Labradorians will be indeed very happy. I have gone there, Mr. Speaker. I have gone to Labrador on two occasions. I have not been there enough. In fact, I hope to get there - in fact, I hope I will be there within the next couple

Mr. Woodrow.

of months, I believe. But there was a man who was living in Labrador said to me - not later than two weeks ago when I was discussing this matter with him - he said, "More action is needed in Labrador not more study."

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Now in other words, you know, we can talk as the saying goes until the cows come home. And I have seen, you know, too much rhetoric used in many things, in many matters.

Mr. Woodrow:

We are all, in fact, probably we will get 100 per cent marks if it came to getting marks on the rhetoric we use. I really think for all of us action is more important than anything else.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW: Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all just to read the Throne Speech on this also. The Throne Speech says - there are two parts in it - "My government stands firm in its commitment to do everything possible to ensure that the benefits of our rich energy potential accrue first and foremost to the people of this Province and will spare no effort to make that commitment a reality. In view of the need for greater freedom of action in the development of our hydro electric resources my government have initiated studies on the transmission of Labrador power through the island and on the floor of the Cabot Straits to the Maritimes. While additional detailed investigation is required, the preliminary conclusion is that such a development is technically feasible. My government is encouraged by the interest expressed by the Maritime Provinces in the prospect of importing power from Newfoundland via that route.

In addition my government will be working to promote the development of Labrador hydro resources for use in Labrador. It is our hope that a major processing and shipping centre can be developed in Labrador and that our hydro power will be used by energy intensive industries who find such a center attractive. An expanded mineral exploration programme in Labrador will enhance the prospects of new development while the availability of hydro resources with stable prices should encourage further processing to take place in the Province."

Now on page 8, Mr. Speaker, of the Throne Speech again, there is the following "My government has been examining a number of mechanisms for enhancing the process of economic development on the Labrador Coast. The Department of Rural Development will assume a larger role on the Coast and will be responsible for initiating

and executing projects along the whole Coast. This role will be complementary to the normal functions of the other departments of government. My Government is very sensitive to the isolation problems in Labrador and has decided to establish regional offices for most departments in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. These offices will be able to respond more quickly and effectively to the needs of the people living in Eastern Labrador.

Great strides have been made in implementing an improved transportation system within the Province. My Government recognizes, however, that there are a number of isolated communities which require airstrips in order to provide better services for people in these areas. On the Coast of Labrador this problem of isolation is particularly acute and My Government has just completed a new airstrip at Cartwright. This airstrip will play an important role in the development of offshore oil and gas off the Coast of Labrador -

MR. STRACHAN: You should correct that because that airstrip is not completed. It is only half completed. So it should be corrected.

MR. WOODROW: Okay, that is fine, Mr. Speaker. - and it will enable the community of Cartwright to participate more fully in the associated economic developments. This

Mr. Woodrow.

policy of building airstrips both to reduce isolation and to encourage economic development will be continued." Well, Mr. Speaker, it is quite obvious from what I have just quoted from the Throne Speech that the government or the administration are certainly aware of the needs of Labrador. And I suppose it is very hard to say when one is doing his best. It is very hard to say whether we consider that they are doing their best or not. I do not know. In fact, I suppose like everything else there is only so much money to go around. But I am certainly conscious after reading this quotation from the Speech from the Throne, and from other things that have been done that certainly the administration is not asleep neither is it falling down on the needs of Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I affirm and support the government's increasing commitment to the responsible development of Labrador. More than ever before there has been demonstrated by this government a sense of awareness of the problems which confront our people in Labrador and the willingness to expand and improve upon existing facilities and initiate further projects. In this regard there has been a dedicated effort by our government to expand government agencies and regional departmental agencies throughout Labrador, including our Premier's office which is in Goose Bay. And this has been already mentioned, as I said, in the Speech from the Throne. These offices will be able to respond more quickly and effectively to the needs of the people living in Labrador, and will help a great deal the isolation problems involved in government participation.

Mr. Speaker, the Department of Rural Development also is assuming a large role in the development of Labrador, and will be responsible for initiating an executing projects which will have positive economic and social benefits for the people of Labrador.

Mr. Woodrow.

In this regard the Rural Development Loan Authority initiated in November 1972 have completed a total of - this was 1972 now - nineteen loans with a total of \$197,000. Under the department's grants programme there were nine ARDA project grants to groups or associations, totalling \$56,426. And six ARDA three incentive with a capital cost of \$161,160 with grants totalling \$71,009.

Mr. Speaker, great strides are being made in implementing an improved transportation system within Labrador. I have already, in fact, quoted some of this in the Throne Speech. But, Mr. Speaker, perhaps what is worst of all in Labrador to my mind is isolation. Now I have spent some years, Mr. Speaker, in some of the more isolated parts of the Province. For example, I have spent about eight years on the South Coast going from Harbour Breton up to Burgeo. At that time I can assure you that it was very isolated, terribly isolated, and I think, you know,

MR. WOODROW: there is nothing worse, Mr. Speaker, than isolation. It is really a curse and I do not think that you can really compare the isolation of Newfoundland that is to, say, to some of the places that were isolated, to Labrador. Of course then isolation, Mr. Speaker, brings on loneliness and I think the hon. member said from Eagle River, he said people sometimes when they are isolated and when they are alone they get the feeling that they are not wanted or get the feeling that nobody cares about them. Then, of course, you have lack of companionship. All this to my mind has a bearing on anybody because actually we are social beings and we want to socialize with one another. Of course then again you have float transportation. My goodness I remember you know when I was on the South Coast the boat would be maybe storm bound four or five days and the boat was the only link we had, in fact, I was going to say practically the only link with the outside world because even there were no such things as telephone systems or anything of that nature. So you would almost go through an agony waiting for the coastal boat to arrive.

Now I can imagine in Labrador what the people must be going through who have to wait many times, in fact, for the arrival of boats and especially boats that are late due to weather conditions and, of course, in winter time you have the ice and so on. In fact, I heard my colleague from Naskaupi tell a story here - He told me a story. I do not know whether I have it right or not. It was about a soldier, the late Robert Michelin I think was his name. This was in the last war and he had to walk from Cartwright, if I am wrong on this I ask you to correct me, he had to walk from Cartwright to Goose Bay. He was coming home from the war and it was only when he arrived in Goose Bay that the people knew the war was over. I think that is what he said. So I am sure conditions have improved since those days but there is certainly always room for more improvement.

MR. WOODROW: Now again, I think, somebody said here also - I think I heard one of the speakers say along a coastline I think it was 1700 - No, 150 miles of coastline I believe there was something like 150 people living. I believe this statement was made so - It certainly would cost untold dollars to really do all that one would like for these people. Of course again the question comes up, the question of money. The question of money, in fact, that is always the - what perhaps - That really is what hinders a lot of stuff from being done not only in Labrador but in some of the Newfoundland communities as well.

