



Province of Newfoundland

THIRTY-NINTH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
OF
NEWFOUNDLAND

Volume XXXIX

Third Session

Number 55

VERBATIM REPORT
(Hansard)

Speaker: Honourable James Russell

Wednesday

28 November 1984

The House met at 3:00 p.m.

Mr. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

The hon. the Leader of the
Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, I rise on a matter of privilege. Mr. Speaker, at the House closing yesterday, in the course of disposing of another matter of privilege, Your Honour took the position that a motion to have a six month hoist of a bill was not debatable. The time of the House was running out and perhaps that was the reason, but Your Honour did not give an opportunity for any member on either side of the House to address Your Honour on the point. We would submit to Your Honour that such a motion is debatable and has been clearly established, according to the precedents of this House, as being debatable. Now, in case Your Honour has some questions as to whether the matter of the precedents of this House should prevail prior to the Standing Orders of the House of Commons, although I would submit to Your Honour that if checked you would find that it is debatable in the House of Commons as well, but, in any event, our Standing Orders come first, then the precedents established under those Standing Orders come next, and that was clearly laid down by the now Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer). I believe it was he who was in the Chair on February 2, 1977 when he stated, Mr. Speaker, 'I am not aware of any rule in our Standing Orders, which is the first source I have to go, nor of any practice in our custom, which is a second source to which I go, and they are the only two to which I go now because the third

one, the House of Commons, their practice is somewhat different in this area.' So your predecessor had established that. It was my understanding that that was not the case, but maybe I could stand corrected on the practice of the House of Commons. But it has been established by this ruling that it is the precedents of this House which Your Honour would look to, following the Standing Orders.

I would draw to Your Honour's attention at least two, and I am sure there are others, but these are two that are precedents of the House. The first is June 27, 1978, and again I think it would be the now Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) in the Chair, where the matter of the six month hoist was raised at the time by Mr. Freeman White on this side of the House. If I could just read for a moment: "If the gentleman who thinks he is such a great expert on parliamentary procedure would only turn to page 498 of May, it reads, 'A traditional way of proposing the second reading of a bill is to move an amendment to the question by leaving out the word 'now'" - and it says specifically second reading - "and adding the words 'upon this day six months'", Mr. Speaker.'" Then, Mr. Speaker, the Speaker ruled that the motion was in order and the debate proceeded, and the debate went on for some two volumes of Hansard.

Another precedent, Mr. Speaker, this one related to third reading of a bill. It is dated May 2, 1975, and I think that may still be Your Honour at that point time, if I am not mistaken, and this is where Mr. Roberts - Hansard refers to the member for The Strait of Belle Isle, Mr. Speaker - rose and said, "Now, Sir, this bill is a

simple little one and the government have attempted to sneak it through. They should not be allowed to succeed. Accordingly I move" -

DR. COLLINS:

Oh!

MR. ROBERTS:

That was before your time John. There is nothing simple now with you here.

MR. BARRY:

"- that the motion before the Chair, Your Honour, is, of course, that the bill be read a third time. I move, Sir, the following motion, seconded by the gentleman from Bell Island (Mr. Neary), that the word 'now' be struck and the words 'this day six months hence' be added so that the motion as amended would read, 'this bill be read a third time this day six months hence', and in doing so, Sir, I would ask Your Honour for a ruling that - I know the amendment is in order, I submit that it is in order, I will be shocked if it is not in order - that it is debatable. And if Your Honour wishes argument on this point I am quite prepared to offer argument, Sir."

"Order, please! The amendment is in order" - this is the Speaker - "the Chair, after some discussion, some research following the previous incident, is willing to rule and indeed does rule, that the motion, the amendment six months hoist is debatable." Now, Mr. Speaker, this is set out in the precedents of this House. It is a matter which is very serious from the point of view of the Opposition in that it is one of the few ways left, with the amendments which have taken place over the last ten years in this

House, it is one of the few ways in which the Opposition can indicate the seriousness of its opposition to a particular piece of legislation and where it can extend debate. It is something which the Opposition cannot lightly see go by the boards and we feel very strongly that Your Honour should look at this matter, have some additional research if necessary, consult for further precedents, contact the House of Commons, whatever, but this is something which should not be decided upon, Your Honour, with no debate and no opportunity for members to have representation in light of these outstanding precedents of this House.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, to that point of privilege. Your Honour will obviously have to take under advisement the argument of anybody of any part of this House who brings up arguments of this nature, but I will indicate, Your Honour, that the matter that is under consideration at the present time, if one considers the proceedings of yesterday, was really, in fact, a hypothetical matter at the particular time, and it goes to show if in fact there is a problem, which I am not saying - not a problem, it would not be a problem, this would be a matter for Your Honour's ruling in relation to what the hon. gentleman is saying - it goes to show what can happen when Your Honour is making a ruling within certain proceedings, and it is quite evident and obvious, in accordance with the rules, that matters should not be pursued and that the Chair should not be

pressed and oppressed, as I felt the Chair was yesterday.

Now, the fact of the matter is the kernel and the very basis of the point of privilege that was raised by the hon. gentleman, he is relating it to what occurred yesterday on the matter of the motion by the hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) for a six months hoist. The fact of the matter is it is hypothetical in that particular instance, Your Honour, and this is the reason why it was hypothetical, because it was quite plain, I think, from the proceedings that occurred at that time that His Honour, the Deputy Speaker (Mr. Aylward), who was then in the Chair, called for a vote, asked it they were ready for the vote and nobody rose. That is the reason why, as far as I am concerned, it would appear to me that that was a full and sufficient answer and disposition of that particular motion of the hon. member for Menihek. And the subsequent occurrences that occurred therefore became really hypothetical, and it goes to show that by raising hypothetical issues like that it really puts Your Honour in an unfair position. And I would suggest that any problem, if one exists, would not exist if people would simply address and approach the proceedings of this House and, in effect, Your Honour, respect the rules and respect Your Honour's authority in the Chair, and you would not be in positions of this nature. And I am not saying that Your Honour is in a position, I am just saying that this protracted argument with respect to the point raised by the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) need not be before the House at the present time.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

If I may, Mr. Speaker, since my name has been taken in vain, I will not get into a discussion with my learned friend opposite -

MR. BAIRD:

You were not here.

MR. ROBERTS:

No, I was not here. And from what I hear went on, I am just as glad I was not here. And the difference between my not being here and the gentleman for Humber West (Mr. Baird) being here is that I make a difference when I am here and he makes a difference when he is not here.

Mr. Speaker, listening to the gentleman for St. John's East (Mr. Marshall) lecture on civility in this House is a little like hearing a dipsomaniac talk about the virtues of temperance. The point of privilege raised by my hon. friend, the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), I suggest is a valid point of privilege in this sense: The precedents of this House, I submit, and my learned friend has quoted them, are clear in that a six month hoist motion is in order on second reading and on third reading and is debatable.

Now, as I understand it, all that is required is an assurance from Your Honour that this is the ruling. That is not a hypothetical one, we could wait the next bill and move one and raise the issue that way. Instead, my friend, the Leader of the Opposition properly, in my view, has chosen to raise it as a question of privilege because it

is a matter affecting the privileges of the House if what appear to be the clearly stated precedents are not being accepted by the Chair and the Chair's view is that they are not binding.

Now, Your Honour, I was down this road before when we had a six month hoist. Your Honour was not in the Chair although you were Speaker, somebody else was in the Chair, Your Honour may recall, the Deputy Speaker of the day, whoever he was. The motion was ruled not debatable. A thorough-going fuss ensued, I believe we sought advice from Mr. Alistair Fraser, then Clerk of the House of Commons, and Mr. Stanley Knowles, then a member of the House of Commons and recognized by all as an outstanding authority on parliamentary procedures, and in due course Your Honour made a ruling and, in fact, if memory serves me, and I believe it does, Your Honour, on this point, the third reading six month hoist which I moved in 1975, which was debated by me for a minute or two or three just to make the point it was debatable, did not take Your Honour as any surprise. I think I had advised Your Honour - I am not asking Your Honour to respond, of course - I would be moving it and Your Honour said, 'Fine, move it and we will see what happens.' I did move it, it was accepted as being in order and it was in fact debated simply to show the point it was debatable.

So that, in my view, Your Honour, is a point of privilege. The clearly understood precedents of this House are that a six month hoist motion is debatable and it is in order, of course, to move it with a mover and a seconder who have not spoken in the debate. And if that is not so, then I

suggest it is a very different matter than the precedents, in my view, very clearly and without any hesitation establish.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

I will hear the hon. the Minister of Justice and then I will have some comment.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I would just like to review what happened yesterday. The hon. the member for Menihek (Mr. Fenwick) moved an amendment and it was seconded by the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary). I, without ever thinking that it would lead to such difficulties, rose on a point of order and made the point that the hon. the member for LaPoile could not second it because he had already spoken. I went on then to say that we were not pressing that point, we just wished it noted, because if the rules fell into disuse, or it could be interpreted that one had acquiesced in a change of the rules, we would end up without any rules, making the point so that the government would not be seen to be sleeping on its rights and then saying, 'However, we are not objecting.' So the Chair adjourned and came back and ruled to the effect that the matter would have to be seconded by another member and it was stated that it was seconded by the hon. the member for Port au Port (Mr. Hodder). Then there was a ruling that the amendment had been, if you wish, slightly altered to bring it within order, which the Chair not infrequently does. Now, that having been done, the Chair said something to the effect, 'Is the House ready for the question.' Nobody got up to speak and there was an oral vote -

the oral vote was over.

MR. NEARY:

We never had a chance.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

No, I think this is what happened. Then, three members on this side rose and asked for a division. Now, everybody knows that when there is a division there cannot be any intervening matters, even points of order or points of privilege; everything has to wait until the division is over and that is pretty clear. So there was a division and then that division vote was recorded. Then what happened?

MR. NEARY:

You have missed one very important point.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Well, I am not trying to retrace every word, just the actual important things that happened. Then what happened, some hon. member got up, I believe on a point of privilege, and said that they wished to debate the motion and there had been no opportunity to do so, and the Chair said something to the effect that the six month hoist amendment is not debatable. Now, in its context the six month hoist motion was not debatable at that time, the matter had been voted on and a division had taken place. Now, I do not have the Hansard in front of me, nor am I checking every syllable, I am endeavouring to outline, not in a partisan manner, that I am interested that the rules be known and clear and that is to everybody's advantage, but there is no doubt that it was not debatable at that time because the matter had already been disposed of. So I think what is really being asked for now is a ruling

with respect to whether the six month hoist amendment is debatable when in fact the main motion has not been disposed of or that amendment itself not disposed of. I do not think we are in kind of an incongruous situation, because the six month hoist amendment or the main motion itself, neither of them were debatable at that particular time because the matter had been disposed of.

Now, I did not go into all of the arguments and points of order and points of privilege in between, I am trying to give an synopsis of the major events that happened. When a statement was made that the six month hoist was not debatable, there is no doubt it was not then debatable because the motion itself and the main motion had been disposed of.

MR. BARRY:

You did not say 'the' motion, you said 'a' motion.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Whether it is 'a' or not 'a' the amendment is a six month hoist amendment.

MR. ROBERTS:

It is debatable you will agree, will you not?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Well, that is for the Chair to rule. I am not trying to anticipate the Chair. I am not endeavouring to anticipate the Chair. I had the honour of being in that position for four years. I am not endeavouring to anticipate the Chair. What I am endeavouring to do is point out that when a ruling was made, irrespective of other circumstances, when the ruling was made, whether 'a', or 'the', or 'an', the six month hoist was

not debatable.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

Certainly the Chair will have to take the whole matter under advisement. It is a very confusing kind of situation in that we have one precedent in 1974, a ruling made by the then Deputy Speaker, now the Member for Stephenville (Mr. Stagg), that the motion was not debatable; and in 1975 there was another precedent, and I was the Speaker at the time, and said it was debatable. In 1978 the incident with the then member for Lewisporte (Mr. White), whether it was debatable or not, was not really challenged. The member for Lewisporte made the motion and then continued into the debate, and, I suppose, one could argue whether it was debatable or not. So we have all three things happening.

I shall certainly check with other jurisdictions to see what their ruling is. Some provinces have it specifically in their Standing Orders, which, of course, we do not. Again, as I said, I will take the whole matter under advisement and then rule on it as soon as I possibly can.

Statements by Ministers.

Oral Questions.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, may I revert to Statements by Ministers?

MR. SPEAKER:

Is it agreed that the hon. minister have leave to revert to Statements by Ministers?

HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is agreed.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I have a statement, an statement and, for today, it is the statement.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I wish to advise members of the House that I will this afternoon be giving notice of motion of a bill to amend the Newfoundland Human Rights Code.

Since the enactment of the Newfoundland Human Rights Code in 1969 the heads of prohibited discriminatory practices have been expanded, as hon. members will recall. In 1974 the Code was amended so as to exclude discrimination based on marital status and in 1981 it was further amended to prohibit discrimination based on physical disability. Further amendments were made last December to prohibit harassment. As well, the act was amended in 1983 to allow the Commission to approve affirmative action programmes for disadvantaged groups in our society. I am also pleased with the expanded role of the Human Rights Commission undertaken over the past few years, especially in the educational area.