Another point I want to make - remember you know in the, say, bygone days, the days that are gone by - I know in my own experience there was a lot of initiative taken by clergymen and teachers of all denominations to improve the lot of people

MR. WOODROW: in the isolated communities of Newfoundland and I suppose that Labrador is no exception in this case. Something else that strikes me Mr. Speaker, also \_\_\_\_\_ I do not know really why but, you know, really Labrador has been a part of this province since we became a province in 1949. It really strikes me funny why more emphasis was not put on Labrador then. Funny you know, it is only now that really this thing, as it were, it is just coming to the top and I suppose naturally it is because of the members. We have at the present time three, is it three members or four, because you know part of the Opposition Leader's riding is in Newfoundland, it is on the Newfoundland side. I suppose really the fact that they are speaking about it and so on I am sure that this is really making it surface more.

But, I would like also you know for all the members of the House of Assembly, 47 we are now, is it, yes, 47 members excluding the Speaker. In any case I think we should all take this thing serious you know. Make it really look a lot because it is really a serious matter and we have to admit that the people in Labrador are, no matter what way you look at it they are much more isolated than we are. I feel that we should more or less, in fact, and I think we will, we should be big enough really to raise this even above politics. There is something more important than that, you know. When you think of those words alone, isolation, loneliness, lack of companionship, slow transportation and so on, no telephones. I have lived with those things and I really know what it is like. In fact, your heart really goes out to people who have to live in those conditions. We do not realize, you know, I suppose like the saying goes, "you never miss the water till the well runs dry." We do not realize what it is

MR. WOODROW: that we can pick up our telephone at night or any time of the day and we can call a friend. I guarantee you this really means an awful lot. I was sort of sorry that the hon. member from Fogo is not here, because I was really charmed and delighted by his words, the words he spoke about Labrador. I was also happy over the fact that he brought in an old friend of mine. He brought in Father O'Brien, Monsignor O'Brien. Actually he never told this story about him. Father O'Brien from the time he was a young man he had white hair. He used to tell us down on Labrador that they changed his name, they called him Father Whitehead. I recall when he used to return from the Mission he would speak about it, probably speak about it in the church on Sunday and maybe possibly at some public gathering and the like. In fact it does bring back a lot of memories to me.

I also remember at home, that people used to go down to the Labrador to fish. This really was a big deal in fact, where I lived down on the North Shore of Conception Bay. It really was a real ritual. There was something to it. They used to go down there and fish each year, come back, we always sort of liked it. In fact, I always called that Labrador fish. Why, it was put up in bulk down there. Labrador fish was better than even the fish that we made here in Newfoundland.

MR. WOODROW:

I suppose it still holds true, you know. However, Mr. Speaker, these are more or less a few of the remarks I had to make and I feel sure that all members of this hon. House will be sympathetic towards the needs of the people, we will say, perhaps the people who are worse off than any other people. And unfortunately the big problem for all of us is - in fact there are so many things I would like to do in my district. When I get a chance to speak in the Throne Speech I will be mentioning my district again - there are so many things I would like to do but there is always one problem. That is the problem of money. And I think we have to be in this House of Assembly I think, you know, as a member - we were sent here because we are responsible people. Somebody in the community must have thought something of us to send us here. I think we have to be big enough to realize that there are fifty-one districts and you can only cut the pie in so many pieces. If you cut it too small -

MR. MURPHY: Safely excluding St. John's Center.

MR. WOODROW: Excluding St. John's Center, so the member said - if you cut it too small there will not be much left for anybody. Well, Mr. Speaker, I have to take off for the beautiful city of Corner Brook.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

AN HON. MEMBER: Catch the boat now, boy.

MR. WOODROW: I remember, you know, what the former Premier used to say. In the late years he said, you know, "My heart says one thing and my head says something else." How does that saying go? What did he say?

MR. NEARY: What does your heart have to say?

MR. WOODROW: My heart goes out to Labrador. My goodness, if it did not go out to the people of Labrador I would not have said what I said.

MR. NEARY: Will you vote for the resolution?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

MR. WOODROW: I am going to -

AN HON. MEMBER: Vote for it?

MR. WOODROW: I will let you know that when -

MR. NOLAN: You are going to get out of town,

MR. WOODROW: - the vote comes.

MR. NOLAN: When the vote comes you will be out of town.

MR. WOODROW: I must say to the hon. member that that is not the reason. I do not know if the vote is coming this afternoon or not.

AN HON. MEMBER: It is. It is.

MR. NEARY: (Inaudible)

MR. WOODROW: In fact that is not the reason I am leaving. In any case, thank you, Mr. Speaker. X

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: If the hon. member speaks now, he closes the debate.

The hon. member for Eagle River. X

MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker -

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

4  
MR. STRACHAN: Mr. Speaker, before I get into my few remarks, there are one or two things I would like to say about the debate in general. The debate generally has been of a reasonably high level with a few exceptions only as it degenerated into a partisan or a political debate. On most levels it has been a debate in which people have tried to wrestle with the problem of Labrador and Labrador and Newfoundland relationships.

I am a great collector of the literature of Labrador. I have been collecting it over the years. And although this may not be one of the best pieces of literature I have taken an effort to collect all of the speeches which have been delivered here on this debate and put it together in one volume so that whatever people have said here in the House can be judged not here, whether they vote for the motion or not, can be judged in years to come and we will see exactly where they stand in years to come as developments affect Labrador. I think in some cases there will be some strange feelings. The people themselves must feel that they had let down the general feeling of the debate and the general atmosphere that we were trying to get and generate.

In Labrador itself I am very much aware because I fly a great deal and have flown probably more than anyone else on bush planes

MR. STRACHAN:

in Labrador. One in flying across Labrador gets the feelings of the vastness of the country, of the size of the land. It is a vastness which often is not felt because as you look at the map of course you see Labrador as the insert and which it is very much reduced and you seldom here it mentioned in terms of the whole Province. You usually hear it mentioned only as the Island of Newfoundland. I should indicate that we feel in Labrador, the people in Labrador feel that where there is carelessness of speech there is often carelessness of mind. So that when you mention Newfoundland or

MR. STRACHAN:

only Newfoundlanders or only the Island Province or, as the weather forecast gives it, in the North in St. Anthony the temperature was so and so and the winds were so and so and that is all there is. And people feel that they are forgotten about if they are not included in the map. And I just throw that out as a small aside that we continually do, and it has nothing to do with that party there or this party here. We experience it all over the place. We experience it at Gander as well where we hear people talk that way and did not like to be reminded. But as you fly across Labrador there is a great vastness and there is also a great cultural difference. I live in the community of Nain. I have lived there for six years, the Northern-most community in the Province of approximately 1000 people, 900 people. And the community is predominantly Inuit people, whom you would call Eskimo. And to live in a community in which you are living with a predominantly different culture and a different language, eighty per cent of the peoples have the Eskimo language, inuktitut, as their first language. If you spend six years like this, then slowly you learn a great deal of humility and if you have to stay for many days not being able to converse or you go to many meetings in which not one word of English is spoken. So when trying to get these understandings one feels very quickly over a period of time that there are many, many different Labradors, that there is the Labrador of the Inuit people, the Labrador of the Indian people, who are basically woodsmen, woods people - the Inuit people being sea people - the Labrador of the settlers, the Labrador of the South, which is different from the North. My district is approximately 800 miles. So the length of my district would be from Port aux Basques to St. John's and on out to the edge of the two hundred mile limit. That is the vastness of the district we are talking about. It is a district in which you cannot fly it totally in one day.

The people have varying cultures and varying differences. They disagree among themselves desperately so as they try to struggle through the next few years and the last few years trying to find a common

MR. STRACHAN:

identity for themselves, an identity which they will not find because as an opposite to some of the members on the other side, we must realize that Canada is a mosaic, it is not a melting pot. And exactly the same, Labrador or Newfoundland is a mosaic, not a melting pot. You cannot create a Newfoundlander who is a Labradorian, nor can you create a Newfoundlander who is a Fogo Islander. There are all different kinds and makes of people who make up this Province and make up the population of this Province. And if one tries by legislation, or by any cultural inference or social laws to try and create a melting pot in which they are all the same, then there will be nothing but strife all the way and battles all the way because they are different.

In the community I live in, and with the people I have lived with and hunted with, I see my hon. member says that Father O'Brien was called Whitehead. My name is KAYVALUK or HUMUSHUUM. And with living with people like that you learn entirely different values to the values that are expressed by most people here. I was once given by someone trying to explain to me his idea of land ownership and a question which you will have to address yourselves the House of Assembly will have to address itself in the years to come. But I was given a letter which indicated their feelings because their feelings are totally different from the feelings that we hold. And if I may be allowed I would like to give it to you the way I got it, if I can have the leave of the Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Does the hon. member have leave? Agreed.

MR. STRACHAN: We understand that this is a bilingual Province, or bilingual is the two languages, English and French. But if you travel the Labrador Coast there are number of languages, different languages. And if you cannot converse in these languages then you have difficulty. It is impossible for an Inuit person or an Indian person to use words such as regulations, to use words such as laws. He cannot use it. He does not understand it. There is no translation, nothing works.

MR. STRACHAN:

To use the common example and maybe a gross example, a sewer pipe is a piece of grass which is laid in the ground down through which excrement flows and it is a great long word put together because there is no such thing or concept as sewer pipe. The same as we use English, two by four, or

MR. STRACHAN: we use apples and oranges, because apples and oranges are totally foreign to people in that land. The letter which I received, and this was a considerable number of years ago and if I may read it in the language, the language of inuttitut I can give the translation of it but it expresses an idea of land ownership and concepts. It says:

"INUUSIVUT PIUSIVULLU AULATTAUJUK UUMAJUNUT.

ULLUT TAMATT UQAALAVUGUT UUMAJUIT NANIIMMANGATTA QANUK, NAUKKUT  
PIGUMALLUGIT, SILALLU PITJUTIGILLUGIT.

UUMAJUNUT KISIANI INUGATTA AVALUNIK ISUMAQANGGILAGUT  
AVALUIT KISIANI ATUTTAUJUT UUMAJUQUTINUT, AJUTTILUGU UUMAJUNUT.  
ATULAUTSIMANGGINATTA AVALUNIK TUKIQANGGILAK" -

MR. MURPHY: I was wondering about the transcription. I mean, the Hansard is going to be quite interesting.

MR. STRACHAN: I already prepared it. I gave Hansard it. I would be interested to see the objections to reading the language which is prevalent in this province.

"UQAGUTTA TAANNA NUNAK NAMMINIVUT, TAIMAAK,  
ISUMAQAGATTA PIUSIVUT ASIANGGUTITAUSIMAJUK (QALLUNAANUT)  
PITJUTIGILLUGU NUNAK. NUNAK AVALUTTAALUGU, ALAKKASAUJATTAALUTALU  
NAMMINIGIGAALLUGU SUNAUNGGILAK TAANNA NUNAK UUMAJUQANGGITUAPPAT."

Essentially what the person is saying, and people express this a great deal, if you live in a community in which you are isolated for eight months of the year then you are not concerned with the House of Assembly, and you are not concerned with politics and you are not concerned with very much; in fact, except your life revolves around wildlife. If you live like that you develop this feeling that life revolves around wildlife and wildlife is very important to you, far more important to you than anything else. We have heard expressions of the people need services, they are demanding services. I say the people in Labrador are demanding

MR. STRACHAN: the same kind of services as people elsewhere, and people elsewhere in this province on the Island part have just as much need for services, the Port au Port Peninsula as some of the communities on the coast. There is no argument. We fight to slice up the pie.

We are not arguing about that. Our argument is an entirely different level. We are not arguing with tangible things. Our argument, as the member for Menihek stated, is an intangible argument. It is an argument, not philosophical, but it is an argument in which we are trying to battle out so that we understand each other and can come to terms with each other. And these people are afraid and very much afraid that they are going to be swamped, that they are going to be put down and kept under. And what he says here is that all of our life revolves around our wildlife. Not a day passes but we discuss where the animals are, how the weather is and how we are to get to them, because it is wild animals that we hunt. We have never thought of fences. Fences are needed for domestic animals, not wild animals. Because we have never needed fences to say that we own the land, then we have grown up with an entirely different concept of land ownership. To fence a piece of land, and obtain a piece of paper to say it is mine, is of no value if no animals live on it. One year we may travel one hundred miles North to get our caribou. This year they are travelling almost six hundred miles. That land is ours. But the next year we may travel eighty miles Southwest for our caribou, and we say that that land is ours as well. We may not use that land in the North for five years or more if the caribou do not return there. That is how we have used the land and how we still use the land. We have used and occupied the land like that for hundreds and thousands of years. When the Europeans first came they wanted the land and we were in the way, and it should be remembered that had it not been for the Moravian Church on the Labrador Coast there would have been probably no Inuit people today. The Moravian Church

MR. STRACHAN:

were the people who prevented the killing off of the Eskimo or the Inuit people, because they were killed off in the Southern part of Labrador and it was the Moravian Church who prevented happening what happened to the Beothuck. They prevented it happening to the Inuit people.

MR. MURPHY: The Inuit were actually killed off, murdered as such, not died through disease or anything like that?

MR. STRACHAN: Killed off.

MR. MURPHY: Just killed, eh?

MR. STRACHAN: Yes, that is documentary. But the expression here is an expression of land ownership, and what I am doing is just using this and hopefully in some kind-of dramatic way to express that people all over Labrador have different concepts. When you go further South there is an entirely different concept. When you go to Happy Valley-Goose Bay area there is another concept. If you go to Labrador West there is a totally different concept. What we were trying to do with this motion was to try, number one, to have debate so that we could hear different viewpoints and also bring up in front of us all the problems which face Labrador. It was also to express here that there are feelings in Labrador of separatism. There are feelings of many other things which can be prevented. What we are stating is that we should not be blind, that we should look at it and take action because it is fundamentally important to this Province that the action is taken now within the next few years and not wait ten years down the road before one takes action. And that is because Labrador is the future of this Province. All your mineral wealth is virtually now located in Labrador. Your hydro wealth is located in Labrador. Labrador in essence has been sleeping for many, many years but now we are finding that there is much wealth there.

The population is low at the moment, but as developments come the population no doubt will increase and increase dramatically. The people there are concerned how you handle their resources. They are concerned that the environment is not damaged, that social life and

MR. STRACHAN:

cultural changes, cultural people are taken into consideration as these changes come about. What we are trying to do here is trying to state that why do we not tackle the problems now, these kind of intangible problems which cannot be solved just by building a road or by building an airstrip. Because in many cases increase in communication and increase in transportation also increases people's feelings of themselves and they also become more vocal as they become more educated. So we find that people will become, I say, increasingly more vocal in the future, not decreasing just because we give airstrips or we give roads. As they become better educated, communications improve and various other aspects of the tangible things fall in place the people will want more and more and will start shouting louder and louder.