In 1981 this Province was signatory to the Constitutional Accord. This Accord provided the necessary support under the constitutional conventions of this country for the patriation of the Constitution, for an amending formula and, most importantly, the

Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedoms. At the commencement of the constitutional debates this Province prepared and published a white paper on the Constitution in which it supported an entrenched Charter of Rights and Freedoms. This Province was, therefore, an early supporter of this important concept among the provinces.

Among the provisions in the Charter is section 15 which comes into force in April of 1985. It provides that "Every individual is equal before and under the law and has the right to the equal protection and equal benefit of the law without discrimination and, in particular, without discrimination based on race, national or ethnic origin, colour, religion, sex, age or mental or physical disability." During the last two and one-half years the Department of Justice has, like all other province and the federal government as well, been engaged in a review of all its legislation with a view to making recommendations to the government as to appropriate legislative changes which should be made in order to have the Statute Law of the Province comply with the provisions of section 15 of the Constitution when that becomes operative. The work in this area will soon be completed and a report made. The appropriate legislative amendments will be introduced in the House of Assembly in the Winter Session.

One of the areas in which a recommendation has been made, or will be made for legislative change will be in the Newfoundland Human Rights Code so as to extend the protection of the Code to those who suffer from mental disability. In the ordinary course of events we would have

introduced these amendments in the omnibus bill that will be presented to the House of Assembly next Winter. However, we feel that we should not wait any longer in this important area and that the protection of the Code should now be extended to the mentally disabled.

I am hoping to give notice of motion this afternoon, but I think, it being Private Members' Day, we will need consent, notice of motion for a bill which will extend the protection of the Code to the mentally disabled in all areas protected by the Code. Those areas, of course, are fair employment, fair accommodation practices, prohibition of harassment, accessibility to affirmative action in all areas covered by the Code and they include: the right to admission to public places, the right to occupy dwelling units, the right to be employed, the right to be protected from discriminatory publications, the right to be protected from harassment, and the right to be included in affirmative actions programmes which may be approved by the Human Rights Commissioner.

I believe that the proposed amendment is an extremely progressive measure. I look forward to its early passage in order that the full rights of the Code may be extended to the mentally disabled, and I feel reasonably confident that I shall have the unanimous support of the House in this measure.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for the Strait of Belle Isle.

MR. ROBERTS:

Mr. Speaker, if the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) is going to make a statement, this is the statement to have made. My colleagues and I will gladly consent to any motion which he asks leave of the House to introduce for the purpose of expediting the introduction, the consideration and the passage and adoption of this bill.

My friend from Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) claims paternity for it, legitimate paternity, I hasten to say for the benefit of the ministers and any others opposite who may be concerned. I gather that last week he raised the matter in the House. The Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) was the acting minister, or at least speaking for the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) in the absence of the minister, and the Minister of Education undertook to bring the matter to the attention of the Minister of Justice, and I have no doubt she did so. I do not really think that the bill is solely the result of the intervention by my friend from Torngat, but I will say that he spoke for us all and I think he spoke for a very wide segment of the people of Newfoundland and he is the first to have raised it here in the House.

Mr. Speaker, we have not seen the bill, of course, so we cannot speak of it even if it were in order for us to do so. But I will say, Sir, there may be many areas of discrimination left, but if there is one area of discrimination that needs attention at this time it is this area of discrimination against those who are mentally handicapped or mentally disabled.

It is not often I find myself in agreement with the gentleman from St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) but I say quite straightforwardly that his comments on the transition house episode last week I agree with whole-heartedly. When I am not here in this kind of institution I, among other things, am chairman of an outfit called the Social Centre, run by the Canadian Mental Health Association, which operates with generous assistance from the government, and generous assistance from the CMHA, and from the public, a facility which provides accommodation and services to people who are discharged from institutional care at Waterford or the other psychiatric institutions in the Province, but many of whom are still receiving psychiatric care on an ongoing day-care basis. These men and these women, 200 or 300 in fact, come to this centre and there are certain physical facilities provided, there are certain counselling facilities, and there are certain educational facilities provided, and these are the types of men and women who, I understand, would be accommodated in this transition house. In fact, Sir, if we are going to claim paternity, it was a committee of the board which I chair that spun off the idea that has led now to this transitional house; it came from a group within that board and the Community Service Council, an old sparring mate of the minister, but on this they are at one. The committee of our board and the Community Service Council have come up with this idea.

Now, I do not propose to tell the St. John's Council what to do, but I will say in my view they were wrong to turn this down. I can

understand how some of the residents felt, but I was quite taken by a letter in the newspaper a night or so ago, by a lady who lived in the area, which said that when she found out what was involved her instinctive aversion and reaction against the proposal disappeared. And having had the privilege and the job of working with some of these members, these people for the last three or four years on the CMHA Social Centre board, you know, the only difference between them and us is that their psychiatric problems are being diagnosed and are being treated. Who knows who among us, and I am not -

MS VERGE:
(Inaudible)

MR. ROBERTS:
For the benefit of the lady from Humber West (Ms Verge) who does not try to be smart-alecky, and is not on this, one out of three of the general population at some point in our lifetimes will need psychiatric counselling, and there has never been any difference, surely, between a person who has a broken leg and a person who has a broken mind.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

MR. ROBERTS:
By leave, if I might, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Could I just say something for a minute?

MR. ROBERTS:
Yes, of course.

MR. SPEAKER:
I merely want to bring to the attention of hon. members that it is Private Members' Day and the

Standing Orders do say that the Question Period should start not later than 3:30 p.m. I suggest if the House wants to do it by leave, that is up to the House itself. Is it agreed that the hon. gentleman have leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:
Agreed.

MR. ROBERTS:
I will be brief. The gentleman for St. John's South (Dr. Collins), I think, had a question which he asked.

DR. COLLINS:
I just wanted to know what the proportion is among Liberals.

MR. ROBERTS:
Oh, the proportion among Liberals, I say to my friend, is about one quarter among Tories. Res ipsa loquitur, it speaks for itself. All the hon. gentleman need do is look in the mirror and he will know what mentally ill is, and he can look at the Province and he will see what physically ill is.

Now, Mr. Speaker, let me come back and be serious. I should not be distracted by the likes of the gentleman for St. John's South, but he tries and sometimes he is very trying. Mr. Speaker, the bill is a wise one and surely this House - I do not know if it is appropriate to move a motion, maybe it is not - if it has a sense, a sense of what the House feels, that the people in this Province who are mentally handicapped deserve what help we can give them, deserve what assistance we can give them. And I can understand the concerns of the people who expressed objections, but I do think that if the right educational and the right counselling processes had

existed, and maybe that is the fault of the people who are advocating the transitional house, but what we saw in St. John's last week was something of which none of us should be proud, no Newfoundlander should be proud. The people who objected did so in good faith, but they were wrong. I would hope that over the weeks ahead the process will work itself out. I would hope that we will be able to reverse it. Certainly the bill which the minister proposes to introduce, I think, will be a significant step in that direction.

MR. HICKEY:

But we should not have to educate the Council.

MR. ROBERTS:

My friend for St. John's East Extern (Mr. Hickey) says we should not have to educate the Council. I take his point, but I suspect the Council was simply reacting to what they perceived as public pressure, in that sense not much different than the government bringing in what I thought a wrong amendment on this nudity thing, where the government did the right thing for entirely the wrong reason a year or so ago. But I can understand the Council, too, although I agree with my hon. friend, they should be leaders. He on this point has definitely taken lead, and I commend him for it.

Anyway, Mr. Speaker, we on this side support the minister's initiative, we congratulate him, and we will do all that we can to expedite passage of the bill as quickly as the minister and his colleagues can bring it before the House, Sir. Thank you.

ORAL QUESTIONS

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to direct a question to the hon. the Premier. Hon. members will recall that when Shoe Cove Tracking Station closed the hon. gentleman made all kinds of demands on Ottawa, including the Province taking over that Shoe Cove Tracking Station. Well, now that the VTS station in Argentia is closing, is going to be mothballed, thirteen employees are about to lose their jobs, would the hon. gentleman inform the House if there have been any demands or complaints directed toward Ottawa regarding the closing of this VTS station at Argentia?

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I am not sure if the hon. the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is right in comparing the Shore Cove Tracking Station to the one he is referring to now at Argentia, because the Shoe Cove Tracking Station was a piece of software or hardware, whatever you want to call it, which was very, very important for a whole range of services in the Province and at the final analysis of it we wanted to even buy the equipment to keep it in the Province for educational purposes, to have it for students to use at the Trades College or at the University or at some post-secondary institution. So I am not sure by using the Shoe Cove Tracking Station as an example as to what is happening now that we are really comparing apples and apples. I think there is a difference altogether.

Obviously we have been in touch with the federal authorities, and we are, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) and others, discussing these matters with the federal authorities and other like matters at the present moment.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for LaPoile.

MR. NEARY:

Do we now have a new policy of consultation where the federal government shoots first and then asks questions after? Is the hon. gentleman aware that it is the latest technology at this VTS station, as well as the one in Port aux Basques that is also in doubt, by the way, it could very easily be phased down, where you have the busiest traffic lanes in the Gulf of St. Lawrence and the Eastern Seaboard of North America? Now, would the hon. gentleman tell the House if he is aware of the importance of this VTS station at Argentia because of the oil rigs and the possibility of concrete platforms being built in the area, the movement of oil rigs in and out of Marystown to the Cow Head development that is taking place down there? And if the hon. gentleman is aware of it, would he inform the House if he will make strong representation to the Government of Canada to keep this station open in view of the increasing importance, down the road, of this VTS station at Argentia?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I just answered the question. We are right now talking to the federal government about this one and other

particular moves that the federal government want to make. As we have mentioned in the House on a number of occasions in the last couple of weeks, the Minister of Transportation (Mr. Dawe) is into discussions now with the Minister of Transport (Mr. Mazankowski) as it relates to CN Marine and we will do what we can as it relates to the matter that the hon. member has just raised. We will do all we can on that score.

MR. NEARY:

Be a sport now.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Well, now, Mr. Speaker, when I was trying to do a whole bunch of things for Newfoundland the people in Ottawa would not listen to us, and I was accused of being a separatist and a confrontationalist. Now that we have somebody in Ottawa who is willing to do it in the Canadian way, which is all I ever asked for, now, of course, I am accused of an entirely different thing. It is too bad, sour grapes. All I can to the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) is it is too bad. You are all jealous now that we can get along with Ottawa. You can no longer attack me now as being a separatist and a confrontationalist, now you have to try to take another turn. Too bad! I say too bad! And you are hoping on hope we will not get an offshore agreement in a couple of months time, you are hoping that nothing will ever be done, that we will get no Trans-Canada agreement, you are hoping that nothing is going to happen. They can see themselves, Mr. Speaker, going further and further down as we get to have this consultation and get these agreements signed and all the rest of it, and now I do not know what they are trying

to do over there, they are trying to oppose now just for the sake of opposing, no principles attached to it. I understand the dilemma they are in, Mr. Speaker, and I sympathize with the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), I sympathize with the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) in their plight, and if there is anything I can do fifteen or twenty years from now to help them out I will only be too happy to do it.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier does not recognize if there is a difference between moderation and appeasement, a difference between being reasonable and rolling over and playing dead. I would like to refer the Premier to the fact that there has recently been a decision by the Government of Canada, Miss Flora MacDonald's department, to bring in a new form of police, Flora's cops, to carry out certain interviews with recipients of unemployment insurance. It is a new inquisition, Mr. Speaker, an unemployment insurance inquisition. I would like to ask the Premier whether he agrees with and accepts this approach, whether he is concerned about the fact that we will have residents of this Province, and perhaps the higher percentage of those interviewed will be from this Province, and whether the Premier intends to take any steps to ensure that the rights of these citizens are protected in these Star Chamber proceedings?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

I have to laugh at the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry). One of the problems you have, Sir, is that you are falling into the same trap as the people who came before you. Now it is all that is under federal jurisdiction that the Province has to answer for. We are doing such a good job in the Province, in our own jurisdiction, Mr. Speaker, that there are no questions to be asked of us. Now, they want us to take on broader jurisdictional responsibilities. Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be Prime Minister of Canada, I wish to stay Premier of Newfoundland and Labrador. I know the Leader of the Opposition recognizes my ability, I know he recognizes that I could be Prime Minister of Canada, and I know that he is trying to get me up there as Prime Minister of Canada so he can have a better crack at being Premier of Newfoundland. But, I am not going to accept it, Mr. Speaker. I know the invitation is out, I know the welcome mat is out, but I am not going to do it.

Mr. Speaker, on the substance of the question I -

MR. NEARY:

You are good today, boy.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Just today? Just today?

MR. BARRETT:

Every day. Every day.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Sure last week, Mr. Speaker, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary) was saying what a wonderful fellow I was. So it is not only today. The rumour is out on the streets that any day now the member for LaPoile is going to come across.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no, no!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Will we take the member for LaPoile?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No, no!

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker can we adjourn the House so I can have a special caucus to further discuss this matter? I think this matter needs to be discussed. The future of the member for LaPoile needs to be discussed. I know why the member for LaPoile talks the way he does, Mr. Speaker, his conscience is starting to bother him. We provided the member for LaPoile with a brand new \$15 million hospital and now he is starting to feel quirks of conscience. He does not have to perform his leadership role now as when he was Leader of the Opposition, he is just the member for LaPoile, he is soon going to pasture and now he has to live with himself. And he knows all the things we did for his constituency - fantastic! Fantastic!