The idea of this was to come to terms, to try to come to terms with the problems that exist now. Because I feel that as it exists now it can be very, not easily, but it can be taken care of. It can be looked into. It can be assessed. There have been statements about the motion, that the motion is concerned with a study. That was the furthest thought from my mind. In fact, the original motion that I was prepared to present here was an entirely different motion from this one here. This one here was written after we decided that the other motion I had was a little too harsh, that it could become political, that it could be a partisan debate. And I dropped many things out of the motion and we cloaked it in the language of the House of Assembly. It is cloaked in legislative language. It is not in specific terms as I had meant it. Neither does the motion express the feelings or emotions that I had in trying to present this motion on Labrador.

What we were talking about was that many people here - and I think everyone will admit that almost every speaker who started off talking about Labrador always prefaced his remarks by saying, "I have been there once. I have been there twice. I do not know much about it. I have not seen much of it." Almost everyone said that. And because

MR. STRACHAN:

of the difficulties of transportation and because of the geographic difficulties we face that is quite understandable, that many people have not seen the coast of Labrador. Many people have not met the Indians of Davis Inlet and can understand them. Their picture of the Indians of Davis Inlet is a picture that CBC may give you after someone has gone in to give a study on how much alcohol they drink. But the question is not fundamentally as to why they are drinking alcohol. Because they feel that they have some very fundamental things happening to them, that they have one foot in one world and one foot in the other world.

MR. STRACHAN: So what we are trying to state here is to try to get the people to understand that because of the geographic difficulties many of you have not seen Labrador, and many of you have only seen Labrador recently because you have become House of Assembly members. You have gone to hockey games, like the member for Mount Pearl and the member for Baie Verte White Bay. And in going up there all of a sudden you realize there is a different Labrador. Yet the Labrador you saw was a very very small Labrador. A very tiny part of it. But if you had travelled north for three hours by bush plane you would have a different concept altogether. If you had gone west you would have had a different concept.

So what we are trying to state is that if we could have taken this House of Assembly and placed this whole House of Assembly in different parts of Labrador for a week each— a coastal community, the centre, and the west— then I am sure we would have a different feeling because we are legislators. Many of us do not tackle the problem seriously but we are legislators who are passing legislation which affects the people of Labrador as well as the people of the Island. Unless you have a knowledge and a feeling for the land and a knowledge of the people and their culture, then how can you pass legislation which is meaningful to them? I can tell you that the more and more we get into resource development legislation then the more there is going to be confrontation. There is going to be discussion, debate and argument with people because they are fighting to try and hold a way of life against all kinds of economic odds. If we are going to, if the business of this House is purely for the economic development of the province, then we are going to swamp them and wipe them aside.

We might as well in many cases go in and shoot

MR.STRACHAN: some of them,if that is our whole purpose, economic development. They feel they are going to be wiped aside and they have stated time and time again.

I know many people do not have these feelings strongly. All I need to tell you is to sit through a meeting of five or six or seven hours in which the language is translated to you,not your language translated to them, when you have got to accept the humble or the humility,the position of humility and not them,then you will understand that they have some values which are worthwhile. Values which we should look at. Values that many young people in this province are starting to question,many young people are not all radical. Many young people are starting to think. They want an identity. They do not know who they are. They also want an identity. They do not want to become a Toronto in Newfoundland . They do not want to become a Chicago or New York. Nor do they want to be run in economic terms by companies or corporations.

The resolution then stated of a Select Committee from this House,and I say in a bias,partisan way that I would love to mention some members of this House who I would like to sit in a Beaver Aircraft in the middle of winter to travel the coast to find out, at 30° below, when you get lying in the snowdrifts and this sort of thing.

PREMIER MOORES: - I have been there.

MR.STRACHAN: Oh, yes; I was not referring to the Premier at all. I was referring to a few of his colleagues and I may say one or two on this side too. I am partly non-partisan but I think that a Select Committee, a few members of this House,would come back with a totally different view a totally different aspect. That is if they travelled I think during the winter,when most people are in the communities, and not travel during the summer, July and August season.

MR. STRACHAN: If they travelled during the winter they would have a different concept altogether.

The Select Committee, as I stated, should not go to just study Labrador. I had no intention in mind to go up and study Labrador. What we had in mind was that these intangible things we are talking about, this form of government or form of jurisdictional control over Labrador requires something different and we think something exciting. That is also something which could be applicable to the northern peninsula. That could be applicable to the Burin Peninsula, as my hon. colleague has stated. We were talking of a form of regional government but it may take another type of form. It is a form of government, because we have gone from this level of government. We have missed out on the intermediary form of government and we have gone down to the municipal governments. There is a big gap, a distinct difference between them. There is very little relationship. We are a poor province, there is no point in saying anything else. We are not a have province. We do not have the kinds of monies that we can fold into municipal councils to keep them happy.

But we should therefore think of something entirely different to get closer to them so that they feel that they have a part to play, that they are not just forgotten or left out or have very little money or funds, that they have a part to play and how resource development affects their area. So what we are stating here is we should go to the people of Labrador as a Select Committee with a number of proposals

Mr. Strachan.

and these can be many and varied. Take the proposals to them. Sit down and say it. Because I found that when we talked to a number of people in Labrador, both the West, the centre and the coast, and we stated, Would you like a concept of a system of regional government? Everyone said to us, "Yes." And then we said; "Well what kind of form is this regional government going to take?" And I left them to argue for about five or six hours and after the five or six hours was up all they could come out with was one or two principles. They could not tell us what type of regional government they wanted for Labrador, because all of a sudden, because we were giving them something to do do, the subject became more complicated and they, therefore, had to start thinking about all the ramifications of it. But I am sure that they had become far happier because they were involved in trying to put something together which controlled their lives. And they did not feel that it was far off St. John's which was putting this together to control their lives, that they were involved. And that was the initial idea behind this motion. The motion was to consult different groups, the group in Labrador West, to consult the native peoples, to consult the groups in Central Labrador, to go to the South Coast and to meet with them, not to sit and listen to them gripe, moan, ease out their frustrations. Because that, in effect, does very little. If one raises their expectations, then we are damaging them; we are creating added difficulties. But to go there and try and present something to them and say, "What kind of government; what kind of administration do you want? Can you fit into this?" And to come back and recommend to this House that we think that we think some of these ideas are no good, some of these ideas will not work. Labrador is maybe just to complex a place, too

Mr. Strachan.

large a place. Labrador West is further from St. John's. For instance for the people in Nain, Labrador West is further than St. John's is. There are many, many people in Nain have come to St. John's but many of them or most of them have never been in Labrador City or Wabush. Similarly in Labrador City and Wabush, many of these people come to St. John's, but they have never been to Cartwright or Makkovick or Fox Harbour. So Labrador maybe then a very complex place in which this kind of form of government may not work. I am not stating that. What I am stating is that people may have that feeling. That it may have to be something entirely different. The West may have to be different or the centre different.

But what I am stating is that the select committee should not go up idly holding meetings, listening to gripes and frustrations, studying what reports there are, bring them all back and saying, now this is what the people are saying. We have heard far too much of that, far too much in the past, in the recent past. But also we feel that that type of study, that type of thing would do nothing else but alienate the people further. What we are asking for here then is for the people to go, a select committee - what higher members can you find than members of the Legislature, whether we think it or not personally - to go and find out and talk about these things in a positive sense, that this is a direction that we are proposing, a number of directions that we are proposing. Which of these directions do you think you would like to take? If we believe in participatory democracy then surely this is one of the best ways of doing it. There are many times that we may have to take steps which the people will not like, that is many times, but it is what you have to do. Hopefully it is done for the good

Mr. Strachan.

of the people and not done for any partisan sense. So that is the essence of the motion. The motion is to select a number of people. And, as I said, I would prefer to see the whole House of Assembly go to many of the areas and to hold sittings for a week just to give the people the idea of what government is. Maybe it might give them a bad idea what government is.

The motion then was given in a non-partisan way. I again state that I was pleased with the level of debate. I thought it was excellent as such that people tended to stay away from the usual political diatribe that sometimes occurs here. Some of the speeches were excellent. I think many of them came close to the point, but they were seen also in their own perspectives that they were getting close, but what we are talking about is something very intangible, and very difficult to come to grasp with. It is very, very difficult to try to stand here and to try to explain to some member

MR. STPACHAN:

who has never been there. The feelings that people tell you are the feelings you have felt yourself. And this is important to get this point over because it is important if we are going to make any decision at all about the future resources of Labrador, that if we are going to try and tie this Island and this mainland part of the Province together, then it has to be done in a sensible, sensitive fashion. And I hope and I was hoping that members would take it upon themselves to feel that they could vote for it not in a partisan fashion, not to vote P.C. against Liberal, not to vote because one does not like the other but to vote in a sense that you felt that something should happen and something had to happen. We did not attack the government and say the government was not doing enough or the government should have done this and the government should do that. We never attacked and we never discussed that kind of thing. Because that is not the essence of the motion. And, as I say, it is unfortunate that the essence of the motion is covered in legislative language or how it is put for the House here. But the essence of the motion was a feeling, a sentiment, an emotion that something must be done, that something has to occur before it is too late.

It is no use waiting until there is oil and gas in Labrador or uranium in Labrador and then turning around-and that might be ten, fifteen, twenty years down the road - and turning around and stating that you want it to become one province. It should be done now.

As I stated then this was a non-partisan - and I am pleased in a sense that most members responded in that fashion. I am pleased that in some cases that people responded-as I remember the Minister of Transportation from his viewpoint. His viewpoint as far as I am concerned was a very narrow one, that he saw it in pure transportation services and providing people with the means. Other people will state their feelings from their each narrow viewpoint. I was stating from my narrow viewpoints as well. But what we had was a feeling that there should be something. If there can be select committees for all various little things, if there can be enquiries on

MR. STRACHAN:

Labrador West for instance all of which I agree with, if there can be enquiries for various other things, then surely what we are talking about here is the essence of the form of government for this Province. That may have to be radically changed. It may require a very big change in the form of government because we are unique, because we do have two separate parts of this Province, geographically, many parts of this Province culturally and in linguistics and language as well.

So we may have to come up with an entirely different form if people are going to feel that they are meaningful, that they are a part of this Province, that they have some kind of input into how they are controlled, how they are run and how the resources are developed. It is with this in mind then and totally with this in mind that this resolution was put.

I feel strongly about it obviously. I feel strongly that in voting against this one has taken out of it small little statements. The fact of a study and saying, "We are voting against a study." The fact of a Select Committee, "We are voting against a Select Committee." That one is voting against it in the terms as it is written here, the legislative and legal terms. That is not how it was meant. It is meant that there is a serious situation, it can multiply, it can increase, it can develop and therefore we should now - it should have been done maybe a number of years ago - but we should now before it increases greatly and increases with a speed and a fervour that we cannot stop, that we should come to terms with it, come to grips with it. And as I stated it could be an exciting form of government, an exciting difference which could be applicable easily to the Northern Peninsula, to the Burin Peninsula, the Port au Port Peninsula. It could come in with a county system for instance. If it is successful there and a county system works there, why can it not work elsewhere in the Province? We are not stating - the

MR. STRACHAN:

only reason we are stating is Labrador here is because Labrador is uniquely different geographically, that it could easily be some other part of the Province that we wish to do this with. But we have a serious problem there. And I hope that the members opposite will not take a partisan view in dealing with this motion, will not take a party view or a party line stance, that members opposite will vote for this according to how they feel. If they feel this problem is great enough, if they feel that there is a problem there, if they feel they do not understand what the problem is and that is a greater admission - the admission that you do not understand, that many times you just do not know what people are talking about down there, Why are they so angry up there? Why do they always want to confront us? If you accept that, then you accept the view that there is something wrong. There has to be something radically changed. And I hope then that the members will take it on that basis and will not vote against it, purely based on the fact that we are voting against a study or voting against a committee or voting against anything else, that they will see that Labrador is crying out for some different type of structure, that moving offices down in many cases will not solve their problems. It will solve the day to day problems. But it will not solve the deep routed emotional understanding of the problems there. And this is what I was hoping was the essence of this and this is why we put this motion together and presented it.

I hope then that all members will think seriously about it and will listen only to the dictates of their own mind rather than dictates of party lines and will think seriously and will cast their vote hopefully in favour of the motion. Thank you. ✕

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER: Is the House ready for the question? The question before the House is as set out in motion number (1) on today's Order Paper. Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion. All those

MR. SPEAKER:

in favour "aye", all those contrary "nay". In my opinion the "nays" have it.

MR. ROBERTS: Could me and my colleagues stand and divide the House on this motion please, Sir?

MR. SPEAKER: Call in the members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The question before the House is as set out in motion number (1) on today's Order Paper. Would those in favour of the motion please rise?

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition, Mr. Strachan, Mr. Nolan, Mr. Simmons, Mr. White, Mr. Flight, Mr. Rideout, Mr. Winsor, Mr. Neary.

MR. SPEAKER: Those against the motion please rise.

The hon. the Premier, the hon. the Minister of Tourism, the hon. the Minister of Health, the hon. the Minister of Social Services, the hon. the Minister of Consumer Affairs and Environment, the hon. the Minister of Rural and Industrial Development, the hon. the Minister of Finance, the hon. the Minister of Fisheries, the hon. the Minister of Manpower and Industrial Relations, the hon. the Minister of Education, Mr. Young, Dr. Twomey, Mr. Wells, Mr. Windsor, Mr. Cross, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Carter, Dr. Winsor, Mr. Marshall.

Nine in favour, nineteen opposed.

I declare the motion lost.

This being Private Members' Day, the House will now debate motion number (2) on today's Order Paper.

The hon. member for LaPoile. The hon. member for Lapoile (Mr. Neary) has been recognized.

X MR. J. CARTER: Mr. Speaker, my references for this point -

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Is this a point of order?

MR. WELLS: Yes. My references -

MR. SPEAKER: A point of order.