MR. NEARY:

Put a chronic care unit in that hospital and then, maybe, we will talk to you.

MR. PECKFORD:

His demands are rising, Mr. Speaker. He did not have these conditions last week, not half these conditions.

The matter of the question at hand that the Leader of the Opposition asked, if in fact, and we will have to wait to see, if in fact the intent of what the minister in Ottawa announced yesterday, last night, this morning or whenever on UIC ensures that those who

legitimately qualify under the rules for UIC get it, and that those who legitimately under the rules do not qualify, if that is what they are about, well, then, I think it is a good method. Because it is like what the Minister of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) did a few years ago here in Newfoundland as it related to welfare payments; there were cases where an individual, or individuals, were getting welfare and also getting another income. The Auditor General is going to come down hard on any government, or a Comptroller General of whoever, if, in fact, we are paying out money illegitimately, if we are doing it illegally, if we are doing it not according to the rules. No doubt there are cases in Canada today where people are receiving UIC who do not really qualify, who take it under false pretenses, false oath or whatever. Now, if that is the intent of what the minister in Ottawa is talking about, well, then, I think that might be a good approach to take. Then, if the intent further is that they save some money as a result of it, well, then, I think that is good. And if the intent is to go even further and the money that they save part of it remains saved and the other part remains to go to those who really are in need, well, then, it is going to be a super programme, in my view.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, that was not the wind behind you, by the way, while the speaker was talking, that was a great sigh of relief from the people of Canada when they heard that he was not going to run for

Prime Minister.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the Premier whether he sees any need for the type of proposal which is now being seriously considered by the Attorney General for Ontario, where that Attorney General is proposing to have video taping of the interviews of those who are charged with an offense in Ontario. Would the Premier feel that there would be any similar need for the video taping, or similar safeguards, of the individuals who are going to be subjected to the scrutiny of this new police force that is being established by the Government of Canada? Does the Premier have any concern at all for the thousands of Newfoundlanders who honestly believe that they are entitled to unemployment insurance, who are now going to be subjected to close questioning by this new constabulary in order to try and catch them out to see whether or not they are going to be able to continue to receive unemployment insurance? Does the Premier have any concern at all that the rights of these people may be interfered with?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Premier.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

No. You know, this is getting to be really something. First of all it was Flora MacDonald, now it is the Attorney General for Ontario. We are going to be in Afghanistan before Question Period is over. Mr. Speaker, there are laws. There is a Charter of Rights on the books. We are doing an amendment now, as the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) just mentioned, to our own Code here in the Province and so on. Obviously, under the law there is

protection. I do not see all these bogey-men behind the announcement that the minister made. As far as I know, the minister in Ottawa is saying we believe that there are people who are receiving money from the Government of Canada who do not qualify, in the same way as there was money being received for welfare, while they are getting another income, and that the system is not being treated fairly by everybody. To me that is fair.

Now, all this videotaping stuff, this is all new stuff to me. I will have to take a look at that right fast. I do not know what the answer is. I am concerned when any individual's rights are going to be trampled on, and I would defend to the death an individual's right to privacy and so on, and to have all their rights protected. And as I understand it, under the various codes in the provinces, and the Constitution, the individual's rights are protected. Sure, I have as much concern as the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) does on that score. I am not sure whether his hypothetical situation, or his guesstimate of what is going to happen with this programme that was announced by the Minister of Employment and Immigration (Flora MacDonald) is going to happen or have the effect that the Leader of the Opposition says it is going to have. I do not know. I honestly do not know. As I understand the programme, they are trying to tighten up to ensure that those people who are legitimate get it, and those people who are illegitimate do not get it. That is how I understand it. But I do have concern if somebody's individual rights are going to be trampled on, of course.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

A final supplementary, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the Premier knows as well as all other members in this House that what is involved here is a tightening up and the more red tape that is involved, the more delays there are, the more forms that have to be filled out, and re-filled out, the more money will be lost to those who might be legitimately entitled to receive unemployment insurance. Now, we would ask for a commitment from this government and from the Premier. I believe it is a matter of record that it was the same Premier who got up, with the support of members on this side of the House, I might say, and objected to the attempts of the previous government to scrutinize the income tax returns of fishermen.

MR. MARSHALL:

A point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Order, please!

A point of order, the hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

I seek to relieve the hon. gentlemen there opposite from the embarrassment of their Leader by quoting this, Mr. Speaker. I do not normally rise on points of order, but you are not allowed to - page 130 of Beauchesne, section 357 (x) - "deal with an action of a Minister for which he is not responsible to Parliament." Now, the hon. gentleman is next going to be asking the hon. the Premier ecclesiastical and theological questions if we do not draw him to heel. And the fact of the matter

is that this is a Question Period with respect to affairs affecting the people of this Province for which the government is responsible, and the hon. gentleman is way out in left field.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Not because I know the answers to all these questions it is necessarily in order.

MR. SPEAKER:

Order, please!

To the point of order raised, the Chair recognized the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) on a supplementary question and he was entering into the realm of debate. It is correct, however, that when asking questions they should be addressed to the minister who has some jurisdiction over the matter that is being discussed.

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and I understand that the Premier of this Province has jurisdiction with respect to making representation to the Government of Canada to protect the rights of all Newfoundlanders, including those on unemployment insurance.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the Premier whether he is prepared to give a commitment to this House that he will make representation to the Government of Canada that before the unemployment insurance regulations are tightened up to the extent that more people are thrown off the UI programme, that they will first ensure that there are either jobs available for these individuals, or else, Mr. Speaker, will the Premier give this House an indication of how much the budget of the hon. minister to his left, the Minister

of Social Services (Mr. Hickey) will have to be increased in order to meet the fact that these individuals who will be thrown off the unemployment insurance programme, if there are no jobs, will have to resort to social assistance.?

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

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Mr. Speaker, I do not even know the details of the programme, I am only surmising, as is the Leader of the Opposition. I think that the intent of what I heard to date as it relates to the revamping of the UIC is along the lines of ensuring that those who are in need and who legitimately qualify get it, and those who are getting it under false pretences do not get it. I do not mind answering the questions. Even though it does not come under our jurisdiction, that is quite all right, I do not mind answering them and giving my opinion. And all I can do is give my opinion which is that from what I know right now about the programme, they are trying to tighten up to ensure that those who legitimately qualify get it and those who legitimately disqualify do not get it, and that sounds to me to be reasonable.

The reason why this country is in the mess it is in today is that there has been money going right, left and centre, helter-skelter and yon across this nation. And here we are with higher interest rates than they have in the United States, and we have a deficit, as I said on Open Line this morning, of about \$36 billion or \$37 billion. If you want me to talk about Canadian issues I will talk about Canadian issues, Mr.

Speaker, no problem. We have a \$37 billion deficit, and if we are one-tenth the size of the United States, which is the normal assumption that is taken, one-tenth, or they are ten times larger, multiply that by ten and you have a \$370 billion deficit in the United States, but the United States only has a \$160 billion or \$170 billion deficit. So look at how much worse off Canada is than they. And even with that lower deficit they have lower unemployment. We have a lot higher unemployment, even though we have spent three or four times as much money per capita as they have. We have spent three, four or five times more money per capita in the last ten or fifteen years, yet we have 11 per cent or 12 per cent unemployment and they have 7 per cent unemployment. So something is wrong. So the answer is you tighten up, but in the same way as we did it here in the Province with Social Services.

We did not disqualify anybody who legitimately was in need and had no job, but we sent people around to investigate. The Minister of Social Services found examples of people who were getting housing assistance who had jobs and were getting cheques every two weeks from Social Services' city office here in St. John's. Now, surely nobody wants that kind of thing to go on.

MR. NEARY:

But these are the exceptions to the rule.

PREMIER PECKFORD:

Sure they are exceptions, but those exceptions amount to a bit of money. But if you can save that money and redirected it back to those who are legitimately in need, then I think you are

performing a great social function. That is my view on it. Now, if the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) would like me to give my view on the latest initiatives by the Government of the United States in trying to quell the arms race, especially on the nuclear front, well, then, I will be only too happy to answer that too, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Menihek.

MR. FENWICK:

I would like to ask a question of the Minister responsible for the Petroleum Directorate. Several of my constituents have expressed a desire to work in offshore oil and they feel that their location in Labrador West is mitigating against their being able to get a job. I have assured my constituents that their position is not taken into account, that it is not a factor that works against them. However, it is difficult for me to prove that to them without any substantial proof to give them. So my question to the minister is would he supply me with a breakdown of the individuals working in the offshore oil industry, not necessarily name by name, but at least with some indication of their current and their former addresses?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the President of the Council.

MR. MARSHALL:

Mr. Speaker, I will tell the hon. gentleman that I will take that under advisement. Obviously I do not have that data available right now. I say I take it under advisement, Mr. Speaker, because I would like to be able to weigh his

question a little bit in my own mind. I do not know whether it is going to be a good practice in this Province to have everybody categorized: Burin gets so many jobs, Gander gets so many jobs, or Corner Brook gets so many jobs. Mr. Speaker, I think I would like to think of the Province, both the Island part and the Mainland part, as one cohesive unit. But having said that, those are just the initial reactions to the hon. gentleman, I will take it under advisement. In his preamble to his question the hon. gentleman indicates somewhat of an innuendo to the effect that he assures the people in Labrador West that he does not think anyone holds it against them because they come from Labrador West. Now, I do not know whether he really meant that, or whether I heard him properly, because there was a little bit of hum in the House at the particular time. I do not think it is appropriate, quite frankly, for any member of this House to get up and cast innuendoes like that unless he has some certain and absolute proof. The Government of this Province treats and will treat the people from Labrador City, and the people from Wabush, or the people from St. Anthony or wherever it may be, equally with citizens all over the Province, everywhere.

But I will take the hon. gentleman's question under advisement, and I say I will take it under advisement because I would like to weigh the implications and imputations of it.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, a question for the

Minister of Education. There were eighteen recommendations in the report called Early Leaving, the report on school drop-outs in the Province. The results of that study showed that we have a crisis on our hands. The report said that something like 46 per cent of the students who are dropping out is a tremendous loss of potential. I was wondering if the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge) would tell us whether the Department of Education itself will be co-ordinating the efforts of the various agencies which were mentioned in the study to see that the implementation of this report is carried out?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, yes, I can assure members opposite, as well as members on this side of the House of Assembly, that the Department of Education will be taking a leadership role in trying to implement the very constructive recommendations that were presented to us recently in the report which was mainly authored by the Provincial School Trustees Association through a lot of hard work on the part of Mr. Hudson Davis, as well as Dr. Tom Pope, who is with the Integrated Education Council.

Those two men were assisted in their task by officials of the Department of Education as well as a representative of the Newfoundland Teachers' Association. Mr. Speaker, specifically I have moved to create in the Department of Education a new school attendance officer position with a mandate which will require that person to address the root causes of the

serious problem of students leaving school early in this Province. That move has been welcomed by the School Trustees Association and other education agencies that are concerned about these serious drop-out problem. And, Mr. Speaker, I anticipate that the person who is recruited to fill that new position, as well as the present senior officials of the Department of Education, will give good leadership to the difficult job of trying to mitigate against the serious problem of early school leaving across the Province.

The report offers several recommendations calling on not only the Department of Education but also school boards and other agencies, to work within their respective jurisdictions to get at the problem of drop-outs.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell)

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, when you ask the minister a question she then goes about telling us what was in the report. We have all read the report, I would like to tell the minister.

MR. YOUNG:

A good answer. A good answer.

MR. HODDER:

A good answer. The member would not know a good answer if he heard one. Mr. Speaker, the minister has said that she will be appointing an attendance officer. In light of the need for quick action on this problem, and in light of the fairly massive undertaking to co-ordinate throughout this Province, the school boards, the school

trustees, the NTA, the duties which must be carried out as recommended in the report by the Department of Education itself, and, indeed, in the schools themselves, what I would like to ask the minister is what sort of a person will this school attendance office be, what sort of qualifications, what sort of education, what will be his scope of authority? Because, obviously, the job that has to be done, and should be done quickly, would require, in my estimation, the co-ordination of both the Minister of Career Development (Mr. Power) and the Minister of Education (Ms. Verge), I would ask the minister if this person is merely a school attendance officer, as she said, or would this be some qualified person who would be able to take control and implement this report?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Education.

MS VERGE:

Mr. Speaker, thank you.

The job description for the new school attendance officer position is now being completed by Treasury Board and will be given to the Public Service Commission for advertising throughout the Province. The job description will call for high academic qualifications as well as relevant work experience to suit the difficult job of getting at the serious problem we do have of early school leaving.

I should point out to the House of Assembly, however, Mr. Speaker, that while we now have what I characterize as a serious problem of early school leaving, that problem is much less serious than it has been earlier in our history. The early school leaving

report contains a table which no doubt the member opposite is familiar with, which points out that the drop-out rate now is only half what it was some twenty years ago or so. So the problem of early school leaving, while still great, is considerably less serious than what it used to be. But to sum up, I assure the member opposite that the Department of Education will endeavour to recruit a person with good academic qualifications and professional work experience for the school attendance officer's position.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Mr. Speaker, it is four o'clock.