X MR. J. CARTER: My references for this point of order, Mr. Speaker, Beauchesne, number 87, page 81, subsections (1), (2) and (3). Hansard is not a record of proceedings. It is only a record of speeches. However when the hon. member rose to make his motion I submit that he did not make a motion. He made no such thing, no resolution, no nothing. He merely said, "Mr. Speaker, whereas joint ventures with

*Wells*  
MR. WELLS:

foreign nations, etc. etc, etc." Now, Mr. Speaker, every single motion that is made in this House, every time a minister gets up to move a motion he says the appropriate words which escape me for the moment. But they are to the effect that, "I move such and such a motion." Now I will be the first one to give unanimous consent that the hon. member may speak by leave. But I feel that he has played fast and loose with the regulations in this House. And therefore I feel it incumbent upon myself to get up and point this out to the House that as far as this House is concerned he might as well have read his grocery list. And we hardly want to debate that. So no resolution has been made, Mr. Speaker, in my submission. And therefore the hon. member may speak only by leave, not as a right.

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

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, I mean it is impossible, it is impossible ever to comprehend the reason - not the reasons to mislead, the hon. member for St. John's North raised these points of order - but it is impossible to comprehend the reasons which he states. First of all, Sir, there is a timeliness rule. This motion has been on the Order Paper for thirty-six sitting days and the hon. gentleman could hardly be heard to maintain that he has moved or raised his point of order at the earliest possible moment. Secondly, - well I do not have Hansard in front of me - all that the hon. gentleman from LaPoile (Mr. Neary) has done on opening day is give notice of motion. And it took place on item number (4) on the regular standing order of business that precedes the Orders of the Day where the Speaker calls Notice of Motion and the hon. gentleman said in whatever words he may have used, "I give notice that I will ask leave to introduce the following motion."

Thirdly, the Speaker at the time accepted - indeed I am not sure if this is one of the matters he took under advisement, but obviously

MR. ROBERTS:

it has been accepted by the Chair, Sir. It has appeared on the Order Paper for thirty-five consecutive sitting days. Fourthly and finally, and the point which really disposes of any merit that may have been in \_\_\_\_\_

MR. ROBERTS: the hon. gentleman's motion and I do not think it was - the hon. gentleman's point I am sorry - I do not think there was very much merit in it - is that the hon. gentleman from LaPoile will make his motion when he makes his speech. The whole point of his speech now, if Your Honour recognizes him as Your Honour has indicated Your Honour will, is to move the following resolution, the one set forth as motion number two on the order paper. And I mean the hon. member for St. John's North has been in the House of Assembly for six or seven years now. I mean there are some things that are passing strange and one is that the hon. gentleman fails to realize that, you know, a motion is not a motion until a speech is made moving the motion. For example, the Minister of Finance shortly will bring in the Budget Speech. The Budget Speech is nothing more or less than a speech on a motion and the motion is that the House do now resolve itself into committee to consider supply.

MR. NOLAN: His advisor slipped him a parliamentary mickey.

MR. ROBERTS: You know, and so the Budget Speech makes that motion. The hon. gentleman from LaPoile's speech, when I sit down in a minute if the Speaker rules it is in order as I am sure he will -

MR. NOLAN: Shame, shame.

MR. ROBERTS: It is nice to welcome back the gentleman from Naskaupi. Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from LaPoile, assuming he is ruled in order, will proceed to make his speech and at some point will doubtless move his motion. Sir, all that this is is an entirely frivolous, vexatious, nit-picking and niddling point of order, Sir, that has no merit. I suggest the hon. gentleman from LaPoile, who has forty-five minutes, should be allowed to proceed with his speech, Sir, to say what he wants and then other hon. gentlemen can speak on this motion as they wish.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear! Hear!

MR. NOLAN: Well done, well done.

MR. J. CARTER: Further to that point of order, Mr. Speaker, the hon. Leader of the Opposition is quite right but he assumes that the member for LaPoile actually gave a notice of motion. He gave no such thing and I submit for your perusal, Mr. Speaker, a copy of the relevant Hansard for you to see there is nothing said here, nothing at all. I wish for you to see this, Mr. Speaker, no motion or no notice of motion was made at all; no notion of motion.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please! The Chair is grateful to the hon. member for St. John's North in bringing to its attention what he considers to be a break with usual procedures and wishes therefore to maintain the decorum of the House and I am also grateful to the hon. Leader of the Opposition for speaking to the point. I think that in view especially of the time that has elapsed since this has been on the order paper that the Chair would be somewhat irresponsible if it did not consider that the hon. member for LaPoile was in fact in order in making his motion. So I would call upon him to -

MR. NEARY: I do not know if any hon. members of this House, Sir, have read the Origin of Species and the Descent of Man but it would certainly make you wonder when you look at the hon. member for St. John's North. Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to suggest to the House that there be a marriage of the resolution that I placed on the order paper on opening day and the motion that was put on the order paper by the hon. Leader of the Opposition, that is motion number two and motion number four. There has been some consultation on this matter, Mr. Speaker, and I believe members on both sides of the House agree that there should be a - that the two motions should be put together as one and the Leader of the Opposition has agreed and I thank him for that. If the House - and this has to be done by unanimous consent as Your Honour knows - but if

MR. NEARY: the House would agree, Sir, I would suggest that the resolution as amended read as follows: that where -

MR. LUNDRIGAN: Summarize it.

MR. NEARY: Yes, I will summarize it, Sir. Take out the "therefore be it resolved" in the first resolution and let the two first "whereases" stand. Take out the "therefore be it resolved" in the first resolution, let the three first "whereases" in

Mr. Neary.

the Leader of the Opposition's resolution stand. Take out the fourth 'whereas' and then it will read on the same as it is now. So the only difference in the Leader of the Opposition's resolution is that the fourth 'whereas' would be eliminated. And I can read the resolution in its entirety if Your Honour, if the House wants it. Take out, 'Therefore be it resolved out of mine altogether,' and take out the fourth 'whereas' in the Leader of the Opposition's resolution. And then we would have a completely new motion, Sir. And if the House agrees then that is the motion we will debate.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

As the hon. member has pointed out unanimous consent is required to give effect to his request, and if hon. members are clear on the adjustment being made to the motion, I would ask if unanimous consent is being given?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Agreed.

The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, the resolution will read now as follows just for the information of hon. members:

"WHEREAS joint ventures with foreign nations could become a way of economic life to the point of forcing Newfoundland fishermen off the very high seas to which the 200 mile management zone finally gives Canada title; and

WHEREAS the reason advanced for allocating part of our quota to foreign fleets is that the ships and equipment of foreign nations are so much better than ours;

AND WHEREAS there has been considerable discussion of the desirability and the feasibility of "Joint Ventures", being arrangements entered into by fishery enterprises based in this Province on the one hand and foreign fishing interests on the other;

Mr. Neary.

AND WHEREAS there is a considerable measure of disagreement about the desirability and the feasibility of such joint ventures;

AND WHEREAS it is essential that the final facts about joint ventures be made public, and that the implications thereof be fully examined and the fullest consideration of its effects both in the short term and the long term;

NOW BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED that in order to give effect to these purposes a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the proposals with respect to joint ventures -

MR. ROBERTS: If the hon. gentleman would permit, Mr. Speaker. I think he misread what he intends to move. As I understand it, it would read, "AND WHEREAS it is essential that the final facts about joint ventures be made public, and that the implications thereof be fully examined," and then all that "whereas" ought to be dropped and then, "NOW BE IT THEREFORE RESOLVED."