MR. SPEAKER:

The reason the Chair was a little hesitant was that leave was granted to extend the comments of the member for the Strait of Belle Isle (Mr. Roberts) later than three-thirty o'clock, and the Chair was assuming that in that case permission should be given to have the full thirty minutes for the Question Period.

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I was looking at the the clock and I assumed that Question Period was over. I have a question for the Minister of Social Services. Mr. Speaker, the government's job creation scheme for social assistance recipients is geared toward getting people off social assistance and onto unemployment insurance, because the projects are for ten weeks and twenty weeks in the vast majority of cases. In light of the new federal regulations which have been brought in concerning unemployment insurance and the tightening up of unemployment

insurance, could the minister tell me if this will affect any of those job creation projects which are benefitting a fair number of people in the Province?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am not aware of any changes in the UI programme which will have any adverse effects on the employment opportunities programme in this Province. If the number of weeks were to change, of course, it would have some affect, but I am not too sure that it would be absolutely damaging or anything like that. As the hon. gentleman says, the unemployment insurance programme is one component that we dovetail with through the employment opportunities programme and it is an important one. But, of course, it is not the only one and it is not to say that the changes which I am hearing about would have any affect. It might have some affect on people if this tightening up falls into place, and some of those people might end up on social assistance. But, Mr. Speaker, as the Premier so appropriately pointed out in responding to a question from the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), that is not necessarily bad. Surely no one supports any system which enables and which indeed encourages the obtaining of money under false pretenses when, in fact, the need is not there. Because when that happens it is at the expense of the poor and the people who are really in need.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Port au Port.

MR. HODDER:

Mr. Speaker, I would like to point out to the minister that the reason I brought that particular subject up is that in recent months Revenue Canada has been disqualifying people who are on unemployment insurance, and one of the reasons that they have given me is that the employment was set up for the purposes of unemployment insurance, and most of the minister's programmes directly take people off social assistance and place them on UI. As the minister just admitted, it dovetails with UI and perhaps with other programmes, but it also dovetails with UI. But Revenue Canada, and I have talked to them in perhaps eight different situations, one of their concerns is that a project not be set up for the purpose of unemployment insurance. For instance, where a group of loggers because they are self-employed cannot get unemployment insurance, so they set up an artificial situation so that they are able to draw unemployment insurance. I would just like the minister to tell me that the set-up of his projects are above suspicion.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the Minister of Social Services.

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, the programme that the hon. member refers to is not only above suspicion, it has been adopted by several provinces across the country because it is very positive and it is based on -

MR. WARREN

Is that true?

MR. HICKEY:

Mr. Speaker, I am sure the hon. gentleman for Torngat Mountains

(Mr. Warren) would like to hear my answer, because it will inform him about this programme.

The programme, Mr. Speaker, is geared to rehabilitate people and to give them an alternative to welfare, number one, and to provide for them an opportunity which leads to full employment, and, Mr. Speaker, there are hundreds, thousands of success stories to prove that.

Now, let me respond directly to what the hon. gentleman said with regard to Revenue Canada. I am not aware of what he refers to, but it is astounding, Mr. Speaker, if Revenue Canada has outlawed something of this nature because some project was set up deliberately to enable someone to draw from the unemployment insurance programme in Canada when, in fact, the federal government, the very government which Revenue Canada is part of, deliberately set up the NEED programme, deliberately set up a programme for fishermen to enable them to get two more stamps to draw unemployment insurance. What is the hon. gentleman telling me? Is the hon. gentleman telling me that the same government, that former government, that champion of rights and human rights of citizens in Canada before they went out of office began discriminating against certain Canadians? Is that what he is saying about his Liberal friends in Ottawa? Mr. Speaker, the only thing I can say is that I am astounded.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):
Order, please!

The time for Question Period has expired.
Is it the wish of the House to

dispense with the other routine matters and get into the Private Member's motion?

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Mr. Speaker, could I have leave to give notice of the motion of the bill?

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) have leave to give notice of motion.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Agreed.

MR. SPEAKER:

It is agreed.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If it is agreed, I will give notice of the motion and then we will have it read a first time. The bill is now being printed, and we will have it distributed to the Opposition office tomorrow morning if it is not available this afternoon. It is, of course, while very important, quite straightforward, because it will prohibit discrimination with respect to the mentally handicapped in all areas. I thank the Opposition for their concurrence in giving the notice. I give notice that I will on tomorrow ask leave to introduce a bill entitled, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Human Rights Code".

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Did I understand the hon. minister to have agreement to have first reading now?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Yes.

Motion, the hon. the Minister of Justice to introduce a bill

entitled, "An Act To Amend The Newfoundland Human Rights Code", (Bill No. 59), carried.

On motion, bill No. 59 read a first time, ordered read a second time on tomorrow.

MR. SPEAKER:

Do I understand we dispense with the other routine matters and proceed with the Private's Members Motion? It is motion 4 on the Order Paper, to be moved by the hon. the member for Torngat Mountains.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, it gives me great pleasure to bring forward this resolution today. In fact, I do not know if it was coincidental or not, but on hearing simultaneous Ministerial Statements and press releases from the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) and the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), I would think that this resolution does have some bearing and would probably gather some interest throughout Labrador. I will not go down through reading all the WHEREASES of the resolution, Mr. Speaker, but the resolution does have to do with the future of Labrador as it pertains to its inhabitants. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will just read the THEREFORE. 'THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government immediately start negotiations with the Native Peoples of Labrador so as to arrive at an equitable settlement and to ensure unhindered development of Labrador resources to the benefit of all the people of Newfoundland and Labrador.'

In October 1980, the Premier introduced Managing All Our Resources in the House of

Assembly. From page 108 of Managing Our Resources I would like to read comments that the Premier made. He said, 'Labrador contains perhaps the largest remaining free-ranging caribou herd in the world. This resource of wildlife is crucial to the livelihood of certain groups, such as the residents of coastal Labrador, but is also an integral part of the way of life throughout the Province. Government is determined,' - and this is the Premier, coming from the government of the day - 'Government is determined to ensure that Newfoundlanders continue to enjoy hunting privileges at a time in history when many countries of the world are seeing their wildlife become extinct.' Here is his final sentence in that paragraph, Mr. Speaker. He said, 'Wildlife will therefore be managed in a context of social goals and in a manner consistent with traditional lifestyles.' That is what the Premier said in 1980. Mr. Speaker, that was part of the Premier's five year plan. However, for some reason the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) has been given a blank cheque in this Province to do what he blinking well pleases. In 1982 the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie), as everybody knows, got up in this House when we were debating the Constitutional amendments - in fact, I would be only too glad to read what the Inuit and Indian support group said about the comments that the hon. minister made. It goes to show, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development has complete control and does not respect the wishes of individuals or individual groups.

Here are the comments, Mr. Speaker, and I quote: The speech of the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development added very little to the debate except to make Mr. Goudie sound very ill at ease with the issue. Although he made a great thing of his Indian and Inuit heritage, he was unable to explain his contradictory position.' Now, Mr. Speaker, I have heard the hon. the minister up time and time again in this hon. House saying, 'I want to fight, I am going to fight for the Native people in Labrador.' But during the past week the minister announced that there would be 'a commercial caribou hunt', I think were the words used. But, Mr. Speaker, it is not a commercial caribou hunt, it is a sports hunt. And, Mr. Speaker, sometimes one has to commend the Premier for what he says but not for what he does. The Premier says a lot but does very little. I have so many notes here, Mr. Speaker, and I only have twenty minutes, it is ridiculous. On October 7, 1982 the Premier issued a statement on Native land claims in the Province. He said, 'The Government of Newfoundland will attempt to settle all claims that are accepted as valid by the federal government.'

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the Premier on making that statement, but that is practically all he has done since 1982, make that statement. In 1982 the Premier said, 'Newfoundland cannot agree with the settlement of land claims without knowing how much it is going to cost.' Now, I can assure the Premier that the settlement of the land claims of the Indian and Inuit people in Labrador will cost money. Now, if the Premier

is so determined in making sure that the Native land claims are settled, let us look at what the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) and the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) - who presumably is the minister responsible for Labrador - said in their statements on Monday: 'Government will provide land leases for up to fifteen years to ten operators.' Now, we do not know who they are. They could be from the United States, they could be from Goose Bay, they could be from anywhere, but ten outfitters are going to be given leases on two acres of land for up to fifteen years. It is amazing, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier would advocate a lands claims settlement on the one hand, and on the other hand the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) would say, 'Look, we are going to lease two acres of land to each of ten outfitters for fifteen years.' So we know automatically that it will be fifteen years hence before any land claims will be settled, because we already know that ten portions of land in Labrador are going to be leased to outfitters for fifteen years. That was said in the statement. The minister cannot contradict that. And not only that, Mr. Speaker, it goes to show what respect this government has for the Native people of Labrador, because, Mr. Speaker, their basic livelihood was eroded by this statement on Monday. I know the minister is going to get up very shortly and say, "Look, we gave the LIA \$50,000 to do an investigation on a commercial harvest hunt." Mr. Speaker, the reason the minister did that was because I brought it up in this House about two years ago, convincing him that the only way a hunt can be carried out in

Labrador is with the co-operation of the people. But that is not happening, Mr. Speaker.

I would like to quote a comment made by the former Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth, the now Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) when we were talking about the concerns of Labradorians some time ago. Now this is concerning low-flying aircraft, which this government favours, this is concerning low-flying aircraft of which this government says, 'there is no need to do a study, we will do the study after the fact.'

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is wrong, Mr. Speaker. That is wrong.

MR. WARREN:

We will do the study, Mr. Speaker, after the fact.

MR. RIDEOUT:

That is not true and you know it.

MR. WARREN:

It is true, Mr. Speaker. This government said, "We will do a study after the fact." Now, Mr. Speaker, we have been seeing low-flying aircraft in Goose Bay for the last two or three years and this government has not done a study. About two months ago they said they would do a study, that is after the fact, so if they have done the study, why not lay it on the Table of this House for all hon. members to read? No study has been done. In fact, even the wildlife biologist in Labrador, and we know who the person is, has admitted in letters to the Native associations that there is concern, he is expressing concern about the low-flying aircraft in the area.

So what do we have? We have a government that is so anxious to get people off the unemployment roles, to make sure that more money comes into the Province, that they will go ahead and develop regardless of cost. This is the underlying factor, regardless of cost. Because, Mr. Speaker, I would venture to say that of those ten operators, and the hon. Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth said there is one in place already, and I believe I know who the hon. gentleman may be talking about but I would not dare say at the present time, but I am sure there is enough evidence to show that there will be very few benefits derived from this for the Native population of Labrador.

Mr. Speaker, I have so much to say I really do not know where to start. The Premier has said that he is concerned about lands claims settlements. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have three very important reasons listed that the Premier gave, number one, 'If there is not a lands claims settlement, Newfoundland is concerned with protecting its jurisdiction over Labrador.' Now, Mr. Speaker, the settlement of the claims of the Naskaupi, Montagnais and Inuit in the area by the Governments of Canada and Newfoundland - because you must remember, Mr. Speaker, that what is so dangerous about this, and this needs to be repeated, is that if the provincial government soon does not settle the land claims for the Inuit and Indians of Labrador the big, big danger is that our friendly neighbours next door, on the border, will be grasping at us. Now, Mr. Speaker, that is exactly why Quebec have settled the James Bay claims, because they did not want to be absorbed by

another province.

Now, Mr. Speaker, number two: 'A settlement of Native claims lays an orderly framework in which development can occur.' This is the Premier's thinking, this is what the Premier wants to do, he wants to get the lands claims settlement over and done with so that development can occur. But how can development occur when the lands claims settlement is not finalized? The lands claims negotiations have been ongoing for a number of years and without its being settled the minister goes ahead and announces that fifteen parcels of land in Labrador is to be given out to operators. And who those operators are one does not know.

AN HON. MEMBER:

Not fifteen, ten.

MR. WARREN:

Ten. But, in the meantime, there could be another ten or fifteen that people do not even know about. Look at what is happening in the Strange Lake Development, for example. This government still does not know if they have any jurisdiction over Strange Lake. In fact, this government and the Quebec Government are both fighting over Strange Lake. This is how much they know about it, Mr. Speaker. If they were not concerned about it, why would they go in there last Summer and build some cabins and put some protection officers in there?

MR. GOUDIE:

I will explain it when I speak.

MR. WARREN:

I have to say to my hon. colleague, when did the hon. member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie) ever speak in this House on a

private member's resolution unless it was after me? You know, Mr. Speaker, the hon. member will always speak after I make my comments, naturally, because he will want to get up and try to outdo me. But fortunately, Mr. Speaker, I will have the last word next Wednesday afternoon, so that will be it.

As I said earlier, I believe that sometimes the Premier has a genuine desire to do something. I believe sometimes he has good intentions, but his intentions cannot get off first base. As for development, regardless of what the Premier says, the Minister of Development is going to control it; he is going to say where it is going and when. In fact, I would venture to say the minister responsible for Labrador (Mr. Goudie) has very little to say as to whether he agreed or disagreed with these ten operators being given licences to hunt caribou.

Mr. Speaker, let us look at some of the history of Labrador. Let us go back to The Journal some year and a half ago which showed the Native Peoples of Labrador as a national disgrace, showed houses owned by this government under the responsibility of the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie), houses not fit for human habitation. And, instead of the government ensuring that those people are given better housing conditions, what do they do, Mr. Speaker? They are going to take away their livelihood.

I think the minister on Monday wanted to deliver a Ministerial Statement in this House designed to assist the people in Labrador. The minister would have announced the opening of a butchering shop in Nain which had already been advocated for a number of years, a

meat packing industry in Nain. Let us first harvest the caribou and have it distributed throughout Labrador. This is what the minister failed to do. And, what is happening is if you have dollars, 'If you have your back pockets full of fifty and one hundred dollar bills, then come on, boys, up to Labrador and hunt caribou.!' I am surprised the minister did not stop the hon. the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) from opening the hunting season from 1 June to 31 October. I have to ask my hon. colleague, the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey), who naturally is making sure that everybody in this Province is kept healthy, how this can be done, when throughout the Island portion of the Province the hunting season for big game is not open until September because before that the weather is too hot. In Labrador, July and August are the two hottest months of the year. In fact, Labrador is probably the hottest place in all of Canada during the months of July and August and here we are, with open season for people from the United States to come in, and they will go into the interior of Labrador and hunt caribou; but, Mr. Speaker, within four hours - the Minister of Health can verify this - within four hours, due to the heat, that meat will be spoiled. And, I am sure the minister is aware of the black flies in Labrador, mosquitoes, they will carry you away in July and August, and this is the time of year that they declare open season! So there was a lot of thought, a lot of consideration put into it. What is going to happen is that hunters will come into Labrador to hunt caribou, they will take the antlers and the meat will be left to rot, because it will rot within four or five

hours on a warm day in July or August.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am sure the Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development (Mr. Goudie) is going to support my resolution, I am sure he will, because there is nothing in the resolution to prevent him from supporting it. I am sure he appreciates the fact that the Native people deserve more recognition than they get, and I suggest to the hon. minister: Do not worry about your colleagues in Cabinet. You may have taken an oath of solidarity but please, not at the expense of the people of Labrador by going ahead with this sports hunt. It is not a commercial hunt. And there was no consultation, Mr. Speaker. The Minister of Culture, Recreation and Youth (Mr. Simms) - I have to bring his name up once in a while, he is a good old buddy of mine -

MR. SIMMS:

Do not tell anybody that!

MR. WARREN:

He said last year in this hon. House that before any decisions were made there would be an annual meeting with the Labrador Inuit Association. In fact, Mr. Speaker, he noted that in his Ministerial Statement, and then they go ahead and make a decision without consulting with them.

MR. MATTHEWS:

They are all in favour of it.

MR. WARREN:

The hon. the member for Grand Bank says they are all in favour of it? I will venture to say, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. gentleman from Grand Bank should take the telephone directory for Labrador and make five calls at random to

the communities Northward from Rigolet and I could bet the hon. member would not find one person in favour of it. But if he made calls to ten or twelve businesses in Goose Bay who are flunkeys for this government, he will find lots of reasons why they are in favour. If he will call Harold Marshall of the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Development Corporation, he will agree with it. Mr. Speaker, any of those people will agree with it. I understand that Mr. Marshall and the Happy Valley - Goose Bay Development Corporation have a mandate -

MR. SIMMS:

What about Bart Jack?

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. the minister said, 'What about Bart Jack?' I would say to the hon. the minister that I believe Bart Jack is a nice, respectable individual, I have no qualms about that, Mr. Speaker, but it is not Bart Jack's wish to go ahead with this project, it is the government that is forcing him into it and using him as a scapegoat. That is what is happening, Mr. Speaker!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

MR. WARREN:

This government is using Bart Jack as a scapegoat and saying, 'Look, Native people are involved because Bart Jack is involved with the Native people. But, Mr. Speaker, for the past three and one-half years, this government has been prodding and prodding until finally they have Bart Jack won over and now they are using him as a Native who is going to be one of the outfitters and, Mr. Speaker, the Indians in North West River, in Sheshatshit and in Davis Inlet

do not buy this. Ask the Native people, ask Ray Penashua, ask William Henderson what they think of this proposal and what they think of Bart Jack being one of the operators.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Oh, oh!

Mr. Speaker, I know my time is coming to a close and I have much more to say.

MR. SIMMS:

We are waiting.

MR. WARREN:

Mr. Newbridge, the wildlife biologist, said, because of insufficient study there are presently no statistics to show that a caribou harvest can be commercially viable. Now, we just lost some 10,000 caribou crossing a river between Quebec and Labrador. Out of a total of 300,000 caribou, that may not be a big loss. But once operators begin going into the interior, in order to get in there those operators will require a plane or a helicopter. Now, Mr. Speaker, how else would you get in in the Wintertime but by skidoo? Easy enough. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister does not understand that not very many of the Native people have aircraft. They use skidoos if they can afford them, if not, some of them still use dog-teams to get in there after the caribou. These are the Native people who do not have much money in their pockets to pay for sports hunts and the like.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please! The hon. member's time has elapsed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. SPEAKER:

Does the hon. member have time to continue by leave?

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

No leave.

MR. CHAIRMAN:

The hon. Minister of Rural, Agricultural and Northern Development.

MR. GOUDIE:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. WARREN:

No co-operation.

MR. GOUDIE:

Well, as the hon. gentlemen said, he has time to sum up at the end of the debate and I assume he will continue with his points at that particular time. But, in the meantime, there are other comments that need to be made and I would like to make a few if I may. I realize it is a private member's motion and being a minister I am not considered a private member, I guess, but, nevertheless, since a number of his particular remarks were directed at me personally, then it might be appropriate that I have a few words to say.

Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentleman from Torngat (Mr. Warren) did not go through his resolution. I should point out there are three particular sections that I can support, that I have no problem with: 'Whereas the Lower Churchill and other resource developments in Labrador should proceed in an efficient fashion; Whereas aboriginal land claims remain unresolved and a fair and equitable land claims settlement is important to improve the status of our aboriginal peoples;' and the other one I can agree with -

well, cannot agree with but certainly bring attention to - 'And whereas government has arbitrarily decided to harvest the George's River caribou herd without consultation with the Labrador people; THEREFORE be it resolved.' The hon. gentleman, in my opinion, seems to be completely misguided in his debate. It is also my opinion that this particular resolution is irrelevant to the situation as it exists today. Now, maybe, five, six or seven years ago, before the hon. gentleman was a member, it may have been relevant in certain of its points, but certainly not as it stands today. Some of the comments he made I would like to refer to briefly. He referred to a document put out by this government in 1980, I think it was - I do not have a copy with me here - Managing All Our Resources, and went on to state in relation to the caribou herd that it is being discussed and debated upon and so on, the one that migrates between Labrador and Quebec, the George's River caribou herd, and I think he said that we gave the Minister of Development (Mr. Windsor) a blank cheque with which to do what he blinking well wanted. Now I am not sure what he meant by that statement. I assume he was referring to the statement that was made in this hon. House on Monday by the Minister of Development, and made by me at the same time on Monday in Happy Valley-Goose Bay. That particular statement, Mr. Speaker, gives the residents of Labrador, be they native or non-native, the opportunity to take advantage of a resource that we have that is managed as well as it can be under the circumstances, two governments, two jurisdictions in terms of provincial governments being responsible, with the Native

interests in Quebec and in Labrador being a part of that whole management system as well. When you are talking of a herd of 350 or so thousand animals, you are talking of a significant resource. And there has been consultation. Contrary to what the hon. gentleman says here in his resolution, there has been consultation over the years not so much by me personally travelling through the coastal communities and asking for input but by groups such as the former Labrador Resources Advisory Council. They discussed with community groups and individuals along the North coast and the South coast the matter of the George's River caribou herd, that resource itself. And so did the wildlife biologist, the gentlemen to whom he referred in his debate, one of the most, if not the most confident wildlife biologists we have in our Province as it relates to caribou, and the information and knowledge he has about not just that herd but the biological aspects of caribou itself. Consultation had been put in place, Mr. Speaker, not based only on that consultation but other factors as well, and the decision made. Now the hon. gentleman, I think, may have again put his foot in his mouth but not as it relates to this government or to me or to any other member of the House of Assembly. I am not sure if I am going to quote him correctly, but the intent, I think, is referring to one Mr. Bart Jack who is a former employee of my department, as a matter of fact, as is the hon. member for Torngat (Mr. Warren); he worked for this department for a few years and for reasons that I will not allude to left the department, but in relation to Mr. Jack he says we have twisted Bart Jack around to

government's side or something like that. I am not sure if he is suggesting that because Mr. Jack worked for this department that he is no longer a Native person of Labrador or in Labrador. I think he made the suggestion that I am no longer a Native person in or from Labrador because I am sitting on the government side of the House and doing what I can to try to bring about some improvements in Labrador. I do not know if the same comment was made here on Monday or not, but my comment in Goose Bay was that there is a proposal in already from a Native group - as it turns out in this particular case it is Innu Limited - for an outfitters license and it would be my hope that that particular group would receive the first outfitters license from this government. But that is only my hope, Mr. Speaker, and if that is not the way it goes, well, that is fine. The applications, the proposals are going to be dealt with on a rational, viable basis and we would certainly encourage all Native groups and individuals in Labrador to take advantage of that resource and receive some benefits from it. Just as one example, Mr. Speaker, of what can be done, and this relates to a commercial hunt, the information which the hon. gentleman withheld from certain comments that he has made in the media this week, so I will explain again what is going on. I think his suggestion was, I did not see it so I only have it second-hand, he can correct me, what I understand him to have said was that we should have announced a commercial caribou hunt before we announced a sports hunt. That is what I understand. Now if that is correct, Mr. Speaker, I again have to remind the hon. gentleman that at the beginning of this fiscal year we are into now,

1984-85, I think we provided in excess, as he said, of \$50,000 from the Native People's Agreement to the Labrador Inuit Association to do a detailed feasibility study. They are into that study now. Now, I am not going to bring undue pressure to bear on the LIA and say, 'You have to have that study in within six months of receiving funding.' They have as much time as they want from my perspective to do the study and make sure that what they are looking at is a practical, viable alternative to harvest the resource, take advantage of the resource they have now. Country Food Store, as I understand it, was the name of the project which possibly will go ahead, and because of funding from the Native Development Corporation in Ottawa - obviously lots of funding available there - and from the Native People's Agreement, if they so desire they can go ahead and prosecute not only a sports hunt, or take advantage of a sports hunt as it was announced, but also get into a commercial harvest as well. Just let me illustrate, Mr. Speaker, what can happen in that kind of a situation. Three years ago I had the good fortune to visit Povungituk in the Northwest Territories and talk to a native gentleman there who has the rights to harvest a certain number of reindeer, which are very close cousins to caribou, in that part of the Northwest territories to sell on the open market. He has these rights. Each year up until that time - I have not talked to him since, so I can only assume that it has been going the same way - each year that gentleman markets 45,000 pounds of reindeer meat. Now, they only have a very small resource in that particular part of the Northwest Territories as compared to the resource that

we have in this Province. That is a Native person employing fellow Native peoples and putting a good product on the market. Now, this is what we funded, or at least the study leading up to this, hopefully, eventually, is what we funded at the beginning of the fiscal year. Now, all I am suggesting to the hon. gentleman is if he is going to make statements to the public, to the hon. House, wherever, that at least he provide information that the public can use to make up its own mind on whether or not we are into a fair situation or an unfair situation. He is losing his credibility by not providing information, and deliberately withholding it, if I can make that suggestion.

So, Mr. Speaker, in relation to the caribou herd itself I think all of the alternatives have been examined, have been looked at, and have been analyzed and we have taken what we consider to be an appropriate and the best step that we could have taken at this particular time. Now in ten years if we have made a wrong decision in what we have done this week and look back - hindsight is always grand stuff - if we can look back and say, "Okay, we made a mistake," then we have made that mistake. But if we do not make a decision we are not going to be in a position to make a mistake in the first place, Mr. Speaker. So we are trying to proceed as best we can.

Now in relation to land claims, Mr. Speaker, this is an extremely complicated topic that could be discussed by any member of this hon. Legislature today, tomorrow and on into infinity just about. Again, during this same trip to the Northwest Territories that I

referred to earlier, I visited Copper Mine, as well, where the national organization - I forget what it was called then - of the Inuit people of Canada were meeting to discuss some of their concerns on a national basis, and some of their priorities and so on. And at that particular conference when I happened to walk in the room at the invitation of one of the territorial MLAs, there was a lady from Labrador, who was at that time representing the Labrador Inuit Association - I will not name her, but the hon. gentleman knows who it is - putting a resolution to the floor calling for the Government of this Province to outline its position on Native land claims in Labrador - a good, valid, simple question, Are you in favour of it or are you not in favour of it? As it turned out, I had a copy of that particular statement in this pocket right here and asked permission from the conference to outline our policy. I was completely turned down flat, they had no interest in hearing it. So the only alternative was that the next day when I could get the attention of the media in that part of our country, I outlined the policy of this government, and that policy recognizes valid Aboriginal rights claims on the part of the Inuit people and the Innu people of Labrador. We do not recognize legitimate land claims on the Island part of the Province.