MR. NEARY: Yes, I am sorry, right.

MR. ROBERTS: That is two lines.

MR. NEARY: That is two lines on that. Yes, Sir. That is correct.

MR. MURPHY: I am just wondering what form this should take, you know. You have two resolutions. I am not objecting to either one, but is there a form that we should go through or some amendment?

MR. NOLAN: We are doing it.

MR. ROBERTS: We have gone through it. We did it by consent.

MR. MURPHY: Is it going to be a formal amendment or not?

MR. ROBERTS: No, it has been done by consent.

MR. MURPHY: Oh, I see.

MR. MURPHY: You know, someone has said that the resolution has been on the Order Paper for - it has not been for thirty-five days, the resolution we are talking about. All I am asking is there a special form to follow?

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. Collins): Order, please!

If I may clarify. The hon. member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) asked for unanimous consent in order to adjust the motion which he had given notice of and had place on the Order Paper. And the understanding of the Chair is that the House gave unanimous consent, and the hon. member for LaPoile is now, therefore, adjusting his motion.

MR. MURPHY: Yes. Well it is the word 'adjust' that I never heard of it in parliamentary procedure that someone is going to adjust a motion or anything else. You amend it or you leave it as it is, you know.

MR. ROBERTS: Mr. Speaker, it is not a point of order, but if I may say a word on it. There was consultation with the officers at the table, and we are assured it is in order or Your Honour would not have accepted it. What has been done in effect is to amend the motion by consent, and the amendment is to take a large part of a motion standing in my name and to put it together with part of the motion standing in the name of my friend from LaPoile. And, therefore, my motion is now off the Order Paper, and there is only one motion on the Order Paper dealing with this joint venture question and that is the one which the gentleman from LaPoile is reading.

MR. MURPHY: In other words, resolution as amended, not as adjusted.

MR. ROBERTS: As amended.

MR. MURPHY: Yes.

MR. ROBERTS. But an amendment by agreement, by consent of all members of the House. I think in view of the time that has passed, you know, it makes good sense to bring these two together and have one debate on the issue of whether or not we should have a select committee on it. In essence the old point is that the House can do largely anything it wants by unanimous consent.

MR. NOLAN: Hear, hear!

MR. ROBERTS: And the Chair asked if there was consent, and no objection was heard.

MR. MURPHY: At this stage or next week we may not do the same thing, and then we have got a reference back to precedent, eh?

MR. ROBERTS: Oh, no, no! The only precedents created is that if every member of the House agrees in effect to a procedure then it is agreed. There have been a million precedents, I would venture to say along those lines.

MR. MURPHY: I have no objections to it. All I am wondering about is the procedure we would take.

MR. ROBERTS: It has been done in consultation with the officers of the table, and I have no doubt the Speaker has take advice.

MR. ROBERTS:

He was advised that the point would be raised, and I have no doubt the Speaker's - well I know what his decision is and I have no doubt the advice, you know, it is in order or the Speaker would not have allowed it to have been done. It was not sprung on the Speaker. It was, you know - I say notice was given.

MR. MURPHY: I say it was the first time I have ever heard of it so I was just wondering.

MR. ROBERTS: Oh yes. Many strange things happen.

MR. MURPHY: Well I know that. I am quite aware of that too. That is what scares me.

MR. NEARY: Mr. Speaker, just to continue -

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY: - with the resolution, Sir.

NOW BE IT RESOLVED that in order to give effect to these purposes a Select Committee be appointed to enquire into the proposals with respect to joint ventures, to examine their implications and effects with respect to the fishery of Newfoundland and Labrador and to report thereon; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Committee have power to sit in and out of session to send for papers and other documents and generally to exercise the powers which may be conferred upon the commissioners under the Public Enquiries Act, Chapter 314 of the Revised Statutes of Newfoundland, 1970; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Committee be authorized to sit from place to place throughout Newfoundland and Labrador; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in view of the great urgency of this question the Committee be directed to submit the initial report within thirty days of its appointment and a further and final report within ninety days of its appointment.

Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most important resolution or motion, Sir, the most important matter ever to come before this hon. House. And I want to thank the hon. Leader of the Opposition, Sir,

MR. NEARY:

for agreeing to have the two resolutions integrated into one. And I want to thank the House for giving unanimous consent to have one resolution debated instead of two. It is the most important matter ever to come before this House, Sir, because in my opinion the whole lifestyle, our whole future in this Province, as in the past, will be based on the fishery and the success of the fishery.

My hon. friend, the Minister of Fisheries, Sir, has probably the greatest responsibility, a far greater responsibility than any of his colleagues. Because on the minister's shoulders falls the success or the failure of this Province in my opinion. Mr. Speaker, up to now I am sure that every hon. member of this House has been concerned about the number of young people that have had to leave the smaller communities scattered throughout this Province. It seems, Mr. Speaker, that over the years that the smaller communities, communities I would say with populations less than 5,000 have more or less developed into dormitory towns, dormitory communities because the young people were unable to find employment. This, Mr. Speaker, this trend has to stop. And I think now it can be stopped. With the implementation of the 200-mile limit and the future that the fishery now has in this Province, Sir, I think that we have a magnificent opportunity to lay a solid, to build on the foundation that is here, to lay a solid foundation for the economy of this Province.

For years and years, Sir, everybody in this Province, I suppose, is an expert on the fisheries, everybody. I have heard more debates in my fifteen years in this hon. House about the fishery than I have heard about anything else and I have heard more discussion and more comments outside the House and inside the House about the fishery than any other matter in this Province. So everybody one way or another is a bit of an expert on the fishery.

But there is one common denominator, Mr. Speaker, in all these remarks and all these comments and all these debates that have taken place. There is one common denominator. That is that the people who have made these comments, whether they made them, whether they were

MR. NEARY:

knowledgeable in the fishery or not or whether they were completely ignorant as far as the fishery in this Province is concerned, the common denominator is that every one of them realized the importance of the fishery to the economy of this Province.

And, Mr. Speaker, it has been argued inside and outside of this hon. House that over the years we have concentrated too much on heavy industry. We have put too much emphasis on linerboard mills and oil refineries and that sort of thing, on mining and so on and so forth and we have put the emphasis in the wrong place. Well, Sir, I suppose anybody can look back ;

MR. NEARY:

and say "Yes, that is true." But I do not think that anybody realized in their wildest imagination in this Province... and my hon. friend probably did not realize it when the present Minister of Fisheries who was a member of the House of Commons up there in Ottawa - did not realize that we would get the 200 mile limit as quickly as we did. I know my hon. friend was fighting hard for it and his colleagues. And we were fighting hard on this end and they were fighting hard up in Ottawa - But I do not believe anybody realized that we would get the 200 mile Canadian management zone as quickly as we did. And therefore Sir, we were totally unprepared when it came, totally unprepared. And, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that one could argue that we have not placed enough emphasis on the fishery in the past. But I do not believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is wise now to dwell on that although we can learn a lot of lessons from our experience and from our mistakes of the past. We can certainly learn a lot from it. What we should do now, Sir, is concentrate on the future of the fisheries as a result of the 200 mile Canadian management zone that came into effect on January 1 of this year. I believe, Sir, that if we as responsible elected representatives of the people take off our coats, roll up our sleeves and get down to brass tacks that we can do something with the fishery in this Province and we can stop that out-migration that I spoke about a few moments ago of young people leaving the smaller communities to go into the urban centres and to leave the Province altogether to find employment. Because, Sir, if we do our job as elected representatives of the people and we cultivate and exploit the fishery the way that it should be done in this Province, that there will be jobs for everybody. The young people will not have to leave the communities. And the fishermen will not continue to be a dying race of Newfoundlanders as they are at the present time.