So this is now all part and parcel of a package known as constitutional discussions. For the past couple of years I have had the privilege and the honour of being involved in discussions as it relates to Aboriginal rights under the Constitution, and I look forward to other meetings coming

up, I believe in December, if plans, as they are right now, fall into place.

The national groups, such as the Assembly of First Nations, the ICNI, the Inuit Committee on National Issues, the Metis Associations and so on, will sit down at the table, in the case in December, with ministers of the various jurisdictions, and eventually with first ministers from across Canada, to discuss on an equal basis with these leaders their concerns and their aspirations. And at the first First Ministers Conference the Premier made his statement as it relates to Native land claims in which we expressed the desire, the intent, and the willingness, and the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) I believe at one point recently, in the last five or six years, was involved in a legal capacity with one or both of the groups in Labrador, advising them on various matters as it relates to their land claims, and supported that particular movement, I understand, at the time. But all of these national organizations which have representation from the provinces and from the Territories, in this case in Newfoundland and Labrador, they deal on the one hand with the ICNI and on the other hand with the Assembly of First Nations, I believe it is, in their attempts to try and reach constitutional accord on the issues which they are concerned about.

In any event, the concerns of the Native people where agreements or treaties are already in place across the country, as I understand their position, have to be entrenched in the Constitution, and any future settlements on land claims or Aboriginal rights,

whatever you want to call them, have to be entrenched in the Constitution as well. And these are matters which are being debated right now and will continue to be debated, as I understand it, for at least the next three years, and further down the road, possibly. I will just read a portion of what the Premier had to say about land claims in Labrador in his Ministerial Statement of October 7, 1980 - it has already been presented to the House: "The government approaches these land claims negotiations in a positive and receptive manner. The attitude can best be summed up by quoting from a statement I made last year," which would have been 1979, "regarding resource development in Labrador. The special relationship of the people to the land must be accounted for. The traditional lifestyle of Labrador based on the harvesting of renewable resources, fishing, hunting, trapping, etc., requires a sensitive and symbiotic relationship between man and his delicate Northern environment. That relationship permeates almost every aspect of the society and culture of Labrador and has to be accounted for in future developments. However, we must also recognize the challenges, opportunities and rewards of new lifestyles which can be ours through a rational programme of resource development."

That, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker, is a very positive statement. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, we have indicated to the Labrador Inuit Association, to the Naskaupi/Montagnais Inuit Association, and to the federal government, that we are ready to sit down now, today, and begin negotiating land claims, Aboriginal rights, in Labrador,

where we recognize that there are valid claims. Now what can be any more positive than that, Mr. Speaker? What can be any more positive?

MR. BARRY:

You have to tell the federal government that.

MR. GOUDIE:

The federal government has been told that. All I am suggesting to the hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) and his colleague from Torngat Mountains is that we are ready, willing, and able and more than anxious to go ahead.

Now, if the Native Peoples themselves are not ready to go ahead that is their business, their problem. We are now waiting on them to begin .

MR. BARRY:

They want the Government of the Government of Canada to act on their behalf in the negotiations.

MR. GOUDIE:

Then they have an argument with the Government of Canada, I would suggest.

MR. BARRY:

You do as well.

MR. GOUDIE:

We have told the Government of Canada, Mr. Speaker, that we are ready to go. The first problem that had to be dealt with from our perspective in relation to Aboriginal rights or land claims settlements, was that the federal government and the provincial government, since this Province finds itself in a unique situation as it relates to Native peoples, had to figure out which jurisdiction was responsible for what?

MR. BARRY:

Did you make representation to the new government on this? Did you ask them to get together with you?

MR. GOUDIE:

I normally would not make a direct representation myself to the new government, it would be done through Intergovernmental Affairs. Whether or not the Premier has, I do not know.

MR. BARRY:

But, in other words, you are the minister responsible for these people.

MR. WARREN:

David Crombie was up in Goose Bay last week.

MR. GOUDIE:

David Crombie was in Goose Bay, my counterpart out of Ottawa, and he was also in St. John's.

MR. WARREN:

Did you talk to him about it?.

MR. GOUDIE:

If the hon. gentleman will please restrain himself I will explain exactly what happened. I met the hon. David Crombie here in St. John's last Friday, as a matter of fact, and I mentioned a number of things to him, one of which was land claims, or Aboriginal rights, whatever you want to call it, and the other was the fact that the two Native Peoples agreements, the one for Conne River and the one for Labrador, have a little over a year left before they expire, and so we have to start discussions in those areas. We talked about low-level flying as it relates to not only caribou, Mr. Speaker, as the hon. gentleman over there would suggest, but also as it relates to the human population of Labrador, and the concerns we

have. As a matter of fact, in an effort of co-operation and everything else, we have agreed to meet on either December 17 or 18, in Ottawa, to discuss these very real concerns, plus additional concerns. So the hon. Leader of the Opposition does not have to be concerned about the federal government not being made aware of precisely what the position of this government is on any matters as it relates to Native Peoples. That will also be brought forward at the Ministers Conferences on December 17 and 18 dealing with Aboriginal rights under the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, I realize I have to sum up very quickly. I wanted to deal with other matters that my colleague from Labrador raised in his remarks, but unfortunately I do not have time. I do want to say, though, that in many of the 'whereases' the points the hon. gentleman raises are valid. There is one here that gives me a great deal of difficulty - let me see if I can find it - "AND WHEREAS recent studies have shown the quality of life of our Native Peoples is a national disgrace." Mr. Speaker, nothing can be further from the truth. There are difficulties in Labrador, there are difficulties in Conne River, there are difficulties wherever Native or Aboriginal peoples reside. These difficulties are being addressed, money is in place, and there will be more money down the road. The hon. gentlemen surely must concede that housing programmes, the retail stores, education programmes, health programmes and all the other matters are going ahead, and there are clinics on the Coast of Labrador. I obviously do not have time to get into all of the details, but I do have to say one

thing, Mr. Speaker, and that is that the action of this government, the administration led by our present Premier, has obviously shown concern for Native peoples at the community level, at the Constitutional level and in other areas coming up, such as low-level flying activity etc.. We have gone beyond taking that first step, have shown our concern, are acting upon that concern and therefore, Mr. Speaker, this motion by the hon. the gentleman representing Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is redundant, irrelevant and I cannot support it.

MR. SPEAKER (Aylward):

Order, please!

The hon. the member's time has elapsed.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER:

The hon. the Leader of the Opposition.

MR. BARRY:

Mr. Speaker, the hon. minister is a gentleman and I like him, and, I would say, Mr. Speaker, that everybody in the House likes this gentleman - no, the minister should not go away because I am afraid that my next statement he will not like as much, and that is, Mr. Speaker, that it is with great regret, listening to the minister here today, that I have to say that the minister should be condemned for the way in which he has permitted the other members opposite, and the Cabinet and the Premier, to show a pattern of continued neglect with respect to the Native people of Labrador.

MR. SIMMS:

I am sure you know something about

it.

MR. BARRY:

The Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) says I know something about it. I will tell him now what I know about it: One of the saddest things that I heard any member ever say in this House was said by the hon. minister a few moments ago when he got up and he said that he did not know whether the Premier of this Province had made representation yet to the new federal government in Ottawa. We heard the Premier say that he has supplied a document with respect to the burning issues of the day in this Province, and that minister says he does not know whether Native land claims, whether Aboriginal rights, whether the sordid conditions in which the Native peoples of Labrador are living, whether this was a matter on which representation was made to the new Prime Minister. I say to the minister opposite he should be ashamed if he does not know what is in that document that has gone up to the new Prime Minister.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask the minister if he will do certain things. I ask him whether he will commit himself to tabling the representation which he is going to make to the meeting of ministers on the Constitutional and Aboriginal land claims? Will he table it in this House? Will the minister make representation to the Premier to have this tabled in the House? The minister says he cannot, the Premier has to do that. Mr. Speaker, the Premier of this Province has stood up in this House many times and said how proud he is that he has met his election promises and he has listed, I think, some nineteen promises that he has met, that he

has fulfilled. One of them, of course, we all know about, the promise to create 42,000 new jobs. The 44,000 unemployed Newfoundlanders and Labradorians know how that election promise was kept. He stood up in the House as well, Mr. Speaker, and said that there would be an Elections Act. That has been on the Order Paper now for a number of times, there have been committees set up to study it and we have yet, Mr. Speaker, to have an Elections Act passed. And it will be very interesting to see if it goes through this Session. He stands up in this House and expresses concern, Mr. Speaker, for the environment and we see decisions such as the one with respect to the caribou in Labrador. And what do we hear from the Minister of the Environment (Mr. Andrews) with respect to the environmental impact statement and the public hearing to get the consultation with the Native peoples of Labrador? Not a thing. Finally, Mr. Speaker, we had this Premier use concern for the Native peoples and settlement of Aboriginal land claims as a plank when he first ran as Premier and, Mr. Speaker, all we have seen since is lip service, words, words and more words but no action. We see the Premier and we see members opposite attempt to pass over the responsibility to the Government of Canada, yet, they will not even make representation to the Government of Canada on this point. Mr. Speaker, if there is any reason why government should engage in more than lip service, this report that was prepared by Doctor K. Watton a few years ago contains more than I can ever say to this House to justify why immediate and urgent action is needed to deal with Aboriginal land claims, because that is the

only way in which the Native peoples of Labrador will be supplied with power, and having real power in the hands of our Native people is the only way in which they will ensure that their concerns are met. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is all too easy for all of us in this House, because of the pressure of other concerns, because of representations of other individuals to ignore legitimate claims by various interest groups. We have a relatively small group here, Mr. Speaker, in terms of population but not small in terms of the moral claims that they have on this government and on this Province. Mr. Speaker, when I was a member opposite I tried and I suggested on a number of occasions that there should be a special task force set up to delve into it. And the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands (Mr. Simms) knows that that is the truth and that is the case. As a matter of fact, if you go back, Mr. Speaker, I dare say, it is carried right in Hansard. Because, Mr. Speaker, the condition that exists on the Coast of Labrador requires more than business as usual, and the Minister of Forest Resources and Lands can grin and smirk. Well, let us take a look at a few statistics.

MR. TOBIN:

Do not get on like that now.

MR. BARRY:

The member for Burin - Placentia West (Mr. Tobin) should sit back and listen and then get up and comment on these statistics that are contained in this report of Dr. Watton and see if this is something to be proud of, for any of us to be proud of. I am ashamed, Mr. Speaker, to be a Newfoundlander when I see these

statistics and I see that our government is not doing anything to deal with them.

Just listen now: In a five year span, from 1979 to 1983 - now this surpasses partisan politics here - there was a rate in terms of suicides on the Coast of Labrador of 80 per 100,000 compared to an Indian rate in Canada, and God knows the Indians as a whole in Canada are not well treated, compared to an Indian rate in Canada of 24.3, an Inuit rate of 25.5 and a national rate of 14.3 per 100,000. The normal situation of these sad cases of suicides is 14.3 per 100,000 and it is 80 per 100,000 amongst the Native peoples of Labrador. Mr. Speaker, it is even sadder with respect to the fifteen to twenty-four year old age group. That is a sad statistic, Mr. Speaker.

MR. DAWE:

Are you ashamed to be a Newfoundlander?

MR. BARRY:

Yes, Mr. Speaker, I am when the government of my province permits this sort of thing to continue.

The rate of Native suicides in the fifteen to twenty-four year old category is known to be seven times the national rate. In Northern Labrador, Mr. Speaker, what do we think the rate is? In Northern Labrador the rate of suicide amongst the young, amongst seventeen to twenty-four year olds is seventeen times the national average. Now, hands up members opposite who are proud of these statistics, and hands up who would disagree with the need to show some immediate action instead of this gibberish that we heard the minister get up and talk about, all these fine flowing words.

MR. TOBIN:

How long were you in Cabinet, and what did you do about it?

MR. BARRY:

Listen, I am on record here in this House, when I was over on that side of the House as well as on this side, I am on record speaking in this House for the Native Peoples of Labrador. Mr. Speaker, between 1971 and 1980 a total of 155 adults died on the Northern Coast out of a population of 2,500, where 50 per cent of the people is less than fifteen years old. For adults, 31 per cent of all deaths on the Coast of Labrador was accidental.

Mr. Speaker, with respect to deaths from fires and drownings: Deaths from fires 63 per 100,000 compared to a national rate, now 63 per 100,000 compared to a national rate of 3.5 per 100,000.

MR. WARREN:

Because of the kind of housing they have to live in.

MR. BARRY:

I will get to the reasons for all of this. That is part of it, the poor standard of housing, which results from poverty, which results from lack of employment, lack of opportunity, lack of real power, but moreso it results from what has been referred to by other commentators and speakers as a mere cultural collapse of a people. The cultural disintegration, Mr. Speaker, which has taken place is the root cause of these statistics.