I have sat down on wharves and sat down on longliners in this

MR. NEARY:

Province and I have heard men say, fishermen say, that they did not want their sons to follow in their footsteps; they did not want them to become fishermen. It was such a difficult and hard occupation where you were working from daylight till dark and not making very much progress. Well, Sir, I believe now the fishermen in this Province, with the union, they are getting a little better organized; they are getting better prices for their fish, they are getting better gear and better equipment, I believe now, Sir, they have an optimistic outlook, that they are no longer pessimistic. And I hope that the day is gone when you go into a school and you hear a teacher saying, "Do you want to grow up to be a fisherman like your father?" I believe that day is gone, Sir. I believe now that the occupation of fishermen in this Province is going to become a very honourable occupation indeed. At least I hope it will, Sir. That is if we do what we are supposed to do.

Mr. Speaker, what we have to do - what do we have to do in this Province? - well, Sir, what we have to do is this - well first of all I will say what we should not do. We should not sell out the fishermen as they have been sold down the drain over three or four hundred years. We should not let the fishermen down by turning over our responsibility, by giving up by default our responsibility for catching the fish that we are allowed to catch within the 200 mile limit. We should look forward to the day, Mr. Speaker, when there will not be one foreign dragger inside the 200 mile limit, not one. It may be ten years away, fifteen years away, twenty years away. But we should set our sights, this should be our goal and our objective in this House that there not be, say, five to ten years from now one foreign dragger fishing within the 200 mile Canadian management zone. And that would mean, Mr. Speaker -

MR. MURPHY: The gentleman used the word 'dragger'. It is trawler we used in -

MP. NEARY: Dragger, trawler, factory ship, whatever you want to call it -

MR. MURPHY: Yes, I was wondering because most people call it 'trawler'.

MR. NEARY: - that there should be no foreign boats, vessels, catching our fish within the 200 mile limit. That should be our main goal, our main objective. Now it is going to take us a little while before we reach that objective and we - the minister told us there a few weeks ago that we should not be dogmatic about it, that Canada would be held up for disgrace in the international world, in the world, if the fish was there in large quantities and we would not allow the foreign fleets to come in and catch some of that fish when you have hungry people in the world. Well that is a pretty good argument and it is indefensible. You cannot argue against it.

MR. W. CARTER: Only if there is a surplus.

MR. NEARY: I beg your pardon? Only if there is a surplus. That is right, if there is a surplus. But, Mr. Speaker, certainly by entering into joint ventures with foreign nations, Sir, is not the answer. And when I put my motion on the Order Paper there on opening day, I was pretty adamant and pretty strong about it when I said that this House should issue an ultimatum to the government of Canada that under no circumstances were they to grant joint ventures to foreign nations and that we give final notice to the fishing industry in this Province to upgrade their vessels, to upgrade their ships and get new equipment and build new boats and build new ships and vessels and let them go out and catch the fish. And if they did not do it, I think I said in another debate in this House that we take over the catching of fish within the 200 mile limit, that we provincialize it.

Now some members may be scared to death of nationalization. I am not a bit worried about it. I think it is more provincializing than it is nationalizing. National, you are talking about nationalizing something that is in existence right across Canada. But we are talking about a Province here and I think that if the fishing industry, Sir, if they do

MR. NEARY:

not do it, then we should do it and provincialize the fleet. The best idea, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion that the administration and the Premier had in five years was to set up a Crown Corporation and operate a dragger fleet, have the draggers built at shipyards in Newfoundland, operated by a Crown Corporation that would catch the fish and sell it to fish plants. It was the best idea the administration had and they dropped it for some reason or other. I do not know how much pressure was put on by the fish merchants, by the plant operators. But there must have been some. The Premier backed away from it which he should not have done. It was the best idea, Sir, that the government had and it is unfortunate in my opinion that they backed away from it.

Not only would it have increased our catching capability but it would have created jobs in the shipyards down in Marystown and in other places. I would like for the Premier - and I presume the Premier is going to participate in this debate - I would like for the Premier to tell us why he got weak-kneed all of the sudden, why he got frightened, why he lost his nerve and backed away from this excellent idea in my opinion. I believe it should be reactivated and put back on the table of this House so that we can get our teeth into it and have a good discussion about it and see if we cannot get this Crown Corporation established and get a fleet of ships that can increase our catching capability. Because that is what we are going to have to do, Sir. Otherwise, Mr. Speaker, we are going to just give up our rights by default. We are just going to abdicate our responsibility to the foreigners and they will be out there forever and there will always be that threat of joint ventures hanging over our head.

MR. NEARY: And, Mr. Speaker, as far as joint ventures are concerned how long can this province alone convince, persuade Ottawa not to allow any more joint ventures? How long can we hold out? We are only one province. Over in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick-and the next thing you will hear them in Quebec probably to - they are advocating joint ventures. They are saying it will create jobs in our fish plants. They are too stunned and probably too lazy and not prepared to risk some capital to build up their own fleet of ships to go out and catch the fish within the two hundred mile Canadian management zone. They want the foreigners to do it for them and we cannot hold out forever. This year we have managed to persuade the Government of Canada to only allow one joint venture but, Mr. Speaker, sooner or later Romeo LeBlanc and the Government of Canada are going to cave in under the pressure and the lobbying of the multi-nationals like Nickerson and National Sea and B.C. Packers and anybody else that has a plant. Who else has plants over in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick? The Connors Brothers which is B.C. Packers. You know, what they will do, they are probably up there now, Sir, lobbying with the Government of Canada to change their mind and change their attitude on this joint venture system and they will get the people to go along with it because they will con their people into thinking that there will be jobs on shore, there will be jobs in the fish plant, but what they will be doing they will be selling their fishermen down the river. They will eventually be forced off the high seas, and you will have all foreigners catching fish and being processed in plants on shore in Eastern Canada.

Mr. Speaker, we can only hold out so long. The fishermen of this province are against joint ventures but that is the union and I presume the non-union fishermen. But if Mr. Cashin

MR. NEARY: and his union are going to be successful in stopping the Government of Canada from allowing joint ventures with our neighbours over in the Maritime Provinces, then they are going to have to go over and organize the fishermen over there. That is a man-sized job and I do not know if it can be done. This government, this House, the Opposition, the union in this one province can say, We are against joint ventures; do not allow any more. But if you have two or three provinces like Prince Edward Island, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick advocating joint ventures who are they going to kowtow to? Is it going to be us standing alone? We can only hold out for so long, Mr. Speaker, as far as this matter of joint ventures are concerned.

Mr. Speaker, it being six o'clock could I move the adjournment of the debate?

MR. SPEAKER: The hon. member has moved the adjournment of the debate.

It being six o'clock, Private Members' Day I adjourn the House until tomorrow, Thursday at 3:00 P.M.

This House stands adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday at 3:00 P.M.