Now there are others. Mr. Speaker, I have just touched on these in terms of the risk of neglect of young people. Pregnancies, for example, amongst single young people, out of 160

pregnancies in 1981-1982, 35.6 per cent of the mothers were teenagers, Mr. Speaker. Rates of children requiring financial assistance outside their family, much higher than the national average. Mr. Speaker, should we be criticizing these families for neglecting their children? Should we be criticizing Native Peoples for having juvenile delinquency a higher rate than the national average? Should we? No, Mr. Speaker, we should not. Because to a large extent it is the fault of our culture, our activity as a people. Not just ourselves, I know that we cannot take responsibility for all the neglect and all of the problems that our ancestors have brought on these people, but at some point in time, Mr. Speaker, we have to say it has to stop. At some point in time we have to see real change, real improvement.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have here a newsletter comment from the Indian and Inuit Supporter Group of Newfoundland and Labrador, and they actually referred to a debate that we had in this House in November 1981. My colleague, I believe, has already referred to it. Some of the points that I made in that debate are the same ones I make now. There are some errors in analysis of what I said then and what I will say now. There is a reference here to the Nishga case, which was the first such case in the Supreme Court of Canada that really recognized that there was such a thing as aboriginal rights. Now, Mr. Speaker, the commentator, Mr. Tanner, in writing his article here said I was wrong on my facts because that case did not grant to the Nishga Indians what they were looking for. That is correct but I was not wrong on my facts. What

I was talking about is that the majority of the Supreme Court of Canada recognized that aboriginal rights were there. The reason the Nishga lost was because one of those judges decided on other grounds, on procedural technicalities that he could not grant them what they wanted. But, Mr. Speaker, the fact that that judge, as well as the other judges who were in the minority, had felt that there was such a thing as aboriginal rights shocked the Government of Canada into this course that we have seen them embark upon over the last four or five - no, longer than that, ten years or more. I forget when this case actually was heard. I think it was in the late 1960s or early 1970s actually.

MR. TOBIN:

Where you involved in that one?

MR. BARRY:

No, I was not involved in this one. I had the opportunity to be involved in doing some research for native land claims in the Naskaupi/Montagnais people in Labrador, but not the Nishga case. But I did have the opportunity to analyze the Nishga case closely. And I tell members opposite that we have a situation legally now in Canada where native land claims will be recognized in law.

There was another case, the Baker Lake case. Again this article misinterprets what I said because it takes me as saying that the Baker Lake case granted an injunction, but then says, no, the final result was that the judge did not grant an injunction. Well, both of us are right again. The judge granted an interim injunction until the case was finally argued. But that interim

injunction had the effect of holding up mining exploration where you had the planes on the runway about to start off and start exploring an area which involved a caribou calving ground, and the native peoples went in and applied for an injunction and said, 'Hold everything. This will be a threat to the caribou, to our way of life. We want an interim injunction.' They got their interim injunction. It had the effect of stopping the exploration and, until there was a trial and until the judge had an opportunity to analyze whether or not the caribou would in fact be affected, there was a halt to this development.

Now the point I made in this House before and the point I will make again is if members opposite believe that we can ever see, assuming proper financial support and so forth, development of the Lower Churchill, or any other hydro site in Labrador on an efficient basis without delay, then now is the time they better start talking about settling native land claims. Because I can tell members opposite there will be an injunction. It may only be an interim injunction. It may only be for a year or a year-and-a-half or two years or five years while appeals are going forward and until the court has a trial and decides whether or not the application should in the long run be upheld, but a court will, in my opinion, in the first instance say, yes, there will be sufficient threat to the aboriginal rights of Native Peoples in Labrador to, in the first instance, grant them an injunction where they to apply for one. And that, Mr. Speaker, could mean the loss of tens, possibly hundreds of millions of dollars if

you see even a delay of three or four months, which is probable, or six months or a year, which could be devastating to the financing of the development of the Lower Churchill River.

So, Mr. Speaker, one of the problems that I see as to why there has not been action up to now by government is because there is not a great groundswell of support for the rights and claims of Native Peoples. In fact, all too often, Mr. Speaker, the majority of people tend to ask why cannot they be like the rest of us and be satisfied, like ordinary Newfoundlanders and Labradorians? Mr. Speaker, they are not. They are culturally different. They were here before us. They have a traditional lifestyle which depends upon control over certain resources where the rest of us are not affected, and Mr. Speaker, they are not like the rest of us. They deserve special attention, they should have it, and they must have it.

MR. SPEAKER (McNicholas):
Order, please!

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, if I could just finish my sentence - what I would say is that we should treat this very timely Private Member's resolution as the beginning of the debate which will take place at the end meeting of the First Ministers' of Canada to deal with a permanent amendment to the Constitution of Canada for the treatment of aboriginal land claims generally. And we should make sure, Mr. Speaker, in the course of this debate that we give direction to the minister opposite and to the government of this Province to make sure that there will be the proper amendment to

the Constitution of Canada, there will be the proper dealing by our government with the rights of these peoples, so that we do not continue to see these horrendous medical statistics, suicide statistics, criminal statistics, child neglect statistics, alcoholism statistics, which will continue as long as the people on the coast of Labrador feel that there is no place for them in Newfoundland society. I say there should be a place where they have special power, where they do not have to depend upon our goodwill and our charity but, as of right, will be entitled to say, 'Stop! This situation cannot go on any longer.' Thank you.

DR. COLLINS:
Mr. Speaker.

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

DR. COLLINS:
Would the hon. member permit a question before he sits down?

MR. BARRY:
Yes, I will.

DR. COLLINS:
The hon. member is merely stating government policy at the present time. I am sorry I was not here at the beginning but does he differentiate between aboriginal rights and land rights? He probably did in his remarks, but I just ask the question.

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

MR. BARRY:
Mr. Speaker, that is a very good question. One of the problems that the courts have had has been to define what is an aboriginal

right, and they have tended to use the term 'usufructory rights', which means, as opposed to there being a right to the minerals in the ground or the oil underneath the ground, that it is a right to use the land as they have traditionally used it, which will mean the right to use the caribou on the land, the right to use the forests on the land, the right to use the water on the land, the right to use the soil, and so forth, all of which can be severely impaired or affected if you have a mining development, for example, or a petroleum development or a hydro development which can affect their ability to use the land. I think that a settlement of aboriginal claims would have to involve giving certain rights which go further than the right to merely use, in the sense that I believe there should be a chunk of territory which the people on the coast of Labrador, through some form of municipal government or analogous to municipal government, over which they have power, in the context of Newfoundland; not a separate state, but that they will have rights to govern that land, to utilize not just the surface of the land but the mineral rights and the hydro rights and the oil rights, if there are any, and the problem will be with negotiating the extent of that claim. We all recognize Labrador is large and rich and I have not heard the native peoples of Labrador say that they want all of Labrador, but they want their little place in the sun where they can control their own destiny. It is what we have always sought and, as well, we should recognize that it is something that they should be entitled to.

MR. TOBIN:

That is what they are getting.

MR. BARRY:

Not yet.

MR. SPEAKER (Dr. McNicholas):

The hon. the member for Bay of Islands.

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, I would like first of all to congratulate the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) for bringing forward this resolution. It is, of course, his obligation to work for the people of his district, as it is incumbent on me to work for the people of Bay of Islands. I think he has spoken very well and I feel certain that he will speak as well when he closes the debate next Wednesday.

I would like also, Mr. Speaker, to congratulate the hon. the member for Naskaupi (Mr. Goudie). He knows, no doubt, a lot more about Labrador than I do and perhaps more than do a lot of members in this House of Assembly. His dear mother, who passed away, certainly brought out, in her book, *Woman of Labrador*, the difficulties and the hardships that Labradorians have encountered in the past.

I must not forget my friend - I call him a friend - the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry), who has spoken so eloquently in this debate. I would not dare, in fact, try to match him because he is learned in law and he certainly has given a very excellent speech.

MR. BAIRD:

Go on over there! Go on!

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW:

No, Mr. Speaker. It is not a matter of crossing the floor, it is a matter, in this world, of treating people fairly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW:

That is the important thing. I did not mean to get off on this, but my good hon. friend probably provoked me to it. I think that we should be more sincere in trying to help the people of this Province on the Island of Newfoundland and, of course, in the Labrador part of the Province as well.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. WOODROW:

Mr. Speaker, I think, therefore, that maybe the essence of this resolution, when you take away all the 'Whereases', is to try to help the people of Labrador, and whether they be Indians or Eskimos, whether they be black, white or yellow, whatever the case may be, treat them as if they were living on the Island of Newfoundland.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to read the resolution and then comment on it: "WHEREAS the Lower Churchill and other resource developments in Labrador should proceed in an efficient fashion;" - now, Mr. Speaker, I am going to stop here. I am going to say this: When I first came to the House of Assembly in 1975, the hon. the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barry) was involved then a lot. I believe the hon. the Minister of Justice in Canada, the hon. John Crosbie, was the minister. We tried to get the Upper Churchill going. And I honestly, in fact,

thought that something could be accomplished, but as time went on we found that we did not get the help we needed from the federal government. It is another example, in fact, where they downgraded not only the Island of Newfoundland but they downgraded Labrador as well. Mr. Speaker, these things should be brought forward.

I understand - and I believe this is factual, and if not, I will stand corrected - I understand that John C. Doyle owns one-tenth of Labrador, and that was given to him under the Liberal administration of some fifteen years ago.

There are examples of where the people of Labrador could be helped but they certainly were not.

"WHEREAS Aboriginal Land Claims remain unresolved and a fair and equitable land claims settlement is important to improve the status of our Aboriginal peoples;

"AND WHEREAS financial arrangements for resource development will be delayed until title is clarified and lengthy court proceedings such as applications for injunctions will be possible;

"AND WHEREAS recent studies have shown that the quality of life of our Native Peoples is a national disgrace;" - I will be commenting on this -

"AND WHEREAS Government has arbitrarily decided to harvest the George's River caribou herd without consultation with the Labrador people;

"THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Government immediately start

negotiations with the Native Peoples of Labrador so as to arrive at an equitable settlement and to ensure unhindered development of Labrador resources to the benefit of all the people of Newfoundland and Labrador."

I think everybody realizes really the needs of Labrador. Since everybody else is quoting today in this debate, I am going to quote from a statement made by the Premier of March 15, 1983. "It is significant that the first conference on constitutional issues since patriation is focused on the aspirations of Canada's aboriginal people. While many of the other major constitutional issues we have discussed in previous conferences remain unresolved, this conference is, I believe, an acknowledgement of the unique place aboriginal peoples have in Canadian society. I believe it also reflects the genuine desire and willingness of government to grapple with the complex issues involved in attempting to meet the aspirations of aboriginal people."

Now, I understand, Mr. Speaker, that there will be a conference when the Premiers and the Prime Minister meet soon or early in the New Year where these things will be discussed and hopefully brought to a conclusion. But I understand that there is a three year span left for these things to be decided on.

In this regard I would like to reiterate some comments also made in the House a few days ago. What I am going to say now may have something to do with the spiritual life of the people. After all, what is the use of going down there and help them in body and neglect them in soul? I refer to

last week when we offered congratulations to Monsignor Edward O'Brien. He spent, I think, just about twenty-six years in Labrador. He used to leave the parish of Northern Bay and go down each year to the Labrador.

He spent fifty years, I think, in the parish of Northern Bay. I was nineteen when I left down there, so he had me under his wing for nineteen years. Although he did not baptize me, I was baptized by Father Fitzgerald who worked later on in Buchans. but Monsignor O'Brien certainly did a great deal to help the people spiritually in Labrador.

Also at the present time there are three Presentation sisters working in Davis Inlet and I understand that they have quite a job down there and there is a lot of work to be done. Also, Mr. Speaker, there are two sisters of the Mercy Order working in Black Tickle and there are others as well, different orders of sisters, working in other parts of Labrador.

I would also like to pay a special tribute to people like Reverend F. W. Peacock and others with the Moravian Mission. I know Reverend Peacock has devoted a lifetime of service to the native people of Labrador. And I am pleased that he is continuing his interest in the North during his retirement through his writing, both prose and poetry. I feel that both Monsignor O'Brien and Reverend Peacock amongst them could contribute in a significant way to this debate today.

I would also, Mr. Speaker, be remiss in my talk this afternoon if I did not mention the sincere interest and sensitivity towards our native people afforded by His

Holiness, Pope John Paul II during his tour of Canada in September. I feel sure he would like to have gone to Labrador, but time and circumstances did not permit it. It was only through his own personal insistence that a visit to Port Simpson was placed on the papal itinerary, and it was evident that John Paul II was deeply disappointed after weather prevented him from meeting with the native people who had gathered in eager anticipation and excitement to hear his message and share in his pilgrimage. It was particularly interesting, however, that His Holiness choice to support the rights of native people in his address which was broadcast. So, Mr. Speaker, it is really nice to know that the people I have just mentioned are so really interested in the native people.

I suppose we will live with that, and our children and our children's children will live with that for years to come. And I do hope that some day that we will see the Lower Churchill started, although it would take God knows how many billions of dollars at the present time.

Now regarding the aboriginal claims once again, I understand that the native people are not prepared to proceed at this present time, but they want to wait until the constitutional meetings are over. And, as I said earlier, I think there are another three years left before the meetings are concluded. If I am wrong on this I would like to be corrected also.

MR. WARREN:

You are wrong on that.

MR. WOODROW:

I am wrong on that? Perhaps I am. Well, it has to be proven.

I understand, Mr. Speaker, that the Labrador Indians and the Inuit have been in Labrador for centuries and therefore they are entitled to the land claims. I think that is what the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is talking about.

"Whereas recent studies have shown that the quality of life of our people is a national disgrace." Well, Mr. Speaker, I think I would have to disagree with that because a lot of things have been done. In the field of housing, things have improved. I know there is not enough housing, Mr. Speaker, in my district, there is not enough in Newfoundland. In fact, if you want to look at things done for Labrador look, for example, at the Royal Newfoundland Constabulary, whom we have sent down there. Another thing, we are building an Arts and Culture Centre, Mr. Speaker, down in Labrador which certainly is bound to add to the quality of life if people want to take advantage of it.

Mr. Speaker, I want to conclude by saying that last year I was one of the people on the Select Committee on Food Prices, and I had the opportunity of travelling to Cartwright, Nain, and other parts of Labrador. You have all, no doubt, read the report, at least it has been tabled in the House of Assembly. It is worthy of note, and do not forget it that that Committee was set up by this PC administration, and there were more recommendations made pertaining to Labrador than to the Island part of the Province. I would just like now, I think it is appropriate in fact, to read a few of them. For example, number one,

'That government take steps to improve the quality and availability of food in Labrador communities by encouraging the establishment of a centralized refrigerated food distribution center in Labrador. The existence of such a center should reduce considerably the need to incur the cost of flying in food products during the Winter Season and should improve the quality of the available food.'

MR. WARREN:

Do you agree with selling the stores?

MR. WOODROW:

Well, I am going to come to that now in a minute.

Number two, 'CN Marine should continue to upgrade its facilities and service in providing freight transportation within the Province especially in isolated areas where the CN coastal boats' - and this means Labrador - 'are such an important factor in the lives of the residents living in these areas.'

Number three, 'That government take the necessary steps to terminate its involvement in the food retailing business in coastal Labrador communities.'

Mr. Speaker, this is for the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), who is wondering about the stores. 'Government operated stores should be turned over as soon as possible to private operators and a competitive market encouraged.'

MR. WARREN:

Do you believe that?

MR. WOODROW:

I believe in anything that is good

to help out people spiritually and materially.

'That greater self-reliance on the part of Newfoundland and Labrador consumers be supported through making available garden plots for home gardening through the construction of community greenhouses, especially in Labrador.' That does not mean either just in Goose Bay or Happy Valley, it does not mean in Labrador City, it means in coastal Labrador and all over Labrador. And, 'Encouragement of cooperative buying of food items by small groups of consumers.'

Mr. Speaker, I assume that my time is just about gone.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

By leave.

MR. WOODROW:

No, there are others who want to speak, but I do thank hon. members, Mr. Speaker, I hope we will in a sincere way - that is very important - try to look after the needs of our people in Labrador and the needs of our people all over Newfoundland because they have sent us here to this House of Assembly. In fact, we, all fifty-two, have been sent here by our people and there are various ways - sometimes we do not always go on the airwaves and shout from the housetops and the like - of helping our people and I do believe they know that our resources are not as plentiful as the resources, say, in Ontario, Alberta and other provinces. I think we should aim, as I feel the aim of this government is, at getting the Newfoundland and Labrador people on the same level as people in other opulent provinces of this Dominion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The hon. the member for Bellevue.

MR. CALLAN:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, first of all I want to say that I do not pretend to be an authority on the aboriginals in Labrador, the people who live on the Coast of Labrador. I have only visited Labrador once in my lifetime and that happened about two months ago, I think. I travelled to Labrador with the then Leader of Liberal party, the member for LaPoile (Mr. Neary), and the Leader of the Fishermen's Union, Mr. Richard Cashin. I went along because one of my colleagues had all the reservations and bookings made and then could not make it because of sickness in his family. But even during that visit, Mr. Speaker, I did not get out on the Coast of Labrador. I visited Goose Bay, Labrador City Wabush and Fermont in Quebec. It was my first time ever visiting Labrador and I am sure that the areas that I visited were not truly representative of the lifestyle that the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) is talking about in his resolution or the people that he is talking about in his resolution, the Natives who live on the Coast, out in Nain and all the other communities. Mr. Speaker, I do want to support my colleague, the member for Torngat Mountains in his resolution.

The member for Torngat Mountains has made a suggestion to me that I make an amendment to his motion and perhaps by making this

amendment that the resolution will be supported not only by all of our colleagues on this side of the Legislature but perhaps it will also be supported by many members on the government benches. Mr. Speaker, perhaps this is an appropriate time for me to move this amendment. It is in the second last WHEREAS. The second last WHEREAS says, 'AND WHEREAS recent studies have shown that the quality of life of our Native Peoples' - and here is the part that the member for Torngat Mountains has agreed to change, instead of - 'is a national disgrace', in other words is a disgrace to the nation, let us replace that with 'is a very serious problem'. So, Mr. Speaker, I make that amendment, seconded by the member for Fogo (Mr. Tulk). I do not know if I am supposed to take my seat or what?

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

The amendment appears to be in order.

AN HON. MEMBER:

I do not think it changes very much.

MR. CALLAN:

No, it does not change very much, and that is the problem, Mr. Speaker, and that is what I will spend the next five or ten minutes talking about. The more things appear to change, the more things remain the same. You see, Mr. Speaker, during the early Spring of 1979 when the present Premier of this Province was travelling across the Province and Labrador, when he was in the media he was using very nice language and talking about all of the things that he would be accomplishing and that he would be pledging to do if he won the Tory leadership and, of course, automatically become

Premier as he did in the Spring of 1979. One of the things, Mr. Speaker, that the Premier paid lip service to, I am reminded, was the fact that he said at that time that he, once he became Premier, would do everything in his power to make sure that Native claims were honoured. Here we are, Mr. Speaker, in 1984 twelve years after the Tories took over in 1972 - and five years after the present Premier took over the reins of power here we are into the same dilemma that we were in five years ago. The Premier has done nothing, Mr. Speaker, except to pay lip service to this terrible problem. I will not bother to read the WHEREASES, I mentioned one already, but the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren), Mr. Speaker, is saying, "THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Government of this Province immediately start negotiations with the Native Peoples of Labrador so as to arrive at an equitable settlement and to ensure unhindered development of Labrador resources to the benefit," and here is the key word, Mr. Speaker, "to the benefit of all of the people of Newfoundland and Labrador." But in recent days, as the member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has reminded us this afternoon, and reminded us a couple of days ago, we saw the spectacle, Mr. Speaker, of a government doing something which is not to the benefit of the people of Labrador, the caribou hunt that was announced a few days ago, Mr. Speaker. It will be great for the sports hunters who fly into Labrador from the United States and Mainland Canada, and take their trophies back home, and it will be great for some of the outfitters, and the member for Torngat Mountains, who knows the Natives in Labrador, feels very strongly that the outfitters will

not be Natives but will be probably outsiders, probably be the Ian Strackens of Labrador.

MR. MORGAN:
Pardon?

MR. CALLAN:
The former Minister of Fisheries (Mr. Morgan) says pardon, Mr. Speaker, and so he should.

MR. MORGAN:
I was just wondering who you were talking about.

MR. CALLAN:
The former Minister of Fisheries, Mr. Speaker, knows all about exploitation and of course the former Minister of Fisheries knows what it is like to go down and to take advantage of the natural surroundings and the wildlife in Labrador. He has enjoyed himself many times down there, shooting the rabbits and so on. In what way he did it I will not say.

But, Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak at any length in this debate because, as I said, I cannot speak with any intimacy because I have never been down to that section of Labrador. I have seen it, all of us not only in the House of Assembly but all across the Province have seen on television, and heard on radio and read in newspapers the stories and saw the pictures of the squallor and the degradation and so on that many of these Native Peoples live in in their dwellings in Labrador. The member for Torngat Mountains (Mr. Warren) has brought pictures into the Legislature and he has tabled them, pictures of dwelling houses -

MR. WARREN:
Belonging to this government.

MR. CALLAN:

That is right, belonging to this government - which you would not put an animal into, let alone human beings, Mr. Speaker. There is a strange dichotomy in the lip service that the Premier pays to what he plans on doing about problems. The same Premier, Mr. Speaker, who in the early Spring of 1979 said that he would have the Come By Chance oil refinery opened in ninety days, and the same Premier who on three occasions during the Bellevue by-election of 1981 said publicly and privately that, "The Come By Chance Hospital will never close as long as I am Premier," and also said that the Markland Hospital would never close as long as he was Premier - we know where Markland Hospital is now, it is on the auction block - Mr. Speaker, the very same gentleman said, "When I become Premier I will look after the rights of the Natives in Labrador," and here five years later and what do we have, Mr. Speaker? We have a resolution on the Order Paper which is, as I said, proof enough that nothing has been done.

The Premier in one of his pamphlets that he puts in the liquor stores and different places across the Province, gives us a picture of the owl, "Who cannot negotiate?" Did the Premier, Mr. Speaker, negotiate with the Natives of Labrador? Of course not. He says, "Who cannot negotiate?" And the very first item that the Premier brags about, in this little pamphlet or brochure or whatever you might want to call it, is the ERCO power contract which by its renegotiation saved the taxpayers \$146 million over the life of that contract. And, Mr. Speaker, who was it renegotiated this

contract? The Leader of the Liberal Party (Mr. Barry) now, the same gentleman who left the Cabinet of the Premier because he was ready, willing and able -

MR. MORGAN:

Because he could not get his own way.

MR. CALLAN:

We saw how able this man is, Mr. Speaker, he has shown on many occasions his abilities and how able he is.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

We will see just how able he is after the next election.

MR. CALLAN:

We will see after the next election, the Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) says. After the next election the Minister of Justice will see that finally the people of this Province will get their just reward, they will get a government that will deliver on its promises rather than reneging on empty promises such as the one to keep the Come by Chance Hospital open, and the one to have the refinery opened in ninety days, and the one to keep the Markland Hospital open. So, Mr. Speaker, it is not strange that the Premier cannot negotiate with the Natives in Labrador and settle their land claims and provide a decent and honourable way of life for them. Mr. Speaker, we saw an example - the new Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) is not in his seat - downstairs yesterday on the main floor of this building in the board room of the Department of Health, of what is happening across this Province, not just in the district of Bellevue. Right in front of the Minister of Health, four dyed-in-the-wool Tories admitted they were in the

hall in Arnold's Cove when the Premier promised to keep the Come By Chance Hospital open, because of what is happening with the Come By Chance Hospital, because they live in that area. Harvey Thistle was there from Sunnyside, and he ran for the Tory nomination a couple of times -

MR. TULK:

A good PC, he got the nomination in a by-election.

MR. CALLAN:

- downstairs yesterday reminded the Minister of Health (Dr. Twomey) that he was there in the crowded hall in Arnold's Cove and heard the Premier. The Minister of Justice (Mr. Ottenheimer) can take all the notes he wants to and get up later with his bit of humour.

MR. OTTENHEIMER:

I would not take notes on this garbage. I am writing out an amendment, that we drop all the words after "Resolved" and add "It is time for Len Stirling." I was going to ask an hon. member opposite to second the motion.

MR. CALLAN:

Mr. Speaker, before the Minister of Justice said what he just said, I had classified it as a feeble attempt at humour and there it is. But anyway, Mr. Speaker, yesterday Harvey Thistle, a dyed-in-the-wool by his self-admission Tory, never intends to vote Tory again. The Chairman of that twelve person committee, Bob Stacey from Arnold's Cove, by his self-admission was Bas's campaign manager in the last election.

MR. BAIRD:

You had better be careful. Don't come back and you will be

out of a job again.

MR. CALLAN:

By brother Don? I have a brother Don. Bas has a brother Don. I have a brother Don as well. I have two brothers and a sister, by the way, and both are living and working in Ontario because they were driven out of this Province by this administration. And the same Premier who is keeping them in Ontario, Mr. Speaker, tried on at least two occasions to try and drive me to Ontario and failed. Nowhere else in this Province, Mr. Speaker, has the Premier been defeated twice, except when he was defeated twice in the district of Bellevue in 1981 and in 1982. In the by-election of 1981 and in the general election of 1982 the Premier pulled out all the plugs. To refer to some of the plugs that he pulled, three times he promised the people in Come By Chance area, 'You are going to have your hospital as long as I am Premier.' That was one plug that he pulled to try and hang onto the district. He did the same thing in Markland, in that area, and, of course, Mr. Speaker, he sent around the infamous, threatening letter than the Premier sent to the people in Bellevue in 1981 where he talked about 'Vote for Jim Peddle, vote for a government member, or vote for little or nothing.' So these are the sorts of plugs that the Premier pulled in the by-election of 1981, Mr. Speaker. But here we have it, getting back to the resolution - somebody suggested I call it six o'clock.

Mr. Speaker, I adjourn the debate.

SOME HON. MEMBERS:

Hear, hear!

MR. SPEAKER (Russell):

Let it be noted that the hon. the member for Bellevue (Mr. Callan) adjourned the debate. It being Private Member's Day, I call it six o'clock and I leave the Chair until tomorrow, Thursday, November 29, 1984 at 3:00 p.m.